

How I'd help people choose an insurance plan (Shory)

A public, end-to-end UX case study built as a design assessment: reframing motor-insurance plan comparison from a table to a Recommend → Compare → Understand → Commit spine, with an explainable AI Copilot that ranks and reasons but never buys.

Client Shory (UAE) — Design assessment · self-directed case study · **Role** Senior Product Designer (UX + AI) · Assessment · **Year** 2026 · **Tools** Figma · Stitch · Claude · Cursor

16 hrs brief to interactive prototype

/ HOW I WORKED

Method

16 hours from brief to submission. Competitor teardown across Policybazaar, InsuranceMarket, and GoCompare, plus a cross-domain reference from Google Flights. Claude for research organisation and copy; Stitch + Figma for UI variations; Cursor to ship the interactive submission.

Insight

It's a choosing problem, not a finding problem. Five comprehensive plans at near-identical prices, all reading like the same words in a different order — so people stall, and leave.

Decision

Don't open with a grid. Open with one explained recommendation, then let people verify it. Everything hangs on a single spine: Recommend → Compare → Understand → Commit.

Tradeoff

A little less control in the first few seconds in exchange for a confident starting point. I'm honest about it in the case study — and I'd test cancellations and complaints as guardrails against a false lift.

/ HOW I SHIP · PHASES

Frame · day 1

Decisions. Reframe from a conversion problem to a choosing problem. Assume quoting works; refuse to remove choice.

Outcome. Named the failure mode: overload, invisible differences, no credible steer, fatigue.

Explore · days 2–3

Decisions. Steal from Google Flights: best option first, reasons visible, full list one tap below. AI as an assistant that has to justify its opinion.

Outcome. One shape the rest of the flow hangs on — reusable across health and travel.

Ship · days 3–4

Decisions. Two-column compare on mobile; one honest exclusion on the plan detail; trust signals sit next to Pay.

Outcome. An interactive submission that reads like working software, not a slide deck.

Hold · if built

Decisions. The metric is compare-to-purchase, not raw conversion. Guardrails: cancellations, complaints, gap between plan chosen and priorities set.

Outcome. A hypothesis I'd be willing to be wrong about — not an invented uplift number.

/ CASE

The problem

The brief calls it a conversion problem. It's really a choosing problem. Finding plans is solved — the quote engine does that fine. Choosing is the hard part. Five comprehensive plans show up at near-identical prices, all reading like the same words in a different order. So people stall, and leave.

The decision model

Everything sits on one spine: Recommend → Compare → Understand → Commit. Recommend kills the blank state. Compare lets skeptics check the pick, not replace it. Understand is where confidence is won or lost. Commit is easy, if the first three did their job.

Where AI sits

In the product: the Copilot ranks and explains, but never buys for you. Every recommendation comes with a visible reason, not a black-box score. In my process: AI made me faster, not smarter. The framing, the interactions, and the calls to cut were mine.

Impact, and how I'd measure it

I didn't run this live, so no invented uplift number. The drop-off is at compare, so that's the metric: how many people get from compare to purchase. Guardrails: cancellations, complaints, and any gap between the plan chosen and the priorities set. The goal is correct choices, not conversion at any cost.

/ OUTCOMES

1 spine Recommend → Compare → Understand → Commit

5 screens prototyped end-to-end on mobile

1 pattern re-skins across motor, health, travel

No fake uplift hypothesis + test plan instead

