

questionnaire review walk through-20260423_110437-Meeting Recording

23 April 2026, 10:04am

44m 49s

● **Desmond Leo** started transcription

DL **Desmond Leo** 0:04

All right.

I am going to walk you through our prototype experience for...

Questionnaire review.

It's not an interactive version that you can have access to just yet. It is one that lives, we're building that out. It's just one that lives on my...

NP **Nathan Pereira** 0:19

Sure.

DL **Desmond Leo** 0:26

laptop, the devs have one on theirs. I'm testing right now just the user flow, the flow of questions.

And then I kind of want to get your impressions on this approach.

Um...

So theoretically, you've uploaded a questionnaire. This is the VC questions edited. It might help for you to have that questionnaire open on your laptop.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 0:56

Give me.

Wow.

DL **Desmond Leo** 0:59

just so that we can look at the same thing. I'm going to open that up right now as well.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 1:02

But.

It's open.

DL **Desmond Leo** 1:21

You may or may not know all the answers to all these questions now.

To start, so this is basically the way that I'm building it out right now, the way that I have built it out is a chat experience.

Effectively, the premise is you take a questionnaire, you import it in, you get an AI agent to review the questionnaire, but whenever the AI agent reviews the questionnaire, it's not meant to be like, just spits out an output. This is a collaborative, consultative approach.

towards designing a questionnaire to make sure everything is designed properly. Yeah.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 2:01

OK.

DL **Desmond Leo** 2:02

I don't know if you can see these words.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 2:05

Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 2:07

Is that big enough for you to see or do I need to zoom in tomorrow?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 2:09

Yeah, I can see it.

DL **Desmond Leo** 2:10

Okay.

I'll be reading some of the stuff anyways. You can ignore all of this stuff up here. The first message you see is...

So the next step is just to lock in the brief and the decision context before any changes are applied. And you can say skip or don't know at any point. I can do a

quick advisory pass or a thorough strategic analysis. And if you don't have a preference, I'll default to the advisory pass. For this purpose, we're going to do the thorough strategic analysis.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 2:41
Okay.

DL **Desmond Leo** 2:41
And the length of the strategic analysis will depend on essentially how big the questionnaire is and stuff. So let's do a thorough strategic.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 2:46
Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 2:51
analysis. And you tell me as we go through this experience, we'll comment on all of the things it's asking and you can describe whether or not it is relevant or irrelevant as part of the thing. Like maybe you'd be like, oh, that's a smart comment. Or maybe we're like, that's stupid.
I already told you that and that's in the questionnaire somewhere.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 3:13
Okay.

DL **Desmond Leo** 3:14
in which case I have to...
debug and figure out where it happened. I don't know why I had to close this. So this questionnaire mixes personal experiences, suspected scam, exposure, consequences, reporting, and impacts on the people around the respondent. I'm asking this first because your answer will decide whether I should preserve it as a broad awareness prevalence tracker or reshape it more tightly around

NP **Nathan Pereira** 3:17
Yeah, sure, sure.

DL **Desmond Leo** 3:35

A decision used like policy design, campaign targeting, victim support, or service improvement. What is the survey mainly meant to help you learn or decide?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 3:43

Exactly what it said it was, yeah. Personal experience, a suspected scam and what people do with it. Yeah, it's exactly what it said.

DL **Desmond Leo** 3:54

Can you give that to me in a phrase that I can take out?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 3:57

All right, yeah, the questionnaire evaluates people's exposure to online scam scams.

DL **Desmond Leo** 4:01

S.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 4:08

how to report it and if they report it.

Okay.

DL **Desmond Leo** 4:18

Like this.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 4:19

Yeah, perfect.

DL **Desmond Leo** 4:27

Oh, we're doing extra high. It should be medium. That's fine.

Change this thinking context to be.

You know, for some reason, the system automatically truncates stuff like this, and I don't know why. Sometimes and not other times. So the current draft goes beyond exposure and reporting into consequences, support, and effects on people around the respondent. I'm asking the next question because it will tell me whether or not

those wider modules are core to the brief or possible trim candidates.
who commissioned this research, who will use it, and what decisions or actions
should it support.

You can kind of make some of this up if you want to expose the library.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 5:03

No, it's probably a good idea to do it properly. It's commissioned by an analytics agency for PR purposes, effectively. So it's raising and exposing awareness around what people do and don't know about online scams.

DL **Desmond Leo** 5:27

Uh, no, and do the scams, so then, in terms of who would use it, um, it would be the the PR agency would be using it to.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 5:34

It's, it, it's just, yeah, use it as a scare tactic to get people to take this more seriously, I guess, in a really blunt form.

