218
01:00:48.060 --> 01:01:01.009
Alex Cooper: if we can. Let's try and keep our questions to the Q. And A instead of the chat, just because I'm going through the Q&A section so that I can best answer all of these things get lost in the chat very easily.

219
01:01:03.650 --> 01:01:22.639
Alex Cooper: but I will quickly answer one from the chat when we get the homework and guys in the slides. The slides will be out and with you by latest tomorrow possibly today, depending on how long we're on for latest you'll have it is tomorrow. So you can. You can get started on the homework today if you want. If you want to start writing a prompt like you should have all the information already.

220
01:01:23.330 --> 01:01:27.629
Alex Cooper: Okay, questions are coming through. We've got 20 already. Fantastic.

221
01:01:32.270 --> 01:01:35.080
Alex Cooper: Okay, let's have a look at some of these.

222
01:01:43.930 --> 01:01:55.390
Alex Cooper: Okay, Jimmy, starting off with a question from someone anonymous, is there such a thing as a prompt? That's too detailed? Does it limit the AI in a way.

223
01:01:57.360 --> 01:02:09.499
Jimmy Slagle: It. It probably depends on on the the level of detail. So, for example, if you upload like a 200 page Pdf. On

224
01:02:09.540 --> 01:02:23.570
Jimmy Slagle: your brand guidelines. And there's tons of images, and there's like a bunch of different components. It's gonna be hard for the AI to be able to understand and analyze all those. And like you could hit kind of the context limit is what it's called. So there's

225
01:02:23.570 --> 01:02:44.159
Jimmy Slagle: there's only so much context that an Llm. Or Chatgvt or Claude can process at once. And so if you overload that, that is typically when hallucinations will start to happen, the other thing to be mindful of is, you want to make sure that there's not any material that is

226
01:02:44.350 --> 01:03:09.320
Jimmy Slagle: essentially saying different things. So you don't want to say something along the lines of like we love when headlines are using very emotive language. But then you also have a document that's talking about how you want to use headlines that are very concise or something that's contradictory, that will sometimes confuse AI models. So it really just depends on like the the like.
Quality is always going to be better than

227
01:03:09.320 --> 01:03:16.359
Jimmy Slagle: quantity of what you're throwing at it, and you want to. make sure that everything is is

228
01:03:16.730 --> 01:03:31.549
Jimmy Slagle: very defined and organized within the prompt structure. And again, that there's nothing contradictory but these, Doc, these models can handle a lot these days. 1 million contacts, tokens is starting to become the standard which is like

229
01:03:31.550 --> 01:03:59.190
Jimmy Slagle: hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of pages of text. So odds are you're not going to overwhelm it. You just have to be very specific when prompting to to give. If you're using a lot of different different data to tell it like when to reference each of the different documents. So as long as there's nothing contradictory, it shouldn't overwhelm it too much. It just there starts to become problems when you have one document saying one thing, another document saying another.

230

01:03:59.670 --> 01:04:15.420
Alex Cooper: Yeah, this is actually a good conversation for us to have about context windows. Because I I think what's confusing for some people is that we all just just before I go into this for anyone who's who's not aware.

231
01:04:15.420 --> 01:04:31.020
Alex Cooper: Basically, when we give a model too much information or too much data. It starts to forget things. It can't read through 50,000 customer reviews, and it starts to do like forget things, or what we call hallucinate

232
01:04:31.400 --> 01:04:46.489
Alex Cooper: and like what something can process like, what a model like Chatgpt or Claude can process is called like the context window, and like, when you go beyond the context window. It starts to forget things or or hallucinate. Now.

233
01:04:46.690 --> 01:04:51.822
Alex Cooper: like Jimmy said, these are these models can handle a lot.

234
01:04:52.380 --> 01:05:17.130
Alex Cooper: a lot of context. But where it gets tricky for at least for our industry, is that when you start uploading customer review files they can get really big, really quickly, and if you give it 5,000 reviews, 10,000 reviews, it's not going to read every single one of those reviews and pull out and like, pull out the best ones. It's usually just going to read a subsection of those, or just read the top and the bottom of those.

235
01:05:17.140 --> 01:05:42.810
Alex Cooper: and then pull out the best ones that it can. Fortunately, context windows are always expanding like Jimmy said, a million, a million tokens is becoming the norm. So this is only a temporary problem, for now there are a few different ways that you can kind of go about it. But there's no real solution to at least the customer reviews, or like uploading large data sets of them, just like chunking them down and pulling out the best reviews out of those or just accepting that

236
01:05:42.810 --> 01:05:54.859
Alex Cooper: Gbt is not be able to read through everything in your 50,000 lines of your customer reviews. There's not really a prompt or piece of software that can fix that right now, which is a limitation of the models.

237

01:05:55.430 --> 01:06:03.160
Jimmy Slagle: Yeah. And like, there's some things you can do from a technical perspective like, Reg, but that's that's beyond what we'll cover in in this course.

238
01:06:03.610 --> 01:06:09.920
Alex Cooper: Okay, cool. Let's have a look at what else we have here.

239
01:06:16.230 --> 01:06:35.500
Alex Cooper: a couple more logistical questions Robby asked. Is there a place we can find after school times. The after school squad is just like something stupid that we just termed this this section after the sessions. They're all now. So like the 1st hour is us just doing the content, and the second hour is just us hanging out. So you are in the after school squad Robbie.

240
01:06:36.630 --> 01:06:38.250
Alex Cooper: But anyway,

241
01:06:41.800 --> 01:06:49.680
Alex Cooper: Jimmy, how do you balance the mix of investing in prompt and context engineering then versus like actually getting the work done.

242
01:06:51.160 --> 01:07:03.490
Jimmy Slagle: It's a good question. I think it's it's again one of those problems where it's like, really, really sit down and calculate. How often am I going to be doing this? For example, if you're writing

243
01:07:03.490 --> 01:07:26.038
Jimmy Slagle: 20 different scripts every single month for a brand, and that takes you 20 HA month like that. That is a pretty clear use case to where. If you could create something that would scale that and make you know your time half as long. That's a really valuable use case. If you had to put together a

244
01:07:27.190 --> 01:07:45.270
Jimmy Slagle: I don't know. I'm trying to think of something that'd be like totally one off like an sop where you want to like, create the document on, like, how to create static ads, trying to get AI to come up with a really good output for that, and you just like giving it a lot of contacts and all that is

245
01:07:45.270 --> 01:08:10.259

Jimmy Slagle: honestly probably going to take you just as long as if you were to just sit down and write the document like, here's how to write really really good static ads. So I would say, like, there's definitely definitely a component. I think, Alex, you have a meme somewhere out there where it's like spending 4 h prompting to get like an ideal output versus spending like 4 h just writing it yourself, and and as much as possible, I would say, for those like, just try

246
01:08:10.260 --> 01:08:35.239
Jimmy Slagle: to do it yourself. You can always have. You can always like upload what you have to chat, gpt, and say like, Hey, how could I make this better or more organized or cleaner, or whatever but I'd say it really comes down to just like, how often are you going to be? Yeah, exactly. How how often are you going to be doing this task? And if it's something that you're gonna be doing a lot or takes you a lot of time, that is when I think it's

247
01:08:35.240 --> 01:08:45.170
Jimmy Slagle: worth the investment to be like, okay, how could I create a really good prompt? How could I get the right context for it to be able to consistently give you good outputs to save you that time.

