

# Cassies 2005 Cases

**Brand: Le Lait - "Deux C'est Mieux"**

**Winner:Regional Success—Certificate of Excellence**

**Client Credits: Fédération des producteurs de lait du Québec**  
Nicole Dubé, Marketing Director

**Agency Credits: BBDO Montréal**  
John Gallagher, Executive Vice-President  
Martin Beauvais, Executive Vice-President, Creative Director  
Lyne Clermont, Client Service Director  
Katia Rassi, Media Planner  
Laurent Prud'homme, Creative Director  
Stéphane Charier, Copywriter  
Patrick Chaubet, Art Director  
Francis Turgeon, Art Director  
Marie-Christine Côté, Art Director  
Colette Dumay, Producer

**Crossover Notes:** All winning cases contain lessons that cross over from one case to another. The notes for this case are as follows, and are attached. The full set can be downloaded from the Case Library section at [www.cassies.ca](http://www.cassies.ca)

- Crossover Note 1. What a Brand Stands For.
- Crossover Note 9. Turnarounds.
- Crossover Note 11. The Eureka insight
- Crossover Note 15. Baby with the Bathwater.
- Crossover Note 16. When a campaign stumbles.
- Crossover Note 31. Transcending Advertising.

To see creative, go to the Case Library Index and click on the additional links beside the case.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**Business Results Period (Consecutive Months):** Q4 2003 – Q1 2005.

**Start of Communication/Advertising Effort:** September 15, 2003.

**Base Period for Comparison:** Year-ago, and historical.

This is about a decision to abandon a 5-year campaign that had captured Quebecers' hearts, in favour of a new direction. Great as the previous campaign was, with brilliant tracking results, it had not stemmed the long-term decline in Milk consumption. Given that this decline is almost universal, what could be done? The case explains a disarmingly simple solution—with a huge return on investment.

The decline was turned around—with consumption growing 3% in Year 1 and a further 1.5% in the first 6 months of Year 2. **Crossover Note 9**. After years of decline, this is outstanding. In Year 1 it translates to an extra \$12.6 million at wholesale, 3.9 times the marketing expenditure.

## SITUATION ANALYSIS

### a) Overall assessment

Milk is an essential part of growing up. It has 98% household penetration, and massive sales – 28% of all beverage dollar sales are milk (ACNielsen). It is a staple in virtually every household. But Milk's image of healthy, wholesome, goodness is so entrenched that people forget its role as a refreshing drink

Milk faces its greatest challenge from demographics. Consumption plummets as people age. Its share of all beverages is as high as 32.6% among 0-5 year olds in Québec, but this drops to just 6.9% by age 30. Choice increases exponentially, starting with teens (water, juices, carbonated soft drinks), then college age (alcohol), then adulthood—where tea and especially coffee are added to the mix. The following table shows the trend:

**Table 1: Consumption of Milk Daily – Québec**

Age group	Avg daily # drinks of Milk/per capita	Milk share of drink occasions – %
0-5	1.5	32.6
6-11	1.5	29.4
12-17	1.2	22.2
18-29	0.9	13.6
30-49	0.5	6.9
50-64	0.3	4.1
65+	0.3	4.4
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>11.0</b>

Source: Commins Wingrove 2003

In Québec the aging population exacerbates the issue. Even if per capita consumption within each age cohort stayed the same, overall consumption would still drop 3.5% between 2000 and 2005.

This demographic erosion is compounded by all the activity with soft drinks, alcoholic beverages, fruit juices, bottled water, and the like.

In 2002, cold beverages (Beer, CSDs, Juices, Water and Milk) spent \$40.8 million on advertising in Québec, and \$122.8 million in the balance of Canada. This gave Milk a 10.3% and 11.8% share of voice respectively—compared to its 28% sales importance.

This is just one factor. Equally or more important is massive in-store merchandising, price-featuring and display. An ACNielsen 2003 study illustrates the discrepancy between milk and other beverages:

- Milk occupied only 5% of linear feet devoted to beverages, while accounting for 28% of beverage dollar sales.
- Milk had only 3% of sales at special pricing, compared to 68% for CSDs, 28% for other beverages, and 33% for all beverages.
- Milk averaged \$1.13 a litre, compared to \$0.75 for all beverages (ex alcoholic).
- Milk got only 1% of trade weighted coop support.

