

Infusing Artificial Intelligence into Saudi Arabia's Agreement Ecosystem: Legal Implications and Practical Insights

دمج الذكاء الاصطناعي في منظومة الاتفاقيات في
المملكة العربية السعودية: التداعيات القانونية
والرؤى العملية

الكلمات الافتتاحية :

الذكاء الاصطناعي، الاتفاقيات القانونية، السعودية، الشريعة، التكامل
التكنولوجي

Keywords :

Artificial Intelligence, Legal Agreements, Saudi Arabia, Sharia,
Technological Integration

Abstract : Purpose: This study investigates the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into the traditional agreement frameworks in Saudi Arabia, focusing on the resultant legal implications and practical insights. The research aims to understand how AI can coexist with and enhance legal agreement processes in a country deeply rooted in a mixed-method approach, the research combines document analysis with case studies to offer a comprehensive view of Saudi Arabia's evolving legal framework. Document analysis reviews existing legal norms and AI applications in agreements, while case studies provide insights into real-world applications and challenges of AI in the Saudi legal system. Findings highlight a complex interaction

Dr. Mohammad O Alhejaili



LL.B, DiplPLaw, LL.M.,
.Ph.D

Associate Professor of
Law

University of Tabuk
malhejaili@ut.edu.sa

between AI and traditional agreements, suggesting potential benefits and legal challenges. AI can streamline processes and enhance the accuracy of legal agreements but also raises critical questions about autonomy, transparency, and compliance with Sharia principles. The need for tailored legal revisions to accommodate AI-driven changes is evident, emphasising the balance between innovation and adherence to traditional legal norms. Originality/Value: This study contributes to the limited but growing knowledge of AI's legal integration in non-Western contexts, particularly within systems influenced by Islamic law. It offers a unique perspective on juxtaposing cutting-edge technology and traditional legal frameworks. It provides valuable insights for policymakers, legal practitioners, and technologists working towards harmonising AI in legal practices.

الملخص:

تستقصي هذه الدراسة دمج الذكاء الاصطناعي (AI) في أطر الاتفاق التقليدية في المملكة العربية السعودية، مع التركيز على الآثار القانونية الناتجة والرؤى العملية. يهدف البحث إلى فهم كيف يمكن للذكاء الاصطناعي أن يتعايش ويعزز عمليات الاتفاق القانوني في بلد متجذر بعمق في الشريعة الإسلامية. باستخدام نهج متعدد الأساليب، يجمع البحث بين تحليل الوثائق ودراسات الحالة لتقديم نظرة شاملة على الإطار القانوني المتطور في المملكة العربية السعودية. يراجع تحليل الوثائق الأعراف القانونية القائمة وتطبيقات الذكاء الاصطناعي في الاتفاقيات، بينما توفر دراسات الحالة رؤى حول التطبيقات العملية والتحديات للذكاء الاصطناعي في النظام القانوني السعودي. ويسلط الضوء على التفاعل المعقد بين الذكاء الاصطناعي والاتفاقيات التقليدية، مما يشير إلى فوائد محتملة وتحديات قانونية. يمكن للذكاء الاصطناعي أن يبسط العمليات ويعزز دقة الاتفاقيات القانونية، ولكنه يثير أيضاً

أسئلة حاسمة حول الاستقلالية والشفافية والامتثال لمبادئ الشريعة. تظهر الحاجة إلى تعديلات قانونية مصممة خصيصًا لاستيعاب التغييرات التي يقودها الذكاء الاصطناعي، مع التأكيد على التوازن بين الابتكار والالتزام بالأعراف القانونية التقليدية. وتسهم هذه الدراسة في المعرفة المحدودة، ولكن المتنامية حول دمج الذكاء الاصطناعي قانونيًا في السياقات غير الغربية، ولا سيما ضمن الأنظمة التي تتأثر بالشريعة الإسلامية. تقدم منظورًا فريدًا على مزج التكنولوجيا الرائدة والأطر القانونية التقليدية. وتوفر رؤى قيمة لصانعي السياسات والممارسين القانونيين والتقنيين الذين يعملون نحو تناغم الذكاء الاصطناعي في الممارسات القانونية.

Introduction

The foray of agreements and artificial intelligence (AI) into agreement is ushering in a paradigm shift globally and in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. As the technological frontier broadens, the foundational tenets of traditional agreement grapple with the invigorating challenges and prospects brought forth by these avant-garde mechanisms. This research initiative endeavours to shed light on the repercussions of agreements and AI on the established agreement principles within Saudi Arabia, embarking on a critical dissection of their legal, regulatory, and pragmatic facets. Agreements, epitomising agreements automatically executed through embedded terms in code, have captured the legal and tech fraternity's imagination. Anchored in blockchain technology, they promise self-sustained validation, execution, and compliance. AI, in juxtaposition, represents a suite of technologies designed to mimic human cognition, facilitating task execution and autonomous decision-making. Implementing AI into

agreement ushers unprecedented quandaries centred on autonomy, transparency, and liability. In Saudi Arabia, the bedrock of traditional agreement principles, akin to its global counterparts, orbits around rudimentary doctrines such as offer, acceptance, consideration, and intent to forge legal bonds. Yet, the oncoming tide of agreements and AI compels a rigorous introspection and recalibration of these doctrines, resonating with the singular challenges and nuances these technologies herald. Central to this exploration is deciphering how Saudi Arabia's legal matrix responds to and assimilates agreements. Whilst foundational s might offer a semblance of recognition to agreement materialised through electronic mediums, it becomes imperative to discern if tailored provisions or revisions are warranted to encapsulate the essence of the agreement. Furthermore, the legal attribution and consequent responsibilities linked with AI entities or autonomous systems, weaving their narrative into agreement undertakings, demand meticulous scrutiny. This research endeavour promises a holistic dissection, traversing the contours of agreements and AI's influence on Saudi Arabia's conventional agreement canvas. It aims to demystify the conceptual underpinnings of agreement, AI's choreography in agreement settings, and the labyrinth of legal dilemmas and regulatory introspections they elicit. Punctuating this exploration with case studies and tangible exemplars, this paper seeks to present an illustrative tableau of the real-world interplay and ramifications of these tech marvels within agreement Jurisprudence. By threading the intricate tapestry of agreement, AI, and Saudi Arabia's

agreement heritage, this research magnifies the imperatives of harmonising pioneering breakthroughs with legal precision¹, equitability, and unwavering protection of stakeholders' rights and interests.

