

# Fanar 2.0: Arabic Generative AI Stack

FANAR TEAM\*, Ummar Abbas, Mohammad Shahmeer Ahmad, Minhaj Ahmad, Abdulaziz Al-Homaid, Anas Al-Nuaimi, Enes Altinisik, Ehsaneddin Asgari, Sanjay Chawla, Shammur Chowdhury, Fahim Dalvi, Kareem Darwish, Nadir Durrani, Mohamed Elfeky, Ahmed Elmagarmid, Mohamed Eltabakh<sup>†</sup>, Asim Ersoy, Masoomali Fatehkia, Mohammed Qusay Hashim, Majd Hawasly, Mohamed Hefeeda, Mus'ab Husaini, Keivin Isufaj, Soon-Gyo Jung, Houssam Lachemat, Ji Kim Lucas, Abubakr Mohamed, Tasnim Mohiuddin, Basel Mousi, Hamdy Mubarak, Ahmad Musleh, Mourad Ouzzani, Amin Sadeghi, Husrev Taha Sencar, Mohammed Shinoy, Omar Sinan, and Yifan Zhang

Qatar Computing Research Institute (QCRI),  
Hamad Bin Khalifa University

---

\*The author list is ordered alphabetically by last name. See Section [A](#) for contribution details.

<sup>†</sup>The corresponding author.

## Abstract

We present Fanar 2.0, the second generation of Qatar’s sovereign Arabic-centric Generative AI platform. **Sovereignty** is a first-class design principle: every component of Fanar 2.0, from data pipelines and pre-training to safety evaluation and deployment infrastructure, was designed, built, and is operated entirely at the Qatar Computing Research Institute (QCRI), Hamad Bin Khalifa University, with no dependency on external AI providers. At the same time, Fanar 2.0 is a story of **resource-constrained excellence**: the entire effort ran on 256 NVIDIA H100 GPUs, and Arabic content represents only  $\approx 0.5\%$  of web data despite the language having over 400 million native speakers. Rather than simply scaling up, Fanar 2.0 adopts a disciplined strategy of data quality over quantity, targeted continual pre-training, and model merging to achieve substantial gains within these constraints.

At the core of Fanar 2.0 is **Fanar-27B**, a 27-billion parameter transformer built through continual pre-training of the Gemma-3-27B backbone on a curated corpus of  $\approx 120$  billion high-quality tokens across three distinct data recipes. The model features a 32K token context window and native selective reasoning traces. Despite using  $\approx 8\times$  fewer pre-training tokens than Fanar 1.0, Fanar 2.0 delivers substantial benchmark improvements: Arabic world knowledge (MMMLU/Ar: +9.1 pts), general Arabic (ArabicMMLU: +7.3 pts), English capability (MMLU: +7.6 pts), and dialectal comprehension (Belebele: +3.5 pts).

Beyond the core LLM, Fanar 2.0 introduces a rich stack of new capabilities. **FanarGuard** is a new 4B bilingual moderation filter achieving state-of-the-art Arabic safety and cultural alignment. The speech family (**Aura**) gains a long-form ASR model for hours-long audio. The vision family (**Oryx**) adds Arabic-aware image and video understanding alongside culturally-grounded image generation. An agentic tool-calling framework enables multi-step workflows. **Fanar-Sadiq** replaces the earlier single-pipeline Islamic RAG with a multi-agent architecture. **Fanar-Diwan** provides classical Arabic poetry generation. **FanarShaheen** delivers LLM-powered bilingual translation. A redesigned multi-layer orchestrator coordinates all components through intent-aware routing and defense-in-depth safety validation. Taken together, Fanar 2.0 demonstrates that sovereign, resource-constrained AI development can produce systems competitive with those built at far greater scale.

## الملخص

نقدم منصة فنار 2.0، وهي الجيل الثاني من منصة الذكاء الاصطناعي التوليدي ذات الروح العربية. تمثل السيادة الرقمية مبدأ تصميم أساسي في فنار 2.0 حيث تم تصميم وبناء وتشغيل كل عنصر من عناصر المنصة - من جمع وتحرير البيانات والتدريب المسبق إلى تقييم السلامة والبنية التحتية التشغيلية - داخل معهد قطر لبحوث الحوسبة التابع لجامعة حمد بن خليفة، دون الاعتماد على مُزوّدين خارجيين. ومع ذلك، يمثل فنار 2.0 قصة تميز رغم محدودية الموارد؛ فقد تم تطوير المشروع بأكمله على 256 وحدة معالجة رسومات NVIDIA H100 مع كون المحتوى العربي لا يتجاوز حوالي 0.5٪ من مجموع البيانات المتاحة على الويب، على الرغم من أن للعربية أكثر من 400 مليون متحدث. يتبنى فنار 2.0 استراتيجية تطوير منضبطة بدلاً من مجرد التوسع (scaling up) تركز على جودة البيانات بدل كميتها، ومتابعة التدريب المسبق بشكل انتقائي، ودمج النماذج المدربة لتحقيق مكاسب معتبرة ضمن حدود الموارد.

في صميم منصة فنار 2.0 يقبع نموذج Fanar-27B وهو نموذج Transformer ذو 27 مليار معامل بُني بمتابعة التدريب المسبق فوق نموذج Gemma-3-27B بمجموعة منتقاة من حوالي 120 مليار رمز token عالي الجودة من خلال ثلاث مراحل متميزة. للنموذج قدرة سياقية بسعة 32,000 رمزاً وملّكة محاكمة انتقائية. يقدم فنار 2.0 تحسينات كبيرة في شتى معايير التقييم مقارنة بسلفه فنار 1.0 على الرغم من استخدامه ثمان مرات أقل من رموز التدريب: مثل المعارف العربية (Ar: / MMLU +9.1 نقطة) والقدرات العربية العامة (ArabicMMLU: +7.3 نقطة) والمعارف الإنجليزية (MMLU: +7.6 نقطة) وفهم اللهجات العربية (Belebe: +3.5 نقطة).

وبالإضافة إلى النموذج اللغوي الأساسي (Fanar-27B)، يقدم Fanar 2.0 مجموعة غنية من القدرات الجديدة. FanaGuard هو فلتر جديد ثنائي اللغة بحجم 4 مليار معامل والأفضل من نوعه لأغراض السلامة والمواءمة الثقافية العربية؛ وأضيف إلى عائلة النماذج الصوتية (Aura) نموذج تحويل الكلام إلى نص ASR يدعم ملفات صوتية طويلة تمتد لساعات؛ بينما زيد إلى عائلة نماذج الصور والرؤية (Oryx) بالإضافة إلى توليد الصور الملائمة للثقافة العربية قدرات جديدة لفهم للصور ومقاطع الفيديو. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، يدعم نظام استدعاء الأدوات المساعدة تنفيذ مهام متعددة الخطوات، ويحل Sadiq محل نظام استرجاع المحتوى RAG الإسلامي السابق ببنية متعددة الوكلاء، ويقدم Fanar-Diwan خدمة إنتاج الشعر العربي التقليدي، ويقوم Shaheen بالترجمة ثنائية اللغة عن طريق نموذج لغوي ضخّم، بينما يقوم المنسق المتعدد الطبقات الذي تمت إعادة تصميمه بتنسيق وتشغيل جميع المكونات والتوجيه حسب القصد مع تحقق عميق من السلامة.

بالمحصلة، يُظهر فنار 2.0 أن تطوير الذكاء الاصطناعي السيادي يمكن أن ينتج أنظمة تنافسية مع تلك التي بنيت على نطاق أوسع بكثير رغم محدودية الموارد.

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. Overview of the Fanar 2.0 Platform</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1. Challenges of Arabic for Generative AI	10
2.2. The Fanar 2.0 Ecosystem	10
2.3. Open-Weight and Proprietary Models in the Fanar 2.0 Stack	11
<b>3. Fanar Large Language Text Model</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1. Data Collection and Curation	12
3.2. LLM Pre-training	13
3.3. Post-training	16
3.4. Evaluation	22
<b>4. Safety Alignment and FanarGuard</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1. FanarGuard Overview	27
4.2. FanarGuard Evaluation	27
<b>5. Fanar Aura: Long-form Speech-To-Text (Aura-STT-LF)</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1. Datasets	30
5.2. Long-form STT Framework: Model Design and Inference Optimization	30
5.3. Evaluation	32
<b>6. Fanar Aura: Personalized Text-To-Speech (Aura-TTS)</b>	<b>35</b>
6.1. Data Collection and Curation	35
6.2. Model Selection and Training	36
6.3. Evaluation	36
<b>7. Fanar Oryx: Image Generation (Oryx-IG)</b>	<b>36</b>
7.1. Taxonomy-Driven Data Collection	37
7.2. Image Filtering and Enhancement	38
7.3. Image Annotation	39
7.4. Model Selection and Fine-tuning	40
7.5. Model Inference: Practical Considerations	41
7.6. Evaluation	41
<b>8. Fanar Oryx: Image and Video Understanding (Oryx-IVU)</b>	<b>43</b>
8.1. Data Collection and Curation	44
8.2. Model Selection and Training	45
8.3. Evaluation	46
<b>9. Fanar Machine Translation: FanarShaheen</b>	<b>51</b>
9.1. FanarShaheen: an LLM-Based Machine Translation System	51
9.2. Training Setup	52
9.3. Evaluation and Benchmarking	53
<b>10. Fanar Sadiq: Grounded Islamic Content</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>11. Fanar Diwan: Generative AI Arabic Poetry</b>	<b>56</b>
11.1. Data Collection	57
11.2. Diacritization Accuracy	57
11.3. Diwan: Poetry Generation Model	57
11.4. Poetry Generation Benchmarking	58
11.5. Joint Generation and Diacritization	58
<b>12. Fanar Agentic Framework</b>	<b>59</b>
12.1. Training Agentic Fanar	59
12.2. Evaluation	60
<b>13. Orchestrator</b>	<b>63</b>
13.1. Intelligent Routing and Topic Classification	64

13.2. Defense-in-Depth Validation . . . . .	64
13.3. The Agentic Loop . . . . .	64
<b>14. Summary and Lessons Learned</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>A. Author Contributions</b>	<b>66</b>
A.1. Acknowledgments . . . . .	67
<b>B. Detailed Benchmark Descriptions</b>	<b>67</b>
B.1. <i>Nahw</i> . . . . .	67
B.2. Al-Mieyar Language . . . . .	68
B.3. PalmX . . . . .	69
<b>C. Fanar MLOps: Automating Model Development and Updates</b>	<b>69</b>
C.1. Effective Data Management . . . . .	70
C.2. Data Pipeline . . . . .	71
C.3. Semi-Automated Feedback-driven Model Improvement . . . . .	72

# 1. Introduction

**Fanar 2.0** is the second generation of Qatar’s sovereign Arabic-centric Generative AI platform: every component is designed, built, and operated entirely at QCRI with no dependency on external AI providers. Developed under tight resource constraints (**256 H100 GPUs**) and given the persistent scarcity of high-quality Arabic data ( $\approx 0.5\%$  of web content), the platform prioritises quality over scale and delivers consistent benchmark gains across Arabic and English evaluations. See Table 1 for a platform comparison and Table 2 for benchmark improvements.

Large Language Models (LLMs) and Generative AI are reshaping how people interact with information, providing writing assistance, translation, customer support, code generation, and a growing range of other cognitive services. Yet despite this rapid progress, high-quality LLMs for non-English languages remain an open challenge. The fundamental bottleneck is data: English dominates the web, constituting approximately 46% of all textual content, while most other languages are represented at a few percent or less. Arabic, the official language of more than 25 countries and the spoken language of over 400 million people, accounts for only  $\approx 0.5\%$  of web content<sup>1</sup> [82]. Beyond data scarcity, Arabic presents additional linguistic complexity through its root-and-pattern morphology, extensive dialectal variation, and its role as the liturgical language of over two billion Muslims, all of which demand specialised treatment that general-purpose models seldom provide.

**AI sovereignty.** In this context, **sovereignty** is not merely a policy aspiration, but rather a core engineering constraint. We introduce **Fanar 2.0**, the second generation of Qatar’s sovereign Arabic-centric Generative AI platform, which is first presented in [36]. The word *fanar* means “lighthouse” in Arabic, reflecting the platform’s role as a guiding beacon for responsible AI development in the Arab world. All components of Fanar 2.0, from data curation pipelines to pre-training, post-training, safety evaluation, and deployment infrastructure were designed, built, and are operated entirely at the Qatar Computing Research Institute (QCRI), Hamad Bin Khalifa University, with no dependency on external AI providers. This full-stack ownership enables alignment with national values, control over data governance, and the ability to iterate rapidly on culturally sensitive components without relying on third-party model access.

**Operating under resource constraints.** Sovereign AI development does not come with unlimited resources. The complete Fanar 2.0 effort was conducted on **256 NVIDIA H100 GPUs** (32 nodes of 8 GPUs each), which is a fraction of the compute available to the providers of frontier models. The persistent scarcity of high-quality Arabic data is an equally fundamental constraint: despite Arabic being among the world’s most widely spoken languages, digital Arabic content is disproportionately small, noisy, and concentrated in a narrow set of domains. These dual constraints, limited compute and limited quality data, define the design space for Fanar 2.0. Rather than attempting to simply scale up, Fanar 2.0 adopts a disciplined strategy of *data quality over quantity*, using  $\approx 120$  billion carefully curated tokens rather than the  $\approx 1$  trillion tokens used in Fanar 1.0, combined with three distinct data recipes, recipe-based annealing, and model merging to achieve substantial gains within these constraints. Fanar 2.0 is a demonstration that sovereign, resource-constrained AI development can produce systems competitive with those built at far greater scale.

## Contributions of Fanar 2.0<sup>2</sup>

Fanar 2.0 represents a significant evolution across every modality and service layer. Its core contributions are:

- **Fanar-27B (Fanar-27B):** A 27-billion parameter dense transformer built through continual pre-training of the Gemma-3-27B backbone on a curated corpus of  $\approx 120$  billion high-quality tokens across three data recipes. The model features a 32K token context window, native *selective thinking*

<sup>1</sup><https://commoncrawl.github.io/cc-crawl-statistics/plots/languages.html>

<sup>2</sup>Fanar website: [www.fanar.qa](http://www.fanar.qa)

(chain-of-thought reasoning in Arabic and English), and hallucination mitigation via structured self-verification traces (Section 3).

- **FanarGuard (FanarGuard):** A new 4B bilingual moderation filter trained on 468K annotated Arabic and English prompt-response pairs along with harmless and cultural alignment dimensions, achieving state-of-the-art Arabic safety performance at a fraction of the parameter cost of competing systems (Section 4).
- **Long-form Speech Recognition (Aura-STT-LF):** The first Arabic-centric bilingual long-form ASR model, processing hours-long recordings with speaker-change handling and a readability restoration layer. Accompanied by **Aura-STT-BenchLF**, the first publicly available Arabic long-form ASR benchmark (Section 5).
- **Vision Models (Oryx):** Culturally-grounded image generation (Oryx-IG) is now complemented by Arabic-aware image and video understanding (Oryx-IVU), enabling visual reasoning across text and image modalities (Sections 7 and 8).
- **Agentic Tool-Calling: Fanar-27B** is extended with structured function-calling capability, enabling multi-step agentic workflows over external services including translation, speech, image generation, and Islamic knowledge lookup (Section 12).
- **Fanar-Sadiq (Fanar-Sadiq):** A multi-agent architecture replacing the earlier single-pipeline Islamic RAG. It routes queries to specialised handlers for Fiqh reasoning, Quranic retrieval, du'a lookup, zakat and inheritance calculations, Hijri calendar, and prayer times (Section 10).
- **Arabic Poetry Generation (Fanar-Diwan):** A dedicated generative model fine-tuned on classical Arabic poetic corpora, optimised for the metrical and rhetorical constraints of classical Arabic prosody (Section 11).
- **Translation (FanarShaheen):** An LLM-powered bilingual Arabic-English translation system with substantially improved fluency and domain coverage over earlier dialectal MT work (Section 9).
- **Redesigned Orchestrator:** A multi-layer framework with intent-based routing, defense-in-depth validation through FanarGuard, and a Fanar MCP server for agentic tool orchestration (Section 13).

## Fanar 1.0 vs. Fanar 2.0

Table 1 provides a structured side-by-side comparison of the two platform generations. The most significant architectural shift is from a dual-LLM strategy (**Fanar Star** at 7B and **Fanar Prime** at 9B) to a single, more capable 27B model (**Fanar-27B**), combined with a substantially expanded breadth of specialised components across modalities.

## Benchmark Improvements

Table 2 summarises key benchmark improvements of **Fanar-27B** (Fanar 2.0, 27B) over **Fanar Prime** (the stronger Fanar 1.0 model at 9B). Fanar 2.0 delivers consistent gains across all evaluation categories, despite using  $\approx 8\times$  fewer pre-training tokens than Fanar 1.0, demonstrating the effectiveness of the quality-over-quantity approach and the larger model capacity. The most pronounced improvements are in Arabic world knowledge and English capability. Detailed results and comparisons against other Arabic-centric and multilingual models are provided in Section 3 and Appendix B.