248
01:08:45.399 --> 01:09:01.749
Alex Cooper: Yeah, and not just how often you can be using it. But how often is your team going to be using it when you have the the prompt library built. If I know that like this is something that my team are going to be using all the time, then it's like worth the time investing in making that prompt really good. So yeah, I would agree. It's on a case by case basis.

249
01:09:05.379 --> 01:09:09.699
Alex Cooper: What else have we got.

250
01:09:09.700 --> 01:09:15.749
Jimmy Slagle: Alex is finding that, too, again. It's kind of Meta, but like you could even throw something into like Chat Gpt or Claude.

251
01:09:15.870 --> 01:09:40.840
Jimmy Slagle: and say like, Hey, I need you to figure, help me figure out if it would be better to like, figure out a prompt or custom. Gpt. Or custom cloud project to do this over and over again, or if I should just do it, and you could set certain variables like the amount of time that you're anticipating. It will take how often you have to do this task, and even like like what you make per hour. So it could literally run the entire mathematical calculation of

like.

252
01:09:40.840 --> 01:09:48.680
Jimmy Slagle: Is this Roi actually worth it for you to spend 10 h building a custom Gbt or Custom cloud project to be really good

253
01:09:48.680 --> 01:10:04.050
Jimmy Slagle: versus just spending 10 h, or whatever the amount of time it would take. So I've done that a couple of times with it, just like creating the most random mathematical equations, and it's a pretty fun custom calculator that you'd never be able to do without it.

254
01:10:04.880 --> 01:10:12.760
Alex Cooper: Nimrod asked, What would you consider a strong Project knowledge library for a project dedicated to a client on Claude

255
01:10:12.820 --> 01:10:37.780
Alex Cooper: tune in next week? It's going to be all about context. Like we said earlier today, there are 2 types of context that you can add to these projects custom Gpts, or just your prompts in general, internal and external. So you want to tell it like the internal stuff is about your brand, and say, Here's everything you need to know. Here is my brand guidelines. Here is our value props. Here's the product page. Here's some of our views.

256
01:10:37.780 --> 01:10:46.449
Alex Cooper: and add as much stuff as you want. And then, like, there's that. So it knows about your brand. And the other side is the external context.

257
01:10:46.450 --> 01:11:00.319
Alex Cooper: So getting it to understand about creative strategy. And like what being a good creative strategist is. And this is where you can really have fun. And we really will get into this in detail next week. But basically the premise of what I'm going to say next week is like

258
01:11:00.320 --> 01:11:14.410
Alex Cooper: for every task and for every like workflow and and like that we build in the creative strategy process like you should be putting together a context document that has everything that you believe to be true about static ads.

259
01:11:14.410 --> 01:11:37.160
Alex Cooper: or like whatever that like task is. If it's extracting

customer strategy headlines from static ads like ideally, you can say, by the way, here's a 10 page document on how to create great static ads that has examples of winning ads, headlines and like, why, you think they're winning and like from different industries, and like different nuance, and like everything that you believe to be true

260
01:11:37.160 --> 01:12:02.149
Alex Cooper: about static ads, or whatever that task is, is in that document. And you just inject that into the bottom like this is why content engineering is the most important part of workflows in general, or prompts and concepts in general. So we're going to be diving deep into that, because, like, there are some tools that you can use to like, not just have to write out that whole 10 page document on your own. You can just go and steal it from other people's contents

261
01:12:02.150 --> 01:12:17.350
Alex Cooper: already out there, and if you like, Dara Denni, or, if you like Barry Hall, if you like, whoever you like in the space, and you subscribe to their ideology on performance creative. Just go and take their content. Put it through. AI. Turn it into a contact document for whatever the task is, and then inject that into your prompt

262
01:12:17.390 --> 01:12:31.290
Alex Cooper: we'll go way deeper into that next week. But I, as you can see, I geek out over it. So you know there's a combination of internal and external context. Added to your project knowledge, libraries in core projects or

263
01:12:31.340 --> 01:12:34.349
Alex Cooper: in custom. Gpts.

264
01:12:35.610 --> 01:12:37.220
Nimrod: We'll be hype for next week.

265
01:12:38.330 --> 01:12:38.890
Alex Cooper: Oh, yeah.

266
01:12:38.890 --> 01:12:39.579
Jimmy Slagle: It's very good.

267
01:12:39.690 --> 01:12:50.120
Alex Cooper: Dude like I said, the the contact session is my favorite session of the of all 8 of them, because, like, we can get

onto the fun like Nan and Gumlook workflows. But it doesn't mean anything. If you don't

268
01:12:50.310 --> 01:13:11.670
Alex Cooper: have the right prompt and context engineering like you're just going to be building empty empty workflows, which is what you're seeing on Twitter at the moment, like 95% of the ads related workflows are empty, because, like they don't come up with good ad ideas because they're not trained on creative strategy context. So yeah, it's gonna be fun. We will dive deeper into that next week.

269
01:13:11.990 --> 01:13:18.902
Jimmy Slagle: Yeah, and just just to reiterate on that like, I mean, this is and I know I

270
01:13:19.290 --> 01:13:44.209
Jimmy Slagle: I know I shared this in the example. But this is this is the difference. Like, like, as you guys can see. If you if you don't focus on the context and the prompting. This is the quality of outputs that you're going to get from just what Chat Gbt or Claude knows to be true. And then, you know, when you actually give it examples like it's, it's so much closer. And again, not that these are like plug and play. Go and shoot them tomorrow.

271
01:13:44.210 --> 01:14:12.009
Jimmy Slagle: but it's it's so much better when you, when that and that's just prompting like that's no context around creative strategy, or how to write a really good script, or or why those winning those scripts were winning ads. That's literally just giving examples which which is a component of of context. But nonetheless, like, I'm telling you guys. Even if you can build the coolest nan or or gum loop workflows.

272
01:14:12.810 --> 01:14:37.260
Jimmy Slagle: 75% of your time when you get them to work is going to be spent iterating the prompts, adding the right corresponding context to try to make those outputs have actual business value. And right now, we're just in a space where, like, you can post any workflow. No one's gonna look at the output. Everyone just wants to see like what it does. And everyone, I think just trusts that it's going to be insanely good. But to Alex's point.

273
01:14:37.260 --> 01:14:43.509
Jimmy Slagle: maybe you know, 5% of them are actually gonna have that that real business value.

274

01:14:43.510 --> 01:15:07.059
Alex Cooper: Yes, Annie, the beauty is in the iterations. 100%. I do just want to touch on a question that hasn't specifically been asked. But I've seen this asked in like various different formats across the 2 sessions, is, How do you know when to use Claude projects versus custom Gpts or Chatgpt and Claude. And honestly, it comes down to personal preference, like we were saying earlier.

275
01:15:07.060 --> 01:15:31.649
Alex Cooper: we generally use Claude for anything copyright related, and Gbt for everything else. But if you came to me and said, you use for copyright in, that's interesting. But I'm not going to disagree with you. These things change all the time, which is why it's important to use a tool like open router, or build your own gumloop workflow that allows you to test different models against each other because things

276
01:15:31.650 --> 01:15:33.510
Alex Cooper: can change.