Research Method: The primary objective of this research is to explore the intersection of agreements, artificial intelligence (AI), and traditional agreements in Saudi Arabia. The research will utilise a mixed-method approach focusing on document research and case study analyses to understand and draw robust conclusions comprehensively. The document research aims to delve deep into the existing legal frameworks and scholarly discussions on agreements, AI, and traditional agreements within Saudi Arabia². The study will examine primary sources, including statutes, regulations, and other relevant legal instruments in Saudi Arabia. Additionally, secondary sources such as academic journals, legal commentaries, discussion papers, and other scholarly writings that discuss the implications, challenges, and prospects of agreements and AI integration into the Saudi legal system will be reviewed. An interpretative analysis will be conducted on these documents to decipher their essence, intent, and implications³. Parallely, case study analyses aim to investigate real-world applications, challenges, and potential solutions concerning agreements and AI in the Saudi Arabian environmental landscape⁴. Cases will be selected based on their relevance, recency, and significance, providing a clear perspective on the complexities and opportunities presented by these technologies⁵. The research will

identify relevant legal cases and gather comprehensive details on their backgrounds, legal issues, arguments, and court rulings⁶. Moreover, case studies from businesses and tech entities in Saudi Arabia that have ventured into agreements and AI will be collated. Upon completing the separate analyses of documents and case studies, findings from both methods will be integrated to provide a broader perspective⁷. This synthesis will facilitate a comparative discussion, emphasising gaps, consistencies, and inconsistencies between theoretical frameworks and practical applications⁸. By juxtaposing themes identified from document research and case studies, the research will present a holistic view of the current state, challenges, and prospects of agreements and AI within Saudi Arabia's legal framework⁹. However, it's important to acknowledge potential limitations¹⁰. The success of this research methodology heavily depends on the availability of relevant documents and detailed case studies¹¹. Moreover, while the research aims for utmost objectivity, interpretative analyses, especially in the legal domain, might be influenced by individual perspectives, and inherent biases cannot be entirely ruled out. This research methodology provides a well-rounded, comprehensive, and critical understanding of the evolving relationship between agreements, AI, and traditional agreements in Saudi Arabia. It blends breadth and depth in exploring the emerging legal-tech paradigm.

In-depth Overview of Traditional Agreements in Saudi Arabia: Saudi Arabia's legal landscape is intricately intertwined with Islamic jurisprudence, where Sharia forms the bedrock of its agreement and

most other legal doctrines. This unique foundation distinguishes the Kingdom's approach to Contractual relations and underlines the importance of understanding its distinct characteristics¹². Saudi agreement is rooted deeply in the principles of Sharia, which are based on the Quran and the Sunnah (traditions) of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). In harmony with these teachings, an agreement in Saudi Arabia requires mutual consent between the Agreement parties. This encapsulates the elements of offer (hijab), acceptance (qabul), and consideration (mu'awadah). Several criteria must be met for an agreement to be valid under Saudi regulations. Both parties must possess the legal capacity to engage in an agreement. The subject of the agreement should be permissible and clearly defined and must not contain forbidden (haram) or speculative (gharar) elements. An agreement should not be designed to enrich one party at the expense of the other unduly and must steer clear of exploitation. Saudi acknowledges a variety of agreements, from sales agreements (Bay'), which concern the sale of tangible assets¹³, to lease agreements (Ijarah) related to the leasing of properties or services and partnership agreements (Musharakah or Mudarabah), which revolve around profit and loss sharing¹⁴. These agreements each abide by specific Sharia provisions detailing the rights and duties of the parties involved. Regarding principles that guide atramental relations in Saudi Arabia, freedom of agreement stands out, although it operates within the boundaries of Islam¹⁵. Agreements in Saudi Arabia are traditionally expected to be entered into with honesty and transparency, reflecting

the principle of good faith (Amanah)¹⁶. Another fundamental tenet is the no-harm principle (La Darar), which emphasises that agreements should not induce undue harm or hardship to any party¹⁷.

Saudi Arabia's remedies align with Islamic principles in scenarios of atramental breaches or disputes.¹⁸ Tangible losses often result in compensatory measures, and specific performance might be deemed the appropriate remedy in certain circumstances. The courts in Saudi Arabia play a pivotal role in this realm, ensuring agreement enforcement stays grounded in Sharia principles¹⁹. When ambiguities arise, interpretations are frequently sought from senior scholars or religious authorities to ensure justice and maintain the essence of the Agreement. Modern adaptations have yet to leave traditional agreements untouched in the Kingdom²⁰. The Vision 2030 initiative, aimed at diversifying Saudi Arabia's economy, has sparked contemporary adaptations and refinements to the legal structure²¹. This ensures that while the nation remains attractive for international business, it always stays within its core Sharia principles²². To truly grasp Saudi Arabia's traditional agreement, one must immerse oneself in its rich historical and religious contexts²³. It presents a harmonious amalgamation of age-old principles and evolving practices, providing a platform for justice, equity, and transparency in atramental relations tailored to the Kingdom's unique socio-cultural backdrop²⁴.

Evolution of Agreements: Insights and Features: While traditional agreements in Saudi Arabia are firmly anchored in the tenets of Islamic Sharia, the emergence of digitised agreements heralds a paradigm

shift²⁵. These agreements are self-implementing and governed by pre-coded terms. Their foundation is blockchain technology, which offers a decentralised, secure backdrop for their function²⁶. The idea of agreement was pioneered by Nick Szabo in 1994²⁷. He postulated a digital setup where agreements would not just be scripted but would also be executable as computer protocols²⁸. These Agreements are codified using specific programming languages, encapsulating the conditions mutually settled upon by the parties²⁹. A salient feature of agreements is their self-execution. When stipulated conditions in the agreement are satisfied, actions or transactions are autonomously initiated, side-lining manual interference³⁰. This guarantees the accurate and prompt fulfilment of atramental duties. A defining aspect of agreements is their immutability. Embedded in blockchain platforms, any changes or tampering attempts are virtually impossible³¹, safeguarding the sanctity and transparency of the agreement terms³². Moreover, blockchain's innate transparency boosts agreement parties' trust, allowing each party to corroborate agreement execution independently³³. Furthermore, agreements herald efficiency in administrative procedures. By side-lining intermediaries, they cut transactional costs and circumvent possible human-induced errors or biases³⁴. However, a notable limitation is their specificity: agreements thrive in scenarios with clear-cut, quantifiable conditions, such as monetary transfers or IP licenses³⁵. Traditional agreements remain indispensable for intricate agreements necessitating human discernment or nuanced interpretation³⁶.

Incorporating Artificial Intelligence into atramental Paradigms:

Incorporating artificial intelligence (AI) into agreement is proving transformative. With subsets like machine learning and natural language processing, AI is refining numerous agreements-related functions³⁷. Agreement management, for instance, has witnessed a substantial overhaul with AI-integrated systems³⁸. Such setups can autonomously streamline workflows from agreement inception to supervision. Machine learning can digest and analyse a vast agreement repository, pinpointing essential data for effective agreement oversight and risk projection³⁹. Natural language processing, a subset of AI, promises to dissect atramental jargon, making it easier to sift through provisions, clauses, and obligations⁴⁰. This simplifies agreement reviews, ensuring swift and precise interpretations. AI's proficiency isn't confined to agreement analysis; it also extends to drafting. AI-driven tools aid legal personnel by auto-generating standard clauses and ensuring legal compliance⁴¹. While AI's prospects in the agreement are undeniably promising, they need challenges⁴². AI's efficiency is tethered to the quality of its training data and the intricacy of the legal domain in question⁴³. Vigilant human oversight remains non-negotiable to counter any AI-induced anomalies⁴⁴. Ethical problems loom, especially if biases mar AI algorithms, leading to potentially skewed agreement formulations or enforcement. Upholding fairness and ensuring AI's accountability is pivotal to maintaining the sanctity of agreement in this digital age. While AI promises a renaissance in agreement, striking a balance between

automation and human sagacity, ethicality, and digital precision is paramount⁴⁵.

