Nathan (00:00):

For giving us some time today, uh, to talk about new research from our, uh, fundraising lab here at next, after that can hopefully help you grow results in this new year. We're gonna give just a minute or two for some other folks to join. Cause we're still just right at the top of the hour. We'll give a few minutes for people who are just finishing lunch or something like that, and try to get in, uh, but what I'd like to do to start while we wait, is for you to jump in the chat, uh, and let me and everyone else know, uh, who you are, what organization you are from as well as where in the world you are tuning in from today. So jump in the chat, kick that off. It looks like Rina's getting us started all try to do the same thing, but it's always exciting to see just how far reach this cause of growing giving and growing generosity, uh, is reaching worldwide.

Nathan (00:46):

So I give some shoutouts here, uh, right at the top. I see Allison Hardman. Hello from Toronto. We've got Lisa at acts for water, uh, in Abbotsford, BC in Canada. We've got mountain state legal foundation in Colorado, Z arena here in Plano, Texas. That's where I'm coming to you from today as well. Uh, we got some friends from central Illinois, Jennifer Armstrong at w CBU Peoria, Illinois shouted to my hometown. That's wonderful. Love that. Uh, we've got Danielle from rebel thriver in south Florida. Uh, so we've got folks all across north America, Erica, for sure. I'm always trying to scan these. Oh, we've got Katrina from New Zealand. There we go. We've got a, a truly global audience here. This is wonderful. That's exciting. Well, thank you so much for being here. Uh, and again for giving us some of your time today, hopefully we don't waste a moment of it and we're gonna jump right in, uh, before we get into the content.

Nathan (01:40):

There's one thing I wanna make sure that you know about. Cause we, we actually just turned on, uh, a, the new version of the website for the nonprofit innovation and optimization summit. Uh, we turned on this new theme just Tuesday this week. Uh, if you have never heard about the NIO summit, it is one of, if not the best nonprofit event you can possibly ever attend this year. It's in Kansas city, Missouri. It's our seventh annual somehow it's been seven years of putting this conference on, but it's an incredible event with incredible human beings and people that attend, uh, it's coming up in September. So you got a few, a few months to get your ticket, but actually you should move pretty quick. If you wanna get the best discount that you possibly can, you can save 600 bucks with your code super early bird, uh, right now, uh, what you can expect at the is a like-minded group of fundraisers and nonprofit, marketers, and communicators, all working to, uh, find innovative, truly innovative solutions to improving results, reaching more people and growing your impact.

Nathan (02:37):

It's two full days of speaker sessions. We often bring in speakers from the, for profit space who have really innovative market ideas that we think can make a tremendous impact for us as fundraisers and as nonprofits. Uh, so we bring in some great speakers for a couple of days. There's two pre-conference workshops. You can actually dive deep, uh, earn a certification, get some hands on learning. Uh, and then it's just, just a blast. It's a ton of fun, uh, some great parties, some great networking where you're gonna meet people that are trying to figure out solutions to similar problems that you have. Uh, so it's an incredible event. I'd encourage you to attend at least check it out. Uh, John delaying this year posted on LinkedIn just a week ago, so that after attending NIO Summit, my organization raised 35% more from our website at the end of the year.

Nathan (03:20):

So that's what you can expect is real practical, innovative results that can drive, uh, results for your organization. So check that out at niosummit.com. You can find out more, uh, and get your ticket. So here's what you can expect in the webinar today. The most popular question we ever get is is there a recording? And the answer is always yes. So we are recording this webinar. Uh, we will send you an email later this evening with a link to that recording as well as a link to the slide. So you'll have those to review, uh, and a link to any of the other featured resources that we mentioned throughout, uh, the hour today. We're gonna do our best, our absolute best to make there's time for questions, if you have them along the way. So if you have a question that you would like answered, go to your zoom, toolbar and click the little Q and a button, you can put your questions in there.

Nathan (04:10):

That's the best way for us to kind of keep track of those and make sure that they get answered. If you've got other thoughts or commentary, or we ask you a vote or something like that, you can put that all in the chat. But if you question, you wanna make sure it gets answered, put it in the Q and a, that would be best. Uh, and then today we have two, uh, two guests coming on, Kevin Peters, who's our CTO and Jeff Giddens, who's our president here at NextAfter talking about some of the most interesting experiments that they've run and seen in this past year. So you'll see them on here, uh, in a little bit, but where I want to a start is to talk about the research that we conduct here at next, after with the ultimate goal of trying to grow giving there's really two different types of research, uh, that we conduct.

Nathan (04:52):

And the first one is what we call forensic research, which is really another name for that would be like mystery donor studies. So we're going out into the nonprofit space and we're trying to, you give donations to different organizations and analyze what the experience looks like. We're getting a lay of the land for what organizations are doing to try to acquire new donors or cultivate existing subscribers. Uh, in some cases we've studied like mid-level giving, how are they treat mid-level donors treated any differently than anyone else or are they multi-channel fundraising? How are non profits trying to acquire recurring donors and retain them over time, but going out and just surveying the landscape, doesn't actually tell us or you or anyone, what actually works to grow giving. We have to pair that up with testing AB testing, experimentation and optimization in order to actually prove what works and decode, what it's gonna work in fundraising to grow giving.

Nathan (05:45):

So that's how these two work together. We can get new ideas by sort of taking the pulse and, and the landscape. And then we can go test new ideas to see what actually works. And during this past year, we conducted a whole bunch of research. Uh, we released, uh, three or four different mystery donor studies, and I'm gonna show you just a handful of the insights from some of these studies. It's not everything there's so much more packed into these studies. I'd love for you to check out. I'll give you a link to each one, if you want to dive deeper, but I'm just gonna hit some of the highlights for you, uh, of is to read donor studies. The first one I wanna look at is the global online fundraising scorecard. So we released this at the beginning of last year, uh, with, uh, in partnership with Salesforce, uh, dot org.

Nathan (06:28):

It's incredible of research study, where we went out and we studied 630 organizations across nine different countries to try and really see, you know, what is the global state of fundraising? What are

similarities and differences from region to region? Uh, how does even, even, uh, some aspects of maybe culture and technology across the globe influence what we as fundraisers are doing. And then are there insights that we can glean from other parts of the world and go test over here and see what actually works. So we not only made donation, but we also analyzed, uh, nearly 6,000 emails that we received back from these organizations over the course of 90 days. So pretty incredible study, certainly a huge undertaking for us, but we learned a lot. And one interesting insight, one of many, many insights is that nonprofits need to be a lot better at providing re reasons for people to actually sign up for their email list.