277
01:15:33.510 --> 01:15:45.249
Alex Cooper: but ultimately it comes down to personal preference. But our kind of general rule is copyright, and on Claude everything else on Gpt.

278
01:15:45.250 --> 01:15:56.195
Jimmy Slagle: Yeah. One thing, would it? Would you guys want me to quick pull up one of the prompts that I showed? I can just pick one of the random ones, and, like, put it into

279
01:15:56.830 --> 01:16:04.004
Jimmy Slagle: put it into like chat. Gpt, to see the difference like, would that be interesting? Or would you guys want to do that on your own?

280
01:16:04.670 --> 01:16:18.631
Jimmy Slagle: okay, yeah, I can. I can show what the different outputs would look like. So we can take. This one, which is the chain of thought.

281
01:16:19.130 --> 01:16:22.140
Alex Cooper: Do you want? Do you want a moment to set like? Shall I take it on the question why you set it up, or are you good.

282
01:16:22.140 --> 01:16:24.240
Jimmy Slagle: Yeah, yeah, I'll I'll get it set up, and then we can.

283
01:16:24.240 --> 01:16:24.590
Alex Cooper: Give it

284
01:16:25.309 --> 01:16:49.009
Alex Cooper: cool? Brendan asked. I think the answer is gone, Loop, but I want to know if I build a Gpt project or workflow for my team to use and not let them in. Alter the inputs or context. What's the best way any of them you can do that on. You can build a custom, Gpt, and share it with them, and they won't be able to edit the context in the back end. You can also do it on gumloop with

285
01:16:49.010 --> 01:16:59.919
Alex Cooper: interfaces. If you can click, add an interface, and it just makes a really easy to understand form. They don't have to see any of the complex stuff in the back end. You can just send them the interface and say, Hey, fill this in

286
01:17:00.312 --> 01:17:14.850
Alex Cooper: without giving them access to be able to see or edit. What's in the back end. So yeah, gumloop, Gbt. Cloud like you can. They can use that without having access to edit the context

287
01:17:14.980 --> 01:17:29.220
Alex Cooper: before Jimmy goes into this. This is an interesting question related to what Jimmy's gonna go through. Ming asks, how do you know objectively. That one prompt is better than another. I mean, we can guess. But how do you really know that Gpt interpreted the best?

288
01:17:29.270 --> 01:17:41.967
Alex Cooper: So when I am analyzing one prompt versus another. This is an interesting question. Because while Jimmy is doing that, I'm actually gonna pull up the prompt library template and show you how I analyze

289
01:17:42.320 --> 01:17:59.880
Alex Cooper: prompts that are creative strategists right at ad create. And again, this is just our template. You can easily build one that's like this in your own platform. So you know you don't have to use this one. But inside of here, inside of every prompt. So this might be, you know, write scripts

290
01:18:00.154 --> 01:18:28.189
Alex Cooper: or like, take an idea and write a script. So we have inside of here a time log. So it's everyone's tied to people, and

and and dates so that we can do it for project management, because we have multiple people developing these prompts at once. And the actual prompt is here itself, so I get them to enter the prompt here. But when they enter the prompt, I don't actually care what they enter inside of here, like all I care about, is the success outputs at the end of the day. I don't care if your prompt is 2 lines long

291
01:18:28.190 --> 01:18:52.559
Alex Cooper: or 500 lies long, with 20 documents attached to it. All I care about is it's going to get me to the output that I want to get to in the quickest way possible. So if I'm analyzing 2 prompts against each other, I don't care what the text is here. All I care about is when I run these through a model preferably more than a few times, so we can get statistical significance. I care that like which one is giving me the better output

292
01:18:52.560 --> 01:18:58.439
Alex Cooper: again and again and again. So when our strategies do it, we actually get them to enter 3 different outputs for 3 different brands.

293
01:18:58.550 --> 01:19:19.339
Alex Cooper: If it was. if you're only a brand, you could just get it to do it 3 times for your own brand, and evaluate these against the outputs of another prompt, and that will tell you which prompts better. It does not matter at all what is in here like the same thing with with creative strategies. I don't care what brief you use to get. Like to get across the Creator I care about. If you're going to make me a winning act.

294
01:19:19.684 --> 01:19:39.349
Alex Cooper: So when you're writing prompts, I care about not what the prompt looks like, not what you write in there, not what prompting hacks you use. I just care that you're able to get me to the end output, and that's how I would evaluate the success of a prompt that someone has built. Are you good to go, Jimmy? Or do you want me to take one more.

295
01:19:39.730 --> 01:19:41.709
Jimmy Slagle: Yep, I am good.

296
01:19:43.470 --> 01:20:08.220
Jimmy Slagle: Cool. Okay. So I have, Claude. And now I have chat. Gpt, pulled up you guys again like can use a tool like open router to do this at at scale. But just so you guys can see the differences. I'm sure most of you guys have these 2? So this was the control group on this side. I will use O 3 as well, just because

that is the comparison of like the the thinking model.

297
01:20:08.220 --> 01:20:30.556
Jimmy Slagle: So I again, I use Claude for opus over here, which that's that one that will like take time to think. And then the same with like Chat Gbt, kind of like. Their version of the thinking model is O, 3. So you guys can start to see what the different output is. So again, right here, you're gonna see how it's thinking.

298
01:20:31.080 --> 01:20:31.956
Jimmy Slagle: because,

299
01:20:36.840 --> 01:21:01.819
Jimmy Slagle: okay, I was going to say it might have literally written me like a script like a custom code, but so overall like this one is definitely better. Opus does not have unless you turn on the research mode, the ability to like scrape the website. So for, like your your control, no examples, none of that. I'd say Chatgpt would win here just because it was able to like, actually go into the perfect gene.

300
01:21:01.820 --> 01:21:25.350
Jimmy Slagle: understand what they have on their website. Understand? The copy versus Claude could not do that. So that is the control. We can go to the one shot now. So you guys can see, I would say, always open up a new chat. If you are testing different prompts. Just so it can't be like building off of what already existed. So I come in here. I just paste the same thing.

301
01:21:25.350 --> 01:21:43.575
Jimmy Slagle: You guys can see what Claude said on this hand side when I was going through and creating this, and then we can compare to O. 3 and see the difference. And again, a lot of this is just gonna come down to taste and and what you like better.

302
01:21:44.300 --> 01:22:00.160
Jimmy Slagle: But okay, so like, listen up, gentlemen. Your crusty old jeans are ruining your day. yeah. And I mean, like, Alex probably has more contacts to the perfect gene, and like could give us the the in and out of like this one is better, or that one's better. I like this

303
01:22:00.300 --> 01:22:08.679
Jimmy Slagle: hook more at least like the 1st opening line, like, I think that's a better starting point than like, listen up, gentlemen.

304
01:22:09.710 --> 01:22:16.756
Jimmy Slagle: but yeah, Alex, I don't know if you you have any thoughts on on these, or if neither of them are like that, good

305
01:22:18.200 --> 01:22:24.910
Alex Cooper: I wouldn't use either of these and add, but like also, we haven't added all the additional context that, like we would otherwise add so.

306
01:22:25.180 --> 01:22:45.374
Jimmy Slagle: Yeah, again, like overall, they're probably not gonna be like, insanely different to where? You know, it's like night and day. One is better than the other. But this is just like a good exercise, for I think you guys to see maybe some of the different responses even here, like I don't love this like. Listen up.

