



MakiPeople - Response to the Job Board Doctor article

"The Human Makes the Final Call, After the Machine Decides Who Gets One" · published July 10, 2026

Thank you for taking the time to examine how AI is used early in the hiring funnel. This is exactly the scrutiny the category needs, and it is the reason we built Maki the way we did: with independent audits, published evidence, and a documented human-oversight model rather than assumptions. Below we answer each point in the article directly. Where the article is inaccurate, we say so and provide the evidence. Where it raises a fair point, we concede it and explain what we do about it. We would rather be measured against what we actually document than against the category in the abstract.

1. "No downloadable bias audit report, no named independent auditor, no ISO 42001."

The claim. Maki claims EU AI Act alignment and NYC Local Law 144 bias audits but publishes no downloadable audit report, names no independent auditor, and holds no ISO 42001.

On the audit, this is inaccurate. Maki's screening agents are audited annually under NYC Local Law 144 by Holistic AI, an independent third-party auditor. The most recent audits of Mochi and Shiro were completed on March 23, 2026, and all impact ratios met the expected criteria. The results are publicly available:

- **Mochi bias audit (public results):** [\[link\]](#)
- **Shiro bias audit (public results):** [\[link\]](#)

We take the fair part of this point: the reports were not easy to find from our own website, and we are correcting that by surfacing both audits there, with the auditor's name and date.

On ISO 42001: this is accurate, and it reflects a deliberate choice of priorities. ISO 42001 is a voluntary management-system certification that only a minority of vendors currently hold. We chose to prioritise alignment with the EU AI Act, which sets stronger, legally binding requirements for high-risk AI than ISO 42001 does, and we have done so well ahead of the regulatory deadline. We are ISO 27001 certified today (certificate dated October 31, 2025), and our EU AI Act conformity assessment is being finalised with Holistic AI as the external partner.

2. "Tested for gender, age, nationality. Not disability. Not veteran status."

The claim. The Mochi page claims adverse-impact testing across gender, age, and nationality before any test ships, and omits disability, veteran status, and, by insinuation, race.

Race and ethnicity are tested and independently audited. Our annual Local Law 144 audit, conducted by Holistic AI, evaluates adverse impact across gender and race/ethnicity at both



standalone and intersectional levels. The 2026 audit scored 74,480 responses across 3,920 interview transcripts, 40 job roles, 7 quality levels, and 14 intersectional demographic groups, and every impact ratio met the four-fifths threshold. The website copy the article quotes describes our internal pre-ship testing, which is additional to this independent audit, not the whole of it, and we are updating that page to reflect the full scope.

That audit sits on top of a continuous validation program run by our science team, led by Dr. Aiden Loe, formerly Lead Psychometrician at the Cambridge Psychometrics Centre. Every assessment is validated before it ships and monitored after: reliability is held to accepted psychometric thresholds, construct validity is benchmarked against established measures, and Differential Item Functioning and adverse-impact analyses run as standard. In live deployments this translates into measurable, fair outcomes, including a 48.6% relative reduction in turnover at Nespresso and a 7% improvement in quality of hire at Foundever.

On disability and veteran status, our answer is practical. No candidate is ever required to take a single experience. Candidates can request reasonable adjustments and additional accommodations, and can choose an alternative format, including asking to speak with a person instead. By design, scoring is content-only: we evaluate substance rather than delivery, pace, or speech patterns, which supports neurodivergent candidates and people with speech or language-processing differences, and the platform is WCAG 2.1 Level AA aligned, with extra time and written alternatives to spoken tasks as standard.

3. "Mochi scores more than knockouts. So what is it really doing?"

The claim. Knockout logic belongs to Shiro; nobody builds a conversational voice agent in dozens of languages to ask yes/no questions; therefore Mochi runs comparative assessment pre-apply, which is not the compliant, standard way to screen early.

Yes, Mochi does more than knockout questions, and we say so openly. Mochi evaluates two things: objective eligibility and administrative checks (for example right to work, location, shift availability, equipment, certifications), surfaced as pass/fail flags; and role-fit competencies scored against Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales (BARS). Every question has a predetermined intent. Mochi and Shiro use the same BARS scoring framework; the difference is the interaction model, not the science.

The premise that only yes/no knockouts can be compliant early in the funnel is not correct.

