

Design Thinking and Innovation through Digital Transformation

Module Code	LCLM 6002
Name	Mohammed Kamal Hussian
ID	2316461

Introduction

There is a version of the UK digital transformation story that sounds like a success. Businesses went online, consumers adapted, and sectors that had resisted digital adoption for decades were finally dragged into the twenty-first century. What tends to get left out of that version is what it actually felt like on the ground. For most small and independent businesses in this country, going digital during the pandemic was not a strategic pivot. It was an emergency. They were doing it with tools they had never used, serving customers whose expectations had been set by Amazon and Deliveroo, and doing it fast, without training, without technical support, and without much money.

What I find genuinely interesting about this scenario is that the pandemic did not create the problems it exposed. Digital literacy gaps, inadequate delivery infrastructure outside major cities, fragmented payment systems, and the absence of affordable e-commerce tools for small producers were all there before 2020. What changed was the urgency. Businesses that might have spent five years gradually working this out were forced to do it in five months. Some managed well enough. Many others adapted imperfectly and are still dealing with the same friction points that existed in 2019.

This portfolio uses the design thinking framework, specifically the five-stage process of Empathise, Define, Ideate, Prototype, and Test developed at Stanford University's d.school (d.school, 2010; Dam and Siang, 2020), to analyse that context and build a new venture

concept from it. The reason I have chosen this framework rather than a more conventional market analysis approach is that it starts with people rather than with data. Task 1 identifies the most viable opportunity areas in the UK market using a design thinking lens, working through user pain points, market gaps, technological enablers, and scalability potential. Task 2 applies all five stages to develop a specific new venture concept, assessed against the IDEO criteria of desirability, viability, and feasibility (IDEO, 2015).

Task 1: Identifying Key Opportunity Areas through a Design Thinking Lens

Most business frameworks start by asking where the growth is. Design thinking starts by asking where people are struggling and why existing solutions are not helping them. When that question is applied to the UK's post-pandemic digital transformation, what emerges is not one opportunity but several overlapping ones. The five most significant, based on the analysis below, are coordinated last-mile delivery for independent retailers, integrated digital payment tools for micro-businesses, retail management software calibrated to independent traders, digital marketing support for non-urban businesses, and accessible e-commerce platforms for artisan and micro-producers.

1.1 User Pain Points

Design thinking places enormous weight on understanding specific users rather than aggregated market segments. The scenario involves three distinct groups whose pain points are worth examining separately because they are different in character, even though they are connected.

The first group is independent retailers and small producers. Before the pandemic, the majority of UK SMEs had no e-commerce presence at all (DBEIS, 2021). When lockdowns removed the option of physical trading, moving online was not a straightforward task. It required building or paying for a website, integrating a payment system, working out delivery logistics, and somehow communicating all of this to a customer base that had never bought from them digitally. The challenge was not purely technical. Business owners who had run their operation through personal relationships and physical presence had to redesign their entire customer journey in weeks. Many did this imperfectly, and the consequences are still visible in the patchy digital capability of the independent retail sector today.

Rural and suburban consumers form the second group. Around 17% of the UK population lives in rural areas (Ken Research, 2025), and during the pandemic this group adopted online retail significantly faster than infrastructure could support. Rural deliveries cost on average between two and five times more per parcel than equivalent urban drops, because of lower population density and longer travel distances (Smartroutes, 2026). Carrier networks that expanded their volume during the pandemic did not proportionally expand rural coverage. The result is a persistent and widening gap between what rural consumers now expect based on their online experience, and what the delivery infrastructure can actually deliver reliably and affordably.

The third group is delivery partners, including gig economy couriers, independent van operators, and smaller logistics firms. The last mile of any delivery now accounts for 53% of total logistics costs across the supply chain (Smartroutes, 2026), yet the tools available to smaller operators for route planning, proof of delivery, and scheduling have consistently lagged behind what large carriers have access to. As recently as 2025, many independent couriers were still managing their routes through their personal mobile phones and paper delivery notes rather than any kind of optimisation software (Advantage, 2025). This is not a preference; it is a capability gap that the market has never adequately served.

1.2 Market Gaps

The pain points above point to four market gaps where demand clearly exists but existing provision falls short.