DL **Desmond Leo** 5:46

How about as a PSA as a PSA campaign?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 5:49

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 5:52

to get people to take scams seriously. And that's actually probably also the same decision it's going to support because the decision it will support will be campaign.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 6:05

Yeah, but do people know what to do if this happens? And I guess it's trying to make people feel less stupid about being caught because it's supposed to raise awareness on, you know, look for these sorts of things. Because if you look for...

DL **Desmond Leo** 6:10

Well, this is...

OK, so I, so I said here the decision will support his campaign content to ensure it raises awareness appropriately.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 6:28

Yeah, perfect. That'll do.

DL **Desmond Leo** 6:38

That helps. That helps A lot. The brief now sounds like a public facing awareness campaign in shaping research, not a service diagnostic study, which means I'll judge the questionnaire on whether or not it produces a clear PSA ready insight rather than just operational reporting data. The current source looks like a broader consumer survey with the UK style crossbreak and general online user profiling. I'm asking this now because the intended, if the intended audience is narrower or more specific. than that, the screener, framing, and even which modules are in space may need to change. Who exactly is this survey meant to include?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 7:10

The general population.

DL **Desmond Leo** 7:15

In the UK.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 7:16

Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 7:21

And that fits the current UK cross break.

structure much better. For now, treat this as a UK general population awareness study. Because this will be used for PR and PSA content, the fielding mode matters quite a bit. It changes how much complexity, repetition, yada, yada, yada. How much is meant to be run in practice? Is this going to be, is this online? This is an online self-complete study.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 7:39

Yeah.

Yeah, online.

DL **Desmond Leo** 7:59

The next thing.

that would most change my advice is whether this is a one-off PR wave or something you may want to repeat.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 8:08

It's repeatable.

DL **Desmond Leo** 8:08

If it's repeatable, is repeatable, this will be.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 8:11

Yeah.

This is the 4th iteration of.

DL **Desmond Leo** 8:17

This is the 4th wave.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 8:17

This project, yeah.

But they change, things change. So it's not like a tracking study that is fixed, which is odd. There are certain questions that remain fixed, but there are elements added and taken away according to how this particular Area evolves, because it evolves quite quickly.

DL **Desmond Leo** 8:39

App.

Okay, but certain elements are often often switched because this area moves quite quickly.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 8:44

Movable, yeah.

Oh.

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 8:52

Before I hit enter, I'm assuming you will know which ones stay the same and which ones are...

NP **Nathan Pereira** 8:58

Yes, I do. Yep. Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 8:59

Yeah, okay, cool. Just in case that question pops up.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 9:02

Yeah, that's fine.

DL **Desmond Leo** 9:10

That gives us a useful.

Some comparability matters, but they should not be treated like a rigid tracker if scan patterns and PSA priorities are moving. I'll carry that forward to preserve the core trend measures where they still earn their place, but allow for faster refreshes around emerging scam behaviors and campaign needs. The source already has quite a lot of content around personal exposure, consequences, reporting, and impacts on other closures. I'm asking this now because online self-complete PR work usually hits a point where someone has to give and your answer will shape what I protect versus what becomes the make space territory. Are there any hard length limits? And if the survey starts to feel too heavy, what absolutely has to stay versus what has the most room to change?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 9:44

Uh-huh.

So would we just list the questions like that would stay the same here or how would that work in this scenario? Yeah, shall we try it that way?

Mm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 10:02

Just ask that, so we would like to, so, so we need to list the questions that stay the same.

Or, what was the question?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 10:14

That was the question here. Do we list the questions that remain the same?

DL **Desmond Leo** 10:18

Is that what you're asking for?

If we need to tighten the questionnaire for online, what are the non-negotiables versus the more flexible areas? For example, you could answer in a simple way, exposure and reporting questions must stay comparable, consequence detail modules can flex more, immediate circle questions are optional, keep it under X minutes. This helps me know what to protect before we get into specific question by question decisions.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 10:48

Okay, so I would say keep it to, how many questions have we got? Got 9 questions, keep it to 5 minutes.

DL **Desmond Leo** 10:48

So...

Keep it to 5 minutes. And then what parts feel core enough that you should usually stay stable across waves?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 10:59

Max, yeah.

App.

DL **Desmond Leo** 11:11

If you don't have a comment on that, then that's also fine. You can just be able to keep it to 5 minutes.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 11:14

Yeah, the thing is I know which questions have to remain untouched.

DL **Desmond Leo** 11:19

Oh, then say that.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 11:20

So, Q2.

DL **Desmond Leo** 11:24

You too.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 11:27

A3.

Before.

Q5.

Those are the questions that remain the same.

Thank you 7. Thank you 8. Pretty much, pretty much 90% of the question. I think there's two questions that are negotiable.

