

Brand/issue working group: Scope of work

Background

The most recent consolidated financial and supporter data of the ChildFund Alliance highlights a trend that the majority of members have been experiencing in recent years – flat or declining revenue. This trend continues in spite of the committed work of individual members to both diversify their revenue sources (government, corporations, etc.) and innovate their fundraising channels, product offerings and supporter experience. We need to reverse this trend as the health of the ChildFund Alliance rests on the financial health and efficiency of the individual members.

Work done by CCFC on its competitive landscape suggests that a transition from a product-oriented organization (sponsorship) to become more of an issue or cause based organization might hold some of the answer. CCFC believes such an approach would elevate their message, increase their credibility and, most importantly, help CCFC to grow revenue and social impact.

In recent years, the ChildFund Alliance has embraced the “cause” of ending extreme violence against children and has been successful in advocating for SDG 16.2 that focuses on ending all forms of abuse, neglect, violence and exploitation against children. Secretariat and member led efforts continue to advocate for this issue. As a result of these many efforts, the visibility of the ChildFund brand has increased at the global level. Members report varying impacts in their fundraising markets.

Thus the CEO Forum agreed to explore the following question: If the ChildFund Alliance members integrated the cause of ending violence against children more closely into our brand would it significantly help us: a) increase our revenue and b) increase our social impact?

SCOPE OF WORK – Questions to address:

1. How might we enhance the ChildFund Alliance brand (making it more relevant and distinctive) by integrating a cause into our brand architecture?
2. Is ending violence against children the best cause to embrace? Brand strategy is most often treated as an indefinite commitment to a positioning strategy. Does ending violence against children fit at the brand strategy level? Does it work better as a sub-brand or as a campaign? How do we change our hunch about EVAC into a strategy for viable testing? Are there other viable alternatives to test?
3. How might a revised brand architecture impact our key sponsorship product? Impact our revenue?
4. To which audiences would the revised brand architecture be relevant? How might audience be a strategic lever in giving greater meaning to the ChildFund brand?

5. What would be a way forward (or roadmap) for involving the key internal stakeholders into this process? At the upcoming April 2019 CMC and APC meetings, what work do we want to task these groups with to advance this issue?
6. Assuming this is a direction that passes our testing and helps us reach our goal, what implications does it have for the ChildFund system broadly? What are the greatest risks? What's the transition strategy and time frame?

DRAFT