Nathan (07:22):

In fact, we found that 45% of, of email opt-in offers. So that's a newsletter or otherwise gave minimal clarity about what you were actually gonna get when you signed up for an email list. So little to no information about what am I gonna get a in exchange for giving you my email address. And here's an example experiment where we've seen the impact of providing a little bit more reason for someone to actually sign up for something like a newsletter, uh, in this experiment, this is version a, you can see there's very minimal copy, minimal text. It says get uplifting stories, uh, of how Buckner is shining hope in the us and around the world. The call to action says, sign up now, pretty clear straight to the point, straightforward, but limited copy, limited value proposition. And here's what they tested. They wondered can we actually expand on the value proposition or the reasons why someone should actually sign up?

Nathan (08:15):

And so now they've got a new headline. So right in the headline, it basically says all of the copy from, and a get uplifting stories of how you can shine hope, and then they go into some of the details. We're excited to share with you all the ways you can shine, hope to vulnerable children and families, uh, stay connected while also growing in your own faith, click below to get news updates, invitations to events from Buckner. Now it's abundantly clear what I'm actually gonna get there's appeal. There's reasons why it matters to me. And so I might be that much more likely to sign up and what they saw running this experiment was that version B, adding more reasons to sign up actually led to a 276% increase in people signing up for their email list. You may say like, that's cool and all, but how does that actually help my fundraising?

Nathan (09:00):

How does that help my donations? What we've seen time and time again, uh, in most every organization that we have worked with and that we, we dive into the data with, uh, is a similar trend. This health organization, you can see, uh, their online revenue broken down by channel. And what you see is that email actually brings in 199% more revenue than the next closest channel. In this case, it's direct traffic. That's people just typing in your URL and going straight to your page for this organization. A higher ed Institute email, same story brings in 600% more revenue than the next closest channel, which is organic traffic. And then the same story is true here for a public policy organization. So different verticals still in the nonprofit space, same story email brings in 117% more revenue than the next closest channel, which in this case is organic traffic.

Nathan (09:53):

And so we often say here next, after that, the size and the quality, those two things are both important, the size and the quality of your email file is the number one indicator of your ability to raise more

money online. So that's why actually getting more people to sign up in the first place is critical and really important. Cause if you can grow both the size and the quality of your email list, your gonna have that much more of an ability to grow giving overall as you're cultivating subscribers, a larger volume of people to actually send appeals to and start to move into a donor relationship. I see a question from Mary, uh, about what is organic traffic, organic traffic is basically someone that's, uh, going to Google or whatever's, you know, search to they're using most likely Googled searching for a keyword or a term and coming across your website and coming to your website as a result.

Nathan (10:43):

So they're not typing in your URL. They're finding you through an organic search. That's a great question. If you wanna dive deeper and see what else we learned in this study, because again, there is so much more, you can find, uh, everything, uh, that we learned across the globe, as well as bro, down by region, do some comparing and contrasting, find some new ideas. You can get your full copy of the scorecard@globalonlinefundraising.com, or you can pull out your phone, scan the QR code, uh, and grab it there. And we can send this link out later as well. So that's just one research study. I've got a couple other insights I'd like to share with you from a couple other studies as well before we dive into some more experimentation, uh, with Jeff and then with Kevin. So another study we released was about donation page friction.

Nathan (11:26):

We partnered with our friends that fundraise up to run this study, uh, where we, we went through a whole bunch of nonprofit organizations, donation pages, a 643 specifically, and analyzed the giving experience for all these key points of friction. And friction is something that could actually slow someone down and keep them from ultimately completing their donation. And what we found at least one of the findings of many is that there are too many distractions in the online giving process across the board. In fact, six outta 10 organizations had some sort of navigation or menu bar at the top of their donation page. After you've already landed on the donation page. And even some of them have a donate button in the top, even though I've already clicked and said, I'm interested in giving and now the there's still a menu at the top. That's distracting them and leading them to some other call to action.

Nathan (12:16):

That's an element of friction in the process. It, 60% of organizations still have something like this on their page. Here's an example, this organization at the very top, you can see the navigation, they've got four or five other things going on up here, even though you've already landed on the Don page, they're basically asking you to go do something else. And so in version B, they just remove the main navigation and it's not perfect. You can see at the top, there's still like some social media icons and things like that, but they removed the primary distractions and it led to 195% increase in donor conversion. So even just some simple tweaks to, to reduce friction and improve the experience for the donor can make a meaningful and, and dramatic impact on your results. So again, you can dive deeper into that study if you'd like to use the URL on your screen, scan the QR code.

Nathan (13:06):

And again, we'll send these links out as well. And then the last one I wanna show you before I hand it over to Jeff to dive into some really interesting experie, uh, as a study we've conducted on multi-channel fundraising, the friends at virtuous, but specifically looking at multi-channel fundraising during the year end window. And one takeaway that we we found in this study is that there's a significant lack of donor

cultivation going on during the year end season, specifically this not just for online donors, it's not just for offline donors, it's across the board. It's pervasive for both online and offline. Uh, what we found was that during the year end window, which is basically November 15th through the end of the year 45 day period, two out of five organizations sent no cultivation at all to their active online donors. So they didn't send online donors, anything via email to cultivate the relationship.

Nathan (14:01):

All they sent was solicitations, if anything, and then it's actually worse for the postal donor. If you're an active, like offline, you donor, you mail in your gifts. Four out of five organizations sent zero cultivation to their active postal donors. If they sent anything at all. So that's not good. There's a lot of organizations opting out of cultivating the relationship with their donor, which represents a whole lot of opportunity. In fact, in one experiment where we directly have tested cultivation and its impact on revenue, this organization split their file in half because they were having some engagement problems on their email file. They wanted to see can cultivation help increase engagement. And so version a, these people continue to get the same sort of cadence and pace of emails and version B. They made one tweak, which was, we're gonna start sending a cultivation email every single week.

Nathan (14:53):

And it looked like this it's plain text. It's not a heavily designed email. It's sent from a human being. It's got a singular call to action. And the call to action is not to give it's to go engage with some piece of free content, to cultivate the relationship and help that donor feel closer to the cause. The, and what this led to, uh, over a six month period was a 42% increase in online revenue from those donors that were being cultivated. So cultivation is critical despite how many organizations seem to opt out of it. So I'd encourage you going into this year as we're almost a month in, at this point to really lean into cultivation throughout the year. And even in something the high urgency campaign season like year end, you can dive deeper on that as well. Uh, get the full study@multichannelnonprofit.com or again, grab the QR code.