These factors have led to declining per capita consumption averaging just over 1% a year for the past 15 years—a steeper decline than in English Canada, as follows:

**Table 2: Milk Consumption – Litres/Capita up to the Base Year**

	<b>1988</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>% change</b>
Québec	101.5	79.5	-21.7%
Total Canada	99.4	85.6	-13.9%

Source: Statistics Canada

## **b) Resulting objectives**

This trend was echoed internationally with every developed country showing decline. Even so, we set ourselves the difficult objective:

### ***Turn the decline around.***

But how do you do this? Many approaches had been tried – both rational and emotional. A highly emotional campaign launched in 1988—“*La Campagne blanche*”—leveraged the wholesomeness of Milk, evoking the nostalgia of childhood. Simple white graphics and classic French songs gave a sense of Milk’s purity. Tracking scores broke all records for likeability, comprehension, and brand linkage. And the campaign became a part of Quebecois culture, with a CD of the songs becoming a number 1 hit.

However, the campaign did not change *behaviour*. When it was launched in 1988 Milk consumption was at 92.2 litres/capita. By 2003 it was at 84.8. **Crossover Note 16**. This raised the difficult question:

*If a powerful campaign like “La Campagne blanche” could not stem the tide, then what could?*

## STRATEGY AND INSIGHT

The answer was simple. **Crossover Note 11**. We decided to focus on stimulating consumption.<sup>1</sup>

But this was a sea change from “*La Campagne blanche*,” and it presented a conundrum. Would we be tampering with the emotional connection we had built?

We decided to look at it the other way. We asked ourselves how strong the emotional connection was, and decided (on the evidence) that it was very strong indeed. This meant we had the licence to launch a much more frontal assault. **Crossover Notes 1 and 15**.

The challenge was to make the consumer actively select Milk, rather than just passively consume it out of habit. So we simply told them that two glasses of milk are better than one—creatively expressed in the line:

*“Un verre de lait c’est bien, mais deux c’est mieux.”*

The secret to salesmanship is getting prospects to agree with you early on. Our target was the 18-29 group, and they were already consuming a glass a day. So it was reasonable to ask them to extend this. Put another way, “*La Campagne blanche*” had reinforced all the values of Milk. So who could argue with the idea that “if one is good, two is better”?

There we had it. A credible, direct proposition to stimulate consumption – built on a great product relationship.

## EXECUTION

### CREATIVE

#### a) Year 1: September 2003 - Spring 2004

We could have developed a hard-hitting campaign based on rational arguments. But we knew that with healthy products, a father-knows-best approach is counter productive. We had to entice rather than sell. So we chose a completely opposite course.

---

<sup>1</sup> Editor’s Note. Years ago, the UK had the famously successful Drinka Pinta Milka Day campaign. This also focused on consumption. It’s worth noting that this is relatively unusual. Most brand-building advertising focuses on *benefits*, for the simple reason that people won’t do things unless they can see what’s in it for them. Sometimes, though, the direct approach works, as this case shows.

For the Fall 2003 launch we used a mix of TV, radio and print. The initial television spots featured characters in, can we say, unusual situations:



A Fortune 500 President is playing with dolls. A wife is caught casually in bed with another man. A boyfriend savours his feminine side by wearing his girlfriend's shoes. But what astonishes the people who catch our protagonists in the act? Not the act itself, but the fact that they are drinking their second glass of Milk!

The protagonists deliver this message in a most understated way—as if it is the most natural thing in the world. The signature “*Un verre de lait c’est bien, mais deux c’est mieux,*” is then the call to action.

Good radio is about theatre of the mind. We created this in the style of a sports announcer calling the action as a person gets one glass of Milk, then raising the tempo as they get a second glass – simple, energetic, impactful work. Print delivered the nutritional message, showing it as the stuff of teeth and bones. Without saying it, we were implying the benefit of calcium. “One glass of milk is good, but two is better” was the only copy.



In January-March 2004, we decided to focus even more on the slogan. In TV we did “Tennis” and “Enfants,” where two people are clearly doing better than one. “*Un verre de lait c’est bien, mais deux c’est mieux*” was on their tee-shirts, in the centre of the action. Newspaper had a simple layout consistent with the TV and again carried the nutritional message.



