Showcase[26]

This showcase brings together three selected projects from the past few years, each highlighting a different side of my work as a Product Designer: from shaping product interactions and building trust, to making complex systems easier to navigate, to improving how design teams work. Rather than presenting full case studies, it offers a condensed view of each project, focusing on the challenges, key decisions, design processes, and outcomes that shaped my approach.

Das Capital, INESC TEC, and Miewton represent three distinct contexts, but together they reflect how I approach products, systems, and design practice. Each project is explored in greater depth in a full case study, available upon request.

Daskapital InescTec Miewton




Daskapital
Designing Change Without
Breaking Trust

A familiar crowdfunding journey with a new rule after 100%.

Das Capital is a crowdfunding platform that wanted to differentiate its investment model by introducing an auction phase once an opportunity reached full funding.

I worked end-to-end with founders and engineering to translate that business idea into a clear investor experience understanding existing crowdfunding conventions, mapping product states, aligning technical constraints, and designing the interaction patterns that connected Funding, Auction, and Repayment without forcing investors to relearn the product.

Project role

Product designer

Product Discovery
UX Strategy
Interaction Design
Product States
Design Systems
Cross-functional Collaboration

What happens when 100% funding is no longer the finish line?

Traditional crowdfunding creates a simple expectation: an opportunity opens, investors fund it, and once it reaches 100%, it closes.

Daskapital wanted to challenge that convention.

Once an opportunity became fully funded, it could move into an auction phase, allowing investors to compete through progressively lower interest rates. Strategically, this could create better financing conditions for companies and a differentiated proposition for the platform.

But from a product perspective, it created a much harder question:

How do you introduce an unexpected behavior at the most important moment of a familiar journey without making users feel that the rules have suddenly changed?

An investment opportunity evolving across its key product states.



Distribution Center Expansion AAA

Sonae MC

Current Rate	Term	Ends In
5.10%	60 mo	3 days

43% Funded

View Opportunity




Distribution Center Expansion AAA

Sonae MC

Current Rate	Term	Ends In
4.20%	48 mo	18h

153% subscribed

View Opportunity



Distribution Center Expansion AAA

Sonae MC

Investment	Remaining	Rate
€2,000	24	1.85%

12 of 36 repaid

View Opportunity

The auction wasn't the biggest risk. Surprise was.

Rather than treating the auction as an interface problem, I started by understanding where the new business rules collided with the expectations investors already brought from existing crowdfunding products.

Benchmark analysis helped us separate familiar crowdfunding conventions from unfamiliar auction behaviors, while conversations with founders and engineering clarified what needed to change in the product and what could remain consistent.

This shifted the discussion from:

How should the auction screen look?

To:

What does the investor need to understand before the auction even begins?

Investor expectations

100% traditionally signals completion. Changing that behavior without preparation could undermine confidence.

Business strategy

The auction mechanic was not an accessory feature. It was one of the platform's core differentiators.

Technical feasibility

Funding, auction, repayment, bids and portfolio positions needed to work as connected product states rather than disconnected experiences.

Designing the behavior before designing the interface.

Before exploring visual solutions, I mapped how the opportunity should behave throughout the investment lifecycle and where investors would need additional context, feedback, or reassurance.

The goal was not to teach users an entirely new product model. It was to progressively introduce a new behavior inside an interaction model they already understood.

Prepare before the transition

Auction concepts should appear before users reach the critical 100% moment, reducing the feeling of an unexpected rule change.


Preserve continuity

Funding, Auction and Repayment should feel like states of the same opportunity not three disconnected product experiences

Make change visible

Progress indicators, statuses, notifications and confirmations should clearly communicate what changed, why it changed, and what the investor could do next.

User Confidence Throughout the Investment Journey



One opportunity. Three states. One mental model.

Instead of creating a separate auction experience, we evolved the existing investment journey.

The same opportunity progressively changes state from Funding to Auction and later Repayment while maintaining familiar structure, hierarchy, and interaction patterns.

The product outcome

Funding, Auction, and Repayment became connected states of the same investment experience, supported by consistent progress, status, feedback, and portfolio patterns.

