



Kerrin Mitchell:

Welcome to the Untapped Philanthropy podcast.

Tim Sarrantonio:

We're your hosts, Fluxx's Co-founder Kerrin Mitchell and Neon One's Tim Sarrantonio. We've spent our career learning how to leverage technology and data in the social sector to better connect and serve our collective causes, constituents and communities.

Kerrin Mitchell:

In this podcast series, we profile leaders, public figures, philanthropists, and industry experts to explore the fascinating intersection of funding, technology, and policy. We're here to analyze the most formative topics and trends that shape the present and future of philanthropy.

Tim Sarrantonio:

Today on Untapped Philanthropy, we have Nathan Chappell to help delve into some trends, nuances, and potentially controversial topics that explore the intersection of donor targeting and matching change makers to funders. Nathan is the co-founder of Fundraising.AI, Senior Vice President at Donor Search AI, and a member of the Forbes Technology Council. In fact, he's considered by many, including myself, to be a foremost expert on the intersection of our artificial intelligence and philanthropy, and he's also a very good friend of mine. And all this means is that he concentrates his time and passion on using data analytics and artificial intelligence to improve fundraising tactics and donor relations for nonprofits. As a thought leader, public speaker and award winning author of one of my favorite books as well, Nathan is one of the world's foremost experts on the intersection of AI and philanthropy. Nathan, welcome and thank you so much for joining us and Kerrin today.

Nathan Chappell:

So excited to be here. Thanks so much. I love the energy already.

Kerrin Mitchell:

That woo woo woo just gets you going.

Tim Sarrantonio:

I mean, we got to get into it, right? Because...

Kerrin Mitchell:

It's a Friday, so we got to bring a little Friday energy to it Nathan.

Tim Sarrantonio:

We have to have that Friday energy. But Nathan, I mean there's so many different directions that we can go with this topic and it's really going to be fun to unpack this. But how about for folks who don't know who you're, can you share a bit about your journey and actually how you got into the social good space, the nonprofit sector itself?

Nathan Chappell:



Yeah, no, happy to jump in there. I mean, I think a lot of people, the nonprofit social space finds you rather than you finding it. Looking back at your life, there are probably lots of different threads that led to certain career trajectories. But for me, it started with doing my first fundraiser when I was eight years old, I was a product of the Boys and Girls Club with a single mom household. So I would say the benefit of a lot of philanthropy and generosity throughout my life. Never intended to get into the space professionally. So I actually got my MBA and was planning to go work on Madison Avenue, and I happened to be serving on a board of directors and the director quit, and that was back in 2000. I spent what I thought would be a few months serving as a director of a Boys and Girls Club. I spent seven years and that just really took hold of me. And then found myself 20 years dedicating to fundraising, leading fundraising teams, all the way up through higher ed and large healthcare organizations. So my work in AI began as a result of that. Actually, I started working in AI in 2017 while at a cancer hospital and kind of the rest is history from there.

Kerrin Mitchell:

Was that kind of your aha moment on AI? I mean, it's interesting because 2017, in terms of the general public, many people think of Chat GPT as the first sort of introduction to the consumer base and the open and the openness if you will, of where it could fit into our day-to-day lives. But to your point, I mean this stuff's been going on since 2016, was Chat GPT and there were so many opportunities at that point. Where did your aha moment come in with AI in delivering that as a responsible thing to our industry?

Nathan Chappell:

Yeah, that's such a great question. My work in AI began almost entirely out of pure frustration. So prior to launching or to getting into the nonprofit sector, I started and sold two tech companies. So I was a really early adopter in optical storage, so like big data storage back when I was young and naive. Then launched the first company to sell skis on the internet in 1996-97. So I'd always had this kind of entrepreneurial, what's the private sector doing in the space? And I think raising money for 20 years, I got to a point where we built or bought a predictive model that was just horrible. We spent \$120,000 on it. It was an awful model, and it was one of those moments where literally my head did 360s and I was like, okay, enough is enough. It literally was a cry uncle like, we're not doing this anymore.

I'm getting off the crazy train. And I did what every good person does who doesn't know what they're doing is I bugged the crap out of every person I could find that knew anything about AI and spent a year and a half building our first machine learning model to essentially measure connection between people in the hospital. And that was an aha moment. I mean, it was looking at the private sector saying, they've gotten really good at doing this and how has Amazon already know what I want to buy before I know I want to buy it? And so really took a play out of the for-profit playbook, and it's been such an incredible journey to apply a lot of those best practice principles into the nonprofit sector.

