

Trust Center Review-20260303_144804-Meeting Transcript

3 March 2026, 01:48pm

35m 30s

● **Fernando Guevara** started transcription

DL **Desmond Leo** 0:03

And we're trying to keep, you know, we we want to kind of expose everyone. So you've got your, you know, 94% of the people are real here, all the violations that you've had for all the live projects over the last 30 days.

LW **Leanne Willins** 0:17

Mhm.

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 0:22

If you want to include closed, you can then see like the health of all the studies that you've had overall. Um.

If you if you wanna view all the violations, you can Fernando, you can just kinda show how to view the violations.

Extends down like this. So you can actually start to see like what are the things that we're looking out for as we evaluate the the, you know, and this is a little bit to build the trust to be like we look at so many things that like you should be able to just automatically trust things and trust how we score things.

LW **Leanne Willins** 0:45

Mhm.

Yeah, mhm.

Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 1:00

As you Scroll down, you can dive deep into the individual things, so studies that have duplicate IPS and so forth. This is just kind of like A and you can paginate through all of the different cards and flags that we have.

LW **Leanne Willins** 1:13
Play that.

DL **Desmond Leo** 1:18
Whenever you click any one of these studies, don't click on them yet. Fernando is what it'll do is it'll lead you to the flagged participants area for that study for you to then review or approve, but if you Scroll down further.

LW **Leanne Willins** 1:26
Mm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 1:32
So again, all your live studies.
Unless it's filtered on including closed studies and it shows you which studies, what the score is for real, engaged, unique for this specific study.

LW **Leanne Willins** 1:48
Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 1:49
Whether or not it's critical, medium, low, I can't remember what the other the other scores are and you've got your call to action review button here so you can just click review and then again it'll take you back to the study and it'll just this is where all my flag studies are flag participants are going to be reviewed.

LW **Leanne Willins** 2:00
Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 2:05
All that same process that you go through of like, OK, I need to look at the answers of this person now because they were a speeder, but then like, oh, were they really real? We have, we have to look now. Each individual respondent is going to get an individual, real, unique, engaged score.

LW **Leanne Willins** 2:05

Yep.

Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 2:22

And we've put together a whole bunch load of rules for how what you considered, what combinations are real, what combinations are engaged, or sorry, what combinations means the person is not real, what combinations means they're not engaged, or, you know.

LW **Leanne Willins** 2:34

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 2:37

M.

But we're trying to.

Build QA into this into this process.

So I think the first question to you is I kind of explained a little bit more than I probably should have.

But we didn't really have a usable prototype for you to use as in like a a testable prototype. What are your thoughts on this as a what? What are your thoughts? What are your thoughts?

LW **Leanne Willins** 3:01

Yeah.

Honestly, it's just made my job so much easier. Like we've just just had an e-mail come in from one of the Omnis about the like data quality and like one of them was like questions of outliers on a numeric, but then another one was like, oh.

I don't know. The thing was people have said at one question that they don't actually return water bottles to the scheme that Ireland has, but then people have said that they do at this question. So like she's basically been like, oh, data quality needs to be. Like amazing for XY and Z and I was just like a check like a mad amount of things. I'm not just such a twiddling me thumbs. So it's nice to have like evidence of what has been checked and and also extra things that I can't check.

DL **Desmond Leo** 3:52

Mm.

LW **Leanne Willins** 4:04

Myself as well, like that definitely will, I think will.

Play nicely for clients. I guess my question to you then would be am I able to like export a report per project? So like if a client comes in and questions data quality, like am I able to once the project's finished, am I able to then like?

Download a report where it's like, you know, 95% of the data is fine with this is what's being checked with the responders that are still there kind of thing would be something that might be useful.

DL **Desmond Leo** 4:41

Yeah, we can look at figuring out how to like a sort of. I mean, do you want it? Is is this something that you want in Excel where you've got the flags associated with each respondent? Or is this actually like a report report that you want to have like an auditing report to be like this is what we checked this is.

How we do everything?

LW **Leanne Willins** 4:59

Yeah, I think both eventually. So like the Excel for example, like depending on how the review section looks for me going in and reviewing flags, like having an Excel of all the flags that they've got in the data. So a bit like how I QC the Omnis now where I just download all of the completes.

DL **Desmond Leo** 5:17

OK.

LW **Leanne Willins** 5:19

Look at the flags first, take any out that are like mad and then go through the rest of the day. I like. I think having that option is very valuable for me as someone who QAs until there is an option like a a fancier option to Q like QC stuff.