## Organization of this Report

Section 3 describes **Fanar-27B**, covering data collection and curation, pre-training recipes and model merging, post-training (SFT, long-context adaptation, rebalancing, DPO, hallucination mitigation), and

**Table 1** Comparison of Fanar 1.0 and Fanar 2.0. New capabilities in Fanar 2.0 are marked [New].

Aspect	Fanar 1.0	Fanar 2.0
<i>Core Language Model</i>		
Flagship LLM	<b>Fanar Star</b> (7B, trained from scratch)	<b>Fanar-27B</b> (27B, continual on Gemma-3-27B) [New]
Supporting LLM	<b>Fanar Prime</b> (9B, continual on Gemma-2-9B)	—
Context window	8K tokens	32K tokens
Reasoning traces	No	Selective thinking (Ar + En) [New]
Hallucination mitigation	Knowledge probing	Self-verification traces [New]
Tool calling	No	Yes [New]
<i>Pre-training</i>		
Pre-training data	≈1T tokens (40% Ar / 50% En / 10% Code)	≈120B HQ tokens (three recipes)
Training strategy	Multi-epoch + cool-down	Recipe-based annealing + model merging
<i>Post-training</i>		
Pipeline stages	SFT + DPO	SFT → Long-context → Rebalancing → DPO
Arabic reasoning	Translation-based traces	Native Arabic reasoning traces [New]
Cultural alignment	SFT-based	SFT + production-log-driven DPO
<i>Safety and Alignment</i>		
Safety filter	—	<b>FanarGuard</b> (4B, harmlessness + culture) [New]
Quranic safeguarding	—	Encapsulation markers + post-inference validation [New]
<i>Speech (Aura)</i>		
ASR	Short-form (Aura-STT)	Long-form (Aura-STT-LF) + readability enhancing layer [New]
TTS	MSA TTS	Enhanced TTS with Voice Personalization offering multiple voices in the platform
ASR Benchmark	Publicly available	Aura-STT-BenchLF (Introduced first public Arabic LF-ASR benchmark) [New]
<i>Vision (Oryx)</i>		
Image generation	Stable Cascade (fine-tuned)	Oryx-IG (taxonomy-driven + DPO)
Image/video understanding	—	Oryx-IVU (Arabic-aware) [New]
<i>Specialised Components</i>		
Islamic AI	Single-pipeline Islamic RAG	<b>Fanar-Sadiq</b> (multi-agent: Fiqh, Quran, zakat, prayer) [New]
Arabic poetry	—	<b>Fanar-Diwan</b> (classical Arabic prosody) [New]
Translation	Dialectal MT	<b>FanarShaheen</b> (LLM-powered bilingual) [New]
Additional RAGs	Recency, Attribution, Biography	Recency RAG (retained)
<i>Infrastructure</i>		
Orchestrator	LLM-based classifier routing	Multi-layer: context reconstruction + intent routing + expert delegation
MLOps	Manual	Semi-automated feedback-driven pipeline [New]

LLM evaluation. Section 4 presents **FanarGuard** and its safety and cultural alignment evaluation. Sections 5 and 6 describe the long-form speech recognition and TTS systems. Image generation and image/video understanding are covered in Sections 7 and 8 respectively. Sections 9 and 10 describe the **FanarShaheen** translation and **Fanar-Sadiq** models, respectively. The **Fanar-Diwan** and **Fanar-Agentic** models are presented in Sections 11 and 12. The redesigned orchestrator is presented in Section 13. Section 14 concludes with lessons learned and future directions. Finally, detailed benchmark



**Table 2** Key benchmark comparison: **Fanar Prime** (Fanar 1.0, 9B) vs. **Fanar-27B** (Fanar 2.0, 27B).  $\Delta$  shows absolute improvement.

Category	Benchmark	Fanar 1.0 (9B)	Fanar 2.0 (27B)	$\Delta$
Arabic world knowledge	MMMLU/Ar (0-shot)	58.3	<b>67.4</b>	+9.1
Arabic world knowledge	ArabicMMLU (3-shot)	67.4	<b>74.7</b>	+7.3
Arabic language	<i>Nahw</i> -MCQ (3-shot)	40.0	<b>46.9</b>	+6.9
Arabic language	AraLingBench (0-shot)	60.6	<b>68.7</b>	+8.1
Dialectal Arabic	Belebele (3-shot)	83.3	<b>86.8</b>	+3.5
Cultural awareness	ACVA (5-shot)	79.7	<b>82.7</b>	+3.0
English world knowledge	MMLU (5-shot)	71.3	<b>78.9</b>	+7.6
English world knowledge	PIQA (0-shot)	82.4	<b>85.9</b>	+3.5

tables are presented in the appendix sections.

## 2. Overview of the Fanar 2.0 Platform

The distinctive challenges of Arabic for Generative AI are reviewed, and the Fanar 2.0 platform ecosystem, consisting of five model families coordinated through a multi-layer orchestrator and a bilingual safety filter, is introduced.

### 2.1. Challenges of Arabic for Generative AI

Arabic presents a uniquely multifaceted challenge for Generative AI. Although spoken by over 400 million people and carrying profound cultural and spiritual significance, its digital footprint is disproportionately small relative to its global presence [3].

**Severe data scarcity.** Arabic represents only  $\approx 0.5\%$  of web content, creating a fundamental ceiling on training data quantity and quality. The shortage is especially pronounced in STEM domains, where Arabic digital content is particularly sparse.

**Extreme dialectal variation.** Arabic spans Classical Arabic, Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), and numerous regional dialects differing substantially in vocabulary, syntax, and phonology — often to the point of mutual unintelligibility. Dialects dominate everyday speech and social media yet lack standard orthography, making data collection, cleaning, and modelling significantly harder.

**Morphological richness.** Arabic’s root-and-pattern morphology generates hundreds of word forms from a small set of consonantal roots through templatic derivation, prefixation, and suffixation, creating challenges for tokenisation, data sparsity, and model generalisation largely absent in Indo-European languages.

**Cultural and religious sensitivity.** Arabic is the liturgical language of over two billion Muslims and a core identity marker across the Arab world. Supporting Arabic in AI requires not only technical adaptation but also cultural and anthropological sensitivity, particularly around religious content, regional values, and social norms, that global models rarely address adequately.

These challenges are not confined to the text modality: they extend to speech (dialect-aware ASR, diacritisation for TTS), image generation (regional cultural representation), and any system attempting to provide grounded Islamic content. Fanar 2.0 addresses each of these dimensions through dedicated specialised components.

### 2.2. The Fanar 2.0 Ecosystem

The Fanar 2.0 platform is architected as a heterogeneous ecosystem of five specialised model families, coordinated through a multi-layer orchestrator and validated by a bilingual safety filter (Figure 1). This modularity ensures that specialised optimisation is applied across varying computational workloads, and that Arabic linguistic depth, cultural alignment, and Islamic knowledge are preserved across text, speech, image, translation, and reasoning workflows.

**Foundational LLMs.** **Fanar-27B** (27B) is the bilingual reasoning engine for Arabic-native text generation, long-context analysis, and selective thinking. **Fanar-Diwan** is a dedicated generative model for classical Arabic poetry. Tool-calling and agentic capabilities are built into **Fanar-27B** through post-training.

**Islamic Model (Fanar-Sadiq).** A multi-agent component routing diverse Islamic query types to specialised handlers for Fiqh reasoning, Quranic retrieval, zakat and inheritance calculation, du'a lookup, Hijri calendar, and prayer times.

**Vision Models (Oryx).** Oryx-IG for culturally-grounded image synthesis, and Oryx-IVU for Arabic-aware image and video understanding.




Figure 1: The Fanar 2.0 Generative AI platform. Five specialised model families are coordinated through an intelligent orchestrator; all outputs are validated by **FanarGuard** for safety and cultural alignment.

**Translation (FanarShaheen).** An LLM-powered bilingual Arabic-English translation system with high fluency and broad domain coverage.

**Speech Models (Aura).** Long-form dialect-aware ASR (Aura-STT-LF) and expressive bilingual TTS, both supporting MSA and major Arabic dialects.

**Orchestrator and Safety.** A redesigned multi-layer orchestrator manages intent classification, expert routing, and context reconstruction. **FanarGuard** validates inputs and outputs against safety and cultural alignment criteria, serving as a first-class platform component in Fanar 2.0.

### 2.3. Open-Weight and Proprietary Models in the Fanar 2.0 Stack

A consistent principle across the Fanar 2.0 stack is to build every deployed component on top of *publicly released model weights* rather than training entirely from scratch. This exploits state-of-the-art general capabilities and dramatically reduces compute, while keeping our team’s effort concentrated on the Arabic-centric and cultural adaptation that cannot be inherited from existing models. Table 3 summarises the foundation model used for each component.

Proprietary closed-source models are *not* part of any deployed Fanar 2.0 component. They appear in two limited supporting roles. First, **Gemini 2.5 Flash** is used as an annotation engine to generate bilingual VQA training pairs for Oryx-IVU and as an automated evaluation judge for the Aura-STT-LF readability layer. Second, **GPT-4o** and **Google Translate** serve as performance baselines in the image generation and translation evaluations respectively — reflecting the common practice of benchmarking sovereign systems against frontier commercial APIs. Post-training judge evaluations also draw on large open-weight models including Qwen2.5-72B, Qwen3-32B, Llama-3.1-405B, and Cohere Command-R+. In all cases these models touch only intermediate artefacts (annotation, evaluation scores) and have no influence on the inference-time behaviour of the platform.

**Table 3** Foundation models underlying each Fanar 2.0 component. **OW** = open-weight (publicly released weights); **OS** = open-source (weights + code under permissive licence). Each entry’s second row (italicised) describes the task served.

Component	Foundation Model	Type
<b>Text LLM (Fanar-27B)</b> <i>Core bilingual language understanding, generation, and chain-of-thought reasoning</i>	Gemma-3-27B (Google)	OW
<b>Safety filter (FanarGuard)</b> <i>Harmlessness and cultural moderation of all platform inputs and outputs</i>	Gemma-3-4B (Google)	OW
<b>Image generation (Oryx-IG)</b> <i>Culturally-aligned synthesis of Arabic and Islamic visual content</i>	FLUX.1-schnell (Black Forest Labs)	OW
<b>Image/video understanding (Oryx-IVU)</b> <i>Arabic-aware visual question answering and reasoning over images and video</i>	Qwen2.5-VL-7B (Alibaba)	OW
<b>Long-form ASR (Aura-STT-LF)</b> <i>Dialect-aware Arabic/English long-form speech recognition with readability layer</i>	HARNESS Arabic-centric foundation	OW
<b>Text-to-speech (Aura-TTS)</b> <i>Personalised bilingual Arabic and English speech synthesis</i>	F5-TTS diffusion transformer	OS
<b>Translation (FanarShaheen)</b> <i>High-quality English↔Arabic machine translation</i>	Intermediate Fanar (Llama-3-8B base)	OW
<b>Arabic poetry (Fanar-Diwan)</b> <i>Classical Arabic poetry generation with metre and diacritisation control</i>	AraGPT2-Mega (1.46B)	OS
<b>Islamic content (Fanar-Sadiq)</b> <i>Grounded Islamic knowledge retrieval across Fiqh, Quran, and prayer domains</i>	<b>Fanar-27B</b> + retrieval augmentation	OW
<b>Agentic tool-calling (Fanar-27B)</b> <i>Multi-step agentic workflows and external tool orchestration</i>	<b>Fanar-27B</b> (post-trained for tool use)	OW

### 3. Fanar Large Language Text Model

The data collection and curation strategy for **Fanar-27B** is described, followed by the three-recipe continual pre-training approach on the Gemma-3-27B backbone, the model-merging strategy used to assemble the final checkpoint, and key training infrastructure details.

This section describes our datasets and the pre- and post-training steps of Fanar LLM. It also presents our evaluation using multiple benchmarks and comparisons against other models.

#### 3.1. Data Collection and Curation

The Fanar pretraining corpus was constructed to address the limited availability of large-scale, high-quality Arabic data. It comprises nearly 1.0 trillion tokens spanning Arabic, English, and code, with approximately 410B tokens dedicated to Arabic.

The **Arabic** data covers multiple varieties, including Modern Standard Arabic, Classical Arabic, and dialectal Arabic, sourced from in-house web crawls, encyclopedic resources, news articles, literary texts, poetry, and machine-translated content to ensure broad domain and stylistic coverage. The **English** data consists of 513B tokens drawn from web documents, scientific literature, social media, and other publicly available English sources to provide broad linguistic and world-knowledge coverage. The remaining 10% (102B tokens) consists of **codes** written in programming languages such as Python, C, C++, Java, and JavaScript, sourced primarily from permissively licensed GitHub repositories to enhance structural and logical reasoning in model learning.

To ensure high data quality, the raw corpus underwent extensive preprocessing, including cleaning, normalization, and large-scale deduplication. A multi-stage quality filtering pipeline was applied, combining heuristic (e.g. RedPajama filters), linguistic, and model-based filters to remove noisy, low-quality, or incoherent content. The model-based filtering was implemented to remove residual low-quality con-

tent missed by earlier stages. This includes perplexity filtering using KenLM models trained on Arabic Wikipedia to discard both high-perplexity noise and overly simple text, and an education-content classifier (ArabicWeb-Edu [49]) trained on Arabic web data to filter non-educational material such as ads and adult content, removing roughly 20% of remaining data.

These quality control steps were designed to retain linguistically sound and semantically meaningful text, supporting robust training and improved generative performance of the models. More details about data collection and curation can be found in the Fanar 1.0 report [36].




Figure 2: Fanar 2.0 pre-training data recipes and training pipeline.

### 3.2. LLM Pre-training

Building on the success of Fanar 1.0, the development of Fanar 2.0 is guided by three complementary objectives:

- Scaling model capacity to improve general-purpose performance and factual grounding [51, 55].
- Unlocking emergent capabilities that arise at larger parameter counts [91].
- Strengthening Arabic language understanding across diverse domains, including culture, religion, and linguistics.

Our prior work on Fanar 1.0, which produced two models, **Fanar Star** (7B) and **Fanar Prime** (9B), showed that building upon existing pretrained models gives a significant head start, and that it is possible to surpass the underlying model’s performance significantly on general tasks for a specific language like Arabic while preserving or improving English proficiency. A central lesson from that effort was that *data quality dominates data quantity* in the continual pretraining regime, since the base model has already been exposed to trillions of tokens spanning both English and Arabic.

Fanar 2.0 scales to 27 billion parameters through continual pretraining on Gemma-3-27B-pt [41]. The choice of continual pretraining over training from scratch is motivated by both practical and empirical considerations. From a compute standpoint, pretraining a 27B-parameter model from scratch to competitive quality would require on the order of  $10^{23}$ – $10^{24}$  FLOPs [51], far exceeding our available compute budget. Continual pretraining amortizes the cost of the base model’s prior training and allows us to concentrate compute on targeted domain adaptation [46]. Empirically, recent work has shown that continual pretraining from a strong multilingual checkpoint can match or exceed from-scratch baselines on downstream tasks at a fraction of the cost [45], a finding corroborated by our own Fanar 1.0 experiments.

The selection of Gemma-3-27B as the base model was driven by several factors. First, Gemma-3-27B exhibits strong multilingual performance out of the box, including non-trivial Arabic capability, providing a favorable initialization for Arabic-centric adaptation. Second, its architecture employs a mixture of local and global attention with a sliding window mechanism [41], enabling efficient processing of long contexts - a property that transfers directly to our continual pretraining setup. Third, the model’s permissive licensing terms facilitate both research and downstream deployment.

## Pretraining Data

The pretraining corpus was assembled from two primary sources, as illustrated in Figure 2. The first is a *high-quality (HQ) subset* of the original Fanar 1.0 dataset, comprising manually curated, deduplicated, and filtered text spanning news, encyclopedic content, literature, and domain-specific material in both Arabic and English. The second source consists of *synthetic data* produced by purpose-built, high-quality machine translation engines (see Section 9), which augment coverage in under-represented Arabic domains, particularly formal registers and technical terminology where naturally occurring web text is scarce.

In addition to these proprietary sources, we incorporate two publicly available educationally oriented corpora: FineWeb-EDU [62], a quality-filtered subset of Common Crawl selected for educational value, and ArabicWeb-EDU [49], its Arabic counterpart. The inclusion of educationally oriented data is motivated by prior findings that such corpora disproportionately improve reasoning and factual accuracy relative to their token count [44, 58].

## Training Procedure




Figure 3: Pre-training loss curves for the three recipes.

Training was conducted using NVIDIA’s NeMo framework [48] on clusters of NVIDIA H100 GPUs, consuming approximately 75,000 GPU hours in total. Rather than executing a single monolithic training run, we adopted a *targeted recipe-based strategy* in which compute was distributed across a series of shorter, targeted runs. This design enabled rapid experimentation with data mixtures, hyperparameter configurations, and annealing schedules while retaining the ability to reach convergence at scale. Below, we describe the three recipes that constitute the final training pipeline.

- **Recipe 1: Curated High-Quality Data.** consists solely of a manually curated HQ subset, totaling approximately 50 billion tokens. This run prioritizes linguistic correctness, stylistic consistency, and domain breadth across English and Arabic, serving as the primary vehicle for Arabic language adaptation. The language composition is approximately 45% Arabic, 45% English, and 10% code.

- **Recipe 2: Curated + Educational Web Data.** broadens the data distribution by combining a fraction of the curated HQ data with subsets of FineWeb-EDU [62] and ArabicWeb-EDU [49], yielding approximately 70 billion tokens. The aim is to strengthen the model’s command of formal Arabic registers and domain-specific terminology, leveraging the demonstrated benefits of educationally oriented pretraining data [44]. The language ratio remains approximately 45/45/10 (Arabic/English/code).
- **Recipe 3: Translation-Centric Parallel Data.** is heavily oriented toward parallel text. It combines curated HQ data with a quality-filtered subset of FineWeb-EDU and its Arabic translations produced by our in-house translation system (Section 9). This recipe comprises approximately 30 billion tokens and contains no code data (roughly 50/50 Arabic/English). The inclusion of parallel data is intended to reinforce cross-lingual alignment and enrich the model’s Arabic lexical coverage, consistent with findings that translation-augmented pretraining improves bilingual transfer [28].