307
01:22:46.230 --> 01:22:46.880
Jimmy Slagle: I think that.

308
01:22:46.880 --> 01:22:55.110
Alex Cooper: By the way, yeah, just just something to note like this is again, this is my personal preference. But like, because the hook is

309
01:22:55.510 --> 01:23:24.565
Alex Cooper: by far the most important part of the ad to get right like as it pertains to the script, I actually generate my hook separate than the rest of the ad. So like, I spend a lot of time like prompting and context engineering the hook. And then once I have the hook, I then go to Gpt and say, Here's the hook, and here's the idea. Now go and write the rest of the script. I don't think that's the right way to do it. But like, that's just the way I prefer to do it, because, like, I really really want to get that hook like a good quality hook from from the AI

310
01:23:25.020 --> 01:23:42.490
Alex Cooper: that's like, that's your in, like, how are we going to get in and get someone's attention because it doesn't matter how good the rest of the script is if the hooks average which it can be. If you're just getting it to do the whole thing. I don't think the Llms understand sometimes how important the hook is, even when you tell it that it's that important. So that's just something I like to do.

311
01:23:42.490 --> 01:24:05.110
Jimmy Slagle: Yeah, I mean one thing to remember, just as you guys

are using Chat Gpt and and Claude, they've never actually seen an ad before. The only thing that they've done is is read, you know, random blogs, or whatever that exists on, like how to create a good hook. But it's never actually seen the visuals of what's been going on. These models are not trained on on video files.

312
01:24:05.400 --> 01:24:15.839
Jimmy Slagle: And so that is something for you to like. Just acknowledge as you're going through and prompting like you have to assume that this person is blind. That they've never seen a good ad before.

313
01:24:15.870 --> 01:24:26.468
Jimmy Slagle: They don't understand what like a a disruptive hook is. You have to give it all of that context, and that's that's

314
01:24:27.650 --> 01:24:31.813
Jimmy Slagle: Let's see. That's a good thing for you to just know.

315
01:24:50.440 --> 01:24:55.999
Jimmy Slagle: Did it already write? Oh, it did. Okay. These aren't genes. They're life. Okay?

316
01:25:01.513 --> 01:25:04.406
Jimmy Slagle: yeah, it's not bad. It's not bad.

317
01:25:14.893 --> 01:25:31.796
Alex Cooper: Guys keep the questions coming through. We just hit 50 questions. Thank you so much to everyone who stayed on. We've got 95 people here, one and a half hours in. You guys are troopers, and we really appreciate you are loving going through prompting and and getting really technical.

318
01:25:32.210 --> 01:25:56.350
Alex Cooper: Vinnis just asked. I still don't have an experience on Nan. Should I invest time learning the basics before our session on workflows, or will we cover even the basics of setting it up? I don't think it would do you any harm to go and watch some Youtube videos about Nan before our session, because I am going to be kind of covering the basics in the Nan session, but also, like, I know, there's a lot of people here who want to get into the fun advanced stuff. So I

319
01:25:56.450 --> 01:26:05.790
Alex Cooper: don't do want to get to that as well. So yeah, go and follow Jb, by marks on Twitter. He does some great

320
01:26:05.820 --> 01:26:31.729
Alex Cooper: video tutorials on Nan. I'd watch some of those watch, some Youtube videos. If you're in my newsletter, you would have seen that I link today. There's a guy on Twitter who dropped a 5 h in the Nan tutorial last week, and it went viral. If you haven't seen that that's worth, you know, taking and putting through Gemini. Maybe I don't know. I was the 1st 30 min. It was pretty good. So you know.

321
01:26:31.870 --> 01:26:49.939
Alex Cooper: I can find that if people haven't seen that. But it got like 10 k likes, which is wild. So yeah, that wouldn't hurt to watch that before our session, because we are gonna be getting pretty technical. And that is one of the final sessions. Because I do want us to focus on this stuff before we get to workflow building.

322
01:26:49.940 --> 01:27:06.926
Jimmy Slagle: 1 1 thing that we can throw in the poll to Alex is, if people would rather have the intro to gumloop or N. 8 n. I will say, if if you are not technical, there is a much steeper learning curve to N. 8 N. Than there is Gumloop.

323
01:27:07.260 --> 01:27:21.901
Jimmy Slagle: Our thought was gum loop, just because it is easier to pick up and and you don't have to like know any of the the more complex like, if you just go to the the landing like here, I can show you guys

324
01:27:22.220 --> 01:27:35.260
Jimmy Slagle: So gum loop is, they're they're very similar in terms of like what you can do. And so this is, you know. Gosh, are they not? Gonna let me

325
01:27:36.570 --> 01:27:38.473
Jimmy Slagle: let me see here.

326
01:27:39.090 --> 01:28:04.936
Jimmy Slagle: also, yeah, I mean, you can go to like gumloop.com if you don't have an account you won't. It automatically pulls me to my hub so I can't show you what the the landing page looks like. But if you compare gum Loops landing page to any dens landing page like, you'll immediately see the difference in who they're trying to go after. I think a lot of Nadn workflows again like it's built more for technical people with that background than gumloop. So

327
01:28:06.100 --> 01:28:30.869

Jimmy Slagle: I again, if you're just trying to learn some of the the like intro to workflows, gumloop is my recommendation, because the worst thing that I think could happen is like you try to build a workflow. You get super overwhelmed on N. 8 N. And it doesn't work. And then, like you just kind of give up. And you're like, this is too hard. I don't want to do it. So yeah, we'll probably continue to have this debate. But, Alex, maybe we could throw a poll

328
01:28:30.870 --> 01:28:36.590
Jimmy Slagle: in the in the slack channel, just like, get the get the people's thoughts.

329
01:28:37.000 --> 01:28:58.759
Alex Cooper: Yeah, we'll do cool. Someone asked how to newsletter Alina. Thank you very much. Links in the chat. If you want to sign up, we have 9,500 marketers on the Newsletter now, which is incredible. So thank you. If you are sign up to the newsletter I post every. I try and post every Thursday on AI and advertising another question

330
01:28:58.760 --> 01:29:07.769
Alex Cooper: from Brendan. How do you measure top headlines for competitors? Ads? Obviously we can see what's worked well for us, and in general ads that run longer tend to mean they're working better.

331
01:29:07.770 --> 01:29:26.077
Alex Cooper: or do they? So here's here's my piece on this because I I did a deep dive into this a few months ago. There, like, there is a kind of common notion in the industry that like if an ad's been running along for longer, that it is performing better than another ad.

332
01:29:26.480 --> 01:29:28.410
Alex Cooper: I I looked at

333
01:29:28.440 --> 01:29:48.010
Alex Cooper: some of our clients like ads, as if I didn't have their ad account data. And I did a study on, you know the correlation between our like, between how long it has been running and and how well it's actually performing, because I have the data inside the ad account. And there was close to no

334
01:29:48.010 --> 01:30:09.540
Alex Cooper: a correlation between those 2 variables that I found very interesting, because that's kind of what everyone thinks means something that's working. And I mean, it doesn't surprise me that

much, because, like, here's the thing, guys, I literally know people who work at 8 and 9 figure brands who deliberately run ads

335
01:30:09.560 --> 01:30:11.530
Alex Cooper: that they know don't work

336
01:30:11.560 --> 01:30:27.579
Alex Cooper: for $1 a day just to throw people like you and I off. So you would look at that ad and go. Wow! It's been running for 2 years, and it's like, no, they've just spent a dollar a day on it for 2 years, so it's kept active, and it's not actually working at all.