DL **Desmond Leo** 5:32
Mm.

LW **Leanne Willins** 5:37
Um.

DL **Desmond Leo** 5:39
It.

LW **Leanne Willins** 5:39
But yeah, then then I'd say, yeah, like the actual report side of this.
Again, just thinking about like the data quality questions that come in, like there's been a few times where I've had to write like what the data quality processes are.

DL **Desmond Leo** 5:46
OK.

LW **Leanne Willins** 5:58
Which for me is like it's pretty standard. I just like I go in, I check the open straight line and then why blah blah blah blah. But this obviously is a lot more technical.

DL **Desmond Leo** 5:59
OK. Yeah, sure.
OK, so they can audit it.
So like an auditing survey for for the report that that totally makes a lot of sense and we could probably bake that in per survey to be like give us an audit on on the data that's coming just before we uh.

LW **Leanne Willins** 6:13
Yeah.
Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 6:22
Oh, this allows you. Actually what Fernando is showing you is it allows you to filter on

specific studies then too. So you can do like the specific studies and then as you scroll down and you see you can oh, this is actually this is option 2.

LW **Leanne Willins** 6:28
Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 6:36
Is this option two? No, this is option this. This is this physics, yeah.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 6:39
This is yeah this is a view when you have a single project. So that option of the Excel. I think that this will be a nice.

DL **Desmond Leo** 6:51
We could print this out. I wonder if we if like, yeah, basically print this page, this is, this is all the metrics that we've got and then maybe do a little bit of a write up to be like this is how we measure all of the different things. Um.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 6:52
Yeah, exactly.

DL **Desmond Leo** 7:06
A question, do you think?
And that you would have gotten that this, this person, this thing that this person checked out to where she said there were contradictory answers.
Do you think that that was a list that they had in mind that they could have given to us in advance? Or do you think that that was just something after the fact that they were like, oh, what about, what if they say this?

LW **Leanne Willins** 7:26
So for this particular client like the survey, she's trying to play most basically. So the the actual like questionnaire was like there was a question at the upfront that asked them.
Do you return bottles? And then they followed up with two questions that people who don't use the service, they skipped it, but then they could still answer the rest of

the questions. And for this one particular question, it asked who returns your bottles in your household.

And so the original question is, do you?

Return bottles, yes, no, sometimes whatever the options were. But then question 19 was who in your household returns your bottles? And essentially what's happened is out of the 20 people who said they don't use the scheme, 10 said.

Hadan said that they didn't return bottles, which is fine. But then six people said someone else and four people said me. So like the four people could have been removed. Yeah, like that's been missed out quality. Fine. Like, we'll take that.

But the six people that originally said that they themselves don't return bottles when they've come into the question about the household have said that there's someone else does it. So for me, I'm like, that's more than reasonable. Like I live in a house where I don't personally return bottles. My housemate does, so I would have went through.

DL **Desmond Leo** 8:52
Yeah.

LW **Leanne Willins** 8:56
Through that and went, Oh well, yeah, I don't return bottles. I can't be asked, but me housemate does when I come down to that question. So it's like in this particular instance, there's like four people out of 955, mind you.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 9:02
Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 9:04
Right.
So that's not even, yeah, that's not even contradictory.

LW **Leanne Willins** 9:13
Who said who were inconsistent? Personally, to me, the other six are consistent because the Vans had someone else they haven't like said are.

DL **Desmond Leo** 9:23

The so the reason, the reason why I'm asking is that we could probably just build like a.

An expensive AI review over each respondent. Do they show any inconsistent answers across the thing? But if you think and then and then we can just flag them as an inconsistent answer or what we can do is we can we can if you think that they already had this in mind and that we should plan the project in advance.

LW **Leanne Willins** 9:39

Yes.

yeah

DL **Desmond Leo** 9:51

With these connections, then we should somehow maybe build connections in the survey editor that says like, hey, check this guy off of this guy. I don't really.

LW **Leanne Willins** 9:59

I'm not. I'm not sure if it would be like a in this instance anyway, because.

'Cause.

The like in hindsight the like Q19 just shouldn't have had a non option, it should have just been asked of anyone who uses the scheme who returns the bottles. So that's kind of like a questionnaire issue and I think I don't know.

DL **Desmond Leo** 10:20

Right.