## b) Year 2 – Fall 2004 - Spring 2005

Strong business results from Year 1, supported by tracking research, showed that we were on track. The slogan was magical, but we kept looking for fresher ways to embed it into the Quebecois vernacular. We wanted to do with our new slogan what the classical French music had done for “*La Campagne blanche*”

We found the answer in the “V” sign. The peace or victory sign could powerfully deliver the message of two glasses of milk a day. This mnemonic was bang on target and could become a simple and cost efficient way to remind Quebecers to drink two glasses a day.



It did two things which we felt were strategically important:

- It stood for victory and had a real sense of energy. It was a strong emotional way to deliver a traditional message. But this was clearly not your traditional milk.
- It would allow us to deliver daily frequency in a more visually impactful and cost efficient way than radio.

So we moved forward with TV, large posters, bus shelters, and newspapers.

The idea for TV and print was simple. People posed with the V sign – some new, some real, and some from history. TV was a montage set to a powerful music track. Based on this, we also created a CD contest for the younger generation through Musique Plus. The station played the track while launching a CD.



We freshened winter 2005 print by using charming cartoon-like executions. And for immediacy, we created executions around Christmas, Valentines Day, Easter, etc.



## **MEDIA STRATEGY AND PLAN**

### **a) Year 1: September 2003 - Spring 2004**

In the past, we had used a mix of TV primarily, with outdoor and print as a secondary medium. Annual budgets ranged from \$1.6 million to \$2.3 million.

For the new campaign TV again formed the primary medium. At the same time we needed high frequency – ideally daily – since we were trying to change daily habits. But the budget did not change. (Fall 2003 was \$1.2million vs. \$1.1million in 2002.)

The solution. A base of :30 TV at roughly equal weights to prior years, but in :30s (vs. :60s and :30s before). Funds saved, with funds traditionally spent in print, now went to 250-450 weekly GRP's in radio.

This gave us 9 weeks of coverage from mid-September 2003 until November 17, when we took a hiatus to avoid Christmas. Most importantly it increased frequency.

We continued the campaign from mid-January 2004 to early March, but now substituted newspaper for radio. This allowed us to deliver nutritional messages. Spend was \$774K, vs. \$954K the prior year.

### **b) Year 2: Fall 2004 - Spring 2005**

Recognizing the Year 1 success the Fédération des producteurs de lait du Québec increased the Fall 04 budget from \$1.2 million in 2003 to \$1.6 million in 2004. TV remained at traditional levels. But with the “V” sign, we wanted to surround the customer – so we used large vertical posters, transit shelters, backlits, wild postings, street corner columns and daily newspapers to hit them at home, on the way to and from work and at play. The result was 60% print & outdoor / 40% TV, the opposite of our traditional mix, but justified by the increased “V” impact.

## BUSINESS RESULTS

The long-term decline turned around, as shown in the following table:

**Table 3: Québec vs. Balance of Eastern Canada**

Source : ACNielsen.	Year 1				Year 2	
	Q1 Oct - Dec 2003	Q2 Jan - Mar 2004	Q3 Apr - Jun 2004	Q4 Jul - Sep 2004	Q1 Oct - Dec 2004	Q2 Jan - Mar 2005
Québec – Sales % change vs year ago	+3	+3	+3	+2	+2	+1
Balance of Eastern Canada – Sales % change vs year ago	-1	-1	-1	0	0	-2

Notes: Q1 and 2 of both years were advertised quarters. Q3 and 4 had no advertising.

Note that Year 2 builds on Year 1, with Oct-Dec 2004 growing 2% vs. year ago i.e. + 5% on two years ago. Similarly Jan-March 2005 is + 4% on two years ago. In contrast, sales in the balance of Eastern Canada (the traditional comparator) continue to slide.

The growth in Year 1 equates to an incremental 16 million litres, \$18 million at retail, and \$12.6 million at wholesale. The structure of the dairy industry makes it impossible to calculate net margin. However, \$12.6 million at wholesale is 3.9 times the annual media and production spend of \$3.2 million.

