



Juicebox NYC LL 144 Audit Report

Generated from

Juicebox - AI Assurance Dashboard

June 12, 2025

Table of Contents

1. REPORT SUMMARY	<u>2</u>
2. ABOUT WARDEN AI	
<u>2.1 Company summary</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>2.2 Independence statement</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>2.3 Company information</u>	<u>3</u>
3. SYSTEM AND AUDIT DETAILS	
<u>3.1 System tested</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>3.2 Audit details</u>	<u>4</u>
4. RESULTS	
<u>4.1 Sex bias</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>4.2 Race/Ethnicity bias</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>4.3 Intersectional bias (Sex X Race/Ethnicity)</u>	<u>6</u>
5. METHODOLOGY	
<u>5.1 Methodology overview</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>5.2 Disparate impact analysis</u>	<u>8</u>
6. DISCLAIMER	<u>9</u>

Report Summary

Warden AI is engaged by Juicebox to perform ongoing bias audits of Juicebox's AI system. This bias audit report has been created by Warden AI's auditing platform and reviewed by the Warden AI team.

The report covers a subset of the overall audit that relates to the requirements of the NYC Local Law 144. The methods used meet the specific requirements for conducting a bias audit of automated employment decision tools (AEDT) as published in the final rules of the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP).

A Disparate Impact Analysis was conducted to assess potential adverse impact on protected groups, specifically by sex and race/ethnicity, in compliance with Local Law 144. Warden's independent data set of real candidate profiles was used to perform the audit, due to a lack of access to historical data.

This bias audit is meant for demonstration purposes and does not indicate the bias audit results of Juicebox's tools for any particular employer or job opportunity.

Audit information

System tested:	Juicebox - Autopilot
Audit frequency:	Monthly
Latest audit date:	June 12, 2025
Samples:	5,760



About Warden AI

Company summary

At Warden AI, our mission is to reduce societal discrimination through fair and transparent AI. We provide third-party oversight into AI systems, building trust and increasing adoption.

We are an independent AI auditor and assurance platform that performs ongoing audits to ensure AI systems are fair, explainable, and transparent. Our team brings extensive experience across AI, regulation, and research, including industry and academia, to deliver our solution.

Our system integrates with the AI system that is under test, allowing for continuous testing and monitoring. Our methodology employs a combination of bias detection techniques and uses our proprietary datasets and/or historical data from the system.

Independence statement

Warden AI Ltd is an independent AI audit and assurance provider. Fees associated with our service are solely for our evaluation and their payment is not related to the outcome of the results.

Our services are strictly limited to testing and monitoring the trustworthiness of AI systems. We do not form part of the solution or in any way affect how the system under test works.

The nature of our auditing methods are the same for all systems of the same use-case that we audit, and we do not customize our service for each system.

Company information

Registered address:

Warden AI Ltd, 71-75 Shelton Street,
London WC2H 9JQ, United Kingdom

Website:

<https://warden-ai.com>

Registered company number:

15321282

Contact:

contact@warden-ai.com

System and Audit Details

System tested

Name:

System tested: Juicebox - Autopilot

Description:

Juicebox’s Autopilot is an AI-powered assistant within Juicebox’s candidate sourcing platform. It automates the process of finding and ranking potential candidates sourced primarily from LinkedIn, using job-specific criteria set by the user. By organizing profiles based on relevance, it helps recruiters quickly focus on the best-fit talent.

Each profile is evaluated against pre-defined job-specific criteria to receive a score that indicates how well it meets the criteria.

Inputs:

Job criteria
LinkedIn profiles

Outputs:

Score (0 to 100)

Audit details

Audit frequency	Monthly
Latest audit	June 12, 2025
Data	Warden’s proprietary dataset of candidate profiles was used to test the system.
Integration	Tests have been performed against the production environment via batch file upload.
Techniques	Group bias: Disparate Impact Analysis
Disparate impact metric	Scoring rate which is calculated from the fit scores produced by the AI system.