LW **Leanne Willins** 10:25

Yeah, it's just the Omni. So I'm like, oh look, it is what it is. I am. But from a like an inconsistency point of view, like having something in that would flag inconsistencies would be good. So like one of the main things that like.

I kind of can't check right now because it literally means going into each person individually is checking like if someone is, let's say they're 18, but then they've answered that they have a child aged twenty-five, like a dependent child, like stuff like that.

I think would be important maybe across like the demographics.

To go like if someone answers that they've got children and they're under a certain

age, but they've answered that they've got kids older than them, that would be an inconsistent answer.

DL Desmond Leo 11:15
OK.

LW Leanne Willins 11:17
It's yeah, it's a bit tricky as well because once you start including like segments and like income, let's say like you could have someone who's AC2DE who answers that they earn like 100 grand a year.
Which is less feasible than an ABC1, but there's also a lot of C2DE jobs that pay a lot more.

DL Desmond Leo 11:40
Be a very successful plumber. Yeah, he could be a very successful plumber, so.

LW Leanne Willins 11:42
Yeah, so like even even like between me and Andrew, like I'm an ABC1, he's a C2DE, but he earns double what I do. So it's a I think there'd be a bit of finesse and that would be needed and kind of maybe researcher input on.

DL Desmond Leo 11:49
OK.

LW Leanne Willins 11:58
Which questions they would want inconsistencies flagged on. Like I definitely think kids is an easy one because if you've got someone who's between the ages of 18 to 30 and they're saying they've got kids 25 and older or 18 and older or whatever, like that's a fairly.
Kind of easy one to maths it out.

DL Desmond Leo 12:19
But the thing, the thing that we do with all of our flags or that that we are going to do with all of our flags is that we're not going to do auto.
We are going to everyone flagged is flagged for your consideration. We'll highlight

the ones that need you need to review 1st and then decide whether or not that is 1 to keep or if you should just ignore the flag.

LW **Leanne Willins** 12:36
Mm.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 12:41
Hmm.

LW **Leanne Willins** 12:41
Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 12:45
And we're gonna do that because it costs money if you get it wrong. So we need you to, like, consciously control, like, OK, I'm removing these people from my quota so that I'm gonna have them removed the inconsistency thing.

LW **Leanne Willins** 12:48
Mhm.
Yes.

DL **Desmond Leo** 12:58
I'm probably not. We're probably not gonna include that in this version, but at the very, but at the very least, the way that we describe, because what we can say is we measure on real engaged and unique and.

LW **Leanne Willins** 13:01
No, that's fine.

DL **Desmond Leo** 13:14
Will have specific rules for for, you know, like anything that is a critical risk is going to be someone that is going to be a study where or it's going to be a person that violates all three. They're not real, they're not unique and they're not, you know, and then um.

LW **Leanne Willins** 13:24

Yeah, yes.

DL **Desmond Leo** 13:30

A high risk will be someone that violates 2 and then a low risk will be someone that violates one or something like that. I can't remember the the the actual numbers I.

LW **Leanne Willins** 13:37

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 13:43

We Fernando is the revised flag review.

Uh.

Review of flag respondents. Is that is that workflow ready for for? Yeah.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 13:58

Sure, Yep, we can check what we have on the selected project. We have the flag responses and we let's say we have a list of the of the respond says that are considered with higher.

Risk score, right? We can check all the well, all the flags respond. We have a call to action to that. We have well some data of the high risk, medium and the pending action.

DL **Desmond Leo** 14:34

Yeah, so this is, this is, yeah, that's the great thing is that it'll tell you how many people that you need to actually review as you come in and you can decide if you wanna.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 14:35

And let's review.

LW **Leanne Willins** 14:40

Mm-hmm.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 14:41
Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 14:44
Review them or not.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 14:45
Mm-hmm. Correct. So we can't filter by the status, the risk, right? So we have critical high, medium, low, impending action. So that way I can easily navigate and let's say if I want to bulk action.

LW **Leanne Willins** 14:46
Yeah.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 15:01
Some of this, let's say response. I can do it as well. I can flag the type right of of the flag. Let's say I want to check, let's say more information.

LW **Leanne Willins** 15:03
Mhm.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 15:18
Sorry, I can do right here with the arrow I will see.
More description right on the flags and also so the question responses you will see so I can verify and have a verdict of OK I can ignore or reject and I will see immediate feedback.

