One of the decisions which must be made in our continuing study of variability is whether it is more efficient (for analyzing variability) to observe a large sample over short times or a small sample over long times. If variability only occurs in a minority of objects with relatively high frequency it would make sense to observe the largest number of QSOs possible, at the expense of observing timespan per QSO. However, if variability occurs in every QSO then we need only observe a given sample long enough to detect variability in all the QSOs. Smith *et al.* (1991) claim to see a slight increase in the fraction of objects with variability up to about 7 years and then a constant fraction. Our own data show no significant increase with timespan.

It is evident that we need to both increase the sample *and* increase the timespans if we are to identify the character of variability in QSOs. It is particularly important to have long observing timespans for specific QSOs in order to study the long term connections between continuum variability and emission and absorption-line variability.

The sensitivity of CCDs allow high S/N with short exposures, allowing us to study a large sample selected over the entire sky (unlike photographic plates which force us to sacrifice S/N or confine our QSOs to a small region of sky). Although the CCD fields are still much smaller than photographic plates, the dynamic range of CCDs allows us to use stars much brighter than the QSO to calibrate the relative intensities over time. Any photon-counting errors due to comparison stars can be made negligible even with a small number of comparison stars.

The monitoring of several hundred QSOs is possible with a dedicated telescope and/or with extensive collaborations. Our own goals are to continue to monitor the BALQSOs in our sample, and increase the sample to include more complex associated absorption-line (CAAL) QSOs, which may also show absorption-line variability, and include a wider range of redshifts (particularly $z_e > 3.5$).