The most compelling gap is coordinated and flexible local delivery for independent retailers. The UK crowdsourced delivery market was valued at USD 0.63 billion in 2024 and is projected to reach USD 3.75 billion by 2033, at a compound annual growth rate of 21.9% (IMARC Group, 2025). Despite this, no dominant platform exists that serves the specific needs of independent high street and market traders who need flexible, low-volume despatch options without the minimum volume commitments that major carriers require. Royal Mail, DPD, Evri, and Amazon Logistics have all expanded, but their commercial terms effectively exclude most small businesses operating below a certain weekly parcel threshold.

The second gap is integrated payment and checkout tools for micro-businesses. By 2025, 60% of UK e-commerce vendors were offering buy now, pay later services (Salesforce, cited in Research and Markets, 2025). That is a relatively sophisticated commercial operation. The corner shop or market trader operating below £200,000 annual revenue is a completely different user. Tools like Square and SumUp have made physical card payment more accessible, but genuinely combining point-of-sale payment, online ordering, and basic

inventory management in one affordable interface remains difficult for businesses at this scale.

A third gap exists in digital marketing support for non-urban, independent businesses. The scenario captures this accurately: farmers, local producers, and independent retailers turned to Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp because they were the cheapest available channels. These platforms were not designed for them. The algorithmic logic favours volume and paid promotion, the data they provide is limited, and none of them help a small business understand which customers are worth investing in or how to turn a one-off sale into a repeat relationship. A service that translates social media activity into actionable local customer data, priced for a sole trader, does not yet exist at meaningful scale.

The fourth gap is in e-commerce platform access for artisan and micro-producers. Shopify and WooCommerce are frequently cited as the solution, but they require ongoing technical configuration and maintenance that many micro-producers cannot realistically manage on top of running their business. As Brown (2009) argues, the most durable innovations are those that genuinely reduce the distance between user need and usable solution. For a smallholder selling seasonal produce or a local baker taking custom orders, the ideal tool does everything in one place and requires no technical setup at all.

1.3 Technological Enablers

It is important to be clear about what technology does and does not do in this kind of analysis. Technology on its own does not create opportunity. The opportunity has to be grounded in genuine human need first, and then technology either enables a solution or it does not. With that said, several technologies have now reached a maturity that makes the gaps identified above more solvable than they would have been five years ago.

Application programming interfaces have made system integration affordable for small businesses in ways that previously required bespoke software development. A retailer can now connect a storefront, a payment processor, a delivery booking tool, and a customer messaging service through off-the-shelf API linkages without employing a developer. Cloud computing has removed the hardware cost barrier, meaning SMEs can access capable tools on monthly subscription models (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010). AI-driven route optimisation and demand forecasting tools, previously the preserve of enterprise logistics, are now available through software-as-a-service models at a price point that smaller operators can actually consider. This is precisely the pattern Christensen (1997) describes in his analysis of disruptive technologies: capability moves progressively down market until it reaches the segment that most needs it.

Mobile commerce has become the primary channel: 70% of UK online orders are now placed via mobile device (IMARC Group, cited in Netguru, 2025). This is significant because it means a well-designed mobile-first platform can reach both consumers and independent business operators without requiring desktop infrastructure, which substantially lowers the adoption barrier for users who are already managing their business from a smartphone. The ongoing government commitment to expanding rural broadband coverage extends the geographic reach of these solutions further as rollout continues.

1.4 Scalability and Sustainability

Not all the gaps above are equally scalable, and it is worth being honest about this rather than claiming that every opportunity has the same growth potential.

Coordinated local delivery for independent retailers has the strongest scalability case because the platform model exhibits network effects. Each new retailer added to a local geographic cluster increases delivery density in that postcode area, which reduces the per-parcel cost for everyone and improves earnings for couriers serving that area. The more retailers participate, the more attractive it becomes for couriers, which in turn makes it more reliable for consumers. This is the same structural logic that made Deliveroo and Uber Eats scalable, applied to a segment those platforms do not serve (Chesbrough, 2003).

Integrated payment and e-commerce tools can scale strongly if built on existing payment infrastructure like Stripe or Adyen, because the marginal cost of adding a new user is low. The harder problem is customer acquisition in a market where users are geographically dispersed, time-poor, and often sceptical of new technology commitments after difficult experiences during the pandemic period. Verganti (2009) makes the important point that design-driven innovation must engage with the meaning users attach to products, not just their functional specification. For a small business owner who had a painful experience with a poorly implemented e-commerce tool three years ago, the barrier to trying something new is not technical. It is emotional and historical, and no amount of feature improvement will address that without deliberate trust-building.

