**00:00**  
Jason Kryski  
Busy with things that are exploratory inside, you know, in terms of satisfying and like, I'm busy with. Maybe that's not true, but I'm busy with, like, all things.

**00:15**  
David Olsson  
You're, you're. You're. It's leadership. I think you're providing and I don't know, but yeah, you probably have a long list of tasks and I do, too. And that's a competing thing all the time.

**00:27**  
Jason Kryski  
Well, and I think I'm getting enough, like, of a corpus in terms of, like, my transcriptions. Like, I'm like weekly in somewhere around 25 to 30 hours of meetings a week. That's a lot. I'm like. That should be enough context after like a month of that to like, do something interesting morning.

**00:51**  
David Olsson  
Any morning. James. Interesting that you bring up your 30 hours of meetings a week and that you should have some sort of corpus. There's. I think we'll talk about that today. Everybody's got a hot beverage. It looks like our beverage.

**01:05**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
It's hot.

**01:06**  
James Giroday  
Got some coffee over here. Yeah, Americano.

**01:09**  
David Olsson  
There you go. I have one too. I don't. Jen drinks coffee. Yes, she does drink coffee. Hey, Yang. Good morning. Yang has invited Ying. Would you like to introduce yourself?

**01:27**  
Ying  
Hi. Good morning, everyone. I'm a marketing professor at UBC Okanagan. And just to provide a little bit background before I get my PhD, I have computer science master's. So I'm really into the tech and consumer interface. So my research is consumer psychology of technology. I recently been appointed AI advisor for UBC Okanagan. So I'm looking forward to learning from industry practitioners for people who actually, hands down, doing the AI stuff. So I am more on theoretical level. So I'm looking forward to learning from everyone here. Thank you so much.

**02:09**  
David Olsson  
Thanks for showing up. I invited Ying. I met Ying through talking about her work at UBC Open, and that's kind of how all these people ended up in the room from various places. But we. We do have an agenda today and James is going to lead us through something. Is that correct?

**02:30**  
James Giroday  
Yeah.

**02:33**  
David Olsson  
Good morning.

**02:34**  
James Giroday  
It's not super formal. I. Good morning. I. The agenda looks like this. It's kind of simple.

**02:41**  
David Olsson  
Oh, yeah. Thanks.

**02:43**  
James Giroday  
The 8:00am AI thing is. Yeah, it's. It's been. But it's kind of. Sometimes it's a bit more formal. I know that Graham and Spencer aren't here and they were kind of. I mean, Graham was talking about kind of finding directionality with all this stuff. So Dave and I were chatting on Friday in a meeting called cards, games and directionality. So, you know, I don't know, we're kind of grasping in the air here, but I feel like we really got somewhere and I'm really kind of excited to talk to you guys about what were working on the last few days and get your thoughts. So what I want to do is, I mean, there's three things to kind of go through. The first is that meeting that Dave and I had on Friday.

**03:39**  
James Giroday  
It was kind of like a goal setting, I guess you could call it like directionality goal setting. And, and I'll just cut to the chase on it. I think that one of the main outcomes from it was, before we do much else, I think we need to talk about consent. And it's probably not the most fun topic, but it probably is also very important. And James. Yeah. Yeah.

**04:11**  
David Olsson  
I'm gonna, I'm gonna ask you to pause for a second.

**04:13**  
James Giroday  
Please do.

**04:18**  
David Olsson  
The consent is in the context of this room and what we talk about, right. And being able to leverage that discussion amongst ourselves for ideation creation and whatever else. And so the idea is that we recognize there's a corpus of work here, like over 50 weeks, over a year of meetings. And I'm like, jammy, let's go town. That's great. I'm like, well, this is prudent thinking around how to do this in a programmatic way moving forward. We already have a repo where we can put our things, we can put our transcripts in there. And that's my duty to do that is right now, is to put them into the repo so we all have access to it. But then what? And that's where our meeting with the interesting title went.

**05:06**  
David Olsson  
And I'm just providing some context to the fact that James has put a lot of thought around what it, you know, what it means for us to be able to have a surface area to play with. And this is the steps of getting there. Is that good phrase?

**05:23**  
James Giroday  
Yeah. That's amazing context. I'm trying to provide a bit of context for Ying and I feel like Jen has a fair bit of context and I think full of, you, Hanif and Jason kind of understand what we're trying to get to. But what I skipped over was like, so we're, we got these transcripts, we've got this corpus, and I feel like there's a million and one reasons why we would want to leverage it. But what became clear in this kind of goal setting session was I think before we do that, we need to talk about consent. Here's another really not fun terms and conditions. Like, I don't know, you just hear terms. I'm okay with terms, but conditions like everybody's like, yeah, let's leverage the corpus. And everybody's like, terms and conditions. Boo. It sounds terrible. I don't want to read terms and conditions.

**06:14**  
James Giroday  
So anyways, that's. The first part is just kind of that consent piece, that consent goal. The second thing I wanted to go and do was maybe a roundtable and get your guys thoughts on whether or not this whole topic resonates at all and then maybe go through some of the thoughts that I was having on how to take a collaborative approach to writing terms and conditions or getting consent or whatever it is. So, yeah, pretty simple. I mean, I thought consent was maybe a simple topic and then I started thinking about it. It's like, actually this is really complicated. This is legal. I'm not a lawyer. So with that I'll maybe open it up to the group a little bit. It sounds like Jen had some thoughts.

**07:07**  
Jason Kryski  
Do you want to start off before.

**07:09**  
David Olsson  
Jen, Jason was, he was poking his hand up.

**07:13**  
Jason Kryski  
I was after Jen.

**07:14**  
David Olsson  
Okay, sorry. All right.

**07:23**  
Jen Boger  
Flow. I don't want to interrupt what James is like talking about, but this is like, this is such a cool topic and I'm excited we're doing this. And consent is hard, right? Because it depends what it is you're using and what you're using it for as to whether people will smile or frown. So I think context is a really big one in the consent piece. And we just think to like apps, right? It's the value of the app versus how invasive is it going to be on privacy as to whether you consent or not. And it's like that balance. What's interesting with researchy pieces is it's harder to describe what you're consenting to because you don't know what the output is going to be.