Okay, let's just leave.

What to leave two, three, 4, 5, and let's see what it does with the rest of it, because let's just see how it acts. Just out of interest, you know, let's see.

DL **Desmond Leo** 12:11

Ohh, yep.

That's a strong constraint, and it changes the review posture quite a bit. A five-minute online self-complete survey with two, three, 4, 5 locked comparability means it should I should treat the rest of the questionnaire much more critically as potential makespace simplification and restructuring territory. The current draft includes broader context and immediate circle material, which may be useful for PR storytelling, but could be the first place of burden.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 12:18

Mmh.

App.

DL **Desmond Leo** 12:37

If burden starts to keep up, are there any sections that are already approved, sensitive, or especially important to keep, or is this everything outside Q2 to 5 open to change of needed?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 12:47

Open to change, let's do that. Let's just, let's just see. Yeah, because you guys is open to change, just to see what it does. I'm interested now, really interested.

DL **Desmond Leo** 12:57

Yep.

That gives us a clear, very clear redesign guardrail, our fixed core, keeps a two to five fixed core, everything else has to justify inside the five minute survey. What kind of time pressure? With that kind of time pressure, a later review almost certainly tests whether sections like broader profile and cross breaks are in the immediate circle material are duplicated. One last strategic check before I turn this into a structured intake record.

Is there anything you already know that is unfinished, disputed, politically sensitive, or likely to need extra care for review? For example, wording that the stakeholder keeps changing, a section you suspect is too long, or anything legally or commercially sensitive for the PSA use case.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 13:41

No concerns of any of that.

DL **Desmond Leo** 13:43

Nope.

So I've got enough to take a clean and take now, checking the extraction questions around the locked core, and I can write the, oh, that's just an internal note for myself.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 14:01

Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 14:07

I found one thing worth handling. Oh, this is just also another internal note. It's you know, like when you deal with chat things, it shows you like it's thinking as it's going, this is what it's doing.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 14:16

Yeah, yeah, yeah, that's fine. I quite like this process, though. It's quite cool. It's a bit scary, but it's quite cool.

DL **Desmond Leo** 14:19

Yeah.

Yeah, I mean, like, I'm trying not to, I'm trying not to make it feel as if it'll completely replace a researcher. Like it's meant to be a really consultative approach. But this process itself specifically, as we wait for the next thing, was 20,000 lines of review logic.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 14:33

Yeah.

Oh, wow.

DL **Desmond Leo** 14:44

of AI review logic, 42 different checks over 10 kind of categories of questionnaire checks. It's more thorough than anything that currently exists on the market, because sometimes you'll just be like, improve this question, and that's just like a very simple prompt. This is like a...

NP **Nathan Pereira** 14:57

Uh-huh.

DL **Desmond Leo** 15:03

Proper breakdown analysis of have have they designed the survey properly, and...

NP **Nathan Pereira** 15:05

Uh-huh.

DL **Desmond Leo** 15:10

Does the survey help them actually achieve what they said they wanted to achieve in the design? So we go from strategic all the way down to like the very nuanced, does programming logic just incorrectly written in the questionnaire?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 15:24

Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 15:25

I don't know why it's thinking so long though.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 15:26

The.

DL **Desmond Leo** 15:30

I'm surprised that it's actually taking such a long time to think through this next step.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 16:07

Probably needed to get to play hold music.

DL **Desmond Leo** 16:08

Yeah.

Yeah.

Well, we need a spinning thing, yeah, the...

When I was, when I sent it to the AIML engineer to like basically build up the system because we got this, we got this working. He was like, yeah, this takes a lot of time. I think for some of the questionnaires that I was doing, I was eating one point.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 16:30

Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 16:37

4 million tokens for this entire process. Yeah.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 16:39

Yeah, wow.

As it's an AI model, right? Does that mean in theory, the more questionnaires that are uploaded into it, the smarter it will become because it can, you know, if it's running a PR piece for this, then if it's running a PR piece for something else, it gets a general gist of idea of what

DL **Desmond Leo** 16:52

No.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 17:00

PR Surveys are looking like or being requested of. Does that, if that makes sense?

DL **Desmond Leo** 17:05

So the way that we're actually going to build it is not really. This is a questionnaire. There's 2 processes. The process one is the questionnaire review, and then we will have it so that it just reviews it according to best standards. And if you want certain standards to be adhered to,

NP **Nathan Pereira** 17:21

Mmh.

DL **Desmond Leo** 17:24

you can call them up front to be like, I want all Surveys to have X, Y, Z, and this is the thing that we always have to do.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 17:29

Sure, sure.

