

Revenue Strategy Comparison Table

Income Strategy Criteria	Enhance	Start	Alliance for cash	Alliance for in-kind
<i>Rapid revenue inflow</i>	Smaller results in the short term	Larger results in the short term	Larger results in longer term	No cash in-flow
<i>Low initial outlay of cash or staff to get going</i>	Moderate expense, with funds found by cutting other programs	Most expensive; have to find outside funds, and fundraising costs rise sharply	None	None
<i>Low in-house resistance to change</i>	Yes	No	Low, as both entities must have a synergistic gain to have reached an agreement	Low, as both entities must have a synergistic gain to have reached an agreement
<i>Risk of failure</i>	Lower	Higher	Low, though surprises are discovered after the agreement is signed	Low, though surprises are discovered after the agreement is signed
<i>Time elapsed till start-up</i>	Rapid	Slow	Dependent upon agreement	Dependent upon agreement
<i>Generates many new names</i>	Yes, from same programs	Yes	No	No
<i>Builds on in-house systems, registrations, reports</i>	Yes, but this may limit the extent on the improvement	No, and often creates new registration, system, and operations issues	No	No, and they may not understand the need for reporting and compliance requirements
<i>Builds on in-house expertise in revenue generation</i>	Yes	No	No	No
<i>Creates urgency or momentum</i>	Harder to create urgency	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Ease of tracking results</i>	Harder, as enhancements undermine existing program results	Yes, though the organization has a slow learning curve to baseline ROI and other results	Yes	Yes, though reporting is difficult, as is substantiation
<i>Needs a consultant to get started?</i>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<i>Ease of termination of program or agreement</i>	Harder	Easiest	Moderate, though dissolution can have issues	Moderate, though dissolution can have issues