

Research Quality Forum

September 26, 2011



Building on the Foundation – The 2012 Research-on-Research Program

SCHEDULE	PRESENTATIONS
2:30–2:35PM	Welcome and ARF Announcements William Cook, PhD – EVP, Research and Standards, The ARF Zena M Pagán – Councils and Ogilvy Awards Manager, The ARF
2:35–2:40PM	Introductions and Agenda Overview / FOQ 1.0 Highlights; Why we Need FOQ 2.0 Gian Fulgoni – Chairman & co-Founder, comScore Don Gloeckler – Mgr, Next Gen Research, The Procter & Gamble Company
2:40–3:20PM	Research Priorities (Q&A to follow) George Terhanian – President, North America, Group Chief Strategy Officer, Toluna
3:20–4:00PM	Routers Research Priorities (Q&A to follow) Nancy Brigham – VP, Global Operations, Ipsos Michael Fallig – SVP, Digital, Online Methodology, GfK Chuck Miller – President, DMS Insights
4:00–4:20PM	FOQ 2.0 Program (Q&A to follow) William Cook, PhD – EVP, Research and Standards, The ARF
4:20–4:30PM	Next Steps and Adjournment Gian Fulgoni – Chairman & co-Founder, comScore Don Gloeckler – Mgr, Next Gen Research, The Procter & Gamble Company William Cook, PhD – EVP, Research and Standards, The ARF

Tweet with us: [#arfforums](#)



HEARST *magazines*

In partnership with Hearst Corporation,
The ARF is hosting a special series of Forums
to celebrate Advertising Week 2011!

Venue: Hearst Corporation "Urban Theater": 57th & Eighth Ave

Monday, October 3, 2011

9:00–11:00 AM

Advances in NeuroMarketing: NeuroStandards
Collaboration Project

12:00–2:00 PM

Shopper Insights: New Learnings on Consumer
Behavior

Thursday, October 6, 2011

2:00–3:45 PM

Print Media Forum: Hearst Magazines' Case Study

4:00–6:00 PM

People/Social Media: Social Media and Multicultural
Consumers



6:00–8:00 PM

ARF: Best & Brightest Reception

**held at the ARF: 432 Park Ave. S (@29th)

To Find Out More and Register

<http://thearf.org/assets/ad-week-2011> or email: forums@thearf.org

DAVID OGILVY AWARDS

Presented by the Advertising Research Foundation

March 27, 2012
Marriott Marquis - New York City

www.thearf.org/assets/ogilvy-12



Save Your Seat and Enter Now

New entry kit and submission form
now available on our website.

Early Bird Submissions due November 11, 2011



Speakers from



Unraveling Complexity: The New Power of Digital

A One-Day Conference

Thursday, October 27, 2011 • 8:00am-6:00pm

Time & Life Building

1271 Avenue of the Americas (50th St. & Sixth Ave.)

At this one-day conference, experts within the digital ecosystem will show us how they've transformed data overload into successful, creative data management.

Learn how big data experts, including NASA and the United Nations, have innovated digital insights, and how those can be applied to our industry.

Early Bird Pricing Ends September 26

Seating Capacity Limited

ARF Members: \$595 • Non-Members: \$895

www.theARF.org/assets/ilf-2010

Diamond Sponsor



ARF 2012

rethink

ANNUAL CONVENTION + INSIGHTS ZONE



March 25-28, 2012

Marriott Marquis - New York City

From Complexity to Simplicity Through Knowledge

www.thearf.org/assets/rethink-2012





Online Research Quality Council – Foundation of Quality 2.0

Meeting: September 26th, 2011

Agenda



- Welcome – Bill & Zena
- Why we're here – Gian and Don
- FOQ 1.0 Highlights and why we need FOQ 2.0
– Gian and Don
- Research priorities 1-7 – George
- Q&A on priorities 1-7
- Research priorities 8 & 9 (Routers) – Chuck, Michael & Nancy
- Q&A on priorities 8 & 9
- Overall FOQ 2.0 Program Resource Needs – Bill
- Q&A & Next steps – Don and Gian

FOQ 1.0 Highlights and Why We Need FOQ 2.0



Foundations of Quality 1.0 an excellent example and foundation to build upon:

- Data sharing: 17 panel companies contributed data gathering
- Field work: Online and offline research was conducted in a short period of time
- Design: Study design was the product of multiple suppliers and buyers
- Insights: Important findings were made on panel overlap, respondent motivation and behavior, panel comparability
Opportunity today to build on that learning



Research Priorities 1 - 7

Meeting: September 26th, 2011

George Terhanian

John Ouren



Committee Participants



Co-Chairs

George Terhanian, Toluna
John Ouren, MarketTools

Leaders across Clients,
Suppliers and Academia



Participants

Fred Conrad, Univ. of Michigan
David Vannette, Stanford University
Doug Rivers, Stanford & YouGov
John Bremer, Toluna
Michael Conklin, MarketTools
Kevin Nuffer, Mckinsey
Don Gloeckler, P&G
Ted Christensen, General Mills
Justin DeGraaf, Unilever
Randall Thomas, ICF International
Steve Schwartz, Microsoft
Susan Frede, TNS/Lightspeed
Nancy Bringham, Ipsos
Steve Gittleman, Marketing Inc.



ORQC Objectives and Accomplishments

- A. Develop an Initial Framework:** A simple, straightforward framework for online research that market researchers and others can use to inform their decision on choice of mode. Revise this framework over time. **Status = Complete**
- B. Systematic Review of Existing Empirical Evidence:** Collect, evaluate and organize existing research on online research, consistent with the above framework. This is a necessary step in developing a prioritized agenda for new research. **Status = Complete**
- C. Evaluate Data Quality Solutions:** Extend existing learning through a new Foundations of Quality (FOQ 2.0) initiative across panels and other sample sources to answer questions concerning the impact on data quality of practices such as real-time and other forms of sample selection, identity verification, survey design, and weighting. **Status = Proposed in what follows**



Proposed Next Steps

- **Phase 1 & 2 Complete:** The Online Research Quality Framework and the Systematic Review of available research are complete, with important findings having been presented and shared with ARF's membership, as well as with the broader research community.
- **Significant Gaps Remain:** The Systematic Review identifies several components of the research process (within which researchers must make important decisions that affect response quality) that lack convincing (or, in some cases, any) evidence of best practices.
- **Additional Questions Can Be Answered:** Fundamental and important questions about online research quality remain unanswered. Many of these questions can be answered through new, primary, research.

Proposed Next Steps

Conduct Primary Research (FOQ 2.0) to address important remaining online data quality questions.

What is Out of Scope for FOQ 2.0?



1. Non-US
2. Design features of web surveys
3. Respondent communication (outside of frequency of participation)
4. Impact of category exclusions on response quality (and capacity)
5. Mobile
6. Other?



Research Priorities of FOQ 2.0

Conduct FOQ v 2.0 depending on (US panels and alternative sample sources)

Scope

All companies with access to US respondents through panels, social communities, databases, and rivers, all of which are denominated hereafter as channels, to participate.

Research Priorities

1. Evaluate impact of different respondent selection procedures (e.g., demographic quotas, others) on response quality (i.e., reliability and accuracy), with reliability determined through study phasing, and accuracy determined by means of (parallel) off-line research, such as a high-quality telephone survey, use of official government statistics, or some combination
2. Evaluate impact of different post-hoc weighting procedures on response quality
3. Evaluate impact of procedures to reduce or eliminate undesired within-survey behavior such as speeding and satisficing on response quality
4. Evaluate impact of identity verification (and exclusions based on non-verification) on response quality
5. Evaluate impact of survey participation frequency on response quality
6. Evaluate impact of respondent motivations and incentives on response quality
7. Evaluate impact of channel differences on response quality

Priority One: Respondent Selection Procedures



Objective

Evaluate the impact of different respondent selection procedures (e.g., demographic quotas, others) on response quality (i.e., reliability and accuracy)

Key Questions to Answer

1. How do different ways of selecting respondents for surveys impact response quality?
2. What advantages, if any, do newer approaches have over standard ones (e.g., demographic quotas) with regard to quality?
3. Are the financial costs of newer approaches worth the benefits?
4. Are the newer approaches reasonably easy to implement?

