Campaign Management Assignment – 2

1. **Media performance across various platforms**

Facebook and YouTube are aimed at a much larger general audience who do not always intend to buy travel insurance. Hence the CTR is high as many people visit these websites without the intent of travelling and the conversion rate on sales is low. On the other hand, Trip Advisor targets potential customers (travellers) and hence the conversion rate on sales is very high i.e. 35.84% with no major difference in the CTR.

Also, if we consider a matric of maximum sales with minimum cost, Facebook is the best performing platform as compared to others because it generates the highest number of sales i.e. 188 with minimum cost per sale of $53.99

Therefore, we clearly conclude that:

* **Facebook worked better** than TripAdvisor and YouTube in terms of **performance** and generating **more business** with **minimum cost**
* **TripAdvisor** worked better than Facebook and YouTube in terms of **conversion rate**.

The below process was employed to calculate the blank values i.e. Spend and CPC:

* Spend = (Sales from DFA\*Cost per Sale)
* CPC = (Spend/Clicks)
* CPM = ((Spending/Impressions) \*1000)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Media** | **Imps delivered** | **Clicks** | **CTR%** | **Spend** | **CPC** | **Successful Attempt (DFA)** | **Sale** | **Conversion Rate on sale** | **Cost per Sale** | **CPM** |
| Facebook | 150,13,683 | 23199 | 0.15% | $10150.12 | $0.44 | 19,211 | 188 | 0.81% | $53.99 | $0.68 |
| GDN & YouTube | 23,42,055 | 8585 | 0.37% | $7112.7 | $0.83 | 1,620 | 126 | 1.47% | $56.45 | $3.04 |
| Trip Advisor | 2,59,682 | 332 | 0.13% | $9099.93 | $27.41 | 82 | 119 | 35.84% | $76.47 | $35.04 |
| **Total** | **176,15,420** | **32116** | **0.18%** | **26362.75** | **$0.82** | **20,823** | **433** | **1.35%** | **$60.88** | **$1.50** |

1. **Web platform vs Mobile platform**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Media** | **Imp Delivered** | **Clicks** | **CTR%** | **Spend** | **CPC** |
| Facebook Web | 142,62,999 | 14,383 | 0.10% | 6,285.37 | 0.437 |
| Facebook Mobile | 7,50,684 | 8,816 | 1.17% | 3,852.59 | 0.437 |
| GDN Web | 18,73,644 | 5,151 | 0.27% | 4,265.03 | 0.828 |
| GDN Mobile | 4,68,411 | 3,434 | 0.73% | 2,843 | 0.828 |
| **Total** | **173,55,738** | **31,784** | **0.18%** | **17,246.34** | **0.542610842** |

**Assumption:** The above Spend is calculated basis the assumption that both web and mobile platform have the same CPC.

As per the above table, better CTR can be obtained by focussing the campaign more on mobile platform as compared to web platform as most people tend to use mobile devices to browse and use Facebook.

The CTR of GDN for mobile platform is 3 times more than the CTR obtained than web platform, The CTR for Facebook mobile is 10 times more than the CTR achieved thorough web platform.

Therefore, we conclude that **mobile platform worked better** than the web platform in terms of **click through rate (CTR)**.

1. **Media Performance – Facebook**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ad Work** | **Imp Delivered** | **Clicks** | **CTR%** | **Spend** | **CPC** |
| Page Post -Web | 8,55,780 | 8,630 | 1.01% | 3771.31 | 0.437 |
| Standard Ad -Web | 129,79,329 | 4,603 | 0.04% | 2011.511 | 0.437 |
| Page App -Web | 4,27,890 | 1,151 | 0.27% | 502.987 | 0.437 |
| Page Post -Mobile | 1,80,164 | 6,700 | 3.27% | 2927.9 | 0.437 |
| Page App - Mobile | 5,70,520 | 2,116 | 0.37% | 924.692 | 0.437 |
| **Total** | **150,13,363** | **23,199** | **0.15%** | **$10,150.62** | **$0.44** |

From the table, we infer that the CTR for Standard ad-web was very low as compared to the other ad types. Hence, the **Standard ad-web did not work** well for the campaign. Similarly, the **Page post-Mobile has the best CTR of 3.72% and clearly worked** the best in terms of Ad types.

Therefore, to **achieve a better CTR** for the overall campaign the **money spent** on **Standard ad-web** can **be distributed** to **Page post-Mobile** which has the best CTR when compared to other Ad types.

1. **Social Influencers’ Performance**

The social influencers had a total spend of $9,500 for 297,632 impressions giving us a CPM of $30. Facebook brought 15,013,683 impression at a CPM of only $0.68. Moreover, GDN & YouTube brought 2,342,055 impressions at a CPM of $3.04, **social influencers’ performance is not as promising**. From the weekly performance stat, we can see that **when the social influencers posted messages** on week 1 and week 3, **the number of new users increased**. The brand awareness improved significantly and the suitcase teaser got good promotion. However, there are no definite sales figures which can help us in understanding if enrolling social influencers had any effect in increase of sales.

