

## Lessons Learned from 2011:

### Advice from the Jury

The 2011 jury want to help make your submission as strong as possible - please see below for a comprehensive guide on how to create a successful entry.

The majority of the entries on the 2011 shortlist had the following things in common - they all had a simple creative idea at their heart; they drew their power primarily from brilliance of execution (and only secondarily from brilliance of deployment); they gave consumers content instead of asking for it; they used high reach media to achieve momentum and scale; they used the web as a PR channel (and not as the main engine); and none of them asked anything too demanding of consumers.

Throughout the judging process the Jury will be asking themselves - *"Has effectiveness been proved beyond a reasonable doubt?"* The task of the entrant is first to establish a compelling relationship between creativity and effectiveness, and then to remove all reasonable doubt. With this in mind here are a few key points to consider when writing your Creative Effectiveness paper.

1. Relate results to objectives and vice versa

- Identify clear objectives and answer them with relevant results. There should be a direct link between stated objectives and the stated results.
- Separate **tactics** from **strategy**. Distinguish between **macro-objectives** and **incidental objectives**
- When describing the relationship between objectives and results, consider the difference between **soft objectives** and **hard**, and indeed between **soft results** and **hard**. Try to make sure that your paper is not over-reliant on a soft objective (e.g. brand affinity).

2. Establish a model for how the campaign was intended to work

- From the outset show how there was an awareness that describes how a particular idea or the campaign or media strategy was intended to work.
- Go beyond relating results to objectives- show a deep understanding of your consumer's behaviour and psychology
- Explain and prove how one thing was intended to lead to another. For example: if your campaign was designed to prompt conversations about oral hygiene between husbands and wives, then try to demonstrate that conversations actually did increase.

### 3. Discounting other factors

- The best approach is to generate as comprehensive a list as you can of the things that may have helped the work to work. Non-disclosure is not a tactic that works here. Judges are interested in your level of 'factor awareness', as much as they are in the way you discount those factors. Every time you identify a factor, you demonstrate your grasp of the influences on the market place and the consumer and this can only be a good thing. Having identified the possible factors, think about different ways in which they might be discountable.
  - a. Discounting shortcuts

If you have access to an **econometric** model that has been designed to put a **coefficient** against all of the possible factors, then use this. Be careful not to present them as assumptive and impenetrable proof. However, it is recognised that most of the time these shortcuts will not be available.
  - b. Manual discounting

Most of the time, factors need to be identified and discounted one by one. Some include:

    - Price
    - Distribution
    - Absolute spend
    - New product attributes
  - c. Discounting new product effects

One of the hardest factors to discount is the launch of a new product with a unique functionality. If the new high profile breed of touch screen tablet is a new breed of tablet, how do you discount that intrinsic appeal of the product? If yours is the first DSLR camera with high definition video capability, how do you know that it wouldn't have sold well unassisted by creativity?

### 4. Calculating a cash impact

- If you think your work has delivered a cash benefit, don't be shy about calculating it. There are two broad approaches to this. **Return on Investment** is the ratio of incremental sales to advertising spend; and **Return on Marketing Investment** is the purer expression of cash generated because it relates marketing investment to profit. The latter is often harder to derive because it requires margin levels and these are all too often undisclosed.

- If it is impossible for whatever reason to calculate cash benefit, let the jury understand why. If you think that you need to use a currency other than cash in your entry, then explain this.
5. Efficiency versus effectiveness
- The age of new media, and more importantly the age of free media, has led to widespread ROI abuse. ROI abuse is what happens when you confuse media efficiencies with commercial effectiveness. All modern marketing is more efficient thanks to the power of earned media, but this is rarely a differentiating facet of a case. Media savings are not the same as cash generated, and the lifeblood of most business is cash-flow.
6. Scale of effect
- The judges are directed to recognise the 'scale bias' that exists in payback calculations, and scale of effect is only one element in judging effectiveness. It will help your entry, however, if you are able to comment sensibly on the scale of effect
7. Scale of reach
- As technology gives us all new ways of deepening engagement and extending interaction with a campaign, there has been a corresponding neglect of the far cruder (but far more valuable) dimension that is reach. Make sure that you make the strongest possible case for the reach of a campaign.
  - Linked to this is the question of visibility. When presenting a case for an international jury of people who may not have experienced that campaign locally, do everything you can to establish visibility. So that less high profile entries do not suffer it is important to establish their credentials on this dimension. If a campaign is small scale then it is far better to acknowledge this up front.