

EXHIBIT 45

Redacted – Personal

** our plan

ok, so the thing to think through is what path we really want to take. it would be nice to be making the billions and to have a concrete technical problem we can go and solve and all that.

Redacted

we've been thinking that maybe we should just flip to a for profit. making the money for us sounds great and all.

Redacted - Personal

Redacted - Personal

the other side of the coin is that maybe we can work out something with companies like quora. ask for a bounty on problems. if we solve them you get the exclusive access to the trade secrets. now why would people want to donate to fund that?

- ligo: \$250M gamble
- media lab: \$45M annual budget (darragh also says has bad reputation)
- cern: \$1.2B annual budget (that's more like it)

the weird thing here is that companies are happy to put in the R&D effort. so our point isn't making the discoveries, it's ensuring that it's a public good.

- reid hasn't replied
- dustin doesn't show up

pretty clear no one is acting as if they really believe or care.

the adam model, does it give us the short term cash? no it doesn't. but it maybe causes people to join the coalition.

Redacted

why should people part with their hard-earned money? reid hasn't actually given yet, nor greg jensen. dustin doesn't even show up. elon puts the time, sam puts a small amount of time.

we were a bit too rushed on the for-profit transition before, i think. fundamentally right now we haven't found the thing to be high conviction on. and people are being whiplashed by that.

but what do we think now? we just want something that'll get us the money. we don't have a plan for productization, but actually by working with companies and asking them for problems which are on critical path we could be in good shape.

it all comes down to the money. we can get it from tesla, probably. we could also probably get it from google. maybe we can get it while staying independent and having this consortium of companies that will put the money in exchange for no particular thing except not being left behind.

ilya: one possible path to a solution: if coalition happens, then have diff countries with powerful AGIs.

the only option:

- coalition
- tesla
- quit

** ilya

- try not to just read off the slides
- dota code
- 7-14 days: show some datapoints, other points of science. as stated on the slide, feels like assertion
- make the argument about the niche:
- maybe dota bot (confidential) bit earlier too
- talk a bit more about the dumb human/einstein gap
- solving accident risk: clearer that no one else cares?
- agi IP resizing
- john notes: at a super high level, the pitch is too long. most meeting slots are an hour. good thing to shoot for 20-30 mins of presentation.
- highest level thing: seen startup pitches, all good pitches follow: narrative Q&A format. startups start with broad statement: we are building an app for sharing photos with your friends. really good ones follow path: when receiving "how does it work?" "you're probably wondering"...
- pitch structured logical: here's what we've done, here's what we're doing next. instead: we are creating a non-profit that's developing human level intelligence. why is that a good thing for the world? as opposed by the info that we have to convey.
- 1. short + tighten
- 2. structure as start with assertion and assertion, questions as someone considering investing might have.
- if considering investing in this, qs that didn't get treatment: is this good for the world? sort of addressed, can paint a pretty good picture: world of abundance is good, spend a bunch of time on safety, a box that needs checked, but less time on why this is a thing that you should want to have exist. we're in the world of openai. ford foundation: money to openai or openphil, or to bill +

melinda. that's where they are.

- tactical stuff: framing of defining AGI economically useful kinda interesting. don't worry about poetry better than humans.

Redacted

- slide design: sat through a lot of presentations. sometimes too text heavy, slides should be duplicative. animations visually distracting. concentrate on deep intellectual point. if do it with build once. talking through it. play once.

- ilya: make it more interactive, break up the flow. lot of lecture. engage the audience, vary the format. speakers do dumb tricks like vary tone of voice. switching between the two of us.

- something same code as dota, deep and interesting point. could do something with that.

- another question: as i watch, success feels very binary, i'll give people some money, then replaced by robot or i won't, laying out some amount of funding milestones. can see what success will look like. throughout the presentation, feels binary outcome. potential donor, map of success in this space.

Redacted

- not sure all the ownership stuff, coalition, helps. kinda needed if companies on board to donate. pitch not to the companies. feels sci-fi to me. up to that point, if you made the pitch that this accelerates economic, next 10x of improvement, drug discovery, cure the illnesses, basic to enumerate, foundation people super stupid approach to cancer.