1. **Facebook Posts**

We can see that during the campaign the number of fans increased by 9,541. The engagement rate of the suitcase teaser post was also very high and comments generated were positive. Again, this was good in terms of promotion of the campaign but we cannot quantify if this helped in the increase of sales

1. **Microsite Site Stats – Participant Stats**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participants Stats** | **Week 1** | **Week 2** | **Week 3** | **Week 4** | **Week 5** | **Week 6** | **Total** |
| No New Users | 2261 | 1651 | 3428 | 2012 | 818 | 1046 | **11216** |
| No of Successful Attempt | 4147 | 7025 | 12282 | 15399 | 16321 | 13699 | **68873** |
| No of Sales on Campaign Code | 32 | 41 | 69 | 74 | 5 | 28 | **249** |
| No of visits to Landing page | 15335 | 18596 | 39911 | 36799 | 32404 | 28792 | **171837** |
| No of view on page with Buy Now | 4640 | 7080 | 12086 | 15777 | 13658 | 13140 | **66381** |
| No of clicks to Buy Now | 95 | 175 | 375 | 458 | 339 | 250 | **1692** |

The graph shows a steep decline in the number of new users in week 5 showing a negative impact of the WOW promo campaign which was conducted during the 5 days of week 5. This is clear because the customers are getting a better discount of 50% in the WOW promo as compared to 20% for registering the game.

The graph shows a constant growth in the number of successful attempts till week 5 but in week 6 there is a sudden decrease in the number of successful attempts. This is due to the decrease in the participation in “Solve the Suitcase” game as customers would opt for WOW promo for better discount instead.

The sales on campaign code experienced the worst impact during the 5th and 6th week as people interested in travel insurance could easily get a 50% discount under WOW promo without participating in the game where they would get only 20% discount. Hence, there is a deep decline in the number of sales.

Therefore, due to WOW promo, “Solve the Suitcase” campaign took a major hit in terms of the new users and sales mainly because **overseas trips are planned in advance** therefore, travellers actively used the WOW promo to avail the discount, severely affecting the traffic visiting the “Solve the suitcase” campaign in the final week. We can conclude that running the **WOW promo during the “Solve the Suitcase”** campaign clearly **did not work in favour of the campaign** but the overall sales increased significantly.

1. **WOW promo week sales**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Facebook** | | | **GDN** | | | **Trip Advisor** | | | **Total** | | | **Sale Recorded from playing the game** |
|  | **Sale** | **Spend** | **CPA** | **Sale** | **Spend** | **CPA** | **Sale** | **Spend** | **CPA** | **Sale** | **Spend** | **CPA** |  |
| 15-Apr | 6 | 421 | 70 | 9 | 265 | 29.4 | 29 | 265 | 9.14 | 44 | 951 | 21.61 | 50 |
| 16-Apr | 9 | 441 | 49 | 11 | 385 | 35 | 104 | 423 | 4.06 | 124 | 1249 | 10.07 | 41 |
| 17-Apr | 8 | 351 | 44 | 16 | 551 | 34.4 | 86 | 345 | 4.01 | 110 | 1247 | 11.34 | 34 |
| 18-Apr | 7 | 215 | 31 | 14 | 345 | 24.6 | 153 | 1717 | 11.22 | 174 | 2277 | 13.09 | 31 |
| 19-Apr | 15 | 315 | 21 | 23 | 417 | 18.1 | 209 | 1382 | 6.61 | 247 | 2114 | 8.56 | 52 |
| **Total** | **45** | **1743** | **215** | **73** | **1963** | **141.5** | **581** | **4132** | **35.04** | **699** | **7838** | **64.67** | **208** |

During the WOW promo week, the sales from Trip Advisor grew exponentially as compared to Facebook and GDN. The **sales in the last 2 days doubled** as more people tend to buy the discounted products in the ending days of the discount

Therefore, **Trip Advisor worked better** as compared to Facebook and GDN in terms **of increased sales**.

To conclude, initiating the WOW promo in the 5th week had a great impact on “Solve the Suitcase” campaign.

**Conclusions:**

1. Solve the suitcase was successful in increasing brand awareness (171,000 visits to landing page) acquiring new customers. (Total sales of 433)
2. Sales were boosted by WOW promo. (Total WOW Promo sales = 699 which was much higher than total sales of 433 from “Solve the suitcase” campaign)
3. The total impact of influencers in terms of CTR was high however more cannot be completely understood without identifying the sales due to influencers.

**The Summary of recommendations from the report above is:**

1. FB generated more business at lower cost for “Solve the Suitcase”. Hence for future, higher percentage of funds be allocated towards such campaigns on FB.
2. The WOW Promo outperformed in Trip advisor and the cost per sale was the lowest, thus in future more budget be allocated to WOW promo on Trip Advisor.
3. The WOW promo could have been timed later after the end of the “Solve the suitcase” campaign as:
   1. this would not create inconsistencies in campaigns for the customers which causes a negative felling for those who availed 20% discount and later learned about 50% discount.
   2. Having WOW promo also negated the purpose of having the suitcase campaign in week 5 and week 6 thus affecting the overall results desired from the suitcase campaign.
4. The campaigns should be weighted more towards mobile platform than web platforms to generate higher CTR.