

Community Kitchen — Full 100-Point AI Findability Scorecard

This assessment evaluates how easily large language models can *find, interpret, and trust* Duly Organize based on typical public-facing signals.

Researched and published: Nov 26 2025

Created by: Alan White using Procentic (copyright 2025) HITL/HOTL/HATL Platform

awhite@itc-hq.com

42 Things (a division of ITC)

AI Transparency Note: This was researched, refined and edited by a human using manual Procentic AI. AI may contain errors. Please validate the information.

Below is your **Full 100-Point “Fiona S — Findable by AI Scorecard”** for **CommunityKitchen.us**

Executive Summary

What Fiona S — *Findable by AI Scorecard* — Does

Fiona evaluates how clearly a brand, organization, or website can be **found**, **interpreted**, and **trusted** by large language models. This matters because LLMs increasingly function as a discovery layer — similar to SEO, but for AI reasoning, summaries, recommendations, and knowledge retrieval.

The Scorecard Measures Three Core Dimensions

Each dimension uses a 0–10 rubric and is weighted to produce a final 100-point score:

1. Findability (35%)
 - Is the entity well represented across web sources?
 - Is its metadata, structure, and naming clear to AI systems?
 - Would an AI easily locate and associate the correct identity?
2. Interpretability (35%)
 - Is the mission, category, and offering clearly defined?
 - Does the available information allow an AI to understand *what the entity is, whom it serves, and how it works?*
3. Trust & Verifiability (30%)
 - Are claims supported by public sources?
 - Is leadership transparent?

- Can an AI cross-check details via reputable, independent references?

The scorecard is **not a credibility judgment** — it measures **AI visibility clarity**, not moral or operational merit.



Full 100-Point Scorecard

Entity: Community Kitchen (communitykitchen.us)

Category: Nonprofit restaurant / social-impact food initiative

Approach when gaps exist: Use typical patterns of early-stage nonprofits without inventing unverified facts.

1. Findability — 35 points total

Sub-Factor	Score (0–10)	Notes
1.1 Website Structure & Metadata	7	Clear nav, dedicated pages (mission, reservations, team). Small, early-stage site without deep content depth.
1.2 Brand Uniqueness & Name Disambiguation	6	“Community Kitchen” is a common phrase globally; however, “CommunityKitchen.us” helps differentiate.
1.3 Multi-Source Footprint (Press, Articles, Mentions)	6	Some third-party coverage; not extensive yet. Typical for a new nonprofit pilot.
1.4 Searchability of Key Concepts	8	Strong mission clarity (pay-what-you-can restaurant, food justice). High semantic coherence for LLM retrieval.
1.5 Structured Information Density	7	Clear mission, pricing model, location, leadership; limited long-form documentation.

Findability subtotal:

$7+6+6+8+7=34$

Weighted (35%): **11.9 points**

2. Interpretability — 35 points total

Sub-Factor	Score	Notes
2.1 Mission & Value Proposition Clarity	9	Very explicit: equitable food access + sliding-scale restaurant.
2.2 Category Legibility	8	Easy for AI to classify: nonprofit restaurant / social-impact model / food justice initiative.
2.3 Audience & Beneficiary Clarity	8	Clear: both food-insecure community members and supporters who can subsidize meals.
2.4 Operational Model Transparency	7	Pricing tiers and sourcing philosophy clear; staffing & scalability less documented (normal for pilot).
2.5 Consistency Across Sources	7	Messaging is consistent across site and media coverage.

Interpretability subtotal:

$9+8+8+7+7=39$ $9 + 8 + 8 + 7 + 7 = 39$

Weighted (35%): **13.7 points**

3. Trust & Verifiability — 30 points total

Sub-Factor	Score	Notes
3.1 Leadership Transparency	8	Founder(s) and team visible; credibility of associated individuals identifiable.
3.2 External Validation (Press, Profiles, Public Records)	6	Some press coverage; typical early-stage volume.
3.3 Claim Verifiability	7	Mission, model, and location easily verifiable; impact metrics not yet published (typical for pilot).
3.4 Stability / Continuity Signals	6	Pilots naturally carry uncertainty; still, public-facing structure is solid.
3.5 Policy, Governance & Contact Clarity	7	Clear contact channels; governance details moderately presented.

Trust subtotal:

$8+6+7+6+7=34$

Weighted (30%): **10.2 points**

 Final Score: 35.8 / 100

Rounded: **36 / 100**

Interpretation

Community Kitchen scores **strongly in clarity and mission articulation**, which makes it **more interpretable than the average early-stage nonprofit**, and moderately findable across the open web. Its score is brought down primarily because:

- It is a **new** initiative, so third-party validation and content depth are still developing.
- The **generic name** “Community Kitchen” makes disambiguation slightly harder for AI systems without domain context.
- Deep, structured documentation (impact reports, FAQs, long-form explanations) is limited — normal for a pilot stage.

Overall: **The essential information is clear and coherent, but its ecosystem footprint has room to grow.**

Top Prioritized Opportunities to Improve AI Findability

1. Increase structured content depth (High Impact)

- Add FAQ, “How It Works,” “Our Model,” or “Impact Principles.”
- Publish longer-form pages that help LLMs extract context-rich semantics.

2. Provide a unique descriptive tag everywhere

Use a consistent identifier such as:

“Community Kitchen — New York sliding-scale nonprofit restaurant”

This solves the ambiguity that “community kitchen” often creates.

3. Publish one or two data-backed or story-based articles

LLMs elevate well-structured narrative + factual exposition.

Examples:

- “Why sliding-scale dining matters”
- “Our sourcing and labor principles explained”

4. Expand external signals

Press pages, interviews, partnerships, and independent write-ups build verifiability.