Redefining atramental Foundations in Saudi Arabia: As technology continues to reshape global legal landscapes, Saudi Arabia finds itself at a pivotal juncture. With the introduction of agreements and the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in agreement formation, the Saudi legal fraternity faces challenges and opportunities⁴⁶.

One of the predominant impacts on Saudi agreement formulation stems from the streamlined automation that agreements introduce⁴⁷. Historically, agreements in Saudi Arabia, rooted in Sharia, have been a meticulous paper-centric process⁴⁸. However, the digitisation brought about by agreements offers automation at pivotal stages such as offer acceptance, tabulation of terms, and considerations⁴⁹. Coupled with blockchain's promise of transparency and immutability, these advancements mitigate potential agreement disputes⁵⁰. Further, AI's involvement in agreement drafting and negotiation can be a game-changer for Saudi Arabia⁵¹. Leveraging AI, parties can gain insights from vast repositories of agreement data, identify patterns, and use recommendations for more substantial negotiation positions⁵². Such capabilities could revolutionise the traditional agreement formulation process, yielding time and cost savings. However, these technological introductions have brought significant legal ponderings to Saudi Arabia's legal framework⁵³. Traditional Saudi atramental norms mandate clear offer, acceptance, and consideration for an agreement's validity. With the advent of the accords, potential ambiguities may arise

in discerning these elements in a digital milieu⁵⁴. Determining legitimate acceptance in an automated setup or gauging the adequacy of considerations in an agreement can lead to intricate legal debates. Moreover, AI's role in agreement drafting poses significant questions regarding atramental intent⁵⁵. Can AI-generated terms genuinely mirror the true intent of the agreement entities? Does an AI recommendation align with the parties' objectives and desires? Navigating these concerns remains paramount to maintaining the agreement's sanctity in Saudi Arabia⁵⁶. As agreements gain traction, Saudi Arabia's legal system may require explicit provisions regarding their enforceability. While traditional agreements anchored in Sharia principles have clear enforceability guidelines, the digital realm of the accords demands specific legal considerations⁵⁷.

Execution and upholding of agreements in Saudi Arabia: Agreement's automated and intrinsic nature presents unique dynamics, especially regarding their execution and upholding⁵⁸. Where traditional agreements in Saudi Arabia primarily rely on human interpretation and adherence, agreements pivot to computer codes and blockchain validations⁵⁹.

A salient merit of agreements is their inherent automation. Built to act once predefined conditions are met, their executions are swift and accurate⁶⁰. For instance, an agreement delineating a payment upon receipt of services would autonomously initiate the transaction upon blockchain verification. This eliminates manual lapses and ensures efficient adherence to agreement terms⁶¹. When delving into

enforceability, Saudi Arabia can lean on its current legal scaffolds. Just as traditional agreements have legal avenues for enforcement, they might find legitimacy within Saudi Arabia's evolving digital frameworks, given their electronic essence⁶². In scenarios of discrepancies, aggrieved parties could use existing legal recourse, albeit with a need for specialised expertise to tackle technology-imbued disputes⁶³. Additionally, technological underpinnings can bolster the enforcement of these agreements in Saudi Arabia⁶⁴. The blockchain records its design's transaction footprints and agreement activities as potential evidence during disputes. Given the unalterable nature of blockchain records, they could serve as definitive markers in ascertaining agreement breaches⁶⁵. However, Saudi Arabia's pertinent task is moulding its legal and regulatory tower to cater to these emerging agreement forms⁶⁶. Considering agreements, challenges concerning accountability, jurisdictional boundaries, and data privacy will necessitate a deepened legal understanding and apt legal apparatuses for their efficacious implementation and maintenance⁶⁷. Regulatory Nuances and Legal Hurdles in Saudi Arabia's Digital Agreement Domain Saudi Arabia's rapid embrace of agreement and AI-driven agreements has ushered in a spectrum of regulatory nuances and legal dilemmas⁶⁸. If left unaddressed, these issues could hinder the seamless and responsible assimilation of these avant-garde technologies into the Saudi legal arena⁶⁹. Legal Authenticity and Conventional Mandates: One prominent dilemma in adopting an agreement is its alignment with longstanding agreement norms, which

typically entail written commitments and physical endorsements. While electronic Agreements find some precedence internationally, the challenge remains in establishing the authentic standing of agreements, especially when they pivot solely on coding and eschew conventional agreement elements. Preserving Data Sanctity: The convergence of agreement and AI in the agreement domain inevitably leads to the processing and conservation of pivotal personal data in a region where the sanctity of personal data is paramount, ensuring adherence to international data protection norms becomes essential, thereby preventing unwarranted access or misuse of such information.

- ✎ **Delineating Liability: Integrating AI into Saudi Arabia's agreement** ignites debates surrounding culpability for AI-induced decisions or misjudgements. Deciphering who bears the onus when AI orchestrates agreement elements, whether drafting or recommendations, demands intricate legal deliberations. Crafting a structured legal framework restricting accountability amongst AI infrastructures, their creators, and end-users is indispensable.
- ✎ **Intellectual Property Deliberations:** The deployment of AI in agreement creation and scrutiny may draw from copyrighted resources, such as legal archives or seminal cases. Striking a balance that respects the intellectual property entitlements of all stakeholders, from data custodians to developers and users, becomes vital to stave off potential infringement complications.
- ✎ **Upholding Ethical Tenets:** The infusion of AI in Saudi Arabia's agreement domain warrants unwavering commitment to ethical

values, notably fairness, transparency, and neutrality. An inherent bias in AI mechanisms could inadvertently bolster pre-existing biases or discriminatory tendencies during agreement inception, negotiation, or validation. Fortifying AI processes with fairness and accountability whilst addressing these ethical quandaries is non-negotiable.

- ✎ Navigating Jurisdictional Waters: Blockchain's inherent decentralised fabric, a cornerstone for many agreements, elicits intricate jurisdictional and transnational transactional questions. Pinpointing the pertinent legal territory and jurisdiction during disputes will mandate synchronised global efforts and crystallised legal blueprints for conflict resolution.
- ✎ Regulatory Evolution: The evolution of agreement and AI demands a parallel evolution of regulatory constructs. Regulatory institutions in Saudi Arabia must holistically grasp the prowess and constraints of these technologies to carve out frameworks that foster innovation yet prioritise legal and consumer interests.

Confronting these regulatory and legal intricacies entails a synergistic effort encompassing legal luminaries, tech visionaries, policymakers, and industry frontrunners⁷⁰. This collective endeavour should focus on meticulously evaluating extant legal towers, complemented by the crafting or refining, to seamlessly weave agreement and AI tools into Saudi Arabia's legal tapestry.

Modernising Classical Atramental Principles for Saudi Arabia's Digital Age

Saudi Arabia's swift embrace of agreement and AI-infused agreement compels a re-evaluation and modernisation of long-standing agreement⁷¹ tenets to harmonise with the distinct attributes and intricacies introduced by these novel technologies⁷².