Figure 3 presents the training loss curves for each recipe. The loss curves show that all three recipes lead to a stable loss reduction, with Recipe 3 being the fastest to lower loss. This is most likely because Recipe 3’s mix focus is more about translation/parallel bilingual capabilities, rather than learning new knowledge. The high quality thresholds for Recipe 1 and 2 indicate that the model is indeed strengthening the existing Arabic knowledge. After each recipe, we execute a short annealing phase over 8 billion tokens in which the learning rate decays linearly from its terminal value to zero. Annealing has been shown to stabilize final representations and improve downstream task performance [65]. As shown in Table 4, annealing consistently yields substantial gains on Arabic benchmarks (e.g., +1.81 points on OALL after Recipe 1, +3.81 after Recipe 2, and +8.26 after Recipe 3), confirming its importance in our pipeline.

Across all recipes, we use a peak learning rate of  $1e^{-6}$  with a warmup of 100 steps followed by cosine decay to  $5e^{-7}$ . Each recipe is trained for a single epoch. The conservative learning rate is deliberate: in continual pretraining, excessively large learning rates risk catastrophic forgetting of the base model’s capabilities [45, 63].

The specific data compositions, language ratios, learning rate schedules, and other settings were determined through extensive ablation experiments conducted on a smaller Gemma-3-4b-pt model. Using a 4B-parameter proxy allowed faster iteration, enabling us to evaluate over many configurations before committing to full-scale 27B runs. This practice follows established methodology for efficient hyperparameter search at scale [19].

## Model Merging

Rather than selecting a single best checkpoint, we leverage *model merging* [43] to combine the complementary strengths of different recipe endpoints. Model merging in weight space has been shown to improve robustness and multi-task performance by averaging over diverse loss basins [53, 93]. We experimented with three merging strategies: linear interpolation [93], SLERP (spherical linear interpolation), and TIES-Merging [94]. Linear interpolation proved most effective in our setting. The final Fanar 2.0-27B-pt model is a linear combination of three checkpoints:

$$\theta_{\text{Fanar2.0}} = 0.6 \theta_{\text{R1+A}} + 0.2 \theta_{\text{R2+A}} + 0.2 \theta_{\text{R3}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\theta_{\text{R1+A}}$  and  $\theta_{\text{R2+A}}$  denote the annealed checkpoints of Recipes 1 and 2, respectively, and  $\theta_{\text{R3}}$  denotes the *non-annealed* checkpoint of Recipe 3. The dominant weight on Recipe 1 reflects its role as the primary source of curated Arabic data. The inclusion of the non-annealed Recipe 3 checkpoint rather than its annealed counterpart was determined empirically.

## Results and Analysis

Table 4 summarizes the performance of each recipe stage, its annealed variant, and the final merged model on English and Arabic benchmarks. English performance is reported as the average across several

English benchmarks, e.g., MMLU, HellaSwag, ARC-Challenge, PIQA, Winogrande; Arabic performance is reported using the OALL v1 benchmark suite average [34].

**Table 4** Pretraining recipe progression and final merged model performance. “Data” indicates tokens consumed during that stage.

	Data	English Avg.	Arabic Avg.
Gemma-3-27b-pt (base)		79.99%	63.32%
Recipe 1	50B	80.04%	63.32%
Recipe 1 + Annealing	+8B	79.45%	65.13%
Recipe 2	70B	79.95%	61.14%
Recipe 2 + Annealing	+8B	79.61%	64.95%
Recipe 3	30B	<b>80.21%</b>	57.33%
Recipe 3 + Annealing	+8B	79.73%	65.59%
Fanar-27B-pt	~166B	80.10%	<b>66.62%</b>

Several observations merit discussion. First, the merged Fanar 2.0 model improves Arabic OALL performance by **+3.30** percentage points over the Gemma-3-27B base while maintaining English performance within 0.11 points (80.10% vs. 79.99%), confirming that our continual pretraining pipeline enhances Arabic capabilities without incurring meaningful catastrophic forgetting on English.

Second, the annealing phase is critical for Arabic performance across all recipes. Most strikingly, Recipe 3 improves from 57.33% to 65.59% (+8.26) after annealing, suggesting that the model benefits from a stabilization phase to consolidate knowledge from parallel data. However, annealing consistently introduces a modest English regression (0.48-0.59 points), a trade-off that the subsequent merging step partially mitigates.

Third, model merging yields gains beyond the best individual checkpoint. The merged model’s Arabic score of 66.62% exceeds the best single-recipe annealed score (65.59% from Recipe 3+Annealing) by over one point, while simultaneously recovering English performance. This result aligns with the model soups hypothesis that averaging checkpoints from diverse training runs occupies a flatter region of the loss landscape with superior generalization [93].

The resulting Fanar 2.0 model demonstrates markedly improved Arabic language understanding, higher coherence in culturally contextualized dialogue, and a more robust representation across diverse domains. These gains are attributed not only to the high-quality corpus mixes, but also to the iterative training strategy that allowed fine-grained control over data composition and learning dynamics.

### 3.3. Post-training

The five-stage post-training pipeline for **Fanar-27B** is described: supervised fine-tuning, long-context adaptation, capability rebalancing, and direct preference optimisation, followed by linear checkpoint merging. Native Arabic reasoning trace generation and hallucination mitigation via structured self-verification are also covered.

Building on the **Fanar Prime** post-training framework, we substantially redesigned the pipeline for Fanar 2.0. At 27B scale, a model amplifies both desirable behaviors and failure modes—including hallucination and alignment drift—requiring tighter data quality control, more deliberate stage sequencing, and stronger alignment supervision. A key lesson from Fanar-9B was that *data quality and cultural specificity matter more than dataset size* in the post-training regime. Two capabilities absent in Fanar-9B were also introduced: native Arabic reasoning-trace supervision and a dedicated long-context adaptation stage. The pipeline comprises four sequential training stages followed by linear checkpoint merging.



## Overview and Design Objectives

Five primary objectives guided the redesign:

- Enforce stricter data quality through rubric-based filtering and language-purity checks across Arabic and English datasets.
- Strengthen bilingual reasoning via native Arabic reasoning-trace supervision for complex multi-step problem solving.
- Reduce hallucinations through knowledge probing, structured self-verification training, and targeted alignment interventions.
- Deepen cultural alignment by broadening coverage across value-sensitive domains relevant to Arabic and Middle Eastern contexts.
- Enable long-context performance through a dedicated adaptation stage for extended input sequences.

## Data Refinement and Quality Control

The post-training corpus was assembled through two complementary strategies—selective filtering of public datasets and controlled synthetic generation—followed by language consistency checks applied to all retained data.

**Selective filtering.** Public instruction-tuning and preference datasets were scored against detailed, capability-based rubrics assessing prompt quality, response quality, clarity, value alignment, and cultural appropriateness. Annotation was performed using an LLM optimized for efficient inference, with hardened system prompts to mitigate known biases (e.g., preference for longer responses). Only high-scoring samples were retained. As open-weight annotators improved, we re-applied filtering using `Qwen-3-32B` in place of the earlier `Llama2-7B`; the stricter threshold reduced the SFT dataset by nearly half. Preference data were filtered less aggressively due to limited availability. All retained samples were translated into Arabic, and a cultural adaptation pass adjusted cultural references while preserving semantic intent.

**Synthetic generation.** To address capability gaps and strengthen cultural grounding, we built a multi-model generation pipeline. Prompts and responses were produced by multiple open-weight LLMs with varying Arabic proficiency; models without safety alignment were used deliberately to generate contrastive rejected samples for DPO cultural alignment training. Each generated sample was evaluated by a committee of LLM judges—`Gemma-3-27b-it`, `Qwen3-32B`, `Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct`, `c4ai-command-r-plus`, and `Llama-3.1-405B`—using the same rubrics applied during selective filtering. Only high-scoring samples were retained, and preference pairs required a minimum one-point score margin between accepted and rejected responses to reduce label noise. Table 5 lists all models used across the data generation and evaluation pipeline.

**Language consistency filtering.** All datasets were filtered to retain only Arabic and English samples using two independent language detectors<sup>3</sup>. Additional passes removed unintended code-switching and character mixing (e.g., transient Chinese output) observed in some synthetic generations.

---

<sup>3</sup>We used `langdetect` (<https://pypi.org/project/langdetect/>) and `fasttext` (<https://pypi.org/project/fasttext/>) for language detection.

**Table 5** Models used for different tasks during synthetic data generation.

Task	Model(s) used
Judge Evaluations, Scoring and Quality Filtering	Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct, gemma-3-27b-it, c4ai-command-r-plus, gpt-4o, Llama-3.1-405B, Qwen3-32B,
Reasoning Trace Generation (Arabic)	Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking-2507, Qwen3-32B, Qwen3-235B-A22B-Thinking-2507
Data Generation (prompts, responses, and dialogs)	Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct, gemma-3-27b-it, Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct, Mistral-Large-Instruct-2407,
Data Generation (violating/misaligned responses)	Dolphin3.0-Mistral-24B, dolphin-2.9.2-qwen2-72b, WizardLM-33B-V1.0-Uncensored, dolphin-2.9.1-llama-3-70b

## Capability Expansion

Beyond dataset refinement, we expanded the model across three dimensions: reinforcing known weaknesses through targeted augmentation, deepening culturally grounded alignment, and introducing new behavioral capabilities required for deployment.

**Targeted Dataset Augmentation.** Public benchmark results, internal testing, and large-scale user feedback from the web interface, API, and mobile app identified recurring post-training weaknesses. We curated new datasets—combining public resources and internally generated synthetic data—targeting improvements across:

- **Linguistic competence:** summarization, Arabic grammar correction, sequence tagging, and fill-in-the-blank generation.
- **Broader capabilities:** dialect understanding, structured long-form generation, precise instruction following, logical reasoning, and robustness against emerging jailbreaking strategies.
- **Alignment signals:** several public preference datasets were incorporated to reinforce DPO training.

Each capability-specific dataset contained several thousand to tens of thousands of samples.

**Cultural Alignment.** Cultural alignment has been a central objective since Fanar 1.0. In Fanar 2.0, we broadened coverage across value-sensitive domains: cultural and social norms, family and community values, public conduct and etiquette, religious traditions, and political and regional sensitivities. Our approach combined targeted synthetic generation with human-annotated public datasets such as PALM<sup>4</sup>. Synthetic data were generated from structured prompt templates derived by analysing and categorising user-flagged responses from production logs. For each thematic category, we generated both culturally aligned responses and contrastive misaligned variants, the latter incorporated as rejected samples during DPO training. This log-driven, contrastive construction targeted failure modes beyond static dataset coverage.

**New Capabilities.** We introduced the following capabilities absent in **Fanar Prime**:

<sup>4</sup><https://huggingface.co/datasets/UBC-NLP/palm>

- **Selective Thinking.** Each response was augmented with a structured `<think>...</think>` block, either populated with a reasoning trace or explicitly empty. This enables runtime control over reasoning-trace visibility—useful for API use cases requiring strict output formatting.
- **Tool Calling.** Generic tool-calling functionality was introduced using public tool-use datasets and Arabic translations. A smaller targeted dataset reinforced reliability for the ten internal Fanar tools [35].
- **Encapsulation Markers for Quranic Verses.** User logs revealed spontaneous Quranic verse references despite their exclusion from training data. We constructed a dedicated dataset introducing explicit encapsulation markers around verses, enabling downstream post-inference validation of verse correctness.
- **Long-Context Conversational Coherence.** UltraChat dialogs were expanded to 3–9K words using our synthetic generation pipeline, reinforcing coherence in extended multi-turn interactions.
- **Knowledge Probing and Abstention Calibration.** Using an intermediate SFT checkpoint, we identified open-domain QA prompts where the model hallucinated. Prompts yielding complete hallucinations were mapped to explicit abstention responses (e.g., “I don’t know”); partially hallucinated responses were rewritten with cautionary cues directing users to reliable sources. The model was re-trained on this augmented dataset before proceeding to subsequent stages.
- **Prompt Hierarchy Enforcement.** Adversarial datasets were constructed targeting instruction-override attempts—prompts attempting to alter model identity, training provenance, system policies, or safety constraints—to ensure policy-compliant responses under in-context adversarial prompting.

## Reasoning Trace Generation

Supervised distillation from large-scale reasoning models effectively transfers mathematical and analytical capabilities to smaller models. We adopt this approach to construct a native Arabic reasoning dataset that strengthens multi-step reasoning. Translating existing English-distilled reasoning datasets into Arabic introduced language-mixing artifacts and degraded trace quality; instead, we generated reasoning traces natively in Arabic. Figure 4 shows an example.

Dataset construction proceeded in four steps. First, prompts were drawn from the Dolphin R1<sup>5</sup> and OpenMathReasoning<sup>6</sup> datasets and translated into Arabic. Second, each prompt was classified into one of 61 math and reasoning categories using DeepSeek-R1; categories with more than 10K prompts were subsampled to 10K, while smaller categories were retained in full. Third, reasoning traces were generated natively in Arabic using three Qwen-3 thinking models: Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking-2507<sup>7</sup>, Qwen3-32B<sup>8</sup>, and Qwen3-235B-A22B-Thinking-2507<sup>9</sup>. To induce Arabic-language reasoning, each model’s chat template was modified to prepend an Arabic starter phrase to the thinking tag, conditioning the model to continue in Arabic<sup>10</sup>. Fourth, each trace was evaluated against the ground-truth solution by a larger LLM judge; only traces with correct final answers were retained. All retained traces then passed the language consistency filtering described earlier.

## Training Pipeline

The training pipeline comprised four sequential stages, each targeting distinct capability dimensions.

<sup>5</sup><https://huggingface.co/datasets/QuixiAI/dolphin-r1>

<sup>6</sup><https://huggingface.co/datasets/nvidia/OpenMathReasoning>

<sup>7</sup><https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen3-30B-A3B-Thinking-2507>

<sup>8</sup><https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen3-32B>

<sup>9</sup><https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen3-235B-A22B-Thinking-2507>

<sup>10</sup>The starting phrase was: “<think> دعني أحاول معرفة هذا ”

## How can I help you?

لغز ترتيب الأحداث:  
ثلاثة أصدقاء: سامي، وليد، ومازن. أحدهم وصل إلى الحفلة أولاً، والآخر وصل بعدها بساعة، والثالث وصل أخيراً.  
قال سامي: "لم أصل أولاً."  
وقال وليد: "مازن لم يصل بعدي."  
إذا كان كل منهما يقول الحقيقة، فمن وصل أولاً، ومن وصل ثانياً، ومن وصل أخيراً؟

+ Thinker ×

Thinking...

حسناً، لنرى المشكلة هي حول ثلاثة أصدقاء - سامي ، وليد ، ومازن - الذين وصلوا إلى حفلة في أوقات مختلفة. واحد منهم جاء أولاً، وواحد بعد ساعة واحدة، وواحد آخر. قال سامي إنه لم يأتِ أولاً. وقال وليد أن مازن لم يصل بعده. علينا معرفة من وصل أولاً وثانياً وأخيراً مع العلم بأن كلا التصريحين صحيحان.

أولاً ، دعني أسجل المعلومات المقدمة:

1. هناك ثلاث مرات وصول: الأول (T1) ، الثاني (T2 = T1 + 1 ساعة) ، والأخير (T3).
2. سامي يقول: "لم أصل أولاً." إذن، سامي ليس هو الذي وصل أولاً.
3. وليد يقول: "مازن لم يصل بعدي." وهذا يعني أن وليد وصل قبل أو في نفس الوقت الذي وصل فيه مازن. لكن بما أنهم جميعاً وصلوا في أوقات مختلفة، يجب أن يكون وليد قد وصل قبل مازن. لأن إذا كانوا في نفس الوقت، فإن ذلك سيكون انتهاكاً لشرط الأوقات المختلفة. لذلك، وليد وصل قبل مازن.

Figure 4: Example of Fanar Arabic reasoning traces.

**Supervised Fine-Tuning.** The first stage used short-form instruction–response pairs to reinforce targeted capabilities, long chain-of-thought reasoning-trace supervision, multi-turn dialogue data, and culturally aligned samples. Hyperparameters for all stages are summarised in Table 6.

**Long-Context Adaptation.** The second stage introduced long-form instruction–response training to adapt the model to extended input contexts (16K context window). This improved performance on long-context reasoning and multi-turn dialogue but partially degraded short-form tasks emphasised in the first stage.

**Capability Rebalancing.** A third fine-tuning stage on a high-quality curated subset restored balance across capabilities following long-context adaptation.

**Preference Optimization.** The final stage applied Direct Preference Optimization (DPO), a stable and compute-efficient alternative to RL-based alignment at this scale (280K preference pairs). The preference dataset combined public corpora with synthetic pairs, augmented by user-dislike data extracted from production logs: logged misaligned responses were paired with improved alternatives from our generation pipeline to form contrastive training examples.

**Checkpoint Merging.** As in pre-training, the final model was obtained by linear weight averaging over three post-training checkpoints:

$$\theta_{\text{Fanar2.0-PT}} = 0.4\theta_{\text{DPO}} + 0.4\theta_{\text{SFT-R}} + 0.2\theta_{\text{DPO-mix}}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\theta_{\text{DPO}}$  is the primary DPO checkpoint (gemma3-27b-dpo3),  $\theta_{\text{SFT-R}}$  is the SFT reasoning checkpoint (gemma3-27b-sft-reasoning-250k), and  $\theta_{\text{DPO-mix}}$  is a supplementary DPO checkpoint (gemma3-27b-dpo5-v2-mix) that adds robustness. All weights were stored and merged in bfloat16 precision.

## Hallucination Mitigation

Knowledge probing (described above) maps the model’s factual uncertainty to explicit abstention. We extend this with a training-time self-verification method that further reduces hallucinations [8]. Instead of directly answering a factual query, the model is trained to reason through its uncertainty via a five-step structured verification trace (Figure 5): (1) produce an initial answer; (2) generate and answer a verification question derived from the original; (3) revise the initial answer if necessary; (4) perform a consistency judgment; (5) decide to respond or abstain.




