

What's in store for fundraising in 2010?

It would be easy to write off 2009 as a terrible year for fundraising. Because of the economic crisis at the end of 2008, the past 12 months have been a time of uncertainty and challenges for many fundraising programmes. Peter Schoewe, Senior Account Executive at Mal Warwick Associates, reports.

*Adapted from
Mal Warwick's
E-newsletter
December 2009
Visit www.malwarwick.com*

INSIDE INFORMATION

Rent or exchange?	2
Philanthropy in focus	3
Prospect research	4
Magical words to use in your direct mail copywriting	6
Why 'you' is glue	7

There have been bright spots – believe it or not – amid the wreckage of falling donor counts and dropping average gifts in the past year. Here are a couple:

- In many ways, the centre has held. The core donors – those who have been with you for years and who are deeply dedicated to your cause – most likely have continued to give, though perhaps not as generously as they were able to in the past. This shows that – for many donors – supporting the causes they're passionate about is not a discretionary expense.
- Necessity has driven innovation and integration. It's no longer an option to have siloed conversations with your donors. In many cases, I've seen the barriers to mail and online integration disappear, with fundraising becoming a priority across all channels. This has allowed for creative exploration of true cross-channel integration—with online and offline efforts bolstering each other and sacrosanct groups of donors and prospects disappearing.

So what does this mean for the year to come? Will 2010 continue to be a year of retrenchment? And what can be done to maximise fundraising opportunities in an environment that remains challenging, but is not dominated by fear?

Steady climb

I'm not an economist, so I cannot predict what's going to happen with unemployment or commercial real estate. But if we assume a steady but slow climb out of the current recession, I will boldly venture a couple of ideas of what to expect in direct response fundraising over the next 12 months. (I only ask not to be reminded of this column in December 2010.)

First, I think we will continue to see greater opportunity to upgrade donors through frequency of giving rather than size of gift. Even with the strongest case for giving, it's been hard to get donors to invest in visionary projects with a significantly

larger contribution. Instead, they respond to urgent need – and the opportunity to make their gift go further, such as through the use of a matching challenge grant offer. And, as donors still want to be a part of the causes they believe in, even if they can't give as much as they used to, membership renewal campaigns should remain a steady source of reliable revenue.

Mature channel

In addition, I think we'll see fewer arguments about the viability of different fundraising channels. Direct mail is an undeniably mature channel that can still be used to build a core of donors who can be upgraded to major and planned giving.

At this point, however, it should also be used as a basis to build robust programs through online channels, because the number of donors who choose to respond by writing a cheque will only continue to dwindle.

What remains to be seen is whether online outreach can completely replace the spur to donate right now that mail has traditionally provided. My guess would be that it cannot, except around events that get a lot of external media coverage, such as elections and natural disasters.

But it's important to remember that it won't be possible to innovate ahead of the donors. Many of the social media tools are being created and refined by a generation that's nowhere near its years of prime philanthropic potential.

That means while they'll be important for lead generation, community building, and cultivation, they will not be able to replace the more traditional channels – at least in the next 12 months.

So at the end of 2010, where will we be? I predict a return to moderate growth, with increasing integration driven by a more focused fundraising. And here's one prediction I stand by 100%: The most successful fundraising innovation in the coming year will be one that ensures an individual – who has the means and inclination to help – is asked for a gift. ■

Rent or exchange?

It's the age-old question of donor name utilisation, reports the Non-Profit Times.

Cutting costs and boosting revenues is a goal for any non-profit, especially during economic downturns.

For those looking to do both, non-profits could re-examine how they handle one of their most important assets – their donor lists.

Exchanging lists is much more economical than renting, with a net difference of as much as \$70/m to \$100/m (per thousand names), said Lauri Palladino Simone, senior vice president at Greenwich, Connecticut-based May Development Services (Direct Media Millard, an infoGroup Company).

Exchanging lists can cost anywhere from \$5/m to \$15/m in processing fees while renting lists can run from \$65/m to \$100/m in base fees, before select charges are added.

Some non-profits won't exchange with commercial mailers or political mailers, and there are those that won't rent or exchange their lists at all.

