AI, responsibility and psychological factors in investments

Interview with Martin Nimbach

NBK Legal | October 2025

I. Introduction – Context and personal background

Question: *Dear Martin, thank you very much for taking the time to do an interview on the topic of "AI and ethics"! To start with, could you briefly explain who you are and what your profession is? What is your connection to AI and/or ethical issues?*

Martin Nimbach:
I have a background in engineering and have worked for many years at the interface between technology and organisation – in corporations, start-ups and interdisciplinary research teams. Today, my focus is on the connection between AI, architecture, leadership and neurocognitive models – models that describe how thinking, feeling and decision-making arise in the brain. They combine psychology (perception, thinking, feeling, decision-making) with neuroscience (activity of nerve cells, networks, neurotransmitters, etc.).

Question: *What does AI mean to you?*

Martin Nimbach:
For me, AI is a new, very flexible tool. It can be used to tackle complex topics, even without traditional programming. Large language models (LLMs) reflect much of what is available on the internet and provide quick access to knowledge. However, their results are not infallible – so always use them with caution and check them.

II. Observations & system questions

Question: *How do you perceive the current debate on AI – in your industry, your field of expertise, your environment?*

Martin Nimbach:
In many organisations, there is tension between hype, excessive demands and misinformation. AI is often implemented – but rarely truly *integrated*.

Question: *What do you think is being overlooked or underestimated?*

Martin Nimbach:
The structural quality of the models: biases – these are distortions that influence the results delivered by AI – interpretability and governance. Many systems are simply not robust enough to be used productively.

Question: *Are there any ethical issues that particularly concern you?*

Martin Nimbach:
Yes – in particular, legal certainty when using data that serves as input for training the models.

III. Responsibility & Design

Question: *Who is responsible for the ethical use of AI – and who actually takes responsibility?*

Martin Nimbach:
From a technical perspective, clear roles are required: audit bodies, ethics boards and a robust security architecture. Anything else is wishful thinking.

Question: *What do we need to make ethical principles effective?*

Martin Nimbach:
Binding standards, transparent tests and mandatory disclosure requirements for critical areas of application.

Question: *Do you have your own principles?*

Martin Nimbach:
Yes, our framework is called "CLEAR": Clarity – Leadership – Ethics – Awareness – Resilience.

IV. Practice & Experience

Question: *Do you have a specific example of good or bad AI practice?*

Martin Nimbach:
In one tech project, AI was used in HR screening – but no one checked the training data. This led to systematic biases that were only noticed at a late stage.

Question: *What is "good practice"?*

Martin Nimbach:
A comprehensible architecture, regular audits, explainability by design (meaning that the AI can explain in an understandable way *how* and *why* it arrives at a certain result), redundant control mechanisms (i.e. multiple systems or procedures that back each other up) and well-thought-out prompting. That sounds technical, but essentially it means that AI should be comprehensible and doubly secured.

V. Outlook & attitude

Question: *What gives you confidence when dealing with AI?*

Martin Nimbach:
The incorporation of rule-based control mechanisms, comparable to the prefrontal cortex – the part of the brain responsible for control and deliberation.

is responsible for. Our intuition is similar to a large language model, but nature has given us impulse control, which acts as a filter for our actions. A corresponding control model with ethical rules should also be implemented in AI systems before they output results.

Question: *What worries you?*

Martin Nimbach:
An uncritical, naive use of LLMs.

Question: *What needs to happen in the next five years?*

Martin Nimbach:
We need binding security standards, ethical architecture principles and interdisciplinary audit mechanisms.

What does the AI hype mean for investors? – 5 in-depth lessons for smart investors

1. Trust is not an AI characteristic – it is a leadership achievement. Trust in AI does not arise from technical performance, but from responsible leadership. No model can generate trust if the team is not capable of making decisions transparently and responsibly. It therefore stands or falls with the way *people* work with AI.

Investors should ask:

- Who bears ultimate responsibility for model decisions?
- Are there documented decision logs for critical AI statements?
- Is there active dissent within the team – and how is dissent handled?

2. A good model without an audit is an unpredictable asset.
A functioning model alone is not enough – it must be explainable, testable and auditable. Without bias scans, verification layers and external review processes, structural opacity arises.

Investors should ask:

- How is bias identified, documented and reduced?
- Who conducts audits – internally, externally, regularly?
- Is there an incident response playbook for model failure?

3. Scalability starts with governance – not GPU power. Many AI start-ups invest in model training but neglect the organisation that has to support it. Scalable AI needs scalable governance – with clear roles, versioning and ethical architecture.

Investors should ask:

- What roles exist for AI governance and ethics?
- Are there protocols for tracking model versions and responsibilities?

- Is the company regulated (e.g. with regard to the AI Act)?

4. Expertise is only valuable if it questions itself.
Many technical teams are excellent, but cognitively homogeneous. Interdisciplinarity is a safety factor. Only diverse teams with psychological safety recognise weaknesses early on – and learn from them.

Investors should ask:

- How diverse is the team in terms of professional culture, perspectives and experience?
- When was external criticism last taken into account – and how was it responded to?
- Are there internal formats for structured error analysis?

5. AI is not an inherent advantage – it is an amplifier.
AI does not improve anything on its own – it amplifies what is already inherent in the system. Good organisations become more efficient, dysfunctional ones more dangerous.

Investors should ask:

- What weaknesses or conflicts could be exacerbated by AI?
- Does the technology serve to create clarity – or just increase efficiency?
- What has the company done to make its structure, leadership and culture AI-ready?

These five perspectives offer investors a holistic basis for evaluation: technically sound, psychologically grounded and structurally well thought out. They help to understand not only the product, but the organisation as a whole – and to distinguish genuine resilience from mere performance.

Thank you very much for your time, Martin!