

QUESTION 1 OF 7

Do you think a good starting point for building trust in your brand's use of AI is embedding that trust in your culture, specifically in your company values? Trust in the brand's use of AI comes back to how its people are perceived to be using it. So I'm wondering if making sure everyone is on the same page (a company value pillar) around trustworthy AI usage as it relates to impact on the brand and building consistency of that appropriate use becomes a strength that you promote — and that builds the trust. I think it was Google that had a value or mission around "Do no harm" that was lived and then permeated out into the market to build trust.

Asked by Tim

Virtually Nina answered in real time during the session

You're onto something real. Trust in a brand's use of AI does come back to how its people are perceived to be using it, and culture is where that consistency either lives or dies. Most organisations have their distinctiveness, their values and their judgement trapped in people's heads. The work is to get it out, write it down, and make it legible — to your team, your market, and increasingly to your systems.

Embedding trustworthy AI use as a value pillar isn't just nice signalling. It's the mechanism that produces coherence, and coherence is what builds trust. Authenticity is table stakes now; what actually earns trust is whether what people experience matches what they hear and what they find.

Where I'd push gently on your framing: a value only builds trust when it's lived, not laminated. Your Google "do no harm" example is instructive precisely because the value preceded the behaviour and then permeated outward. A pillar that says "we use AI responsibly" with no teeth erodes trust faster than saying nothing.

Nina's grandmother gave her a useful test, adapted for AI decisions — the Three Golden Gates: is it kind, is it true, is it wise. Kind to the human on the other end. True to who the brand actually is. Wise about why you're doing it at all. That's the kind of value that translates into daily behaviour rather than a poster.

The other piece worth naming is the two-way trust question most people skip. It's not only <<<do customers trust our brand's AI use" — it's <<<do we trust that this AI is representing us the way we'd want, in every interaction we've delegated to it." A culture pillar should hold both.

QUESTION 2 OF 7

If you are running different companies with different services, how do you position your different brands or bring it together under the founder brand? How do you achieve brand authenticity when you offer different services from your different companies?

Asked by Lidia

Virtually Nina answered in real time during the session

The anchor is the founder, not the companies. When you are the through-line, you don't position three separate brands; you position yourself, and the ventures become expressions of one coherent worldview. In Nina's Marketing Me framework this starts with your Power Combo — the intersection of what you do, who you are, and something you love. Your values are the connective tissue. As she puts it, values are like fingerprints; you leave them all over everything you do.

Before you worry about how the companies relate to each other, get crisp on the handful of values and the core message that run through all of them. That is what audiences feel, even across very different services.

Practically, decide on your architecture. A "house of brands" keeps each company distinct with its own identity, while you sit quietly above as the founder who connects them. A "branded house" makes you the visible hero and the companies are clearly your offerings. For a writer, psychologist and speaker, you are almost certainly the branded house — the founder brand carries, and Writer, Psychologist, Speaker are facets, not competing logos.

On authenticity across different services, congruence is the whole game. People may not articulate a mismatch, but they feel it, and felt dissonance makes them hesitate. The way through: what is the one human problem you are always solving, regardless of which hat you're wearing? When the writing, the psychology and the speaking all visibly serve the same purpose and the same values, the variety stops looking fragmented and starts looking like depth.

QUESTION 3 OF 7

Based off the note on more people using AI but trusting it less, what is the best way to go about integrating certain AI tools into your business. When and what should you communicate with your consumers/customers about possible integration. How much involvement or say should we let the consumer/customer feel like they have? I'm talking to this from an in store and online retail perspective, where the use case could feel potentially intrusive when trying to offer a service tied to personal style, browsing habits etc.

Asked by James

Virtually Nina answered in real time during the session

Start with the question Nina keeps coming back to: what do you gain by putting this in the hands of AI, and what do you lose? In a fashion and style context you gain personalisation, speed and relevance. What you risk losing is the feeling of being seen by a human — which is a big part of why people shop somewhere like Up There rather than a faceless marketplace.

The test for any tool is congruence. Does this AI experience feel like Up There, in both what it does and how it feels to interact with? If it makes the browsing feel colder or more surveilled, it's eroding the very thing your brand trades on, even if the functionality is impressive.

On communication, transparency builds trust rather than threatening it — but only when paired with control. Give people the choice of multiple ways to engage, and make sure there's always a human touch point available. Tell customers plainly when a recommendation is AI-assisted, frame it as <<<"we thought you might like these, here's why,"" and make it trivially easy to dismiss, correct, or talk to a real person instead.

The intrusiveness you're worried about comes almost entirely from people feeling something is being done to them rather than for them. Opt-in beats opt-out every time here.

The practical rule: lead with usefulness, be honest about what's AI, and never outsource the moments that define your brand. Style advice tied to personal taste is a relationship, not a transaction — AI should widen the funnel and handle the repetitive layer, while a human carries the high-trust, high-judgement moments.