It depends on internal policies. 'Most non-profits are making their lists available,' she said, but some also do exchange-only. A file with less than 50 000 names usually means an exchange only, Simone said.

Increasing costs have put an increased focus on efficiency.

Exchanging lists can yield 'quite a bit' of savings, with a name costing less than a penny as opposed to 5 or more cents for renting, said Michael Kertelits, account executive at RMI Direct in Danbury, Conn. Pennies might not sound like much until you do a 1-million piece mailing.

In addition to a base fee of \$65/m to 100/m, \$5/m to \$20/m can be added depending on the type of select, such as, recency, donor amount, age, and other demographics.

The most valuable selects are things like age, income, recency of the file and contribution level, Kertelits said.

Small charities end up with high acquisition costs to grow their lists because they need to rent lists. 'You can have success exchanging with local non-profits but to grow more, you have to go to bigger non-profits,' Simone said.

When trying to put together an aggressive campaign, some organisations rent names from larger charities. 'That's where you're going to have the counts, especially in larger metropolitan areas,' she said.

'If you're exchanging, then exchange all you can, because you will save in the long run, Simone said. 'You want to get as many exchange names as you can, so it's beneficial from the standpoint of being cost effective in your acquisition programme,' she said.

It depends on the policy of the non-profit

whether they rent or exchange lists, Simone said, but 'if they're pretty savvy about what they're doing,' they'll do both.

'Everybody's policy is different,' Simone said. 'Non-profits that do make their names available for rent have a nice healthy income stream. 'Those exchanging, or doing both', she said, 'are saving money on acquisition, and generating income that can be put toward acquisition costs.'

Sometimes non-profits whack others with a non-reciprocal fee of as much as \$20/m, if another organisation rents a list but does not make its own list available.

The other mailer would want to have access to those names; if your list is not on the market.

That generally happens with organisations that are in the mail a lot, said Kathleen Stivaletti, client relationship director at Lake Group Media, Rye, N.Y.

Maintaining exchange balances is critical when exchanging your lists. 'That's money on the books. It's free, but at the same time, if you're not taking advantage of that, you're leaving money on the table,' Stivaletti said.

While a non-profit might not be paying hard Rands like a traditional list rental, she said outstanding exchange balances can be like free names for your organisation.

When a balance is creeping into the six figures, the other organisation is 'just pounding your names away, and you're not taking advantage of that. Someone needs to be minding that shop,' Stivaletti said.

If an exchange balance leans too far to one organisation, the other non-profit can hold back exchanging until it reduces its name balance, she said.

List rental can help defray the costs of other aspects of your mailing, whether it's postage, printing or merge/purge. 'No one's going to send you a donation until all that's done,' Stivaletti said.

Exchanging lists instead of renting lists might seem like a no-brainer when looking at your bottom line expenses but it doesn't help the income side of the ledger.

If a non-profit is thinking about putting its names on the market, Simone said it should expect to net about \$1.25 per name rented, but it also depends on how many names it has and how often the file is turned.

For example, an organisation with a 50 000-name list would only be turning it a few times a year.

Some smaller organisations not having luck exchanging their small lists may rent it for

Continued on page eight

*Adapted from
The Non-Profit Times
1 August 2009
Visit www.nptimes.com*

Milestone Thinking

On-target observations in brief

What we have done for ourselves alone dies with us; what we have done for others and the world remains and is immortal.

Albert Pike

The wealthy have a responsibility to invest in addressing inequality. This is especially true when the constraints on others are so great.

Bill Gates in

*The Chronicle of Philanthropy
Volume XXII, 29 October 2009*

When soliciting gifts recognise the importance of listening. Don't do all the talking. Train yourself to accept pauses of silence. Your silence encourages prospects to say more than they otherwise might.

With acknowledgement to

*Successful Fund Raising
December 2009, Volume XVII, No. 12*

Giving away money to good causes helps the wealthy get richer – and live happier lives, new research finds.

With acknowledgement to

*The Chronicle of Philanthropy
Volume XXII, 29 October 2009*

Where there is no vision, there is no hope.