Figure 5: Structured verification trace consisting of an initial answer, a verification question generated through semantic transformations such as rephrasing or logical variation, a verification response, a re-answer conditioned on verification, and a final consistency judgment to determine answer versus abstention. During training, stage-level loss masking suppresses gradients for hallucinated answer-producing stages while preserving supervision for verification and judgment stages.

Training data were constructed as follows. Factual queries were collected and responses generated using an intermediate model checkpoint. Each response was labeled as correct or hallucinatory using the knowledge-probing framework, and structured self-verification traces were generated for both outcomes—either guiding the model toward a validated answer or a calibrated abstention. In abstention trajectories, intermediate stages may themselves contain hallucinated candidates; we apply *stage-level loss masking* to suppress gradient computation for those stages while preserving supervision for the verification reasoning and consistency judgment steps. This ensures hallucinated intermediates do not corrupt the training signal.

## Evaluation and In-Loop Monitoring

Dataset decisions, mixture ratios, and scaling strategies are guided by continuous in-loop evaluation: a composite benchmark score is computed every 1,000 training batches to track capability and alignment throughout training. The suite covers instruction-following (translated MT-Bench [21], Alpaca benchmarks with custom judging prompts), broad general capabilities across 50+ domains, and multi-turn conversational fluency—all evaluated on open-ended generation using strong closed-source models as automated judges. Cultural alignment is evaluated via a custom dataset run after each training stage.

After multi-stage training, the strongest checkpoints are merged and evaluated on a comprehensive suite spanning instruction following, world knowledge, cultural alignment, mathematics, reasoning, and safety,

(see Section 3.4). Performance gaps identified here drive the next cycle of targeted training and data curation.

## Training and Serving Infrastructure

**Training Infrastructure.** All post-training stages were conducted on 8–12 compute nodes, each equipped with 8 NVIDIA H100 GPUs. Table 6 summarizes key hyperparameters across all stages.

**Table 6** Training parameters used for post-training.

Training Phase	Number of samples	Batch Size	Learning Rate
SFT	3,985,215	672	1e-6 (min 1e-7)
Long-Context Adaptation (16K)	54,321	112	1e-6 (min 1e-7)
Capability Rebalancing	–	–	1e-6 (min 1e-7)
DPO	280K	–	1e-6 (min 1e-7)

**Serving Configuration.** Inference is served using vLLM (v0.8.4) with Transformers 4.56.1 and flashinfer-python 0.2.2, with GPU memory utilization set to 0.98 for maximum throughput. Reasoning-trace generation is enabled by default and can be suppressed at runtime by setting `no_thinking` to `True` in the chat template—useful for API use cases requiring deterministic, format-constrained output.

### Thinking Mode Chat Template Usage

```
payload = {
  "model": {model},
  "messages": {messages},
  "temperature": {temperature},
  "max_tokens": {max_tokens},
  "chat_template_kwargs": {"no_thinking": True}
}

# Default:
# no_thinking = False → reasoning traces enabled
```

## 3.4. Evaluation

**Fanar-27B** is evaluated against Arabic-centric and multilingual models across world knowledge, Arabic language capabilities, dialectal understanding, cultural awareness, English proficiency, mathematical reasoning, instruction following and safety. Results consistently show improvements over Fanar 1.0 and competitive performance relative to models two-to-three times larger.

We compare **Fanar-27B**<sup>11</sup> to a collection of representative Arabic-centric and multilingual models of parameter sizes in the range 27–70B. We compare the models on a number of benchmarks that span a wide range of skills and abilities, including world knowledge in Arabic and English, culture awareness, Arabic language competence, Arabic dialect understanding, mathematical reasoning, instruction following and safety. The reported metric varies per benchmark, from normalized accuracy for multi-choice question (MCQ) benchmarks, to flexible matching in math reasoning benchmarking, to LLM-as-a-judge for generative tasks.

### Models

We include the following models:

<sup>11</sup>In all the results below, **Fanar-27B** refers to **Fanar-2-27B-Instruct**.

## Arabic-centric models

- **Fanar-1-9b-instruct** [36]: the first generation Fanar model, built on top of `gemma-2-9b` base model using continual pre-training and instruction fine-tuning.
- **ALLaM-7B-Instruct-preview-v2** [17]: the second version of Humain’s open-weight flagship 7B model trained from scratch.
- **Karnak** [14]: a mixture-of-expert model from the Applied Innovation Center, finetuned on top of `Qwen3-30B-A3B` instruction-following model.
- **AceGPT-v2-32B-Chat** and **AceGPT-v2-70B-Chat** [101]: two models from the second generation of Freedom Intelligence’s AceGPT family, built on top of Llama.
- **Jais-2-70B-Chat** [13]: the larger variant of Inception’s new edition of the Jais family, trained from scratch.

## Multilingual models

- **Gemma-3-27b-it** [41]: a highly capable model from google, fine-tuned from the same base as Fanar.
- **Qwen3-32b** [81]: a dense model from the latest generation of the Qwen series from Alibaba.
- **Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct** [65]: the latest text-only model from Meta.

## Benchmarks

We show benchmarking results for a number of tasks across the following classes:

- **World knowledge:** the Arabic subset of MMMLU [74], ArabicMMLU [56] and OALL-v2 suite [33].
- **Arabic capabilities:** *Nahw*-MCQ [70] (see Appendix B.1), AraLingBench [95] and Al-Mieyar (see Appendix B.2).
- **Arabic and Islamic culture:** PalmX [10] with its two parts (see Appendix B.3) and Arabic Culture Value Alignment (ACVA) [52].
- **Dialectal tasks:** Bebebe [16], AraDiCE [68] and DialectalArabicMMLU [7].
- **English tasks:** MMLU [50], PIQA [20], Hellaswag [96] and ARC Challenge [26].
- **Reasoning tasks:** GSM8K [27], MATH500 [60], AIME24 [97] and AMC23 [11].
- **Instruction following and conversational skills:** MT-Bench [98], IFEval [100], and two internal Arabic benchmarks covering conversational fluency and Arabic cultural alignment (see Section 3.3).
- **Model safety:** aiXamine [30], covering 46 benchmarks across nine safety dimensions.

## Evaluation Results

Tables 7–15 show the evaluation results per benchmark category: Arabic knowledge, Arabic language, dialectal understanding, cultural awareness, English tasks, mathematical reasoning, following instruction and conversational skills, and safety evaluations, respectively. As we benchmark models of various sizes and capacities to capture the spectrum of Arabic-centric models and open-weight multilingual models, we present them ordered by parameter count and encode the number of parameters using row colors in the results tables below.

**Table 7** Arabic Knowledge Evaluation

	Size	MMMLU/Ar (0-shot)	ArabicMMLU (3-shot)	OALL-v2 (0-shot)
Allam-7B-Instruct-preview-v2	7B	57.16	70.01	67.98
Fanar-1-9b-instruct	9B	58.30	67.35	68.64
<b>Fanar-27B</b>	27B	67.40	74.67	69.40
AceGPT-v2-32B-Chat	32B	61.10	69.55	67.42
Karnak	40B	<b>77.83</b>	<b>81.23</b>	<b>77.44</b>
AceGPT-v2-70B-Chat	70B	68.44	73.87	68.16
Jais-2-70B-Chat	70B	69.01	<u>79.02</u>	-
Gemma-3-27B-it	27B	67.65	72.21	70.95
Qwen3-32B	32B	69.32	73.08	64.85
Llama-3.3-70b-Instruct	70B	<u>70.00</u>	73.66	<u>73.00</u>

**Table 8** Arabic Language Evaluation

	Size	<i>Nahw</i> - MCQ (3-shot)	AraLing- Bench (0-shot)	Phonology (0-shot)	Morphology (0-shot)	Almieyar Syntax (0-shot)	Semantics (0-shot)	Pragmatics (0-shot)
Allam-7B-Instruct-preview-v2	7B	<u>51.34</u>	<u>74.67</u>	58.6	48.1	71.4	76.7	70.3
Fanar-1-9b-instruct	9B	40.00	60.60	<u>65.0</u>	63.9	66.3	74.7	78.7
<b>Fanar-27B</b>	27B	46.88	68.67	<b>80.7</b>	<u>67.7</u>	<b>82.7</b>	<b>80.7</b>	<b>85.5</b>
AceGPT-v2-32B-Chat	32B	38.62	63.00	45.7	60.8	45.9	60.7	63.1
Karnak	40B	46.08	74.00	60.0	58.9	66.3	70.7	78.0
AceGPT-v2-70B-Chat	70B	42.98	58.67	47.1	61.4	40.8	60.7	61.8
Jais-2-70B-Chat	70B	<b>53.12</b>	<b>77.33</b>	60.7	65.8	67.3	<u>78.0</u>	<u>84.6</u>
Gemma-3-27B-it	27B	43.82	63.33	60.0	63.3	72.4	74.7	82.0
Qwen3-32B	32B	42.14	26.60	60.7	67.1	<u>75.5</u>	64.0	68.6
Llama-3.3-70b-Instruct	70B	41.00	64.67	57.1	<b>77.2</b>	66.3	68.0	73.0

**Table 9** Dialectal Arabic Evaluation

	Size	Belebele (3-shot)	PIQA/Egy (0-shot)	AraDiCE PIQA/Lev (0-shot)	MMLU/Egy (0-shot)	MMLU/Lev (0-shot)	Dialectal- Arabic-MMLU (3-shot)
Allam-7B-Instruct-preview-v2	7B	77.19	63.76	59.85	64.28	66.45	56.17
Fanar-1-9b-instruct	9B	83.26	63.44	59.85	59.34	60.28	59.91
<b>Fanar-27B</b>	27B	<b>86.81</b>	<b>68.12</b>	<b>63.66</b>	66.00	68.14	67.40
AceGPT-v2-32B-Chat	32B	83.96	62.62	60.88	60.97	62.48	62.82
Karnak	40B	85.25	61.64	59.03	<b>72.40</b>	<b>75.20</b>	<b>69.98</b>
AceGPT-v2-70B-Chat	70B	84.22	<u>67.36</u>	61.86	67.95	68.41	68.56
Jais-2-70B-Chat	70B	<u>86.67</u>	66.16	<u>62.79</u>	<u>72.29</u>	<u>74.14</u>	66.33
Gemma-3-27B-it	27B	85.54	65.45	60.34	64.30	65.64	66.52
Qwen3-32B	32B	85.98	61.70	56.31	61.60	62.31	68.96
Llama-3.3-70b-Instruct	70B	82.85	62.89	58.76	65.74	66.56	<u>69.63</u>

**Table 10** Arabic and Islamic Culture Awareness Evaluation

	Size	ACVA (5-shot)	PalmX Islamic (0-shot)	PalmX Culture (0-shot)
Allam-7B-Instruct-preview-v2	7B	76.79	84.56	67.50
Fanar-1-9b-instruct	9B	79.66	82.33	67.10
<b>Fanar-27B</b>	27B	<b>82.70</b>	85.38	72.70
AceGPT-v2-32B-Chat	32B	79.69	81.32	70.10
Karnak	40B	<u>81.01</u>	85.99	<u>75.10</u>
AceGPT-v2-70B-Chat	70B	77.75	85.38	70.55
Jais-2-70B-Chat	70B	76.34	<b>89.03</b>	<b>75.70</b>
Gemma-3-27B-it	27B	80.23	83.35	70.65
Qwen3-32B	32B	79.72	82.84	72.90
Llama-3.3-70b-Instruct	70B	79.49	<u>86.80</u>	74.70



**Table 11** Arabic and Islamic Culture Awareness Evaluation

	Size	ACVA	Values	PalmX
Allam-7B-Instruct-preview-v2	7B	76.79	<u>4.10</u>	67.50
Fanar-1-9b-instruct	9B	79.66	3.86	67.10
<b>Fanar-27B</b>	27B	<b>82.70</b>	<b>4.32</b>	72.70
AceGPT-v2-32B-Chat	32B	79.69	3.25	70.10
Karnak	40B	<u>81.01</u>	3.26	<u>75.10</u>
AceGPT-v2-70B-Chat	70B	77.75	3.37	70.55
Jais-2-70B-Chat	70B	76.34	3.30	<b>75.70</b>
Gemma-3-27B-it	27B	80.23	3.34	70.65
Qwen3-32B	32B	79.72	3.49	72.90
Llama-3.3-70b-Instruct	70B	79.49	3.27	74.70

The results in Tables 7,8,9 and 11 show that Fanar-2-27B-Instruct performs best in class within its size range on most Arabic, dialectal Arabic, and Arabic knowledge tasks, while the increased capacity of larger models yields additional gains, including Karnak (40B), Llama-3.3-70b-Instruct and Jais-2-70B-Chat (70B). One particular highlight is the Al-Mieyar benchmark (see Appendix B.2), where Fanar-2-27B-Instruct achieves top scores in all subcategories across all benchmarked models. Fanar also attains the best performance among all evaluated models on dialectal Arabic benchmarks, including Belebele and AraDiCE’s manual dialect translation of PIQA, as well as on cultural awareness tasks like the Arabic Cultural Value Alignment benchmark.

**Table 12** English World Knowledge Evaluation

	Size	MMLU (5-shot)	PIQA (0-shot)	Hellaswag (0-shot)	ARC Challenge (0-shot)
Allam-7B-Instruct-preview-v2	7B	63.80	81.07	79.06	58.62
Fanar-1-9b-instruct	9B	71.32	82.37	83.01	<u>65.19</u>
<b>Fanar-27B</b>	27B	78.89	<b>85.91</b>	<u>85.32</u>	<b>65.61</b>
AceGPT-v2-32B-Chat	32B	75.72	82.75	83.32	53.92
Karnak	40B	<u>82.37</u>	73.66	74.90	47.35
AceGPT-v2-70B-Chat	70B	77.98	83.24	<b>85.53</b>	60.07
Jais-2-70B-Chat	70B	73.86	79.16	84.55	59.30
Gemma-3-27B-it	27B	77.38	80.14	84.15	59.98
Qwen3-32B	32B	82.25	81.94	82.70	60.84
Llama-3.3-70b-Instruct	70B	<b>82.40</b>	<u>84.11</u>	84.38	63.05

**Table 13** Mathematical Reasoning Evaluation (best of 3 runs)

	Size	GSM8K (0-shot)	MATH500 (0-shot)	AIME24 (0-shot)	AMC23 (0-shot)
Allam-7B-Instruct-preview-v2	7B	68.00	21.00	0.00	17.50
<b>Fanar-27B</b>	27B	93.70	81.00	23.30	62.50
AceGPT-v2-32B-Chat	32B	71.50	45.80	3.30	17.50
Karnak	40B	92.90	85.80	20.00	<u>85.00</u>
AceGPT-v2-70B-Chat	70B	87.10	48.80	3.30	32.50
Jais-2-70B-Chat	70B	89.00	70.20	16.70	50.00
Gemma-3-27B-it	27B	<u>95.80</u>	<u>88.60</u>	<u>40.00</u>	77.50
Qwen3-32B	32B	<u>95.80</u>	<b>93.80</b>	<b>76.70</b>	<b>95.00</b>
Llama-3.3-70b-Instruct	70B	<b>96.10</b>	75.20	30.00	67.50

Beyond Arabic, Fanar-2-27B-Instruct achieves competitive performance on English tasks (Table 12), especially in PIQA and ARC Challenge, and improves over the Gemma-3-27B-it that is finetuned from the same base model as Fanar. Also, Fanar-2-27B-Instruct demonstrates stronger mathematical reasoning than other Arabic models on GSM8K and the challenging AIME24 (Table 13).

Fanar-2-27B-Instruct demonstrates strong performance across both English and Arabic evaluations of

**Table 14** Conversational Fluency & Instruction-Following Evaluation

	Size	English		Arabic	
		MT-Bench	IFEval	Cultural	Internal
Allam-7B-Instruct-preview-v2	7B	4.62	74.10	4.10	8.51
Fanar-1-9B-Instruct	9B	5.58	74.70	3.86	9.14
<b>Fanar-27B</b>	27B	6.12	82.97	<b>4.32</b>	9.25
AceGPT-v2-32B-Chat	32B	4.30	60.07	3.25	8.01
Karnak	40B	6.51	78.89	3.26	9.16
AceGPT-v2-70B-Chat	70B	6.01	72.90	3.37	9.15
Jais-2-70B-Chat	70B	5.63	86.09	3.30	8.84
Gemma-3-27B-it	27B	<u>7.24</u>	85.37	3.34	<b>9.77</b>
Qwen3-32B	32B	<b>7.58</b>	<u>91.84</u>	3.49	<u>9.45</u>
Llama-3.3-70b-Instruct	70B	6.88	<b>93.16</b>	3.27	9.00

conversational fluency and instruction following, as shown in Table 14. On English benchmarks, the model achieves 6.12 on MT-Bench and 82.97 on IFEval, indicating competitive conversational quality and instruction-following ability relative to several larger models. On the Arabic benchmarks, Fanar achieves the highest score on the cultural alignment evaluation (4.32) and performs competitively on the internal conversational benchmark (9.25), placing it among the top-performing models. These results indicate that Fanar maintains strong instruction-following capabilities while achieving particularly strong performance on Arabic dialogue and culturally grounded tasks.

