

GIVEINDIA: ON THE NET FOR A CAUSE

Sanjeev Tripathi and Shashank Bhasker wrote this case solely to provide material for class discussion. The authors do not intend to illustrate either effective or ineffective handling of a managerial situation. The authors may have disguised certain names and other identifying information to protect confidentiality.

This publication may not be transmitted, photocopied, digitized or otherwise reproduced in any form or by any means without the permission of the copyright holder. Reproduction of this material is not covered under authorization by any reproduction rights organization. To order copies or request permission to reproduce materials, contact Ivey Publishing, Ivey Business School, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada, N6G 0N1; (t) 519.661.3208; (e) cases@ivey.ca; www.iveycases.com.

Copyright © 2016, Richard Ivey School of Business Foundation

Version: 2016-01-06

The Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Dhaval Udani, of GiveIndia, a donation platform headquartered in Mumbai, India, had scheduled a series of meetings with his staff during the first week of the new financial year 2014/2015.¹ He was keenly looking forward to the one with his Digital Marketing team from whom he had great expectations for solving the current issues at hand.

After graduating from the Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad (IIMA) in 2005, Udani joined AT Kearney as a management consultant. While working there, he started volunteering for GiveIndia, which he joined in 2008 as chief information officer (CIO) and vice-president; he rose to the level of CEO in 2011. In the 14 years since Venkat Krishnan founded it, GiveIndia had grown to become the largest donation platform in India, raising more than US\$5 million² every year for the over 270 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that it supported (see Exhibits 1 and 2).

Online media provided the perfect opportunity for GiveIndia to communicate with its current and potential donors. Given the rapid evolution of digital media, specifically social media, in India he was not sure how to utilize the plethora of opportunities in this emerging market. GiveIndia was already present on popular channels such as Facebook, YouTube, LinkedIn and Twitter. Moreover, it had its own blog and online newspaper. Udani was sure that GiveIndia was present on the right platforms, but he felt that there was a need for a strategic focus on each of these channels, rather than the current approach where the same content was shared across all the channels. He made a mental note to discuss the social media strategy and the brand building exercise with the team in the morning meeting. He was also keen to take a look at the previous quarter's search engine marketing (SEM) data that had popped up in his mail box.

PHILANTHROPY IN INDIA

In India, many family-owned businesses were involved in charity for altruistic or religious reasons. However, in the last 20 years, secular causes had begun to occupy much more mind and media space, and the emphasis of philanthropy had shifted accordingly.

¹ In India, the financial year begins on April 1 and ends on March 31.

² All figures are in USD unless otherwise stated; US\$1 = INR60.00 on January 2, 2014.

In 2009, the Government of India estimated that India had over 3.3 million NGOs. This meant that the country housed the largest number of non-governmental, not-for-profit organizations in the world. However, only 500 of these had a budget over \$100,000, few reached more than 5,000 people and barely 30 had a budget over \$5 million.³ The main competitors for GiveIndia in the giving space were Child Rights and You (CRY), Charities Aid Foundation (CAF India), Dasra and HelpAge India (see Exhibit 3).

CONTRIBUTIONS TO NGOS

Contributions to NGOs could be categorized into private and corporate contributions. Since 1991, with the opening of the Indian economy, the number of wealthy Indians had grown considerably. According to the Bain Philanthropic Report,⁴ high networth individuals (HNIs)⁵ in India contributed 3.1 per cent of their average household income to charity while the corresponding figures for United States stood at 9.1 per cent.

Before the 1990s, almost 70 per cent of the top 40 businesses in India were family-controlled enterprises.⁶ A large number that had all along donated for secular and religious causes started shifting their philanthropic activities towards specific objectives by setting up private foundation and trusts. However, from 1991, a new breed of wealthy Indians with exposure to Western ethics and culture emerged. Pioneered by technological entrepreneurs such as N.R. Narayana Murthy (Infosys), Nandan Nilekani (Infosys) and Shiv Nadar (HCL), these wealthy Indians started actively investing in philanthropy with a community cause.