George Washington Carver

Greater emphasis on corporate social responsibility and the emergence of businesses whose primary aim is to do good are challenging the non-profit field's traditional identity, but are also creating openings for new partnerships.

With acknowledgement to

*The Chronicle of Philanthropy
Volume XXII, No. 4, December 2009*

Make donor retention the top priority, especially those who give at higher levels. It's much more time- and cost-effective to retain past donors than to find new ones.

With acknowledgement to

*Successful Fund Raising
December 2009, Volume XVII, No. 12*

Opportunity dances with those who are ready on the dance floor.

H. Jackson Brown Jnr.



Animal cops – and so much more

For the Cape of Good Hope (CoGH) SPCA, fulfilling its mission to prevent animal abuse is a 24-hour commitment – as evidenced through their Inspectorate, which operates around the clock.

Other focus areas include education, veterinary services (an animal hospital, outpatients' clinic and mobile clinics), horse care and wildlife units.

Their adoption centre incorporates kennels and a cattery that's known as 'kitty palace'!

Covering a vast area – around 11 000km² – is no easy or inexpensive task, especially when one considers that the CoGH SPCA does not receive government funding.

But the CoGH SPCA's excellent relationship with the communities it serves – and its passion for the welfare of animals – underlines its success.

What better proof than their record-breaking adoption rate in December last year, when 70 dogs and cats found caring new owners – and five horses and ponies went to good homes, too!

- The CoGH SPCA is the founding society of the SPCA movement in South Africa and is the oldest animal welfare organisation in the country.

Visit www.sPCA-ct.co.za

(Readers are invited to submit photographs, together with a brief overview of their organisation's work, for inclusion in this regular feature.) ■

Perhaps you saw the Cape of Good Hope's SPCA Inspectors on DSTV's Animal Cops. But the work of this SPCA far exceeds the cases portrayed in that series ...

FUNDRAISING FORUM

Fundraising Forum is a regular newsletter dedicated to the enhancement of management, fundraising techniques and the promotion of community service, welfare and not-for-profit organisations of all kinds.

It is published by Downes Murray International and circulated, free of charge, to anyone with an interest in the growth and improvement of the non-profit sector and those served by it. In addition to regular features written by Downes Murray International staff, there are extracts from international fundraising publications which are reprinted with acknowledgement to the publishers.

We welcome submissions for publication from all writers involved in not-for-profit work.

Visit www.dmi.co.za

Prospect research: the information you need

In theory, everyone in the world is a potential contributor to your non-profit, but that's obviously an impossibly large list. Waddy Thompson explains how to go about developing a successful prospect list.

Some board members think they are being helpful by giving the development director the Forbes list of wealthiest Americans, suggesting that all of them should be solicited.

After all, they have lots of money; never mind that some of them live thousands of kilometres away, have demonstrated no interest in philanthropy, and know nothing about your non-profit.

Fortunately, there is a better way to go about developing a workable and successful prospect list.

Developing a strong prospect list requires a thorough examination of everyone who might want to support your non-profit, including individuals, foundations, corporations, and government agencies.

You'll find that these funders fall into three groups that can be thought of as occupying concentric circles in their relationship to your non-profit.

The inner circle

The inner circle is just that – people who are already closely allied with your non-profit. These include current donors, as well as volunteers and clients. And don't forget to include people whose last gift was one or two years ago.

Donors don't think of themselves as 'lapsed donors' if more than a year has elapsed since their last gift.

They probably don't remember when they made their last gift. Treat them like your more recent donors, and you will increase the likelihood that they will make a new donation.

To develop the inner circle, you'll need to break it down into four overlapping circles. Put all of your current donors, large and small, individuals and institutions in the first circle.

The second of your inner circles will contain your non-current (or lapsed) donors. Volunteers will make up the third inner circle.

Make particular note when there are overlaps with your donors. Someone who contributes to your non-profit and volunteers will be one of your strongest prospects for current and planned gifts.

In the fourth inner circle place the names of all of your clients.

This obviously will be a more helpful list for fundraising at an arts organisation, for example, where it will consist of ticket buyers, as opposed to a social service agency serving the poor. Your clients have a vested interest in your non-profit's welfare – they already pay

for and/or use its services, so asking them to contribute is an easy step.