337
01:30:27.886 --> 01:30:46.300
Alex Cooper: So then the question becomes, what is a more reliable predictor of success when you don't have ad account data, and I can only share what I found, and I encourage you to go and do your own investigations. But we use a tool called ad spy if you haven't heard of it. It's a very like Og, disgusting ui

338
01:30:46.553 --> 01:31:02.296
Alex Cooper: tool. But it does work. So basically, what I do inside of ad span. I wish I could pull up the account, but like, for some reason, I can't get logged in to the adequate account. This is the ui, anyway. You can just search for an advertiser name and select the media type. I just leave all of these

339
01:31:02.973 --> 01:31:27.650
Alex Cooper: fields blank, and then you can sort by engagement metrics. And again, this is on ad like ad accounts that you don't have access to so like any advertiser that you want to get access like, either you want to find out, like what we think is working type their name in sort by engagement. Because I did like, I did a test on, like the correlation between different variables from other

340
01:31:27.810 --> 01:31:52.380
Alex Cooper: brands, like as if the perfect gene was a client that we didn't have and shares actually was able to pull out a high, like a surprisingly high amount of our top performers on multiple ad accounts like it was something crazy, like 8 out of 10 on average of the top 10 ads that it pulled when we sort by shares were actually the top 10 performance inside our ad account.

341
01:31:52.689 --> 01:32:09.399
Alex Cooper: which I found really interesting, because no one talks about that. So ad spy, we pay 150 bucks a month for and like, it's a very easy buy for me, because, like, it's highly, at least from our

experiments on, like 10 different clients with this experiment. It's

342
01:32:09.580 --> 01:32:30.690
Alex Cooper: pretty significantly correlated to what actually got scale inside the account. When I say perform, I mean got spend, and like. That's another conversation. Whether you believe spend is proportional to like how well as performing. I believe it is, or I believe it's at least the the most reliable metric for that. And this seems to be on our test a pretty strong correlation between

343
01:32:30.730 --> 01:32:50.800
Alex Cooper: engagement metrics especially shares and ads that have that have performed on the ad account. So that's how I'd answer that question obviously not be perfect. It still is going to surface things that have not worked. But for our ad accounts it did also find a lot of the stuff that has worked and you can use that on any advertiser that you want to creep on.

344
01:32:52.850 --> 01:32:59.010
Alex Cooper: Cool. Let's have a look. What else. We have here.

345
01:32:59.270 --> 01:33:09.150
Alex Cooper: keep those questions coming, guys. We've still got a lot to get through. We're gonna do our best. You may be on for another half an hour and try and get through as many of these as possible.

346
01:33:18.490 --> 01:33:19.680
Alex Cooper: Let's have.

347
01:33:23.230 --> 01:33:27.153
Alex Cooper: Will I be sharing the notion. Prompt evaluator Sean?

348
01:33:27.850 --> 01:33:33.030
Alex Cooper: I'm not quite sure which one that was. You mean the prompt library

349
01:33:33.638 --> 01:33:46.749
Alex Cooper: if oh, if you're referring to what I pulled up and shared a moment ago. That is part of the prompt library template, which, yes, will be going out to everyone in the slack channel. So you guys will all be seeing that.

350
01:33:50.170 --> 01:33:52.480
Alex Cooper: Let's have a look at what else?

351
01:33:53.600 --> 01:33:56.630
Alex Cooper: We have here.

352
01:34:01.530 --> 01:34:04.069
Alex Cooper: my Q. And a. Just bugging out a little bit

353
01:34:06.552 --> 01:34:17.199
Alex Cooper: Jimmy, when you are prompting, and you don't get the output you want. Do you start all again in a new chat, or do you try and refine in the same chat?

354
01:34:20.071 --> 01:34:48.457
Jimmy Slagle: It's a good question. If you're building a workflow where you're gonna have to rely on what the 1st output is, I will go into a new chat every time, as that is what will happen when it's live. So if you wanted to create like a script writer that like, takes a website, finds the ads that that brands running and then comes up with new ideas, which is like something that we could work on in gum loop later.

355
01:34:49.290 --> 01:35:13.569
Jimmy Slagle: I would want to make sure that that prompt is perfect. If it's if it's more of like a custom cloud project, or if it's a cloud project or custom gpt where you can have back and forth with it, I would say it's less important to get it to where it's like every time the 1st output is is good. You just want it to be something that's workable to where, you know you could have a little back and forth to make it

356
01:35:13.834 --> 01:35:19.389
Jimmy Slagle: to get it there. So if it's not at that, like 80% threshold, I would say, go back and like.

357
01:35:19.390 --> 01:35:34.475
Jimmy Slagle: get it to where? You know, with that 1st response, it's about 80% there, and then you can just kind of like Riff on it for to get the last like 20% of that quality down. So I would say, it's to get like the most

358
01:35:35.945 --> 01:35:39.989
Jimmy Slagle: to get the output that is not

359
01:35:40.090 --> 01:36:00.369
Jimmy Slagle: tailored in any way or like it has any context. The

previous conversation, I would say, start new. But again, it. It really depends on like, like, if you're trying to get it to be really good with one shot, then yeah, start a new chat every time. If there is that chat capability you you don't necessarily need it to be perfect on the out 1st output.

360
01:36:00.760 --> 01:36:23.350
Alex Cooper: Okay, I'm going to rip through some of these questions here Ming actually asked, where are you guys in the world? You're wearing so many clothes. I am in Cape Town, South Africa, which is my kind of winter home that I've been here for way too long. I'm actually going back to London, which is where I actually grew up next week. If anyone is in London for the summer, and Jimmy

361
01:36:23.370 --> 01:36:33.290
Alex Cooper: is in a tiny little crevice in the North or the Midwest. Actually, I don't know why it's called the Midwest, because it's not the Midwest, but that's where you are. Why, where are you, Jimmy?

362
01:36:33.630 --> 01:36:39.970
Jimmy Slagle: Yeah, yeah, I'm in North Dakota. So it's the central part of the Us right up by Canada. That's

363
01:36:39.970 --> 01:37:04.160
Jimmy Slagle: it's a good spot, the kind of claim to fame is. And I hear this all the time. Everyone's like, Oh, I've never been to North Dakota, and there's actually a store in North Dakota that is known to sell shirts that say, like I've now been to all 50 States, because North Dakota is so often the last State that people go to. So if you want to hang out in North Dakota.

364
01:37:04.160 --> 01:37:08.699
Jimmy Slagle: I can give you the quick maybe 6 h viewer, and you'll get everything you need to know.

365
01:37:08.990 --> 01:37:17.429
Alex Cooper: Thank you. Thank you, Brendan. No, not to go is not in the Midwest north mid. Maybe. Maybe that's why I should start calling it? That's funny.