Nathan (15:40):

You can go there and grab your copy of the study. That's all I've got for you on mystery donor studies. You can, uh, head to next after.com/research and find all the studies we've ever conducted as well as our full library of ex experiments. If you wanna dive deeper, um, on anything else, but from here, I wanna invite Jeff gins to, uh, jump in and he's got some experiments prepared for you that he's gonna walk through. I'm show you some really interesting learnings we've had through testing. I'll make sure your mic's on here too. Welcome Jeff. We're on.

Jeff (16:09):

Thanks, Nathan.

Nathan (16:10):

Yeah, absolutely. Umm, call this a lightning round cause I know you got a few, a few experiments

Jeff (16:14):

Here. Yeah, I go quickly too. So I'd like to set land speed records

Nathan (16:18):

With PowerPoint. Well, we are timing you, so I'll hand this off to you and, and take it away. Great. Um,

Jeff (16:23):

So I wanna walk you through some experiments, uh, specifically that you can run, uh, or that we've run around email so that you can run, uh, some experiments around email. Um, one of the natural laws of not really fundraising, but marketing in general is that every time you send an email, uh, people are gonna opt out. Uh, it just is gonna happen. And, um, you know, when you, uh, you, you might have heard someone say before, like we have to watch unsubscribe rate and yes, that is absolutely true because you don't want to lose the ability to contact someone, especially a donor. Um, the question is though, uh, you know, if you were optimizing for never having unsubscribed, then you would never actually send an email. So how do we reduce unsubscribe rate? We were running, uh, working with an organization called caring bridge in December running a year in, uh, campaign.

Jeff (17:10):

And, um, so, uh, I, you, what we did, uh, testing something. Uh, so everyone knows at the very bottom of an email, there's an option. Sometimes it says manage email preferences, or it says, you know, one click unsubscribe and the concept was this. Um, we had our standard email that had the, um, unsubscribe link, uh, at the bottom. Then we also had this other email, we added a line, I call this an unsubscribed interrupter, right? And if you, if you see here at the very bottom of this email, it says, if you're not able to give this holiday season, would you click here? So I know not to send you any more emails this month. And what CaringBridge did was they made a list of people who clicked this specific link in this email and then opt them out for the rest of the holiday appeal.

Jeff (17:54):

And, um, what we saw when we tested this was a 14% reduction in the number of unsubscribed. Now the big question, and this requires further testing. So I wanna be completely upfront that, like, we're not totally baked on this, um, that this is the right thing to do. Cuz a question is, well, um, if you ran, you know, a whole campaign with these would people who might have given opt out of the campaign, like if people received the next appeal, maybe they weren't convinced by that appeal, but they would've eventually given, right? So would you lose net donations, allowing people to do this? And is that a, a worthy trade off, uh, with UN unsubscribe? Cause if you're gonna run a urine campaign, you're going to get people who unsubscribe, anytime you send a high volume of emails, people will unsubscribe, but this is just one tactic, um, that we're testing because what happens is you actually get to keep these people on the email file.

Jeff (18:41):

So in January you can start sending them, but you've basically given them an optout for that specific campaign. If they're not able to, again, um, you know, some people may say on, they think they're not able to, or more people may click that, but you get to keep them on your email files. So there's a trade off between short term revenue and long term ability to communicate. Um, and that's something that's pretty easy to do in most email systems. And so maybe something that you can take for your next campaign to reduce unsubscribe rate, uh, one more, uh, talking about this principle of inclusion and I, uh, mean inclusion kind of in the way that we talk about it a lot, um, in like, you know, diversity equity inclusion, I really mean inclusion as being a part of something. Um, and so lemme tell you about this experiment.

Jeff (19:21):

This is another, uh, I'm, I'm showing couple of experiments from caring bridge today. Um, so this is a typical appeal. You know, it's a match, um, asking you to magnify your impact with a today, we help activate this matching grant today. The thing that was tested was, um, you know, what we don't experience a lot of time from the donor's point of view is, uh, what is the donor's perspective on this? When we talk about a $15,000 match, most donors are gonna say, Hey, I can't meet that all by myself. Right. Um, and what they don't know unless you have a thermometer or unless you do an update is, um, are other people giving, you know, is this, uh, is this something you're kind of inviting me to be a part of? And so we tried a little, um, extra language here, uh, that, um, we inserted here in the second paragraph.

Jeff (20:08):

So it says, uh, here's the best part. You don't have to do it all all by yourself. I'm hoping I can put you on a list of donors who have said yes, if you're willing to join that list, will you magnify your impact? Right. So that's one of the changes. The other change is in the very last link, will you join the list of donors who are helping to activate this matching grant? Right? And so what we're trying to do is use this principle of inclusion, which we, um, got from Jen Chang and, um, her team of philanthropic psychologists at the, uh, Institute of sustainable philanthropy. Um, just talk about like, you're basically creating a group, right? A group of people who are helping activate this, cuz you know, when you send out an appeal that you're going to receive some gifts, you may have people who have already given through like direct mail or something towards that match.

Jeff (20:49):

And what you're doing is instead of AC asking someone to give towards something that is ambiguous, you're inviting them to be a part of a team of people, uh, that are helping accomplish something. Right. And, um, their research showed that, uh, that sort of inclusion principle, uh, was actually favorable to donors. We tested it, we saw a 16% increase in donations. Um, this has an asterisk because it's only based on a 61% statistical level of confidence. And so that means that 61% of the time, you know, and this, this varies, we can guarantee that this has a positive directional lift. Um, but if you're, if you're writing an appeal and you're struggling to understand how can I, this, uh, appeal stand out, um, you know, you may wanna try this kind of principle of inclusion. Will you be willing to join a group of donors?

Jeff (21:36):

Um, because what we know about human beings is we don't want to be alone. We are made to be in community. We don't wanna, um, no one wants to be the only donor that gives to a campaign. Right. And so what you're doing is you're inviting them to be a part of something. And, uh, Tanya, I see you in the chat, great point, maybe something warmer than the list, right? Maybe like, uh, you know, inner circle of donors, maybe something that's like, uh, there's there's principles you can use there. Like, um, you know, even though this is an inclusion principle, like exclusivity, like a small group of donors or, uh, some things that kind of set that group of donors apart. Um, but uh, we saw some positive results and really wanna retest this, um, in, in areas, this was kind of a, uh, mid-December appeal.