The middle circle

The second concentric circle consists of donors to organisations similar to yours. You'll find that it is rare for someone to give to only one non-profit, whether it's in culture, social services, or health.

A gift to a peer organisation is a great indicator of a potential donor's likelihood of giving to your group.

For example, a membership officer at a major New York City museum discovered that a 30% redundancy was not unusual when renting mailing lists from peer museums.

Use annual reports and online donor lists to discover who gives to organisations similar to yours, noting in the process how much they are giving. Make note of individual and institutional donors.

You'll also gather information on your existing inner circle donors when doing this research, and probably discover that some have a greater giving potential than they are demonstrating with your non-profit.

In developing the second ring, don't be led astray by grants from foundations and corporations that are inconsistent with those funders' stated guidelines. Some quick research will probably reveal connections with a non-profit's board or donors.

If the foundations states that it supports work to alleviate hunger and there is one and only one grant to an opera company, you can bet a board member of the foundation directed that grant.

In this case, exclude this funder from further research, as they are unlikely to make grants to any arts organisation with which they are not personally involved.

The outer circle

The third circle of prospects will take the most work to find and even more work to cultivate. These are funders (not so much individuals) whose stated purposes align with what your non-profit does, but who haven't yet made a contribution to you or a similar organisation in your area.

For example: Geographic restrictions are so common among foundations that it's understandable to only look in funder directories for foundations in your state. That's a mistake because many foundations

Continued on page 5

Prospect research: the information you need (cont.)

made grants nationally or in multiple states. They might fund at-risk youth in your state, but because they are located in another state, they might have been unsolicited by you and your peer non-profits.

Also, be creative in how you think about what you do: an arts program serving inner city schools might qualify for education funding for high poverty schools as well as arts funding.

A documentary film on AIDS could look for funding from foundations supporting filmmaking, AIDS, public health and LGBT causes.

Refining the prospect list

Once you've developed your three circles of prospects by determining their confirmed or potential interest in your non-profit, you'll need to evaluate those in the outer two circles to determine (1) if they are likely to give to you and (2) their giving potential.

For foundations and government agencies, this is a simple matter, using these organisations' Websites or an online foundation database.

Check first to see if they will accept unsolicited proposals. Many do not, but don't eliminate them yet. Instead, put them in a file to be researched later.

By studying the people associated with these foundations, you might be able to find a connection through your board or volunteers that will lead to your being invited to submit a proposal. But, see the caveat above about one-of-a-kind grants.

Corporations, if giving through a foundation, will appear in the foundation databases, but much corporate giving lies outside the structures of their foundations. You'll have to do more online research to review donor lists at a wide range of organisations to estimate how much a corporation is really giving.

There are online databases for researching individuals, too, but you will be able to gather much of the information you need to rate a donor by reviewing donor listings in annual reports, newsletters, and online acknowledgement lists.

Evaluating every client might be impractical, so concentrate on those who have used your services the most, for example, people who have had several family members as patients in your hospital frequently, the subscribers to a concert series, or people on your newsletter list.

For those who appear to have more potential, subscribing to a wealth-screening database could be well worth the cost. Organising your lists

You'll want to add all of the information you have gathered into a database. Many fundraisers (and executive directors) love spreadsheets for tracking funder information.

A spreadsheet works fine up to a point, but a database will serve you better in the long run.

Although both methods can store virtually limitless bits of information, a database organises the information in categories (addresses, giving history, contacts with the donor, links to other donors, etc.), which it manages differently according to the type of information and in relation to all the other pieces of information.

It also presents it visually to you in a coherent fashion. This is much better than a table going to column DZ.

More importantly, since you probably use a database for your mailing list, it is infinitely preferable to have all your information in one place to avoid duplicate updating (or missed updating) of basic information.

In your database, include:

- Name, address, phone, email, contact names for institutional funders;
- Where the prospect came from (source code);
- Application deadlines;
- Application special requirements or an individual's particular interests;
- Sample donations to other organisations; and,
- Prospect type.

