

Personal agents bring UX craft back to the center, and put pressure on Amazon

PM Daily Digest

2026-10-04

Personal agents bring UX craft back to the center, and put pressure on Amazon

By PM Daily Digest • October 4, 2026

Personal agents are making interaction design and platform strategy core PM problems again. Elsewhere: a debate over broad versus specialized agents, keeping judgment while using AI, and how leadership styles cost teams.

Personal agents make product craft matter again

@sriramk sees “a come back of product management” in how personal agents are designed. Instinct, Dot, Muse, and Grok bot each involve real product work to connect the UX with the model underneath and with the services it can reach [1]. He says he “rarely care[s] about the underlying model” but cares a lot about small touches, like Muse’s activity notification or Instinct’s thumbs-up emoji to acknowledge a message. He contrasts this with the “upgrade to latest model” path the industry is otherwise on [1]. Lenny Rachitsky shared it with the comment “PM ascendant” [2].

The strategy question is what happens to companies these agents route around. In “The Amazon Trap,” @mvernal (an initial investor in Instinct and on its board) [3] argues that Amazon spent 15 years training shoppers to start on Amazon instead of Google, and its \$80B ad business is the reward [3]. Now it is reacting badly to Instinct and Muse and leaning on an “Alexa for Shopping” tab [3]. His case: horizontal agents win because they hold all of a user’s context. That leaves Amazon choosing between giving up ad revenue and annoying its customers, while Walmart and Shopify can take share by supporting agents [3]. His proposed way through is a “Prime+” tier at about \$299 a year with agentic purchasing only available there. It would give loyal customers a way in and replace lost ad revenue without betting the company [3]. Scott Belsky agreed: “you can’t fight customer preferences for horizontal agents, you must innovate

to meet them” [4].

Broad versus specialized agents

An a16z conversation pushed back on the all-in-one model. One speaker connects his agent to everything so it can join context across chat history, GitHub, Salesforce, and his calendar [5]. The counterpoint: the more work you hand a general agent, the more understanding you give up, and “agents don’t have any responsibility” [5]. That speaker expects vertically focused sub-agents with quality checks, possibly coordinated by a chief-of-staff agent [5]. Replit spent nearly a year making its product deployable in customers’ own clouds because of data-leak worries. Speakers agreed that making agents useful at work is still largely unsolved [5]. OpenRouter added that it is surprised how little benchmarking enterprises do, and it expects internal AI teams to build more evals [5].

On the build side, Teresa Torres found that when an agent edits a tree, comparing the input and output trees can produce several valid change sets, and only one shows what actually happened. Her fix is to give the agent rules for meaningful moves and log every move as it builds [6].

Keep the judgment yourself

Aakash Gupta disagrees with the complaint that Claude Code dulls you. If 90% of your job is pressing enter, “the model is making your decisions” [7]. He cites an MIT Media Lab EEG study: people who wrote on their own first and then brought in the model showed the highest engagement [7]. His real workload is deciding which of a dozen prototypes “deserves to exist” and saying no, because “when building is free, shipping everything buries the three things that matter” [7].

A practitioner post shows the same shift landing on teams. A PM leading two PMs and three designers says that after adopting GitHub and Claude, designers were expected to deliver close to production-ready pages, covering every error state, breakpoint, and accessibility case, without training for it. Meanwhile engineering keeps setting and changing direction [8].

Leadership and growth

- **The Standard-Setter.** John Cutler argues that pushing people harder produces evidence “that people can respond to pressure,” not evidence of impact. Many people respond better to clarity, trust, autonomy, and good feedback [9]. The style looks good to executives, while the costs (exhaustion, churn) land on the team [9].
- **Upskilling for today.** Shreyas Doshi says mid-career PMs wrongly see upskilling only as preparation for the next job. Building stronger leadership skills would free up time in their current role, which breaks the “too

busy to upskill” loop [10].

- **Flat teams.** Belsky praised “talent dense, aligned, flat, and empowered teams” [11]. The example he quoted was Nikita Bier dropping his assigned work to fight spam. Bier himself notes the model is “very hard to make ... work in a larger company” [12].
- **Occasional expertise.** Hiten Shah: you don’t review pricing or plan a launch every day, but competitors keep moving. AI changes what it costs to keep that expertise current [13].

Sources

1. X post by @sriramk
2. X post by @lennysan
3. X article by @mvernal
4. X post by @scottbelsky
5. Why Specialized AI Could Beat The God Model
6. X post by @ttorres
7. substack
8. r/ProductMgmt post by u/Smart_Recipe_7820
9. TBM 443: The Standard Setter
10. X post by @shreyas
11. X post by @scottbelsky
12. X post by @nikitabier
13. X post by @hnshah