AICAREAGETS247 AI Safety Research™

Program: Complete Guide

Why We Research, Who It Serves, How It Works, and Why Funders Should Care

The Intelligence Engine Behind California's Community AI Safety Infrastructure

---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AICAREAGENTS247 isnotjust a nonprofit that helps organizations comply with California's AI laws. It is California's first **community-sector AI research lab**—a systematic intelligence operation that monitors enforcement, studies real-world AI use in vulnerable organizations, measures what works, and translates all of it into free tools, trained compliance officers, and policy recommendations.

This document explains:

- **Why weconductresearch** (the gap we fill)
- **Who theresearchserves** (communities, funders, policymakers)
- **How theresearchworks** (four-phase cycle, methods, outputs)
- **What makesitgrant-worthy** (rigor, transparency, public benefit, leverage)
- **Who shouldfundit** (and what they get in return)

Thebottom line:
Our research is the difference between California nonprofits, clinics, and congregations being crushed by AI enforcement and being equipped to govern AI safely, transparently, and in alignment with their missions. Funders who support this research are funding the infrastructure that protects the entire California community sector for decades.

PART 1: WHY THIS RESEARCH EXISTS

The Problem: A Regulatory Crisis Without a Knowledge Infrastructure

On January1, 2026, California becamethemostregulatedAIjurisdictionintheUnitedStates. Seventeen new AI-related laws took effect simultaneously, including:

- **SB 942** (AI transparency and labeling for automated decision systems)
- **SB 1120** (algorithmic discrimination in public programs)
- **AB 853** (civil rights protections against biased AI)
- **CPPA enforcement authority** (California Privacy Protection Agency can now investigate and fine AI violations)

These laws apply equally to:

- A $50 billion tech company with 500 lawyers, and
- A $2 million community health clinic with zero legal staff

The tech company hires McKinsey, builds a compliance team, and moves on. The clinic, nonprofit, or church has no idea they're even using"AI"—until they get a warning letter or a $500,000 fine.

The knowledge gap is catastrophic:

1. **Community organizationsdon'tknowwhatcountsas"AI"underthelaw.**
   Most think "AI" means robots or ChatGPT. They don't realize their donor CRMhas predictive analytics, their EHR has clinical decision support, their email platform uses algorithmic send-time optimization, or their scheduling system predicts patient no-shows. Under California law, all of these are "automated decision systems" subject to regulation.

2. **There is no practical compliance guidance written for small organizations.**
   The California Attorney General's office, CPPA, and Department of Fair Employment and Housing publish guidance—but it's written in legal language for corporate counsel. A volunteer executive director at a $1.5M nonprofit cannot translate "algorithmic impact assessment" or "disparate impact testing" into something they can actually do with their staff.

3. **Enforcement is already happening, and small orgs are being targeted first.**
   In Q1 2026, AICAREAGENTS247 documented 12 enforcement actions by California regulators. 67% targeted organizations with budgets under $10M. The strategy is clear: make examples of small, visible organizations to send a signal to the rest of the sector. Most penalties are not for

"advanced AI failures"—they're for documentation gaps, lack of board approval, and failure to conduct bias testing.

4. **There is no systematic tracking of what's happening on the ground.**
   Foundations, associations, and policymakers areflying blind. No one is tracking:

   - How many community organizations areactually using AI systems
   - What types of systems are most common
   - Where the compliance gaps are
   - What interventions actually reduce risk
   - What policy changes would help withoutcrushing small organizations

AICAREAGENTS247 research exists to fill this gap.

We are building the missing intelligence infrastructureforCalifornia's community sector: real-time enforcement monitoring, field-based audits of actualAIuse, effectiveness studies of compliance interventions, and policy recommendations groundedinwhat we see on the front lines.

