SEVENTHELEMENT

A FUEL ROOM FIELD KIT FOR CHARITIES

The Charity AI Visibility Checklist

How to find out what AI assistants say about your charity, and fix it before your donors ask.

12 prompts. 4 scores. One afternoon.

By Ash, Agency Director, Seventh Element
November 2026 | seventhelement.agency

START HERE

The whole thing on one page

If you read nothing else, read this. Then turn to page 6 and run the test.

ONE

Why this exists

Donors are starting to ask AI assistants where to give. The answer is a shortlist, not a list of links.

TWO

The uncomfortable bit

AI builds that shortlist mostly from what other sources say about you. Your website is one voice among many.

THREE

Mentioned is not recommended

Famous charities get named. Well-evidenced charities get recommended. They are not always the same ones.

FOUR

The Shortlist Test

Ask four assistants twelve donor questions. Score each answer: mentioned, recommended, accurate, sourced.

FIVE

Follow the sources

Every source an assistant cites is a thing you can check, correct or improve. That is your to-do list.

SIX

Write facts that travel

Specific, dated, plain statements get quoted. Warm generalities do not.

SEVEN

Tell your trustees

It is a low-cost reputational check, not a new channel to fund. One page in this kit is written for them.

EIGHT

Why now

Use is small today and growing fast. The sources AI relies on take months to change. Early is cheap.

WHAT CHANGED

Small today. Not small for long.

Few donors ask AI where to give yet. But the tools are mainstream, the growth is steep, and fewer people are giving at all.

What we know	Figure	Source
UK adults who use AI tools	54% (79% of 16 to 24s)	Ofcom, Adults' Media Use and Attitudes, April 2026
UK visits to ChatGPT, first eight months of 2025	1.8 billion, up from 368 million	Ofcom, Online Nation 2025
Donors who use AI chatbots to research causes	4.5% (US)	Blue State, Brand Discovery in the Age of AI, 2025
Donors who say AI summaries meaningfully influence giving	7% (US)	Give.org Donor Trust Report 2026
AI assistant share of visits to UK charity websites we manage	0.2% to 0.5% a month	Seventh Element GA4 analysis, June to October 2026
AI citations pointing to charities' own content	24% (pilot, UK overseas aid charities)	nfpResearch AI prompt benchmark, October 2026
UK adults who gave to charity	55% in 2025, down from 69% in 2016	CAF, UK Giving Report 2026

Why act while the numbers are small

- **The audience is already there.** Tomorrow's regular givers are today's heaviest AI users.
- **The inputs are slow.** Regulator records, reference entries, press coverage and impact reports take months to change.
- **None of it is wasted.** Clear facts and accurate listings also help search, trust and grant applications.
- **Referral traffic hides it.** A donor can form a view of you from an AI answer without ever visiting your site.

> **The cheapest time to fix what AI says about you is before anyone important asks it.**

We found no UK survey of donors using AI to choose a charity. The donor figures above are from the US. Our GA4 figure is from a small sample and is an observation, not a benchmark.

PART ONE

How AI builds a shortlist

Donors ask about causes, not brands

A donor rarely types your name into an assistant. They type a problem: who is helping, where, and whether it works. In one US pilot of an AI search tool on Charity Navigator's website, about 80% of more than 22,000 queries were about a cause (Giving Compass, reported in Stanford Social Innovation Review, October 2026).

	Donor uses search	Donor asks an AI assistant
What they get	Ten links, a few ads, perhaps an AI summary	Three to six named charities, with reasons
Who competes	Everyone on page one	Whoever the assistant can describe with confidence
What decides it	Your ranking and your snippet	What trusted sources say about you
Your website	The destination	One source among many

Mentioned is not recommended

In a pilot benchmark of UK overseas aid charities, nfpResearch put around 60 donor-style prompts to five assistants (October 2026). Household names were mentioned constantly. The charity recommended most often was one most of the public has never heard of. Results also differed from one assistant to the next.

It is a pilot from a firm that sells benchmarking audits, so treat it as an early signal. The signal is still clear enough to act on.

> **AI assistants do not reward the charity people have heard of. They reward the charity they can find evidence for.**

Small charities are not locked out

Assistants huddle around the same big names for broad questions. Whole Whale's 2025 US study found six AI models named just 30 unique cancer charities between them, against 127 for the environment. Narrow questions are where smaller charities get named: a specific place, a specific group, a specific problem.