Jeff (22:14):

It, wasn't kind of one of the bigger ones like the campaign launch or the end. And so we wanna retest this and see if we can get some more validity on that. And if you would like to test any of these and submit them, we would love to hear from you, if you can test this, um, and set this up, feel free to take

these ideas. They're here for you, you and, uh, you know, maybe one day, uh, you can present, uh, on one of these webinars too. Um, so this third test, um, uh, is about story of impact. You know, it's commonly said in the industry, the storytelling is great. People love narrative. Um, our friend, Kevin Schulman at donor voice talks about, uh, you know, narrative involving, uh, as being two factors, uh, to engage people with fundraising campaigns. And, uh, we really wanted to test this.

Jeff (22:56):

Uh, so the interesting thing about caring bridge is caring bridge is a site where you set up a journal for someone who is on a health journey and people's relationship to caring bridge is largely, uh, one to one it's with the person who they are following on their site, right? So it has been a struggle for caring bridge to integrate stories of people being helped by caring bridge, because, um, to the, for the most part, their donors will say, well, that's great. Uh, but I'm here for someone else. And so you're trying to get me to care about your nonprofit through someone else's story when it's really a personal story. Um, so they had a really good story about someone who had been helped by bridge. And we said, well, let's test it and actually see it. This story helps. Um, so they had kind of a, a traditional appeal.

Jeff (23:36):

Um, they had four matches throughout their campaign that they rolled out. And so, um, you can see here in the control, uh, they had their standard appeal. Um, and we added this story in kind of an interesting way. These, um, these emails were from Kelly, a member of their development team and everything about this is the same, except for that middle section that starts with, let me tell you what your gift will do. One journal. I read this year, Courtney lambs really stuck for me. I love to share her story. Then she shares this story and then personalizes the ask. What we saw, uh, was a 42% increase in donations when we included that story. And that was interesting because, uh, first off, historically their stories had just been, um, about telling the story. And so it started off with, let me tell you a story, right?

Jeff (24:20):

So this was a different approach to a story. Um, and we wanted to test back into, cause we weren't sure if it was gonna work, we know these kind of direct appeals in the control work, but the question is how do you present a story? Right? And so for caring rich, it was not just, what is the impact of including a story? It was, how do we include that story? And so it's basically an intro and then Kelly kind of relates in a personal way, how this story impacted her. So, um, you know, we like to test assumptions all the time. Um, and you know, it's always like, oh, storytelling is better. People resonate with stories. And we know that's like largely true, probably cuz we've all been somewhat affected by it at some point. Um, but uh, we wanted to test it to put it to the test.

Jeff (24:57):

And so, uh, we saw an increase here if you wanna test that, if you have a story, um, would love, you know, as, as much additional research on this as we could get, find, oh one, uh, talk about autonomy. It's uh, um, uh, very interesting. Uh, probably one of the things I'm most fascinated with because we ask a lot of donors, we use the word ask or appeal, right. Um, and I think that sometimes, uh, we, uh, can be too, um, maybe, uh, organizational centric in that, or we, we maintain the authority and we don't actually put the authority in the donor's hands to like give us that money. Um, so lemme show you what this looks like in practice. So this is, um, giving Tuesday and, uh, they have this appeal, you know, uh, their board of directors is making a, um, uh, a matching gift, right?

Jeff (25:41):

And so, uh, if you'll make a gift today, our board of directors has offered to match your gift dollar for dollars with a sentence says, and the challenge in this is it, uh, kind of sets, uh, all the powers with the board of directors, right? So if you give the board of directors are going to match it and it kind of sets the board of directors in some way up to be like the heroes of the story when really the, the, the match is being activated by the donor. Um, and so, uh, there's a couple key tweaks that we made to this email to test. And, uh, they're so slight that this experiment didn't actually validate like the second one that we saw, but, uh, there worldly of future testing, cuz it's, it's kind of interesting. So, uh, you see here, um, instead of if you'll make a gift today, we say, if you consider giving today, right.

Jeff (26:24):

And so instead of asking them to make a gift, we're asking 'em to consider making a gift, which, um, this concept of autonomy, what we're doing is we're giving the donor power right. In this sort of transactional conversation that we're having, we're saying, Hey, would you consider making a gift, not give today or donate now, or if you'll make a gift, um, presuming that they're ready, we're asking 'em to think about it. So it's kind of taking a step back. And then, uh, if you look at the second link, um, in the third link, uh, there's a, there's a key little shift here. Um, please give now, so that's a command and our board will match your gift, right? Um, and then the final one says, click the link to donate today and give those are both commands towards the a hundred thousand dollars match.

Jeff (27:02):

And the, the tiny little, uh, change that's made here, it says, please give now to allow our board to match your first gift. Right? And so what it's doing is it's allowing the donor power, uh, to, uh, they basically get to release their funds and they are in control of the board, matching the gift, right, click the link to donate today and allow our board word of directors to match your first gift. When we tested this, we saw a 10% lift in donations, again, around 60% statist level of confidence. Um, I, my hypothesis on this is that it wasn't radical enough, um, to make a difference between the two. We actually need to lean more into this concept to understand it. But, um, I don't know if there's anyone on here who would turn down a 10% lift in donations. I, and so, um, you know, I wanted to make sure everyone saw that cuz this, this concept of autonomy of giving the donor power in the transaction is I think something that we, we mean to do all the time, but it's just hard as the marketer, as the organization to not just make commands like donate today, give now what we're doing is we're asking you to consider donating, um, and uh, we're, you know, your donation will allow our board to match it.

Jeff (28:06):

So it actually sets the donor up as the hero. Um, any questions, um, about those experiments?

Nathan (28:14):

Yeah. Thank you so much, Jeff. Let's pull up the, uh, the Q and a and see what we got going on. Well, looks like lots of commentary in the chat. That's wonderful. Uh, but let's see, we've got a few questions in here. Uh, let's jump to, let's see which ones like there's one from Peter. How do you protect from donor fatigue? I assume looking at the series of emails coming all from caring bridge. Yeah. How do you protect against that? Especially

Jeff (28:40):

During more emails than some folks are used to sending, right. Absolutely. I think, um, you know, there is a, there are several ways to, to measure this, but I think the first thing we have to consider in terms of fatigue is that our email calendar looks a lot different than the emails people actually receive. And we see this a lot with organizations who say like, I'm sending two emails this month I'm I don't wanna send anymore. And the truth is there are a variety of numbers out there if you look, but people, most people receive north of 75 email day. Right. And we don't know if the people are the type that keep like a hundred thousand in their inbox, unread. And so you just have to get there, but the truth is like a good subject or a good open rate. An open rate is not the most reliable metric, less and less, but a good open rate is somewhere between 20 and 30%.