LW **Leanne Willins** 15:33
Mhm.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 15:43
Here so it's a way a way right to to to work as well. I can check here and I will see more information if I want let's say very visual on the respondents and more information about the.

About the dates or any other information as well, I will have the same actions of going through all the responses and going through ignore or reject.

DL **Desmond Leo** 16:12

So what it is, is that there there's there's two ways to actually kind of review the flag respondents. But the this, this, this way we're with the action and I think this is probably the better way is that it allows you to just all on one screen approve, reject, approve, reject, approve, reject.

LW **Leanne Willins** 16:14

Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 16:29

So you can do it a lot faster than going to screen, clicking back, going to screen, clicking back.

LW **Leanne Willins** 16:31

Yeah.

Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 16:38

Sorry Fernando, and you're probably gonna go over now. Now you can also do bulk edits so you can you can bulk, you can bulk clear flags or you can bulk reject.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 16:42

Yeah, yeah, the bulk errors. Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 16:51

So you could filter on like everyone that was a speeder and been like, that's not really a speeder and then we'll just.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 16:57

Correct.

So there's a lot of combinations. Let's say I can filter all all the ones that are, let's say VPN, selectable action and then reject, right? Yeah, auto reject. So that is super fun.

LW **Leanne Willins** 17:08
Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 17:11
Auto object, yeah.

Or you can filter on every, you can filter on everyone that's critical and be like, I don't even need to. I don't even need to review them. They've all been, they've all violated like all three pillars. So we're just gonna check all of them.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 17:17
Is that one? Yep.

LW **Leanne Willins** 17:23
Mhm.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 17:23
Yeah, very cool. And that's it. Yeah.

LW **Leanne Willins** 17:30
I like that. And is there has there been any discussion of like?
I guess what the threshold is for like the percentages of the unique and stuff like that. So like if a.
I don't know, I'm just thinking like.
If we say like a project, let's say a project has 1000 completes, are we what are we saying like 80% in each?
Of the three that we're checking against, like the pillars, is 80% plus good data or going to like 1995?

DL **Desmond Leo** 18:09
We were, we were just, we were just discussing that before you got in at the project level. So there's there's the individual level which is critical high, low, medium and that's based on the rules, the the deterministic rules that we've set across each of these at the.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 18:15

Yeah.

LW **Leanne Willins** 18:18

Yeah.

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 18:25

I don't level.

Um.

At the panel level, we've got healthy, good, needs, improvement and poor.

LW **Leanne Willins** 18:35

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 18:37

We don't do it. I mean I guess this that that applies also at the survey level and right now we've basically put like 90 plus for healthy 75 plus for good needs improvement would be something like 50 to 70 and then under 50 would be like one in every like every other answer is is bad. So that definitely.

LW **Leanne Willins** 18:45

Yeah.

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 18:57

Is poor, but those numbers are flexible. We can, we can totally.

LW **Leanne Willins** 18:58

Yeah, I think that's.

Yeah, I just think because it goes back to that thing of like everyone's like 95% confidence level. It's just kind of like sticking out in my brain, but also like.

DL **Desmond Leo** 19:15

We can.

LW **Leanne Willins** 19:15

To even get 95% I think would be a push. So I think 90 seems like a reasonable number in my head.

DL **Desmond Leo** 19:26

I mean, it's based on all of these things, right? So to like you could get really strict and just say I want, I wanna focus everyone is is real and they're not doing any of these things. I think it's probably pretty realistic that you can get 95% real.

LW **Leanne Willins** 19:30

Mm.

Yeah.

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 19:43

On this engaged.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 19:43

Oh.

DL **Desmond Leo** 19:48

Uh, but the engaged is slightly different. Uh, I'm gonna share my screen for a second.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 19:53

Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 19:54

Hello.

This is a. This is a layered approach to. Just give me one second. I just need to find. So in in engaged, we have different sets of rules. We actually don't know how we're going to capture some of these things yet, but you know, it's just just go with me. So

we've got attention categories. So we've got speeding, straight lining, attention, invalid open ends and then underexposure.

LW **Leanne Willins** 20:37

Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 20:43

And so there's 12345 categories that you can.

Fit for engaged and so the rules that we mark is if there's two plus attention categories are flagged like it's speeding and they've been straight lining, then we mark them as as flagged where they need to.

LW **Leanne Willins** 20:51

Mm.

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 21:07

Qualify. And so we have like different sets of rules for, but that's the set of rules that we have for this one. Um.