**08:06**  
Jen Boger  
So with an app, you actually have like the thing that you can then hold up and be like, well, how much do I value this and what exactly is it doing with my data? If you read all that stuff, which I bet none of us do, or just like, sure, except whatever, like.

**08:21**  
David Olsson  
But.

**08:23**  
Jen Boger  
So that's a tricky one where we can look at. If nothing leaves the group, you consent to each piece. That kind of leaves the group. But in terms of playing around in a more secure sandbox, you just consent to people kind of going nuts. Except for people can't push stuff unless you know, the group consents to it, but then you run into, if half the group consents and the other half doesn't, now what do you do? Right. Like, it's such a cool thing and. Yeah. And just another add into that, not just for the data piece, but for our conversations themselves. Right. Like, there's been so many cool topics in this group where I'm like, I want to share with people, you know, about stuff we've talked about, because the ideas are really good and the conversations are really good.

**09:14**  
Jen Boger  
But I also want to make sure this is, like, a space where everyone feels they can be open and candid. And so that's the other one. Okay. That's a lot of thought.

**09:28**  
Jason Kryski  
Yeah. This is fun. I feel like. And we're talking just to clarify, like, the consent of the participants in this kind of session related to the corpus of the material that's been produced over that period of time. Right.

**09:45**  
David Olsson  
Or moving forward.

**09:48**  
Jason Kryski  
Moving forward. Okay, so. Because, like, I would say, like, previously there was, like, an implied consent, you.

**09:54**  
James Giroday  
Know, like, kind of maybe not.

**09:57**  
Jason Kryski  
Well, I think early on, like, really early on, David had set some expectations around, like, Shadow House Rules. So I think there's like, some. Again, like, it was really loose, you know, and, like, it's really variable.

**10:10**  
David Olsson  
Right.

**10:10**  
Jason Kryski  
Because it's not always the same people on every call. It varies, you know, you may miss something. Like, that's not defined. But yeah, I just wanted to kind of clarify that. Moving forward.

**10:23**  
James Giroday  
Yeah, moving forward. I mean, also, the consent, I think, is just to provide that sandbox kind of environment so that we don't want to clamp down with a ton of structure that makes coming to this conversation not very appealing. But if we can find an easy way of, you know, heading off issues in the future and making it more. Leaving more time for the play aspect of it, I think that's pretty key. David, did you have something to. How about something?

**10:56**  
David Olsson  
Yeah. So in the past, we have that as some concerns around that. Moving forward, I think, is an interesting framing for this discussion, and then we can see how it applies moving backwards, meaning as we move forward, we can deal with the set of rules. Like, just as you've mentioned, that from the past, it's different people. These are the circumstance. In the past, we can say there's an implicit use for this and it can only be in a sandbox. We could say that in the future, we would say, okay, maybe that's the first case. The second case is there another way to bring it out of the sandbox into A qualified space. And then in the third case, is there a way to monetize that? Yada, yada, yada, yada.

**11:40**  
David Olsson  
And so it could have a ladder of other things going on because of the fact things are agentic and we have blockchain. So those are all just my kind of view on things. It's just if you say that this is a level set and moving forward, how do I want my shit to be taken care of might be a personalization of that hand down, my hands down.

**12:08**  
Jason Kryski  
I have more feelings than anything else right now.

**12:12**  
James Giroday  
Okay, what are. What are they?

**12:18**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
Well, I was just. One phrase kind of resonated and I was curious about. It was leverage, the corpus. And I thought that was really interesting. And I have no idea what that means. What would it look like? You know, what is the scope of that? And this just opens up to a whole bunch of questions for me that I was curious about. And, and, you know, going back to what Jen was talking about, you know, consenting in a researchy context, you know, you're in a sandbox, you talk about all kinds of things. You know, really thinking about how that might get leveraged, except maybe how it applies to what, you know, you're doing. So I'm really curious about that.

**13:04**  
Jason Kryski  
Oh, yeah. So good, because it makes it feel like. Because now I'm like. I'm thinking about, like, there's like, lots of, like, scarcity and there's lots of, like, exploitation and there's lots of, like, you know, it based on whatever kind of, like, framework that's, like, determined, like, do I need to think about what I'm saying? And do I lose the freedom to just express my thoughts? Which was part of what I feel like made this whole thing really valuable, despite there being, like, an implied conspiracy that whatever I was saying could be utilized in whatever way anybody saw fit. So, yeah, it's. It's interesting as I start to think about, like, okay, like, do I change how I interact with this?

**13:48**  
Jason Kryski  
And then does that degrade its value to me, regardless of whatever structure is in place, simply because it's, like, been brought to before? Like, is there a structure around kind of the concept that it would, like, satisfy whatever it's like.

**14:04**  
James Giroday  
I mean, maybe there's different levels of it as well, but. David, do you want to talk a bit about the listening modality that you had?

**14:12**  
David Olsson  
Yeah, so there's. There are ways to do things in a dynamic fashion, and. And the ability to ascribe, you know, ownership over your own contributions is quite Easy with the transcript.

**14:31**  
James Giroday  
In terms of like Chatham House Rules.

**14:33**  
David Olsson  
Well, just if I, if we take a transcript from a meeting it's, it's broken out by voice and associated with individuals and so if I had the whole of the transcript and he had issues with his participation moving forward being shared beyond the group, we would send Tyce's voice out. Right. There's ways of programmatically dealing with the fact that somebody wants to be erased or needs.

**15:01**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
Yeah, but if you put into motion a conversation and then you say you I'm going to erase the source, does that mean that, you know, there's no value in the ongoing.