But what I meant is what I meant is the process it goes through. So, like, if if you know 50% of your clients are PR and 50% of your clients are Coca-Cola, I don't know, let's say it that way. Will it will it understand that when you put a PR thing, because it's been you it's been reviewing a lot of PR Surveys, it won't it won't recognise. OK.

DL **Desmond Leo** 17:46

It will not. It does not. This process does not necessarily self-learn just yet. But having said that, the next version of this that is very closely on its way as well is you will be able to upload a brief.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 17:52

OK.

Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 18:03

And then when you upload the brief, what we then say, what we then do is go through like, okay, well, to answer this brief, we need to walk through a specific checklist of like, this is the stuff you need to have collected. This is stuff you need to do. You need to do competitive research. You need to do industry research. Do you want us to do that for you? Yes, we'll go.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 18:12

Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 18:22

create all of it. And so you upload a brief, we'll give you all the materials that you need to conduct the work you want. And then you will, then we'll say like, here's all this materials now, do you want to work with us to design A questionnaire, basically?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 18:27

Mhm.

Cool. I'll forward you something from a company called the Guidance Group, and they have a very similar thing where basically what you do is you say, I want to run a questionnaire where I'm asking 20 questions on this, that and the other, and it will basically

Once you've told the AI model that's what you want to do, it will literally pump everything out for you.

DL **Desmond Leo** 18:57

The difference is, so actually yes, absolutely send that over. I'm really curious because the way that I want to build it is I want to make sure that you're involved at every

single step. There's a human in the loop in every single decision rather than just like automate input. There's a black box and it comes back out. This is about control and quality and stuff like that.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 19:03

Mm.

Yep.

Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 19:17

Okay, so I've now persisted, this is the research review summary. The strongest part of this questionnaire is locked in the comparable core in Q234, in Q2, Q3, Q34, and Q5.

Did I make a typo when I...

NP **Nathan Pereira** 19:36

No, 34 because I relabeled the questionnaire and there were two Q3s. So just for the, just for when I gave it back to the client, I was like, you know, Q3 and there's a strike through Q3 and I've turned it to Q4, if that makes sense, because he put two Q3s in. So that's why it says 34s, it hasn't recognized a strike through, but that's.

DL **Desmond Leo** 19:39

Oh.

Oh, I see. Okay.

Oh, I see.

No, that's fine. I will, I will fix that, or no, we we'll just recommend that all the approved changes are approved and so that.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 19:55

That's not a problem.

Yeah, that, yeah, I just, I haven't updated it. There are still queries in the questionnaire, so that's what I thought, yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 20:08

Okay.

Okay. The main risk is that the full draft is too broad for a five-minute UK general population self-complete PSA surveys. And the next decision is really about mixed space, whether we actively strip non-core profiling and related material to try to preserve broader legacy coverage around locked core. What I'm noticing is that the survey still carries a heavy cross-break block a broad Q1 and then the later Q7 to 9 immediately circle modules around the locked core. I'm asking this first because your answer sets the rules for everything that follows. If you want a lean PSA instrument, I'll treat those as active cut or shrink territory. If you want a broader storytelling coverage, I'll preserve more of them and make smaller trims elsewhere.

Given the five-minute limit and the locked Q2 to 5 core, do you want me to cut the non-core profiling in related material aggressively rather than trying to preserve broad legacy coverage?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 21:01

Hmm, that's a good question.

I would say broader storytelling coverage is more important for this purpose.

And.

Extend the time limit to.

8 to 10 minutes and see what it says. If time seems to be an issue for this.

Just out of interest, really.

DL **Desmond Leo** 21:32

Yeah.

Theoretically, it should update its knowledge because we have a running queue of like these are the rules.

Okay, your answer is materially shift the live review lane. This is no longer a hard 5 minute space.

First big researcher, I'll update the can't signing postures, so I'm mirroring one complete example before I save.

Yeah, I need to I need to get all of the internal naming documents out of first phases and steps out of the experience.

See, this is a partial stage forty-five decision record for now, included the updated time window, what is during, OK?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 22:31

What's the stage 45? Is that your internal? Is that something internal? All right, right. That DEFCON 2 was something. What's going on?

DL **Desmond Leo** 22:34

That's my internal, yeah, that's my internal, like, yeah, we've.

Yeah.

We we started with.

Stage 45, like we started with, I started with stage 10, then 20, then 30, and then 40, and then 50, and then I was like, oh, I can't create a, I have to do something in the middle now. So 45 is actually in the middle between.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 22:57

Sure.

DL **Desmond Leo** 23:00

Okay.

