

The Clarity *Method*

A five-phase framework for turning product complexity
into measurable clarity

Adrien Castelain

PRODUCT DESIGN CONSULTANT

Most design engagements follow the *same pattern*.

A consultant reviews the product, runs some workshops, produces a recommendations deck, hands off a Figma file, and moves on. The client's team implements what they can, skips what's hard, and three months later the underlying problem is still there.

Seventeen years across fintech, crypto, SaaS, and AI. Six of them embedded with a crypto exchange serving 100,000+ users. I got tired of that gap.

The Clarity Method is how I closed it for myself, then systematised it so I could close it reliably for clients.

What it produces isn't a deck. It's a decision, with the evidence to back it.

01

Diagnose

02

Align

03

Design

04

Build

05

Measure & Scale

Diagnose

What is the real problem?

Clients often arrive with a solution already in mind. These are real observations, rarely the full picture.

The founder interview comes first. Then I use the product as a new user would. No guided walkthrough. I follow the natural entry path and document in real time where it loses me.

In parallel, a Playwright agent runs a systematic pass through every major flow. Where my observations and its output overlap, that's high-confidence friction. Where only I flagged something, that's often the highest-value strategic finding.

All of this synthesises into a Friction Inventory: a ranked set of hypotheses about the constraints most worth solving first, with the evidence that supports each one.

DURATION

2 weeks standard
4 weeks with research

OUTPUT

Friction Inventory
Hypothesis Statement

AI ROLE

Playwright flow audit
Screenshot review
Text synthesis

Where my observations and the agent's output overlap, that's high-confidence friction. Where only I flagged something: that's often the highest-value strategic finding.

Align

Are we solving the right problem, in the right order?

The most dangerous moment in a design engagement is skipping straight from diagnosis to design. If you haven't pressure-tested the hypotheses and agreed on what success looks like, you'll be redesigning the solution in week six.

Align is a single session. Two hours, no longer. The output is a Strategic Brief: a short, unambiguous document that becomes the source of truth for everything that follows.

Six items: hypothesis validation, priority sequencing, success metrics, constraints, scope, and build mode. We agree on Priority #1: the one constraint that, if removed, unlocks the most downstream value.

Once the Brief is signed off, it's locked. No invisible scope drift.

DURATION

1 session (2 hrs)
+ 1 week Brief review

OUTPUT

Strategic Brief
(locked source of truth)

FORMAT

6-item agenda
CEO + key stakeholders

The Strategic Brief is locked once signed off. If something material changes, we update it formally. No invisible scope drift.

Design

What is the right solution, built to the right standard?

Every design decision traces to the Strategic Brief. If a choice doesn't address a finding from Phase 1, or conflicts with a constraint from Phase 2, it shouldn't be in the file.

Phase 3 has five steps. First, the Brief becomes 3–5 design principles: the decision criteria throughout. When two solutions are viable, the principles resolve the tie.

Next: wireframe and flow iteration. AI generates initial variants from the brief. I review, challenge, and push. The goal is to move through the solution space faster, spending more time evaluating than generating.

High-fidelity design is built to the client's design system. Every component has a defined state. Design QA runs before handoff. Blocking issues resolved before anything ships.

DURATION

4–8 weeks

OUTPUT

Annotated Figma
Component specs
Handoff package

QA

Inspector agent
Reviewer agent
Pre-handoff sign-off

Every design decision traces to the Strategic Brief. If a choice doesn't address a finding from Phase 1, it shouldn't be in the file.

Build

Does what ships match what was designed?

Most design consultants hand off a Figma file and consider the engagement complete. The gap between a Figma design and a live product is where most design quality is lost.

Build mode is determined in Phase 2. Three options: QA Oversight (client's team builds, I validate at checkpoints), Webflow Delivery (I build directly, AI-assisted), or Full Stack Delivery (I lead with a CTO technical partner).

In all modes: Playwright runs post-build flow tests against the same flows it mapped in Phase 1. Any regression or implementation gap is flagged before launch.

Two sign-offs before production: mine (design QA complete) and the client's (written confirmation). Phase 4 ends with a 1–2 week post-launch window, included in scope.

MODES

QA Oversight
Webflow Delivery
Full Stack Delivery

GATE

2 sign-offs required
before production

POST-LAUNCH

1–2 week window
included in scope

If I'm not accountable for what ships, I can't honestly claim accountability for the outcome.

Measure & Scale

Did the work move the metrics?

Most consulting engagements end when the work ships. The Clarity Method doesn't.

The work doesn't depreciate. It compounds. But only if you measure it, learn from it, and act on what you learn.

Window 1 — 2–4 weeks post-launch. Leading indicators: drop-off at redesigned flows, time-to-complete, error rates, early support ticket signal. These tell you whether the design is working mechanically. The business outcome takes longer to show.

Window 2 — 6–8 weeks post-launch. Lagging indicators: completion rate, downstream conversion, churn, support ticket reduction. The most common mistake is reading these at two weeks. The numbers haven't stabilised. That's noise, not signal.

Window 3 — 3–4 months post-launch. Is the improvement holding? Has Priority #1 revealed Priority #2? This is where the real business case for design investment is built — and where the next engagement is identified through data, not a sales call.

The deliverable is an Impact Report: metrics against baselines, a findings synthesis, and a Next-Cycle Brief. If the engagement ends there, the client has everything they need to act on it themselves.

WINDOW 1

2–4 wks

Leading indicators

WINDOW 2

6–8 wks

Lagging indicators

WINDOW 3

3–4 months

Scaling effects

The work doesn't depreciate. It compounds. But only if you measure it, learn from it, and act on what you learn.

What this looks like *in practice.*

A domain platform serving 90+ countries, over 2 million domains under management. When I joined in 2022, the platform worked technically. The customer experience hadn't kept up with the growth. High churn, low retention, fragmented flows across every touchpoint.

Diagnose mapped the full picture. Align set one clear north star: make domain management obvious. Design and Build ran for 20 months across a distributed team. Churn dropped from 10% to 5% monthly. Conversion tripled. Domain purchase completion went from 55% to 80%.

That would have been a complete engagement. But because the design system was built right in Phase 1, Phase 5 identified the next constraint clearly: the foundation was ready for something more ambitious.

Six months after the platform redesign shipped, they came back with an AI-powered website builder. It turned the platform from a registrar into an all-in-one product. The UX I designed for it runs on the same architecture the Phase 1 work established.

CHURN

10% → 5% monthly

CONVERSION

3× increase

COMPLETION

55% → 80%

The second phase was possible because the first one was thorough. That's what compounding looks like.



Adrien Castelain

PRODUCT DESIGN CONSULTANT

<https://adriencastelain.studio>
adrien@adriencastelain.studio