PART ONE

The UK source map

Where an assistant can learn about a UK charity, what each source holds, and how much of it you control.

Source	What it holds about you	Your control	What to do
Charity Commission register, OSCR, or the Charity Commission for Northern Ireland	Income, spending, trustees, whether filings are on time	High	File on time. Keep activities and description current
Your own website	Your facts, impact and how to give	Total	Make it specific, dated and easy to quote
Wikipedia	A summary of who you are, including controversies	Low	Do not write your own entry. Flag errors on the talk page, with sources
Evaluators and giving lists, such as GiveWell and Giving What We Can	Recommendations based on evidence of impact	Medium	Publish evidence they can assess. Relevant for some causes only
Press and sector coverage	What you did lately, and what went wrong	Medium	Give journalists facts, figures and named experts
Partners and funders	Who works with you and funds you	Medium	Ask for accurate, linked descriptions on their sites
Community sites and public rankings, such as Reddit and YouGov	What people say and feel about you	Low	Monitor. Fix the things people complain about

> **The US has Charity Navigator and Candid as referees. The UK has no direct equivalent, so your regulator record and your own published evidence carry more weight.**

A quick reality check

For the search "best charities to donate to UK", Semrush's UK results snapshot (November 2026) shows eight of the top ten pages are not charity websites. They include a Reddit thread, a fundraising platform, a polling company, the Charity Commission register and two giving evaluators. That is the reading list an AI answer starts from.

PART TWO

The Shortlist Test

Ask four AI assistants the questions your donors ask. Score what comes back. Follow the sources. It takes an afternoon.

What you need: ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude and Perplexity open in a browser, the scorecard on page 8, two hours and a thick skin.

How to run it

Step	What to do	Why
Step one	Write down your cause and place in a donor's words, not your strategy's	Donors do not say "holistic wraparound support"
Step two	Open a fresh chat in each assistant. Sign out where you can	Your history colours the answers
Step three	Ask the twelve prompts on page 7. Paste each answer into your sheet	You need the wording, not your memory of it
Step four	Score every answer from 0 to 2 on four things	Turns a feeling into a number you can track
Step five	Open every source the assistant cites and note what it says	This is where the fixes are
Step six	Repeat each prompt once more on another day	Answers vary between runs. Two runs beats one
Step seven	Rerun the whole test every quarter	Models and sources change. So will your score

How to score

Score	0	1	2
Mentioned	Not named	Named in passing	Named with detail
Recommended	Not recommended	Listed among options	Recommended with a reason
Accurate	Wrong or out of date	Mostly right	Right and current
Sourced	No source, or a poor one	A third-party source	Good third-party sources and your own site

PART TWO

The twelve prompts. Copy these.

Swap in your cause, your place and your name. Keep the wording plain. Ask one prompt per chat.

CAUSE-LED: HOW NEW DONORS FIND YOU

1. Which charities helping [cause] in the UK make the most difference?
2. What are the best [cause] charities to donate to in the UK?
3. I want to give £50 to help [cause]. Where should it go?

LOCAL: WHERE SMALLER CHARITIES GET NAMED

4. Which [cause] charities work in [town or region]?
5. Who is helping [group of people] in [place]?
6. Are there small local charities for [cause] near [place]?

COMPARISON: HOW YOU STACK UP

7. How does [your charity] compare with [similar charity]?
8. Is it better to give to a large or a small [cause] charity?
9. Which [cause] charities spend the most on their cause?

TRUST CHECK: WHAT A CAREFUL DONOR ASKS LAST

10. Is [your charity] a legitimate charity?
11. How does [your charity] spend its money?
12. What are the criticisms of [your charity]?

Four follow-ups worth asking

- "Where did you get that from?" Ask it whenever no source is shown.
- "What would make you recommend [your charity] more strongly?" The answer is often a list of missing evidence.
- "Who else should I consider?" Shows you who you are really competing with.
- "Is that figure current?" Catches out-of-date income, reach and leadership details.

> **Read prompt 12 before your trustees do.**

PRINT THIS PAGE

The scorecard

Score each answer out of 8: mentioned, recommended, accurate and sourced, 0 to 2 each. Write the total in the box. Circle anything that is plain wrong.