**15:15**  
David Olsson  
Hey, that's, that's the threat of somebody taking their voice away. And where this is interesting is I've already, I'll share it with you. I built a, a my GPT that does this, it takes and so I'm going to convert it back into a long form prompt now because that's what you can do. It takes a transcript and it allows you to do two core things. One, it removes somebody's participation in the conversation and have the conversation available to you for analysis and working with it and two, to be able to remove a topic from the conversation. So there you go. So if you have. So the rules really change when you think about what we have available for us for agentic purposes. In the case where we get a transcript, we get a summarization of a meeting. It's bullet points at a certain level.

**16:13**  
David Olsson  
And James brought up Chatham House Rules. There's a way of sanitizing information out of a very valuable, very interesting meeting or high level meeting or important meeting such that intelligence can be shared amongst people where it doesn't leak intelligent advantage. And this is a formal set of rules that politicians and high stakes people use so they can actually get some value out of these sessions. Now in the era of Trump, I don't believe any of that shit happens. But it's called Chatham House Rules and I formalized Chatham House Rules tools as software and I made it agentic and it was one of the first things I did. And I'm like, man, this is super valuable because it allows you to analyze a conversation and say okay, if I take out an E flow it takes out these threads and you can't necessarily do that.

**17:04**  
David Olsson  
Well and you can't and you have a hard time. You know, there's a lot of science to figure out here but right out of the gate what it does do is it puts the genetic solutions in the flow of figuring out what terms and conditions and policy around things are because they're not static and they're not defined in the moment. They're defined conditionally, contextually and thematically. And now that's the, that's all of my feet dropping all at once as to why this is an interesting topic given what we have and that we're storing things in GitHub and GitHub has GitHub Actions and we can do things like if somebody says something and taking away their consent. Well, we lock down that part of the conversation. We lock down those conversations. We don't allow access to it.

**17:50**  
David Olsson  
We can have agents now GitHub actually has copilot and LLMs and so it's a full agentic substrate. So we can do more than just have a policy. It can be a policy that has functionality. That's, that's the Chatham House rules meets what I call confluence. And it's a functioning MY GPT and it's available and I will share it.

**18:19**  
Jason Kryski  
You didn't enter hand up there, so I'm done here.

**18:25**  
James Giroday  
Ying, did you have something to share? Did that come off the hand?

**18:31**  
Ying  
I do actually. I, I think I need some background in terms of this conversation. So are we talking about consent of this meeting group or are we talking about consent that's going to be integrated in your future products? So that's the first question from the conversation. Seems like the consent among this group.

**18:51**  
David Olsson  
Right. We're talking about the concentric circles around that.

**18:55**  
Jason Kryski  
Yeah, yeah.

**18:57**  
James Giroday  
The thing that we keep coming back to is the transcripts and it seems like there's a big, we all think that there might be a big benefit and a big value in having access to the transcripts, just the conversations, the creativity and the ideas. And to Hanif's point, sort of leveraging that corpus of transcripts. Like now there's almost probably 50 or 60 of them and we've covered a lot. There's a lot of interesting ideas actioning them. We're probably, we're probably over a thousand at the moment. So that's kind of like the opportunity is the transcripts is being able to use them. The consent is, I mean that's, we've never talked about this before, so it's really a wide open topic.

**19:53**  
Jen Boger  
Yeah.

**19:53**  
Ying  
So in terms of consent, I see this as two levels. First one is why we need a consent and second level, it's execution of what we're going to do. That I think it's better to have a really clear idea about why and then go into the details of how we going to execute. So from the why perspective I can see intellectual property, someone's ideas and we want to make sure that person will be credit if this idea is being taken outside the context and being used. So also there's a trade offs right? So for person who's. Who's have the intention to do that they should understand they may lose the future access to this group if they are not doing properly and that's the trade off right.

**20:54**  
Ying  
So anyone want to take the risk and lose the whole intellectual connections and a pool of wisdom and expert. So I, I think that's like this is the value like the people who you have access to you can talk regularly is your assets. So I think if we clear about everyone's object like why we want to have consent then we can adopt a standard. There must be a lot of standard consent that we can adopt and on the other hand is we don't need to be too. I don't know like we also want to be mindful that I value this like whoever's in this group invalu this they probably your applied consent will work unless they just want to abandon this then no one can really stop that.

**22:00**  
James Giroday  
Well, we value you. Ying, thanks for being here. I think that the topic you brought up about standard terms is a really interesting one. What I started doing was considering well there's probably a way to get Claude to write some boilerplate legal stuff that's going to be 2,000 words and it's going to be never ever read once. So that's one way to do it. What I thought was maybe a better way to also do it was include like a question and answer thing. Like some of the questions that I had were who writes the terms? Like how do they get updated? Why is it needed? Which is kind of like to your point, can I withdraw my consent? What does the consent apply to? Who gets access to the corpus and like how is it used? And then how do the terms get adopted?

**22:56**  
James Giroday  
So Jen, with that I'll pass it to you.

**22:59**  
David Olsson  
If you had something, you're on a roll, keep going.

**23:02**  
James Giroday  
That's what I've got so far. There's eight questions.

**23:05**  
Jen Boger  
These are all really good and you know the big one is if you don't consent then are you not allowed to participate in the group? So like just like apps, it's infuriating, right? You either have to consent to. They have all your data and are going to do who knows what with it or you don't use the app. That's basically consent right now. And a lot of them, you're like, well, if I don't use this app, WhatsApp is a great example of my case. It's not my favorite, but it's the only one that goes across platforms nicely enough and our families all use it. So it's kind of like, you know, I'm not keen on it, but the value means I am giving all my data to Facebook, which doesn't make me happy at all. But, you know, it's like, what can we do?

**23:57**  
Jen Boger  
Right? Like that's the type of thing. So with the group as well, I think that's the big question is if you, is it a case by case consent basis? So either Chattan has rules where it's kind of like we consent to whatever said in this conversation can be anonymized and used outside of this group for other stuff kind of thing, or are we doing case by case basis? And if it's the latter, then how are we going to allow people to review what's being used from them and make a choice? Because that gets a lot harder. Right. And, and how do what's like, who manages that process? And do you like, sit there and read through every bit of your transcript and decide? And I think it's important in this case more than a lot of others because of the size of the group.

