Prof Doshi-Velez's (and yours) paper was amazing! The main argument is that explanation in AI, in the form that we generally expect in the legal sense, is possible through the methods of local explanation and constructing counterfactual scenarios. An important insight is that explanation is not the same things as transparency, meaning that showing the source code for an algorithm is neither necessary nor sufficient in giving a human interpretable explanation. Instead, articulating the parameters that played a role in a particular decision, their weights, and how the decision would have changed with a modification of one of the parameters, seems at least on a part with what we expect from humans. One challenge that is interesting is the question of proxies, meaning that making sure a factor did not play a role in a decision is not as easy as subtracting the parameter of that factor, since AI algorithms determine high-level factors using a number of low-level parameters. Nonetheless, even with the technical challenges, it seems that we can (and should) expect the same form and amount of explanation from AI algorithms that we do from human beings. It was an inspiring read, and I would love to use this as an expert point of view in my thesis.