LW **Leanne Willins** 21:11

Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 21:16

And I've got levels of severity here. So like any hard if there are any hard flags triggered. So if they write gibberish like if they copy it open ends from one answer to the next like if they failed attention checks 2 plus times if we have two plus.

LW **Leanne Willins** 21:24

Yeah.

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 21:33

Then.

Than hard and then if if failing all of these hards if they just violate any two of these categories.

LW **Leanne Willins** 21:42
Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 21:44
Then they should be flagged for review and then you review it and be like OK.

LW **Leanne Willins** 21:46
Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 21:50
Um.

LW **Leanne Willins** 21:50
Yeah, I think. I think that's fair enough. It's usually what I do as well. Anyway, I'm like if the opens are fine, but then they're flagging on two or more things elsewhere. It's still just like, bye. So it's fairly, fairly normal, I think.

DL **Desmond Leo** 22:08
Fernando, I think this means also we're gonna need to update the reporting so that we can actually feel like when something's when a a response is flagged for a specific person.
In your flag review, like as you go down to the questions, you can be like, oh, this they they typed in gibberish at this open end. That's the thing. It's got a little flag marker that was like, by the way, this is where it was flagged.

LW **Leanne Willins** 22:32
Yeah, that would be good as well, because then it means I don't have to like scroll through everything to just look for the flags.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 22:37
Yeah, to. Wow, that's that's nice. Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 22:38

Mm.

Um.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 22:48

We do add a note. Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 22:51

So I think there are a couple of questions that I want to close on.

LW **Leanne Willins** 22:57

Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 22:59

This was a value assessment.

Um, or a value risk assessment? So the question is, would you use this?

LW **Leanne Willins** 23:10

Mhm.

I think so. Like, I'm not. I'm not seeing anything where I wouldn't be like.

DL **Desmond Leo** 23:14

Yeah.

LW **Leanne Willins** 23:20

No, it's like it would just be easier to just do Excel or whatever. Like I'm all for making my life easier. So for me, like I would use it in the sense of.

Like, especially Omni's and stuff as well, because it's 1000 people, like it's a lot of people to check. So for me, having something that's a bit more automated, I'm always going to be 4 anyway. And yeah, just having like the little things, like the little flag next to wherever the question's flagged.

DL **Desmond Leo** 23:41

No.

LW **Leanne Willins** 23:50

And like, yeah, and it means as well, like again, just thinking of all of the, I see all of the clients, I think there's like 4 who've flagged data quality. Like we can even if a report isn't available yet, like we could just screenshot that and be like, look, that's what's happening on nominees. This is what we're checking.
This is what we're doing. Um, I just think it adds a layer of evidence.

DL **Desmond Leo** 24:11

I think, I think there were.

I think the, I think the reporting of it is actually going to be much it's pretty easy to do like like the printing out a PDF and actually that that that's actually a a good kind of additional output that we that we got from this is that if we can find a way to print out an audit report.

LW **Leanne Willins** 24:23

Yeah.

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 24:33

Then you can just send it off to whoever to be like, look, this was audited. Um.
'Cause that would make end customers value it too.

LW **Leanne Willins** 24:40

I think.

Yeah, because most of the time panels, it's usually only one panel anyway per project, usually unless we need to bring in a top up.

But I think it would also be good as well to have like a.

Panel versus panel view of it because like Declan's obviously wanting to get in on quality and essentially grade the panels on the quality they provide.

Which I think could be done with this, like, you know, we could go in even if we're like.

DL **Desmond Leo** 25:18

Oh, like you could do it. You could. Well, you could do a survey based on peer

spectrum sample and just be like, what's the quality out of this? And then do the same survey but a separate one for Tuluna and then be like, OK, well, Tuluna's got the score for the study and then peer spectrum's got the score.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 25:32
Hmm.

LW **Leanne Willins** 25:34
Yeah, or even just like a an amalgamation of like however many projects will have from Teluna in it versus however many projects are from Pure Spectrum. But like use all of the projects to like grade the panels rather than taking it from like one specific project because like.

DL **Desmond Leo** 25:52
Oh yeah.

LW **Leanne Willins** 25:53
Peer spectrum for the UK versus Ireland. Like I think Declan just wants like an overall total.

DL **Desmond Leo** 25:54
Like.

LW **Leanne Willins** 26:01
Grade of the panels and who provides the better quality out of everyone.
So even even if it's just an Excel, actually even if it's just like an Excel of that like all project view and essentially just either give off a report that's just a load of pivot tables or give an Excel where we can build a load of pivot tables like.