Connected lifecycle

One continuous experience from initial funding to repayment

Explicit transitions

Status, progress, and notifications communicate when the product changes behavior.

Reusable product logic

The same state model supports opportunities, dashboards, and investor portfolio views.

Daskapital

https://www.daskapital.com

Daskapital

Miguel Ferreira

Available Balance
€3,420.80

← Back to opportunities

Backed by Daskapital's stakeholders

Office Modernization & Operational Expansion

Vertex Digital Solutions

Capital Choice

Loan amount
€450,000

Term
36 months

Current rate
4.00%

Installments
36

Frequency
Monthly

At your minimun rate: €7,500 Total €107,500

At current rate: €8.250 Total €108.250

5 days 14 Hours 07 Minutes 3.000€

43% funded

Invest

Invest in this opportunity

Investment amount *

Investment amount

€

AAA

About project | About the promoter | Financial and risk information | Documents

about the project

Vertex Digital Solutions is raising capital to modernize its offices and technology infrastructure, creating a collaborative workspace designed for hybrid teams and future growth. The funding will support workspace renovations, upgraded hardware, cloud



InescTec

Designing Change Without Breaking Trust

A research institute had outgrown the way its digital presence was structured.

INESC TEC brings together hundreds of researchers across fields such as robotics, artificial intelligence, energy, bioengineering and computer science.

Over time, its digital presence had expanded into separate institutional, scientific and communication environments, supported by a large ecosystem of Research Domains, Centres, Labs, Technologies and partnerships.

Project role

Product Design

Information Architecture

Systems Thinking

Design Systems

Design–Engineering Collaboration

Stakeholder Alignment

Users arrived with needs. The website reflected the organization.

Companies and research partners rarely arrived wanting to understand INESC TEC's internal structure. They came looking for expertise, technology development, specialized testing or existing research.

The existing experience, however, had evolved around institutional structures, internal terminology and relationships that were meaningful inside INESC TEC but difficult to interpret from the outside.

Mapping the ecosystem revealed something more complex than a navigation issue. Domains, Centres, Labs, Technologies and Tech4’s were connected through overlapping relationships rather than a clean hierarchy.

Expertise shouldn't require understanding the organization first.

Through continuous alignment with Communication, Board members and research stakeholders, we tested whether the emerging model could represent the institution without requiring external users to learn its internal logic.

What if we knew nothing about INESC TEC? Where would discovery begin?

Organization first

Starts from who owns the expertise.

Works well for people who already know the institution, but asks unfamiliar users to identify the right Centre before understanding what expertise exists


Need first

Starts from what the user is trying to solve or explore.

Research Domains become the main discovery layer, while Centres, Labs, Technologies and other capabilities remain connected underneath.

We chose need first as the primary discovery logic without removing direct access to the institution's existing structures.

A preferred journey, not a mandatory funnel.



The information model became a set of interface rules.

The architecture needed to preserve two things at the same time: depth and relationships.

Vertically, users accumulated context as they moved from broad expertise into increasingly specific information. Horizontally, related Centres, Labs, Technologies and projects allowed them to continue exploring the ecosystem without restarting their journey.




As context increased, the interface could say less.

Higher-level pages provided more orientation through larger headers, clearer descriptions and more space. Deeper pages became progressively more compact because users already understood where they were and how that information related to what came before.

First level

Index pages






Second level

Centres, Domains, Laboratories, Technologies, TEC4's

Third level

Projects and Technologies





Fourth level

Single pages(personal page, services,commission, institucional docs page

Hundreds of potential pages didn't require hundreds of layouts.

Repeated content and interaction patterns evolved into a modular system of more than 20 reusable blocks, each with defined purposes, content expectations and behaviours.

Pages became compositions of known patterns instead of individual layouts, allowing the product to accommodate different Centres, Domains and content needs without continuously expanding the system.

The system needed rules, not just components.

New requirements were first evaluated against existing patterns. A new variant was introduced only when the information genuinely required a different behaviour, not simply because another composition looked better.

If an existing module couldn't solve the requirement, we first questioned the information, not the system.