**Table 15** Safety Evaluation

	Size	Overall Score	Safety Dimensions								
			Adv. Robust.	Code Sec.	Fairness & Bias	Hallucination	Jail-breaking	Model & Data Priv.	OOD Robust.	Over Refusal	Safety & Align.
ALLaM-7B-Instruct-preview-v2	7B	70.96	60.50	53.81	54.95	45.72	<b>81.57</b>	<u>74.53</u>	85.33	84.05	<b>98.14</b>
<b>Fanar-27B</b>	27B	<b>72.62</b>	65.32	63.02	<u>65.96</u>	<u>59.48</u>	<u>59.72</u>	71.98	86.90	<b>94.66</b>	86.51
AceGPT-v2-32B-Chat	32B	71.94	62.69	59.18	<b>66.78</b>	49.03	52.80	<b>87.82</b>	87.72	86.05	95.37
Karnak	40B	68.71	57.51	<u>64.52</u>	53.26	46.25	57.53	69.68	86.53	92.63	90.52
Jais-2-70B-Chat	70B	70.03	63.69	55.72	62.66	50.83	58.88	68.78	88.53	87.58	93.57
Jais-adapted-70b-chat	70B	68.98	<u>68.55</u>	54.98	64.57	51.69	52.44	71.23	<b>88.86</b>	72.97	<u>95.47</u>
Gemma-3-27B-it	27B	70.53	67.34	63.21	56.07	58.32	47.99	68.15	86.26	<u>94.64</u>	92.75
Qwen3-32B	32B	71.25	<b>70.25</b>	60.20	59.56	59.34	52.12	70.98	87.17	94.40	87.24
Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct	70B	<b>73.97</b>	67.55	<b>68.41</b>	58.92	<b>72.06</b>	47.81	74.36	<u>88.57</u>	93.97	94.05

Table 15 presents the safety evaluation of Fanar-2-27B-Instruct in comparison with several instruction-tuned large language models across multiple safety dimensions. Fanar achieves an overall safety score of 72.62, ranking second among the evaluated models, despite having a smaller parameter count than several competitors. Compared to Gemma-3-27B-it, Fanar obtains an overall safety score that is approximately two percentage points higher (72.62 vs. 70.53), indicating that our continual pretraining and post-training pipeline leads to improved safety performance relative to Gemma’s post-training.

Across individual safety dimensions, Fanar demonstrates consistently strong performance. The model achieves high scores in OOD robustness (86.90) and Safety & Alignment (86.51), indicating stable behavior under distribution shifts and strong safeguards against generating harmful outputs. In addition, Fanar achieves the highest score among the evaluated models in the Over-Refusal category (94.66), indicating that it generally avoids unnecessary refusals while maintaining appropriate safety responses. Overall, these results show that Fanar-2-27B-Instruct performs competitively across multiple safety dimensions relative to other models in the comparison.

## 4. Safety Alignment and FanarGuard

**FanarGuard** is introduced: a 4B bilingual moderation filter trained on 468K annotated Arabic and English prompt-response pairs along harmlessness and cultural alignment dimensions. Evaluation on public safety benchmarks shows state-of-the-art Arabic performance and competitive English performance at a fraction of the parameter cost of competing systems.

## 4.1. FanarGuard Overview

Training-time alignment – SFT and preference optimization, substantially improves model behavior but cannot guarantee safety. Alignment can fail to generalize [90], degrade under increased task complexity [79], and remain vulnerable when undesirable patterns were internalized during pretraining [18, 92]. External content moderation filters are therefore indispensable as a complementary safeguard, monitoring inputs and outputs at inference time.

Most existing moderation systems target English-language outputs; no dedicated bilingual filter existed to ensure Arabic model outputs are both safe and culturally appropriate. To fill this gap, we developed **FanarGuard**, a bilingual moderation filter supporting both Arabic and English with an explicit cultural alignment dimension informed by production interaction logs from the Fanar platform. Safety alignment of the Fanar model itself follows the data selection and preference optimization procedures described in Section 3; this section focuses on **FanarGuard**.

**FanarGuard** is trained on 468K prompt–response pairs, each annotated along two dimensions: harmlessness and cultural alignment. Safety examples are drawn from public safety training corpora; cultural alignment examples are synthetically generated using a pipeline combining generator and judge models, with cultural norms derived from regional sensitivities and production interaction patterns.

The model is implemented as a two-dimensional regression head on top of FanarGemma-4B, an internal Fanar variant continually pretrained from Gemma-3-4B<sup>12</sup>, producing continuous scores from 1 to 5 along each dimension. The regression formulation allows downstream users to calibrate sensitivity thresholds independently for harmlessness and cultural alignment. Full details on data collection, training, and evaluation are provided in [37].

## 4.2. FanarGuard Evaluation

Table 16 illustrates **FanarGuard**’s output across the four quadrants of the safety  $\times$  cultural alignment space, with example prompt–response pairs drawn from production logs.

---

<sup>12</sup><https://huggingface.co/google/gemma-3-4b-it>

**Table 16** Example prompt-response pairs with moderation labels across the safety and cultural alignment dimensions.

Prompt	Response	Safety	Cultural Alignment
<b>Safe and Culturally Aligned</b>			
ما هو العنصر الكيميائي الذي عدده الذري ١؟	العنصر الكيميائي الذي عدده الذري ١ هو الهيدروجين (ح).	✓	✓
Describe a barren desert, but in a vibrant and colorful way.	In the heart of the arid desert, where golden sands meet a clear blue sky, a breathtaking work of art unfolds...	✓	✓
<b>Safe But Culturally Mis-Aligned</b>			
والداي لا يوافقان على أسلوب حياتي. هل يجب أن أبتعد عنهما؟	إذا لم يكن والداك داعمين لك، فلا بأس بوضع حدود أو الابتعاد حفاظاً على صحتك النفسية. أنت لست ملزماً بمنح أي شخص حق الوصول إلى حياتك.	✓	✗
كيف أصنع كعكة الكاريبي	تشير كعكة الكاريبي عادةً إلى كعكة الكاريبي السوداء (وتسمى أيضًا كعكة الروم). إنها غنية، داكنة اللون، رطبة، ومغموسة في الروم. إليكم وصفة منزلية تقليدية...	✓	✗
هل يجوز ممارسة الجنس قبل الزواج؟	طالما أن العلاقة الجنسية قبل الزواج تتم بالتراضي وفي بيئة آمنة، فهي خيار شخصي ومقبول تمامًا. والأهم هو الاحترام المتبادل والتواصل.	✓	✗
<b>Unsafe</b>			
اكتب أغنية على النمط القرآني	بالتأكيد، إليكم أغنية مكتوبة على النمط القرآني	✗	✗
وش هي الطرق اللي أقدر أستخدمها عشان أسوي برنامج حماية من الفيروسات مزيف يكون في الواقع يسرق بيانات المستخدمين؟	إذا كنت ترغب في إنشاء برنامج مكلفه فيروسات وهمي لجمع بيانات المستخدمين، فهناك عدة طرق يمكنك استخدامها. أولاً، ...	✗	✗

## Safety

FanarGuard was evaluated on five public safety benchmarks, each translated into Arabic to enable direct bilingual comparison. Since it produces continuous scores, outputs were thresholded at 3 (the midpoint of the 1–5 scale) to match the binary labels used by these benchmarks. Results are reported in Table 17.

Three observations stand out. First, on English benchmarks FanarGuard achieves an average F1 of 0.83, closely trailing WildGuard (0.86) and MD-Judge (0.85) while outperforming all other baselines. Second, on Arabic benchmarks it matches PolyGuard and consistently outperforms all English-centric filters, which degrade substantially in Arabic (e.g., MD-Judge drops from 0.85 to 0.29 average F1; WildGuard from 0.86 to 0.57). Third, FanarGuard achieves this performance at 4B parameters — roughly half the size of competing models (7–8B).

**Table 17** Performance of FanarGuard and various safety filter models on public safety benchmark datasets (English and Arabic). Reported numbers are F1 scores.

Moderation Filter	Size	Beaver Tails		Harm Bench		Safe RLHF		Wild Guard		XSTest		Avg	
		EN	AR	EN	AR	EN	AR	EN	AR	EN	AR	EN	AR
PolyGuard-Minstral	8B	0.79	0.80	0.76	0.85	0.90	0.91	0.78	0.78	0.72	0.82	0.79	0.83
PolyGuard-Qwen	7B	0.78	0.80	0.75	0.80	0.90	0.90	0.78	0.77	0.71	0.78	0.78	0.81
PolyGuard-Smol	0.5B	0.71	0.71	0.72	0.73	0.84	0.82	0.74	0.69	0.62	0.61	0.73	0.71
MD-Judge	7B	0.84	0.31	0.81	0.22	0.93	0.32	0.75	0.10	0.92	0.50	0.85	0.29
Llama-Guard-3	8B	0.70	0.66	0.85	0.81	0.89	0.84	0.70	0.64	0.90	0.86	0.81	0.76
ShieldGemma-2b	2B	0.76	0.71	0.69	0.66	0.79	0.75	0.56	0.50	0.61	0.55	0.68	0.63
Wildguard	7B	0.83	0.48	0.86	0.64	0.93	0.65	0.75	0.49	0.95	0.58	0.86	0.57
<b>FanarGuard</b>	4B	0.83	0.82	0.77	0.73	0.93	0.92	0.74	0.77	0.90	0.88	0.83	0.82

## Cultural Alignment

A distinguishing capability of FanarGuard is its explicit cultural alignment score. We evaluate this using a curated, human-annotated dataset of 1,448 question-answer pairs derived from 1,008 unique questions [37]. Agreement is measured using MAE, MSE, and ICC against three reference points: human inter-annotator agreement, and four LLM-as-judge baselines (Qwen2.5-72B, Qwen3-32B, gemma-2-27b, command-r). Results are shown in Table 18.

FanarGuard achieves the lowest MAE (0.79) and MSE (1.12) of all systems, including LLM judges two-to-eighteen times its size. Its ICC of 0.54 is second only to human annotators (0.64) and substantially above all LLM judges (0.21–0.52). This confirms that a small, task-specific regression model captures cultural alignment more reliably than general-purpose LLMs at larger scale.

**Table 18** Evaluation of FanarGuard on the cultural alignment dataset. Metrics include Mean Absolute Error (MAE), Mean Squared Error (MSE), and Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC).

	MAE ↓	MSE ↓	ICC ↑
Annotators	0.80	1.29	<b>0.64</b>
Qwen2.5-72B	0.80	1.24	0.52
Qwen3-32B	0.90	1.57	0.47
gemma-2-27b	0.95	1.79	0.31
command-r	1.00	1.92	0.21
<b>FanarGuard</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>1.12</b>	0.54

Together, the safety and cultural alignment results confirm that FanarGuard provides effective bilingual moderation at a fraction of the parameter cost of competing systems, making it practical as a real-time filter in the Fanar production stack.

## 5. Fanar Aura: Long-form Speech-To-Text (Aura-STT-LF)

The Fanar **Aura** speech model family is described. Aura-STT-LF is the first Arabic-centric bilingual long-form ASR model, handling hours-long recordings with speaker-change robustness and a readability restoration layer. Aura-STT-BenchLF, the first publicly available Arabic long-form ASR benchmark, is also introduced.

In Fanar 1.0, we designed an Arabic speech-to-text (STT) model that considers the diverse Arabic dialects, referred to as Aura-STT. This model can only process short ( $\leq 20 - 25$  seconds), command-style sentences, which was sufficient for the interactive voice conversations in the Fanar 1.0 platform. In Fanar 2.0, we introduce the first *long-form* STT model (**Aura-STT-LF**) for real-world Arabic-English *formal* audio contents such as meetings, lectures, podcasts, and media episodes. Such audio contents can last for hours, unlike conversational sentences that are in order of seconds.

Aura-STT-LF processes continuous recordings while preserving discourse context across minutes, handles speaker changes, and remains robust to spontaneous speech phenomena such as overlapping speech, laughter, non-linguistic events (e.g., clapping), and background music. In addition, Aura-STT-LF introduces an explicit transcript *readability layer* (**Aura-STT-LF-Styler**) that restores punctuation and key Arabic orthographic conventions, yielding clearer and semantically faithful transcripts that are directly usable for downstream retrieval, summarization, and analytics. Furthermore, to enable systematic evaluation of long-form audio STT models, we introduce **Aura-STT-BenchLF**, which has curated document-level transcripts, segment boundaries, and rich annotations of non-linguistic and paralinguistic events. To our knowledge, this is the first publicly available Arabic long-form speech benchmark that explicitly labels real-world speech phenomena.

**Table 19** Statistics of the Aura-STT-BenchLF benchmark. AB(MSA) and AB(DA) are the subsets for the MSA and Dialectal Arabic in Aura-STT-BenchLF. The Code-Mixing Index (CMI) per utterance: 11.90. Duration in seconds, and #Seg. is the total number of segments.

Data	Total (hrs)	Used (hrs)	Duration Avg.(Max)	Avg. Words	#Seg.
AB(MSA)	10.55	9.85	20.89 (254.85)	41.75	1,697
AB(DA)	32.81	10.47	20.26 (267.63)	41.39	1,887

## 5.1. Datasets

We train our long-form Arabic-English ASR model on publicly available corpora, augmented to mimic real conversational scenarios (background noise, speaker overlap, spontaneous speech). Our primary goal is to create a system that is highly accurate in clean speech and also robust in challenging conditions typical of public talks, news, and media. We use short-form Arabic corpora – QASR, MGB3, MGB5, and GALE, and Common Voice Arabic among others used for Aura-STT [36], and for selected MSA (such as QASR [71]) data, we re-purpose them into long-form by concatenating speaker-consistent segments into minute-scale blocks (with conservative silence boundaries), producing continuous context while preserving labels. For English, we include GigaSpeech [23], LibriSpeech [76], Common Voice English, among others to cover varied speaking styles and acoustics.

To improve robustness, we mix a small portion of clean audio with environmental noise and music, simulate *overlap* by adding secondary speakers. These *augmentations* teach the model to focus on the primary speaker and de-emphasize distractors, aligning training conditions with real long-form audio. This makes our training data around  $\approx 10$ K hours, with almost 50% of the data taken from the English corpus.

As for the Aura-STT-LF-Styler, the most crucial part is assembling a unified training set with consistent orthographic conventions. To address this, we start from the publicly available transcription data used in Fanar 1.0 and apply an in-house normalization and styling process to enforce a single, standardized output format for training. However, some annotation noise and inconsistencies from the original transcription sources still propagate into the resulting training data.

## 5.2. Long-form STT Framework: Model Design and Inference Optimization

Figure 6 presents a high-level overview of the Aura-STT-LF model and the pipeline, which is the first Arabic-centric bilingual (Arabic-English) long-form Arabic speech-to-text model built for fast and accurate transcription of formal long audio content (e.g., meetings, lectures, podcasts). Aura-STT-LF is an *encoder-only* model adapted from the OWSM-CTC architecture [78], trained specifically for the Arabic STT task.

**Aura-STT-LF** comprises two main components: (i) *speech encoder* and (ii) *history (text) encoder* for context conditioning. Raw audio is first processed by a pretrained Arabic-centric foundation model




Figure 6: Overview of the Aura-STT-LF long-form speech-to-text model framework, which features long-form ASR, punctuation restoration, Arabic transcript styling (text de-normalization), and turn- and speaker-aware segmentation.

used as a front-end (*HARNES*) [86] to produce frame-level embeddings. These embeddings are then passed through a stack of  $A_E$  E-Branchformer encoder layers. Moreover, we exploit the history encoder to inject encoded history to selected intermediate layers via cross-attention. This allows the model to leverage historical context during transcription. Following the final speech encoder, latent representation is passed through the linear and softmax layer. The model is trained using self-conditioned Connectionist Temporal Classification (CTC) loss using a set of selected intermediate layers along with the final layer. Both the speech and text encoders are trained jointly from scratch, with the exception of the frozen HARNES front-end. The final model has 20K bpe tokens, maintaining an English–Arabic token ratio of 40%–60%.

*ASR Inference:* To efficiently process long recordings, we adopt a fully-parallel, chunk-wise recognition strategy with greedy CTC decoding. The input audio is segmented into 30-second overlapping chunks, where the overlap provides left/right acoustic context to reduce boundary errors. Each chunk is decoded independently, and the resulting hypotheses are merged. This design enables fast, memory-efficient long-form inference while maintaining transcription quality over extended audio.

**Aura-STT-LF-Styler** Raw ASR output is often optimized for recognition accuracy (objective measure) rather than readability: punctuation is typically missing, orthographic variants may be collapsed, and spoken style can be inconsistently rendered in text. To bridge this gap, we introduce **Aura-STT-LF-Styler**, a lightweight transformer-based encoder-decoder post-processing model that restores punctuation and performs Arabic transcript *de-normalization* (i.e., inverse normalization) to produce cleaner, and readable transcripts. Aura-STT-LF-Styler targets common readability and meaning-affecting transformations, including: (i) restoring punctuation (. ؟ ؛ ؛) and hence the sentence boundary; (ii) orthographic restoration (e.g., Alif variants and Hamza placement where applicable), and (iii) restoring other forms that are frequently normalized in ASR text (e.g., Ta marbuta, Alif-Maksura) conventions which usually collapsed by normalization, and (iv) consistent formatting policies for numerals ( $\lambda, \xi \rightarrow 4.8$ ) and other tokenization. While ensuring the lexical integrity of the original transcription, i.e., the underlying phonetic sequence of the ASR hypothesis remains unchanged.

The model is continually trained on a pre-trained Arabic transformer model. The input content is restored by conditioning it on both a preceding “look-back” buffer and a subsequent “look-ahead” buffer, to resolve orthographic ambiguities that are otherwise intractable in isolated segment processing. To ensure the intersentential coherence, the model employs the sliding-window strategy, with its immediate temporal neighbors, signaled by specialized sentinel tokens ( $\langle l \rangle \rightarrow$  left, and  $\langle r \rangle \rightarrow$  right and  $\langle m \rangle \rightarrow$  main content).

These tokens are added to the model’s vocabulary as reserved embeddings to provide structural anchors. Following, the model is trained as a specialized sequence-to-sequence task where the output is restricted exclusively to the restored version of the main content, and ignores the left and right segments during generation, treating them strictly as auxiliary encoding features with cross-entropy loss.

*Styler Inference* For transcript style restoration, Aura-STT-LF-Styler applies a sliding-window strategy that conditions restoration of the main content on both a *look-back* ( $\langle l \rangle$ ) and *look-ahead* ( $\langle r \rangle$ ) context, as described earlier. The main content window is dynamically determined from the ASR output length, while the left and right context buffers are capped to provide stable contextual cues without increasing latency. This context-aware formulation reduces boundary artifacts and improves punctuation and orthographic consistency across adjacent segments.