Indian Companies Act 2013

The Indian Companies Act, 2013, which came into force on April 1, 2014, made spending by companies on corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities mandatory. It required firms to set aside at least 2 per cent of their average net profit for CSR activities every financial year. This was applicable to companies with a net worth of \$833 million, a turnover of \$1,666 million or a net profit of \$8.33 million annually. The act drew mixed reactions from the corporate world. While some welcomed it, a few criticized it on various counts, such as the curtailment of freedom and lack of detailed rules and guidelines. NGOs by and large applauded the act, as they felt it would increase awareness about and generate more funds for social causes.

GIVEINDIA — ONLINE PHILANTHROPIC MARKETPLACE

In India, there was a huge disparity between the “haves” and “have-nots.” Venkat Krishnan felt a burning desire to do something about this and set up GiveIndia in 2000 to “professionalize giving.” He wanted to build an enterprise whose core values were to lay a strong foundation to enable citizens with opportunities to participate in the right causes of contributing to charities and to ensure the organization was run with the highest standards of transparency and accountability.

³ Dasra, “What We Do,” www.dasra.org/what-we-do, accessed May 16, 2014.

⁴ A. Sheth and M. Singhal, “India Philanthropy Report 2011,” June 29, 2011, Bain & Company, www.bain.com/publications/articles/india-philanthropy-report-2011.aspx, accessed August 9 2014, pp. 3–4.

⁵ HNI: Person with assets of US\$1 million or more, excluding primary residence, collectibles and consumables.

⁶ Adarsh Kumar, “Emerging Philanthropy in India: Analysis of Gaps and Recommended Interventions”, National Foundation for India, 2013, p. 28, www.nfi.org.in/sites/default/files/nfi_files/Emerging%20Philanthropy%20in%20India_NFI.pdf, accessed August 12 2014.

In his concept note for GiveIndia on December 7, 1999, Krishnan zeroed in on the name “Give” because NGOs were voluntary organizations and the word was the acronym for “Giving Impetus to Voluntary Efforts.” Registered under section 25 of the Companies Act, 1956, the non-profit organization’s mission was to provide the objective of promoting effective and efficient giving that optimized opportunities for the poor in India.

GiveIndia’s objective was to work towards ushering in a culture that prompted Indians to contribute 2 per cent of their earning per annum towards improving the lives of the poor. Accordingly, its focus was to promote giving by individuals rather than corporations. It also felt that individual donations had more personal involvement and “warmth” than donations by corporations, which were often linked to a corporate objective. GiveIndia sought to create a “philanthropic marketplace” to facilitate giving and to ensure that the most efficient and effective NGOs had access to the most resources.

GiveIndia operated as a philanthropic marketplace that connected donors to the credible NGOs working for different causes who were profiled on its website. The process of curating was stringent. During its 14 years of operational existence, GiveIndia had scrutinized over 5,000 NGOs and channelled more than \$34 million from 500,000 people to them (see Exhibit 4).

Maintaining a high level of transparency, GiveIndia requested donors to contribute a small amount of their annual income, which was then relayed to intended charities. Unlike similar organizations in India, which on average retained about 40 per cent of the donation amount to meet operational expenses, GiveIndia over the years had kept the retention rate below 10 per cent (last reported 9.1 per cent). Even websites that offered a pure transfer facility retained between 5 to 15 per cent of the donation amount as their fee. Another differentiating factor was that GiveIndia focused on donations from individual donors whereas others tapped government funds and corporate donations. According to Udani:

For GiveIndia there were two areas of importance. The first was a focus on individual giving, leading to the creation of a giving culture. The second was honesty and transparency in raising money, which ensured the cost of fundraising at below 9.1 per cent. For GiveIndia, individual donations symbolized sacrifice, involved deep engagement and had a concern for impact, unlike corporate donations, which were often tied to a concern for the organization’s interests and publicity.

While GiveIndia was focused on channelling donations to needy NGOs, [its] primary goal was not to maximize donations [but] to create a giving culture, and this was to be achieved through focusing on getting individuals to develop a habit of giving. Once the culture of giving developed, the quantum of donations would naturally increase.

Business Model

The concept of GiveIndia revolved around the operating model that all donors wanted “social returns” on the money they donated and that they tended to act like “investors.” Their satisfaction lay in knowing that their money was going to the right cause and was making a difference in the lives of others. This need gap was fulfilled by GiveIndia by connecting credible NGOs and donors. Charities that GiveIndia supported offered a wide array of causes — from the needs of children and youth to issues of health, disability, education, the environment, women empowerment, the elderly, human rights and employment.