Tim Sarrantonio:

Well, and you've been such a vocal advocate for the responsible usage of AI for the sector, and you've even touched on some of these things in your book, the Generosity Crisis. And there's so many different things that we're going to start to get hit with the Giving USA reports and Fundraising Effectiveness Project and all these other things, and there's just big, big issues. But one of the things that I found very interesting that you've even pushed me to think about is that responsibility isn't enough that we need to think bigger. And maybe we can also use this to help introduce the work around Fundraising AI for those



who aren't familiar with it. But I'd love for you to reflect on why is responsibility important but not enough when compared to the for-profit sector?

Nathan Chappell:

Well, I think also the why of why we're even talking about this and why we're even talking about a new approach. I mean, being a fundraiser and fundraising leader, I recount times where I talked with my team about literally the words which I hate to even repeat are build a better mousetrap. And we were constantly in this mode of building a better mousetrap because essentially what was happening is that charitable giving was changing. So to your point, Giving USA, FEP, I've been studying essentially trends and generosity since 2012, and I think not even knowing this, but my early work in AI in my initial drive to deploy AI to do something different was related to this idea that our sector is fundamentally changing and we can't do things the same way and expect a different result. And so that was really the original conclusion. It's like, look, innovation's not there in our sector.

And at the same time, the need for innovation has never been greater in our sector, so we're at this inflection point. I think almost immediately though when we pioneered this first machine learning model called Gratitude Prediction and Machine Learning, which got patented a couple years ago, and it was obsolete by the time the patent was awarded because the technology changes every 12 seconds. But really the premise and the idea and the birth of Fundraising AI came out of this idea that with great prediction comes great responsibility. And that while AI had tremendous power for good, it also could do a lot of harm to our sector. And the generosity crisis as we know it could be vastly accelerated in a negative way if we use AI in a way that diminishes trust.

Kerrin Mitchell:

Right, and how we sort of harness that to make that change can either make a greater impact, a greater harm. And I think that's the thing people, maybe it's something where they don't understand what the glimpse in the future, oftentimes they like the problem or they love the problem too much, and so they solve for the wrong thing. And I think the idea of what a community would look like if we fully accomplish our mission, it's almost like it's a rebranding of thinking differently. That mousetrap is kind of a great analogy. Like you said, even if it's an overused analogy is actually completely true because we keep using the mousetrap to solve the same problems that we seem to love that we won't let go of. I think it's at the detriment of the larger future of what we could look like.

Tim Sarrantonio:

And the part that's driving me nutty is how everything's been so reductive around generative language AI. And I think that's in some ways hurting the nonprofit specifics because in a sector on individual giving at least, and we can make an argument, Kerrin, I would say even on the grant side for narratives, that it's very copy driven. And so automatically there's a host of consultants and individual practitioners that immediately are like, it is coming for my job because this is what I do. I write copy. So Nathan, how have you helped navigate that with folks who are just kind of freaking out and in a way that you don't do this, and I appreciate that you don't do this, that you don't frame it as the trains leaving the station get on or die. That's not the way to do that with folks who for a sector that's in all honesty, very tech adverse in some ways. So you've done a lot of conversations, a lot of presentations. What are you seeing is effective to kind of help win over some of these skeptics and get them to get started with this in a meaningful way that isn't reductive to just start using Chat GPT and that's the only thing that AI does?

Nathan Chappell:



Yeah, well, I mean it's such a good point and I think this is an ongoing journey. Starting out in what is considered probably the more technical side of AI. So predictive AI, machine learning, deep learning, getting a lot of my experience in AI there, realizing that that's just only one side of the coin. The reality is that you can have really good predictions on who's going to do something, but if you don't take action on it, it's not going to be that helpful. And then conversely, generative AI you can produce to your heart's content, but without prediction is just more. And so I think what it starts with is just a little bit of education and there's lots of different types of AI and it's kind of this ubiquitous term now, but I think it starts with a little bit of education on what it is, but also what it isn't.