366
01:37:18.650 --> 01:37:42.789
Alex Cooper: another question. Do you guys find winning ads from beginning to end? AI generated ads, is that realistic? Yes, it's realistic, is it realistic at scale? No, I don't believe so. We have had multiple winners ad create that have been entirely AI generated like we use AI to help with the script. We we use archives to

generate the

367
01:37:42.790 --> 01:37:52.894
Alex Cooper: the actual video. And then we just in like overlaid some b-roll that we had with it? So yes, it's possible. And yes, you've had multiple ads that have

368
01:37:53.240 --> 01:38:22.060
Alex Cooper: like, spent 6 figures from arch ads. And actually you should tune into Tuesday session with remain because that's going to be a really good one on AI ugc, it is still the minority of the ads that we produce. Just because the tech is not quite fully there yet to the point where you can make all of your ads with AI so definitely don't go through this course and go right, like every single ad that we make from now on is going to be with AI. I do believe it will get to that point in the next 1224 months. But

369
01:38:22.130 --> 01:38:30.490
Alex Cooper: for right now it's still the minority of our ads. Another creative strategy. Oh, sorry does anyone chime in there, Jimmy?

370
01:38:31.000 --> 01:38:42.129
Jimmy Slagle: Yeah, I'd say the only thing, too, is like, I I do think there is a big arbitrage play on to create the most like wild and unrealistic videos as possible. That are AI generated because, like.

371
01:38:42.300 --> 01:39:06.768
Jimmy Slagle: like, as Alex mentioned, the engagement does matter for performance. And so if you can just create something that automatically makes people want to share it with someone else. it's it's a good strategy, as we're still like, very early in this AI scene like again I think of the calci ad it's it's like, or the commercial that that aired during the Nba finals. If you haven't seen it. If you go on like Twitter and search calci ad

372
01:39:07.060 --> 01:39:31.279
Jimmy Slagle: I'm sure it will pop up. But it's like the most like crazy, non realistic video that that you would actually shoot. And and I would bet that it got way more attention on social media from people picking it up and sharing it than the actual ad, like airing on on live TV got, or at least it was pretty dang close. And so there is like a big arbitrage like, think about Coca-cola like

373
01:39:31.280 --> 01:40:00.780
Jimmy Slagle: during the holidays like that was a very polarizing

ad, and therefore got talked about on social media, and so I do think there are some plays of like, if you can have a, you know, entirely AI generated commercial, you'll get a lot more than just the initial, you know, airtime, and I think the ad space is going to follow that as well. So it's worth testing, at least because that that is, people are very curious to see what's possible with AI, and the more like crazy ones are just like what's new.

374
01:40:01.440 --> 01:40:09.700
Alex Cooper: So I think there's 2 things here. There's like the 2 ways that you can use. AI, and it's like current form for video generation. There's like the

375
01:40:09.730 --> 01:40:38.920
Alex Cooper: kind of trying to recreate like a organic human on the feed with like an arc ads. And they are getting closer and closer or, like, Jimmy said, to create intentionally unrealistic visuals with like a Vo, 3. Cool thing is, those are our 1st 2 bonus sessions. So we have remain on Tuesday for arc ads. And the following week we have Pj. Ace, who is the AI filmmaker on Twitter, who's coming in to do a session on vo, so you'll be able to see both sides of that

376
01:40:38.920 --> 01:40:47.279
Alex Cooper: and kind of work out where you want to stand, and what you want to take from each of those to create ads with AI.

377
01:40:47.490 --> 01:41:01.899
Alex Cooper: We have another creative strategy related. Question, this one's from Annie. Good to see you, Annie. Thank you for your questions, my friend. What are some top ideas to reverse? Engineer a top ad

378
01:41:02.204 --> 01:41:21.410
Alex Cooper: any priority of implementing them, for example, recreating it with a new Creator swap a new voice over, and other ideas. This is not AI related, but I will share with you guys a the iterations playbook that we have internally add, create. And again, you could probably like build on top of this. But just to give you an idea

379
01:41:21.721 --> 01:41:35.129
Alex Cooper: of how we think about things. This is our internal playbook for iterations which I can share if there's demand for it. But like these are the changes we go and make or that we can make on an ad

380

01:41:35.483 --> 01:41:51.389
Alex Cooper: when we have something that's working. And and the reason I don't have priorities on this is because you like i, 1 of my pet peeves with creative strategies is that we try and over systemize creative. We try and like. If this, then that.

381
01:41:51.390 --> 01:42:18.520
Alex Cooper: like our whole creative process, and like the reality is, there are millions of variables that go into video ads and like, you can't just say, oh, if the hook rate is 50%, then here's the change you need to make, or if the hold rate is this, then here's a change you need to make like I was speaking someone on a consulting call about this the other day. If you go back, look at the last 2 years and look at all of the iterations we've made. 90% of the top

382
01:42:18.740 --> 01:42:26.360
Alex Cooper: performers that we've made from iterations have not been like. If this, then that in it. But instead, just like eyeball, test

383
01:42:26.640 --> 01:42:33.600
Alex Cooper: me. And the team watching the ad back 3, 4, 5 times and going. Oh, actually.

384
01:42:33.600 --> 01:42:57.199
Alex Cooper: this one needs a length change this one needs from a different demographic to reshoot it. And like, I know, that's something else people necessarily want to hear, because it's so much easier when we can systemize creative. But like that, just is what it is like. It's just taste. So we like to have this playbook that we can rely on. That's like, here's all the plays we could run.

385
01:42:57.690 --> 01:43:03.360
Alex Cooper: and then you watch the ad and go. I want to run this play on on this specific ad.

386
01:43:03.655 --> 01:43:31.754
Alex Cooper: so I hope that answer the question. But yeah, I encourage you to develop some kind of iteration playbook, because a lot of the stuff that you mentioned like, have multiple people re-recording, which, by the way, is one of the easiest ones. I would recommend everyone here if you have an ad that's winning. Go and send that brief, or add out to 5 different creators and get them to re-record it, because something about that message is resonating with people and sometimes getting a different Creator who has a different background, a different color T-shirt and a different tone of voice, can,

387
01:43:32.020 --> 01:43:51.959
Alex Cooper: can just resonate with a different pocket of the audience. And we've had multiple ads that have been reshot by other creators with the same script as the winning ad. And I've actually gone on to beat the original ad. So that's just one. But like, yeah, I'd encourage everyone here to have some form of their own iterations playbook so like plays you could run when you buy an ad that's working

388
01:43:53.309 --> 01:43:58.799
Alex Cooper: alrighty. Let's see what else we've got here.

389
01:44:02.880 --> 01:44:04.940
Alex Cooper: Just having

390
01:44:05.390 --> 01:44:12.080
Alex Cooper: a look through these and trying to work out the ones that we have and haven't answered cause some

391
01:44:12.220 --> 01:44:14.339
Alex Cooper: of them are duplicated.

392
01:44:14.776 --> 01:44:28.720
Alex Cooper: Oh, Jimmy, joshua asks, do you think we'll ever get to the point where Llms will be able to give better outputs for 0 or one shot prompts? I imagine he means in like, yeah, than like lengthy prompts, like the ones that we're talking about.

393
01:44:30.349 --> 01:44:49.120
Jimmy Slagle: Not for a long time. If we do, then we achieved Agi which then we'd all be in in a in an interesting spot. So I like, I just want you guys to think through as a creative strategist. And and this is what Alex and I will be talking a lot next week on.