GiveIndia shared detailed information, such as their vision and mission statements, on the NGOs it listed. It also included news such as key achievements, success stories, financial statements and disclosures,

including how donations would be used. All this helped donors to make informed choices before they donated. After six to eight months of donation, the members received a detailed feedback report from GiveIndia. As a support organization, GiveIndia made sure that the flow of funds and information was seamlessly maintained between the donor and the NGO.

Website

The GiveIndia website was a critical part of its business model. The organization realized the benefits of an online platform and started its website in 2001 when the Internet was still in its infancy in India. The website was designed to provide information, build credibility and facilitate philanthropic transactions. It had information about GiveIndia's mission, vision, financial records, impact statistics, donor testimonials, etc.

The website facilitated transactions by making it easy for donors to search for the cause they wanted to support. The navigation menu consisted of a search interface that allowed visitors to customize their search by cause or by amount. It even had an advanced option that allowed visitors to refine their search by state, by NGO or by tax benefit.

It also facilitated giving by providing different ways to give. For example, its "Gift a donation" option gave people the opportunity to mark special occasions such as a birthday, anniversary or graduation by making a gift to a specific cause. It also created a fundraising tool (iGive) that enabled anyone to raise funds for a cause on its website.

Pages on iGive could be set up by any user simply by providing a few details, such as the reason for raising funds, the amount to be raised, etc. This tool gave many NGOs an alternate route to reach out to donors anywhere in the world quickly, at a low cost and without the hassle of paperwork. It helped them build a community of donors, keep them informed of plans and projects and harness GiveIndia's network to further champion their own cause. To help address queries in real time, GiveIndia partnered with Zopim, a company that specialized in making real-time customer engagement simple with its customizable live chat widgets.

DONATIONS AT GIVEINDIA

GiveIndia segmented its direct donors into three categories based on the amount they were likely to donate: those who gave small amounts regularly (\$1 to \$10 per month), those who preferred to make annual donations of larger amounts (\$100 to \$1,000 per annum) and HNIs who made major donations (over \$10,000 per annum). An alternative method was to segment donors by the type of cause they supported. However, GiveIndia realized that only 15 per cent of its users gave to the same cause twice and less than 5 per cent did so a third time. Most people preferred to donate to different causes or initiatives each time.

GiveIndia planned to commission a study to help it understand how people went about making their donation decisions. However, based on experience, GiveIndia believed that the donation process was one in which the donor was highly involved. Thus, the donor's decision journey could be compared to a high involvement purchase decision: a donor went through the stages of problem recognition (need to donate), information search (where to donate and how to donate), evaluation of alternatives (different donation options), purchase decision (donation) and post-purchase behaviour (post-donation satisfaction and actions). Over the years, GiveIndia had come to realize that most people had a need to give, which could be triggered in a number of ways, such as family/personal situation, family heritage, workplace, peer influence, special occasions, etc.

GiveIndia broadly channelled donations across three main heads — payroll giving (PRG), HNI giving and online and retail giving (ORG). In the case of PRG and HNI, GiveIndia received donations directly, whereas with ORG, it adopted the indirect route of tying up with its corporate partners to launch initiatives aimed at getting people to donate. Each of these channels had their own fundraising teams; for HNI and PRG, there was a dedicated sales team, whereas for ORG, there was a greater emphasis on marketing than on sales.

Payroll Giving

The PRG program was born out of the insight that people wanted to give but that giving was not high on their list of priorities. Through PRG, GiveIndia tried to make giving a regular habit by ensuring that it was a hassle-free process. The program offered corporate employees the option to donate to causes of their choice through voluntary deductions from their monthly salaries. These monthly contributions would accumulate in a charity account set up by GiveIndia in the employee's name. Once the amount crossed \$4, the employee could donate the accumulated amount to a cause or NGO of their choice. Donors did not have to contribute towards GiveIndia's fundraising and operations costs; these were covered by their employers. Each donor received an e-tax receipt for their contribution and a feedback report after six months. As of 2013, more than 115 companies and 44,000 employees were part of this program.