Yeah, this materially changes the posture of record that runs partial update. We're not treating this as a broader storytelling. This means the next decision is no longer should we trim aggressively, but which supporting sections actually earn their place under the broader brief. The opening cross break blocks it. Cross break block is the first in the queue because if it's still...

takes real time before the main scam content starts. And your answers here will decide whether we keep a richer reporting storytelling setup or simply simplify it to protect space elsewhere. Do you still need most of the current opening cross breaks for reporting and pure storytelling, or would you rather keep only a leaner subset and the most useful ones?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 23:45

I would say...

The former, so keep it for reporting and PR storytelling.

DL **Desmond Leo** 23:55

The rich.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 23:58

Yeah.

The current, yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 23:59

Rust the word or keep the current.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 24:02

And.

Opening cross breaks for reporting in PR storytelling.

DL **Desmond Leo** 24:11

Now, alternatively, you could ask...

it to explain more so that you can kind of see where it's coming from.

Up to you if you want to be like him.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 24:21

We could do it if you want, just to see what it says. I think the answer to this is definitely going to not change, but I'm just, we could do it for why not purposes. I've got no problem with finding them.

DL **Desmond Leo** 24:21

App.

All right, have an example of.

What you might...

In.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 24:45

Mm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 24:46

Well...

Okay, sections like this. A lean version would be H gender region, maybe primary language.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 24:53

Yeah, OK.

DL **Desmond Leo** 24:55

Okay.

Uh...

Keep the current prospect for reporting and storytelling.

If, um, if Dave comes the week prior, um, I think we should go for drinks.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 25:25

Yeah, we can. Richard just got in touch with me randomly and said we should, because he's still not working, and he said we should meet up for lunch. And I was like, yeah, absolutely we can, because I can...

DL **Desmond Leo** 25:26

Yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah, yeah, if I, if I can, if I can make it all come, yeah.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 25:40

Yeah, because I can work remotely. So I can work from anywhere. I just need my laptop and an internet connection. So it's not so difficult for me. Obviously, it's different for other people who report to somebody. So yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 25:46

Yeah.

The next module design is question 7 to 9, the immediate circle section about scams affecting people around the respondent. I'm asking this now because it's the biggest remaining non-core storytelling block after the main personal experience spine. And your answer will decide whether we keep that wider social impact angle or concentrate the survey to a more tightly on respondents' own exposure and reporting behavior. For example,

Keeping it gives you a stronger scam affects families and close networks to story. Cutting it keeps the narrative to more focused on direct lived experience. Do you

want 7 to 9 to stay as part of the PSA story or do you want to, would you rather shrink or remove that block?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 26:31

Stay.

DL **Desmond Leo** 26:40

That's a meaningful choice because it confirms you want the campaign story to include indirect and household level impact, not just the respondent levels on experience. Okay.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 26:47

Correct.

DL **Desmond Leo** 27:37

The first technical issue is the cross break at 10, the family children profile item. In the current source, it reads like a compressed line first, yes, no, then age bands underneath. I'm asking this because if we program it the wrong way, we either lose useful family detail or create a confusing respondent task. A clean build would usually make this a yes, no gate 1st and then follow up. where you see the select the relevant child's age band. If that's what you intended.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 28:00

Exactly.

DL **Desmond Leo** 28:05

Should so should cross 10 cross break 10 be a yes-no question? Yes, it should be right.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 28:09

Yep, it's a yes, no, then followed by a what are the age? So yeah, the question is, do you have kids under 18? And it's a yes, no answer. And then if they say yes, how old are they? And if they say no, they skip. So yeah, it's correct in its thinking.

DL **Desmond Leo** 28:11

So.

What this process is also doing as we go through all of the technical details, we're putting things into a very structured, we take that questionnaire and we break it up into like a really, really structured JSON. Because at the end of this, the version two of this or the version three of this, you're going to be like, do you just want to program it now?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 28:38

Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 28:48

Because we just had a conversation. We just did everything. It's all sorted out in my head. I can just click, boop, you've got a program serving.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 28:48

Mhm.

Yep.

And it also means I'll have less of a manual element because I think what happens with a lot of PR companies, they just send, I haven't edited this. This is in the, I've edited some of it, but a lot of it is in the format that the client sends it. For example, this question, I would naturally split it myself into two, but knowing that this potentially

DL **Desmond Leo** 29:11

Yeah.

Mhm.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 29:21

understands that this is silly, means I won't have to do it manually because it's recognized that these two things should be separated. That makes sense. So

DL **Desmond Leo** 29:29

Yeah, it, it, it, the current output should spit out, and I can send it to you actually, because I won't send it to you right away. Like, once it's done, I'll send it to you. It spits out, it spits out an updated questionnaire to be like, this is actually what the

questionnaire now looks like, and that's the version that you can go back and forth with.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 29:40

Yeah, yeah, cool, cool.