✎ **Redefining Canonical Tenets:** Foundational elements of traditional agreements, namely offer, acceptance, consideration, and the intent to birth legal obligations, warrant fresh interpretation in the era of the accords and AI-engineered agreements. Saudi Arabia's judicial bodies and legal practitioners must pivot their understanding to accommodate the digital DNA of agreement and the AI's instrumental role, ensuring an accurate discernment of agreement obligations and party intent⁷³.

✎ **Legal Endorsement of Agreement:** Validating agreements within the Saudi legal landscape is pivotal. While international standards might provide some direction on electronic contracts, tailored provisions or legislative tweaks could be indispensable to acknowledge agreements' peculiarities, especially their automated operation and dependence on the blockchain⁷⁴.

✎ **Accountability of AI Entities:** The amalgamation of AI within an agreement triggers deliberations on AI entities' legal positioning and responsibility in crafting or executing the agreement, such as algorithms or automated systems. Sculpting legal parameters that bestow rights and duties upon these artificial entities is paramount to navigating the labyrinth of liability and legal redress⁷⁵.

- ✧ **Uniformity and Elevated Standards:** Architecting uniform benchmarks, best practices, and sector-specific guidelines for the agreement and AI's role will bolster consistency, openness, and trustworthiness. Cohesive endeavours spanning legal minds, tech innovators, and industry leaders will pave the way for interoperable systems, easing the mass adoption of such transformative tools⁷⁶.
- ✧ **Championing Consumer Rights and Equitability:** As agreement and AI-driven agreements gain traction, upholding consumer rights and ensuring balanced dealings take centre stage. Saudi Arabia's consumer-centric regulations may demand revisions to address the distinct challenges tied to AI-curated agreements. Measures focused on heightened transparency, comprehensive disclosure, and robust grievance redressal mechanisms will fortify consumer safeguards in the burgeoning digital space.
- ✧ **Fostering Legal Acumen and Academic Rigor:** The morphing landscape of agreement, underscored by agreement and AI, beckons the cultivation of specialised legal expertise. Legal academia and vocational training must enrich their curricula with insights into emergent technologies, their legal ramifications, and the nuanced application of age-old legal doctrines in this dynamic domain.
- ✧ **Synchronising on a Global Scale:** Given the agreement's inherent borderless essence and blockchain's worldwide resonance, aligning legal constructs and championing global collaborations becomes indispensable. Engaging with international entities and immersing

in dialogues centred on agreement and AI will anchor Saudi Arabia's legal constructs to global benchmarks and best practices.

The metamorphosis of traditional agreement doctrines in Saudi Arabia mandates a symbiotic synergy of legal mavens, tech enthusiasts, policymakers, and industry champions. Carving out holistic legal contours, complemented by perpetual assessments and refinements, will seal the seamless fusion of agreement and AI tools while preserving the sanctity of fairness, responsibility, and legal predictability.

Illustrative Examples from Saudi Arabia's Digital Agreement Landscape
Delving into practical examples and real-life scenarios offers an illuminative understanding of how agreement and AI reshape agreement in Saudi Arabia. These instances elucidate these transformative tools' potential advantages, hurdles, and judicial repercussions.

- ☞ **Saudi Aramco and Streamlined Supplier Transactions:** Renowned global energy giant Saudi Aramco orchestrated a pioneering initiative with leading tech entities to orchestrate a blockchain-driven mechanism for managing supplier financial transactions. This cutting-edge system harnessed the power of agreement to automate checks and settlements, significantly truncating the duration and expenditures traditionally linked with supplier financial reconciliations.
- ☞ **Al Rajhi Bank and Blockchain-Powered Financial Solutions:** Al Rajhi Bank, a leading banking institution in Saudi Arabia, is in synergy with global tech giants and has ushered in a blockchain-driven

platform for vendor payments. Harnessing agreement, this innovation expedites the validation and payment process, curtailing the logistical and financial burdens synonymous with conventional financing procedures.

- ✧ **Atramental Undertakings on Leading Blockchain Architectures:** Various trailblazing efforts within Saudi Arabia have ventured into harnessing agreements on avant-garde blockchain foundations such as Ethereum to materialise binding agreement engagements. For instance, an endeavour dubbed "SahihDoc" endeavours to expedite the genesis and validation of digital agreement documents, augmenting the swiftness and genuineness of agreement governance.
- ✧ **Insurance Agreement and AI-driven Claims Adjudication:** Saudi insurance magnates are progressively adopting AI innovations to optimise claims adjudication. Sophisticated AI mechanisms scrutinise policy clauses, appraise claims, and finalise compensation values rooted in pre-established criteria. This avant-garde paradigm significantly uplifts precision, velocity, and fiscal prudence in supervising insurance agreements.
- ✧ **Digital Commerce Outlets and Agreement Mechanisms:** E-commerce behemoths in Saudi Arabia are avidly researching the amalgamation of agreements to mechanise diverse facets of virtual commerce. For example, these agreements can be architected to guarantee safe and transparent financial settlements, monitor

consignment benchmarks, and autonomously invoke reimbursement policies anchored in present stipulations.

☞ **Real Estate Documentation and Blockchain Integration:** In Saudi Arabia, forward-looking blockchain solutions are being trailed for real estate record-keeping. These platforms aspire to amplify transparency, diminish deceitful activities, and simplify real estate ownership transfers by melding agreements with distributed ledger paradigms.

These instructive examples from the Saudi milieu underscore the myriad applications of agreement and AI across varied agreement segments. They shed light on the technological potential to elevate efficiency, transparency, and confidence in agreement inception, realisation, and regulation. However, it remains imperative to recognise that each instance has distinct judicial considerations and obstacles. Legal specialists, regulatory architects, and industry influencers must meticulously dissect the legal ramifications and tweak prevailing structures to ensure alignment with the Kingdom's statutes and norms.

Recommendations for Refining Regulatory Approaches in Agreement Digitization

Legal Reforms and Updates: The Saudi Arabian legal system should consider revising and updating existing agreements to accommodate the nuances introduced by agreements and AI. This includes addressing areas where traditional digital agreements need to be clarified.

Capacity Building and Training Legal professionals, from judges to attorneys, should undergo continuous training on the intricacies of agreements and AI technologies. This will ensure accurate interpretation and enforcement of such agreement.

Standardisation of Agreement: Authorities should consider developing standardised frameworks for drafting and executing agreements to ensure consistency and reduce discrepancies that could lead to legal disputes.

Public Awareness and Education: Public campaigns could help educate the general populace about the benefits and limitations of agreement and AI, ensuring they make informed decisions when entering such agreements.

Ethical Guidelines for AI in Agreement : Given the potential for biases in AI algorithms, it's imperative to establish ethical guidelines that AI developers and users must adhere to, ensuring fairness and justice in agreement executions.

Regulatory Oversight and Auditing

Establish regulatory bodies responsible for monitoring and auditing the deployment of agreements and AI in legal settings. This will ensure adherence to legal standards and provide avenues for addressing grievances.