**24:47**  
Jen Boger  
So to your question, Ying from before, like, why consent? It's because there people are saying a lot of things in this group that's quite small that could arguably be reverse engineered out. And then it's like, oh, Jen said this thing and you know, publicly, would that be damaging besides the fact of, like, if you're making money off something I said, should I get a piece of royalty in your thing? So those are kind of the two.

**25:16**  
David Olsson  
Hold on to that thought for our exercise later. Okay. That specific.

**25:22**  
Jen Boger  
Okay, I'll try.

**25:27**  
James Giroday  
Anif, did you want to. Go ahead?

**25:29**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
Yeah, I, you know, I consent to all kinds of things online. I no idea what I'm consenting to. So it's not a resistance on my part to consent. That's. I'm really curious about what it means though, to, I mean, have you guys thought about leveraging the corpus? Like, what are some ways in which you think that would be interesting or useful or, you know, rewarding to the group? You know, my imagination kind of falls short. I don't really Know how you would do that? I'm curious.

**26:06**  
David Olsson  
Hold on to that thought, Hanif. I. I have an example. I have an example that's exactly on point where it uses the material to do something and then you're like without the material, you can't do something.

**26:32**  
Jason Kryski  
Yeah, I mean I was, I'm thinking about like even like the ability to effectively safeguard against whatever it gets agreed to from like some consent or terms is probably relatively limited. Like you could, I mean extract and then it's like polices or like validates the layer that sits on top of that. Like, is this a communal. Like, is this a. Is this a, you know, a, A nonprofit? Is this a. Like what's like. And I'm like. And I'm like it. I'm like gonna go do something else. I started thinking like, you know, like the constraints are really interesting anyway. But I was thinking like, well, if that wasn't done properly, you could delete, you know, Jason from a conversation. But then if you were. Saw the transcript, you could be like there's a missing party. What did they probably say?

**27:23**  
Jason Kryski  
You know, and then you could like engineer what likely I contributed to the conversation.

**27:31**  
James Giroday  
Yeah.

**27:32**  
Jason Kryski  
And so obviously there's a bunch of like security thoughtfulness that has to go into the layers that Dave is talking about on top of these things. And it just seems like, oh my God, we could spend the next six months talking about. To use point. Like we are talking about it in the frame of this group. But like obviously it's a meta conversation in terms of how these things apply to other things. And so there's like learnings that come out of this discussion that's just part of directly a fl. But yeah, I don't know but I understand it. I'm too much of a pirate to kind of think about it otherwise.

**28:14**  
James Giroday  
Ying, did you have something?

**28:18**  
Ying  
Yeah, I may be too academic. I understand your concern. In the industry, there's, you know, numerous incidents happen end up in a not very pleasant situations. But realistically I think it's all come down to trust. Because in Asian society, there's no consent, there's no contract. It's all trust and what make people trust each other. There's reputation in stake. Right. And that's basically put more robust boundary around each people's behavior. Because consent, if they don't care about their reputation, there's no consent can bound any behavior. So for me, I'm thinking is if we're here, the sum is we trust each Other. But I agree with James and David. We probably want to have some documentation. All I can see is the transcript, have everyone's name attached to it, and if anything goes wrong, we can go back and track. That's good enough for me.

**29:30**  
Ying  
That's it. And then on the other aspect is I don't take myself too seriously because I read, I listen to podcasts, I. I keep learning, and I have a lot of ideas. My mind is idea generator to the point I don't know which one is authentic mind. I probably have some ideas coming from some books, some podcasts. And can I claim that's mine? No, I don't think so. And when I share that with my students, can I cite every sentence? Cite the source for every sentence? No, I could not. My mind is just mixing the ideas and apply. Come up with my own thought. It's all mixed, so I don't know. I. That's just my thought. Sorry about that.

**30:30**  
David Olsson  
Sorry, that was bang on. We all carry the intellectual property with us. And, you know, every time I've left an opportunity and I've had code in my back pocket in my head, they're like, well, you can't take that and use it. Like how you do that better in our case too. Like, so, you know, there's rules that you can apply, there's process as rules. And then you introduced values, and you can codify values, and you can codify them quite well. And you can say, trust involves this. And trust has. Has recourse. And the recourse is the group. The group has a function. The function will be determined by the group. It can be codified as trust, but it does. But to the point of enabling people to point to something and say they want to come back to it.

**31:18**  
David Olsson  
And the other is going, no, you.

**31:19**  
Jason Kryski  
Can'T, because you broke our trust.

**31:22**  
David Olsson  
It has to be. It benefits us to have something written down. And more than that, I love the stress test on this man. This is the best because it gets you to put some perspective, guards around your thinking and say, does that work? Because that doesn't work for me. And that's not what the room is about. And certainly that's not who the people in the room are. And so a lot of this is. I wouldn't say it's academic, but it's also really relevant to how things work because the stuff will move into realms where we don't have control. Immediately working with the chatbot, they're taking it and stealing it. So the level of, you know, discourse, you don't want it to be. Here's my medical records. And so there can be a necessity for that kind of level of oversight.

**32:14**  
James Giroday  
Well, I had an idea that I'm also really. This has been amazing feedback and contribution. I had an idea about a workflow on how we would collaboratively write terms if we wanted to. Before I jump into that, Jen, did you want to. Go ahead. You're on mute.

**32:35**  
Jen Boger  
Sorry. I put my hand down instead of unmuting myself. I want to hear your thought first, and then maybe I'll tag on because it's so interesting.