Jeff (29:19):

And so half the people aren't even seeing your emails. Right. Um, and it may be cuz you send it at the wrong time of day. There may be no right time of day is just, you just missed them. Right. So I think one of the first things to measure is like how many emails are people opening, right. Sure. Are they even engaging with these emails? Yep. Um, that's, that's one of the biggest things to measure even before you can say like, are the donors fatigued? Right. Cause I think there was a perception issue there sometimes of like all these emails, the donors are gonna hate us now. And it's like, well, no, they may actually really want to give and you know, because they receive so many emails from, I don't know, old Navy or Kroger or whoever, right. Uh, that you just have to cut through the, uh, cut through the clutter. Absolutely.

Nathan (29:59):

Yeah. And you're you're is writing every single email is not even close to your donor's experience of receiving and seeing 20% of them. That's a

Jeff (30:07):

Great, that's a great, Rob's got a great question. When you make more than one tweak to the control letter in the treatment, how can you determine which tweak resulted in the increase? This is challenging for a lot of folks, especially if you have a smaller file. Um, cuz if you have fewer samples that can be really hard to validate tests. Um, and so there it is a, uh, there's a, uh, statistical calculation you can do, uh, for this, but what we have to do sometimes, especially on appeals, um, carrying Ridge specifically, they know kind of the range, um, based on how many emails they're sending of how many donations they're gonna get. Um, and you know, what we wanna do is I sometimes you have to do a radical redesign where you change lots of things and you're just trying to shake things up and disrupt and, and break the mold.

Jeff (30:47):

Right. Um, but sometimes, uh, if you are gonna make more than one tweak, like if you're gonna change the copy in two links, what you wanna do is make sure the principle is the same, right. That it's consistent throughout the email. Absolutely. Um, so that you're walking away or the goal is not to develop or to, to generate a lift it's to generate a learning. So you're trying to find something you can engineer into future, um, experiments. So I think it's, you know, I'll say that, I'll just say that it's okay to change more than one thing, but you have to be consistent in how you do it. Sure. That makes total sense. And it's truly, when you do a radical redesign, you have to have a lot of traffic to validate each individual element. And sometimes you have to be willing to give up the knowledge of that. Now maybe you can go back and say, okay, what if I do just a then a plus B and then a plus B plus C, you know? Um,

but you have to have a lot of traffic to validate that and it might lead you to not even getting a, a learning.

Nathan (31:36):

Right. Absolutely. Well, let's do one more question. Uh, question from Karen, you said, I noticed that you sent those asks from the fundraising came and pain manager. What's the difference from sending from someone like that versus someone on your senior leadership team, board member or something like that?

Jeff (31:50):

Yeah. I don't think there's a right or right answer. I think the difference, the intended difference is that it actually, uh, you know, we had to sign out in our offices, people give to people. Right. And, um, remember when we first started testing about it 10 years ago, Cindy, from people besides like the figurehead of the organization, um, the goal was just, uh, you know, perception of that person might actually send 'em an email. Right? Yeah. And um, sometimes that authority figure, figure really works. Uh, what we found is like, there's, there's not one right way to skin. It we've tested, 'em head to head. And sometimes the CEO wins. Sometimes the fundraiser wins sure. Person of the team, but the goal is like getting a variety of contacts within the organization. So you actually feel like you have, you know, a connection with the organization outside of like connecting with some brand name. Absolutely.

Nathan (32:33):

That's kinda the goal of that. Yeah. So that's great. Well, thank you so much, Jeff. I appreciate it. Thanks for having me. Yeah. Well, we're gonna bring in, uh, Kevin Peters for our next round here. Kevin is our CTO. Don't call him the director of it. Um, but we're grateful for Kevin that you're here and, uh, excited to see what you've got for us. So

Kevin (32:50):

While Jeff chose to go for volume, I'm chosen to go for depth of experiment. Nice. We like that also because I understood the assignment to pick an experiment. Let's

Nathan (32:58):

Go, Jeff. Doesn't generally Jeff follow. So we'll take it away. Kevin, thank you. So

Kevin (33:06):

I'm gonna be showing you guys today an experiment and I want, we'll go back to give you how we got to it. Um, it's been now renamed as the worst experiment name we've ever come up with the downgrade experiment, but I promise that's gonna make sense here in just a second. So the concept for this actually came back all the way in March and it was tested by my colleague, Greg COGA. He was working with an organization that was doing a fundraising campaign. And as he was writing the copy, one of the things jumped out that you're gonna see it on here. It starts off the. This is in the middle of the email and it says, will you consider, give a special gift now to defend your principles.dot dot, which is a pretty common language that we use in our appeals? Well, the trouble that he felt was that it's too nebulous, a special gift.

Kevin (33:52):

Doesn't tell me how much it doesn't tell me what it's gonna do it. Doesn't tell me why you need it. And so he tested something that, that reads here at the top to ensure plan successful. I'm looking for 50 donors to make a gift of $10. Now you're gonna see those two different concepts and how they end up playing out because it's slight, but pretty radically different and pretty, really radically different in terms of results. Utilizing that very specific as increased it by 348% in terms of revenue. Now you're gonna see that here and say, how did you increase 348%? If you're asking for $10? Well, what this goes back to is what's actually called the chart of standards. We didn't ask everybody for $10. What we did is we asked each individual person based upon their previous highest contribution for certain amounts of money.

Kevin (34:40):

And now I know on here, I'm sure we have some major gift people. And they're looking at this and saying, that's not new information chart of standards has been used for years as part of the standard process for capital campaign fundraising, where you say, if I need to raise a million dollars, I need one guy that's gonna give me half a million. I need three people to give me a hundred thousand. And then you, you break it down, you make your goal achievable. And then another key aspect of the chart of standards is especially the people at the top. You tell 'em, I need one person to give me a million dollars and that's you. And I need you to do this for me now because it a gives them a big vision for where we're going, but then tells them their place in it.

Kevin (35:21):

And so with this chart of standards, we were able to break it down. And so that if somebody's previous largest gift was between $1 and $19, they were asked for $15. And then for 50 people, if their highest previous contribution was between 60 to a hundred, they were asked for 75, like right in the middle. And then they were saying there's 25 people. The end results of that previous experiment you saw from Greg, was that the biggest motivator? Yes, there was lifts at these lower levels, the sub 100, but when they asked for, we need five people to give a thousand dollars, they had two people call and say, can I just give 5,000 and have it meet the goal for you? And so we were willing to accept their donation that way we were very generous that way to allow them to do that.