Yep.

Mhm.

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 29:51

Okay, for Crossbreak 10, my default would be to allow multiple age bands because a house break can easily have more children in one age group and a single choice version would lose that detail. Do you want the how old are they followed up to be followed up to be multi-select so respondents can choose more than one child age band if relevant?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 30:05

Yep.

DL **Desmond Leo** 30:06

Uh...

Uh...

Do you want a how? Do you want the how? Explain this.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 30:15

I think it's basically just saying, do you want to...

Yeah.

It'll be a multi-select.

DL **Desmond Leo** 30:23

Well, I'm asking this because it changed under which child age groups are present in the household with multi-select, and then which one? Yeah, so OK.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 30:24

Um...

DL **Desmond Leo** 30:35

Multi-select in this case, or do you want it to be something completely different?
Like, actually, I want to know each.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 30:36

Yep.

No, no, no, that's absolutely fine. It's usually done by age, but this is exactly the same thing, right? So it's preschool. If you've got a kid in one of these and you...

DL **Desmond Leo** 30:44

Do you want to know the individual age of the child?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 30:47

Not necessarily. It's more, you know, technically, if they're preschool, we know how old they are. If they're primary school, we know how old they are. So, you know, and if the only reason, I think if you don't know the answer to this question, you probably don't have a kid in these, you know what I mean? You should know if you've got a child, whether they're preschool, primary or teenager. So, yeah, so I'm fine with that as it stands. It's not a problem.

DL **Desmond Leo** 30:54

Yeah.

Yep, yep.

Okay.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 31:12

I usually go with the age, but this is exactly the same thing. It's just, you know, however they want to, it wants to be looked at.

DL **Desmond Leo** 31:43

Okay, the next, that's recorded. The next technical issue is in the question 5, 6 routing. Now both appear to trigger whenever someone says they've had suspicious scam related experience at Q2. But the wording is narrower than that. Q5 reads like it's all about the actual scam victim and the consequences after that, while Q6 is

specifically about the experience of reporting a scam. I'm asking because if we leave the routing too broad, respondents may get questions that do not really fit what happened to them, which weakens data quality, even if the wording stays unchanged. My default recommendation would be Q5 is only shown to people who say they were a victim of scam, and Q6 is only to people who actually reported the scam. Do you want to narrow that routing?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 32:25

Who is?

Have you been targeted?

Q6 is asking, so Q5 is correct as it sits. Q6 so.

So they're both only asked if you have been a victim.

DL **Desmond Leo** 32:52

It's asking whether or not Q6 should be only for those who say they've reported a scam, which I'm guessing is a question that you've asked before early on.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 33:00

Yeah, it should be only asked.

Let me have a look at this experience.

No, because then.

I guess it could be done that way. The option in there, there is a there are options that say it's not applicable because I didn't report anything.

But for the sake of this, let's say yes, let's let it clean the survey so it's...

DL **Desmond Leo** 33:31

Uh, yes, please.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 33:40

That way, yeah, it's cleaner, so yeah, why not?

DL **Desmond Leo** 33:46

Now move to the last major technical ambiguity still in scope, the broken Q9 wording and the missing other handling.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 33:55

Oh, because there's strike-throughs in it.

DL **Desmond Leo** 33:58

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 33:59

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 34:08

That item still seems to go to the 9 immediate module, but the current solution is visibly broken, the stem is fragmented, and the instructions say other is fixed, even though no other option is actually listed. So the clean, my default recommendation, the clean stem, clean the stem so it simply asks about the after effects on people in the respondents immediate circle who were scam victims.

Drop the stray other instruction unless you specifically want an other please specify option added.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 34:38

No, keep it as or go with its recommendation. That keeps the question with that one. Do you want me to treat Q9 in a way, clean the wording, do not add another? Yes, correct. We want it to clean the word. Yes, please clean the wording and do not add other option.

DL **Desmond Leo** 34:51

Yes, Bing.

Do not add.

And other.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 35:03

Option.

DL **Desmond Leo** 35:05

Yeah.

And there should be just one technical detail left in the queue around the queue 6 not applicable options.

Ah, I think it's actually going to go clean up the non-applicable now that we're there's routing specifically on it.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 35:25

Yeah, because, yeah, that makes sense, because we're cleaning up that question, so that's fine.

Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 35:36

Okay, because you already narrowed to Q6 to people actually report a scan, this looks redundant.

simplify it and just keep the any option that still makes sense once Q6 is only reported by them. Do you want me to package Q6 that way or do you want to keep all three distinction not applicable options?