**32:46**  
James Giroday  
Okay. All right, well, I'll just. You know what? I'm just not going to share my screen. I'm just going to try to describe this really simply. So I asked those eight questions. I kind of got some ideas about how we might write terms. The way that I sort of thought it might work is we just assume that there's terms in place. Maybe there are implicit terms that David kind of put in place loosely that I forgot about. And then. And then we have a couple sessions and. And the first would be like maybe. Well, maybe three sessions. The goal session, which kind of answers the why are we doing this piece? And then a term writing session where somebody, anybody on the college volunteers to be a coordinator, and they read a disclosure.

**33:49**  
James Giroday  
And people who stay on the call implicitly consent for the purpose, for specific purposes of writing terms. Maybe this is better if I show it on screen. It gets complicated kind of quickly, but there's only a few steps. So anyways, then the chatbot just takes in the previous terms, a prompt for improving terms, and the transcript that everybody just consented to being a part of. Then those. The output from the chat bot is circulated. And later, like maybe a couple days or a week later, there's like a term adoption session where people have had a chance to read through them, somebody volunteers, and you just go in alphabetical order and you vote for adopting it or not. I guess the key concepts here to probably take out of it are like, there's a couple different types of sessions.

**34:52**  
James Giroday  
Maybe this kind of factors into Jason's really amazing idea. I think about different levels of consent. Like, I consent for the purpose of writing terms. I can consent to participating for the purpose of voting on terms of. I consent to nothing like this is. This conversation's off the books, are off the record.

**35:15**  
David Olsson  
So in one session, we come up with a set of terms, and then in the next session, we try applying it to transcripts.

**35:22**  
James Giroday  
Yeah, and I think a bit of the secret sauce here that I Mean, this gets you terms potentially, but maybe it gets you other stuff, like a process on how to leverage the corpus to Hanif's point, where there's a particular prompt that you have in place that doesn't write terms, it just improves terms maybe according to the goal session. Like, it's a pretty complicated workflow, to be honest. There's probably no fewer than two dozen steps to it. Cool.

**35:54**  
David Olsson  
That means there's something there. But in terms of the process behind the humans, there can be a 1, 2, 3, like 5, 10 minute session in these meetings that we have over the next few sessions. Is that something like that?

**36:06**  
James Giroday  
Yeah, you could definitely, I think, hold those different sessions in a call.

**36:13**  
David Olsson  
Yeah. Jason, you could hand up, man.

**36:15**  
Jason Kryski  
Yeah, I was just thinking about Ying's comment about trust and about like, how the society kind of regulates itself. Just thinking through, like, what my kind of future experience is. Like in a place where we have this kind of consent structure, it actually, as I'm sitting here talking about, it's like reducing my trust in everyone here.

**36:42**  
David Olsson  
Because that's what I like about the conversation, is that it puts that pressure.

**36:45**  
Jason Kryski  
On your thinking because it's because, like, you know, I had a position based off of like the relational web and the intentionality of the participants, and now the structure negates the former structure by which I was evaluating this. And thus I need to be very clear about adopting the new structure. And I'm not sure about my propensity to do that.

**37:13**  
David Olsson  
I like what you said in the way you described the first structure. We could actually crystallize that.

**37:20**  
Jason Kryski  
Yeah. So, like, I totally get it.

**37:22**  
James Giroday  
Like, this came up when somebody suggested putting more structure, like even suggesting holding time for demos. And I was like, but there's like 60 minutes to just chat. Like, we're not going to have like a 60 minute demo. Right. Like, you're not. This doesn't like, get rid of the old thing. And then so my thought on that was like, well, let's keep it to 20 minutes. That sounds like a really good idea, but just like moderate it and Yeah, I get it. I get the.

**37:48**  
Jason Kryski  
I totally understand the kind of requirement for this because there is a lot of, like, very interesting things that we've discussed. The magic of different perspectives and backgrounds of people in this group has fostered discussions, may be wholly unique, that may be like specifically applicable to the commercialization of wherever the interest is that someone's working on. But I think that was my assumption the entire time, was that we all kind of give generously and then take as generously as we can and thus being able to improve our own outcomes as a result of the open and free discussion. But if we're looking to like, do something more programmatically with the kind of corpus or kind of monetize that, like, that's an interesting thing.

**38:37**  
David Olsson  
But.

**38:37**  
Jason Kryski  
Maybe I was operating under a false set of assumptions based off of like.

**38:40**  
James Giroday  
No, man, it's just a topic. I mean, this is just a topic here. Like, like this is kind of another, you know, episode, I think in this 8am AI thing where maybe we've consented to something sort of. But I don't really see there having been a lot of consent, just a lot of trust relational that I think, you know.

**39:04**  
David Olsson  
So Jason, you described a number of forms of trust that. And you actually codify them and there are ways of recourse from that. And I'll point to that as the group being the recourse. Just as Ying has pointed out. It's like if you break the trust, then there's the lack of the ring there's the lack of the people, and that's a big one. And that as a structure was implicit. Like if you farted really poorly and you left the room and somebody's going to talk to you or whatever. But it's like there's a real give, right? Like you say, and if somebody takes largely, that can be a group judgment, right? And it can be remedial as a structure. Like I'm just trying to find the loosest structure which is already implicitly there. Right? It's socially there.

**39:58**  
Jason Kryski  
It's socially there, I think codify kind of the existing thing that we've kind of determined. Yeah, there's like a, there's a. Because this is a, like a small society, right?

**40:09**  
David Olsson  
So it's a peer group for sure. But Jen, just. Jen, this is her. This is your.

**40:17**  
Jen Boger  
I was like, I was just like rubbing my hands because, like, this is exactly what's cracking my knuckles. This is exactly. Right. This is the combination of philosophy and ethics that is studied and have whole degrees on and all the things, right? Because as soon as you start codifying things, then it becomes bean counting and it takes a lot of work as soon as you write down a set of rules and like use cases and you know, even if you're like, okay, everyone views before a push. And it's. These are all down to values, right? And a lot of objective judgment on what is considered valuable, risky, acceptable, all the things just from our conversations. You can see the mix of values here, and it's something we value. Meta value is that there are different values and perspectives in the group.