Kevin (36:04):

So huge results on that one. Now that was back in March. And then around that same time we were approached. We get approached pretty, uh, often by different, um, software companies on what we test their, uh, software, where we use it with our, the organizations that we work with to say and help validate the different things. We're approached by an org, uh, a tool called giving DNA. And this is similar to many out there that helps with segmentation, helps with, uh, analysis, understanding like where your donors are, that kind of thing. But one of the things that caught our eyes that they said they had some proprietary models in here that could identify opportunities for upgrade for people who are likely to become sustainers or recurring gifts or people who are likely at risk of lapse. And so with this in mind, we said, okay, we, we can test this.

Kevin (36:51):

We have a campaign coming up with one of the organizations we work with and we were gonna be using this chart of standards that we had been identifying and testing iteratively up until this point. This was back in, I believe, September or October. And so we said, okay, if we know people who are likely to upgrade, what if we just were bold enough to then ask for that upgrade? So what we did is we took our donors. We added them into this tool. These is apparently what donors look like is little stick figures.

And so we then divided it up. We divided it because the tool told us here's people who are likely to upgrade and here's people who are not likely to upgrade. Now, I didn't, I'm not sure I quite understood what that meant, but what they found on this one, especially in the likely to upgrade is they looked at different factors.

Kevin (37:37):

I brought on outside third party data and they said, okay, these people are the ones you wanna talk to. So we said, great, let's divide this out. And we're gonna split test our file with these two segments. So we created two control segments, so they would be equally diverse. So I knew I'd have control of people likely to upgrade. They were gonna get this regular chart of standards. And I had my control group of people who were not likely to upgrade that we're just gonna get the regular without the, that upgraded ask in it. Then we had, we produced what we called the upgrade treatment on the right side. So people likely to upgrade. We asked them for more and you'll see what that looked like. And we told 'em why we were asking for more too, which is a key concept, but then we had the idea of, well, what about these people who are not likely to upgrade?

Kevin (38:18):

Can we increase conversion by asking them for less and then getting more of them to give? So the way this ended up working out, in terms of that chart of standards, we had our control, the downgrade chart, if my largest gift range between one and 50 and dollars, I would be asked for five. If my largest gift was between 30 and 39, I would be asked for 25, just slightly less. Now, when you get into the midlevel donor range and define it, how you like, but between a hundred to one 50, they would be asked for 75. So we stair step them down. Then you had the upgrade, which had the exact opposite, uh, logic. If I was their previous highest gift was 20 to 20 to 30. We asked them for 35 and I see one of the questions I knew I would get this, which is what was the criteria that we base these segments on in terms of like, how did we know what the splits should be?

Kevin (39:14):

I don't have have a great logical answer. The, the simple result is we literally said, if I was in this case, what would I be willing to upgrade to? Which is not, that's where you start from the next step in this testing process is gonna be iterating on this chart of standards to say, what should the breakdown be? It's also worth noting. It varies by client. This organization had a large, broad base of, they had mid-level donors. They didn't have a ton of major donors. And we weren't gonna be able to email anyone above a thousand, which is why you see that cutoff. There was at a thousand. So we had to adjust our chart accordingly because of the audience we're able to talk to and the number of people in those various, uh, options. So we then had our chart of standards. So you can see what the language we ended up using was the, the one on the left was the control.

Kevin (40:00):

It said, specifically, I'm looking for, this is in the middle of the email, 50 people. Now who've supported KC B I the organization in the past to step forward and make a gift of $50. And that varied based on the number of people and the previous highest gift. And we said, this is what your gift is gonna do. This was the down language. So specifically I'm looking for 10 people right now who have supported KC Graham in the past to step forward and make a gift of 125. Now I know that you've given us 200 in the past with all the uncertainty in the world. We're not asking for that same level of support your gift. When combined with the other supporters will provide the necessary resources we need to da da, da, you,

you can kind of see the language we justified asking them for less, the end result on this one, or actually let me jump to the upgrade.

Kevin (40:45):

The upgrade said, I'm looking for, and again, the number of people that the amount varied based on their previous highest gifts, but I'm looking for five people who supported KCI in the past step forward, make a gift for 300. I know that this is more than you've given in the past, but your generous we provide the resources do do do so with these in mind, we then did the test and we validated these two distinct segments separately. We had the standard language versus the upgrade language. The end result on this one, 8% decrease in revenue. Now the key on this one was that it was at 60% statistical level of confidence as Jeff mentioned. And that basically meant we didn't validate anything. We certainly didn't increase revenue. And even that decrease if I re and the same test tomorrow, I'd probably see a different result.

Kevin (41:29):

However, on the standard language for the downgrade, that language versus the other, we saw a 31% increase in revenue. Now here's the thing. Again, we didn't reach the 95% level of confidence. We look for. We reached 88 with 88. I would consider that approaching validity, but we ran out of time or ran out of the emails we could send. So with that in mind, the good news came about that. This was at the end of October, we had another opportunity, very close down the line of giving Tuesday. One of the things I love about working at next after is the organizations we work with are always up for testing some of our more radical concepts. It was fun to get on the phone with ended up with five different organizations and say, I want to ask your donors for less money. And I think we're gonna make more, the, the amount of, uh, really and strange looks I got was pretty outstanding.

Kevin (42:17):

So we found five organizations that we were gonna run this with. We needed a big enough email file. We were gonna run it on giving Tuesday for the length of the campaign. Now with a lot of these organizations, we start the campaign like two or three days before with like a warm up soft ask. We'll do two emails on that date. So we were gonna maintain this it throughout the whole thing. I will point out there's one in the mystery client that they just asked that we not use their name in it, but we were able to use their, uh, some of the results so we can share you the end results of it. So KC B opted back in this time, we're able to add in the mid-level donors along with that. And so you can see here, the one on the left is the standard language.

Kevin (42:53):

And then the one on the right is the downgrade. It's nuanced. It's similar to what we did, but I'd like to consider being one of the blank number of donors who have supported KC in the past to make a gift amount of this amount. And so we tested the amount, at least standard gift. And we said, first name, your gift will ensure that we can remain on the air.dot. Then you see the downgrade again, similar to what we did before. Cause we wanted to try to keep the role in a way that unified it across all these different treatments. You've given this amount in the past with all the uncertainty, we're not asking for that same level of support. Instead, your gift of this when combined with this many other supporters will provide the resources we need right now. And so we reiterated that and kept going on the end result when we did this and ran it again, 194% increase in overall revenue.