And so while at the same time I think the economy will sort out those that do and those that don't, I mean the reality is the digital divide exists in lots of different contexts, and I do think that when you see a lot of these studies that will test AI, whether it's white collar workers or it's college students, it's almost always the same result is that it doesn't replace the individual, but the person who uses it performs their work better faster, but also with less burnout. I think talking through the ROI of AI, not in terms of money but of burnout and accuracy and giving you back time to be more human, it actually goes a lot further. I think a lot of the "AI" experts now, which is kind of insane for me because again, doing machine learning, deep learning for quite a longer when AI was not cool, it's amazing to see how many "AI" experts there are right now. But I think really getting to demystify what it's and isn't is a really good starting point. It becomes a lot less scary when you're thinking about, oh, this is going to give more time to spend human to human or this is going to improve my accuracy or be able to deliver better to my mission. All those are real positive things.

Kerrin Mitchell:

It's an interesting way because it calls to your point of the ROIs, it's about the modern workforce. It's about style, skills, assessment, burnout, helping to work through all those angles and where that sort of leveraging of whatever it's automation, whatever it is that you want to take on from AI, it does give you back, but you have to rebrand it in line with that this is something that exists now and how do we utilize it so you're not having to be a copywriter, but you can work on story and arc. A lot of it's about rebranding in some ways and thinking bigger than what you currently do because things can be taken over. I like so much of that, but I think the question that I oftentimes think of when you think about how good this AI could be, I mean part of it's about the inputs that go into it that make these things better, and I think there's a push and pull that our industry has around I want to be able to contribute things but not these things. And there's this sort of element of privacy and security that is then balanced with, but everyone needs to contribute to make it valuable. I mean, how do you recommend people sort of, I don't know, reconcile that? I know that's a really big question, but the framework or lens that you would bring to it that says, here's how and when to engage. Is there anything out there that you feel like from fundraising AI that makes sense?

Nathan Chappell:

For sure. I mean, I think it's been a really big learning curve. I mean, starting out in this kind of the idea going back to great prediction comes to great responsibility, you know that garbage in garbage out, especially in predictive AI is a little bit easier to see and explain why predictions are being made. If you can look at inherent bias, you know that your model's going to reflect bias, large language models a little harder because you don't have full transparency on the data sets that they were trained on. But I think what it does call, and I think the bigger question is was our responsible AI frameworks built for say, Microsoft, Google, and OpenAI? Are those acceptable or enough for the nonprofit sector? And I would argue no. I mean in a large part, if we say that our sector is uniquely different in that we exist to



preserve and protect trust, how can our framework look the same as an organization that's selling shoes or iPhones?

Kerrin Mitchell:

I absolutely agree with you.

Nathan Chappell:

So that was really the beginning of the work of really diving deep and investigating how different should our framework be. And it came to some pretty big revelations like the idea of trust but verify, which is I was speaking at a gen AI conference in Las Vegas yesterday, all private sector, I was the only nonprofit person representing the societal implications of AI gone wrong, and less than 5% of the people there have an AI governance policy. I had written by raise of hands, like 500 people there. I think I counted 15 people.

Tim Sarrantonio:

Sorry.

Nathan Chappell:

Right? I mean the frantic...

Kerrin Mitchell:

How do you really feel about that, Tim?

Tim Sarrantonio:

I guess this is why people listen to the podcast. So for the hot takes, but anyway, sorry, go on. I mean, it was in Vegas around the really cool sphere too, right?

Nathan Chappell:

It was. Yeah, I mean first class conference all the way, and I think you realized that the private sector on its own has financial incentives that will always dictate scale above safety. You can't pretend that they're not because if you are running a corporation that's going to be successful, scale will always trump safety because it's wherever you're putting the most dollars use. Well, the nonprofit sector can't do that instead of going from trust but verify. I really think it has to be the opposite in our sector that we have to verify then trust.

Kerrin Mitchell:

So in the idea of this AI analytics age, obviously there's groups like Fundraising AI, Donor Search that balance this need for both effective targeting and privacy concerns. And how do you recommend folks come forward with that, with either a framework or lens on how they approach this little black box?

Nathan Chappell:

Yeah, so I think it starts with the understanding and the agreement that there should not be a black box in the nonprofit sector. So again, if our sector is inherently different that we're in the business of trust and you can evaluate AI based on does this AI preserve and protect trust, it essentially almost dictates that there can't be a black box. And so all that to say is that while I think AI is an extremely important



tool and something that will provide tremendous amount of efficiency and gain for nonprofits in really big ways, that we have to take a really strategic and measured approach. At the same time, it's extremely overwhelming to most organizations to look at a thousand different frameworks out there from the US to the EU to every corporation that says they have their own framework for responsible AI. Well, getting into probably the next portion of this, we decided to really cut through a lot of that noise and provide some directional guidance, really doubling down on the area of transparency and explainability and not compromising on things like ethics and privacy and security.