Use the prospect's position in the concentric circles as the basis for designating the relationship with your non-profit, e.g.:

- 1A = current donors;
- 1B = non-current donors;
- 1C = volunteers and other friends of your organisation;
- 1D = clients;
- 2A = second circle prospects who accept unsolicited proposals;
- 2B = second circle prospects who do not accept unsolicited proposals; and,
- 3 = third circle prospects.

Using this or any other system will help you prioritise your list and develop a work calendar that will insure that none of your best prospects are forgotten and that new prospects are continually being researched and developed.

Your calendar will obviously concentrate on current and past donors, but be sure to leave room for potential donors from the other two rings every month.

No donor lasts forever.

The deeper your prospect list today, the better you will be prepared to replace donors who leave you. With the economic turmoil continuing, it's more important than ever that you manage your prospects carefully and systematically.

Research is your first step toward fundraising success.

Waddy Thompson is the author of *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Grant Writing*. His email is waddy_t@yahoo.com ■

Adapted from
The Non-Profit Times
15 September, 2009
Visit www.nptimes.com

Magical words to use in your direct mail copywriting

Time and again we've written about the ultimate importance of the word 'you' in direct mail fundraising copy. We've even gone so far as to say that 'you' is the single most important – truly magical – word you can use. Deborah Block and Paul Karps look at some other magical words.

What other words fall into this category of being magical? So, while you may have your own favourites, here's the list we came up with:

You (with a dash of I)

Just to reiterate, you can't go wrong using 'you' too many times. Not only does it psychologically involve the reader in your copy, but forces the writer to adopt the perspective of the reader. As opposed to focusing solely on the needs of the organisation.

(Tom Ahern took a similar perspective in his November 2009 newsletter article, 'Why "you" is glue' – reprinted on the facing page).

Yet, simultaneously, throwing in the occasional 'I' does wonders to warming up the copy. Because this gives an identity to the signer, allowing her to emote and be personal, while forging a real one-to-one bond with the reader.

Thank you

Being polite – just like your mother always taught you – can go far to cement a relationship. And saying 'thank you' is the easiest, simplest, and most straightforward way of doing this.

In fact, we're always surprised when we read a letter that doesn't thank a donor for her support.

Please

This is another case of Ms. Manners exerting profound authority in the giving process. Using the word 'please' when asking for a gift is just the right thing to do, etiquette-wise. Combined with the proper punctuation, the word can also offer an interesting mix of gentility and urgency. As in: 'Please, rush a gift right away to . . .'

One side note: Sometimes – particularly for social service organisations – we'll write an Ask incorporating the word two times (while varying the punctuation).

For example, 'So please, do your part to end poverty in America. Please send a gift today to . . .'

However, some groups feel this approach sounds a bit too much like begging. A subtle alternative would be: 'So I urge you to do your part . . . Please, send a gift . . .'

Free (var. FREE)

The magic of the word 'free' – or, in its

gaudier form, FREE – transcends fundraising copy to include pretty much any type of direct response writing.

Basically, it reflects the most fundamental truth about humanity: We all want something for nothing . . . even if it costs R50 to get it!

So if you've got it (to offer, that is), flaunt it.

Renew

Granted, this is a specialised word for a specialised mailing.

But if you're writing any sort of a renewal package to donors or members, don't be shy about using the word 'renew' as many times as possible throughout the package – without going overboard.

For example, many organisations will always have some form of the word on every outer envelope and reply slip in the series, as well as sprinkled liberally in the letters and all other components.

Member

We tend to subscribe to the theory that for many organisations, membership provides an additional psychological bond between the individual and the non-profit.

So whenever possible, we prefer to take advantage of this connection by using the word 'member' as much as seems appropriate.

And, to be honest, we're a little confused when groups that do have a membership structure seem to go out of their way not to acknowledge their members as such. It just seems like a wasted opportunity to us.

Exclusive

This word taps into one of those key emotions that motivates people to give. It's the idea that you're offering something really special . . . something the person reading your package wouldn't get anywhere else.

This could be tangible in nature – as in 'an exclusive array of benefits reserved just for you' or an 'invitation to an exclusive event'.

But it could refer to an intangible benefit, as well.

Like giving the reader 'an exclusive inside look' into a programme or service or the 'exclusive opportunity to take part in . . .'