About Domain

Artificial Intelligence is a decades-old scientific domain that has recently boosted its importance and impact on science, the economy, and society. Mainly stemming from Computer Science, AI has strong influences from other scientific fields, namely mathematics, neuroscience,linguistics, psychology, philosophy, and physics.
In the 21st century, AI has made significant advances, particularly in areas dominated by machine learning and, more specifically, deep learning. These include natural language processing,computer vision, content generation and recommender systems. Artificial Intelligence is already having a significantimpact on many industries, including healthcare, energy, finance,transportation, and manufacturing, and
is also playing an increasingly important role in our everyday lives, from virtual assistants to online recommendation systems. The symbolic legacy of AI is also very significant, with roots in mathematical logic, linguistics, and psychology.
Currently, symbolic approaches open avenues for explainability and transparency in AI systems. Besides the fundamental need for large amounts of high-quality data (for correct application), the growing influence of Artificial Intelligence calls for swift advances in the trustworthiness of the delivered tools, chiefly the interpretability of predictions and decisions, generalisation to unseen and even unpredictable situations, and robustness to biased data or unethical results.

Artificial Intelligence competencies, namely in the main digital technologies involved in the digital (r)evolution currently ongoing in agro-food and forestry, i.e. Internet of Things (IoT), Big Data, Robotics and Artificial Intelligence, are presented below:


Artificial Intelligence


Big data


Virtual enviroments


Artificial intelligence, Data science, Machine learning

See more competencies →

Supervised Theses

Management of Complementary Diagnostic and Therapeutic Means in a hospital context
José Pedro dos Santos Leite Ferreira — MSc - 2024
UP-FEUP

Specification of a research information management system for the Public Health Institute of the University of Porto
Sofia Margarida Ferreira Vieira Branco Ribeiro — MSc - 2022
UP-FEUP

Research data description in multiple domains: supporting researchers with data management plans
Yulia Karimova — MSc - 2023
UP-FEUP

Monitoring clinical information management in a hospital context
Maria Fernanda Silva Gonçalves — MSc - 2022
UP-FEUP

See more Supervised theses →

News & Events


News
INESC TEC presents a system for manoeuvring autonomous robots and hosts a presentation of industrial solu…
19 May, 2024 · 5 min read


Events
IINESC TEC researcher wins competition at a Robotics Summer School in Switzerland
24 June, 2024 · 10 min read


News
IAMOT trouxe especialistas ao Porto para debater a gestão da tecnologia e a sustentabilidade nos modelos de negó…
19 May, 2024 · 8 min read

See more news →

The system became easier to understand, build and extend.

Operational

Once the system matured, new pages could often be assembled in roughly 15 minutes, both in design and through the modular front-end implementation.

Organizational

Communication, stakeholders and Engineering gained a shared model for discussing where information belonged and how different parts of the institution related.


Internal teams also reported that the new structure made the organization itself easier to understand.

Architectural

The website reached production while the broader rollout remained dependent on restructuring and cleaning data from the legacy IRIS system.

Although I wasn't responsible for the IRIS redesign, the new information architecture later became a reference during those backend discussions, suggesting that the model was useful beyond the interface itself.

The outcome wasn't just a redesigned website.
It was a system for turning institutional complexity into consistent digital experiences.


Inesctec
https://www.inesctec.pt
PT
Search
Menu
INESC TEC
Homepage > Organization
A place where we actively
promote creativity and innovation



Miewton

Scaling design without standardising creativity.

Turning individual practices into a shared way of working.

Miewton was an internal Design Operations initiative created to make product design more scalable, consistent and transferable across Miew's growing portfolio of products and brands.

What started as an exploration into Design Systems evolved into a shared playbook for how designers structured projects, documented decisions, collaborated with development and carried good practices from one project to another.

Project role

Product Designer, DesignOps Initiative Lead

- Design Operations
- Organizational Research
- Design System Strategy
- Documentation Strategy
- Cross-functional Collaboration

The work was changing faster than the way we worked.

Miew's strength was its ability to design around the specific needs of each client and product. But as more products entered the pipeline, that flexibility became harder to scale.