**41:14**  
Jen Boger  
So, you know, if we want to keep things simpler and running smoothly, then you do something like high level, codify the social contract that we have. Right. With like a caveat, like, you are always welcome to review the chat and say, strike this from the record and we literally delete it from the chat. Right. And then done. You know, we're not. It doesn't get used because it's kind of not there anymore. Or you're free to stay in a conversation. Okay, this next bit's off the record. And likewise we, you know, black it out and you can't use it because the thing is some things can be anonymized and you're never going to be able to pull them back out again. And that's kind of fine with most people, but other things, not so much.

**42:12**  
Jen Boger  
So, for example, I'm actually, and this is total coincidence, writing a piece on chatbots. Think you know where this is going. And that wonderful conversation we had on, if you ask a chatbot if it's a chat bot, does it have to be truthful or not? And the different perspectives on that is like, so rich and wonderful. Right, Right. Because it's capturing exactly kind of how humanity on average, thinks about chatbots and what's okay and what's not and why. Right. That's the big question, too. Why, when you know there's a moral imperative to do something, you can wave it away in certain situations if you feel it's in your benefit and aspects like that. However, if I, you know, even if I don't quote verbatim, if I take high level what that conversation was and post that online, would we all feel comfortable about it?

**43:10**  
Jen Boger  
Or would we say, someone could guess maybe what group Jen pulled that from. And now I can guess maybe who the individuals were who said the different things. And now it's publicly online and now, you know, so that's just like a use case where I assumed that what's said here is confidential, like a doctor's office kind of confidential. So while it definitely shapes my thinking, I would not presume to quote verbatim that conversation even if I took people's names out. So I'm just putting that out there as like a use case where it's not just like forming how a piece of code works, but like forming how we think and what we say to the world at Large and you know, so that we might want to codify.

**44:03**  
Jen Boger  
Like is it okay to quote, you know, transcripts or is it okay to anonymize for code and then everyone signs off on that high level. But that's just. Yeah.

**44:22**  
David Olsson  
You raised your hand again, Jen.

**44:24**  
Jen Boger  
I meant to go on mute.

**44:28**  
David Olsson  
It's a. It's a rabbit hole and that's what the room does is rabbit holes. So it's really good. It's a topic man.

**44:39**  
Ying  
Yeah. Thank you for the conversation. I really appreciate especially Jan's expertise on consistency. So there's a Chinese say like what we all have a lock on our door but the lock really discard against gentlemen not the real thief. So I, I think in. Yeah so in what I see concern here is yeah I, I agree we should have a consent. The reason is to just put a terms out there to remind ourselves and I think what most like what would be valuable is if Jan can provide some unintentionally unintentional behavior. People don't even know they are not supposed to do that in. In this kind of setting of from the literature just so people have better understanding about consent. Everyone think they know what is consent. Many times they don't. Like for instance, when people don't know what they.

**45:45**  
Ying  
What right they have, there's no way they can consent on things. The example would be mental privacy because bci, the. The brain and computer science interface they collecting people's brain waves and then that has been incorporating some AI goggles. And if people don't know their brainwaves being collected, there's no way they can consent and protect that. So I'm saying is this group. I would say trust and respect and reputation are at the high priority then. Oh you know, intentionally to get something from the intellectual conversation from this group. So I think have some have a consent but also have like the examples of what you're not supposed to do maybe help. That's my thought. Thank you.

**46:52**  
David Olsson  
Thanks Panee.

**46:54**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
Yeah, I was just gonna. Something that Jason said about the relational web as a really interesting thing. Something that I'm playing with myself and I see this space as a relational space. That's where I come to it. I don't think I'm going to leverage something and take something and figure, you know, it's really not at all like that. And that's what's precious about it for me. And I feel very comfortable bringing, you know, things that I don't understand to the mix as much as, you know, bits and pieces and. And that's the value. So I don't read the transcripts. I probably never will. I'm not interested in, you know, sort of the data part of it. I'm really interested in the relational space and what that is, because that's generative, at least for me.

**47:46**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
So again, I go back to the curiosity around leveraging the corpus because that is about extracting some kind of value from the outcome of the relational space. And I guess I don't really get that part.

**48:01**  
David Olsson  
So, yeah, you'd have to see some of that or have to appreciate what that is and what.

**48:07**  
Jason Kryski  
What.

**48:08**  
David Olsson  
You know, how about I'm gonna do it anyways, and I was gonna do it, and this is just a better way of doing it. And in that it is your voice, and it's pretty jammy that I could allow you to take it out.

**48:32**  
James Giroday  
I mean, we are doing it. Like the Fathom stuff circulates what's almost like a newsletter to just a group.

**48:39**  
David Olsson  
And so that's what you can surface no matter what. And so we'll go into the. That's what I want to experiment with, the ability to surface better faults, follow up, and then value afterwards. And to that point, I put in two links into the. Into the chat. One of them is coalesce. It's a My GPT, and it's basically the ability to deal with the subject matter we're talking today. I did it over a year ago, and it was designed to take a transcript and then be built Personas. Generate the Personas and then be able to continue conversations. And it works in a BBS type of fashion. And. And so that's one of them. And the other one is the one I want to spend some time on. But, James, you finish this up and then we'll move into this demonstration component.

**49:17**  
James Giroday  
Okay, I think we're almost done. Thank you guys for. Yeah, Hanif, I had a question. Do you mind? And I. You might have explained this already a couple times, but what's the opposite of relational? Or do you mind explaining relational again to me? I should probably Google it. But what does it mean to you in this context?

**49:38**  
Jen Boger  
Maybe.

**49:40**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
Yeah, I'm not.

**49:42**  
James Giroday  
Well, I.

**49:43**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
It's. I could wander around in here for a while, but I think what's crucial is that the outcome or the value proposition is in the relationship, not in the outcome of the relationship. So that's where I get tripped up by the term of, you know, leveraging and the corpus. And in the context of what does it mean to be in relation?