Example Solutions to Evaluate

1. Demographic Quotas—simple and complex
2. GMI Pinnacle
3. SSI Dynamix
4. Marketing Inc

Scope

1. Sample: online panels, rivers, other
2. Comparison: telephone survey, official government statistics, other

Priority Two: Post-hoc Weighting Procedures



Objective

Evaluate the impact of post-hoc weighting procedures on response quality

Key Questions to Answer

1. How do different ways of adjusting the responses through post-hoc weighting impact response quality?
2. What advantages, if any, do non-traditional approaches (e.g., propensity score weights) have over standard ones (e.g., demographic weights or no weights at all) with regard to quality?
3. Is weighting more, or less, effective than respondent selection at reducing bias? Or are the two, in combination (and if so, what combination?) more effective than each one in isolation?
4. Are the financial costs of non-traditional approaches worth the benefits?
5. Are non-traditional approaches reasonably easy to implement?

Example Solutions to Evaluate

1. Demographic Weights—simple and complex
2. Cell Weighting vs. Rim Weighting vs. Hybrid
3. Propensity Score weights, other

Scope

1. Sample: online panels, rivers, other
2. Comparison: telephone survey, official government statistics, other

Priority Three: Undesired Within-Survey Behavior Procedures



Objective

Evaluate the impact of procedures to reduce or eliminate undesired within-survey behavior such as speeding and satisficing on response quality

Key Questions to Answer

1. What impact, if any at all, do undesired behaviors make on response quality?
2. Are some ways of identifying such behaviors more effective than others?
3. Is the effort to identify (and, in turn, reduce or eliminate) undesired within-survey behavior worth the cost?
4. Are solutions to identify and remove respondents exhibiting undesired behavior reasonably easy to implement?

Example Solutions to Evaluate

1. TrueSample Engagement Score
2. Survey Monkey.....
3. Other Satisficing/Engagement algorithms

Scope

1. Sample: online panels, rivers, other
2. Comparison: telephone survey, official government statistics, other

Priority Four: Identity Verification



Objective

Evaluate the impact of identity verification (and exclusions based on non-verification) on response quality

Key Questions to Answer

1. Does the exclusion of respondents (because their identities could not be verified) increase response quality?
2. Do some methods to exclude respondents work better than others at improving response quality?
3. Is the effort to exclude respondents worth the cost?
4. Are solutions to verify the identify of respondents reasonably easy to implement?

Example Solutions to Evaluate

1. TrueSample RealCheck
2. Imperium Verity
3. Other?

Scope

1. Sample: online panels, rivers, other
2. Comparison: telephone survey, official government statistics, other

Priority Five: Survey Participation Frequency



Objective

Evaluate the impact of survey participation frequency on response quality

Key Questions to Answer

1. Does the frequency by which respondents participate in surveys affect response quality?
2. How effective are procedures to control participation frequency?
3. Do respondents tell the truth when asked about participation frequency?
4. Do procedures to select respondents for survey participation based, in part, on survey frequency work across all channels; e.g., rivers, panels, databases?
5. Is the effort to identify and control the activity level of respondents worth the cost?
6. Are solutions to identify and control the activity level of respondents reasonably easy to implement?

Example Solutions to Evaluate

1. Survey access/completes/invitation caps by panel or channel
2. Cap overall panel participation using TrueSample Panel Overlap codes
3. Real-time sample sources (Usamp, Toluna, SSI, ResearchNow)

Scope

1. Sample: online panels, rivers, other
2. Comparison: telephone survey, official government statistics, other

Priority Six: Respondent Motivations & Incentives



Objective

Evaluate the impact of respondent motivations and incentives on response quality

Key Questions to Answer

1. Are some incentives more effective than others at increasing survey participation rates? If so, which ones?
2. Are some incentives more effective than others at producing high quality responses? If so, which ones?
3. Do some incentives create unintended effects, such as satisfying, speeding, and lying (at the screener stage of surveys)? If so, which ones?

Example Solutions to Evaluate

1. For this study, we will ask providers to use whatever incentive they typically use, thereby creating a natural environment to determine how such incentives impact response quality

Scope

1. Sample: online panels, rivers, other
2. Comparison: telephone survey, official government statistics, other

Priority Seven: Channel Differences



Objective

Evaluate the impact of channel differences on response quality

Key Questions to Answer

1. Does the channel (e.g., panel, river, database, community), or combination of channels, from which a respondent enters a survey affect response quality? **Note that two different panels (or two different rivers, for example) could constitute two different channels.**
2. Is the effort to select one channel, or some combination of channels, over another, or others, worth the cost?
3. Are solutions to manage the flow of respondents from multiple channels into the same survey reasonably easy to implement? Are they worth the effort?