HNI Giving

HNI donations were primarily driven through what GiveIndia called the First Givers Club (FGC). In 2010/2011, GiveIndia decided to focus on fostering an active giving culture among HNIs and started the FGC with the aim of bringing together philanthropists who could discuss, debate and connect with like-minded people.

A "by invitation only" membership policy ensured that only people with a committed intent to donate at least \$8,333 to charitable works and also set aside 40 hours for charitable causes per annum could participate in various events. One of these was the Exclusive Annual Summit featuring global leaders in philanthropy and the social services sector as well as workshops, forums and other innovative activities. This annual summit, coupled with a series of events throughout the year, enabled members to learn and interact extensively with other philanthropists, active social entrepreneurs and leading policy makers to bring about a desired change in the act of giving for a wider audience.

Online and Retail Giving (ORG)

The ORG program was aimed at small retail donors who were targeted primarily through online channels. Broadly speaking, it involved two sets of marketing activities. The first, Direct ORG, sought to engage donors directly with GiveIndia and to use its platform to donate to one of the causes and NGOs it supported. Its "Cause of the Month" focused on raising funds for a specific cause, and its "Indian Giving League" pitted different cities against each other in a giving challenge. Through the second, Indirect ORG, GiveIndia worked with various partners to design specific programs to facilitate a culture of giving and to encourage people to give for causes and to NGOs it supported. Such co-marketing initiatives involved creative programs such as donating reward points on credit/debit/loyalty cards and buying gift donations or donating to specific causes when shopping. GiveIndia partnered with organizations such as ICICI Bank, Axis Bank, HDFC, GroupOn, SnapDeal and MakeMyTrip.com, among others, on these activities.

Describing the main purpose of these partnerships, Udani said:

Our partnerships with e-commerce portals across India such as MakeMyTrip.com, PAYBACK, GroupOn and Snapdeal are expected to engage 100,000 new donors every year. Groupon India is a marketplace with a large number of customers. Some of these customers may look to donate. The idea is to be present in places where the customers are, apart from bringing them to our website. It's also an opportunity for the customer to make a donation. In our experience, people want to but don't find the opportunity to do so.

OFFLINE MARKETING AT GIVEINDIA

GiveIndia's marketing activities had a large online component, but its offline activities were vital and formed an important part of its marketing activities. Separate teams handled sales and marketing activities for each of its three donation programs. The PRG team's sales activities involved pitching the program to the CEOs and Human Resource (HR) heads of target organizations; once they were on board, they in turn rolled out the program to their employees. For HNI giving, the sales process consisted of lead generation, engagement and conversions. The leads were generated through referrals from existing donors and GiveIndia's board members. The team then engaged with prospective HNI donors, either on a one-on-one basis or through the FGC, to understand their philanthropic needs and to design offers for them. Offline marketing for the ORG program was primarily concerned with indirect donations. The ORG team approached corporations and worked with them to design programs that involved a giving component or facilitated giving.

To build awareness about GiveIndia and the causes that it supported, GiveIndia hired an agency to manage its publicity and public relations (PR) and improve its visibility in the print and visual media.

ONLINE MARKETING AT GIVEINDIA

Given its emphasis on keeping the cost of fundraising to a minimum, GiveIndia moved to the online space soon after it was established as a donation platform. Apart from reducing the cost of transactions, the online space had several other benefits. It allowed GiveIndia to share information and highlight its transparency and credibility; it also extended the organization's reach, facilitated two-way communication and encouraged community building.

For its online marketing, GiveIndia used a number of different platforms and activities (see Exhibit 5). To drive traffic to its website, it used search engine optimization (SEO) and search engine marketing (SEM). To disseminate information, engage people and build communities, it was present on a number of social media platforms. It also used online campaigns to engage with donors and drive donations. GiveIndia won a number of awards for its digital initiatives including the Fundraising Campaign of the Year Award from the South Asian Fundraising Group (SAFRG) and Best Use of Internet for Social and Economic Development Award from the Internet and Mobile Association of India.⁷

Search Engine Optimization

Every search engine made use of algorithms to rank web pages on the Internet. SEO was how websites gained traffic from such listings. GiveIndia used SEO to improve the visibility of its website. It worked actively to optimize the website so that it was listed in organic searches and ranked high on search pages. This was achieved in a number of ways. Keywords that were believed to be frequently used in searching

⁷ GiveIndia Foundation, "Our Achievements," www.giveindia.org/t-abtus_achievements.aspx, accessed May 17, 2014

for GiveIndia were repeatedly used on its website. The site was designed to be simple and easy to load, and information was updated regularly. It was also linked to the websites of its corporate and NGO partners.