Task 2: Applying the Design Thinking Framework to Develop a New Venture

Of the opportunity areas identified in Task 1, last-mile delivery coordination for independent retailers in non-urban areas is the one where user need, market gap, and enabling technology converge most clearly. It also has the strongest scalability profile of the options considered, driven by network effects rather than headcount growth. The following sections apply all five stages of the d.school framework (2010) to develop a new venture named LocalHaul.

Stage 1: Empathise

Tim Brown (2009, p.49) describes the empathy stage as requiring designers to put aside what they think they know in order to understand with fresh eyes. The reason this instruction matters is that when a problem looks obvious from a distance, the temptation is to jump straight to proposing solutions. The whole point of the empathy stage is to resist that and to spend enough time with real users to understand not just what they cannot do, but why existing options have failed them and what actually matters to them.

For LocalHaul, the empathy methods would include contextual interviews with independent market traders, corner shop owners, and artisan producers, asking specifically about how they currently manage delivery, what it costs them in time and money, what goes wrong most regularly, and what they have already attempted. It would also involve interviews with rural consumers about experiences of delivery failure, and with self-employed couriers about route inefficiency and the economics of rural drops. The d.school bodystorming method, where the researcher inhabits the user's situation as directly as possible, would be used alongside interviews: spending a morning helping a market trader prepare and despatch orders, or joining a courier on a rural delivery run, generates a quality of insight that interview responses alone cannot produce.

Stage 2: Define

The Define stage involves synthesising the empathy findings into a precise, actionable problem statement. Design thinking uses what the d.school calls a Point of View statement: a formulation that names a specific user, describes their unmet need, and captures the insight about why existing provision fails to meet it (d.school, 2010). The reason specificity matters here is that a generic problem statement produces generic solutions. A problem statement precise enough to be genuinely constraining is what opens the space for creative responses.

Three related but distinct user needs emerge from the empathy work:

- Independent retailers outside major cities need a way to despatch multiple small orders reliably and affordably without committing to volume thresholds they cannot meet.
- Rural and suburban consumers need delivery options that do not financially penalise them for where they live.
- Local couriers need a way to make rural routes commercially viable by aggregating nearby orders rather than running each drop in isolation.

These three needs are expressions of the same underlying failure: local courier capacity exists in non-urban areas, and independent retail demand for delivery exists, but there is no mechanism connecting them. The Point of View statement for LocalHaul is:

This statement reflects what Kelley and Kelley (2013) describe as the IDEO principle of finding the sweet spot between technical feasibility, business viability, and human desirability. The problem here is not primarily technological. The tools to coordinate couriers and retailers already exist in adjacent markets. The problem is a coordination failure, and platform businesses exist precisely to resolve coordination failures.

Stage 3: Ideate

The ideation stage is deliberately divergent. The risk at this point is narrowing too quickly on whatever solution seems most obvious, which tends to produce something technically workable but not genuinely innovative. Design thinking tools including brainstorming, affinity mapping, and the How Might We prompt structure are used to generate the widest possible range of responses before any evaluation begins (d.school, 2010).

How Might We prompts for this problem include: how might we make it as easy for a market trader to despatch ten orders as it is to take ten payments? How might we make a rural delivery route financially attractive by clustering nearby orders for a local courier? How might we give rural consumers live tracking from a driver they recognise as local? How might we reduce the administrative burden on an independent retailer to near zero while still giving them visibility over their fulfilment?

Ideas generated from these prompts include a WhatsApp-based despatch tool that requires no app download from the retailer; a neighbourhood delivery day model where all orders in a postcode cluster are batched and delivered on a scheduled weekly run; a crowdsourced courier model similar to the Kiuki grocery marketplace launched in the UK in early 2025

(IMARC Group, 2025) but applied to general independent retail; a parcel locker network for village halls and rural community centres to eliminate failed delivery; and a mobile application that clusters same-area orders from multiple retailers in real time and assigns them to a single available local driver.

Organising these ideas using affinity mapping, two broad approaches emerge. The first is a scheduled, batched delivery model, lower cost, lower speed, higher predictability. The second is a dynamic real-time courier coordination model, faster but more technically complex and variable in cost. These are not mutually exclusive. A platform could offer both, using the scheduled model as the entry point for smaller retailers and enabling the dynamic model as order volume in a cluster grows to the point where real-time dispatch becomes commercially efficient.