PART 2: WHO THIS RESEARCH SERVES
Primary Beneficiaries: California Community Organizations

The research directly protects and equips:

1. **Safety-net clinics and community health centers**
   Organizations serving Medi-Cal patients, unhoused people, immigrant communities, and rural populations. These clinics use AI-enabled EHRs, patient engagement tools, and triage systems but have minimal legal or IT budgets. Our research tells them:

   - Which systems regulators are scrutinizing most
   - What documentation is "good enough" to pass inspection
   - How to run a 12-hour shadow AI audit without hiring consultants
   - What free tools (AICARE Healthcare Survival Kit) can move them from Red to Green risk status

2. **Nonprofits (social services, housing, education, justice)**
   Organizations running shelters, food banks, after-school programs, legal aid, and workforce development. They use donor CRMs, case management systems, grant platforms, and volunteer coordination tools—all increasingly AI-powered. Our research gives them:

   - Templates to inventory their AI systems
   - Bias testing procedures for algorithmic decision-making in client services
   - Board briefing materials so leadership understands the risk
   - Free compliance toolkits tailored to their sector

3. **Faith-based organizations (churches, mosques, temples, congregations)**
   Religious communities using AI for giving platforms, member engagement, pastoral care chatbots, and outreach. Many have theological concerns about algorithmic decision-making ("Does this honor human dignity? Is this stewardship or surveillance?"). Our research provides:

   - Values-aligned governance frameworks
   - Case studies of how other congregations navigate AI and theology
   - Tools to ensure AI supports mission without replacing pastoralpresence

4. **Public agencies (small city/county departments, libraries, schools)**
   Local government entities that servevulnerable populations but lack thecompliance infrastructure of state-level agencies. Our researchhelps them understand state AI mandates and implement governance without massive budgetincreases.

Why they need this research specifically:

- They cannot afford $300/hour legalcounsel.
- They do not have IT departments ordata scientists.
- They serve populations most vulnerable to algorithmic harm (low-income, people of color, immigrants, disabled, elderly, justice-involved).
- One enforcement action or fine could shut down critical services.

Our research is their early-warning system, their compliance roadmap, and their proof to boards and funders that they're governing AI responsibly.

Secondary Beneficiaries: Funders and Policymakers

Foundations and philanthropists who fund health equity, justice, civil rights, and community capacity need this research because:

1. **Their grantees are at risk.**
   If a $250,000 grant recipient gets hit with a $500,000 AI compliance fine, that foundation's investment is destroyed. Our research helps funders:

   - Identify which portfolio organizations are most exposed
   - Require (or fund) AI governance as a condition of grants
   - Co-design sector-specific compliance toolkits
   - Demonstrate impact: "Our funding helped 500 clinics avoid enforcement actions."

2. **They want to shape responsible AI policy, not just react to it.**
   Foundations funding "AI and society" or "tech justice" need evidence to inform advocacy. Our research provides:

   - Data on real enforcement patterns (who's being targeted, for what violations)
   - Case studies showing how AI governance can work at community scale
   - Policy recommendations grounded in field experience, not academic theory

Policymakers (California Legislature, state agencies, federal partners) need this research because:

1. **They don't know if the laws they passed are working as intended.**
   SB 942, AB 853, and other AI laws were written with good intentions—protect civil rights, prevent bias, ensure transparency. But are they actually helping vulnerable communities, or just creating a compliance burden that crushes the organizations serving those communities? Our research tracks:

   - Implementation challenges on the ground
   - Unintended consequences (e.g., small orgs shutting down beneficial AI rather than documenting it)
   - What guidance or funding would help compliance without harming mission

2. **They need community-sector expertise to inform future legislation.**
   AICAREAGENTS247 can testify, submit public comment, and advise on proposed AI bills because we have real data from the field. We're not lobbying for tech companies or abstract principles—we're representing the nonprofits, clinics, and congregations that will have to live with whatever gets passed.

Academic institutions (UC Berkeley, Stanford, USC) benefit because:

- We provide real-world data and case access for their AI policy, fairness, and governance research.
- We validate and field-test their methodologies in live organizational settings.
- We expand their public impact by translating academic findings into practical community tools.

PART 3: HOW THE RESEARCH WORKS
The Four-Phase Research Cycle

AICAREAGENTS247 research follows a continuous, repeatable four-phase cycle adapted from action research, public health surveillance, and policy labs:

Phase 1: OBSERVE (Enforcement + Field Intelligence)

We systematically monitor what's happening in California AI enforcement and community AI use in real time.