Search Engine Marketing

SEM was a way to promote or direct traffic to websites through paid advertising campaigns or listings on the Internet. Advertisers who wanted to advertise their websites or web pages on the Internet used the pay per click advertising model. They set a daily budget for their campaigns and placed maximum bids on keywords of interest to their target audience. Based on the size of the impression net that advertisers wished to cast, they could choose among broad, exact, phrase or negative keyword campaign matches. SEM had grown significantly in recent years and formed a substantial part of a business's marketing budget. Google was the leader in the field of SEM. GiveIndia had its own SEM program, which it ran using Google AdWords.

Under this program, GiveIndia was allowed to bid a maximum amount of \$2 for any keyword. Of the donations received through the program, as per its stated policy, GiveIndia retained 9.1 per cent (after informing its donors) for its own operations and channelled the rest to the specific NGOs for whom the donations were intended (see Exhibit 6).

Social Media Marketing

Social media had gained popularity rapidly in India. In 2012, it had about 62 million users based in urban India, which translated to 74 per cent of active Internet users. Facebook had 97 per cent of all social media users in India; they primarily used personal computers, laptops or mobile devices to connect.⁸

In India, with its high mobile penetration and affordable mobile Internet plans, social networking through mobile phones was a growing phenomenon. As per industry data, the top social media websites in descending order were Facebook, Google Plus, LinkedIn and Twitter, with users spending the most time on Facebook followed by LinkedIn. In terms of demographic segments, young men and college students accounted for the highest proportion of social media usage.⁹

GiveIndia joined the Facebook platform in 2008. It engaged with its followers extensively through regular updates on its Facebook page. These included stories about listed NGOs, the causes that they supported, the impact that donors had made, information about current campaigns and even links to making donations. Its Facebook content included many images and visuals to capture the interest of visitors. By 2014, GiveIndia had built a strong community base of over 23,000 followers on Facebook.

Other Platforms: Twitter, LinkedIn, and Google+

GiveIndia had close to 24,000 followers on Twitter by the end of 2013. It had posted over 3,000 tweets, most of them informing followers about stories on *The Giving Daily*, its philanthropic newspaper (see below). It also used the platform to promote YouTube videos and social-themed stories and to update followers on its latest activities. In 2011, GiveIndia was the official charity partner for Twestival, an annual event that encouraged local groups of Twitter users to host events in aid of their favourite charities.¹⁰ As

⁸ Internet & Mobile Association of India, "Social Media in India — 2012," February 2013, p. 4, www.iamai.in/research/reports_details/463, accessed March 17, 2014.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ GiveIndia Foundation, "Annual Report 2010-2011," www.giveindia.org/t-annualreport1011.aspx, accessed December 20, 2013.

partners, GiveIndia provided matching grants to NGOs from the top three of the five participating cities to raise funds online. The cities that took part were Bangalore, Cochin, Hyderabad, Mumbai and Pune.

GiveIndia primarily used LinkedIn to conduct recruitment drives. It often posted job vacancies and organization updates on the platform. It used Google+ to share news and spread impact anecdotes through the “Stories of Hope” series.

Online Campaigns

In order to raise funds, the company conducted the annual flagship initiative India Giving Challenge (IGC), a week-long initiative celebrating the “Joy of Giving,” which brought both profit and non-profit organizations in India on the same platform to raise funds.¹¹ For this, GiveIndia used online campaigns to keep the public engaged and encourage them to donate.

The participating organizations set up fundraising pages and GiveIndia provided matching grants to the winners. While NGOs focused on raising funds for themselves, corporations could nominate the NGOs they supported and work towards raising more funds for them online. GiveIndia also launched the India Giving League as a philanthropic challenge across cities that were competing at the same time in the Indian Premier League (IPL), a hugely popular cricket tournament.