Infrastructure and Technology Adoption

Promote the establishment of robust and secure technological infrastructures that can support the efficient functioning of agreement and AI tools and ensure their reliability.

Collaboration with Tech Experts

Encourage partnerships between legal professionals and tech experts to ensure technology integration into the agreement framework is legally sound and technologically efficient.

Research and Development

Support and fund continued research into the intersection of AI, agreement, and Saudi Arabian agreement. This will foster innovation and ensure the legal system remains updated with technological advancements.

Pilot Programs and Case Studies

Before widespread adoption, pilot programs can be established to test the feasibility and implications of AI and agreement in specific sectors. Learning from these pilots can guide broader implementation.

Conclusion

The fusion of agreement and AI into Saudi Arabia's longstanding agreement traditions heralds a new potential dawn while simultaneously facing multifaceted challenges. While catalysing enhanced efficiency, unerring transparency, and streamlined automation, these novel technologies mandate an intricate balancing act of weighing the inherent legal, regulatory, and ethical ramifications. In the wake of these innovations, Saudi Arabia's agreement tower stands at a crossroads, where a reasonable review of prevailing legal edifices and recalibration of established doctrines to mirror the nuances of these avant-garde tools becomes paramount.

Core domains require rigorous exploration and nuanced adaptations, encompassing the reinterpretation of entrenched legal paradigms, formalising agreement recognition, delineating AI-associated liabilities, and safeguarding consumer interests. The intricate labyrinth of regulatory considerations tied to these innovations, spanning legal sanctity, data integrity, clarity in accountability matrices, intellectual property management, and unwavering ethical commitments, heralds the pressing need for crystallised legal directives, standardised benchmarks, and robust best practices to steer the realm of technology-driven agreement towards responsible assimilation and risk mitigation.

Real-world narratives and tangible examples from Saudi Arabia elucidate the pragmatic meshing of agreement and AI across a spectrum of sectors, spotlighting the transformative attributes of these technologies in redefining efficiency paradigms, fortifying transparency, and economising processes. However, these instances simultaneously beacon a clarion call underscoring the indispensability of legal understanding and agile adaptations to dovetail with extant regulations.

The confluence of agreement and AI within Saudi Arabia's agreement framework is a thrilling voyage into uncharted terrains. It mandates legal specialists, regulators, and industry vanguards to amalgamate their expertise, craft agile legal scaffolds, and instigate global synergies to navigate the intricate terrains presented by these technological marvels adeptly. A conscious, informed, and

collaborative progression is the linchpin to seamlessly embedding these innovations into Saudi Arabia's legal fabric, ensuring an equilibrium of rights protection and ethical adherence and fostering a culture of equitable and transparent agreement engagements.

References

1. Ahmad, J., & Majid, M. A. (2011). Benchmarking of Financial Solutions Offered by Islamic Banks.
2. Al-Debei, M. M., & Avison, D. (2010). Developing a unified framework of the business model concept. *European journal of information systems*, 19(3), 359-376.
3. Alattas, K. (2023). Saudi Arabia Corporate Firms are Hesitant to Embrace Artificial Intelligence as of 2020 Despite the Numerous Benefits. *WSEAS Transactions on Systems and Control*, 18, 38-46.
4. Aleid, A. I. A. (2017). The Saudi legal system and its effect on electronic contract formation (Doctoral dissertation, Queensland University of Technology).
5. Alharby, M., & Van Moorsel, A. (2017). Blockchain-based smart contracts: A systematic mapping study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.06372*.
6. Almajid, W. (2010). The Legal Enforceability of Contracts made by Electronic Agents under Islamic Law: A Critical Analysis of the Effectiveness of Legal Reform in Saudi Arabia (Doctoral dissertation, Association for Computing Machinery (ACM)).

7. Atabekov, A., & Yastrebov, O. (2018). Legal status of artificial intelligence across countries: Legislation on the move. *European Research Studies*, 21(4), 773-782.
8. Azmi, N. A., Sweis, G., Sweis, R., & Sammour, F. (2023). Exploring Blockchain-enabled smart contracts technology implementation within ready-mixed concrete plants industry in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 23(14), 2400-2408.
9. Balala, M. H. (2010). *Islamic finance and law: Theory and practice in a globalized world*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
10. Bantekas, I. (2021). *Transnational Islamic Finance Disputes: Towards a Convergence with English Contract Law and International Arbitration*.
11. Barnett, R. E., & Oman, N. B. (2021). *Contracts: Cases and doctrine*. Aspen Publishing.
12. Basiouni, A. F. (2022). Blockchain Technology Adoption in the Context of Saudi Arabia: An Empirical Analysis for a Future Outlook. *Mathematical Statistician and Engineering Applications*, 71(4), 3248-3259.
13. Belonick, P. (2020). Transparency Is the New Privacy: Blockchain's Challenge for the Fourth Amendment. *Stan. Tech. L. Rev.*, 23, 114.
14. Blaszczyk, M. (2023). Smart Contracts, Lex Cryptographia, and Transnational Contract Theory. *Lex Cryptographia*, and Transnational Contract Theory (January 6, 2023).

15. Bodó, B., Gervais, D., & Quintais, J. P. (2018). Blockchain and smart contracts: the missing link in copyright licensing?. *International Journal of Law and Information Technology*, 26(4), 311-336.
16. Brownsword, R. (2019). *Law, technology and society: reimagining the regulatory environment*. Routledge.
17. Burton, M., & Watkins, D. (2013). *Doing Empirical Research. Research Methods in Law*, 59-63.
18. Buterin, V. (2014). *A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application platform. white paper*, 3(37), 2-1.
19. Chalkidis, I., Androutsopoulos, I., & Michos, A. (2017, June). *Extracting contract elements. In Proceedings of the 16th edition of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law (pp. 19-28)*.
20. Childress, C. L. (1990). *Saudi-Arabian Contract Law: A Comparative Perspective. Thomas LF*, 2, 69.
21. Christidis, K., & Devetsikiotis, M. (2016). *Blockchains and smart contracts for the internet of things. IEEE Access*, 4, 2292-2303.
22. Cong, L. W., & He, Z. (2019). *Blockchain disruption and smart contracts. The Review of Financial Studies*, 32(5), 1754-1797.
23. Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., ... & Williams, M. D. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. International Journal of Information Management*, 57, 101994.

24. Elmahjub, E. (2023). Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Islamic Ethics: Towards Pluralist Ethical Benchmarking for AI. *Philosophy & Technology*, 36(4), 73.
25. Ferreira, A. (2021). Regulating smart contracts: Legal revolution or simply evolution?. *Telecommunications Policy*, 45(2), 102081.
26. Finck, M. (2018). Blockchains: Regulating the unknown. *German Law Journal*, 19(4), 665-692.
27. Giancaspro, M. (2017). Is a 'smart contract' really a smart idea? Insights from a legal perspective. *Computer law & security review*, 33(6), 825-835.
28. Gunning, D., Stefik, M., Choi, J., Miller, T., Stumpf, S., & Yang, G. Z. (2019). XAI—Explainable artificial intelligence. *Science robotics*, 4(37), eaay7120.
29. Hafner, C. D., & Berman, D. H. (2002). The role of context in case-based legal reasoning: teleological, temporal, and procedural. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 10(1-3), 19-64.
30. Hollweck, T. (2015). Robert K. Yin. (2014). Case Study Research Design and Methods. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 30(1), 108-110.
31. Howell, B. E., & Potgieter, P. H. (2021). Uncertainty and dispute resolution for blockchain and smart contract institutions. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 17(4), 545-559.
32. Hutchinson, T., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: doctrinal legal research. *Deakin law review*, 17(1), 83-119.