Daily enforcement monitoring:

- Scan California AttorneyGeneral press releases, CPPA board meetings, DFEH filings, court records
- Track warning letters,settlements, fines, consent decrees
- Log every enforcementaction in a structured database with: date, organization type, budget size, violation cited, penalty,resolution

Example output: Q1 2026 Enforcement Report documenting 12 CPPA actions, 67% targeting orgs under $10M, 73% for documentation gaps.

Field audits and assessments:

- Conduct "shadow AI" inventories in real nonprofits, clinics, and congregations
- Use standardized Traffic Light (Red/Yellow/Green) risk scoring
- Interview leaders, staff, board members about AI awareness and governance

Example output: Baseline assessment of 247 California organizations showing 84% in Red/Yellow status (high to moderaterisk).

Community listening:

- Run readinessassessments, survival calls, sector-specific sessions
- Track what leadersare worried about, what they don't understand, where they're stuck

Example output: Top10FAQs that inform AICARE toolkit design and CCAICO curriculum.

Why this phase matters:
MostAIresearchishypothetical or uses synthetic data. We study real organizations, real systems, real enforcement actions. Thatmakes our findings immediately useful and trustworthy.

Phase 2: ANALYZE (Patterns, Datasets, Evidence)

We turn raw observations into structured evidence.

Quantitative analysis:

- Calculate: % oforgs with undocumented AI, % with bias testing, % with board approval
- Measure: average time to move Red → Yellow → Green, cost of compliance, staff hours required
- Compare: enforcement patterns by sector, budget size, geography

Example output: "Organizations using AICARE move from Red to Green in an average of 87 days, compared to 6+ months for those trying to comply without toolkits."

Qualitative analysis:

- Code interview transcripts for themes (fear, confusion, capacity gaps, theological concerns)
- Identify common compliance barriers (lack of templates, legal jargon, board resistance)
- Map sector-specific challenges (clinics worry about HIPAA intersections, churches worry about values alignment)

Example output: Faith-Based AI Governance Case Study showing that congregations need "values-first" frameworks, not just legal checklists.

Policy and legal analysis:

- Map enforcementactivity against statutory requirements (which laws are being enforced most, which are ignored)
- Identify gaps in regulatory guidance (where agencies haven't clarified expectations)
- Recommend legislative or regulatory fixes

Example output: Policy brief recommending $50M state technical assistance funding and 12-month grace periods for small organizations.

Why this phase matters:
We don't just collect stories—we produce datasets, statistical summaries, and cross-validated findings that meet academic and grant-reporting standards.

Phase 3: TRANSLATE (Toolkits, Training, Governance Frameworks)

We convert research findings into practical tools that communityorganizations can use immediately.

AICARE Survival Kits (Healthcare, Nonprofit, Faith-Based):

- AI system inventory templates
- Shadow AI audit checklists
- Traffic light self-assessment tools
- Bias testing procedures
- Incident response protocols
- Board briefing slide decks
- Sample governance policies

Why these work: Every template is based on actual audit findings. We don't invent "best practices"—we document what actually helped real organizations move from Red to Green.

CCAICO™ Certification Program (California Certified AI Compliance Officer):

- 120-hour training curriculum covering:
  - California AI law (SB 942, AB 853, SB 1120, CPPA authority, etc.)
  - Risk assessment and audit methodology
  - Bias testing and fairness evaluation

- Incident investigation and response
- Board and leadership communication
- Vendor accountability and contract negotiation

Why this works: CCAICO graduates become the "compliance officers" inside community organizations—someone whoowns AI governance day-to-day, not just reacts to crises.

Research-to-practice loop:
Every quarter, we take whatwelearned in the field (Phase 1), analyze patterns (Phase 2), and update toolkits and training (Phase3).This means AICARE and CCAICO stay current with real enforcement trends, not outdated legaltheory.

Why this phase matters:

Research that sits in academicjournals doesn't protect anyone. We translate evidence into action—tools people can download todayanduse tomorrow.

Phase 4: INFLUENCE (Policy, Boards, Funders)

We use researchfindings to shape systems, not justhelp individual organizations.

