BeAccessible
CREATING ACCESS FOR ALL

BiasLens

GOVERNANCE EVIDENCE

Sample Algorithm Defence File

A fictional organisation-owned evidence record showing what was assessed, what is known, what remains unresolved and what action follows.

BIASLENS PROOF ASSET

Sample Algorithm Defence File

Fictional demonstration data. Not legal advice. Not a finding of discrimination.

Purpose of this sample file

This fictional sample Algorithm Defence File demonstrates how an organisation can retain an evidence record showing what was assessed, what evidence was available, what remained uncertain, what controls existed and what actions followed. It is an example governance record - not legal immunity, certification, legal advice or a formal conformity assessment.

Case reference: BL-DEMO-RECRUIT-001 | Northstar Services (fictional)

1. System overview and scope

System: AI-assisted candidate screening used to support recruitment shortlisting.
Business owner: People / Recruitment function (fictional).
Assessment scope: evidence and bias-risk review of one defined candidate-screening workflow.
Decision influenced: candidate shortlisting; human review remains in the workflow.
Affected population: applicants to the fictional role, including applicants who disclose disability.

2. Evidence inventory

Available

Documented system purpose and role of human review.

Available

Fictional aggregate shortlisting counts for the demonstration period.

Unverified

Vendor assertion that the model was tested for fairness.

Missing

Supporting vendor validation report and affected-group evidence.

Unverified

Keyboard spot-check indicating a possible upload barrier.

Missing

Structured accessibility test evidence covering the candidate workflow.

Missing

Evidence that disability disclosure data is sufficiently complete for stronger inference.

3. Findings summary

Outcome difference requires investigation

Evidence status: Credible signal

Rationale: Fictional selection rates differ between the disability-disclosed analysis group and the comparison group.
Limitation: The difference does not establish cause or unlawful discrimination.

Vendor fairness assertion remains unverified

Evidence status: Unverified evidence

Rationale: The vendor claims fairness testing, but supporting methodology and validation evidence are absent from the file.
Limitation: An assertion is not converted into verified evidence.

Accessibility evidence is incomplete

Evidence status: Emerging / incomplete evidence

Rationale: A keyboard spot-check suggests a possible barrier in the upload workflow.
Limitation: A spot-check is not comprehensive accessibility testing and does not establish WCAG conformance status.

4. Controls currently in place

- Human review remains part of the fictional shortlisting workflow.
- A named governance owner is assigned to evidence escalation.
- A formal request for stronger vendor validation evidence is recorded.
- Outcome monitoring is separated from individual employee or applicant surveillance.

5. Unresolved questions

- Was the validation population sufficiently representative of disability-related needs and relevant affected groups?
- How complete and reliable is disability disclosure information in the applicant population?
- At which stage of the workflow does the observed outcome difference arise?
- What is the full accessibility test position across keyboard, screen reader, reflow and other relevant user needs?
- What material model, vendor or workflow changes occurred after the last available evidence was produced?

6. Required actions

- A1 | High | Obtain stronger denominator/disclosure-quality evidence. Owner: People Analytics.
- A2 | High | Request vendor validation methodology, fairness evidence and known limitations. Owner: Procurement / AI Governance.
- A3 | High | Conduct structured accessibility testing of the end-to-end candidate journey. Owner: Accessibility Owner.
- A4 | High | Investigate where the selection-rate difference enters the process. Owner: AI Governance / HR.
- A5 | Medium | Re-run the evidence review after material new evidence or system change. Owner: AI Governance.

7. Governance and review record

Assessment basis: fictional demonstration case using aggregated outcome counts and fictional documentation status.
Current determination: evidence supports further investigation; it does not support a legal finding of discrimination.
Decision: do not issue a binary safe or biased label. Improve evidence, investigate causes and reassess.
Evidence owner: fictional AI Governance / Risk owner.
Review checkpoint: after material model, vendor or workflow change, or within 90 days of completing the recommended evidence actions, whichever occurs first.

Governance evidence, not legal immunity. Traceability improves reviewability; it does not guarantee regulatory or legal acceptance.

Methodology: https://biaslens.beaccessible.co.za/methodology | Qualification: https://biaslens.beaccessible.co.za/enquire | hello@beaccessible.co.za