33. Jabbar, R., Kharbeche, M., Al-Khalifa, K., Krichen, M., & Barkaoui, K. (2020). Blockchain for the internet of vehicles: A decentralized IoT solution for vehicles communication using ethereum. *Sensors*, 20(14), 3928.
34. Kaledio, E., Oloyede, J., & Olaoye, F. (2023). AI in Relation to Law: Transforming the Practice, Enhancing Efficiency, and Ensuring Ethical Compliance.
35. Kemp, R. (2018). *Legal Aspects of Artificial Intelligence* (v. 2.0). Kemp IT Law. –2016.–URL: <https://www.kempitlaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Legal-Aspects-of-AI-Kemp-IT-Law-v2.0-Nov-2016-.pdf>.
36. Khan, R., Qudrat-Ullah, H., A. Khan, R., & Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2021). Technology Adoption in Saudi Arabia. *Adoption of LMS in Higher Educational Institutions of the Middle East*, 19-26.
37. Kuanova, L. A., Sagiyeve, R., & Shirazi, N. S. (2021). Islamic social finance: a literature review and future research directions. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, 12(5), 707-728.
38. Lescrauwaet, L., Wagner, H., Yoon, C., & Shukla, S. (2022). Adaptive Legal Frameworks and Economic Dynamics in Emerging Technologies: Navigating the Intersection for Responsible Innovation. *Law and Economics*, 16(3), 202-220.
39. Marjanovic, O., & Milosevic, Z. (2001, September). Towards formal modeling of e-contracts. In *Proceedings Fifth IEEE International Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference* (pp. 59-68). IEEE.

40. Martin-Bariteau, F., & Pavlovic, M. (2021). AI and contract law. Artificial Intelligence and the Law in Canada (Toronto: LexisNexis Canada, 2021).
41. Masum, M. A., & Hassan, M. K. Islamic Finance And its modern applications (V. 01).
42. Mik, E. (2017). Smart contracts: terminology, technical limitations and real world complexity. Law, innovation and technology, 9(2), 269-300.
43. Mmadu, R. A. (2014). Application of Implied Terms in the Sales of Goods act to Consumer Transactions in Nigeria: Between Consumers Protection and Safeguarding the Sanctity of Contracts. Journal of Business Law, 2(2), 63-106.
44. Mohanta, B. K., Panda, S. S., & Jena, D. (2018, July). An overview of smart contract and use cases in blockchain technology. In 2018 9th international conference on computing, communication and networking technologies (ICCCNT) (pp. 1-4). IEEE.
45. Msawil, M., Greenwood, D., & Kassem, M. (2022). A Systematic evaluation of blockchain-enabled contract administration in construction projects. Automation in Construction, 143, 104553.
46. Oseni, A., Moustafa, N., Janicke, H., Liu, P., Tari, Z., & Vasilakos, A. (2021). Security and privacy for artificial intelligence: Opportunities and challenges. arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04661.
47. Oseni, U. A., Hassan, M. K., & Ali, S. N. (2020). Judicial support for the Islamic financial services industry: Towards reform-oriented interpretive Approaches. Arab Law Quarterly, 35(4), 421-443.

48. Rahim, S. M., Mohamad, Z. Z., Bakar, J. A., Mohsin, F. H., & Isa, N. M. (2018). Artificial intelligence, smart contract and islamic finance. *Asian Social Science*, 14(2), 145.
49. Raj, K. (2019). *Foundations of blockchain: the pathway to cryptocurrencies and decentralized blockchain applications*. Packt Publishing Ltd.
50. Raskin, M. (2016). The law and legality of smart contracts. *Geo. L. Tech. Rev.*, 1, 305.
51. Riva, G. M. (2020). What happens in blockchain stays in blockchain. A legal solution to conflicts between digital ledgers and privacy rights. *Frontiers in Blockchain*, 3, 36.
52. Sambasivan, N., Kapania, S., Highfill, H., Akrong, D., Paritosh, P., & Aroyo, L. M. (2021, May). "Everyone wants to do the model work, not the data work": Data Cascades in High-Stakes AI. In *proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1-15).
53. Savelyev, A. (2017). Contract law 2.0: 'Smart' contracts as the beginning of the end of classic contract law. *Information & communications technology law*, 26(2), 116-134.
54. Semmler, S., & Rose, Z. (2017). Artificial Intelligence: Application today and implications tomorrow. *Duke L. & Tech. Rev.*, 16, 85.
55. Siapka, A. (2018). The Ethical and Legal Challenges of Artificial Intelligence: The EU response to biased and discriminatory AI. Available at SSRN 3408773.

56. Spafford, M. L., Stanaway, D. F., & Chung, S. (2019). Blockchain and cryptocurrencies: a cross-border conundrum. *Journal of Investment Compliance*, 20(3), 10-19.
57. Stewart, D. W., & Kamins, M. A. (1993). *Secondary research: Information sources and methods* (Vol. 4). Sage.
58. Surden, H. (2019). Artificial intelligence and law: An overview. *Georgia State University Law Review*, 35, 19-22.
59. Szabo, N. (1994). Smart contracts.
60. Taekema, S., & van der Burg, W. (2020). Legal philosophy as an enrichment of doctrinal research part I: introducing three philosophical methods. *Law and method*, (January).
61. Van Eijk, E. (2010). Sharia and national law in Saudi Arabia. Sharia incorporated: A comparative overview of the legal systems of twelve Muslim countries in past and present, 139-180.
62. Vogel, F. E., & Hayes, S. L. (1998). *Islamic law and finance: religion, risk, and return* (Vol. 16). Brill.
63. Wang, W., & Siau, K. (2019). Artificial intelligence, machine learning, automation, robotics, future of work and future of humanity: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Database Management (JDM)*, 30(1), 61-79.
64. Wong, A. (2021). Ethics and regulation of artificial intelligence. In *Artificial Intelligence for Knowledge Management: 8th IFIP WG 12.6 International Workshop, AI4KM 2021, Held at IJCAI 2020, Yokohama, Japan, January 7–8, 2021, Revised Selected Papers 8* (pp. 1-18). Springer International Publishing.

65. Zheng, Z., Xie, S., Dai, H. N., Chen, X., & Wang, H. (2018). Blockchain challenges and opportunities: A survey. *International journal of web and grid services*, 14(4), 352-375.