## CAUSE & EFFECT BETWEEN ADVERTISING AND RESULTS

- **Advertising was the only variable.** There was no other outside stimulus in the marketing mix compared to the prior year.
- **Sales growth vs. year ago shows the classic pattern driven by advertising.** There was immediate impact in Q1 which then held through Q2 as the campaign weight built. Only after some time (over 3 months since advertising stopped in March 2004) did growth slow, (July-Sep 2004) and then only marginally to 2%.
- **Pricing and promotion were not variables.** Milk is a controlled product in Québec with no price promotion activity. And milk gets virtually no promotion support.
- **Media spend was not a factor.** Media spending was in line with historical levels – in fact in Year 1 it was 10% lower than in the base year.
- **The in-market tracking has been outstanding.** [Detailed results were supplied.]
- **“Un verre de lait c’est bien, mais deux c’est mieux” has moved into the vernacular.** It appears in everything from award shows (“One award is good but two is better”) to everyday lives (“One garage sale is good , but two is better”) **Crossover Note 31.**

End of Case. Crossover Notes follow.

## INTRODUCTION TO CROSSOVER NOTES — CASSIES 2005

[Québec Milk]

Crossover Notes have been going for several years, and now run to 28 pages.

We used to attach a full set to all cases, but to save a few trees, we now include only the Notes particular to any case.

The idea of Crossover Notes occurred to me while I was editing Cassies 1997.

I was a consultant by then. Before that I had reached the category manager level at P&G (what they quaintly called the Associate Advertising Manager). I had then clambered up the ladder at O&M, eventually becoming President and later Vice Chairman—both in Toronto. P&G and O&M were both passionate about “lessons learned,” and so was I. In those days (it seems hard to believe now) we felt rushed off our feet. But we did have time to study if campaigns were working or not, and come to conclusions about why.

There are lessons, like gold dust, in all the Cassies cases. So in 1997 I decided to extract them. This started with bite-sized footnotes about lessons that “cross over” from one case to another. And the idea kept growing. It is still anchored to winning cases, but I also draw on other thinking for more complex issues.

You can use Crossover Notes in two ways. Although they didn’t start out as a crash course in advertising, they are worth reading as a whole. You can also dip into them selectively. The headings on the next page will help you choose.

I’ve tried to be even-handed on controversial issues, but here and there you will sense my point of view. For this I thank the Cassies for not editing their Editor.

We now have over 150 published cases. They’re a growing body of experience. I hope I’ve helped pass some of the learning on.

*David Rutherford*

*Toronto: December 2005.*

***For advice on brand-building see Excellence in Brand Communication—authored by leading Canadians from across the marketing and advertising spectrum.***

***It is published by the ICA. See [www.ica.adbeast.com](http://www.ica.adbeast.com).***

## INDEX OF CROSSOVER NOTES FOR CASSIES 2005

<b>All Cases</b>		<b>Québec Milk</b>
1.	What a Brand Stands For.	✓
2.	Brand Truths.	
3.	Core Equity versus Price & Promotion.	
4.	Business Strategy dictated by the Brand Positioning.	
5.	The Total Brand Experience.	
6.	Should the product be improved?	
7.	Fighting for the Same High Ground.	
8.	Classic Rivalries.	
9.	Turnarounds.	✓
10.	Conventional Wisdom—should it be challenged?	
11.	The Eureka Insight.	✓
12.	Changing the Goalposts.	
13.	Immediate vs. Long-Term Effect.	
14.	Refreshing a continuing campaign.	
15.	Baby with the Bathwater.	✓
16.	When a campaign stumbles.	✓
17.	Turning a liability into a strength.	
18.	Keeping it Simple.	
19.	Great minds think alike.	
20.	Emotional versus Rational.	
21.	Likeability.	
22.	Humour in a Serious Category.	
23.	Problem versus Solution.	
24.	Tough Topics.	
25.	Brand Linkage (when should the brand name appear).	
26.	Awareness Alone.	
27.	Share of Mind, Share of Voice, Spending.	
28.	Media Learning.	
29.	Pre-emptive Media.	
30.	Reach and Frequency versus Large-Space Impact.	
31.	Transcending Advertising.	✓
32.	Internal Marketing.	
33.	Changing the Target Audience.	
34.	Longer and Broader Effects, and <b>A Closing Thought</b> .	

The Notes for this case are marked ✓ and come next.

## QUÉBEC MILK. CROSSOVER NOTES. CASSIES 2005.

1. **What a Brand Stands For.** People in real life hardly give the deeper meaning of brands a second thought. They know that some appeal more than others. They may have a sense that brands jostle for their attention. But that's about it. They certainly don't agonize over what is the essence of this, or the abiding truth of that.