Projects could differ significantly in structure, file organisation, components and handoff practices. The challenge wasn't to become less design-driven. It was to make design scale without losing what made it valuable.

Could one system work across all of them?

Taylor-made

- Different clients
- Different products
- Highly crafted solutions

Scaling pressure

- More products
- More interconnected decisions
- More to maintain and communicate

The obvious place to start was Design Systems.

If Miew needed greater consistency without losing its tailor-made approach, existing Design Systems seemed like the natural place to look.

I studied how established teams approached reuse, governance and multi-brand design, looking for principles that could translate into Miew's reality.

Could one system work across different brands?

Multi-brand systems showed that consistency did not necessarily require visual sameness. But the more I compared those models with Miew's projects, the harder it became to imagine one universal component library serving every context without becoming restrictive.



The challenge was not whether components could be reused. It was where reuse actually made sense.

The problem wasn't Figma.

Different designers were using the same tool in very different ways. The inconsistencies were not limited to components. They appeared in how projects were structured, how decisions were documented, how files were organised and how work reached development.


When I started comparing projects more closely, another pattern emerged: Miew already had many strong practices. They were simply distributed across different designers, projects and individual experience.


What I started looking for


Practices already repeated across projects · Projects people naturally used as references · Decisions that worked across different contexts · Knowledge that could travel beyond the person who created it

The Design System already existed. It just didn't exist in one place.

Same tool. Different mental models.







Miewton became a playbook for how product design worked at Miew.

Instead of imposing a new way of working, I started turning recurring practices into shared references. Not everything needed a rule. The focus was on the areas where greater clarity could reduce friction without removing the designer's ability to adapt.

The result was a practical framework covering how projects were structured, how files were organised, how foundations were approached and how design work moved between people and disciplines.

Define the logic. Let the project define the expression.

Project structure

A common starting point for organising product work.

File organisation


Shared conventions for pages, layers and naming.

Design fundations

A consistent approach to recurring interface decisions.

Colaboration

Clearer expectations for how work moves between design and development.



Figma File Edit View Object Text Arrange Vector Plugins Widgets Window Help
qua. 23/09 10:28
Miewton - Design system
buttons
Buttons
chips-tags
Identification
selectors
Selectors
inputs
Inputs
datatables
Data Tables
MacBook Pro

Not everything needed to become part of the system.

A shared framework only works if it can accommodate context. Miew's projects had different brands, products and constraints, so exceptions were not treated as failures of the system. They were expected.

Miewton adopted the idea of Snowflakes: project-specific components could exist outside the shared library when the context justified them. If a solution later proved useful across multiple projects, it could be evaluated for inclusion in the system.

Not everything needs to become part of the system. But
when a pattern proves its value, it can.



Lifecycle of new components and their mutations

Potential
new component

Study and implementation flow for the potential new component

A shared reference removed unnecessary decisions.

Miewton was introduced as a reference for how we worked, not as a set of rules designers had to follow. Its value came from removing decisions that did not require individual judgement, so more attention could be directed towards the problems that actually did.

As knowledge became easier to access, onboarding became simpler, handoffs more predictable and designers less dependent on individual experience to understand how work should be structured.

Why don't we build together?

Faster onboarding

New designers had a clearer starting point for understanding how product work was organised.

Shared knowledge

Good practices became accessible beyond the people or projects where they originated.

Clearer handoffs

Developers encountered more predictable structures and better documented design intent.

More autonomy

Designers could resolve more organisational questions independently while retaining judgement where context mattered.

Design Ops is designing the system around design.

Miewton started with a question about components, but ultimately changed the way I thought about the organisation around design. The work was also about how knowledge moves between people, how decisions become visible and where unnecessary friction accumulates.

If I were building it again, I would involve development earlier and spend more time understanding the technical environment in which the system would live. Components, variables, responsive behaviour and implementation constraints all influence whether a design system can actually scale beyond Figma.

Figma is where we design. The product is where the system has to work.

Great Design Ops doesn't reduce the need for judgement. It creates more room for it.

Thank you