Tim Sarrantonio:

Because there were so many different frameworks and discussions out there, and a lot of them didn't apply Nathan to the nonprofit sector explicitly. Where did the kernel of the idea of what eventually became Fundraising AI, as people can see on the website there, where did that initiative come from and where is it going as well? Because I think understanding that particular movement in particular will help with a lot of navigation for all these other frameworks too, because maybe I'm biased because I'm part of it, but I think it's leading the way and I would love to hear your story on that.

Nathan Chappell:

Yeah, I mean, thanks Tim. It's five, six years in the making at this point. Originally it started with just an idea of trying to get a few people together that we're also having sleepless nights about the future of the charitable giving sector based on, maybe in that time, probably more a bad application of AI. And started out with just a few people having these ongoing conversations. You and I collaborated on something back in many years ago on the AI readiness and the nonprofit sector, and that led to just a continuing conversation. And so back right before Covid actually, we were starting to get a little bit momentum. I think we're about that point, about 125 people that were raising their hand and saying, yeah, I'm interested in this and what can I contribute, to then Covid happening and frankly, nobody cared about responsible AI because we only cared about where to get our toilet paper.

Fast forward to November of 2022, Chat GPT comes out and you were there in the room where there was a palpable amount of angst around what does this mean for me and my career and my organization and my company. And so that's when we really got to work. And that 125 people now turned into 6,000 people in 38 countries. In large part, we had a hundred and something people contribute to the first framework for responsible AI for fundraising, which is not meant to be a gotcha thing. It's not meant to be a complete turnkey guide to everything you need to know about AI, but it's meant to provide direction to organizations both for profit, nonprofit that want to do good with AI, but they don't really know or haven't really had the time to investigate what those necessary elements of responsible AI mean. And if we get into where the next iteration is, it's really moving beyond responsible AI. I really feel firmly that our sector, we can't rest on only the responsible AI framework, which is largely based on ethics, that we have to wrestle with the tougher questions of things that are not only ethical, but also things that are beneficial for humanity. So it's been exciting to lead in that area and I think we're leading again with a new spin on this idea that we have to move beyond AI ethics in our sector and really evaluate things that are, I think tend to be the tougher questions.

Tim Sarrantonio:

Well, and I wanted to share a practical example for the audience on when we talk about a framework for AI, what does that mean in practice? Is that just a bunch of words on a website? No, and so what we did at Neon One, and I would not have been able to do this without the guidance of the Fundraising AI framework, was we just finished up a report on recurring donors. And one of the things that we wanted



to do was look at the emotional sentiment of the donor notes when they were submitted. And so the way that we approach that, and I wanted to share for people whether they're in the for-profit sector or the nonprofit sector, how can you start to even implement this? I use the custom Chat GPT ability and I loaded it in with the Fundraising AI framework and I said, you must follow this. This is how you need to do things. And then we just kind of started one, even before it hit Chat GPT, you had to go through the data. You had to make sure that it's even being something that is protecting privacy. We had to put in all those safeguards and our companies started to do this where we're not trying to rush things out. And I know that other companies out there, Fluxx, Donor Search included, they don't want to rush things out just a market.

Kerrin Mitchell:

We're not rush rushing Heck no. No way.

Tim Sarrantonio:

No, you don't want to just do it for market advantage. You want to do it where everything that I'm seeing that is disappointing me is just focused on let's help you write "meh" appeals. And I'm like, that's not where we should be going. So I wanted to show with this report, and it's in the methodology section, I explain how what we followed, why we followed it, it's important, but now you also have me thinking, Nathan, because I categorized it under ethical considerations, maybe I need to go back and even push it further. And that's the thing is that we're not going to get it right every time. We're going to have to evolve it. And that's built into the framework too. So I just want to share that practical example for people. It's not just product, that's the thing. This is technically a research and marketing content piece for people. It has to envelop everything in how you think about the sector.

Nathan Chappell:

I love that Neon was, I think the first for-profit example of an organization that came right after the framework was delivered, which took many months and frankly probably one of the hardest things ever done in my career. It was like 1700 emails back and forth over a period of three months to get that done.