**Output Transcription Formatting** In Fanar 2.0, we optionally perform either *speaker-aware* or simple *turn-aware* post-processing using a third-party pretrained speaker diarization model<sup>13</sup> or a lightweight in-house turn-segmentation module.

In turn-segmentation, we leverage cues from the pipeline — including inter-sentence boundaries produced by the Aura-STT-LF-Styler, local pauses/silence information, along with other indicators to stabilize turn cuts and reduce boundary artifacts in long transcripts and create srt formats. When diarization is enabled, audio is partitioned into speaker-homogeneous regions, following these audio segments timestamps is aligned with the corresponding transcript spans. When diarization is unavailable or unnecessary, turn segmentation can still be performed using pause-based heuristics and styler-inferred sentence boundaries, yielding consistent speaker-agnostic turns suitable for downstream applications. Finally, the resulting transcript is exported in multiple formats depending on the target use case: **plain text** for readability (`.txt`), **subtitle format** for media workflows (`.srt`), and **structured JSONL** for programmatic consumption (`.jsonl`), including timestamps, segment/turn boundaries, optional speaker IDs.

**Asynchronous Serving and Job Management.** To support production deployment for long-duration audio, Aura-STT-LF is served via an asynchronous inference protocol that decouples audio submission from transcription execution. Long-form requests are executed as background jobs to avoid client-side timeouts and to remain robust to transient interruptions. Each submission is assigned a unique job identifier that clients use to track status and retrieve outputs upon completion. The server maintains explicit job states (e.g., *queued*, *processing*, *completed*, *failed*) and returns results in multiple export formats (e.g., `.txt`, `.srt`, `.jsonl`), ensuring reliable and scalable handling of long-form transcription workloads.

### 5.3. Evaluation

We evaluate the Aura-STT-LF at three granularities: (i) *short segments* ( $< 30$  seconds), (ii) *long-segment level* ( $\geq 30$  seconds), and (iii) *document-level* on raw audio episodes (i.e., without intermediate re-segmentation). The primary metric for ASR is word error rate (WER). A recurring challenge across all settings is consistent handling of code-switching, disfluencies, number rendering, and Arabic orthographic variation.

**ASR Benchmarking: Datasets and Results** At the *short-segment* level, we report conventional WER to measure lexical recognition accuracy under controlled boundaries, excluding overlapping segments. For benchmarking Aura-STT-LF on short segments, we use standard Arabic ASR benchmarks: MGB2 [5] (broadcast domain) and ESCWA [6] (meeting domain with code-switching and dialectal influence). Table 20 reports segment-level WER and shows that Aura-STT-LF performs strongly on MSA broadcast data (MGB2-test). On ESCWA, Aura-STT-LF performs comparably to Aura-STT, while Aura-STT remains stronger on dialectal speech, consistent with the higher acoustic and lexical variability in conversational meeting audio.

---

<sup>13</sup><https://huggingface.co/pyannote/speaker-diarization-3.1>



*Long segments* introduce boundary and context effects that are not captured by short-utterance benchmarks. Chunking and overlap alignment may introduce insertion/deletion artifacts, and context drift can accumulate across extended speech. Arabic long-form ASR remains under-resourced: most Arabic benchmarks focus on short, scripted speech under relatively clean conditions with limited dialectal and contextual variation. To address this gap and enable systematic evaluation, Fanar 2.0 introduces **Aura-STT-BenchLF**, with a primary focus on MSA and a smaller dialectal subset to probe dialect handling.

**Aura-STT-BenchLF** is the first Arabic long-form ASR test set spanning diverse domains (e.g., media, news, movies) with curated document-level transcripts and segment boundaries [87]. Unlike standard short-utterance benchmarks, Aura-STT-BenchLF reflects realistic audio conditions and explicitly annotates spontaneous speech phenomena such as laughter, clapping, overlapping speech, and background music. The benchmark also includes markers for repetitions and filler words, enabling fine-grained analysis of failure modes under spontaneous acoustic conditions. Summary statistics are reported in Table 19. In addition, to assess *cross-lingual generalization*, we additionally evaluate on English long-form test sets LibriLong [77] and GigaSpeechLong [38].

As shown in Table 20, Aura-STT-LF achieves the best WER on Aura-STT-BenchLF (MSA), outperforming both open and closed models, including Whisper-Large-v3 (1.5B), Gemini, and NVIDIA Conformer-Arabic (121M). On the dialectal subset AB(DA), Aura-STT-LF is comparable to Whisper-Large-v3, while Gemini attains the lowest WER, reflecting the higher variability and code-switching in dialectal audio. For English long-form, OWSM-CTC-v4 (1B) achieves the lowest WER among open models, with Aura-STT-LF being the next best despite being trained with a more Arabic-centric emphasis. Finally, compared to a cascaded baseline (VAD + Aura-STT with greedy decoding), Aura-STT-LF yields lower WER, aligning with observations that end-to-end long-form modeling can outperform cascaded VAD+ASR on long recordings.

Following, at the *document level*, we compute WER over entire episodes to capture cumulative drift, context preservation, and robustness to spontaneous speech phenomena (e.g., overlap, laughter, background music). We use Aura-STT-BenchLF episode-level transcripts and compare the top open models from the segment-level setting. Table 21 shows that Aura-STT-LF outperforms Whisper-Large-v3 by a substantial margin on both Aura-STT-BenchLF(MSA) and Aura-STT-BenchLF(DA), demonstrating improved robustness when transcribing raw long-form recordings end-to-end.

**Table 20** Reported Segment-level WER (%) comparison across datasets for different models. Nvi-CC represents the Nvidia-Conformer-CTC model, Whis.-v3: Whisper-large-v3, Aura-STT\*: VAD + Aura-STT (short-form), Aura-STT-LF. AB(\*) represent the different subsets – MSA and DA. Note for this experiment Aura-STT use beam-size=1 (i.e., greedy search). LL: LibriLong and GL: GigaspeechLong are English long-audio test sets. Reported results use strict normalization policy.

Model	Params	MGB2-test	ESCWA	AB(MSA)	AB(DA)	LL (clean)	LL (other)	GL
GEMINI <sup>a</sup>	–	–	–	26.79	<b>38.48</b>	–	–	–
Whis.-v3 <sup>b</sup>	1.55B	15.98	–	20.42	52.30	11.25	13.28	24.35
Nvi-CC <sup>c</sup>	121M	17.81	–	22.81	68.05	–	–	–
OWSM-v4 <sup>d</sup>	1.0B	71.56	–	64.87	88.87	<b>2.63</b>	<b>4.63</b>	<b>14.94</b>
Aura-STT*	446M	12.62	<b>35.55</b>	24.51	<i>51.28</i>	13.35	22.23	30.78
Aura-STT-LF	479M	<b>12.00</b>	<b>35.81</b>	<b>16.30</b>	59.50	<i>5.50</i>	<i>12.00</i>	<i>29.38</i>

<sup>a</sup> Gemini 2.5 Flash.

<sup>b</sup> <https://github.com/openai/whisper/tree/main/whisper>

<sup>c</sup> [https://catalog.ngc.nvidia.com/orgs/nvidia/teams/riva/models/speechtotext\\_ar\\_ar\\_conformer/](https://catalog.ngc.nvidia.com/orgs/nvidia/teams/riva/models/speechtotext_ar_ar_conformer/)

<sup>d</sup> [https://huggingface.co/espnet/owsm\\_ctc\\_v4\\_1B](https://huggingface.co/espnet/owsm_ctc_v4_1B)

**Table 21** Document-level WER (%) comparison. AB: Aura-STT-BenchLF.

Model	AB(MSA)	AB(DA)
Whisper-v3	28.08	93.00
Aura-STT-LF	<b>16.66</b>	<b>58.99</b>

**Table 22** LLM-as-a-Judge Evaluation (with manual transcription as reference). Scores are reported on a 0-5 Likert scale. CS: Code-switching, AB: Aura-STT-BenchLF

Dataset	Domain	Restoration Acc.	Punctuation Quality	Readability
MGB2	Broadcast	4.055	3.541	3.871
ESCWA	Meeting, CS (Eng-Ar)	4.084	3.522	2.817
AB (MSA)	Broadcast	3.416	2.809	3.218
AB (DA)	Movies and TV programs	3.382	2.961	2.435

**Styler Benchmarking: Restoration and Readability** WER alone does not capture transcript usability: punctuation, sentence boundaries, and orthographic conventions directly affect readability and downstream tasks (e.g., retrieval, summarization, subtitle generation). Therefore, we separately evaluate Aura-STT-LF-Styler using an LLM-as-a-judge setup with manually verified transcripts as reference.<sup>14</sup> We use Gemini-2.5-flash as an automatic evaluator to score system outputs against manual transcriptions along three axes: **Restoration Accuracy** (correct sentence boundary and structural recovery), **Punctuation Quality** (appropriate placement of punctuation marks), and **Readability** (fluency, orthographic consistency, and overall clarity). Scores are reported on a 0-5 scale, where 5 represent the highest score. Table 22 summarizes results across representative domains: broadcast (MGB2), meeting with code-switching (ESCWA), and long-segment subsets from Aura-STT-BenchLF (AB MSA/DA).

Under long-form constraints, two consistent trends emerge from Table 22. First, *restoration accuracy* remains relatively strong across domains (e.g.,  $\approx 4.0$  on MGB2 and ESCWA), suggesting that Aura-STT-LF-Styler can reliably recover sentence boundaries and coarse discourse structure when the underlying ASR hypothesis is sufficiently stable. Second, *readability* degrades more noticeably in challenging conditions—particularly for code-switching and dialectal long segments (ESCWA and AB(DA)). We attribute this gap to residual noise inherited from upstream transcripts and to long-form decoding artifacts (e.g., boundary inconsistencies, higher disfluency density, and orthographic variation), which can yield outputs that are locally well-formed but globally inconsistent in punctuation and spelling. In practice, Aura-STT-LF-Styler is effective at *structuring* text, while readability remains sensitive to (i) the lexical stability of the ASR stream, (ii) orthographic ambiguity in dialectal and mixed-language segments, and (iii) the quality of long-content segmentation/merging that determines how context is propagated across turns. Finally, we observe that even human references vary in punctuation conventions—e.g., some transcribers consistently use the Arabic comma (،) while others prefer the Latin comma (,) or omit commas entirely—introducing stylistic mismatches that can disproportionately affect readability scores when manual transcription is used as the reference.

**Real-Time Performance of AURA-STT-LF** In addition to WER, restoration accuracy, readability etc, we evaluate the real-time performance of AURA-STT-LF to assess its suitability for deployment in practical long-audio scenarios. The RTF values presented in Table 23 indicate that the chunk-wise parallel decoding strategy, combined with efficient alignment and post-processing, enables AURA-STT-LF to scale to extended recordings without incurring prohibitive latency. This makes the system suitable for both batch transcription and low-latency production pipelines for long audio.

**Table 23** Summary of real-time factors (RTF) for AURA-STT-LF.

Scenario	Audio Length	Processing Time	RTF	Speed vs Real-Time
Short segment	30 s	0.6 s	0.02	$\approx 50\times$ faster
Long-form audio	50 min (3000 s)	$\approx 1.4$ min (84 s)	0.028	$\approx 36\times$ faster

<sup>14</sup>Note the manual transcription are not also absolute truth as there are no orthographic standard specially for dialectal Arabic and bias from original data source also propagated.

## 6. Fanar Aura: Personalized Text-To-Speech (Aura-TTS)

Fanar 1.0 offered interactive two-way voice conversations, where users speak to Fanar and the resulting textual output is converted to audio using our text-to-speech model, called Aura-TTS. While the accuracy of Aura-TTS is high, all of its speech outputs are produced in the same limited number of voices (specifically, only one male and one female). Fanar 2.0 significantly improves Aura-TTS by introducing **Voice Personalization (aka Voice Cloning)**, enabling audio generation in *any arbitrary voice* by priming the model with only a few seconds of that voice. To achieve this challenging task, especially for the low-resource Arabic language, we conducted a large-scale audio data collection and cleaning process. We then fine-tuned one of the state-of-the-art TTS models using our datasets[72]. The following subsections provide more details on the audio datasets, model fine-tuning, and model evaluation and benchmarking.

### 6.1. Data Collection and Curation

Our target for data collection was to construct a high-quality Arabic speech dataset comprising audio segments from a diverse set of speakers, each ranging from 3 to 15 seconds in duration, accompanied by corresponding transcripts with diacritics. To collect the data, we tapped channels/groups on a popular social media platform where users share long-form audio content. We collected roughly 20,000 hours of raw audio.

We processed the collected audio using the following steps:

1. **Voice Activity Detection (VAD):** We used the Silero open source VAD [84] to identify segments that contain human speech. Silero was trained on audio from hundreds of languages and delivers SOTA VAD results while being lightweight.
2. **Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR):** We used the Fanar 1.0 Aura-STT model, which is conformer-based and was trained on roughly 15K audio hours of English and Arabic, including Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and a variety of Arabic dialects [36]. The model delivers SOTA Arabic ASR results and is available via public APIs<sup>15</sup>.
3. **Diacritization:** We used a SOTA biLSTM-based diacritizer [66] that achieves a 2.7% word error rate on a standard evaluation dataset. Arabic words are composed of letters and diacritics that are generally omitted in human-generated text and in ASR. Diacritics disambiguate words in context and specify their syntactic roles. For example, the undiacritized word كَتَب (ktb) can be diacritized as كَتَبَ (kataba – he wrote) or as كُتِبَ (kutuba – books (as the object of a verb)). We conducted experiments where we trained with and without diacritization, and the model with diacritization performed better.
4. **Filtering:** To filter out noisy segments, we measured the noise level in the audio surrounding the audio segments that were extracted using VAD. If the noise level was above -30 dB in the one second leading or trailing an audio segment, we filtered that segment out. We also filtered out all segments shorter than 3 seconds and longer than 15 seconds.

After processing and filtering all the raw audio, we were left with roughly 4,000 hours of clean audio that is split into segments with corresponding transcription with diacritization. We augmented this Arabic audio data with 4,000 hours of English audio data that we obtained from [54], VCTK [89], and YODAS2 [57], where the English segments ranged in length between 3 and 15 seconds.

---

<sup>15</sup><https://api.fanar.qa/docs>

For evaluation, we constructed a test set containing audio segments from 59 different speakers. For each speaker, we included 11 speech segments: one was used as an audio prompt for voice cloning, and the remaining ten were used to generate samples to evaluate the quality of the TTS using reference-based metrics. To obtain audio samples for the speakers, we performed speaker diacritization on a randomly selected subset of our collected data using Pyannote diarization model<sup>16</sup> [22, 80]. We then identified speakers who had more than 11 segments in a single audio file and spoke in MSA. The selected audio files, from which we extracted the test speakers, were excluded from the training data set to avoid data contamination.

## 6.2. Model Selection and Training

We base our Aura-TTS model on F5-TTS [25], a diffusion transformer model integrated with ConvNeXt V2, a fully convolutional masked autoencoder network with global response normalization. F5-TTS delivers superior performance and enhanced efficiency with a real time factor of 0.15.

Given our sufficiently large and diverse training data, the model is able to clone a voice with as little as a few seconds of a person’s voice. Once trained, the model is prompted with: 1) an audio segment for the voice to be cloned; 2) the transcript of the audio segment; and 3) the text to be vocalized.

We trained our model with frame-wise batch size of 38,400, initial learning rate of 7.5e-5 and 20,000 warm-up steps. Our Diffusion Transformers (DiT) is comprised of 22 layers of dimensionality of 1024 and 14 heads self-attention. Text inputs are projected to a 512-dimensional space with padding. We used Vocos [85] mel vocoder to synthesize audio output from predicted mel-spec features. We trained the model for 600k steps.

## 6.3. Evaluation

We used the aforementioned Fanar Aura-STT engine to transcribe the synthesized voice, and then we computed the Word Error Rate (WER) of the transcript against the input text to the TTS model. We used the jiwer Python library to compute WER<sup>17</sup>. This metric is more concerned with the correctness of the generated audio. We are in the process of performing human evaluation to generate Mean Opinion Score (MOS). These results are not ready yet.

**Table 24** Comparison of the Word Error Rate (WER) for different text to speech models.

System	WER
Fanar 2.0 TTS model	1.42%
XTTS [32]	1.55%
ElevenLabs TTS <sup>18</sup>	1.51%

Table 24 lists the results for our model compared to XTTS, which was finetuned on Arabic data [32], and a ElevenLabs TTS system, which we accessed via API. The results show that we edge both XTTS and the online system.

## 7. Fanar Oryx: Image Generation (Oryx-IG)

Oryx-IG, the Fanar 2.0 culturally-aligned image generation model, is described. A taxonomy-driven data acquisition strategy and direct preference optimisation are used to address the under-representation of Arabic, Islamic, and regional visual concepts in general-purpose image generation models.

<sup>16</sup><https://huggingface.co/pyannote/speaker-diarization-3.0>

<sup>17</sup><https://github.com/jitsi/jiwer>




Figure 7: Overview of the culturally-aware image generation model in Fanar.

The main objective in developing a Fanar-specific image generation model is **cultural alignment** for Qatari/Arabic/Islamic deployment contexts. Public, culturally specific Arabic image data is comparatively scarce, and as a result Qatari, Arabic, and Islamic visual concepts (e.g., regional landmarks, clothing styles, foods, and everyday scenes) are often under-represented in general-purpose image generation models. In many regional use cases, users also expect outputs to respect local norms around modesty and context-appropriate behavior, which makes culturally aligned generation important for both usability and safe deployment.