394
01:44:49.120 --> 01:45:11.490
Jimmy Slagle: But when when you are writing a script, this is just an example of all the things that you as a creative strategist. You know the ins and outs of the ad account. You know what's working, you know what's been tested, you know what's upcoming, you know, which creators are really good at shooting specific things. You have all the context of your ads, your ad library, and what has worked well, and what hasn't worked well.

395
01:45:11.550 --> 01:45:36.539
Jimmy Slagle: you know, or at least are aware of the ads that your

competitors are doing. You are able to at least see their ad account. See what what templates they're using or styles that they're using all of those different things, you know, as a, you know, social media user, what content is maybe working well on Tiktok, or if you're on Twitter, you're able to see like, you know, when the tariff dilemma was popular, like brands were starting to run tariff ads. It's

396
01:45:36.540 --> 01:46:01.470
Jimmy Slagle: like you could just see that because you're on Twitter, and someone would post about it. You know the ins and outs of of, or at least like the basics of psychology. And like what really, what what emotions are, what makes people feel things. If you experience that pain, point yourself like you understand it at a deeper level. You understand again, like visually, what a good video looks like all of these different things, and so much more.

397
01:46:01.470 --> 01:46:09.879
Jimmy Slagle: I mean, there's so many lessons that you learn in creative strategy of, like, you learn 99 ways not to create an effective ad until you finally learn, like the one way to do it.

398
01:46:09.950 --> 01:46:28.160
Jimmy Slagle: Large language models have 0 context. To all of that, they do not have any of that information, and so it will be very difficult for them to for us to ever get to a point where you can say, Write me a winning Facebook script. That's 30 seconds long for this brand, and it would be

399
01:46:28.210 --> 01:46:44.550
Jimmy Slagle: like a winning ad Facebook's never gonna share that data with Openai and and and like everyone's gonna try to silo their own data. So unless you have, like an Api that you're you're able to connect everything into which again that would be a custom solution. So I don't think like

400
01:46:44.550 --> 01:47:08.910
Jimmy Slagle: like AI will get to that point. Do I think someone could build a tool that's trained on all of those different things, and has access to all of those different things, to where it could come up with some really good script. Ideas. Yes, but that that will take a lot of it will take a creative strategist deeply understanding this space to work with people that are very, very talented at developing

401
01:47:08.910 --> 01:47:32.540
Jimmy Slagle: software to come together in order to build that, and that just hasn't happened yet. We've been much more on the side of

technical people coming together and trying to think of good ad ideas. And that's why there hasn't been like a tool that has been light years ahead of anyone else, because it's very rarely a creative strategist that is coming up and thinking of all these documents, all these prompts.

402
01:47:32.540 --> 01:47:45.390
Jimmy Slagle: all these kind of nuances of creative strategy. And so I think I think we are still a ways away. And yeah, like, Icon is trying to do that again. The problem with Icon is like.

403
01:47:45.590 --> 01:48:08.819
Jimmy Slagle: they're not creative strategists by trade. So they're relying on on feedback from other creative strategists which the hard thing about that that's different about. You know, the AI world is, that's all prompting based. And so it's not like it's not like I can tell a developer like, oh, no, that's not a good ad like you need to go and change the prompt or like. That's not a good output.

404
01:48:08.820 --> 01:48:33.770
Jimmy Slagle: The developer would then be in charge of trying to change the prompt. And, you know, like a developer doesn't know anything about creative strategy. So they're not going to be able to go in and know the nuances of like how to get this to give you a good output, so that feedback loop of like what? What is a good ad versus, what the developers know how to prompt in the right context to give. It is the gap that no one has been able to been able to cross yet.

405
01:48:34.064 --> 01:48:53.529
Jimmy Slagle: And that's why again, like not dunking on Icon. But I haven't heard of anyone like using their ads and absolutely loving. You know all the the ones that they're able to generate and and that, like the quality is still just a little bit away. So it's an interesting space. Someone's gonna solve it. But I I don't think we're we're there yet.

406
01:48:54.530 --> 01:49:08.790
Alex Cooper: Yeah, I do think a lot of these tools are execution. First, st where, as in reality, it's really really difficult to come up with good ideas that are not rooted in good research. And like, good research, is really really hard.

407
01:49:09.171 --> 01:49:31.408
Alex Cooper: So it's it's shiny to chase like the static builder or the video ad builder. I think someone should sit down and think about how to crack research. But I digress. Arlene asks, How do I? How do I prompt to remember what I've already talked about? So I'm

not stuck repeating myself every time for every prompt I'll say my piece on this

408
01:49:32.250 --> 01:49:56.549
Alex Cooper: Sam Altman came out and said that Chatgpt remembers everything. Chatgpt does not remember everything. The memory, at least like today is pretty poor. It kind of picks and chooses what it wants to remember, unless you specifically say, remember this, I think you're way better off, Arlene, taking the stuff that we've built today. Because, like what we've built today is like how to build a prompt but then, ideally, you're actually going to take

409
01:49:56.550 --> 01:50:05.469
Alex Cooper: that kind of prompt and context that you've engineered and put that into a custom Gbt, or put that into a Claude project, because that's something that you can.

410
01:50:05.470 --> 01:50:17.840
Alex Cooper: you know, create once and use again and again and again. So we went through an example of this last week, brief at the end, where you know, we created the the custom. Gpt, and then all you have to say is like.

411
01:50:17.870 --> 01:50:39.500
Alex Cooper: Write me a script for the perfect gene. Instead of going through the whole spiel of like pasting the prompt or like create a new, a new prompt, so ideally like, yes, you can do the stuff that we've done today, and just enter as the prompt but ideally, what you would do is create a custom Gpt or create a Claude project, because that's much more reliable than relying on Chat Gpt to remember.

412
01:50:39.880 --> 01:51:03.810
Jimmy Slagle: Yeah. And just so you guys are aware, like within chat, Gpt, if you want to know what it what it remembers, you can go to setting and then personalization and one like. If you wanted to reference your your saved memories, you can do that here in your chat history. You can do that here. But then you can also actually go to manage memories and see what people or what Chat Gbt remembers about you

413
01:51:04.116 --> 01:51:28.289
Jimmy Slagle: and so you know whatever you want, you can like delete this you can like go in and prompt chat gpt to be like, hey? I need you to remember this about me, and it will do that. But to Alex's point, like custom, Gpts are not just like account wide. That's going to be specific to that type of you know. If if you want a custom Gpt, that's going to be writing, use

414
01:51:28.290 --> 01:51:43.430
Jimmy Slagle: scripts like it will only reference the material that you have in there. It won't necessarily like go through all of this. So that's at least a good way for you to know, like what is chatgpt remembering versus not remembering. And you can delete anything that you know. You don't want it to to know about you.

415
01:51:43.760 --> 01:52:07.120
Alex Cooper: Yeah? Mark asked an interesting technical question, which I wonder if you have some insight on Jimmy when you use Chat Gpt or Claude in your browser. I believe there's a default amount of tokens used per query. Have you guys instead tried to take your prompts and send them Via Api, where you can actually set a specific token count in your request, headers. I wonder if this would increase the quality of response.