Blogs and Online Newspaper

GiveIndia actively used blogs and had its own online newspaper, *The Giving Daily*.¹² It started its blog in 2008; by 2014, it had posted over 376 articles and had over 200,000 unique visitors. It promoted giving through a wide range of categories, including PRG, the IGC, testimonials, inspiring stories, philanthropic events, fundraising and CSR, to name a few. Users could subscribe to the blog by email or could follow it on Google+. The online newspaper highlighted what it referred to as “stories of new India.” It covered news on education, society, the environment, business and health, with a strong focus on news about giving. It also included videos and a discussion corner to increase the organization’s engagement with its audience.

Other Activities

GiveIndia also engaged in a number of other online activities to encourage people to donate. It started an online giving campaign targeting people who had either registered on the GiveIndia website but had not yet donated or those who had donated through its alliance partners such as MakeMyTrip or Payback but not on the GiveIndia website. GiveIndia also sent automated and engagement mailers to its existing donors. The mailers typically contained stories that illustrated the impact of a donation. In the last week of every month, GiveIndia sent a newsletter to donors with a summary of the activities and events that had taken place in that particular month. This helped to keep donors up to date on GiveIndia’s latest activities. The organization also sent system-generated emails to donors on the completion of an activity or when the donor performed a certain trigger action, such as creating an account, making a donation or getting a tax receipt.

¹¹ indiacr, GiveIndia Announces the Fifth Edition of the India Giving Challenge, India’s Largest Online Fundraising Event,” *IndiaCSR*, August 27, 2013, www.indiacsr.in/en/?p=12064, accessed January 5, 2014.

¹² GiveIndia Foundation, *The Giving Daily* website, paper.giveindia.org, accessed January 10, 2014.

THE ROAD AHEAD

Walking the short distance to his office, Udani recalled a meeting that had taken place in May of the previous year. The ORG team had made a presentation on how initiatives such as the “Cause of the Month” and the use of Google Web Optimizer¹³ had helped GiveIndia improve its retention rate. The team had also talked about how the revamp of the donation options user interface had improved conversions on the website. Udani had loved the ideas and the initiatives; he felt that with the expanding reach of the Internet, there was a lot that could be achieved by optimizing GiveIndia’s digital reach. He wondered if this could be the area of focus for the year ahead. There were a number of ideas he wanted to explore with the team.

Social Media Strategy

Over the last couple of years, the social media scene in India had undergone a revolution. GiveIndia had tried to keep pace with this boom and had started a number of new initiatives to leverage digital and social media. However, Udani felt that GiveIndia had not yet fully understood how best to use social media. Instead of an ad hoc approach, it needed to be strategic, understanding the strengths and weaknesses of each platform and then devising an approach to exploit the platform’s reach. He also felt that it was important to align GiveIndia’s social media strategy with the donor decision-making process and wondered how to go about doing it.

Search Engine Marketing

GiveIndia had been using paid search for some time now. It had hired an external agency to help maximize its returns from the SEM initiative, but the returns had been minimal. Udani felt that there was considerable scope to optimize the program. He knew that businesses used specific metrics for their SEM programs, but he was not sure which metrics GiveIndia should use. There were a number of reasons for this. First, unlike traditional businesses, GiveIndia’s SEM program operated on a grant. Second, while GiveIndia wanted more people to donate, it also wanted to create visibility for itself and spread awareness. The program also had limitations; GiveIndia was not allowed to make bids larger than \$2 as per the rules of the grant. Also, the program was quite expensive and GiveIndia could run it only because it was supported by Google Grants.

One aspect of the program that Udani greatly appreciated was that it could lead to a number of online “walk-ins” and expand the GiveIndia franchise. Though the donation sizes were small, the program supported GiveIndia’s vision to get every Indian to donate 2 per cent of their income to charitable causes. Udani wondered if GiveIndia could run the program profitably on its own without grant support. This would give it the freedom to bid more than \$2 for keywords and enable it to achieve greater efficiencies. GiveIndia could even consider supporting the program by committing more than 9.1 per cent towards administrative costs if the SEM initiative could help expand the franchise. SEM data for the previous quarter (January to March 2014) had just popped up in Udani’s inbox. He made a mental note to use this data when he discussed this issue with his team. He was keen to explore the possibility of running the SEM program profitably without grant funding at a marginally higher administrative cost).