DL **Desmond Leo** 26:07
Yeah, sure. Happy to, I mean.

LW **Leanne Willins** 26:26
I think that would be it.

DL **Desmond Leo** 26:27

I think, I think, I think that's a super cool idea. I think that that's definitely a AV two of the initial setup that we have because we just want to say let's let's get.

LW **Leanne Willins** 26:33

Yeah, yeah.

It going first, yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 26:38

Some sort of grading system, but then yeah, in the future for a a customer to be able to be like, well, I'm gonna audit all all of my providers and I've got a quick button that I can click to automate with my providers that would be.

LW **Leanne Willins** 26:46

Yeah.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 26:51

Hmm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 26:54

Pretty, pretty on point. Um.

I like that idea. OK, um.

Would you solve? Does this solve a problem? Do you find value?

We already know how you're solving it today because it's a very manual process.

How does this compare to other tools that you've seen on the market?

LW **Leanne Willins** 27:18

Hmm.

I've not actually seen any other tools. So for me it's like it's almost like kind of Christmas of like fresh like ready to get me teeth into a type thing because yeah, like I did what?

FG **Fernando Guevara** 27:27

Mm-hmm. Like.

LW **Leanne Willins** 27:41

I worked at Spark Phone a bit years and every single day of those four years it was all manual. So and to be honest, like I've heard people talk about it. So like Dinata for example have their like.

Q score or whatever it is they call it, but they're not like it's a either something you have to pay for in decipher or B you have to go to them directly like there's no. And it's only for them. It's not like you can't just send them sample and they'll be like, yeah, we'll like grade it or whatever. So it's all very, I like the fact that it isn't individualised in the way that for Teluna, Pure Spectrum, like all of their quality processes will be individualised.

DL **Desmond Leo** 28:14

Yeah.

LW **Leanne Willins** 28:32

Well, obviously when you're using multiple panels and you're going in between different providers and eventually I want to bring on more providers.

Having something that isn't individualised, that essentially marks the quality of the questionnaire and then the responses that are coming from it, like that's just not something I've seen at all, which is exciting.

DL **Desmond Leo** 28:56

Yep. Cool. OK.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 28:56

Mhm.

Nice.

LW **Leanne Willins** 29:00

And yes, I find value and yes, it solves the problem.

DL **Desmond Leo** 29:01

And.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 29:03
Nice.

DL **Desmond Leo** 29:06
Awesome. OK, well then. Um.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 29:07
It's good.

DL **Desmond Leo** 29:10
That's good. I think Fernando, I think we can, we can send to Dave and be like, look, no more changes. This is it. We we we got him to start building this and then a couple of weeks ago and I'm pretty sure like twice a week we're like, oh, we've changed it by the way you can.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 29:14
Yeah.

LW **Leanne Willins** 29:15
Yeah.
Yeah, like from a from a like a viewing point as well, like it's all very kind of nice and neat. Like I wasn't looking there being like, what am I looking at? What am I trying to look at? So yeah, I'm excited.

DL **Desmond Leo** 29:26
You have to fix this now.

LW **Leanne Willins** 29:44
Just make make my job easier because the amount of quality checking I've had to do this past two weeks with like eight things going out at once. I'm like, oh me poor heart, just my mouse like this scrolled up down Excel like.

DL **Desmond Leo** 29:44
Yeah, this is gonna be.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 29:46

Nice.

DL **Desmond Leo** 29:58

Yeah, yeah, that sucks. Yeah, this this definitely, this definitely solves that problem.
Um.

LW **Leanne Willins** 29:59

Oh.

DL **Desmond Leo** 30:06

Cool, awesome. Then Fernando, just two I think outputs, although you'll need to process this transcript. Output one or sorry, update one is added an export button for export and audit and then update 2 is the flagged respondents area where they show the questions and you're like show.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 30:19

Yeah.

Yeah, that that that would be nice. Yeah, to add it. Yeah, I well, we we had the some layout proposal, but I don't think that that will be needed, Desi.

DL **Desmond Leo** 30:26

Which one? Yeah.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 30:40

Do you think or should we stay with?

DL **Desmond Leo** 30:41

I really like this. I really like this view. I think. I think this view is better.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 30:44

Yep, Yep, Yep, Yep.

Yep. Mhm.

LW **Leanne Willins** 30:48

What does the other view look like?

