## Applicants on Demand vs. Traditional Job Boards





## The Challenge with Traditional Job Boards

Platforms like Indeed and ZipRecruiter operate on pay-to-play models that prioritize visibility over applicant quality:



**Indeed** allows free job postings, but visibility fades fast. They now require a \$25/job minimum for sponsorship—making it even more important to spend wisely. Most employers end up paying per click, often at a recommended rate of \$48/day, regardless of applicant fit.



**ZipRecruiter** charges \$16—\$48/day on a subscription basis, distributing posts to 100+ job boards and using AI to invite candidates—though quality can vary widely.

These models frequently result in large volumes of unqualified applicants, heavy manual screening, and escalating costs without hiring guarantees.

## **AOD: A Smarter Approach to Hiring**

Applicants on Demand (AOD) revolutionizes recruitment by focusing on quality and efficiency:



**Outcome-Based Pricing:** Pay only for qualified, interview-ready applicants—not for clicks or impressions.



**Agentic AI + Human Vetting:** Combines intelligent automation with expert oversight to ensure candidate relevance and readiness.



**Active & Passive Talent Reach:** Sources candidates beyond job boards, tapping into passive talent pools.



**Seamless ATS Integration:** Delivers candidates directly to your Applicant Tracking System or schedules interviews, reducing manual workload.

Feature	AOD	Indeed	ZipRecruiter
Pricing Model	Pay-per-qualified applicant	Pay-per-click (PPC)	Pay-per-post/day
Daily Cost	Variable, based on results	From \$5/day	\$16-\$24/day
Candidate Quality	Pre-vetted, interview-ready	Varies; manual screening needed	Varies; manual screening needed
Talent Reach	Active & passive channels	Primarily active seekers	Primarily active seekers
ATS Integration	Direct delivery or scheduling	Available	Available
Human Oversight	Yes	Limited	Limited