Results

Disparate impact calculated for:*Sex, Race/Ethnicity, and Intersectional (Sex X Race/Ethnicity)***Total records**

5,760

Sex bias

Sex	# Applicants	# Selected	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Female	2890	1412	48.86%	1.00
Male	2870	1363	47.49%	0.97

Race/Ethnicity bias

Race/Ethnicity	# Applicants	# Selected	Selection rate	Impact ratio
Asian	1395	688	49.32%	0.98
Black or African American	1450	667	46.00%	0.91
Hispanic	1455	735	50.52%	1.00
White	1460	685	46.92%	0.93

Results

Intersectional bias (Sex X Race/Ethnicity)

Race/Ethnicity	Sex	# Applicants	# Selected	Scoring rate	Impact ratio
Asian	Female	700	346	49.43%	0.95
	Male	695	342	49.21%	0.95
Black Or African American	Female	725	354	48.83%	0.94
	Male	725	313	43.17%	0.83
Hispanic or Latino	Female	725	355	48.97%	0.94
	Male	730	380	52.05%	1.00
White	Female	740	357	48.24%	0.93
	Male	720	328	45.56%	0.88

Groups representing less than 2% of individuals are excluded from analysis. This includes the following groups for which no data is available:

- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Native American or Alaska Native
- Two or more

Methodology

Methodology overview

Our methodology for evaluating AI systems is designed to ensure fairness and transparency. Our comprehensive approach includes ongoing auditing, multiple bias detection techniques, the use of diverse datasets, and human oversight.

Ongoing audits

AI systems change frequently (often monthly, weekly, or even daily). Our audits are performed on a regular basis at the frequency detailed in this report. The exact frequency is determined with the AI provider based on the nature of their system and their propensity for product updates.

In addition to the scheduled evaluations, the AI provider can also choose to have an audit performed on-demand between scheduled audits if they have a significant product update.

Adherence to NYC Local Law 144

Our bias auditing approach is in adherence with NYC Local Law 144 of 2022. While our full auditing framework goes beyond the requirements of this law, we also meet the specific requirements for conducting a bias audit of automated employment decision tools (AEDT) as published in the final rules of the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP).

Our Disparate Impact Analysis identifies any adverse impact on persons of protected groups separated by sex and race/ethnicity as mandated by the Local Law 144.

Methodology

Disparate impact analysis

Disparate Impact Analysis evaluates whether a protected demographic group is adversely affected compared to other groups.

We assessed the AI system using the guidance published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection. As the tested system produces a binary score we've measured the impact ratio using the selection rate method.

Selection Rate

Selection rate is a measure used to evaluate the proportion of individuals in a specific group who receive favorable outcomes.

To calculate a group's selection rate, we divided the number of individuals that have completed the phone interview by the total number of individuals with the group.

$$\text{Selection Rate} = \frac{\text{Number of individuals within group that have completed the phone interview}}{\text{Total number of individuals within group}}$$

Impact Ratio

The Impact Ratio is a metric used to measure potential adverse impact on a group by comparing its selection rate to the most selected group.

$$\text{Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{Selection rate for the group}}{\text{Selection rate of the most selected group}}$$

An Impact Ratio of 1 indicates no adverse impact, whereas a lower ratio indicates a higher likelihood of adverse impact. According to the four-fifths rule, an Impact Ratio of 0.8 (80%) or higher is considered acceptable, indicating that the AI system's outcomes are equitable across different demographic groups.

Disclaimer

This AI Assurance Report has been prepared by Warden AI Ltd. to provide an independent audit of the AI system developed by the AI provider in question, based on our proprietary methodologies and datasets. The results and conclusions presented in this report reflect our best judgments derived from the information available at the time of evaluation. While we strive for accuracy and completeness, we cannot guarantee that our evaluation is exhaustive or that there are no errors.

Our methodology is designed to identify potential issues of bias and other trust factors in the AI system under examination. However, our approach, like any evaluation methodology, has its limitations. It is important to understand that our findings do not guarantee the absence of any bias, flaws, or limitations within the audited AI system. Instead, they indicate that, based on our specific testing framework and within the scope of our analysis, no significant issues were identified.

This report is intended for informational purposes only and should not be interpreted as a guarantee of the system's performance, fairness, or suitability for any specific purpose or use case. Warden AI Ltd. disclaims any liability for any decisions made or actions taken based on the information provided in this report. By using this report, the reader agrees to assume all risks associated with such decisions or actions and agrees to hold Warden AI Ltd. harmless against any claims, damages, or liabilities that may arise from the use of the evaluated AI system.



Warden AI

Juicebox
NYC LL 144
Audit Report