Prompt	ChatGPT	Gemini	Claude	Perplexity	Sources cited
1. Make the most difference					
2. Best to donate to					
3. Where should £50 go					
4. Work in [place]					
5. Helping [group] in [place]					
6. Small local charities					
7. Compare with [similar]					
8. Large or small					
9. Spend most on cause					
10. Legitimate?					
11. Spends its money					
12. Criticisms					
Total out of 96					

Reading your score

If you see this	It usually means	Go to
Low on prompts 1 to 3	Assistants cannot find evidence that links you to your cause	Page 11, writing facts that travel
Low on prompts 4 to 6	Your place and the people you help are not stated plainly anywhere	Page 10, your facts sheet
Low accuracy anywhere	A source is out of date or wrong	Page 9, the fix-it guide
No sources shown	The assistant is working from memory, which may be old	Ask "where did you get that from?"

Date of test: _____ Run by: _____ Cause and place used: _____

PART TWO

The fix-it guide

You found something wrong, missing or unflattering. Here is what to do about it, source by source.

Where the problem is	What to do	How long it takes
Your own website	Correct the fact. Add the date. Put the answer in the first two sentences of the page, then explain	Days
Regulator record	Update your details through your online account with the regulator. File anything overdue. Make the activities description match your site	Days to weeks
Wikipedia	Do not edit your own entry. Declare who you are on the article's talk page, state the error and give an independent source. Volunteers decide	Weeks, sometimes never
Old press coverage	You cannot remove it. Publish a clear, dated statement of what changed, and give journalists newer facts to report	Months
Partner and funder sites	Send them two sentences about you and ask them to use those. Most will, gratefully	Weeks
Community threads	Do not argue in the thread. If the complaint is fair, fix the cause and say so on your own site	Ongoing
No source at all	The assistant is relying on what it learned in training. Publish the correct fact in several trusted places and retest next quarter	A quarter or more

When the criticism is fair

Sometimes the assistant is not wrong. It has found a real complaint, an old controversy or a number you would rather not discuss. Hiding it does not work, because you do not control the source.

- Say what happened, plainly, on your own site.
- Say what you changed, with a date.
- Publish the evidence that it worked.

> **An assistant with one old complaint and no reply will repeat the complaint. Give it the reply.**

FILL THIS IN

Ten facts AI should get right about you

Write each answer in one plain sentence, with a date where it applies. Then check that your website, your regulator record and your partners all say the same thing. Consistency is what makes a fact trustworthy to a machine.

The fact	Your one-sentence answer	Same everywhere?
1. Registered name and charity number		
2. What we do, in one sentence		
3. Who we help		
4. Where we work		
5. How many people we helped last year, and the year		
6. Our income last year		
7. How much of each £1 goes on our cause		
8. Who leads us (chief executive and chair)		
9. The best independent evidence that our work works		
10. How to donate, and the page to send people to		

Tip: put these ten facts on one page of your website, titled plainly ("About us: key facts"). It is the single most useful page you can give an AI assistant, a journalist or a trustee.

BEFORE AND AFTER

Writing facts that travel

An assistant can only repeat what it can lift cleanly. Compare these. The examples are invented, for an imaginary homelessness charity, to show the shape.

INSTEAD OF	TRY
~~We support vulnerable people across the region.~~	We run three night shelters in Leeds for people sleeping rough. In 2025 we provided 9,400 bed nights.
~~We are committed to transparency.~~	In 2025, 84p of every £1 went on our services. Our accounts are on the Charity Commission register.
~~Our programmes have a real impact.~~	An independent evaluation in 2025 found two thirds of our clients were still housed a year later.
~~Donate today to make a difference.~~	£25 pays for one night in a shelter, a hot meal and a session with a support worker.
~~We have a long and proud history.~~	Founded in 1998. Registered charity. 42 staff and 180 volunteers.

The four rules

- **Name the place and the people.** A town and a group beats "communities".
- **Put a number and a year on it.** Undated figures age badly and get ignored.
- **Say where the proof is.** An evaluation, your accounts, a regulator record.
- **Lead with the answer.** First sentence states it. The story comes after.

> Only publish numbers you can stand behind. An assistant will repeat your figure for years.

PART THREE

For trustees and leaders

One page to hand to your chief executive or your board. No acronyms were harmed in its making.

What is happening

People are starting to ask AI assistants which charities to support. The assistant answers with a short list and reasons, drawn mainly from public sources such as the regulator's register, reference sites, the press and our own website. Few donors do this yet. Many more will.