- would talk about the openness. helps, intuitive idea: science is

all about scientific commons, making this work avail to benefit all. instinct of googles commercialize, optimize ad words. for us it's good goals for the world. without reaching takeoff, next level up in human cog ability. as you get into the details + levels, feels cabalistic, ford foundation. thought i was curing cancer, didn't realize. don't raise -> don't think too hard. fact that we're a non-profit. 501c3 granted magical powers. must be good.

- showing to them a good idea? every slide, show awesome end state thing. here's what your funding in this round gets us to. link between that and end state, logical next step. some concrete milestone that \$75M gets to, clearly measurably.

- large amounts there.

- (any new info?) none of this was wildy new. basically not.

- (how much do you believe?) strong openai and a weak one. strong: agi is coming, has to be done in an open non-profit structure, takeoff will happen. weak: are on the cusp of progress in AI speeding up. better AI tech will be good in the ways have been good. that's good and we should fund it. no one else really funding in quite the same way and as well.

- fundamentally even google, which is most spend happy company, is a company at the end of the day. way we should be in this is positive externalities on the world. like science, can't monetize scientific advances that well, reasons companies are good is clear reward and incentive. in science kinda skewed. but fundamentally, not a benefit that can be captured easily. stock corporation: railroad, charge you to use it, almost all the benefits from having built the railroad, etc..

- progress fundamentally has to be made by non-profit, interesting direction you could go. everything i perceive with openai, race dynamics vs demis + brain + whatever, gotta get there first. another angle: they'll never do that much that's interesting.

- ilya: don't think it's true, that's the problem. pitch: important that not absorbed.

- john: ruth will get to DM like she's gotten to everyone eventually, battle between DM and ruth, ruth wins.

- ilya: if ruth wins then yep.

- john: if you want sustainable investment towards the goal. DM

has most borrowed time + money. i do believe that. more correct. not the most important. think about ownership. biggest highlevel: pitch structure, more narrative oriented, significantly less detail. tactics: more interactive, clean up slides. third: get more into the mindset of the person at the ford foundation writing checks, what risks + benefits. we've been in this world long enough that are obvious to us, like why step in human efficiency.

- detail(??)

ok so 19 minutes ago

i want the fundraiser to succeed 19 minutes ago

for the simple reason that 19 minutes ago

value is independent of form 19 minutes ago

it is better for us to become increasingly kings of this industry 18 minutes ago

if we give up at this juncture, i think we will never succeed 15 minutes ago

as before, the choice defines us 15 minutes ago

For sure

15 minutes ago

also you say we should have been more ok with giving it to elon. hile it's true, it's also the case he's now given it to us 15 minutes ago

the grand upside is here 15 minutes ago

i want it 15 minutes ago

need to stop letting distractors get to me/us 14 minutes ago

Being the Kings of AI is not so bad

12 minutes ago

not so bad 12 minutes ago

and just remember 12 minutes ago

if we do it all over again 11 minutes ago

we know how to solve/head off all the problems we've already solved 11 minutes ago

we don't know how to do that with the ones we haven't 11 minutes ago

Redacted

also keep in mind that by allying with elon, we'll get the jim hardware 9 minutes ago

also don't forget there's always the "become cerebras research" route 9 minutes ago

heh 9 minutes ago

Jim hardware is sweet

7 minutes ago

unique in history 6 minutes ago

Tesla research beats cerebras research

6 minutes ago

(our options here) 6 minutes ago

or like 6 minutes ago

the non-profit we can build 6 minutes ago

if we can get the funding 6 minutes ago

nothing like it 6 minutes ago

Heh

6 minutes ago

the us gov people have no idea what to do with their money right now 6 minutes ago

No doubt

5 minutes ago

there's money sloshing around 5 minutes ago

Just need to find it

5 minutes ago

Redacted

Redacted - Personal

Every problem can be solved

1 minute ago

yep 1 minute ago

value is the hard part 1 minute ago

let's just keep building it 1 minute ago

And if we're the true kings of AI

1 minute ago

:+1::+1::+1:

now

great now

ok now

we are decided now

no surprises now

but at the very least now

we are now rationalized :)

so why is this is important for people to buy into? scientific applications, we can *speed it up* and we can ensure it's not turned by google towards google purposes, owned by the world, public good. the AGI system itself for sure, but also the technologies produced along the way.