Well, that's our list of magical words – given the confines of limited space.

Copywriters Deborah Block and Paul Karps are partners in BK Kreative.

Email bkkreative@aol.com



*Reprinted from
Mal Warwick's
E-newsletter
December 2009
Visit*

www.malwarwick.com

Why 'you' is glue

Once I'd posted a critique of her donor newsletter on my website, Kate Lucas, grants and communications coordinator at truly wonderful Common Hope in St. Paul in the United States emailed some terrific follow-up questions.

Below: her queries, my answers. Kate asked: (1) How many 'you's' do you need in order to pass the 'you' test and (2) Don't the donor profile stories touch on this as well, in another way?

Most pages in Kate's newsletter failed the 'you' test. The pronoun was simply not there in the headlines, captions, and stories in enough abundance, liberally sprinkled across every page and article, to reliably trap readers.

Donor love

Kate wondered, though: When you talk about donors, as she does in her profiles, isn't that sort of the same as using the pronoun 'you'? Aren't they both forms of donor love?

Donor love is never a bad thing; keep doing the profiles, Kate.

But using 'you' is not about donor love. It's about rank, day-to-day, practical psychology. It's about using a particular pronoun (in Twitter-talk, 'u') to stimulate a mechanical, Pavlovian response in a reader.

It works. And here's why it works, in my view.

We are addressed by the word 'you' from our earliest days.

It begins with: 'Aren't you the most beautiful baby in the world? Oh, yes, you are!'

And it never quits. Every day, many times a day, you'll hear the pronoun 'you' and know you're being spoken to.

Multiply that stimulus/response over the years and decades . . . and that's why the word 'you' is so reliably magnetic.

You is glue

Each time we see the Imperial Pronoun in print or hear it aimed our way, the programming in our brains insists we respond.

Then Kate asked: My other question is: Would you approach a donor newsletter any differently knowing that it receives a large amount of its revenue through recurring monthly gifts?

A reading audience comprised of monthly

givers is maybe a bit different. After all, they've shown their commitment to your mission in a profound way. They've made you part of their regular life.

Other donor newsletters hope extra gifts come back in the enclosed reply envelope; a charity well supported by monthly gifts might not need to. Maybe that's a difference.

Where another donor newsletter might highlight a matching gift offer, hoping that would spur added immediate response, you might not care to. Maybe that's a difference.

But here's what a good donor newsletter always does, whether the audience is monthly givers or not: it gives ample helpings of credit to the donors, in part by using the word 'you' copiously, like pepper on steak *au poivre*.

Most non-profits talk the wrong way.

They say: 'We did this great thing. We did that great thing. And, oh, by the way, if you sent a gift, thank you very much.'

The proper (i.e. more profitable) way to speak to donors is this: 'Thanks to your support, we did this great thing and that great thing. And – just as important – you have to make room for donors on your team – 'without your help we can't'.

You don't have to distort stories to do this, by the way. Your stories can run just as they are.

But the donor must see her presence in high-visibility locations like headlines.

I sometimes just insert what's called an 'eyebrow' above the headline. The eyebrow is a few words in small type that say something like 'Your donor Rands at work . . .'

That introductory phrase helps donors see the connection between their gifts and your activities.

Lesson: Charity newsletters are not about what the charity finds interesting. Charity newsletters are about what your donor/investors find interesting, namely: What kinds of good did you do with my gift and other gifts like it?

Profitable charity newsletters all have one thing in common: they shovel joy, promise, and proof into their donors' hearts and heads.

Many charities never realise this fact and wonder why their newsletters seem like such a waste of time and money. ■



This pronoun rules the English speaking world – and a reader writes: What's the 'you' limit? Is 'the monthly giver' a different donor animal? Tom Abern reports.

*Adapted from
Abern E-News 7.8*

*Visit
www.aberncomm.com*

Rent or exchange? (cont.)

Continued from page two

a simple, flat fee, Simone said, like \$300 for 2 000 names.

The base price, she said, can depend on what segment of their list is being made available for rent.

List rental revenue can yield significant income and have a big impact on the overall cost of a programme.