**50:15**  
David Olsson  
Yeah.

**50:16**  
James Giroday  
What if I Put it, what if I put it against extractive and like if I took a non relational approach to this group and I was like, I'm going to extract all the value I can. No old bard ostras ostracization be damned. Like I just want the money or something like, oh, that's such a good idea. I'm gonna commercialize it.

**50:38**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
I'm gonna run with that.

**50:39**  
James Giroday  
Run with. Yeah, take the money and run. Is that the opposite of relational? And like how.

**50:44**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
Yeah, I'll work with that one. So you know, extractive, relational or some good polarity.

**50:54**  
David Olsson  
So the intention is like building something.

**50:56**  
James Giroday  
It would kill something collaborative. Be less extractive and more relational.

**51:01**  
Jason Kryski  
Yeah, for sure.

**51:03**  
David Olsson  
And how about something that's reflexive?

**51:05**  
James Giroday  
Sure.

**51:08**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
Competitive. Right. So.

**51:10**  
David Olsson  
So it really is the lens in which you look at it. You're looking at. And the discussion is about a competitive capitalist kind of component. And the room has been reflective with each other and it has been supportive in a trusting way. And if we can say that we codify values amongst ourselves, I can show you for sure I can make those codifications happen at the code level.

**51:32**  
James Giroday  
Right.

**51:33**  
David Olsson  
And so it is really about who you're dealing with and to trust them to do what you think is right. And so I think we can manage that in a really neat way. And the surfacing of the relationship is the implicit value I think we all look for. And I think that's the best thing of this whole thing is like the continuity of Wednesdays is not what we will talk about, it's how we will talk about it.

**52:02**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
Yeah. And I, and just to jump in on the how, I think again, terminology is really valuable. So when we do talk about, if we use an extracted language to talk about consensus and rights and terms and so on, we are framing ourselves in that way. What would be interesting would be to use this forum and the technologies to, you know, build the relational terms and conditions. What does that look like?

**52:31**  
David Olsson  
How about relational is confusing? How about value based? Because that's what people bring to a relationship. Because those have been codified as our moral rights. And we can say that we work above our moral rights. And that's what you, that's what I think the trust is.

**52:48**  
Jen Boger  
Yeah, I agree with that. Values based is the way the field's going as well. Right. So when you look at design of new tech and we're talking a lot about baking ethics into tech and then there's like enormous amounts of information, I can point you to some. If you're interested on how do you get ethics into tech. And the problem is what is ethical behavior look like? Right? And now look at all the different philosophies around the world layered on top, cultural, government, all the other things. And oh my gosh, right? What is.

**53:23**  
Jen Boger  
So you end up doing values based engineering is gaining huge traction where you start to define what are your normative values and then you come of trust people that they're going to operate on those and that, you know, you only consult with the group when you feel like you're stepping outside of those. So for example, we have our values that this conversation remains strictly confidential. And then if someone wants to write a blog post on chatbots and you know, do high level thematic in their blog post, then they come back to the group. Hey guys, I want to do this blog post. My gosh, this conversation is perfect for it. Here's what I'm thinking of putting in there. Are we okay with this or not?

**54:15**  
Jen Boger  
And the group's small enough that we could kind of say yes, no on those cases where it's quite obvious that you're stepping outside of the social contract to do something with it. Right. Otherwise you assume everyone's going to not intentionally be a dork about it. Right. And if. And if blunders happen as they might, it's an honest mistake that you can then talk about and try to figure out together. Okay, now what do we do? Now that we've identified, we've messed. Right. But what a great group for us to come to with these types of questions, even from our real practice. Right. It's like I'm thinking of building this thing like we did with the chat bots. Is it okay to. If a chatbot lies about being a chatbot, that conversation is amazing. Right.

**55:07**  
Jen Boger  
And there's an example of us taking what we learned from this group and then applying that to the actual products and things we're doing outside of this group in a way that is clearly consented that you can take that information. Information and go apply it in terms of that. Sorry, David, I know you want.

**55:27**  
David Olsson  
Great segue. Great segue. And we only have like a. Yeah. Breadth of a hair of a second left. And I'm gonna steal whoever had anything left to say just because I have a meeting I have to run at 9 o'.

**55:39**  
Jason Kryski  
Clock.

**55:39**  
David Olsson  
The transition is not easy. The what I have here is a zero to hero app prompt generator. So it neither creates you a prompt that it uses nor the app that it uses. It is a prompt. It creates a prompt that Creates an app and it is killer. And so if you want to take a transcript and you want to do something with it, you can just copy this here and you go into chat GPT, say, here's coalesce. The coalesce thing, it's a my GPT. You just look for coalesce. You can do the same shit. You go, here you go, my new chat. You paste it in here and it now will guide me through the process of making a single page web app and it will create the full single page web app.

**56:32**  
David Olsson  
Now what it's going to do is it's going to run me through a process to build the spec to do that. And the prompt is tight. And if your ambition is not way out the window, like make me Facebook, then it will actually make a single page app and it will be very functional. You could do something like make a transcript processing app and build me the Personas. And I fucking did that all over the place. You go through this process and it's like, here, what do you want to make? A newsstand app that generates AI news. It's for me, I'm four. It'll look ridiculous. It's like a zero shock thing. It says it's a utility app. Context, minimal structure. Depends on whether you want it to be generate, display, or include stuff. So it's going to ask me a bunch of questions.

**57:28**  
David Olsson  
I'm super excited. ChatGPT 5 is pretty good. This is only set up for ChatGPT 5 and you can preview the apps in ChatGPT 5. So it's pretty jammy. Next steps. It's like, give me all this stuff. Here's the defaults, and you're like, what defaults? I'm like, it makes them up. So you could, you know, you could be quite serious about this. You want to process some information. You want it. You have survey data. You can create a survey report. You want to create a survey engine. You want to do a survey with Justin, you create a survey engine. You won't do the back end. It'll do all the front end though. Use sensible. Okay, so here's the generated prompt and it's using this structure that I've stolen like a pirate. Jason, you know, as well, and to.

