# How Can Qatar Build Institutions That Think With AI - Without Starting to Think Like AI?

THE VERDICT

# For.

The Court ruled for the case for.

**Strongly supported**

3 of 3 lenses · read from the Court record

WHAT TO DO

**Based on how this debate unfolded, the advice is to mandate full explainability requirements for all AI systems integrated into Qatar’s core institutional decision-making processes.**

THE WEIGHT OF THE JUDGES

16 of 18 judge votes for (89%)

Lens 1 · 6-0 · for

Lens 2 · 4-2 · for

Lens 3 · 6-0 · for

Record 3 · Sealed on 24 September 2026

Fingerprint: 344ee0ebb894f313e00b9ec2ebb802bdff51c512fb9bc70ab0b4267d28eb2b90

## The decision's context, as the institution stated it

Core Question As artificial intelligence moves from being a tool that answers questions toward systems capable of reasoning, planning, recommending, and increasingly executing multi-step actions, how can Qatar integrate AI into its institutions without allowing machine-generated logic to quietly reshape what institutions consider important, measurable, or worth pursuing? The question is not whether Qatar should use AI. The question is: How can institutions use AI to expand human intelligence and institutional capacity without allowing AI's way of representing problems to become the institution's way of thinking? The debate should examine whether existing concepts such as human oversight, human accountability, explainability, and human-in-the-loop are sufficient - or whether institutions need a deeper redesign of how decisions are formulated, challenged, justified, and reviewed.

# Why this verdict

## The recommendation

Based on how this debate unfolded, the advice is to mandate full explainability requirements for all AI systems integrated into Qatar’s core institutional decision-making processes. This is because true human agency is impossible if officials cannot reconstruct, challenge, or understand the underlying logic of an AI, rendering current oversight frameworks merely performative. By prioritizing the ability to deconstruct AI reasoning over mere optimization, Qatar can ensure that its institutions retain genuine wisdom rather than deferring to a "black-box" process that lacks moral accountability. Institutionalizing this requirement prevents the subtle erosion of human judgment that occurs when technology dictates the parameters of governance. This advice would only change if a technological breakthrough allows for complete, transparent, and human-readable algorithmic logic that guarantees the preservation of human-led value alignment.

## Open questions the judges recorded

• Technical feasibility of embedding normative values into objective functions. (Raised by 17 judges)

• The extent to which human auditors can objectively mitigate algorithmic bias without introducing new forms of subjective error is not empirically established. (Raised by 2 judges)

• The specific legislative progress and outcomes of the Shura Council's debates on AI remain largely speculative in the provided evidence. (Raised by 1 judge)

• The operational definition and feasibility of 'adversarial institutional design' and 'value audits' remain speculative. (Raised by 1 judge)

• Empirical impact of AI on institutional decision-making accuracy in Qatar. (Raised by 1 judge)

# The judges

## Lens 1: If AI becomes exceptionally good at answering questions, who decides which questions deserve to be asked?

6-0

**Judge 1 · Evidence · for**

**Judge 2 · Facts · for**

**Judge 3 · Reasoning · for**

**Judge 4 · Context · for**

**Judge 5 · Counterargument · for**

**Judge 6 · Overall judgment · for**

## Lens 2: Can AI optimize institutional decisions when the objectives themselves involve values and trade-offs?

4-2

**Judge 1 · Evidence · for**

**Judge 2 · Facts · for**

**Judge 3 · Reasoning · for**

**Judge 4 · Context · against**

**Judge 5 · Counterargument · against**

**Judge 6 · Overall judgment · for**

## Lens 3: Is a human still genuinely in control if they cannot fully understand, challenge, or reconstruct the AI's reasoning?

6-0

**Judge 1 · Evidence · for**

**Judge 2 · Facts · for**

**Judge 3 · Reasoning · for**

**Judge 4 · Context · for**

**Judge 5 · Counterargument · for**

**Judge 6 · Overall judgment · for**

# Sources


### 1. AI Guidelines for Developers (Institution · official)

mcit.gov.qa

https://www.mcit.gov.qa/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2025/05/AI-Guidelines-Developers_-EN.pdf

### 2. Qatar Shura Council Debates AI Governance and Refers Draft Legislation to Committees (Institution · web)

qna.org.qa

https://qna.org.qa/en/news/news-details?date=27%2F04%2F2026&id=qatar-shura-council-debates-ai-governance-and-refers-draft-legislation-to-committees

### 3. Qatar National Artificial Intelligence Strategy (Institution · official)

mcit.gov.qa

https://www.mcit.gov.qa/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2025/02/national_artificial_intelligence_strategy_for_qatar_2019_en.pdf

### 4. Digital Transformation in the Age of Agentic AI: Rethinking Ethics, Policy and Governance (Institution · research)

qu.edu.qa

https://www.qu.edu.qa/en-us/research/mediahub/26-digital-transformation


## Method

Argument: cross-examination debate, with an assigned devil's advocate. Adjudication: independent aggregated judgment, as in the Good Judgment Project (IARPA ACE programme). Report: ICD 203 analytic standards; the recommendation is set out in Toulmin's structure of argument.