Non-profits must manage list rental income against exchange balances, making sure on the acquisition side they keep costs low by exchanging as much as they can, Kerteklits said.

While most non-profits are trying to

exchange more, once they do, they have to realise the impact on the other side, where they might not have the rental income they once did.

'Exchanging that much more, a non-profit could be saving on the acquisition side but losing list rental income,' he said.

Renting versus exchanging lists depends on an organisation's goals.

If the goal is to bring as many new donors to a file as possible, optimise the ability to do so, reduce costs, and exchange as much as possible.

If the goal is to maintain file size, then a non-profit might think about exchanging less aggressively, Kerteklits said. ■

What the NSRI says about list swaps

According to the National Sea Rescue Institute (NSRI) they mail their main, annual acquisition appeal early each year.

Some 80 000 appeal letters are mailed to prospects from rented (cold) lists.

Affinity lists – which the organisation receives for free from yacht clubs, sailing magazines and groups associated with the ocean – are also mailed.

Of vital importance are the lists which are received by exchanging lists with other non-profits.

In 2008 the NSRI mailed their acquisition mailing to nine charity lists, four affinity lists and nine rented lists.

'The lists we exchange with other charities tend to outperform any other lists that we're either given or have purchased, by a considerable margin,' said Bill Wells, Business Development Manager at the NSRI.

'The average return from most lists, excluding the charity lists, is 0.5% or even less, and produces a net loss. However, with the swapped lists we've received an average response of over 1%.'

'In 2008 the swapped lists brought in a 1.25% response,' he said.

That means if you exchange 10 000 names you should expect to acquire 100-125 new donors.

'To re-iterate, this is a far greater return than you'll receive from anywhere else'.

'Some charities are reluctant – or even afraid that they'll lose some of their donors'.

'Actually, the absolute reverse occurs'.

'Most donors will remain faithful to their selected charities. When they receive an appeal letter from a new charity they'll decide whether to support it by adding it to their portfolio, or just ignore it,' he said.

'So if you're approached by another charity to exchange names, give their request careful consideration'.

'But make sure that you both agree that the exchange of lists is for a single mailing, and if your charity is a provincial charity you should only exchange names of prospects who fall within your postal code area'. ■

"Reprinted with acknowledgement to ..."

Fundraising Forum prides itself on keeping South African fundraisers right up-to-date with developing attitudes, trends and techniques, both here and overseas. We are grateful to the following international publications, which are regularly quoted and highly recommended:

- *Successful Fund Raising*, PO Box 4528, Sioux City, Iowa, 51104, USA, (12 issues per annum \$159) website: www.stevensoninc.com
- *The Non-Profit Times*, 190 Tamarack Circle, Skillman, NJ08558, USA, (\$129 per annum) website: www.nptimes.com
- *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, PO Box 1989, Marion, Ohio, 43306, USA, (24 issues – one annum at \$95) website: <http://philanthropy.com>
- *Successful Direct Mail, Telephone and Online Fundraising*™. Subscribe for free at www.malwarwick.com/newsletter
- *Abern E-News*. Subscribe for free at www.AhernComm.com

Fundraising Forum is edited by Richard Solomon and published by Downes Murray International. Views expressed are not necessarily those of the publisher.

Downes Murray International

Downes Murray International are fundraising consultants, working with non-profit and non-government organisations of all kinds, to increase their fundraising effectiveness.

We offer feasibility studies, strategic planning workshops, direct mail fundraising, mail/phone, corporate and capital fundraising campaigns, Internet fundraising and website design, church fundraising and bequest promotion programmes. In addition, Downes Murray International has close links with a number of fundraising consultancies across the globe, and represents DVA Navion International Consultancy in Africa, enabling us to keep a finger on the pulse of international trends and techniques. For more information contact your nearest office.

Durban

Tel. 031 207-3755

Johannesburg

Tel. 011 465-7217

Website

www.dmi.co.za

E-mail

fundraisingforum@dmi.co.za

If you would like additional copies of *Fundraising Forum* or would like to add names to our mailing list please write to:

The Editor
Fundraising Forum
PO Box 3455
Durban
4000

E-mail: Casey.DeKok@dmi.co.za