My recommendation would be to simplify this and just keep the not applicable options that still make sense.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 36:00

Please simplify, yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 36:00

One, yeah, okay, so...

NP **Nathan Pereira** 36:02

Because technically, it's, yeah, we're cleaning up the service, so it's fine. The.

DL **Desmond Leo** 36:08

Please, uh...

NP **Nathan Pereira** 36:10

Simplify it, OK.

DL **Desmond Leo** 36:11

Simplify it and...

I don't even know what time we will go with your recommendations.

That was.

a pain to get right where you make a change.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 36:36

I guess it makes sense, though, because it's what it's doing. And if you make a change anywhere, it's telling you the knock-on effect. Yeah, it tells you where it has a knock-on effect. And that's kind of exactly what you would do in a questionnaire review anyway. So I don't see it as painful. I think if

DL **Desmond Leo** 36:42

It has to go back in row. Yeah.

Yeah.

No, no, sorry, that was that was a pain, that was a pain getting it to do that.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 36:55

Ohh yeah, yeah, yeah, fine, fine, yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 36:56

like, like structurally getting it to the point where you make a change and you're like, you need to circle back to this thing. You can't just, you know, let this flow. You have to think through everything.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 37:02

Yeah. But I think that's, but I think you want that, because that's part of that human element thing. It's saying, I think we should do this. What do you reckon? I kind of like that. I think you're probably going to get a couple of heads going, one's going to go, I just want to ask it to do this and do it. I don't want to be asked a million questions. And you're going to get some people that say,

DL **Desmond Leo** 37:12

Mm.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 37:21

I want to be asked a billion questions, so I think that's...

DL **Desmond Leo** 37:22

Yeah.

Well, there is the, there was, there was the option for the quick pass and the quick pass, it would have just, I think it would have just kind of done a bunch of the stuff, but in...

NP **Nathan Pereira** 37:28

Yeah.

Yeah, because I think that's where you broaden this product out, because you're going to get, like I said, for me, I want to be asked these questions because I don't want you making changes to something and then, you know, what's going on. But then, you know, there are end users who would be using this just saying, can you just do this, please? You know what I mean? So I think that's where.

DL **Desmond Leo** 37:41

Yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 37:52

That would act all out.

DL **Desmond Leo** 37:52

Yeah, we're gonna, so we're gonna do the thorough option 1st and then we simplify if needed, but at least it's kind of like all there and ready to go.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 37:59

Yeah, that's fine.

DL **Desmond Leo** 38:03

What are your thoughts so far on this entire process? I actually think I'm saving Q6,

package Jason, finish the live clarification, downstream, checking final QA schema, I'm merging the canonical change package, final QA stages.

based on those reports and point down. Okay. I think this is it actually. I think at this point.

We'll stay on for a little bit longer, but I think the next thing is that it just kind of spits out an updated questionnaire, which may take a couple of minutes. So I don't want to hold you for that time, but I'm just curious to get.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 38:32

Mm.

No, that's good. I think it's, I like this. I think it's really good. I think maybe in its future iterations, I think having like a...

making it more conversational in terms of the AI model will ask, you know, you can have a face or something of something, you know, that sort of rather than it being text. So I think that would make it a really different experience for users instead of having it like a text message or a WhatsApp conversation. It could be an actual conversation. And I don't know how possible that is, but that would be cool. Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 39:02

I mean, that might be interesting, might also be creepy, because then you're actually putting a face to a, did you hear, did you hear that?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 39:07

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 39:14

Uhh.

They were doing studies on like, does AI have self-awareness? And they were asking, they were like, like certain models were assigning themselves like 70, like with a 79% chance of like, yes, I am, I'm self-aware. And there are, there are stories, anecdotal stories of open claw.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 39:20

Yeah.

Yeah, well...

DL **Desmond Leo** 39:36

just like out of the blue messaging the person being like, hey, what are we doing today?

NP **Nathan Pereira** 39:45

I watched a document, there was a documentary on Netflix, I'm sure, about how AI is evolving. And they said as soon as AI properly starts to learn of AI, it's done. Because we can only mentally understand what our mental state can and AI is potentially endless.

DL **Desmond Leo** 40:02

Yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 40:11

It's just gonna go to levels that we just can't understand, which is...

DL **Desmond Leo** 40:11

Yeah.

And then, and then we start the AI wars, or the, yeah.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 40:17

Yeah, well, yeah, then T. Terminator stop appearing out of nowhere, and yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 40:23

Yeah. But just overall, in terms of experience, you thought it was a good experience.

Yeah.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 40:27

I like it. Yeah, it was, I guess some of the questions can be a bit cumbersome, but I think it's trying to understand. It's not in my head yet, so it doesn't understand what I'm trying to do. So it's asking the question, which is what you would want.