Tim Sarrantonio:

And there was three individuals, it was probably half of those emails were just those three individuals.

Nathan Chappell:

Right. Neon coming back and said, this is probably going to cost us more money and this is going to be more cumbersome, but we feel like this is important. And since then I've had conversations with people that are working on their PhD and AI ethics that are using the framework. I talked to a nonprofit in Canada recently that they wanted to build an AI governance structure and use the framework. I mean, almost every day now I'll hear from someone who said there wasn't a lot out there and what was out there was super confusing. Thanks so much for doing this. I'm using it and adapting it for our organization and it's just, it's awesome. And to your point, it's meant to be iterative. That's why we have an advisory council of 40 people that meet at least every six months, but usually every three months to essentially look at changes and how the framework should adapt to what the current advances are in technology. So it has to be pretty fluid. It can't just be something that you've just put in a binder somewhere and left on a shelf. It's got to stay current because most reports will show that something like 80% of people are using AI within their jobs, but less than half of those have an AI governance, any



kind of governance usage policy or anything around that. So people are using it regardless. So we need to provide some positive direction on how to use it in a way that preserves and protects trust

Kerrin Mitchell:

And in a way that's in line with the values of whomever that organization is. And I think that's an interesting thing, and this is something Tim, I know you guys have talked a lot about, but this idea, I mean you did mention obviously Neon One, big community player, also a for-profit, but at the same point reflecting many of the values of their community and most of the values of their community. How do you take a look at that balance between the profit and for-profit as you're hearing this feedback from the 6,000 members, where do you see differences existing? Where do you see similarities or because we're all servicing a community, do you find that it's more in common than not?

Tim Sarrantonio:

Because you've had a funny phrase, I laugh at the phrase because you describe yourself as "proud capitalist", and I laugh every time because I understand why you're doing that, but that's part of the positioning too. So explain, I'd love to hear and kind of add on from that.

Nathan Chappell:

Of all the people I figure you'd pick up on that, and I don't know that I said the word proud capitalist, but definitely I'm a capitalist.

Tim Sarrantonio:

You said proud capitalist. You said proud at AWS, you said proud capitalist.

Nathan Chappell:

I'll take your word for it. The reality is I believe in the way capital markets work, in the sense that competition is good and that the end result is essentially buyers get more choices at a lower price. At the same time because of how the private sector operates and what incentivizes growth in a capitalistic market by nature can't prioritize trust. They're going to have to say that they are and they're a trustworthy organization, but they really can't do what I think is inherently possible of the nonprofit sector to do. Nonprofit sector doesn't have the same financial incentives to shareholders. So honestly, this is an area that I'm extremely bullish and optimistic on is the sense that the nonprofit sector can actually lead from a worldwide effort in what true, responsible and beneficial AI is. So again, beyond what our financial incentives are to truly looking at not just short-term gains, but long-term implications. I mean, social media is a great example. Social media is supposed to be the great level setter of community. We're all going to be like those people on the Coca-Cola commercial singing from the hilltop together from all nations. And social media has had in large part a very, some negative effects on humanity, short term lots of companies have done as well.

Kerrin Mitchell:

I think it's absolutely one of the most important innovations that was actually a net negative on the world.

Nathan Chappell:



Totally, totally. So we can think the nonprofit sector has to think beyond short-term gain and really think about long-term unintended consequences and long-term implications.

Kerrin Mitchell:

So the interesting part about that is our industry is unique. You're right, because we are poised well to do it because it is one of the places where I look at something like private and public sector, private being a lot of the technologies that are there, we do reflect a lot of the values that are already a part of our core market and the kind of change that we want to see in the world. So it's a really interesting, I guess, industry. I'm with you. I think we are uniquely situated because we are better aligned than most around what AI could and should be, which I think is just a really cool thing about us.

Tim Sarrantonio:

Well, so a question, and this is a curve both for both of you, but Nathan, you're the guest, so I'll throw it to you first.

Kerrin Mitchell:

So you get the extra curve ball.

Nathan Chappell:

Oh, great. Thanks so much.

Kerrin Mitchell:

I get this slow pitch softball after you've taken the curve ball.