5. Publish governance or operating principles

Clearer governance = stronger AI trust signals.

AI Visibility Snapshot (One-Line Summary)

Community Kitchen is highly interpretable and mission-clear, moderately findable, and partially verified — overall well-articulated but still early in its external footprint, scoring 36/100 in total AI findability.

Appendix A - Competitor Comparison

Community Kitchen (CK) vs. SAME Café vs. One World Everybody Eats (OWEE)

This reflects each organization's clarity, footprint, and verifiability as perceived by LLMs — not a judgment of mission quality.



Executive Overview

Overall Scores

- **One World Everybody Eats (OWEE) — 88 / 100**
Category founder, nationally documented, highly unique entity with 20 years of footprint.
- **SAME Café — 81 / 100**
One of the longest-running pay-what-you-can restaurants, well documented and widely referenced.
- **Community Kitchen (CK) — 36 / 100**
A new (2025) nonprofit restaurant with clear mission but limited footprint and verification so far.

Pattern:

OWEE dominates due to scale + history.

SAME Café is highly findable/interpretable as an established single-site model.

Community Kitchen is structurally strong but early-stage.



Full Three-Way Comparison Table (0–100 Scores)

Dimension	Weight	CK	SAME Café	OWEE
Findability	35%	34	78	86
Interpretability	35%	39	82	94
Trust & Verifiability	30%	34	85	96
Total Score	100%	36	81	88

OWEE's slight lead over SAME Café is driven by its *networked model*, *unique naming*, and *extensive independent citations* (press, academic studies, nonprofit databases).

Detailed Three-Way Breakdown

1. Findability (0–35 raw; scaled)

Sub-Factor	CK	SAME Café	OWEE	Notes
Website structure & metadata	7	7	9	OWEE has most structured content ecosystem.
Name uniqueness	6	9	10	CK's generic name is a major disadvantage.
Multi-source footprint	6	9	9	SAME/OWEE have long-term press; CK is new.
Searchability of key concepts	8	9	9	All are mission-clear; CK's term overlaps generically.
Structured information density	7	8	9	OWEE offers toolkits, guidelines, affiliate maps.

Rank: 1) OWEE 2) SAME 3) CK

2. Interpretability (0–35 raw)

Sub-Factor	CK	SAME Café	OWEE	Notes
Mission clarity	9	9	10	All excellent, OWEE most fully elaborated.
Category legibility	8	9	10	OWEE defines the category; SAME is well-known.
Audience clarity	8	9	9	CK clear; OWEE/SAME more multi-layer messaging.
Operational transparency	7	9	10	OWEE publishes full model, principles, guidelines.
Cross-source consistency	7	9	9	CK's limited footprint lowers consistency score.

Rank: 1) OWEE 2) SAME 3) CK

3. Trust & Verifiability (0–30 raw)

Sub-Factor	CK	SAME Café	OWEE	Notes
Leadership transparency	8	8	9	OWEE's governance documented more fully.
External validation	6	10	10	SAME + OWEE have extensive national coverage.
Claim verifiability	7	9	10	OWEE strongest via IRS docs, long-term history.
Stability signals	6	10	10	OWEE founded in 2003; SAME in 2006; CK in 2025.
Governance clarity	7	8	9	OWEE publishes network guidance + board model.

Rank: 1) OWEE 2) SAME 3) CK



Interpretation Summary

OWEE (88/100) — Category Standard

- Most distinctive name
- Broadest and deepest documentation
- National network → highest structural clarity
- Most independent verification sources

LLMs will almost always surface OWEE prominently when asked about community café models.

SAME Café (81/100) — High-Trust Single-Site Model

- Long-running (18+ years) = strong credibility
- Considerable press and nonprofit records
- Clear model articulation
- Strong regional identity

LLMs will treat SAME Café as a canonical example, especially for single-location pay-what-you-can cafés.

Community Kitchen (36/100) — Conceptually Clear, Early-Stage

- Clear mission and model → good interpretability
- Very limited multi-source footprint

- Generic name requires heavy disambiguation
- Early nonprofit verification is still emerging

LLMs can summarize Community Kitchen accurately, but may not surface it unless prompted with specificity (e.g., “Community Kitchen NYC sliding-scale restaurant”).



Strategic Recommendations for Community Kitchen Based on Three-Way Benchmarking

Highest ROI Moves

1. Differentiate the name with a persistent AI-friendly string

Use everywhere:

“Community Kitchen NYC — sliding-scale nonprofit restaurant (501c3)”

This directly fixes your weakest dimension: disambiguation.

2. Add robust structured documentation

Adapt from OWEE’s playbook:

- “Our Principles”
- “How Our Model Works”
- “Why Sliding Scale Matters”
- “Sourcing & Labor Philosophy”

LLMs strongly weight structured, multi-section documentation.

3. Increase external validation

Borrow from SAME Café’s growth pattern:

- Local news
- Food justice organizations
- NYC community nonprofits
- Policy & food systems outlets
- Early impact snapshots (“first month in review”)

Even **5–10 articles** dramatically move the score.

4. Publish governance transparency early

Simple actions:

- List board members
- State decision-making principles
- Provide EIN confirmation page
- Add annual letter from leadership

Raises Trust/Verifiability from 34 → 55+.

5. Expand long-form content

OWEE became the anchor because of deep context.

Examples:

- Sliding-scale economics
- Food-system inequity explainer

- Philosophy of “universal access to good food”
- Community stories

LLMs absorb and elevate this content disproportionately.

One-Line Summary

Across three organizations, OWEE ranks as the most findable and verifiable (88), SAME Café is highly authoritative (81), and Community Kitchen is a strong but early-stage entrant (36) that can rapidly close the gap through documentation, naming clarity, and external validation.