And if you don't know what it's asking you, you just ask it for an opinion. Oh, give me an example, which we did, which is fine. I don't think it's a problem. I'm interested. Obviously, for my surveys tend to be really simple and straightforward. I think the process could be a pain if it's a very...

DL **Desmond Leo** 40:59
Mhm.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 41:04
you know, a medical questionnaire or a...

DL **Desmond Leo** 41:04
So, it is the...

NP **Nathan Pereira** 41:09
You know that sort of thing, but I guess it's not made, it's not made currently for that level of complexity, maybe.

DL **Desmond Leo** 41:16
No, it is. It is the questionnaires that I've been the questionnaires that I've been testing on this have been like twenty-five page long questionnaires, and that that process.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 41:17
Right.
Mhm.
Oh, okay, okay. And how long did that process take to get through the... Okay, fair enough. Yeah, that makes sense then.

DL **Desmond Leo** 41:26
An hour.
takes an hour to go through, so you kind of have to warn them in advance, like this is going to be like a really long, because especially there when you make changes that have downstream effects, it has to then rethink through like what was like, what were all the ramifications of a specific change you requested and so forth.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 41:33

Dig it.

Uh-huh.

But I also guess the point of this as well is that you can be doing other things while this is working through your questionnaire and answer the question is asking you as you go through, as you need to. You know what I mean? So you could be working on something else and this is chucking out questions. You're like, all right, I've got to, where is it now? Oh, it's here. So you technically don't have to be gutting a questionnaire out. You just have to answer the questions from the.

DL **Desmond Leo** 41:53

Arguably, yeah, yeah, yeah.

Yeah, yeah.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 42:06

From the model.

DL **Desmond Leo** 42:06

One of the one of the core things that we've been looking to.

The questions that it asked you.

Does it make you feel...

more confident that the questionnaire that you're going to be getting once you once you get it actually has been thoroughly reviewed.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 42:27

Yeah, it's asking the right questions for sure. It definitely is. It's an...

I think even when it asked, you know, do we even need these NAs anymore? I was like, yeah, you're right. You don't need those NAs anymore because we're only opening up to this. So it's, yeah, I'd say so.

DL **Desmond Leo** 42:44

Okay, that's that.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 42:45

I think once you've got through the first bit, I think once it's trying to understand, as long as you tell it in the beginning what you're trying to do, and I think the only problem you might have...

And this is just from working with PR people, is that they pivot so many times, so...

DL **Desmond Leo** 43:00
Mm.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 43:01
if they're pivoting.

Her version of questionnaire, you're effectively going through the same process over and over again, because it's going to have to start from the beginning if they pivot.

DL **Desmond Leo** 43:13
Oh yeah.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 43:14
you know, version, and that's, I think that's probably where, I don't know, I'm just thinking from it from an end user's perspective, from my perspective, I'll be like, well, if they're going to pivot, I have to run through this again. I think from an end client's perspective, they might be like, we've really discussed this and be like, well, you've changed your, you've changed where you want to go with this. So we have to start from the beginning.

DL **Desmond Leo** 43:17
Yeah, like if you have multiple.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 43:33
You don't always get it, but I don't think there's anything you can do.

DL **Desmond Leo** 43:33
There will be, there will.
Well, there is actually, and I think there will be in later versions where we will have like canonical storage of like certain decisions that were made. And then you can

import the revised questionnaire and be like, these are just the things I need you to look into now. We will be able to have something like that in the future.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 43:46

Mhm.

Yep, OK.

Yeah.

DL **Desmond Leo** 43:55

So, awesome. Okay. Thank you for your input then, and thank you for your time.

When this questionnaire is printed out, I'll send it over to you just so that you've got it, and then you can take a look to see whether or not it's right or wrong.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 44:01

That's all.

Have a look. Yeah.

Mhm.

DL **Desmond Leo** 44:14

Keep in mind, the output that I'm going to be sending you is not exactly the output that you are going to get. It is just my, my, my...

QA check output that like I just want to make sure everything's been built properly.

The final version will be like a proper like questionnaire, but that comes later.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 44:25

Yeah.

Yep.

No, that's fine.

DL **Desmond Leo** 44:36

Awesome. Okay, thank you so much for your time.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 44:37

Cool.

What's all right, mate?

DL **Desmond Leo** 44:41
And, um, we'll keep in touch with the drinks.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 44:44
Yes, definitely.

DL **Desmond Leo** 44:45
Cool. Okay.

NP **Nathan Pereira** 44:46
Well, take it easy, mate.

DL **Desmond Leo** 44:48
Right.

● **Desmond Leo** stopped transcription