- Hutchinson, T., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: doctrinal legal research. *Deakin law review*, 17(1), 83-119.
- Khan, R., Qudrat-Ullah, H., A. Khan, R., & Qudrat-Ullah, H. (2021). Technology Adoption in Saudi Arabia. *Adoption of LMS in Higher Educational Institutions of the Middle East*, 19-26.
- Stewart, D. W., & Kamins, M. A. (1993). *Secondary research: Information sources and methods* (Vol. 4). Sage.
- Hollweck, T. (2015). Robert K. Yin. (2014). *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 30(1), 108-110.
- Aleid, A. I. A. (2017). *The Saudi legal system and its effect on electronic contract formation* (Doctoral dissertation, Queensland University of Technology).
- Basiouni, A. F. (2022). *Blockchain Technology Adoption in the Context of Saudi Arabia: An Empirical Analysis for a Future Outlook*. *Mathematical Statistician and Engineering Applications*, 71(4), 3248-3259.
- Taekema, S., & van der Burg, W. (2020). Legal philosophy as an enrichment of doctrinal research part I: introducing three philosophical methods. *Law and method*, (January).
- Hafner, C. D., & Berman, D. H. (2002). The role of context in case-based legal reasoning: teleological, temporal, and procedural. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 10(1-3), 19-64.
- Wang, W., & Siau, K. (2019). Artificial intelligence, machine learning, automation, robotics, future of work and future of humanity: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Database Management (JDM)*, 30(1), 61-79.
- Hutchinson, T., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: doctrinal legal research. *Deakin law review*, 17(1), 83-119.
- Burton, M., & Watkins, D. (2013). *Doing Empirical Research*. *Research Methods in Law*, 59-63.
- Vogel, F. E., & Hayes, S. L. (1998). *Islamic law and finance: religion, risk, and return* (Vol. 16). Brill.
- Childress, C. L. (1990). *Saudi-Arabian Contract Law: A Comparative Perspective*. *Thomas* LF, 2, 69.
- Masum, M. A., & Hassan, M. K. *Islamic Finance And its modern applications* (V. 01).
- Almajid, W. (2010). *The Legal Enforceability of Contracts made by Electronic Agents under Islamic Law: A Critical Analysis of the Effectiveness of Legal Reform in Saudi Arabia* (Doctoral dissertation, Association for Computing Machinery (ACM)).
- Kuanova, L. A., Sagiyeve, R., & Shirazi, N. S. (2021). Islamic social finance: a literature review and future research directions. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, 12(5), 707-728.
- Barnett, R. E., & Oman, N. B. (2021). *Contracts: Cases and doctrine*. Aspen Publishing.
- Ahmad, J., & Majid, M. A. (2011). *Benchmarking of Financial Solutions Offered by Islamic Banks*.

- Almajid, W. (2010). The Legal Enforceability of Contracts made by Electronic Agents under ^{١٨}
Islamic Law: A Critical Analysis of the Effectiveness of Legal Reform in Saudi Arabia
(Doctoral dissertation, Association for Computing Machinery (ACM)).
- Bantekas, I. (2021). Transnational Islamic Finance Disputes: Towards a Convergence with ^{١٩}
English Contract Law and International Arbitration.
Masum, M. A., & Hassan, M. K. Islamic Finance And its modern applications (V. 01). ^{٢٠}
- Oseni, U. A., Hassan, M. K., & Ali, S. N. (2020). Judicial support for the Islamic financial ^{٢١}
services industry: Towards reform-oriented interpretive Approaches. Arab Law Quarterly,
35(4), 421-443.
- Ahmad, J., & Majid, M. A. (2011). Benchmarking of Financial Solutions Offered by Islamic ^{٢٢}
Banks.
Balala, M. H. (2010). Islamic finance and law: Theory and practice in a globalized world. ^{٢٣}
Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Mohanta, B. K., Panda, S. S., & Jena, D. (2018, July). An overview of smart contract and ^{٢٤}
use cases in blockchain technology. In 2018 9th international conference on computing,
communication and networking technologies (ICCCNT) (pp. 1-4). IEEE.
- Raj, K. (2019). Foundations of blockchain: the pathway to cryptocurrencies and ^{٢٥}
decentralized blockchain applications. Packt Publishing Ltd.
Szabo, N. (1994). Smart contracts. ^{٢٦}
- Buterin, V. (2014). A next-generation smart contract and decentralized application ^{٢٧}
platform. white paper, 3(37), 2-1.
- Cong, L. W., & He, Z. (2019). Blockchain disruption and smart contracts. The Review of ^{٢٨}
Financial Studies, 32(5), 1754-1797.
- Jabbar, R., Kharbeche, M., Al-Khalifa, K., Krichen, M., & Barkaoui, K. (2020). Blockchain ^{٢٩}
for the internet of vehicles: A decentralized IoT solution for vehicles communication using
ethereum. Sensors, 20(14), 3928.
- Alharby, M., & Van Moorsel, A. (2017). Blockchain-based smart contracts: A systematic ^{٣٠}
mapping study. arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.06372.
- Mmadu, R. A. (2014). Application of Implied Terms in the Sales of Goods act to Consumer ^{٣١}
Transactions in Nigeria: Between Consumers Protection and Safeguarding the Sanctity of
Contracts. Journal of Business Law, 2(2), 63-106.
- Blaszczyk, M. (2023). Smart Contracts, Lex Cryptographia, and Transnational Contract ^{٣٢}
Theory. Lex Cryptographia, and Transnational Contract Theory (January 6, 2023).
- Savelyev, A. (2017). Contract law 2.0: 'Smart' contracts as the beginning of the end of classic ^{٣٣}
contract law. Information & communications technology law, 26(2), 116-134.
- Giancaspro, M. (2017). Is a 'smart contract' really a smart idea? Insights from a legal ^{٣٤}
perspective. Computer law & security review, 33(6), 825-835.
- Jabbar, R., Kharbeche, M., Al-Khalifa, K., Krichen, M., & Barkaoui, K. (2020). Blockchain ^{٣٥}
for the internet of vehicles: A decentralized IoT solution for vehicles communication using
ethereum. Sensors, 20(14), 3928.
- Surden, H. (2019). Artificial intelligence and law: An overview. Georgia State University ^{٣٦}
Law Review, 35, 19-22.
- Kemp, R. (2018). Legal Aspects of Artificial Intelligence (v. 2.0). Kemp IT Law.-2016.-URL: ^{٣٧}
<https://www.kempitlaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Legal-Aspects-of-AI-Kemp-IT-Law-v2.0-Nov-2016-.pdf>.
- Chalkidis, I., Androutsopoulos, I., & Michos, A. (2017, June). Extracting contract elements. ^{٣٨}
In Proceedings of the 16th edition of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and
Law (pp. 19-28).
- Semmler, S., & Rose, Z. (2017). Artificial Intelligence: Application today and implications ^{٣٩}
tomorrow. Duke L. & Tech. Rev., 16, 85.