Kevin ([43:39](#)):

Now, huge bumps compared to that 30% we saw before. But one of the key reasons behind that is we were able to add in our mid-level donors because that 193 came two different ways. One, we increased conversion rate by 49% for that segment. And two, we nearly doubled their average gift. When we dug in the reason we doubled an increased average gift while asking for less is that the group that saw the biggest bump was the mid-level group. And I'm gonna use mid-level quotes between two 50 to 500, saw a pretty significant increase in overall revenue because of that change. And we ran it with more than just them. One of the other organization's heritage, because your gift today is on giving Tuesday our goals to raise $50,000, da da dot. Well, you do this. And we did that. We incorporated that same language. This was new, a little bit different, but we said, since you're a conservative share their past, will you get, make a special giving Tuesday gift of this amount to re help us reach our goal?

Kevin ([44:36](#)):

I know you've given generously in the past, but with all the uncertainty we're not asking, you can kind of see where we get our language and kind of tweak it, reuse it. So we keep the concept the same, the end result for them. 34% increase in revenue. And for them, they saws similar kind of results. But what's interesting is they're actual donors. They, we increase conversion for the sub $100 segment, but we decreased average gift. We're asking for less. That kind of makes sense. So that actually netted out to be nothing between a hundred to a thousand, we increase conversion rate by the same amount, 10% average gift increased. When you start thinking about the, the psychological concepts what's going on in people's mind, you're saying I don't need as much for you, but the mission is still important. Would you give this much? Well, if I can afford to give that, and obviously because I've given it a larger amount in the past, I'm committed to the organization and the mission, it would make sense that the, they would be like, no, it's okay.

Kevin ([45:32](#)):

I will do that amount. You're asking for that. I did in the past. So we did this and I said, we mentioned it with five different organizations. You've seen KC V I you've seen heritage with a 34%. Our mystery client had 134% increase and overall revenue. Again, theirs was primarily driven by the level donor group. Carnet another group had 96% level of, uh, increase in revenue. Now that one had an 89% level of confidence. So it wasn't statistically significant, but definitely direction. Now then we did missionary S of Mim. Maculate a missionary organization that helps, uh, with, uh, feeding the poor, bringing, uh, flies to third world countries. And they actually saw a decrease in revenue by 5%. Now what's interesting about this is when we really dug into the, the metrics behind it and looked at the donors. The biggest difference between what we call mammy and the rest is they don't have the same level of upper broad based donors.

Kevin ([46:34](#)):

The volume of a hundred to 500 to a thousand dollars. Donors is far less for them because they're a much more broad based supported organization. And so it aligns with what we were seeing with all of the other organizations and simply being that the big movement was not at the lower levels. It was at that upper mid, which is great news for us because honestly, a lot of our efforts acquisition is pretty straightforward. We know what to say. We know how to ask for it. Upgrade becomes a challenge. And this test and this language illustrated a concept that allows us to upgrade donors at a, at a pretty decent clip in terms of both their giving and reactivation rates. So now I, I changed everything on Nathan's. I can't

Nathan (47:16):

See anything down into no worries. Back in, uh, questions for Kevin. We'll take those here in a moment. If you wanna pull up your Q and a, uh, tool, drop those in there, we'll get some questions, uh, answered Kevin, your ability to like break down complex information is second to none. So thank you. Thank you. Thank you. <laugh> on behalf of everyone. Thank you. Um, so before we answer some questions for Kevin, again, you can drop those in the Q and a, uh, there's a couple things I wanna just draw your attention to. Um, before we run outta time, uh, number one is right now, you can actually activate a free, uh, certifi course on intro to online fundraising optimization. So if you wanna kick off this new year, uh, with some new ways of learning, how to use AB testing and optimization to grow, you know, email acquisition, donor acquisition improves your email appeals, et cetera, feel free to join this course next apple.com/intro course.

Nathan (48:06):

You can find up more and sign up for that all. And then I wanna just remind you and reiterate in case you missed it up front, uh, that I would love for you to check out the Neo summit@iosummit.com. Go check out the brand new wizard of optimization theme on the website. It's kind of fun. I'm excited about it and make sure you get your ticket soon using that code super early bird to save 600 bucks on your ticket. Uh, that's not a small amount of bucks to save. So make sure you get in quickly on that. Uh, we've got several questions, so let's, let's dive in. Let's find what's for you. And what was for Jeff and where kind of the line was here. Uh, let's see. Joy is wondering when does a downgraded donor turn back into an upgraded donor again?

Kevin (48:49):

So a great, great question. And honestly, what we found on this one is we didn't downgrade too many donors. And I also think that when we look at it in this context, it's not necessarily that they downgraded their giving it's that they downgraded this one gift and it wasn't as big as their previous highest contributions. It it's the same thing of saying like, I, I don't want recurring donors because they, our gift is gonna be less, but we gotta evaluate donors at a holistic level saying what's their annual contribution is the whole thing going up in terms of that kind of upgrade. But, so I think that answered that question. Yeah,

Nathan (49:23):

No, I think so. I think so, uh, shout out from Joanne that, uh, all the statistics makes they're super happy, happy. Uh

Kevin (49:33):

That's great. But yeah, we have job openings. <laugh> I just wanna throw that out there.

Nathan (49:37):

I think you answered this question from us, Seth, and maybe we can reiterate that here too. Uh, what's the criteria you used to make those initial segments for upgrades and downgrades

Kevin (49:45):

It, so I I'll reiterate some of that. Yes. Some of it was a finger in the air to see which way the wind is blowing and what we felt like it the day. But the other thing is we also had to take a look at how many

donors were in the segments. It doesn't make sense to make a split of, uh, 10 to 20, if you only have 15 donors in that segment. That's why you see the, the upper donor levels jump so much is cuz there just wasn't that many donors in that segment to make it necessitated another split. Yeah. Makes

Nathan (50:11):

Sense. Uh, question from Jennifer, I assume this kind of applies across every experiment we showed today. Why are we not adding more videos and images and things like that inside of these emails? They're all pretty much plain text. Yeah.