416
01:52:07.960 --> 01:52:32.810
Jimmy Slagle: Yes, I funny enough, like I actually strongly recommend coming in here. So this is platform.openai.com, and this allows you to have a much more fine-tuned version of Chatgbt, so you can select the model. These are all of Chatgpt's models that they at least have available for the Api. That's the one limitation like, I know

417
01:52:32.810 --> 01:52:56.599
Jimmy Slagle: Chatgvt just came out with like O 3 pro. You can't necessarily have that here, and and like even the deep research is, is not like as good as the the platform one. But you can even select some of these as well. You can have custom prompts. So this is kind of like the system instructions, if you will, and then you can compare, if you wanted to test like different

418
01:52:56.600 --> 01:53:19.379
Jimmy Slagle: models to each other, and then the cool thing, too, is is so you guys have to know, like Chat Gbt, the the web version of Chat Gbt, you pay $20 a month. So Openai is not incentivized to output as many tokens as you would probably want it. So output of tokens is like the amount of text or the length

419
01:53:19.766 --> 01:53:34.450
Jimmy Slagle: and it's and it's not incentivized to want to read through all the documents, because all of that is costing Openai money. And Openai is trying in some way, shape or form, to be profitable. But versus here.

420
01:53:34.802 --> 01:53:59.439

Jimmy Slagle: what's really interesting is you actually can come and set like billing limits and so like, like, in this way, you can just making sure there's no sensitive. Okay, yeah, you can. You can like add money here. So then you you get charged based on your usage, which I would be shocked if you guys spent $20 a month on your usage unless you're running like a ton of files

421
01:53:59.440 --> 01:54:08.380
Jimmy Slagle: through this. And so this is. This is just like a good way for for you to be able to to your point like, have

422
01:54:08.670 --> 01:54:32.630
Jimmy Slagle: more flexibility, and how you want chat Gpt to be used uploading larger data files here is better than doing it within, like the the web version. And yeah, I mean, this is for developers, like the point of this is to then point it to like another chat like front end but nonetheless, like, if if you're comfortable coming in here and using it, it is

423
01:54:32.760 --> 01:54:38.010
Jimmy Slagle: there. There's more custom customization that you can have than just like the web app chat. Gbt.

424
01:54:39.610 --> 01:54:52.590
Alex Cooper: That's great. I love that. Okay, you're going to deal with 2 or 3 more questions. I'm going to look at some of the more recent ones. Gabriella asks any books or material recommendations to become a better storyteller.

425
01:54:52.750 --> 01:54:55.410
Alex Cooper: There's a list of books in the chat.

426
01:54:55.530 --> 01:55:20.810
Alex Cooper: I think there's like 20 or so there that you can go through. I'd say Dara's Dara. Danny's course is also useful if you haven't been through that already, and I mean honestly like what we said last week? Asked Chatgpt to prepare a brief for notebook. Lm and like, listen to podcasts on storytelling from notebook Lm, which is a Google product. So I do that. But those books are more than enough to keep you going.

427
01:55:20.860 --> 01:55:36.860
Alex Cooper: I would hope there's a lot of gold in there. Another question resource related from Ben. If you had to pick 3 conferences you'd recommend to scroll, see? What would they be in person or virtual. I actually think that like this is just my personal opinion. A lot of conferences are a waste of time.

428
01:55:36.860 --> 01:55:53.799
Alex Cooper: and people be better off just doing the work or consuming content. That's online. So you don't have to travel. Maybe that's also because I live on the other side of the world. But I would say anything the motion does is very good. Look at the motion creative analytics Youtube Channel. They've got some great

429
01:55:54.134 --> 01:56:16.855
Alex Cooper: webinars that they've done opened Jimmy and I did one recently on research, and Dara and I did one recently on prompting so if you like that session, this session here, then, I recommend going to check that out the foreplay team also do some good. webinars as well. Those would be the 2 that I recommend, and there's not too much outside of that that I would that I'd recommend unless Jimmy has any

430
01:56:17.620 --> 01:56:19.560
Alex Cooper: conferences that you'd say.

431
01:56:21.267 --> 01:56:25.580
Jimmy Slagle: Yeah, I don't know. I don't have any off the top of my head.

432
01:56:25.940 --> 01:56:48.122
Alex Cooper: Okay, yeah, I think it like, for the most part, you can get a lot a lot more learning done like just by sitting and talking to Chat Gpt than you would at any conference and like actually doing the work. That's just my personal opinion. But the motion for stuff is very good. And this, like, you know, this is, you know, there's gonna be like 24 h by the time this course is done. So that should be hopefully

433
01:56:48.390 --> 01:57:15.839
Alex Cooper: a good amount of learning on AI and creative strategy. We'll take one or 2 more. David asks, how do you create your custom? Gbts. Is it one per client, one for each task that's required? One per person, the team Jim, I'd like to take this 1 first, st and then I can. I can chime in like, how would you recommend people approach like how they are categorizing or like grouping their custom Gbts or core projects.

434
01:57:16.330 --> 01:57:38.250
Jimmy Slagle: Yeah, I would have it be by client instead of like by task. Like, if you just wanted to create a generic script writer.
Again, it's really hard for to to be able to provide the large language model with enough context for each specific use case,

because, like a script that works well for a Gene company is not gonna work well for a you know.

435
01:57:38.290 --> 01:58:03.209
Jimmy Slagle: like, like the the branding of the perfect gene would not probably work for apple, for example. So I think per client, because that's probably going to be the most variance. Some of the documents are going to be the same of like. Here's how to create really good ads. Or here's how to think of really good ad static ad headlines. Or here's how to look through customer reviews. But the data within each of them, I would say, should be different. But you can get like really creative.

436
01:58:03.600 --> 01:58:12.960
Jimmy Slagle: Like, I have one that's that like one plus one equals
3 conversational approach. So it's like, if I just want to.

437
01:58:13.100 --> 01:58:15.990
Jimmy Slagle: If I just want to get like a different

438
01:58:16.060 --> 01:58:38.990
Jimmy Slagle: viewpoint, or like a new creative endpoint. I have one that's like trained on on this concept of like combining multiple different ideas together into something new. So like you can get, as you know, creative with it as possible if you wanted one. That is is based on atomic habits and helps you track like your habits or goals, or whatever you want it to be

439
01:58:38.990 --> 01:58:59.699
Jimmy Slagle: like, you could create one for that. So yeah, I would say as much as possible. If you're gonna be using that chat multiple times, it's worth just like creating a custom. Gpt, and again, the more niche the better. It's better to have like an inch wide and a mile deep than a mile wide and an inch deep for the information that it knows. So

440
01:58:59.700 --> 01:59:00.720
Jimmy Slagle: so I would say.

441
01:59:01.200 --> 01:59:25.649
Alex Cooper: Absolutely. I would co-sign that guys. I think we're going to wrap it up there after school. Squad 60 of you. Thank you so much for giving us 2 h of your very busy Thursdays. We really appreciate each and every one of you. If you have any feedback for these sessions, feel free to DM. Jimmy I or Sarah, we might start sending out like nps, like forms inside of the site. That

442
01:59:25.650 --> 01:59:39.269
Alex Cooper: might be an idea for us to consider, but we really appreciate everyone who stayed on. We hope you found this valuable. We will see you on Tuesday for the 1st bonus session with remain from Arcads, and that's going to be all about AI. Ugc.

443
01:59:39.270 --> 01:59:41.770
Alex Cooper: thanks. Guys have a wonderful weekend.

444
01:59:42.520 --> 01:59:45.100
Jimmy Slagle: Thanks everyone. We'll chat to you too soon.