- Kemp, R. (2018). Legal Aspects of Artificial Intelligence (v. 2.0). Kemp IT Law.–2016.–URL: ^{٤١}
<https://www.kempitlaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Legal-Aspects-of-AI-Kemp-IT-Law-v2.0-Nov-2016-.pdf>.
- Sambasivan, N., Kapania, S., Highfill, H., Akrong, D., Paritosh, P., & Aroyo, L. M. (2021, ^{٤٢}
May). "Everyone wants to do the model work, not the data work": Data Cascades in High-
Stakes AI. In proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing
Systems (pp. 1-15).
- Gunning, D., Stefik, M., Choi, J., Miller, T., Stumpf, S., & Yang, G. Z. (2019). XAI—^{٤٣}
Explainable artificial intelligence. Science robotics, 4(37), eaay7120.
- Siapka, A. (2018). The Ethical and Legal Challenges of Artificial Intelligence: The EU ^{٤٤}
response to biased and discriminatory AI. Available at SSRN 3408773.
- Zheng, Z., Xie, S., Dai, H. N., Chen, X., & Wang, H. (2018). Blockchain challenges and ^{٤٥}
opportunities: A survey. International journal of web and grid services, 14(4), 352-375.
- Alattas, K. (2023). Saudi Arabia Corporate Firms are Hesitant to Embrace Artificial ^{٤٦}
Intelligence as of 2020 Despite the Numerous Benefits. WSEAS Transactions on Systems and
Control, 18, 38-46.
- Azmi, N. A., Sweis, G., Sweis, R., & Sammour, F. (2023). Exploring Blockchain-enabled ^{٤٧}
smart contracts technology implementation within ready-mixed concrete plants industry in
Saudi Arabia. International Journal of Construction Management, 23(14), 2400-2408.
- Van Eijk, E. (2010). Sharia and national law in Saudi Arabia. Sharia incorporated: A ^{٤٨}
comparative overview of the legal systems of twelve Muslim countries in past and present, 139-
180.
- Msawil, M., Greenwood, D., & Kassem, M. (2022). A Systematic evaluation of blockchain-^{٤٩}
enabled contract administration in construction projects. Automation in Construction, 143,
104553.
- Howell, B. E., & Potgieter, P. H. (2021). Uncertainty and dispute resolution for blockchain ^{٥٠}
and smart contract institutions. Journal of Institutional Economics, 17(4), 545-559.
- Marjanovic, O., & Milosevic, Z. (2001, September). Towards formal modeling of e-contracts. ^{٥١}
In Proceedings Fifth IEEE International Enterprise Distributed Object Computing
Conference (pp. 59-68). IEEE.
- Elmahjub, E. (2023). Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Islamic Ethics: Towards Pluralist Ethical ^{٥٢}
Benchmarking for AI. Philosophy & Technology, 36(4), 73.
- Atabekov, A., & Yastrebov, O. (2018). Legal status of artificial intelligence across countries: ^{٥٣}
Legislation on the move. European Research Studies, 21(4), 773-782.
- Oseni, U. A., Hassan, M. K., & Ali, S. N. (2020). Judicial support for the Islamic financial ^{٥٤}
services industry: Towards reform-oriented interpretive Approaches. Arab Law Quarterly,
35(4), 421-443.
- Elmahjub, E. (2023). Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Islamic Ethics: Towards Pluralist Ethical ^{٥٥}
Benchmarking for AI. Philosophy & Technology, 36(4), 73.
- Atabekov, A., & Yastrebov, O. (2018). Legal status of artificial intelligence across countries: ^{٥٦}
Legislation on the move. European Research Studies, 21(4), 773-782.
- Azmi, N. A., Sweis, G., Sweis, R., & Sammour, F. (2023). Exploring Blockchain-enabled ^{٥٧}
smart contracts technology implementation within ready-mixed concrete plants industry in
Saudi Arabia. International Journal of Construction Management, 23(14), 2400-2408.
- Savelyev, A. (2017). Contract law 2.0: 'Smart' contracts as the beginning of the end of classic ^{٥٨}
contract law. Information & communications technology law, 26(2), 116-134.
- Zheng, Z., Xie, S., Dai, H. N., Chen, X., & Wang, H. (2018). Blockchain challenges and ^{٥٩}
opportunities: A survey. International journal of web and grid services, 14(4), 352-375.
- Christidis, K., & Devetsikiotis, M. (2016). Blockchains and smart contracts for the internet ^{٦٠}
of things. Ieee Access, 4, 2292-2303.
- Raskin, M. (2016). The law and legality of smart contracts. Geo. L. Tech. Rev., 1, 305. ^{٦١}

- Oseni, A., Moustafa, N., Janicke, H., Liu, P., Tari, Z., & Vasilakos, A. (2021). Security and privacy for artificial intelligence: Opportunities and challenges. arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04661.
- Belonick, P. (2020). Transparency Is the New Privacy: Blockchain's Challenge for the Fourth Amendment. Stan. Tech. L. Rev., 23, 114.
- Azmi, N. A., Sweis, G., Sweis, R., & Sammour, F. (2023). Exploring Blockchain-enabled smart contracts technology implementation within ready-mixed concrete plants industry in Saudi Arabia. International Journal of Construction Management, 23(14), 2400-2408.
- Riva, G. M. (2020). What happens in blockchain stays in blockchain. A legal solution to conflicts between digital ledgers and privacy rights. Frontiers in Blockchain, 3, 36.
- Al-Debei, M. M., & Avison, D. (2010). Developing a unified framework of the business model concept. European journal of information systems, 19(3), 359-376.
- Zheng, Z., Xie, S., Dai, H. N., Chen, X., & Wang, H. (2018). Blockchain challenges and opportunities: A survey. International journal of web and grid services, 14(4), 352-375.
- Rahim, S. M., Mohamad, Z. Z., Bakar, J. A., Mohsin, F. H., & Isa, N. M. (2018). Artificial intelligence, smart contract and islamic finance. Asian Social Science, 14(2), 145.
- Azmi, N. A., Sweis, G., Sweis, R., & Sammour, F. (2023). Exploring Blockchain-enabled smart contracts technology implementation within ready-mixed concrete plants industry in Saudi Arabia. International Journal of Construction Management, 23(14), 2400-2408.
- Lescrauwaet, L., Wagner, H., Yoon, C., & Shukla, S. (2022). Adaptive Legal Frameworks and Economic Dynamics in Emerging Tech-nologies: Navigating the Intersection for Responsible Innovation. Law and Economics, 16(3), 202-220.
- Azmi, N. A., Sweis, G., Sweis, R., & Sammour, F. (2023). Exploring Blockchain-enabled smart contracts technology implementation within ready-mixed concrete plants industry in Saudi Arabia. International Journal of Construction Management, 23(14), 2400-2408.
- Brownsword, R. (2019). Law, technology and society: reimagining the regulatory environment. Routledge.
- Savelyev, A. (2017). Contract law 2.0: 'Smart' contracts as the beginning of the end of classic contract law. Information & communications technology law, 26(2), 116-134.
- Ferreira, A. (2021). Regulating smart contracts: Legal revolution or simply evolution?. Telecommunications Policy, 45(2), 102081.
- Savelyev, A. (2017). Contract law 2.0: 'Smart' contracts as the beginning of the end of classic contract law. Information & communications technology law, 26(2), 116-134.
- Finck, M. (2018). Blockchains: Regulating the unknown. German Law Journal, 19(4), 665-692.