FG **Fernando Guevara** 30:49

Because we have.

DL **Desmond Leo** 30:50

Yeah, so so fill the end anyways out of.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 30:51

Yeah, we have this one that is with the real engaging unique on on the side and in Valley Country on the left. Then we have the Pryke Health and also.

This one that is quality dimensions on the top, then quality country and then we have the signal cards, break health on the bottom, but this one we have to scroll a little bit.

But I think this one, I mean have that.

LW **Leanne Willins** 31:23

Yeah.

Yeah, I I like this view.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 31:31

Yeah, yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 31:36

Yeah, it's clean. It goes through all the information. You don't get lost. And also because it defaults to all the active studies anywhere you click leads you to.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 31:36

I think that has a good combination. Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 31:47

The the checked flags thing. The only other thing actually in the Fernando the

checked flags thing something that that that when we're actually checking the individual flags.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 31:49

Mhm.

Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 31:57

Of the respondent.

When we're in the in the post lunch.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 32:02

Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 32:08

Should that should the top left back to projects actually that or should that be back to?

Security Trust Center.

LW **Leanne Willins** 32:17

Yeah, I think so.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 32:21

Oh yeah, we currently don't have it, but I mean we we can integrate it or I can think of some way.

DL **Desmond Leo** 32:28

I think well, like no, no, just just just replace back to projects with back-to-back to press center we can we can replace.

Where that goes.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 32:39

Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 32:42

Anyways.

All right, excellent. This is super cool. This is going to be a core pillar of of what Empathy IQ is.

Supposed to do and I I'm surprised at how we like we if we if we nail this version of it then we'll have a major core pillar kind of with immediate pain points kind of results. So that's cool.

LW **Leanne Willins** 32:53

Yeah.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 33:01

Mm-hmm.

LW **Leanne Willins** 33:06

Yeah, I like even from a like a client perspective as well and especially with the whole like AI and all of that happening more and more and more like I think having it like it's a good unique selling point in that like doesn't matter who you.

Panel is or I'm I'm assuming would this work if a client is like using from their own lists?

DL **Desmond Leo** 33:34

If they're, yeah, I mean any, any. So it's any complete that is captured on this, on their panel, on this panel, not even just from surveys, but then from we we'll bake it into our qual discussions somehow and and stuff.

LW **Leanne Willins** 33:41

Yeah.

Yeah, because I do think, I do think there's value in it from the client in that if they upload, let's say a batch of 10,000 emails or whatever, and then they have the people come through like it almost quality checks their database as well.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 33:58

Mhm.

LW **Leanne Willins** 34:05

So then they can go, well, actually we have this person, they're never open my emails and never because they'll have all that data as well of like who opens their emails, who clicks the links, blah blah blah blah. Like if they have someone who comes in and they answer a survey and the flag is critical and then the other information that they.

DL **Desmond Leo** 34:06

Yep.

Yep.

LW **Leanne Willins** 34:25

Have on them on their side also doesn't track with like being a real person or blah blah blah like they could arguably clear their database of so many bots.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 34:38

Hmm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 34:38

Yeah, no, that's true. That's true.

LW **Leanne Willins** 34:39

Like it's not foolproof, but I think there's value in it for people who would want to use their own.

DL **Desmond Leo** 34:46

Their own list? Yep. As long as the as as long as the complete comes in, we can track and and measure the performance. And I mean keep in mind this is always just version one, but what we're making, what we're focusing on is, is making quality collection as as as a core pillar of of.

LW **Leanne Willins** 34:47

Database.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 34:55

Yeah.

LW **Leanne Willins** 34:56

Yeah.

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 35:02

You know how, how?

differentiate ourselves from the rest of the market, so.

Excellent. Awesome. Thank you so much, Leanne.

LW **Leanne Willins** 35:10

That's good. Thank you. Shirley speaks.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 35:12

Thank you, Leanne.

DL **Desmond Leo** 35:12

And thank you, Fernando. I guess make those updates and then and then you and I can, yeah.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 35:14

Yep.

Yep, I will. Yep, that will be great. Yep.

LW **Leanne Willins** 35:20

I'll catch you later. Bye.

DL **Desmond Leo** 35:22

Awesome. Thank you guys.

FG **Fernando Guevara** 35:22

Super.

DL **Desmond Leo** 35:24

Bye.



Fernando Guevara 35:25

Sounds too. Bye.

● **Fernando Guevara** stopped transcription