Example Solutions to Evaluate

1. See all example solutions described in Priorities 1-6. We will be able to determine their relationship to response quality within and across channels.

Scope

1. Sample: online panels, real-time sample, other
2. Comparison: telephone survey, official government statistics, other

Process and Overall Timeline



Timing	Oct-Nov	Dec-Feb	Mar	Apr-June
Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Recruit Project Manager▪ Identify Initiative Research Leads (7)▪ Fund ROR - \$300K▪ Develop rules of engagement for Sample suppliers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Design studies(sample, survey)▪ Identify solutions to test▪ Recruit sample suppliers▪ Identify offline partner▪ Identify hosting platform	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Field offline studies▪ Field online studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Analyze Results▪ Develop Conclusions▪ Present results▪ Make data set available for additional research





FoQ Router Committee

Meeting: September 26th, 2011

Chuck Miller, uSamp-DMS

Michael A. Fallig, GfK

Nancy Brigham, Ipsos

- » Although pioneering use of Survey Routers can be traced back a decade, only recently has the MR industry begun to pay considerable attention to them.
- » Hardly any published information or research is available to inform the industry about appropriate practices and buying decisions...
 - ...leading the ARF to establish an FoQ team to expressly examine Survey Routers.
- » The team will deliver an exhaustive body of knowledge on the implications of routers, including findings from primary research.



Team Mission

Expand industry knowledge about routers by understanding the effects of practices on research outputs. Provide a level playing field in terms of transparency between clients and router providers.

Team Goals

- » Document current router practices, key variables and terminology
- » Examine router optimization practices, evaluate router impact on sample survey results and overall quality; begin mapping out appropriate practices

To best accomplish its mission and goals, the Router team has partitioned itself into three groups with distinct responsibilities...

Subgroup Objectives

- » Group 1: Identify current practices, collect existing R-on-R, identify the universe of router variables around which practices may differ, including “upstream” and “downstream” variables that are not within the team’s present scope to examine.
- » Group 2: Design and conduct research to assess router optimization practices, configurations and sample re-allocation practices.
- » Group 3: Develop router schematics, questions that buyers should ask, outline appropriate practices and compile a dictionary of router terminology.

Team Members, Group Affiliation & Oversight Leadership



Oversight Leadership

- » Michael Fallig, GfK (co-chair) (Group 2)
 - » Chuck Miller, uSamp-DMS (co-chair) (Group 3)
 - » John Bremer, Toluna (Group 2)
 - » Nancy Brigham, Ipsos (Group 2)
 - » Pete Cape, SSI (Group 3)
 - » Mike Conklin, MarketTools (Group 2)
 - » Steve Gittelman, MKTG Inc. Group 1)
 - » Paul Johnson, Opinionology/SSI (Group 1)
 - » Efrain Ribeiro, Kantar Lightspeed (Group 1)
- » Bill Cook, ARF
 - » Don Gloeckler, P&G
 - » Gian Fulgoni, comScore

Research Priority 8: *Frame current router*



Group 1, Core Activity:

Two Focus Groups:

» Practitioner Focus Group (in-person with virtual participation)

- Three areas of expertise, three participants from each from: IT, Operations and Sample Frame
- Questions prepared by the subgroup with full team input

» End User Focus Group (in-person with virtual participation)

- Wider cross-section of participants by role in the research process, including client facing individuals
- Gather reactions and further guidance from users/buyers of router sample

Objective: Obtain expert input and end-user key considerations. Learning advances committee deliverables, particularly with regard to existing practices, user needs and buying decisions. It will also provide information that could refine aspects of the existing research design and variables of exploration.