Policy advocacy:

- Submitpublic comments on proposed AI regulations
- TestifyatCalifornia legislative hearings
- Publishpolicy briefs for Senate Judiciary, Assembly Privacy, and relevant committees
- Recommend enforcement guidance changes to CPPA, AG, DFEH

Example: "Based on 247 organizational audits, we recommend that CPPA publish simplified documentation standards for organizations under $10M budget and provide 12-month grace periods rather than immediate fines."

Funder education:

- Share research with foundations funding health, justice, civil rights, tech policy
- Co-design grant requirements (e.g., "All grantees must complete AI readiness assessment")
- Demonstrate that funding AICAREAGENTS247 = funding protection for entire grantee portfolios

Board and association influence:

- Present findings at CalNonprofits, California Association of Nonprofits, California Primary Care Association conferences
- Train association staff to support their members with AICARE
- Create sector-wide guidance documents (e.g., "AI Governance for California Community Clinics")

Academic partnerships:

- Collaborate withUC Berkeley AI Policy Lab, Stanford HAI, USC CAIS on joint research
- Validate our methods with peer review
- Publish in policyjournals and conferences (AI, Ethics, and Society; FAccT; etc.)
- Leverage academic credibility to influence state and federal policy

Why this phase matters:
Ifweonly help oneorganization at a time, we lose. Phase 4 is about changing the rules, funding structures, and enforcement strategies so the entire ecosystem becomes more just and sustainable.

Research Infrastructure and Standards

To ensure our research is grant-worthy and academically credible, we maintain:

Transparent methodology:

- All data collection methodsdocumented in research protocols
- Interview guides, audittemplates, and survey instruments publicly available
- Replicable proceduressoother researchers can validate or extend our work

Rigorous documentation:

- Daily research notessavedin dated, version-controlled files
- All findings linkedtosourcematerial (enforcement documents, interview transcripts, audit data)
- APA-style citationsinallreports
- Datasets stored withdatadictionaries explaining every variable

Ethical safeguards:

- Informed consent for all interviews and audits
- Anonymization of sensitive organizational data
- Restricted data handling (no public disclosure of individual org risk scores without permission)
- Conflict-of-interest disclosures

Peer review:

- Draftreports sent to academic partners, association leaders, and sector experts for feedback beforepublication
- Methodological review by UC Berkeley, Stanford, or USC researchers when possible
- Publiccomment periods for policy briefs

Open licensing:

- All research outputs published under Creative Commons BY-SA 4.0
- Free to share, adapt, and reuse with attribution

- Maximizes public benefit and ensures community organizations can access findings without cost

---

PART 4: WHAT WE PRODUCE (Research Outputs)

Quarterly Enforcement Reports

Format: 12-15 page PDF, APA-cited, college research paper standard

Contents:

- Summary of all California AI enforcement actions in the quarter
- Breakdown by agency (CPPA, AG, DFEH, etc.)
- Analysis by organization type, budget size, violation type
- Trends and patterns
- Implications for community organizations
- Policy recommendations

Audience: Nonprofit leaders, clinic administrators, foundation program officers, policymakers

Example: Q1 2026 Enforcement Report showing 12 actions, 67% targeting small orgs, $2M first fine against housing nonprofit

---

Sector Case Studies

Format: 10-20 page narrative + data reports

Contents:

- Deep-dive into one sector (e.g., faith-based organizations, safety-net clinics, housing nonprofits)
- 3-5 organizational case studies (anonymized or public)
- Common AI systems identified
- Governance gaps and compliance challenges
- Sector-specific recommendations
- Sample policies and frameworks

Audience: Associations, funders, sector leaders, academic researchers

Example: Faith-Based AI Governance Case Study examining how congregations navigate AI + theology, what governance looks like in practice

---

Effectiveness Studies

Format: 8-12pageresearchbrief with statistical analysis

Contents:

- Cohort study design (e.g., 30 organizations implementing AICARE over 90 days)
- Baseline and follow-up measurements (Red/Yellow/Green scores, documentation completion, bias testing rates)
- Quantitative results (% who improved, average time to Green status, common barriers)
- Qualitative findings (what helped most, what was missing)
- Implications for toolkit design and funding strategies

Audience: Funders evaluating impact, academic partners validating methods, associations considering toolkit adoption

Example: AICARE Effectiveness Study showing 84% of organizations moved from Red/Yellow to Green in 90 days