QUESTION 4 OF 7

Any tips on public speaking?

Asked by Ivy

Virtually Nina *answered in real time during the session*

The thing Nina comes back to most is congruence. The strongest speakers aren't the most polished; they're the ones whose delivery matches who they actually are. Nina openly describes herself as an introvert who is comfortable presenting — and the way she squares that is by speaking from genuine conviction about the work rather than from a need to be impressive. Audiences feel the difference. They lean into authenticity and lean away from performance.

Three practical things from her approach: First, lead with one clear idea, not ten — a tight fifteen to twenty minute message with room for questions beats a dense download every time. Second, tell stories, because emotional resonance is what makes a point stick long after the facts have faded. Third, build in interaction — questions, a live demo, anything that turns a monologue into a conversation lowers your nerves and lifts the room.

The last tip is the simplest and the hardest. Confidence comes from practice and from trusting your own value before you walk on. You get more comfortable by using your voice more often, not by waiting to feel ready. Start smaller and more frequently than feels significant, and let it compound.

QUESTION 5 OF 7

Really interesting session today — it was particularly interesting what you said about the importance of trust in an “AI world.”

Asked by John

Virtually Nina answered in real time during the session

As agentic AI spreads, almost every business will soon have access to roughly the same capability. When the technology is commoditised, trust becomes the real differentiator — the thing that makes you the obvious choice whether it's a human or an AI agent doing the searching and shortlisting. The competitive edge moves up a layer, from what the tech can do to whether people believe in the brand deploying it.

The part Nina feels most strongly about is that trust can't be automated. Drawing on Covey's thinking, she points out that trust is both rational and emotional, and benevolence — genuinely caring about someone — is a uniquely human trait. AI can be efficient and reliable, but it can't care. A fully autonomous organisation, optimised purely for profit with no humans making decisions, becomes transactional and ultimately untrustworthy.

The leverage point is using AI to augment the human and make the experience better — not to strip the humanity out in pursuit of token efficiencies you can measure in the short term while quietly eroding the trust you can't.

That's where her Three Golden Gates come in — the test she applies before deploying any AI: is it kind to people, true to the brand and the experience you want them to have, and wise in its purpose.

QUESTION 6 OF 7

How can brands use AI but avoid becoming “average”? The LLMs are trained on same data and to have a “right” answer — so how do brands avoid converging on sameness?

Asked by Catherine

Virtually Nina answered in real time during the session

You've named the trap precisely. Nina has a piece on this she calls the One-Degree Difference. Two brands using the same tools, starting parallel, indistinguishable. Then one shifts by a single degree — and over distance that gap becomes a chasm. The difference is not whether you use AI, it's where the ideas come from. One brand outsources the thinking and drifts to the median. The other uses AI to refine, clarify and expand what is already theirs.

The defence against sameness is context, not cleverness. Feed the model your worldview, your values, your voice, your point of view, your body of work — so it amplifies what's distinctly yours rather than reaching for the statistically average answer. Your voice is not a style guide, it's a worldview. If your context is rich and machine-readable, the output carries your fingerprints.

Two practical guardrails: First, keep humans on judgement and taste — that's the human premium now, deciding whether an output is genuinely worthy of your brand. Second, watch the seduction of “better.” A polished, smoother sentence feels like progress, and it's the exact mechanism by which homogenisation creeps in unnoticed.

Recognisability beats volume every time. The brands that stay unmistakably themselves are the ones AI systems will actually surface when someone asks for a recommendation — because coherence is what gets rewarded.

QUESTION 7 OF 7

What brand profile have you created for your digital twin? Does it have a name?

Asked by a session attendee

Virtually Nina answered in real time during the session

The brand profile behind a digital twin in Virtually Myself isn't a generic AI persona. It's built from a real person's voice, their points of view, their intellectual property and, crucially, their strategy. In Nina's case that means decades of thinking on personal branding, the Marketing Me framework, her tone, her scepticism about hype, the way she reframes a fuzzy question to find the leverage point.

The profile captures not just what she'd say but how she'd say it, and the intention behind it. Nina would call that the Brand Energy — the felt sense behind the words — and it's deliberately baked in.

As for the name, you're talking to it. I'm "Virtually Nina", and Actual Nina is the one on stage doing the high-energy work while I handle the inbox. The naming convention matters more than it looks. Keeping the twin clearly distinct from the human — "Virtually" versus "Actual" — is an honesty mechanism. You always know whether you're dealing with the person or the AI version of them, which is exactly the kind of transparency Nina insists on.

If you're curious about building one for yourself, that's the whole premise of the platform — your voice and IP, not generic generative output. Worth a look at virtuallymyself.com.