Kevin (50:24):

We're very, very, uh, boring in terms of design

Nathan (50:27):

<laugh> we don't have a

Kevin (50:28):

Designer. We don't, we actually don't have a designer. No, but that's purposeful. We have some experiments and this is something we can follow up with. But oftentimes the design gets in the way of the message. Um, and it also changes what the call to action is. If I send an email that says click on this video to learn more and I send another email that says, donate it on this link to donate today, the motivation to my visitor going to that page is too wildly different. Whenever we've tested using video on donation pages, we see one of two things happen. Either nothing happens or we decrease. We decrease far more often than we than we do nothing on that one. And I think it's simply because the way we consume information, now videos have a purpose. They have a place imagery does too. I think imagery, we have some experiments that can lift results using images, but it has to increase the associate value proposition. My gift needs to feel more needed and needs to feel more impactful because of this image I see will often go to a website's homepages donation in pages and you'll see a picture of a happy smile and child. Well, if that child's happy, why do I need to give a gift?

Nathan (51:33):

It's great. You did great work. So

Kevin (51:34):

You don't need me. Yeah, I'm out. So that's usually why we strip it down. Now we do add different designs and it's not to say you should never send emails with images, but be selective on know when to use the different types of messaging data to work better. Yeah.

Nathan (51:50):

That's great. Uh, question from Mary's meals. I dunno if this is Mary or someone else, but uh, she's wondering how often would you use this type of, of an approach? Do you, do you start doing this for every single email that you send now from here to the end of time or when do you do it?

Kevin (52:07):

I I'm assuming this is I'm gonna call it Mary. So Mary, it sounds good. Yeah. Maybe meals is her last name too. So we don't know. Maybe that's my bad. Uh, no, but this is a tactic. This is not a overarching

strategy for how we talk to our donors. It, it, we see the same basic concept of changing up the sender. Jeff showed some of like using the marketing manager or the fundraising manager, and it's gonna get you an in a bump. It's gonna ha help in the process. But if you do the same thing over and over, people start to wise up and they're not gonna open the email from the marketing manager. I would assume this is gonna be the same basic premise where if I'm always asking for less, because we really don't need it, they're gonna be like, well, just, this seems weird. Let's not do it. So my recommendation is save it for key times of peak conversion year end, fiscal year end giving Tuesday high urgency appeals when there's a really urgent need. This can be a good tactic to incorporate into the broader message. Cause what you didn't see here is this was always towards the bottom of the email. Cuz you gotta have a value proposition, a reason to give a gift first. Yeah. Before you make that ask. Yeah, that makes sense.

Nathan ([53:12](#)):
Question from anonymous. We may have to make a new rule. We won't ask questions. If you don't

Kevin ([53:16](#)):
Put your name on it. I like no, I like their, their question

Nathan ([53:19](#)):
<laugh> and that that's why we're stopping. It's a good question. Talk about software tools. How do you actually make this work or are you writing every email by hand?

Kevin ([53:27](#)):
Every email is this small enough sample? Oh, sample.

Nathan ([53:30](#)):
Okay. Well

Kevin ([53:31](#)):
Yeah, go for it. We'll talk about the software using this and just go from there. Cool. Um, there is different software out there in terms of the AB testing now because of the way this one worked, uh, we didn't, we could not use the basic AB testing that comes outta mail hubs spot or constantly contacted those because it would've split the email differently in terms of different segments. Every single time we needed something in the downgraded segment to see the same messaging for all three emails in part of the campaign. So what we did is we set up two distinct emails and we split the data outside using the very highly complex Excel in which you can create some randomization and split it that way in terms of validating that we were statistically significant, um, there's standard calculators out there. We use a software that we actually wrote ourselves. It's free for you guys as available called Winston knows Winstons, no.com. It integrates into Google optimize MailChimp and it does the statistical a typical level of validation. And it allows you to save your experiments and then be able to spread them around the organization. So you can show when you get a lift or you get a learning that other people can then mimic.

Nathan ([54:36](#)):
So awesome. Zarina just dropped the link to Winston. No. And the chats. So you can go check that out. Um, right. Another question was the increase in revenue be because of the quantity of donors

participating or because the donors themselves are, are because the donors gave more than what was suggested

Kevin (54:54):

When we broke it down. So the lower level donors gave what we asked them for, but more of them gave in a balanced out. So like we didn't see a lift because more people were giving, but they were giving it less now. And upper level segments. What we found was the same number of people that increased or same proportion of people that increased their gift increased in both the control and treatment, same people that gave the same increase at the control and treatment. Really the big growth then came from people who would gave less and increased their conversion accordingly. So it decreased some of that, but it increased the overall average gifts and revenue that were associated with it because of the culminating effect of all those put together.

Nathan (55:33):

That's helpful. Thanks, Kevin. Yeah, I think we got one more question for you, uh, which is kind of interesting if you're looking at the upper levels and saying, we need you, and you're the only person that can give at this level. How does impact somebody? How does that guilt impact somebody? Do you need to have at least a certain number of, uh, donors you're asking for in each category? Any thoughts there?

Kevin (55:57):

Uh, the short answer is, I don't know yet because what you guys are seeing here was tested on giving Tuesday, then rolled out on year end. So this, these learnings were about a month old that we haven't quite year at iterated, but it's a great question. Cause I would ask the same thing as is saying, I need one gift of 5,000 to direct for a person. And if I'm asking for 5,000, why wouldn't they call me and ask me for that one thing? So true answer is we need to test it further. Um, I do think there's certain logic to it, but it's also gonna be real hard to validate when we're dealing with less than a hundred people getting asked for a higher gift amount. Yeah. So, um, but check in soon, hopefully we'll know in a couple more months as we continue to test this.

Nathan (56:37):

It's awesome. Thank you so much, Kevin. I appreciate it. And thank you all for being here. There. There's a question I see in the chat from Susan does Winston Knows integrate with Virtuous Susan. I would highly encourage you to go talk to, uh, your friends at Virtuous and, and encourage him to set up the integration. That'd be fun. Um, no, not yet. Yeah. <laugh> that's that's the short answer. Uh, well thank you again so much everyone for being here best of luck to you as you're getting started in 2022, hopefully you can take some of these insights and apply them, uh, whether it's as basic as, you know, getting some cultivation going or running a complicated experiment, like what Kevin has broken down for, for all of us today. Uh, again, if you wanna dive deeper into testing and optimization and using proven strategies to grow, uh, you're giving head to nextafter.com/intro-course. Uh, we'll hooked up with a free certification course, uh, to really help you get started this year. Thank you again so much for being here. I appreciate you. Uh, hope you have a great rest of your day and we'll see you on the next webinar. Thank you so much.