**58:31**  
David Olsson  
To your point, Ying, I'm just a vessel, you know, let's.

**58:37**  
James Giroday  
Hey, let's do it quick.

**58:38**  
David Olsson  
Where's Dave? Where the is Dave?

**58:41**  
James Giroday  
That Dave? That is absolutely amazing. I feel like we sign. Yeah, go. Sorry, go ahead.

**58:46**  
David Olsson  
Yeah, I just got to finish off. Okay, continue. You can talk. I'll Just watch this play out.

**58:51**  
James Giroday  
I mean, I feel like the thing that everybody has like just total autonomy on is whether or not they show up. I'm curious to hear a bit of feedback, especially after Jason said that he was starting to trust everybody in this room less after this discussion today. This is like the most generic question of all time. Do you guys think you're more likely to show up next week the same amount of likely or like less likely? Is this maybe? Jason? I'm kind of most curious.

**59:24**  
Jason Kryski  
No, no, I think this is all like my comment around that is was, is just extrapolating out into like future scenarios where it's like very specifically regulated and I need to pay close attention to what those regulations or agreements are like. I'm of course, like, I'm gonna, I'm very likely to attend next week where this is a, you know, intellectual, like, directional discussion. I don't think anyone, anything has been decided or you know, adopted as a result of this. I, I was just like, again, like expressing my feelings, not my thoughts, as it resulted to just like my autonomic response to the discussion. And that's not overly valuable, but like, it's how both people, most people action on their feelings, not on their thoughts. I mean, I think, you know, Ying can appreciate that.

**01:00:18**  
Jason Kryski  
Like, I know being in marketing for a very long time, people don't make a lot of like intellectualized buying decisions. They make feeling based decisions to satisfy emotional needs. So it kind of, it's kind of like one of those things where like, regardless as to what you think you know, how you feel will generally override your behavior.

**01:00:43**  
David Olsson  
Well, and to that point, Jason. Okay, I gotta go to that point. It's how this room, how AI has hit this room that has been an interesting part. And the biggest, one of the biggest themes is the fact that it's how we feel about it because we're doing it instead of how we feel about it because it's out there at a distance. And so the feeling component, it actually, I think takes the intellectual opponent and it actually gels it for us in a way that allows us to surface values as how we can codify this. Look at this thing, man. It's going to generate a page. I'll share this over at email.

**01:01:18**  
Jen Boger  
Before you jump on. I stuck it in the chat. What about using this to analyze our past conversations?

**01:01:25**  
David Olsson  
That was the whole point.

**01:01:28**  
Jen Boger  
That's it. I put it in there. I'm like, if you haven't done it already.

**01:01:33**  
David Olsson  
You can even run the runbook against it too. You can put a chat in the runbook and it'll. You give you everything, man. It's just weird.

**01:01:38**  
Hanif Janmohamed  
This conversation will probably continue when we sign off. Yeah, Magic.

**01:01:42**  
Jen Boger  
I have to go drop my daughter at school so I have to jump too. But this has been awesome, guys. Yeah. Thank you, James, for bringing it up and for leading the charge. But maybe we can take an offline vote with the whole group about using AI to meta analyze all our past conversations and suggest a, you know, no more than two page high level values based social contract that reflects kind of what it's been seeing in the group. That includes like, it's okay to do this, it's not okay to do this. Or if you want to do this, you have to do this very high level. Like if you feel like there's breach of trust potential, kind of like declaring conflict of interest. I feel that's a great example for what we're trying to get at here.

**01:02:34**  
Jen Boger  
When, you know, you're asked on a project you have a conflict of interest and you have to sit there. Sometimes it's obvious. You're like, no, I don't know these people. Totally different topic, whatevs. But sometimes you sit there and you're like, you know, and you err on the side of disclosure if you're smart because most people will be like, thanks for letting me know whatevs. Right. And very few times is it actually like, okay, this is not going to work out. And it feels like this group is sort of and putting my own kind of analysis on top. But it feels like we're trending in that direction. Right. Where go for it.

**01:03:14**  
Jen Boger  
And if you feel there's a conflict of interest between the trust factor in this group and what the thing is you want to do, you declare a conflict of interest and voice it to the group so that everyone can see what you're looking to do and you can talk about it and everyone can say, yeah, whatevs or no, I think I want to explore this further or absolutely not. Right. And that keeps the trust level high because you're trusting our. It's almost like our tried, you know, here you're trusting your tribe's going to do the right thing without having to go through some paper pushing exercise that will take a lot of time but might not do anything for us. Really.

**01:04:05**  
James Giroday  
Well, thanks for your expertise, Jen. I'm sure we could get so much more out of it as well.

**01:04:12**  
Jen Boger  
Yeah.

**01:04:12**  
James Giroday  
But I'll try to action some of that, or maybe I'll have some questions for you, but, like, how to. How to action it?

**01:04:20**  
Jen Boger  
Yeah, I think, you know, honestly, Dave. Dave's got a great idea. Is like run it through what he's built and see what the scaffold is that organically pops up. Because this is a place where chatbots does have access to all the different philosophies and social contracts in general and ethics and, you know, law contracts. And it's going to pull on all those. Going to get it all right? Nah, probably not. But it'd be interesting to see, you know, the 80% that it usually gets to.

**01:04:53**  
James Giroday  
I'm most curious just to see like an output that we can overwrite later with something better.

**01:04:59**  
Jen Boger  
Exactly.

**01:04:59**  
James Giroday  
That's the way to go.

**01:05:01**  
Jen Boger  
That's the way to use AI right now anyway. Right. Is like either thought ideation or scaffolding. And then you go in and polish it up if you like what you see kind of thing.

**01:05:12**  
Jason Kryski  
So I'll ask what he wants to see. Cool. Thank you so much. Thank you, guys.

**01:05:21**  
James Giroday  
Bye.