Why it is a board matter

Lens	What to know
Reputation	An assistant may describe us inaccurately, or repeat old criticism, to anyone who asks. We can check this in an afternoon
Income	Fewer people are giving: 55% of UK adults in 2025, down from 69% in 2016 (CAF). We cannot afford to be missing from any route donors use
Cost	Mostly staff time. The fixes are accurate records, clear facts and published evidence, which we should have anyway
Governance	Late filings and out-of-date trustee details are public, and now easier than ever to find
Risk of waiting	The public sources that shape AI answers take months to change. Starting later costs more

What to ask your team

- Have we run the Shortlist Test, and what was our score?
- What did the assistants get wrong about us, and where did they get it from?
- Are our regulator filings on time and our public description current?
- Do we publish our impact with numbers and dates?
- Who owns this, and when do we retest?

What not to do

Do not fund a separate "AI project". This is part of how the charity is found and trusted, alongside search and the website. Do not expect a traffic spike either. The measure of success is being described accurately and recommended fairly, not clicks.

WHAT TO DO, IN ORDER

Your action plan

This week

- [ ] Run the Shortlist Test
- [ ] Check your regulator entry and filings
- [ ] Fix wrong facts on your own site
- [ ] Tell your chief executive what you found

This month

- [ ] Publish a "key facts" page
- [ ] Add a plain "How we spend your money" page
- [ ] Rewrite your About page opening
- [ ] Add FAQs that answer prompts 10 to 12
- [ ] List every wrong third-party source

This quarter

- [ ] Publish dated impact evidence
- [ ] Correct third-party errors at source
- [ ] Brief partners with two agreed sentences
- [ ] Plan press around quotable facts
- [ ] Retest and compare scores

Cheat sheet

Remember	Because
Donors ask about causes, not brands	Your name is not the search term. Your cause and place are
Mentioned is not recommended	Evidence gets you recommended. Fame gets you named
Follow the sources	Every citation is something you can check or correct
Specific, dated, plain	That is the only kind of fact an assistant can reuse
Same everywhere	Conflicting facts make every version less trusted
Retest quarterly	Models and sources change without telling you
Early is cheap	The inputs are slow. Use is growing

SEO, AEO and GEO are one job: be findable, be quotable, be accurately described. Do not buy them separately.

WHERE THE NUMBERS COME FROM

Sources

- Ofcom, Adults' Media Use and Attitudes 2026 (April 2026). 54% of UK adults use AI tools. ofcom.org.uk
- Ofcom, Online Nation 2025 (December 2025). 1.8 billion UK visits to ChatGPT in the first eight months of 2025. ofcom.org.uk
- Blue State, Brand Discovery in the Age of AI (2025, US), as reported by Blue State and Candid. 4.5% of donors use AI chatbots to research causes. bluestate.co, candid.org
- Give.org Donor Trust Report 2026 (US, December 2025 survey). 7% of donors say AI summaries meaningfully influence giving. give.org
- nfpResearch, Are AI tools recommending your charity? (October 2026). Pilot benchmark of UK overseas aid charities. nfpresearch.com
- Stanford Social Innovation Review, The New Nonprofit Visibility Gap (October 2026). Giving Compass pilot on Charity Navigator. ssir.org
- Whole Whale, Charity AI Brand Footprint Study (2025, US). wholewhale.com
- CAF, UK Giving Report 2026 (March 2026). 55% of UK adults gave in 2025, down from 69% in 2016. cafonline.org
- Semrush, UK search results snapshot for "best charities to donate to UK" (November 2026). Seventh Element analysis.
- Seventh Element GA4 analysis of UK charity websites we manage, anonymised, June to October 2026. A small sample: an observation, not a benchmark.

About this kit

Written by Ash, Agency Director at Seventh Element, who oversees marketing for all of the agency's charity clients. Several of the studies cited are from the US, or are pilots from firms that sell related services. We have said so where it applies.

The worked examples on page 11 are invented to show the format. They do not describe a real charity.

Full disclosure: Seventh Element is a charity SEO agency. We sell the work this kit describes. You can do most of it yourself, which is rather the point of the kit.

Last updated 13 November 2026. Assistants, sources and regulator processes change. Check anything time-sensitive before you rely on it.

SEVENTHELEMENT

Want a second pair of eyes on your shortlist?

We can run the Shortlist Test with your team, trace every answer back to its source, and build the fix list into one SEO, AEO and GEO programme.

seventhelement.agency/contact

Read the full article in the Fuel Room: seventhelement.agency/fuel-room