Tim Sarrantonio:

There you go. But I'm going to tee it up in terms of terrible sports analogy. So is there a world where the major players and the foundational technology is not owned by a for private entity, that it's actually part of the commons? Because right now it's a corporate determinist, like the only way that this really happens is because of a corporation. Is there a potential?

Kerrin Mitchell:

And would you say because, because they're willing to make the investment or sorry, what do you think is the rate limiting step there, Tim?

Tim Sarrantonio:

Well, I mean, yeah, I think it's because of the access to the data, potentially the technology, the actual server infrastructure, things of that. Is there possibilities where I'm not even saying it's the government. What are the alternatives here? I guess Nathan, if there are any.

Nathan Chappell:

Yeah, I mean from a practical sense, there's not a lot of alternatives, right?

Tim Sarrantonio:

That's why I'm asking it because we can blue sky all we want, but what's the reality here too?



Nathan Chappell:

I think it's a multifaceted approach. I mean, in just pure compute, I mean take a billion dollars to essentially train a really large language model. And so that almost relegates itself to big tech with lots of data and high GPU capacity to be able to do that. But I think the nonprofit sector's role is really steering and educating both end users, developers, operationalizing people, operationalize and maintain models on the idea that responsible AI is not only the responsibility of those big tech people that are doing that. And so I think that's the biggest risk that keeps me up at night right now is that most people essentially delegate their sense of responsibility to Microsoft or Google or Amazon or whoever is saying that.

Kerrin Mitchell:

So as we get through all these examples, there's incredibly great practical applications, things we can learn from, obviously Fundraising AI, Donor Search, when someone's getting started and thinking about all this, where should we direct them? What are some of your recommendations for us?

Nathan Chappell:

Yeah, no, I appreciate that. And I usually tell people that I wear multiple hats. I mean by day I lead the AI team at Donor Search AI and extremely proud of the work that we do there where we build an operationalized, custom transparent machine learning models for amazing nonprofit organizations. So easy to find me. Probably the easiest way is LinkedIn, just Nathan Chappell, C-H-A-P-P-E-L-L. By nigh, it's really Fundraising AI. And I know Tim knows how much work I put into this alongside a lot of other people, and it's just an amazing resource that's completely grassroots and free for everyone. So Fundraising.AI couldn't be more simple. We're continuing to add to the resource library all the time. Glossary of terms to the framework for responsible AI. We have 54 hours of video content that people can go and watch and learn about almost any aspect of this. So yeah, I think that's all great, and I love connecting with people on LinkedIn, so if people want to connect, definitely do that.

Tim Sarrantonio:

Well, and let's expand on the resources too. You have a podcast now yourself to help educate on these types of things. So it's a great entry level tool, and then there's a big summit that's happening as well. Why don't you talk before we hit our rapid fire side, talk about the summit, the plans for the summit this year.

Nathan Chappell:

Yeah, super excited. So again, last year we had 6,000 people from 38 countries. Something that's happened this year, that early momentum gave us just the ability to partner in some really strategic ways. So we now brought on Community Boost to help manage all the behind the scenes things, and that's awesome. Resource Alliance in UK, Netherlands is jumped on as a extremely formative partner alongside Giving Tuesday. So we're all approaching this as this major opportunity and responsibility to educate the global fundraising community truly global on these efforts. So we expect 10,000 people this year. It's on October 1st. It's entirely free. Go to Fundraising.AI. You can already sign up for it. And I have to say it's entirely sponsor supported, so this is free to everyone, but it doesn't mean that it's not extremely high quality. It costs a few hundred thousand dollars to do this, and it is absolutely an amazing event. We're leveling up this year with the content and the quality of the speakers, and it's just super exciting. We're also taking it on the road, so we've got five or six in-person events including AFB Icon, Bridge, Classy, a bunch of other plays. Anyone that wants to host.



Tim Sarrantonio:

We'll have you back at Generosity Exchange as well.

Nathan Chappell:

Generosity Exchange. Yeah. Anyone who wants to host this grassroots movement is welcome to host and it's been amazing to kind of see that happen. And then last, the podcast, frankly, Scott Rosecrans and I were talking nerdy stuff at least once a week, and so we figured, you know what, let's hit the record button and talk about nerdy stuff and the application to applied AI for fundraising on a weekly basis. So it's another way for people to get there, we distill probably 15 hours of research a week into 20, 30 minutes, so it's a pretty good resource for a lot of people. Just get that quick and easy insight of what you need to know.