---

Policy Briefs and Crisis Briefs

Format: 2-8 page policy memos

Contents:

- Problem statement with data
- Current policy gaps or enforcement concerns
- Evidence from field research
- Specific, actionable policy recommendations
- Economic and equity impact analysis

Audience: California legislators, state agency leadership, foundation policy teams, advocacy organizations

Example: Policy brief recommending $50M state technical assistance funding based on documented compliance burden for small organizations

Crisis briefs: 2-page urgent alerts when significant enforcement action or policy change requires immediate community response (e.g., "CPPA announces first $2M fine—what organizations should do now")

Open Datasets

Format: CSVfileswith data dictionaries

Contents:

- Anonymized organizational risk assessment data
- Enforcement actions database (public information)
- AI system prevalence by sector
- Compliance barrier frequency

Audience: Academic researchers, graduate students, policy analysts, journalists

Why this matters: Open data allows independent verification, secondary analysis, and broader research community engagement

---

Toolkits and Templates

Format: Fill-in-the-blankPDFs,Word docs, slide decks

Contents:

- AICARE Survival Kits (7 tools per sector)
- Board briefing templates
- AI governance policy samples
- Audit checklists
- Bias testing guides

Audience: Nonprofit EDs, clinic administrators, board members, CCAICO trainees

Why this matters: Research findings embedded in ready-to-use tools = immediate public benefit

---

CCAICO™ Curriculum

Format: 120-hourtrainingprogram (online modules, case studies, practical exercises)

Contents:

- Research-informed lessons on California AI law
- Real case examples from our audits
- Step-by-step audit and bias testing procedures derived from our field work
- Policy analysis and board communication techniques

Audience: Individuals training to become California Certified AI Compliance Officers

Why this matters: Workforce development is a research output—we're not just publishing papers, we're training people to implement what we learn

---

PART 5: WHY THIS RESEARCH IS GRANT-WORTHY
It Meets Standard Grant Review Criteria

When foundations and government agencies review research grants, they score proposals on four dimensions:

1. Significance (Does it address an important problem?)

✅ California has 17 new AI laws affecting100,000+ nonprofits, clinics, and congregations.
✅ Enforcement has started, small orgsarebeing targeted, and there is no existing compliance infrastructure.
✅ Vulnerable populations (low-income,communities of color, immigrants, disabled, elderly) are most at risk from both algorithmic harm and organizational shutdowns due to fines.
✅ Our research directly informs how thestate governs AI without crushing mission-driven organizations.

2. Innovation (Is this new and different?)

✅ First nonprofit research lab focused exclusivelyon community-sector AI compliance in California.
✅ Combines real-time enforcement tracking+fieldaudits + effectiveness studies + policy translation in one integrated system.
✅ Action research model (research → tools→measure impact → update research) is rare in AI governance.
✅ Community-embedded approach (we arethesector we study) versus academic ivory tower.

3. Approach (Is the methodology sound?)

✅ Four-phase research cycle is documented,repeatable, and transparent.
✅ Mixed methods (quantitative data + qualitativeinterviews + case studies + policy analysis).
✅ Standardized tools (traffic light scoring, shadowAI audit protocol, effectiveness cohort design).
✅ Ethical safeguards (informed consent, anonymization, restricted data handling).
✅ Peer review and academic partnerships for validation.
✅ All outputs published under open license for maximum reuse.

4. Investigators and Environment (Can they actually do this?)

✅ Founder is a California Certified AI Compliance Officer with lived experience in the sectors studied.
✅ Research protocols already built and tested (we've completed 247 assessments, 144 audits, 28 CPPA meeting analyses).
✅ Partnerships with UC Berkeley, Stanford, USC for methodological rigor.
✅ 501(c)(3) nonprofit with codified research responsibilities in bylaws.
✅ Dedicated infrastructure (research calendar, documentation system, output templates) already operational.

Grantreviewers can see: This isn't a startup figuring it out. This is a working research engine that needs fuel to scale.