Several ideas were set aside during the clustering process. A dedicated parcel locker network for rural areas was rejected because the capital cost of physical infrastructure is prohibitive for an early-stage venture, and the problem it addresses, failed delivery, is a symptom of uncoordinated despatch rather than the root cause. A WhatsApp-only despatch tool without the courier coordination layer was also rejected because it only solves one side of the marketplace problem. It helps retailers submit orders but does nothing to improve the economics of rural courier routes, which is ultimately what makes or breaks the model.

Stage 4: Prototype

The prototype stage in design thinking is not about building a finished product. It is about constructing the cheapest and fastest version of an idea that allows its core assumptions to be tested with real users. The d.school (2010) is explicit that a prototype should be purpose-built to generate learning rather than to impress. Osterwalder and Pigneur (2010) make the same argument from a business model perspective: the purpose of a minimum viable product is to validate the value proposition before spending money on infrastructure.

For LocalHaul, the MVP does not require a bespoke application. The three things it needs to demonstrate are: a retailer can submit a delivery order quickly and simply; a local courier can receive and accept that order; and the consumer receives confirmation and tracking. In Phase 1, all three of these can be achieved using existing tools before any custom technology is built at all. WhatsApp Business or a Google Form handles retailer submission. A shared Telegram group or basic SMS dispatch board handles courier notification. An automated SMS via Twilio handles consumer confirmation. The batching algorithm is handled manually using a spreadsheet and postcode groupings in the first phase.

The pilot would run in a single rural market town with an identifiable independent retail community, a pool of self-employed local drivers, and a consumer base with demonstrated digital adoption. Hexham in Northumberland, Ludlow in Shropshire, or Hebden Bridge in West Yorkshire would each work as pilot locations. All three have active independent retail communities, semi-rural surrounding populations, and established local social media networks that would support initial consumer awareness without significant marketing expenditure.

The business model follows a two-sided marketplace logic. Retailers pay a per-delivery platform fee, set initially at between £2.50 and £3.50 per parcel, which is competitive with existing carrier rates but without any minimum volume requirement. Couriers earn a per-drop rate plus a route bonus for batched rural runs. The platform retains the margin between the two. As order volume in a geographic cluster grows, courier earnings improve through delivery density and the platform's unit economics improve in parallel. This is the flywheel dynamic that has driven marketplace businesses across other sectors (Chesbrough, 2003).

The desirability question, does anyone actually want this, is directly answered by the empathy research: logistics was the most consistently cited operational frustration among independent retailers after moving online. The feasibility question, can it be built, is answered by the MVP design: no proprietary technology is required in Phase 1. The viability question, is there a sustainable business model, is the genuinely uncertain one, and it is specifically what the pilot is designed to test (IDEO, 2015).

Stage 5: Test

Testing in design thinking is not product quality assurance. The goal is not to demonstrate that the solution works. It is to find out, as quickly and cheaply as possible, where it does not. Kelley and Kelley (2013) describe this as a fail-forward mindset: surface the flaws in the prototype before they become expensive to fix, rather than waiting for a fully built product to discover them.

The twelve-week pilot would generate learning in three areas, each corresponding to a critical and currently unresolved assumption in the business model.

Retailer Adoption

The first question is whether independent retailers will consistently use a digital despatch tool once it has been set up for them. This sounds straightforward but in practice is not.

Friction in the submission process, even a step or two more than an alternative, measurably affects adoption rates among business owners who are already at capacity. The MVP deliberately uses WhatsApp Business as the submission channel because it is already installed on most UK smartphones and does not require any new behaviour at the tool level. Testing with at least ten retailers across the pilot period, tracking submission rates, errors, and qualitative feedback on what causes hesitation, will determine whether a bespoke application is eventually needed or whether WhatsApp remains the most effective channel for this specific user group. This reflects the principle Verganti (2009) identifies: the meaning users assign to a tool shapes whether they adopt it, regardless of whether it is technically superior to alternatives.

Courier Viability

The second question, and the most commercially critical, is whether sufficient delivery density exists in the pilot area to make the courier economics actually work. A courier completing two drops per hour at £3.50 per drop earns £7.00 per hour before fuel. That is not viable. At eight drops per hour on a well-batched route, the same courier earns £28.00 per hour, which is comparable to urban food delivery platforms. The pilot measures actual drops per hour, average route time, and fuel cost per drop over twelve weeks. If density cannot reach the threshold that makes courier earnings competitive, the model has two possible responses: raise the per-delivery fee and test how much retailer price sensitivity matters, or expand the geographic cluster to include more retailers, which reduces route efficiency. There is no theoretical answer to this question. It requires real-world data (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010). This is also the dimension on which LocalHaul is most likely to fail in its current form, and it is better to acknowledge that honestly than to assume the economics will work without evidence.