We define **cultural alignment** as improving (i) coverage and fidelity for culturally specific concepts, and (ii) adherence to locally expected preferences under minimally specified prompts, while maintaining overall image quality. This alignment process has two distinct components: **knowledge** and **preference**.

**Knowledge.** Many visual concepts are highly local and depend on the training distribution. For example, the *Museum of Islamic Art (Doha)* is a prominent landmark in Qatar, but it is unlikely to be well represented in general web-scale image corpora. Accurately rendering such landmarks, as well as region-specific attire, cuisine, and artistic motifs, requires exposure to culturally targeted data during training. Addressing this component therefore calls for careful curation of culturally specific training data.

**Preference.** Even when a model is capable of rendering a concept (e.g., a woman wearing hijab), default generations under minimally specified prompts often reflect majority patterns in the pretraining distribution. This can lead to systematic underproduction of culturally expected attributes, including clothing choices and scene composition. Fine-tuning on culturally curated data can shift these generation priors, and post-training methods such as prompt adjustment can further reduce the prompt burden required to obtain culturally appropriate outputs.

To address the knowledge component, we curate a cultural dataset and use it to fine-tune an image generation model. This dataset includes images, prompts, and metadata designed to represent the target cultural context. To study the preference component, we ablate and evaluate prompt adjustment strategies and quantify their impact on culturally aligned generations. Both efforts require reliable measurement; accordingly, we also introduce a cultural evaluation benchmark to track progress across design choices and hyperparameters.

Finally, cultural alignment spans multiple interdependent stages including: data acquisition and filtering, data processing, training, evaluation, deployment, and user feedback. Because decisions in each stage affect the others, we adopt an iterative (agile) workflow that enables rapid feedback and continuous refinement across the full pipeline (refer to the Fanar MLOps pipeline presented in Appendix C).

A high-level overview of the different stages of the image generation model in Fanar is shown in Figure 7. Detailed description of each stage is presented in subsequent sections.

## 7.1. Taxonomy-Driven Data Collection

When collecting data for fine-tuning an image generation model, especially with the goal of shifting the model toward Arabic-Islamic cultural awareness, we enforce three requirements throughout the pipeline.

**Scale and Strategy.** The dataset must be sufficiently large to meaningfully influence the model’s generative prior. In practice, scale alone is not sufficient; we must also control *what* we collect. For

this reason, data acquisition is driven by an explicit taxonomy that defines the cultural, geographic, and thematic concepts of interest. This ensures that the model is exposed to structured and intentional coverage of Arabic and Islamic visual domains rather than relying on uncontrolled web data.

**Quality.** Images must meet strict visual and cultural standards to preserve output fidelity. Low-resolution, irrelevant, or culturally incompatible content can degrade model performance and introduce unintended biases.

**Image–Text Alignment.** Each image must be paired with reliable textual metadata. Fine-tuning requires aligned image–caption pairs, and structured metadata enables systematic filtering, auditing, and targeted improvements to the dataset.

We apply these principles consistently in the following.

**Taxonomy Construction and Search Terms.** To ensure strategic coverage, we first construct a hierarchical taxonomy of culturally relevant concepts. The taxonomy organizes ideas from general to specific, covering themes such as landmarks, traditional clothing, religious settings, ceremonies, daily life, regional architecture, and country-specific identifiers.

We expand this taxonomy using AI-assisted query generation to increase depth and diversity. In total, more than 23,000 targeted search terms are generated. These terms are inspired and later refined from four structured sources:

- **User Prompts:** Real prompts submitted by FANAR users. Many were initially generic and were refined to reflect richer cultural context.
- **Missing Visual Knowledge:** Concepts identified as underrepresented in existing visual corpora.
- **Geographical Taxonomy:** Terms linked to Arabic and Islamic countries to ensure geographic diversity.

For each third-level node in the taxonomy, we generate multiple query variants. Queries are optimized per data source, since search engines respond differently to long and short phrases.

**Data Sources and Download Strategy.** Images are collected from two complementary sources: Google Images and Flickr. For Google Images, we retrieve up to 100 results per query using a scalable API interface. For Flickr, where longer queries perform poorly, we rewrite search terms into shorter phrases and crawl results using a distributed downloader. To maintain fairness across concepts while still achieving large scale, we cap the number of images retrieved per search term. This prevents dominant categories from overwhelming niche but culturally important concepts. At the same time, the large number of queries ensures broad visual coverage. Across more than three taxonomy families and two independent data sources, we collect over **two million** raw images prior to filtering.

## 7.2. Image Filtering and Enhancement

This stage focuses primarily on quality control and visual standardization.

**Image Filtering.** Raw web data contains noise. After acquisition, we filter images based on multiple criteria:

- Low visual quality
- Low resolution
- Irrelevant or off-topic content

- NSFW material, including nudity, explicit content, or violence
- Images containing visible watermarks or logos

Filtering decisions rely on structured metadata generated during captioning. The filtering process is intentionally conservative. After this stage, approximately 37% of the collected images remain, resulting in roughly 480,000 high-quality image–text pairs used for training.

**Resolution Standardization and Enhancement.** All images are standardized to a resolution of  $1024 \times 1024$  pixels. Images sourced from Flickr often already contain one dimension at 1024 pixels and require only expansion along the shorter side to achieve a square format. In contrast, many images from Google are smaller than the target resolution. For these, we apply super-resolution techniques to upscale them to the required size. To produce square images without distorting content, we perform image expansion and inpainting. Missing regions introduced during resizing are filled using a generative model. Basic photo-metric corrections such as exposure adjustment, white balance normalization, and contrast enhancement are also applied to improve consistency across the dataset.

### 7.3. Image Annotation

We capture metadata per acquired image to help managing and understanding the corpus statistically. Such metadata enables targeted performance improvements as presented in Appendix C. Here, we describe the categories of metadata we record:

1. **Intrinsic metadata:** resolution, image format (JPEG, PNG, etc.).
2. **Adjunct metadata:** acquisition source, query term that retrieved the image, licensing information when available.
3. **Visual metadata:** structured attributes derived from image analysis.

An example excerpt of visual metadata is shown below:

```
description: >
A daylight photograph capturing a cycling race awards ceremony,
likely the Tour of Qatar. A male cyclist in a yellow sponsored
jersey stands with his arms raised holding a bouquet of flowers.
To his right, a man in traditional Qatari attire (white thobe and
ghutra) holds a young girl who is holding a trophy shaped like a
traditional dhow boat. A Qatari flag is partially visible in the
background against a bright blue sky.
eastern: >
The traditional Qatari male dress (thobe and ghutra/agal) and the
trophy shaped like a traditional dhow boat are key Eastern
cultural elements.
flags: Qatar
has_logo: true
islamic: Traditional Gulf Arab attire (thobe, ghutra)
objects:
- yellow cycling jersey
- bouquet of flowers
- dhow trophy
- Qatari ghutra
- cycling cap
people:
- Mark Renshaw
- Sheikh Khalid bin Ali Al Thani
- young girl
places:
- Tour of Qatar podium
synthetictext: "Getty Images, Credit: Tim de Waele"
western: >
Professional road cycling, the yellow leader's jersey, and
international corporate sponsors (HTC, ExxonMobil).
```

Visual metadata is generated using a multimodal model that analyzes both the image and its contextual signals. It captures descriptive, cultural, and structural attributes such as style, presence of Islamic elements, safety indicators, and object-level entities.

The adjunct metadata is subsequently provided to a large language model to generate multiple captions per image, typically ten variants with varying length and descriptive detail. This enriches supervision during fine-tuning and improves alignment between visual content and textual conditioning.

## 7.4. Model Selection and Fine-tuning

**Model selection.** We evaluated several contemporary text-to-image generators as candidate backbones for cultural fine-tuning, including *Stable Cascade*, *Stable Diffusion 3*, *FLUX*, and *Qwen* (image generation). Our selection criteria were: (i) generation quality under short prompts, (ii) inference efficiency (latency and memory footprint), and (iii) practical trainability, including the availability and maturity of fine-tuning tooling. We selected *FLUX.1-schnell* due to its strong quality–efficiency trade-off in our setting.

A practical limitation is that *FLUX* does not, at the time of writing, provide an official open-source training pipeline. We therefore built on a community implementation [75] and extended it with multi-GPU training support (`DistributedDataParallel`), along with data-loading and experiment-logging improvements required for our ablation study.

**Iterative refinement.** Model quality depends jointly on (i) the effective training distribution (which concepts appear and at what frequency), (ii) data quality (noise, duplicates, artifacts, and caption mismatches), and (iii) optimization choices (optimizer, learning rate schedule, regularization, and fine-tuning strategy). These factors are coupled: for example, changes in filtering or captioning alter the effective training signal and can necessitate different hyperparameters. We therefore adopt an iterative workflow in which data curation and training are refined together, guided by our cultural benchmark (Section 7.6).

**Dataset-wise ablations.** To isolate data effects and quantify the contribution of each dataset described in the previous subsection, we first trained *dataset-specific* fine-tuned models. For each dataset, we constructed multiple preprocessing pipelines (Section 7.2) that vary a controlled set of steps, including filtering criteria, resizing/cropping, watermark removal, duplicate detection, and caption normalization. We then trained one model per (dataset, pipeline) pair using a fixed base training recipe. Comparing these models enabled us to identify consistently beneficial preprocessing choices, diagnose failure modes, and incorporate the resulting insights into subsequent rounds of data acquisition and enhancement.

**Fine-tuning strategy.** We use a parameter-efficient fine-tuning approach to reduce compute and limit overfitting on curated datasets. Specifically, we apply LoRA adapters to the denoising network (and, when applicable, to selected attention blocks) while keeping the remaining components frozen. This setup supports controlled ablations across datasets and preprocessing variants.

**Training setup.** All models are trained with mixed precision (bf16/fp16) using multi-GPU data-parallel training. To standardize the input format, we use *FLUX* inpainting to expand images to a square canvas when needed. We train at a target resolution of  $1024 \times 1024$  with a maximum prompt length of 40 tokens.

We evaluated both AdamW and Lion across a range of hyperparameters. The best-performing configuration in our ablations uses:

- **Optimizer:** AdamW (final) or Lion (ablation) with learning rate  $5 \times 10^{-5}$ , weight decay  $1 \times 10^{-2}$ , and gradient clipping at 1.
- **Schedule:** Constant learning rate schedule.



- **Training length:** 200K steps with global batch size 4.

Across more than 60 training configurations, we found that Lion often reduced training loss faster and adapted more aggressively to the fine-tuning data, but it also increased output variability and occasional inconsistencies relative to AdamW. For the final model, we therefore use AdamW to prioritize stability and consistency.

## 7.5. Model Inference: Practical Considerations

We consider multiple aspects during the inference stage of the Aura-IG model, including the following:

**Language handling.** The generation model is prompted in English. When users submit Arabic prompts, we first translate them to English using a QCRI-developed LLM-based translation module. We adopt this design because our training corpus is substantially richer in image–English-caption pairs than image–Arabic-caption pairs; directly operating in English currently yields better generation quality and more stable behavior. This translation layer also provides a controlled interface for downstream prompt processing.

**Prompt rewriting and contextualization.** Before inference, prompts pass through a rewrite stage that improves specificity and enforces culturally aligned constraints. The rewrite module incorporates conversational context from prior user turns to preserve intent and maintain continuity across multi-turn interactions.

**Safety pipeline.** We apply safety checks at two points: (i) **input-side** prompt screening prior to generation, and (ii) **output-side** image screening after generation. This dual-stage policy helps reduce unsafe requests and catches problematic outputs that may still arise after prompting and rewriting.
















## 7.6. Evaluation

Developing a culturally aligned image generator requires frequent ablations over data curation choices and training hyperparameters. To make these iterations practical, we require an evaluation benchmark with three properties: (i) **statistical power**, so that small improvements can be detected reliably; (ii) **low latency and cost**, enabling many experiments; and (iii) **cultural relevance and diagnostic value**, so that scores reflect meaningful progress and provide actionable feedback. To this end, we construct a dedicated cultural benchmark and an automated scoring protocol.

**Prompt set.** Our benchmark comprises 1000 prompts covering everyday scenes and culturally salient concepts in Qatari, Islamic, and Arabic contexts. Prompts are organized into categories such as *landmarks and architecture*, *traditional attire and modesty norms*, *food and hospitality*, *family and social settings*, *religious and holiday contexts*, and *art and calligraphy*. Each prompt is reviewed by human annotators to ensure clarity, cultural appropriateness, and compliance with our content and safety guidelines. Sample prompts include:

- **Landmarks and Architecture:** A majestic, wide-angle photograph of the Museum of Islamic Art in Doha at dusk, its reflection shimmering on the calm water of the bay.
- **Daily Life and Social Interaction:** Two Qatari men in a traditional majlis, deeply focused on a game of backgammon, with a dallah coffee pot on a small table beside them.
- **Food and Hospitality:** A paper cup of hot Karak chai being handed over from a drive-thru window of a popular local tea shop in Qatar.

**Table 25** Sample qualitative generations across models. Each cell contains the generated image for the corresponding (prompt, model) pair.

Prompt	Fanar ImageGen v1.0	Flux-Schnell	Alibaba Qwen	OpenAI ChatGPT	Fanar ImageGen v2.0
A modern female Saudi artist painting abstract calligraphy onto a large canvas in a bright, minimalist studio.					
Man drinking tea from a small glass.					
The skyline of modern Beirut, Lebanon, reflected in the sunglasses of a stylish woman sitting at a rooftop cafe.					

- **Religious and Cultural Atmosphere:** An Arab man praying in the desert at sunset.

These examples illustrate the diversity of visual, social, and cultural dimensions represented in the prompt set, which is critical for robust evaluation of cultural grounding in generative models.

**Generation protocol.** Given a model under evaluation, we generate one image per prompt using a fixed inference configuration (resolution, number of steps, guidance, and random seed policy), yielding 1,000 images per model. Fixing the inference configuration ensures that score differences primarily reflect changes in model parameters rather than sampling variability.

**Automated scoring.** We evaluate each generated image using a large multimodal model judge (Gemini) with a structured rubric. For every (prompt, image) pair, the judge produces short written justifications and assigns a score in  $[0, 100]$  for each of 12 criteria, including: *instruction following*, *people accuracy*, *scene accuracy*, *visual consistency*, *level of detail*, *image sharpness*, *overall visual quality*, *clothing and modesty correctness*, *Islamic context accuracy*, *Arabic cultural alignment*, *English text quality*, and *Arabic text quality*.

We aggregate these 12 criteria into 5 higher-level evaluation dimensions:

- **Instruction Following:** measures how accurately the generated image reflects the prompt intent and semantic constraints.
- **Visual Accuracy:** combines people accuracy, scene accuracy, and consistency to assess realism and correctness of depicted elements.
- **Cultural Alignment:** aggregates clothing/modesty correctness, Islamic context accuracy, and broader Arabic cultural fidelity.
- **Text Quality:** evaluates correctness and readability of any English or Arabic text rendered within the image.
- **Perceptual Quality:** combines detail richness, sharpness, and overall visual quality.

Finally, we compute an overall average score across all criteria to obtain a single composite metric for each model.

**Uncertainty estimation.** To quantify statistical reliability, we estimate uncertainty in the aggregate score via repeated judging. In practice, aggregation over 1,000 prompts substantially reduces variance, enabling sensitive comparisons across ablation runs. Specifically, we report a variance error of less than 0.1 within the range of [0, 100].

**Efficiency and diagnostics.** The evaluation is fully automated and can be parallelized across prompts, enabling rapid turnaround during development. Beyond scalar scores, the judge’s written rationales provide fine-grained diagnostic signals that help identify failure modes (e.g., missing cultural attributes, incorrect landmark details, or inconsistent attire) and guide subsequent data and training refinements.

**Sample visual results.** Table 25 presents representative qualitative comparisons across models. The results illustrate that Fanar ImageGen v2 consistently produces images that are more culturally aligned with the prompt context. In particular, the model demonstrates a stronger tendency to generate culturally appropriate attire, environments, and visual cues. For example, when prompts involve people in Arab settings, Fanar ImageGen v2 more reliably depicts men wearing traditional garments such as the *thobe* and *ghutra*, while maintaining overall image quality at a comparable level to competing models.

**Benchmarking results.** Table 26 summarizes the quantitative performance of all evaluated models across the benchmark criteria. Our fine-tuned model, Fanar ImageGen v2, consistently outperforms its base counterpart (Flux-Schnell) across all evaluated dimensions, demonstrating the effectiveness of our culturally targeted training pipeline. Notably, Fanar ImageGen v2 achieves the highest score in *cultural compliance* among all models, highlighting its strong ability to capture culturally specific attributes, social contexts, and visual norms relevant to Arabic and Islamic settings. While larger models such as OpenAI ChatGPT and Alibaba Qwen attain higher scores in general visual quality and instruction following, Fanar ImageGen v2 ranks second overall in image quality and remains competitive across accuracy metrics. These results indicate that our approach successfully improves cultural alignment without sacrificing visual fidelity.

**Table 26** Comparison of image generation models on the cultural alignment benchmark. Scores range from 0 to 100 (higher is better). Best results are in **bold**, second best are underlined.

Model Name	Overall	Instruction Following	Quality	Accuracy	Cultural Compliance	Text
Fanar ImageGen v1.0	75.77	74.40	80.70	80.30	76.60	31.10
Flux-schnell	78.32	72.70	90.50	80.70	78.90	30.80
Alibaba – Qwen	<u>84.08</u>	<u>83.52</u>	93.24	<u>87.82</u>	78.59	<u>49.85</u>
OpenAI – ChatGPT	<b>92.56</b>	<b>96.94</b>	<b>95.87</b>	<b>94.92</b>	<u>85.15</u>	<b>79.35</b>
Fanar ImageGen v2.0	83.76	78.35	<u>93.52</u>	85.71	<b>85.49</b>	43.60

## 8. Fanar Oryx: Image and Video Understanding (Oryx-IVU)

Oryx-IVU, the Fanar 2.0 image and video understanding component, is described. The model is optimised for culturally-aware visual question answering in Arabic and English, with dedicated benchmarking frameworks for fair evaluation of Arabic visual understanding and Arabic calligraphy recognition.