Focus Group deliverables:

- » Report of findings from expert discussions
 - Contributes to overall guidelines for router practices
- » Identification of all router variables, including those upstream and downstream from router execution
 - Some will be examined now in our testing
 - Others may be assessed in subsequent research
- » Summary of current router practices
 - Includes possible labeling of router types
- » Assessment of industry reaction to team efforts (particularly sample buyer) and key considerations prior to fielding our quant research

Research Priority 9: *Examine router optimization*



Group 2, Core Activity: Quantitative Research Study

Objectives:

- » Assess important variables, *unique to routing*, around which the industry can establish appropriate practices
- » Test different router configurations (e.g., total random, total priority) for impact on outcome metrics (e.g., efficiency, demographics, survey results – configurations and output metrics TBD)
- » Assess impact of various reallocation and sample “re-use” strategies on response rates, completion rates, satisfaction with the experience, level of engagement throughout survey, survey results
- » Examine variables within a controlled environment to reduce confounding and difficulty in assessing a particular variable’s impact
- » Provide results that can lead to a set of recommendations and appropriate practices

Group 2, Core Activity: Quantitative Research Study

Design Elements:

- » Experimental design employing a mini-router, populated with projects of our choosing.
- » Router environment will simulate 15 studies, distribution of studies will reflect those found on existing routers today.
- » “Live” panelists sourced from four panels will complete 5 full studies on the router. Screening criteria for 10 other studies will also be completed.
- » Additional sample from the same sources will be assigned to complete 5 online surveys via “traditional” invites sent to email inboxes. These will serve as “parallel test” control groups for each of the 5 studies on the router.
- » Certain independent variables under study will be experimentally manipulated, information about others will be produced via simulation.
- » Variables to study have not been finalized.
 - Group 1 activities will help inform design.
 - ARF membership is encouraged to offer suggestions regarding variables to explore
- » For this initial project, all sample will be sourced from four existing consumer access panels

Research Priority 9: (cont'd)



Group 2, Core Activity: Quantitative Research Study

Summary of Key Elements:

# & type of surveys tested	5 – (a) customer satisfaction, (b) omnibus, (c) U&A, (d) concept test, and (e) TBD
# of sample sources	4 sources per survey – 25% each. Proportion same for each survey. Quotas set on supplier. Sample source will be blinded. We anticipate only panel sample will be used, to remove “panel vs. non-panel” as a potential confounding variable.
Completes per survey	n=2500 for each full study on router n=1,000 for each of 5 parallel test control groups, N=17,500 in total
Full Survey length	20-30 minutes on average
Additional screening criteria	Need to develop screening questions for an additional 10 studies (e.g., trackers, copy)
Sample frame – demo quotas	Age, Gender, Region, Education (within supplier)
# of samples	For router: 20 samples in total – 5 surveys x 4 sources. 5 samples of 625 per supplier source For “parallel test”: 5 samples of 250 completes per supplier source.



Research Priority 9: *(cont'd)*

Group 2, Core Activity: Quantitative Research Study

Controlled Mini-Router Environment / Router Simulation (MRE) + Parallel “Email to Inbox Invites” Control Groups (PCG)

Potential Examinations:

- » Explore useful limits/parameters of several key router variables (MRE groups)
- » Evaluate appropriate practices “range” (MRE groups)
- » Test impact of different router configurations (MRE groups)
- » Examine & compare response rates & completion rates (MRE vs. PCG)
- » Calculate & compare incidence (MRE vs. PCG)
- » Examine & compare distributions of key demo and response measures (MRE vs. PCG)
- » Measure speeding & straight lining (MRE vs. PCG)
- » Measure respondent satisfaction (MRE vs. PCG)

Group 2, Core Activity: Quantitative Research Study

Deliverables:

» Report of findings from Mini-Router Environment simulations – to be incorporated into overall guidelines for parameters and acceptable practices

» Report of findings comparing Mini-Router simulation with “Parallel Test” (MRE vs. PCG)

All analysis will be conducted by an external consultant who will participate in the set up of the analytic plan and who will be blind to conditions at time of analysis

Research Priority 9: *(cont'd)*



Group 2, Core Activity: Quantitative Research Study

Potential Key Variables to Assess
Independent variables (examined via manipulation or simulation)
Priority vs. Random Assignment
Number of studies in router
Incidence rates of studies on router
Correlation among screening questions
Manipulate number of surveys someone can take in one sitting?
Number of times someone could be reallocated? (Limit number of touches)
Dependent variables
Response rate, completion rate, over quota's, incidence calculations
Efficiency metrics – capacity lift due to reallocation, etc.
Sub-categories of questions – e.g., demos, attitudinal, behavioral, population benchmarks
Router engagement - measures of respondent straight lining, speeding (Group 1 should say what these are)
Respondent Satisfaction

Research Priority 9: (cont'd)