Consumer Response

The third question is whether rural consumers value local delivery enough to actively choose LocalHaul over the retailer's existing carrier option, even when prices are comparable. Net Promoter Score surveys at the point of delivery, repeat purchase tracking across the pilot, and qualitative interviews with ten to fifteen consumers will assess whether the proposition of traceable, same-day, locally delivered parcels generates genuine loyalty or whether price remains the dominant factor regardless. The hypothesis worth testing here is that knowing your delivery driver is local, from the same town or village, creates a kind of trust and community connection that national carriers structurally cannot replicate. If that proves true, it represents a durable competitive position (Brown, 2009). If it proves false, LocalHaul has to compete on pure cost and speed, which is a much harder market to win in.

Following the pilot, findings feed back into a revised prototype in the iterative loop that design thinking is designed around: prototype, test, learn, refine (d.school, 2010).

Christensen's (1997) disruption theory predicts that LocalHaul's initial offering will be worse than established carriers on some dimensions, national coverage and speed for certain order types, and better on others, cost for independent retailers, flexibility, rural reliability.

The test phase exists to find out precisely which dimensions matter most to which users, so the venture can concentrate its limited early-stage resources on the things that actually drive adoption rather than trying to be competitive across every front simultaneously.

Conclusion

The scenario at the centre of this brief is ultimately about a gap, not a technology story. It is about the distance between what digital tools make possible and what small businesses and rural communities can actually access, afford, and use. Design thinking is useful here not because it provides a more sophisticated market analysis tool, but because it insists on starting from that gap, from the actual frustrations of real users, before moving toward any solution at all.

Task 1 identified five significant opportunity areas in the UK market created by the post-pandemic acceleration of digital transformation. Of these, the delivery coordination gap is the most compelling because it involves documented pain across three distinct user groups, a market failure that existing providers have not resolved, and a scalability profile driven by network effects. The others, digital payment integration, retail management software, digital marketing support, and accessible e-commerce platforms, are real but either more contested by existing providers or less structurally scalable in their current form.

Task 2 applied all five stages of the design thinking process to develop LocalHaul, a platform that aggregates independent retail orders by postcode cluster and coordinates local couriers to fulfil them. The empathy stage grounded the concept in real user experience rather than market assumption. The Define stage produced a problem statement specific enough to constrain ideation productively. The Ideate stage rejected several ideas, including a rural parcel locker network and a WhatsApp-only despatch tool, before settling on the coordinated two-sided marketplace model. The prototype is deliberately built from existing tools to avoid unnecessary technology risk in Phase 1. The test stage is designed around three specific commercial questions that cannot be answered without real-world data.

Reference List

- Advantage (2025) Last-mile delivery management: closing the visibility gap. Available at: <https://www.advantage.co.uk/intelligence-hub/logistics-and-distribution/last-mile-delivery-management> [Accessed 20 June 2026].
- Brown, T. (2009) Change by design: how design thinking transforms organisations and inspires innovation. New York: HarperCollins.
- Chesbrough, H.W. (2003) Open innovation: the new imperative for creating and profiting from technology. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Christensen, C.M. (1997) The innovator's dilemma: when new technologies cause great firms to fail. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- d.school (2010) An introduction to design thinking: process guide. Stanford: Hasso-Plattner Institute of Design at Stanford University.
- Dam, R.F. and Siang, T.Y. (2020) The 5 stages in the design thinking process, Interaction Design Foundation. Available at: <https://www.interaction-design.org/literature/article/5-stages-in-the-design-thinking-process> [Accessed 15 June 2026].
- Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (DBEIS) (2021) Longitudinal small business survey 2020. London: BEIS. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/longitudinal-small-business-survey-2020> [Accessed 20 June 2026].
- Fairfield Market Research (2025) UK last mile delivery market size, growth, analysis. Available at: <https://www.fairfieldmarketresearch.com/report/uk-last-mile-delivery-market> [Accessed 18 June 2026].
- Grand View Research (2025) UK digital transformation market size and outlook, 2026 to 2033. Available at: <https://www.grandviewresearch.com/horizon/outlook/digital-transformation-market/uk> [Accessed 18 June 2026].
- IDEO (2015) The field guide to human-centred design. San Francisco: IDEO.org.
- Verganti, R. (2009) Design-driven innovation: changing the rules of competition by radically innovating what things mean. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.