But branding goes deeper than we in marketing may realize. Before marketing was even thought of, branding was part of life. Everything from national flags, to coinage, to the uniforms on soldiers, boy scouts and Supreme Court judges, to the plumage on peacocks (human and otherwise), is a form of branding. Business had an early example in the 1800s when Harley Procter of P&G heard a pastor quote a biblical text about ivory palaces. Goodbye Procter & Gamble White Soap. Hello Ivory. More recently, Tom Peters published *A Brand Called You*. And Tony Blair tried to re-brand the UK as "Cool Britannia."

A brand, in the fullest sense, is hard to define. Dictionary definitions tend to focus on the trademark aspect, and yes, branding does involve some sort of identifying mark. But this misses the point. What makes a brand valuable?

The answer is *The Advantage of Belief*.<sup>2</sup> Charles Revson of Revlon famously said, "In the factory we make cosmetics. In the store we sell hope." In other words, a brand is not a product; it's what people believe about a product. These beliefs can be immensely powerful. The most astonishing is the placebo effect. In clinical trials, many patients respond to the "sugar pill," even when they have serious diseases. We see the same thing with blind and identified product tests. With a strong brand, the preference jumps. (See *What's in a Name* by John Philip Jones.) And when the *Advantage of Belief* takes hold, it leads to a long list of benefits:

- |                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| a) Customer loyalty               | e) Facilitating brand extensions              |
| b) Higher price                   | f) Withstanding competitive attack            |
| c) Higher cash flows              | g) Motivating staff and attracting new talent |
| d) Higher long-term profitability | h) Potentially augmenting the stock price     |

This doesn't, of course, answer the question, "how do you build these beliefs?" There are widely varying notions, but most agree on the basic principles: (1) stake out what the brand can and should stand for (2) stick with this over time (3) evolve to account for lessons learned and market changes.<sup>3</sup>

This can't be done by empty promises. We have to assess what consumers want against what the product delivers—and tell the story better than competitors do. We have a melting pot of perceptions and reality to work with. All the "brand" ideas are there to help—Brand Image, Equity, Personality, Character, Essence, Relationship, Footprint, Truth, Soul, Identity, and so on—along with old faithfuls like Positioning, Focus of Sale, USP, Features, Attributes, Benefits and Values. Whatever the terminology, though, "what the brand stands for" is critical.

<sup>2</sup> This is a phrase of mine, though the idea that a brand is "more" has been described by many authors.

<sup>3</sup> How do you do this, and evolve? See *Excellence in Brand Communication*: [www.ica.adbeast.com](http://www.ica.adbeast.com)

**9. Turnarounds.** There are a number of these in the Cassies:

**Cassies I**

- Crispy Crunch. Molson Canadian.
- Pepsi. Québec.

**Cassies II**

- Listerine. Québec.
- Oh Hungry? Oh Henry.

**Cassies II**

- Dove. "Litmus."
- Molson Canadian. "I AM."
- Philadelphia Cream Cheese.

**Cassies 99**

- becel. "Young at Heart"
- Eggs. Wonder Bread
- Sunlight. "Go Ahead. Get Dirty."

**Cassies 2001**

- Kraft Dinner.
- Lipton Chicken Noodle.

**Cassies 2002**

- BMO Québec.
- Campbell's Soup. Listerine.
- CFL. Pro•Line.
- Easter Seals Relay.
- Sleeman Québec.

**Cassies 2003**

- Aero. Bait Cars.
- Crown Diamond Paint.
- Dodge SX 2.0.
- Motrin.
- Pro•Line. Super 7.
- Université de Montréal.
- VodKice.

**Cassies 2004**

- Cottonelle.
- Gaz Metro.
- Kit Kat.
- Milk (Québec and Prairies).
- Toyota Sienna.

**Cassies 2005**

- Crescendo.
- Energizer Lithium.
- Toyota Tacoma.
- Eggo French Toast Stix.
- Twix. Hubba Bubba. Juicy Fruit.
- Coricidin II.
- Moores and Harvey's.
- Québec Lotto 6/49.
- Pepsi – Québec and Québec Milk.