The Uniform Guidelines do not restrict early selection to knockout questions; they require any selection procedure to be job-related and validated. What Mochi replaces is the unstructured recruiter phone screen: inconsistent questions, no transcript, no audit trail, judgment that varies by recruiter and by time of day. Mochi asks every candidate the same questions derived from a job analysis, scores them against published behavioral anchors, and produces a full transcript with per-question rationale. That is a stronger compliance record than the status quo, not a weaker one.

4. Thresholds, AEDT scope, and Mobley v. Workday

The claim. A threshold the machine applies determines who a human ever sees; NYC's AEDT law covers tools that substantially assist discretionary decisions, not only those that replace



them; and Mobley v. Workday shows that “the human made the final call” is not functioning as a liability shield.

We agree that “a human clicked the button” is not, by itself, a defense, which is why we have never built our posture on it. Maki treats its screening as an AEDT under NYC Local Law 144 and as a high-risk system under the EU AI Act, and is audited accordingly. Our own LL144 applicability analysis states plainly that the law applies to Maki even when a recruiter makes the final call, because NYC LL 144's scope is not limited to tools that automate decisions, but also covers tools that support final decisions (like Maki).

On automatic rejection, there is no inconsistency in our approach. There is no feature in the Maki platform that allows a candidate to be automatically rejected, and our formal EU AI Act Instructions for Use prohibit clients from configuring auto-rejection on their side.

From the MakiPeople EU AI Act Instructions for Use (v1.0.1): “A human must review a candidate’s AI outputs before any rejection or other significant decision. In particular: Maki scores and/or AI-generated candidate information must never be used to automatically trigger disqualification or any equivalent adverse outcome. Any final decision (whether favorable or not) must also undergo a human review.”

Mobley is precisely the scenario our architecture is built for. When a decision is challenged, the defense is validation evidence and records, and Maki produces both by design: the transcript, the rubric, and the per-decision rationale for every candidate.

5. “Considering candidates at scale makes them applicants, and a much larger compliance risk.”

The claim. For US federal contractors, once you consider someone, applicant status attaches under the OFCCP Internet Applicant rule, triggering recordkeeping and adverse-impact obligations; moving screening pre-apply expands the considered population.

This is a fair consideration for US federal contractors, and it applies to any screening method, including a recruiter phone screen. It is a client-side compliance matter rather than a defect in the technology, and our posture mirrors what we did for Local Law 144: help clients comply rather than argue about scope. The difference with Maki is that every interaction produces a complete, retained, auditable record: transcript, criteria, scores, and rationale. If a client’s considered population grows, its compliance record grows with it. Retention is configurable (default 24 months) and adverse-impact monitoring is available.

6. “How is it pre-apply if it is a screening interview?”

The claim. “Pre-apply” is a misnomer; screening simply moved earlier; what changed is who conducts it, what gets scored, and when scoring starts.

We do not believe moving screening earlier moves it outside the law, and nothing in our compliance posture depends on the word “pre-apply.” The term describes a candidate-experience choice, one continuous flow instead of apply, wait, and then get screened,



not a regulatory carve-out. The proof is that we apply full AEDT and high-risk treatment to every person we screen, regardless of where in the flow the conversation happens.

In closing

The through-line of this article is that our safeguards are missing. They are not; they were simply not where the author looked. Our bias audits are independent, conducted by a named third party, and public. Our screening is treated as high-risk and audited accordingly. No candidate is ever automatically rejected, and a human reviews every adverse decision. The one accurate observation, that we do not hold ISO 42001, reflects a deliberate choice to prioritise the EU AI Act, a stronger and legally binding standard. We are making our audits and our full testing scope easier to find, not because they were deficient, but because evidence this strong should never be hard to locate. This is the same rigour that has earned us the trust of numerous Fortune 500 organisations, including leading professional services firms and financial institutions or retailers such as Volkswagen Group, Nespresso, Forvis Mazars, Capgemini, Foundever and OMF, where the bar for compliance is set as high as it goes. We are glad to continue the conversation, on the record, with the receipts in hand.

Contact. Maxime Legardez, CEO · max@makipeople.com · MakiPeople · makipeople.com · Maki Trust Center (<https://trust.makipeople.com>).