A form that addresses the challenge or my question, to make my concern emotional, because when I connect with my feelings, I get much closer to the core of my question. And the process to the answer is so essential, as the question can completely transform through this. Let me give an example: one of the ten questions I might want to ask could be something like, 'How do I become a millionaire?' Such a legitimate question—but the background to this question is that I associate happiness with being a millionaire, thinking that I could afford everything, all my financial problems would vanish at once, and I'd be a happy person.

In the process of how I become a millionaire, the question might evolve if we emotionally approach it, ultimately leading to a much broader question: will being a millionaire really make me happy? Following that question, we might get a little more specific, to what truly matters to me—like, I have problems, for instance, I'm hesitant to make decisions; I'm stuck in a situation where I feel kind of trapped. It then becomes more personal, more private, until one reaches the point of saying, 'Hey, this question about becoming a millionaire ends up leading me to a more personal question: how can I be fair to myself and my mother in this situation that affects both of us? How do I make the best of it?' Yes, it can definitely become more personal, more concrete. And this is the process that the Oracle of Melk should support, a process that might take longer than just one session at the computer or a visit to the oracle.

Like, okay, now I'm ready to get to the topic about my mother, my sick mother, but there's, of course, much more behind it. Most of our challenges are rooted in our childhood. Sometimes it gets down to the very core, and besides that, there's a need for a protective function because people react to these things in vastly different emotional ways—up to crying or even like scenes from a movie. So, for situations where people sit at their computers, we need to design it in a way that enables them to engage with these processes and also allows us to continuously support them and to ask them if it's digestible at that point to continue working alone, or if it might make sense to have a friend or someone else with them.

So, there's a whole narrative around it because it's not just about Q&A. It's about supporting a process—a spoken process. It's not like someone asks a question, receives a five-sentence answer, and that's it. We've talked about allowing a small dialogue. So they would receive an answer, and then, as was just mentioned, an example could be shared. They can ask follow-up questions if something wasn't clear. They could ask a second question and receive another answer, enabling a 2-3 minute dialogue, whether through audio or written text—both options are possible. So, that's one part of the process.

And then we talked about the philosophical background. You know they spoke with Renata about what should be included. It should be universal—not just a German or European perspective, but encompassing Chinese wisdom, Greek philosophy, and so forth. That's no big deal; then I just came up with ten words, values behind which the whole thing could be oriented. One could discuss each of these individually: words like Humanity, Love, Happiness, Peace, Contentment, Harmony, Unity, Justice, Calmness, and Health. These are just ten concepts that could serve as a basis for questions, creating a frame of reference instead of being lost in the endless expanse of the internet. Questions could then emerge in such a way that they don't feel overly analyzed or overly structured.

Because in essence, these essential questions we come back to tend to revolve around Love, Relationships, Health, Family, and Career. These are the core questions that people have been exploring for years. Many of them are similar and recur over time. Whether it would make sense to pre-group questions or categorize them right away, I'd leave that open for now, unless you think it would be technically beneficial to start with categories early on instead of letting the questioner themselves define the direction of the question.

I think the most critical thing would really be to structure the questionnaire in a way that lets users go deeper into their question and understanding why they're asking it. This way, the response could focus on the specific categories within the Oracle—whichever direction makes sense. If a question starts out being about relationships, it could transition to a career theme, then switch to health in a third step. I think categorizing too early might be less necessary unless, from a technical standpoint, it's beneficial to establish categories from the start.

The primary goal would be to really structure the questions so they dig deeper, like, 'Why are you asking this?' and that the answer aligns with the Oracle's specialization in those categories. In terms of the format, it should aim to encourage dialogue, allowing people to move from one question to another and receive answers that help them stay in that conversational flow. Trying to reach something like ten dialogues could give us an idea of how effective the system is. Ideally, with those ten sample dialogues, we'd determine how close we are to achieving this dialogue process, and then test it to see if it actually fulfills the purpose.

Then there's the experience where people come into contact with the Oracle, perhaps through an introductory dialogue before visiting it in person. In this preliminary process, we'd ask central questions to find the optimal experience for each individual—questions like, 'Do astrological signs matter to you?' or, 'Do you feel connected to them, or not at all?' People have very personal histories, and cultural backgrounds play a significant role. This could all be captured in a preliminary dialogue—like a list of questions to gather as much information as possible about the person to define the direction that best aligns with their question. For instance, if a person indicates they're interested in psychology, work in social fields, or maybe craftsmanship, it provides a lot of insight to tailor the response.

Ultimately, communication is about what actually resonates. So if I give a particular answer, ten different people will interpret it ten different ways, depending on their personal history, culture, and current state of mind. Therefore, it's important to define the direction clearly and say, 'Okay, this is the direction,' and while there are only so many directions one can go in, it's relatively easy to identify those paths. From that set of responses and insights about the person—like their background, specific areas of interest, or professional context—we could develop a custom format or even algorithm that reflects the way of communicating and language style that suits them best.

Should the initial conversation be led by AI, or is this something that a human should manage? It could go either way, as it could definitely be defined to the point where AI can do this effectively. Because, ultimately, it's about the right response and direction