**11. The Eureka Insight.** These feature in many cases. Some examples:

- Oh Henry! None of the gut-fillers had tried to own hunger, even though it was the high ground for the category. Cassies II. See also *Crossover Note 7*.
- Buckley's. Rather than side-step their bad taste, Buckley's relished it. Cassies III.
- Chrysler. Minivans were "my most expensive household appliance." Even so, *emotion* was the key to an immensely successful launch. Cassies III.
- Philadelphia Cream Cheese. In research, people often do not own up to what they really want, which in this case was "permission to indulge." Cassies III.
- Richmond Savings. Almost everyone hated banks, but it still took insight to turn this into the "Humungous Bank." Cassies III.
- Eggs are natural, but in word-association tests, consumers did not say so. (See *12. Changing the Goalposts*.) The former campaign brought "natural" to life.
- Sunlight. Getting dirty is fun. This is diametrically opposed to the conventional wisdom, dominated by Tide, that clean is good and dirt is bad. Cassies 99.
- Fido in Cassies 99. In an echo of Apple vs. IBM, Fido saw that consumers needed the human touch. See also Clearnet and "the future is friendly" in Cassies 2001.
- Diet Pepsi in Cassies 2002. They found a way to be youthful without being too young in the "forever young" campaign.
- Listerine in Cassies 2002: healthy gums, after a century talking about bad breath.

- Pro•Line in Cassies 2002: Appealed to non-experts with “Anyone can win.”
- Aero. Saw the power of “melting” in Cassies 2003.
- Crown Diamond. Used the fact that men hate to paint in Cassies 2003.
- Super 7. Ignored the political correctness of being tasteful. Cassies 2003.
- Cottonelle. Talked to women as women, not as “family.” Cassies 2004.
- Québec Milk. Saw the blindingly obvious. That just asking people to drink more milk might cause it. Cassies 2004.
- Toyota Sienna. Realized that the answer lay not in what minivan buyers do, but in what SUV buyers do. Cassies 2004.
- Irving’s Cruisin’ to Win. Saw the power of *small* prizes. Cassies 2005.
- Crescendo. Like Oh Henry! saw unoccupied high ground. Cassies 2005.
- Butter. Saw a way to use “natural” to connote taste and health. Cassies 2005.
- Anti-Smoking. Saw the power of “Stupid.” Cassies 2005.
- Jergens Ultra Care. Saw a way to reposition skin. Cassies 2005.
- Whiskas saw things from the *cat’s* point of view. Cassies 2005.
- Moores used the fact that their target audience hates shopping. Cassies 2005.
- Harvey’s realized the significance of The Grill.
- Québec Lotto 6/49. If 6/49 winners are so generous, be nice to them.
- United Way saw power in the Hand icon.
- Leucan realized that there is still hope, despite childhood cancer.
- CIBC Run for the Cure saw the power in the Pinnie idea.
- Juicy Fruit saw how to build a new image by (almost literally) destroying the old one.
- Québec Milk saw power in the obvious—if one glass is good, two are better.
- Plus virtually all the cases in *Crossover Note 10*.

**15. Baby with the Bathwater.** Campaigns can run out of steam, and it may be right to throw everything out (*Crossover Notes 14 and 33*). But it’s worth checking to see if anything should be kept. “I am Canadian” from the “I AM” campaign in Cassies III was discarded when the campaign later faltered. It came back with “Joe’s Rant,” with a twist. The Campbell’s Kids re-appeared in Cassies 2002 after years in oblivion. It will be interesting to see how this plays out. Cottonelle in Cassies 2004 knew that they had properties in the cottony soft jingle etc. But these were also dating the brand. So they found a way to use the jingle in a tongue in cheek way.

Quite often, properties get discarded because the people who believe in them go off the brand. This happened on Smarties with “Red Ones Last.” Sometimes they are discarded for a good reason. Dove’s “pour shot” had appeared in every commercial since launch. For Litmus (Cassies III) the Canadian team decided to drop it—to help consumers see Dove in a new way. The global powers-that-be (client and agency) reacted as if Dove was committing suicide, and said so. Their sense of bereavement turned to horror when their advice was ignored. “Litmus” ran without the pour shot, and was immensely successful.

This is an important point about long-running properties. Many believe they should be used in every communication—and in the normal run of things, this is a good idea. But if you have reason to drop a property for a while<sup>4</sup> consumers will not forget it. These images have a grip on long-term memory. For example, imagine you had to *erase* an entrenched image. Could you do it? I watched Lever try for years to kill “ring around the collar” on Wisk. They couldn’t. That said, my view in general is that we are too quick to change things for changes sake.