Group 2, Core Activity: Quantitative Research Study

Resources needed

Who?	Router team, supplier personnel, external. Independent analyst/contractor
For what?	Router team - design and set-up the study; determine final conclusions Supplier personnel – manage/script/DP Analyst/contractor – create simulator and analyze; develop preliminary conclusions Suppliers and clients - input as needed
When?	Oct. 2011 – June 2012
How long?	Oct. 2011 – June 2012
<i>Contributions in kind</i>	
Router use	One supplier needed to provide a router
Study design	Engagement/ ideas/needs from industry on what is valuable to include in the design.
Study materials	5 surveys needed – 1 survey per volunteer
Fieldwork	One supplier needed to host, manage, and process the surveys (can either be the same as router supplier or a separate company to program, host and deliver data file)
Sample	Samples – need 4 suppliers to provide sample for 250 completes a survey, for 5 surveys
Data processing	Part of fieldwork
Analysis	Engagement/ ideas/needs from industry on what is valuable to include in the design. ³⁷





FOQ 2.0: The Value, The Price, and The Pitch

William Cook – EVP, Research & Standards – ARF



Nine Priorities

1. Evaluate impact of different respondent selection procedures on response quality
2. Evaluate impact of different post-hoc weighting procedures on response quality
3. Evaluate impact of procedures to reduce/eliminate undesired within-survey behavior
4. Evaluate impact of identity verification (and exclusions based on non-identification) on response quality
5. Evaluate impact of survey participation frequency on response quality
6. Evaluate impact of respondent motivations and incentives on response quality
7. Evaluate impact of channel differences on response quality
8. Frame current router practices, key variables and research implications
9. Examine router optimization practices and evaluate router impact on sample and survey results.



Building on FOQ 1.0 Raises the Stakes

- » Shift focus from are panels different – to impact on quality
- » From does weighting work – to which weighting methods work best
- » From how much undesirable behavior is there – to what is the impact of reducing/eliminating such behavior
- » Deepen our understanding of how respondent motivations and incentives affect response quality
- » Build framework for documenting and assessing current router practices
- » Begin to weigh the benefits and costs of employing routers for given objectives under various conditions

Proposed FOQ 2.0 Budget Is 2X FOQ 1.0



- » **FOQ 2.0 Payoff will be 3-4X that of FOQ 1.0**
- » **Immediate benefits**
 - Industry-wide collaboration brings powers of scale
 - Frameworks offer common focus and terminology
 - Buyers and sellers have “appropriate practice” models
- » **Long-term benefits**
 - Quality metrics and practices reduce risk and waste
 - Tools to estimate bias in survey approaches will:
 - allow us to reduce bias
 - better match research needs and research selection
 - better align research price and value



What will FOQ 2.0 support GAIN you?

» Buyer Sponsors will

- Be able to influence the study design vis-a-vis their particular product categories
- Attend two sponsor-only briefings
- Receive preliminary reports
- Receive free consulting from Provider Sponsors
- Gain an early mover advantage over non-sponsors

» Provider Sponsors

- Improve quality of services
- Gain close collaboration with client management on critical issues
- Have opportunity to work with prospects on implementation of new strategies, methods, practices stemming from FOQ 2
- Gain an early mover advantage over non-providers
- Free presentation opportunities at future ARF events



Funding Requirements (Est.)

<u>Priorities 1 – 7</u>	<u>\$220-320</u>
Study Planning & Design	\$50K
Survey Programming	\$20K
Reporting & Analysis	\$50-100K
Offline Research Field Costs	\$50K
Project Mgt Costs	\$50-100K
<u>Priorities 8 & 9</u>	<u>\$200-230k</u>
<u>Total Cash outlay</u>	<u>\$420-550K</u>
<u>Donated Services</u>	<u>\$1,000K</u>

As in FOQ 1.0, substantial amounts of donated services including: planning, research design, survey design, online samples, simulation programming and analyses.



What will FOQ support cost you?

- » Buyer Sponsors are asked to contribute \$25,000
- » Provider Sponsors are asked to contribute \$25,000 or to donate services worth \$50,000





Are You IN?



Proposed Next Steps



Milestone

- Gain ARF ORQC Approval
- Fund initiative
- Select Project Manager
- Identify Research Design Leads

Timing

Today

September

October

October

Responsibility

ORQC

DG, GF, BC

BC

GT, MF, CM