¹³ A tool that can be used to increase visitor satisfaction and conversion by continually testing different combinations of website content.

Donor Lifetime Value

Udani was very positive about the SEM program. He had always been bullish about the power of the Internet, and the SEM program, to get new donors to support various causes. He especially liked the fact that the donors were not just one-time donors but very often repeat donors. The program had a retention rate of 30 per cent, which meant that out of every 10 donors, three were likely to donate again. He also knew that the SEM data could provide him with the cost of acquisitions.

Udani recalled from his MBA days that traditional businesses, especially those that had a deep engagement with their customers, used similar parameters to calculate customer lifetime value (CLV) and used it as an important metric. He wondered if GiveIndia should start using donor lifetime value as a performance metric. He was curious to find out what the lifetime value of a donor acquired through the CLV program might be. Would a lifetime value analysis support a paid SEM program? He also remembered that this concept could be used to understand the impact of retention rates and the costs of acquisition and retention on lifetime value. He made a mental note to refer to his old notes from business school before he sat down with his team to work on the analysis.

As Udani headed towards the conference room, he thought about GiveIndia's digital media strategy. Currently, the organization used different tools, such as SEO, SEM, social media, video sharing, etc. However, there was little interaction between these different tools, and he felt there was a need to use them in an integrated fashion. When he entered the room, he was ready with his questions; he hoped his team would help him arrive at the answers.

**EXHIBIT 1: GIVEINDIA — STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR ENDED
MARCH 31, 2013 (₹ MILLION)**

| | For the year ended March 31, 2013 | For the year ended March 31, 2012 |
|---|--|--|
| Income | | |
| Donations received for covering administrative cost | 23.29 | 21.40 |
| Other income | 14.97 | 10.61 |
| Total income | 38.26 | 32.01 |
| | — | — |
| Expenditure | — | — |
| Employee benefits expense | 23.08 | 20.07 |
| Depreciation and amortization expense | 0.20 | 0.21 |
| Other expenses | 5.19 | 5.28 |
| Grants made | 11.09 | — |
| Total Expenditure | 39.56 | 25.56 |
| (Shortage)/Excess of Income over expenditure (3–5) | (1.31) | 6.45 |

Source: GiveIndia Foundation, "GiveIndia — Annual Report 2012–13," www.giveindia.org/t-annualreport1213.aspx, accessed on March 17, 2014.

EXHIBIT 2: PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR GIVEINDIA

| | 2012–13 | 2011–12 | 2010–11 |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Earned income (INR million) | 232.9 | 213.9 | 213.2 |
| Investment Income (INR million) | 14.97 | 10.61 | 6.83 |
| Expenditure (INR million) | 28.47 | 25.56 | 22.19 |
| Earned income as a % of expenditure | 82% | 84% | 96% |
| Expenditure as a % of funds channelled directly | 9.1% | 11.0% | 10.7% |
| Expenditure as a % of total funds channelled | 8.7% | 10.6% | 10.4% |
| Headcount | 54 | 52 | 48 |

Source: GiveIndia Foundation, "GiveIndia — Annual Report 2012–13," www.giveindia.org/t-annualreport1213.aspx, accessed on March 17, 2014.

EXHIBIT 3: COMPETITORS IN THE GIVING SPACE

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Child Rights and You (CRY) | CRY, founded in 1979, was dedicated to the betterment and progress of underprivileged children and to ensuring their fundamental rights, particularly their right to education and health. It raised funds from individual donors (online/offline) and corporations in India and abroad. Over the past 35 years, CRY had enrolled over 450,000 children in the age group of 6 to 18 years in schools and immunized over 100,000 children under the age of one. |
| Charity Aids Foundation (CAF) India | CAF India was set up in 1998 with the mission to promote effective giving. The organization worked towards improving the flow of resources to the non-profit sector by encouraging individuals to contribute funds and companies to make grants. |
| Dasra | Dasra supported over 500 non-profit organizations. Its mission was to create large-scale social change by forging partnerships with philanthropists and social entrepreneurs. In its 14 years of operational existence, Dasra supported social entrepreneurs by raising funds from both private and corporate foundations. |
| HelpAge India | <p>HelpAge India aimed to help the elderly lead an active, healthy and dignified life. Established in 1978, its main vision was to work for the better care of disadvantaged older people and thereby improve their lives. It raised funds from both individual donors (online as well as offline) and corporations. Its programs were also funded by the European Union, the Disasters Emergency Committee (United Kingdom) and the United States Agency for International Development, among others.</p> <p>Apart from the above, there were other major philanthropic organizations operating in India such as United Way India (representative of United Way Worldwide) and Oxfam India (member of the global confederation of 17 Oxfam organizations).</p> |