One of the main reasons that brands are valuable — *Crossover Note 1* — is that they accumulate added values over time. The evidence says that this does not happen if a brand keeps changing the face it presents.

I need to stress that I am not advocating *no* change, but something closer to Paul Feldwick’s “exercise” model in *Crossover Note 13*. Let the effort on the brand be part of a coherent program, evolving as needed over time, all building brand muscle.

**16. When a campaign stumbles.** This might be a momentary stutter and (if we were clairvoyant) we would know what was needed to make a minor fix. But it might be the first clue that something is going off the rails. In this situation, the pressure can lead to snap (and wrong) judgments. The best answer usually comes from a blend of experience, judgment, intuition, vision, and research. Here are some pointers.

1. **Dig deep into trends and tastes.** You could be on the wrong side of a tectonic shift. They can be massive. “Made in Japan” used to mean a cheap, shlocky, knock-off, and North American business took years to see what was coming. *Crossover Note 6*. Consider Listerine. “Always a bridesmaid, but never a bride” started life in a Listerine advertisement, reflecting a bad breath positioning that had been in place for as long as anyone can remember. But a shift was happening, towards the idea of a healthy mouth. (See Cassies 1995 and 2002). Something similar has happened in toothpaste. At one time, Pepsodent (“you’ll wonder where the yellow went...”) was the leader, and whitening was the high ground. Crest came along with fluoride (and dental association endorsement). This transformed the market, and Pepsodent slid into history. Over the next generation, though, cavities stopped being the problem they once were.<sup>5</sup> The market started to shift towards “mouth health” and Colgate got there first with Colgate Total, knocking Crest off its #1 perch. Crest responded with Crest Complete—and now the whole market has come full circle with a furious battle for whitening again.
2. **Look at the goalposts.** If they really haven’t changed, then it’s likely that you just have a short-term stutter. But if they have, try to envisage the new game. See *11. The Eureka Insight*, and *12. Changing the Goalposts*.
3. **Think through the change needed.** See *6. Should the product be improved?* and *14. Refreshing a Continuing Campaign*.

---

<sup>4</sup> On Prairie Milk in Cassies 2004 they dropped the classic pour shot because it is a cliché to teenagers.

<sup>5</sup> Ironically, Crest had helped make this happen, by driving the whole market in this direction.

4. **Change for the right reasons.** It's broadly true that long-running campaigns—kept fresh and relevant—are great brand-builders. And it's sadly true that new people, wanting to make their mark, change things for change's sake. But once in a while, wholesale change is right. Molson Canadian (Cassies I) was a niche player when it launched "What Beer's all About" in the late 80s. Canadian became mainstream, and displaced Labatt Blue as market leader. You'd think they'd keep going with "What Beer's all About." And they did for a few years. But tastes were shifting. To stay ahead of this, they launched "I AM" in the mid 90s (Cassies III). This was successful, but eventually it too ran out of steam. Canadian then re-incarnated again with "Joe's Rant." (Cassies 2001.)

More recently, though this time the need for change more obvious, Juicy Fruit (almost literally) destroyed its former image with the guitar-smashing campaign. (Cassies 2005.)

- 31. Transcending Advertising.** A number of Cassies campaigns have moved into popular culture—at least for a while. Generally, advertisers and agencies are pleased when this happen, though there are always nay-sayers asking "Is it on strategy? Is it relevant? Is it building the business?"

"Where's the Beef?" had a lot more than 15 minutes of fame. But did it build the Wendy's business? I've seen arguments on both sides. Budweiser and "Whassup" faced similar questions. Cassies cases that mention the effect—and they all do it positively—include Richmond Savings (Cassies III); Molson Canadian, Tourism New Brunswick, Manitoba Telecom (Cassies 2001); Bank of Montreal and ED (Cassies 2002); Familiprix, Irving Mainway Coffee and Motrin (Cassies 2003); Desjardins and Québec Milk (Cassies 2004). Crescendo Pizza, Familiprix, Pepsi – Québec and Québec Milk (Cassies 2005).

Viral marketing is the latest incarnation of effort that transcends advertising. There has not yet been a Cassies winner based on this, but it would be good to see one.

End of Québec Milk Crossover Notes