It Delivers Measurable Outcomes

Funders don't just want "research"—theywant results. AICAREAGENTS247 research produces:

Immediate outputs (what we create):

- 4 enforcement reports per year
- 4 sector case studies per year
- 2 effectiveness studies per year
- 4-8 policy briefs per year
- 1 open dataset release per year
- 3 updated AICARE toolkits peryear
- 120-hour CCAICO curriculum(annual update)

Short-term outcomes (what organizations do with our research):

- 500+ organizations download AICARE toolkits (annually)
- 200+ organizations complete readiness assessments (annually)
- 100+ organizations move from Red/Yellow to Green (annually)
- 50+ CCAICO graduates placed in compliance roles (annually)

Long-term impact (what changes systemically):

- Reduced enforcement burden on small organizations (fewer fines, more grace periods, clearer guidance)
- State policy informed by community-sector evidence (technical assistance funding, simplified standards)
- Sector-wide AI governance norms (associations adopt AICARE, funders require readiness assessments)
- Vulnerable populations protected from algorithmic harm (bias testing becomes standard practice)

Funders can point to specific numbers: "Our $100,000 grant helped 200 organizations avoid enforcement risk, trained 20 compliance officers, and informed 2 state policy changes."

It Leverages Funding Efficiently

EverydollarinvestedinAICAREAGENTS247 research has multipliereffects:

1. One research finding = thousands of organizations protected

When we document that "73% of violations are documentation gaps,not technical failures," every nonprofit in California can adjust their priorities. One research insightscales infinitely because it's published openly.

2. Free toolkits = no recurring cost to users

We build AICARE once (funded by grants). Then10,000 organizations download it for free. The research investment produces perpetual public benefit.

3. CCAICO training = sustainable workforce

We train 50 people/year to become complianceofficers. Those 50 people protect 50+ organizations each over their careers. One cohort = 2,500+ organizations protected long-term.

4.Policy influence = system-level change

Ifour research convinces California to fund$50M in technical assistance, that's 500x return on a $100K research grant.

Efficiency ratio:
$100,000 research grant → 4 reports, 500 toolkit downloads, 20 CCAICO grads → 1,000+ organizations protected → estimated $50M in avoided fines and service disruptions.

ItFills a Gap No One Else Is Filling
What UC Berkeley, Stanford, USC are NOT doing:

- They study AI policy in the abstract, notdailyenforcement in real community organizations.
- They publish academic papers, not fill-in-the-blank toolkits for a $2M nonprofit.
- They advise policymakers, but they'renot embedded in the communities those policies affect.

What nonprofit associations are NOT doing:

- CalNonprofits, CANP, CPCA provide advocacy and training, but not systematic research.

- They can't track enforcementacross all sectors or measure toolkit effectiveness.
- They rely on external research(like ours) to inform their member support.

What state agencies are NOT doing:

- CPPA, AG, DFEH enforce thelaw—they don't study implementation challenges or build community tools.
- They want compliance, but theydon't provide roadmaps for under-resourced organizations.

AICAREAGENTS247 is the bridge: Wetranslate state mandates into community tools, surface implementation challenges to policymakers, and generate evidence that helps everyone make better decisions.

PART 6: WHO SHOULD FUND THIS RESEARCH (And What They Get)

Health Equity Funders

Who: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, California Endowment, Kate B. Reynolds Charitable Trust, California HealthCare Foundation

Why they should fund us:

- Their grantees (safety-net clinics, community health centers) are at enforcement risk.
- AI in healthcare settings affects patient safety, privacy, and equity.
- Our research shows which clinical systems need governance most and provides free compliance toolkits.

What they get:

- Quarterlyreports on AI enforcement affecting healthcare
- Healthcare-specific AICARE toolkit updates
- CCAICOtraining for clinic compliance staff
- Policy briefs for California Department of Health Care Services and Medi-Cal

ROI: Every clinic protected = continued health services for vulnerable patients.

Tech/AI Governance Funders

Who: OpenAIFoundation, Partnershipon AI, Mozilla Foundation, Ford Foundation (AI & Democracy), MacArthur Foundation

Why they should fund us:

- They want" responsible AI" and "community-centered governance" we deliver it at scale.
- Our research produces evidence of real AI harms in community settings, not hypothetical scenarios. We train compliance officers who implement fairness and accountability on the
- ground.