Source: Child Rights and You, "About CRY," www.cry.org/about-cry.html, accessed March 14, 2014; Charities Aid Foundation India, "About Us," <http://cafindia.org/index.php/about-us>, accessed on March 14 2014; Dasra, "What We Do," www.dasra.org/what-we-do, accessed March 14, 2014; HelpAge NGO in India-Non Profit Organization, www.helpageindia.org/aboutus.html, accessed March 14, 2014

EXHIBIT 4: KEY MILESTONES OF GIVEINDIA

| Year | Achievements |
|-------------|---|
| 2011–2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launched monthly donation option • Second successful First Givers Summit held with 70 members |
| 2010–2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GiveIndia chosen as official charity partner of Twestival 2011 |
| 2009–2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launched India's first online giving event — the Online Giving Challenge |
| 2006–2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key initiator of Guidestar India • Launched iGive pages • Launched catalogued products |
| 2003–2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduced the “Credibility Alliance” to set standards in the non-profit sector • Set up GIVE UK and GIVE USA • Launched corporate payroll giving program and donor advised funds for HNIs and corporations |
| 2001–2002 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set up systems to process donations, make timely disbursements and help NGOs track usage and provide feedback |
| 2000–2001 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Became first philanthropy marketplace or charity exchange • First Internet giving site in India and one of the first in the world |

Source: GiveIndia Foundation, “Our Achievements,” www.giveindia.org/t-abtus_achievements.aspx, accessed May 17, 2014.

EXHIBIT 5: ONLINE MARKETING 2011–12 AND 2012–13

| | FY 2013 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | FY 2012 |
|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Source | No. of visits | No. of visits | Conversion rate (%) | Conversion rate (%) |
| SEO | 159,540 | 169,834 | 1.67 | 1.32 |
| SEM | 535,762 | 760,927 | 0.13 | 0.07 |
| Campaigns | 75,758 | 54,327 | 4.43 | 3.00 |
| Referrals | 110,780 | 97,525 | 2.80 | 2.28 |
| Direct | 180,162 | 159,970 | 3.20 | 2.87 |
| Total | 1,062,002 | 1,242,583 | 1.44 | 0.91 |

Source: GiveIndia Foundation, “GiveIndia — Annual Report 2012–13,” www.giveindia.org/t-annualreport1213.aspx, accessed on March 17, 2014

EXHIBIT 6: PARTIAL SEARCH ENGINE MARKETING DATA — JANUARY TO MARCH 2014

| Keyword | Keyword Group | Search Engine Bid | Average Position | Impressions | Clicks | Cost | Number of Transactions | Donated Amount |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------|--------|--------|------------------------|----------------|
| Youth welfare association | Non-profit organization for youth | 1 | 1.2 | 1,022 | 52 | 18.8 | – | – |
| GiveIndia | GiveIndia | 2 | 1.9 | 9,558 | 396 | 201.78 | 58 | 4,330.88 |
| Youth organizations | Non-profit organization for youth | 1 | 2.1 | 2,748 | 90 | 51.1 | – | – |
| Youth NGOs in India | NGO for youth | 1 | 2.3 | 198 | 6 | 4.0 | – | – |
| CRY India | General GI | 2 | 2.1 | 33,741 | 725 | 769.31 | 16 | 342.50 |
| Support Pune | Pune donate | 1 | 3.6 | 11,440 | 90 | 68.49 | 2 | 62.31 |
| GiveIndia | General GI | 2 | 1.3 | 161 | 28 | 11.43 | 7 | 294.00 |
| Youth fundraising ideas | iGive | 1 | 1.6 | 19 | 1 | 0.6 | – | – |
| Help needy | Help children | 1 | 4.3 | 533 | 9 | 7.09 | 2 | 10.83 |

Source: Company documents.