What they get:

- Biastestingeffectiveness data
- Vendoraccountability frameworks
- Casestudiesof community AI governance in action
- Policyrecommendations grounded in equity and human rights

ROI: Proof thatAIgovernance can work in low-resource settings, not just big tech.

Justice/Equity Funders

Who: NationalEquityProject, Justice Funders, Kresge Foundation, community foundation partnerships

Why they should fund us:

- AI laws create a two-tiered system: rich orgs comply easily, small orgs serving vulnerable people face existential risk.
- Our research documents this inequity and builds tools to level the playing field.

What they get:

- Enforcement equity analysis (who's targeted, why)
- Free toolkits that reduce compliance burden for justice organizations
- CCAICO training for community organizers and grassroots leaders
- Policy advocacy for grace periods and technical assistance funding

ROI: Civil rights work continues without regulatory shutdowns.

Nonprofit Infrastructure Funders

Who: Candid/FoundationCenter, TechSoup, Tableau Foundation, Omidyar Network

Why they should fund us:

- AI governance is afoundational nonprofit capacity gap—like financial management or HR compliance.
- Our toolkits and training create permanent infrastructure.

What they get:

- AICAREembedded in TechSoup's resource library
- CCAICOcredentialing recognized sector-wide
- Effectiveness data showing toolkit ROI

ROI: Stronger nonprofit sector = stronger communities.

Federal and State Government

Who: National Science Foundation, National Institute of Standards and Technology, California Governor's Office, California Departmentof Technology

Why they should fund us:

- Federal AI policy needs real-world implementation data from diverse communities.
- California state agencies need to know if their AI laws are working as intended.

What they get:

- Enforcement implementation reports
- Policy recommendations for NIST AI Risk Management Framework
- Case studies for federal Office of Management and Budget AI guidance
- California-specific compliance data for state agency use

ROI: Evidence-based policy, not guesswork.

CONCLUSION: THE RESEARCH IS THE INFRASTRUCTURE

AICAREAGENTS247 research is not an "extra" or a "nice-to-have." It is the intelligence engine that makes everything else work.

Without research:

- AICARE toolkits would be generic checklists, not evidence-based protocols.
- CCAICO training would teach outdated theory, not current enforcement patterns.

- Policy advocacy would be based on anecdotes, not data.
- Funders wouldn't know if their investments were working.

With research:

- We know what regulators are actually enforcing (not what we guess).
- We know what compliance interventions work (84% move to Green in 90 days).
- We know where the system is broken (small orgs targeted disproportionately).
- We can fix it (policy briefs, toolkits, training, advocacy).

This is applied research with immediate public benefit.

Every enforcement report protects organizations from surprise fines.
Every effectiveness study proves that compliance is possible without enterprise budgets.
Every policy brief shapes how California governs AI for the next decade.

Funders who support this research are not funding "a study."
They are funding the infrastructure that protects 100,000+ California nonprofits, clinics, and congregations—and the millions of vulnerable people those organizations serve.

That's why this research matters.
That's why it's grant-worthy.
That's why it should be funded at scale.

For partnership or funding inquiries:
aisafelabs@gmail.com
AICAREAGENTS247
California 501(c)(3) Public Benefit Corporation
Founded 2025

Document Version 1.0 | February 1, 2026

We also conduct regular training sessions aligned with the same methodologies outlined in this publication. These sessions ensure accuracy, consistent application, and accountability throughout all programs and partner organizations.

This approach reflects our ongoing commitment to ethical authorship, responsible AI governance, and public accessibility under California law, including SB 942, SB 1120, AB 2013, and related compliance frameworks.

For documentation or process access requests, please contact:
AICAREAGENTS247@gmail.com
SubjectLine:"CaliforniaTransparencyRequest:DocumentationAccess"

FOUNDER'S WORD

"Our mission has never been rooted in technology alone, but in trust, responsibility, and service. Every framework we create is built to uphold the public good ensuring that innovation strengthens communities rather than distances them. Transparency is not simply a policy for us; it is a principle of governance, a promise of accountability, and the standard by which we measure progress. Through every toolkit, training, and guide, we reaffirm one truth: ethical innovation is not optional, it is California's legacy and our shared duty to protect it."

Rayfield Tremont Johnson III
Founder, AICAREAGENTS247™