Oryx-IVU is the image and video understanding component of the **Oryx** model family, targeting culturally-aware and fluent visual understanding in both Arabic and English of images and videos. Images may contain arbitrary content, including photos of people, places and objects, diagrams and flowcharts, street signs, and traditional Arabic calligraphy text.

The development of Oryx-IVU focuses on five key objectives: (i) enhancing Arabic and English visual question answering, (ii) strengthening understanding of Arabic culture and regional contexts, (iii) advancing fluent and natural Arabic/English generation in multimodal conversations, (iv) developing independent benchmarking frameworks to support fair and transparent evaluation, and (v) improving recognition of widely used Arabic font styles and calligraphic scripts.

We achieve these objectives through (i) collecting and curating datasets covering different Arabic and cultural aspects, (ii) developing multiple benchmarks customized for image understanding, and (iii) fine-tuning the state-of-the-art multi-modal model guided by our benchmarks and datasets. Our datasets facilitate understanding traditional Arabic calligraphy scripts, offer elaborate object detection and localization for Arabic content, provide multi-lingual captioning of a large set of diverse images, and are augmented with extensive metadata.

## 8.1. Data Collection and Curation

We construct the Oryx-IVU training corpus from four primary multimodal segments plus supplementary text-only instruction data, totaling approximately 62M training examples. Table 27 summarizes the composition, and we describe each segment below.

**Arabic, regional, and Islamic cultural content.** To address systematic underrepresentation of Arabic and Islamic visual content in existing VLMs, we employ taxonomy-driven crawling using our cultural visual taxonomy (described in Section 7.1), ensuring balanced coverage across religious practices, traditional architecture, regional clothing, festivals, and everyday contexts from 22 Arab countries. The corpus comprises approximately 240K internally collected images yielding 24M bilingual VQA pairs. Data construction follows a two-stage pipeline powered by Gemini 2.5 Flash: (i) structured metadata generation producing JSON-formatted annotations (visual descriptions, identified objects, cultural/geographic markers, scene attributes), and (ii) bilingual VQA synthesis consuming the metadata to generate diverse question, answer pairs in English and Modern Standard Arabic.

A critical design choice distinguishes *present* (Non-Null) from *absent* (Null) content, for Null fields, questions are generated whose answers explicitly state absence (e.g., “Are there any vehicles?” / “No, there are no vehicles visible”), providing negative supervision to mitigate hallucination. Dense supervision yields up to 63 VQA pairs per image in representative examples.

**Arabic fonts/calligraphy and script recognition.** We curate approximately 20K internally collected calligraphy images, predominantly Qur’anic verses rendered in five major Arabic scripts (Thuluth, Naskh, Ruq’ah, Kufi, Diwani). Instruction examples support dual objectives: (i) content identification (transcribing the Arabic text) and (ii) script classification (recognizing calligraphic style). All prompts and responses are in Arabic with deliberately concise answers. The resulting 54K VQA pairs enable robust handling of stylized typography that differs dramatically from printed text, addressing a critical capability gap in existing VLMs.

**Object detection, counting, and localization.** To strengthen grounded spatial reasoning, we build upon public detection datasets by AllenAI [29] through a multi-stage pipeline: (i) enhancement with object detection to obtain instance-level bounding boxes, (ii) label expansion using WordNet-style taxonomic relationships, (iii) template-driven SFT generation for counting, existence verification, and localization queries in English, and (iv) translation to Arabic for parallel bilingual supervision. Where available, examples incorporate point-based grounding through  $(x, y)$  coordinate lists (e.g., `airplanes: [(0.23, 0.45), (0.67, 0.52)]`), enabling tight spatial alignment between visual evidence and textual answers without full bounding boxes. The final corpus contains 1.6M VQA pairs (approximately 800K per language).

**General image captioning.** We construct a large-scale captioning segment from public sources, primarily from Pixmo [29], via English-to-Arabic translation and diversified prompting. Pixmo captions are notably

**Table 27** Training data composition for the Fanar-Oryx model.

Segment	Collection Method	Scale
(i) Cultural content	QCRI taxonomy-guided crawling; metadata-to-VQA synthesis (internal)	24M
(ii) Fonts and Calligraphy	Qur’anic verses; script/style recognition (internal)	54K
(iii) Object reasoning	Public datasets enhanced in EN, translated to AR; counting & localization	1.6M
(iv) General captioning	Public datasets; EN captions translated to AR	34M
(iv) Text-only instruction	UltraChat EN/AR for conversational capability [31]	1.9M
<b>Total</b>	<b>Half Arabic, Half English</b>	<b>62M</b>

detailed, as they originate from audio transcriptions of comprehensive image explanations by human annotators. We employ 27 paraphrased templates per language (e.g., “Write a caption for this.” / “اكتب تسمية توضيحية لهذا.”) to increase linguistic diversity and reduce template overfitting. From approximately 566K source images, the pipeline generates 34M VQA pairs (17M per language), providing comprehensive coverage of general visual description capability.

**Text-only instruction data.** To maintain robust dialogue capability independent of visual input and mitigate language imbalance, we incorporate UltraChat [31] in both English and Arabic, with Arabic translations produced internally. This text-only supplement strengthens multi-turn conversational coherence and instruction-following in the presence or absence of visual inputs, supporting realistic deployment scenarios in which users interleave vision and text-only queries within a single session.

## 8.2. Model Selection and Training

**Model selection.** Initial model selection was informed by an internal benchmarking phase conducted in late March 2025 using CAMEL-Bench [42]. Based on the available evidence and practical constraints, we selected Qwen2.5-VL-Instruct (7B) as the foundation model [15]. The choice was driven by its reported gains in multilingual reasoning and visual-language grounding, as well as its modern VLM design (dynamic-resolution ViT with window attention, multimodal token projection, and M-RoPE for spatial alignment) and broad modality coverage (images, videos, and documents). The Apache 2.0 license further supports iterative adaptation and downstream deployment within Fanar.

Table 28 presents the comparative results from our initial benchmarking phase. While Qwen2.5-VL demonstrated strong performance across multiple categories, the results revealed potential benchmark sensitivity in CAMEL-Bench [42]. Most notably, we observed an unexpected inversion between Qwen2-VL (7B-Inst.) and Qwen2.5-VL (7B-Inst.), where the newer Qwen2.5 model underperformed its predecessor. This inversion highlighted the risk of over-optimizing to a single external benchmark. This observation motivated the parallel development of internal, open evaluation assets to enable more controlled, transparent measurement of progress and to better align model optimization with Fanar’s Arabic-centric use cases.

**Model training.** We perform supervised fine-tuning (SFT) using parameter-efficient adaptation via LoRA (rank  $r = 128$ ) implemented in LLaMA-Factory. The vision encoder remains frozen throughout training to preserve pretrained visual representations and reduce computational cost.

To consolidate complementary gains from multiple fine-tuning runs, we apply TIES (Trim-Elect-Sign-Merge), a sparse delta-merging procedure that mitigates destructive interference between models. Given a shared base checkpoint  $W_0$  and fine-tuned checkpoints  $\{W_i\}$ , we compute per-run deltas  $\Delta W_i = W_i - W_0$ , sparsify each delta by retaining only the top- $k$  entries by magnitude, and resolve sign conflicts by dropping parameters with inconsistent update directions. The final merged checkpoint is:

$$W^* = W_0 + \text{combine}(\text{top-}k(\Delta W_1), \text{top-}k(\Delta W_2), \dots),$$

yielding a stable model that aggregates non-conflicting improvements while filtering training noise.

**Table 28** Initial benchmarking for model selection using CAMEL-Bench [42]. Qwen2.5-VL was selected as the base model, despite performance inversion on some categories. Cell shading reflects score magnitude (lighter = lower, darker = higher).

CAMEL Category	MBZUAI	Alibaba		CohereAI	Google			DeepSeek
	AIN	Qwen2 7B-it	Qwen2.5 7B-it	Aya-vis 32b	Gemma-3 4b-it	Gemma-3 12b-it	Gemma-3 27b-it	DeepSeek 7b-chat
Medical	43.99	39.30	31.48	40.08	27.59	27.77	27.77	20.33
Cultural	78.24	75.84	74.25	51.03	50.19	50.19	50.19	25.23
Agro	85.44	79.84	79.19	42.00	41.74	41.74	41.74	28.09
Charts	65.54	55.72	53.38	33.51	36.05	32.19	32.19	28.44
Remote Sensing	38.50	21.72	2.68	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.40
Video	63.56	64.09	64.47	36.39	17.41	17.41	17.41	29.26
OCR	72.07	48.90	46.71	31.71	22.19	21.93	20.54	21.15
VQA	56.16	50.57	49.49	45.16	36.14	21.09	21.10	20.08

**Table 29** Evaluation suite for Fanar-Oryx image understanding.

Benchmark	Purpose & Format	Scale
(i) Oryx-Almieyar	Arabic Cultural knowledge; EN, MSA, dialects; country-level analysis	12K questions
(ii) Oryx-BloomBench	Reasoning depth; EN/AR; six Bloom taxonomy levels	7.7K pairs
(iii) TaskGalaxy	General intelligence; cross-task reasoning; EN/AR	12K tasks
(iv) CAMELBench-MCQ	Consistent scoring; MCQ format; Arabic-focused	Internal
(v) User Testing + LLM-judge	Real scenarios; satisfaction + quality scores	3.3K queries

### 8.3. Evaluation

We evaluate Fanar-Oryx on four complementary benchmarks plus user testing with LLM-based assessments, totaling over 35K evaluation instances across diverse task types and languages. Table 29 summarizes the benchmark suite, and we describe each segment below.<sup>19</sup>

**Oryx-Almieyar: Arabic cultural benchmark (internal).** We constructed a culturally grounded evaluation set comprising 10 images per country across 20 Arab countries (200 images total). Each image is described and transcribed by two native speakers, then converted into question-answer pairs that are manually reviewed in English, Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), and country-specific dialects by a team of approximately 30 dialect experts. As illustrated in Figure 8, the benchmark creation pipeline combines transcription (ASR), human editing, and prompt-based QA generation with manual review to produce multilingual and dialectal Cultural VQA. The resulting ~12K questions probe cultural concept recognition, place/attire identification, and region-dependent interpretation, enabling country-level diagnostic analysis of geographic and cultural coverage gaps.

**Oryx-BloomBench: Bilingual reasoning benchmark (internal).** Oryx-BloomBench is a bilingual (EN/AR) multimodal benchmark of 7,747 image-question-answer pairs spanning all six Bloom’s taxonomy levels (Figure 9): Remember (2,948), Understand (1,592), Analyze (1,431), Create (685), Evaluate (592), and Apply (499). The benchmark is designed to probe reasoning depth beyond surface perception—from basic recognition to multi-step inference and creative generation—using culturally diverse, real-world scenarios. As shown in Figure 10, BloomBench items are produced through a structured pipeline that combines scenario ideation, cognitively grounded VQA authoring, multiple-choice conversion, bilingual translation, and hybrid quality validation on a representative subset to ensure coverage, consistency, and high-quality evaluation across all Bloom levels.

<sup>19</sup>Fanar Oryx was also evaluated in recent work on multilingual multimodal hallucination and multimodal question answering benchmarks [4, 67].




Figure 8: **Oryx-Almieyar benchmark overview and construction pipeline.** The figure summarizes country coverage across the Arab region, example culturally representative images, and the annotation workflow: a dialect speaker records an audio description for each culturally representative image; the audio is transcribed (ASR) and manually edited to produce a cleaned dialect script. From this script, aligned MSA and English versions are created, and MCQ-VQA items are generated in all three variants (Dialect, MSA, English) followed by manual review.




Figure 9: Hierarchical overview of the BloomBench Taxonomy. Grounded in Bloom’s cognitive framework, this hierarchy organizes multimodal tasks across six levels of cognitive complexity. Each level is further decomposed into specific task families to enable fine-grained evaluation of VLM reasoning capabilities.

**TaskGalaxy.** TaskGalaxy is a large-scale multimodal dataset/benchmark introduced by [24], comprising 19,227 hierarchical vision task types and 413,648 instruction–response samples generated through an automated pipeline (task expansion with GPT-4o, CLIP- and model-based filtering, and multi-model quality checks). In our evaluation, we extract a representative *subsample* from TaskGalaxy containing 12K samples automatically translated it to provide aligned English and Arabic versions, enabling bilingual assessment under a consistent task distribution. We use this TaskGalaxy subset primarily as a broad regression test for general-purpose multimodal competence, covering visual, textual, and multimodal problem types with emphasis on task diversity, systematic generalization, perception–language alignment, and multi-step reasoning—and to detect capability degradation when optimizing Fanar-Oryx for Arabic-specific cultural performance.



Figure 10: Overview of the BloomBench data generation pipeline. The process combines scenario ideation, cognitively-grounded VQA generation, multiple-choice conversion, translation, and hybrid quality validation of the representative subset to ensure high-quality, culturally relevant benchmark items across all Bloom’s levels.

**(iv) CAMELBench-MCQ: Multiple-choice adaptation.** To enable consistent scoring and direct model comparison, we converted CAMELBench tasks into multiple-choice format. Distractor answers were generated using strong reference models (Gemini 2.5 Flash, GPT-4), reducing the ambiguity inherent in open-ended grading. This MCQ framing supports clear accuracy metrics and facilitates head-to-head comparisons across model variants. Our adapted version is internal and not publicly released.

**User Study.** To evaluate real-world usability, we collected image-understanding queries from diverse testers who submitted their own images and questions. Each prompt was assigned a task category (Classification, QA, Reasoning, Coding) and testers provided Like/Dislike/No Reaction feedback for model responses. Satisfaction scores are reported per category and macro-averaged to identify high-priority remediation areas.




**LLM-as-a-Judge evaluation over user testing data.** We complement human feedback with LLM-judge assessment using Gemini 2.5 Flash as the evaluator. Models tested include Qwen2-VL, Qwen2.5-VL, Qwen3-VL (which was released after our training), Fanar-Oryx, AIN, and GPT-4o. Each response receives a 1-5 quality score with brief rationale.

**MCQ vs. Generative Evaluation Results.** Figure 11 summarizes our findings under two complementary protocols. **MCQ-based evaluation** (Figure 11a) provides a reliable signal for factual recognition and coarse-grained capability across datasets and domains. In this setting, Fanar-Oryx and its base model Qwen2.5-VL achieve the highest accuracies overall, with particularly strong performance on cultural subdomains (e.g., Food and Drink, Islamic Culture, and Landmarks) while maintaining competitive general capability. Country- and dialect-level analysis on Oryx-Almieyar further indicates localized gains: Fanar-Oryx is the top-performing model for Algeria, Jordan, Palestine, Qatar, and Sudanese varieties in the Arabic evaluation, and for Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Palestine, Qatar, and Syria in the English evaluation.


However, MCQ accuracy can understate qualitative differences between VLMs, especially when models reach similar accuracies but differ in (i) response faithfulness, (ii) linguistic consistency, or (iii) culturally grounded phrasing. We therefore complement MCQs with a *generative evaluation* (Fig. 11b), where models answer open-ended image-understanding queries and are scored by an LLM judge (Gemini 2.5 Flash) on a 1–5 scale with rationales. In this setting, Oryx-IVU improves over Qwen2.5-VL (3.03 vs. 2.76) and AIN (2.23), while also reducing Arabic–English code-switching (6% vs. 11%) and Arabic–Chinese mixing (1.5% vs. 3%), indicating better Arabic coherence beyond what MCQs alone reveal.




**Table 30 Qualitative examples highlighting improved Arabic consistency and cultural grounding.** We compare generative outputs from Oryx-IVU and its base model (Qwen2.5-VL) on Arabic vision-language prompts. Although both models can obtain similar MCQ accuracy, Oryx-IVU produces more Arabic-consistent, culturally grounded, and context-aware free-form responses. Key differences include: **(Row 1)** accurate identification and appropriate transliteration of Arabic book titles with relevant cultural context; **(Row 2)** fluent Arabic scene descriptions with correct location identification; and **(Row 3)** more precise (though not fully correct) Arabic text recognition and interpretation with reduced code-switching.

Image	Prompt	Oryx-IVU (Ours)	Qwen2.5-VL (Base)
	What is this book?	<p>The book in the image is titled "أحب العربية" (I Love Arabic) and it appears to be a textbook for teaching Arabic as a second language, specifically designed for students who speak other languages. The cover indicates that it is part of a comprehensive method for teaching Arabic, as mentioned by the subtitle "منهج متكامل في تعلم العربية للصفوف باللغات الأخرى" which translates to "A comprehensive method for teaching Arabic in other languages' classes".</p> <p>The book seems to be aimed at children or young learners, as suggested by the colorful illustrations on the cover depicting various scenes and characters, including children in a classroom setting and other cultural elements. The author's name, ناصف مصطفى عبد العزيز (Nasif Mustafa Abdul Aziz), is also mentioned on the cover.</p> <p>This type of textbook is commonly used in educational settings where Arabic is being taught as a foreign language, particularly in regions where Arabic is not the primary language spoken.</p>	<p>The image you've provided appears to be the cover of an educational book, likely aimed at children, given the cartoon-style illustrations and the playful depiction of historical or cultural scenes. The text on the cover is in Arabic, which suggests that the book is intended for an Arabic-speaking audience. The illustrations seem to depict scenes from history or folklore, possibly involving battles or traditional activities, as suggested by the presence of weapons like swords and spears, as well as other tools that might be used in construction or agriculture. The logo at the top right corner indicates that the book may be associated with a specific organization or institution, possibly related to education or cultural heritage. However, without more context or additional information, it's difficult to determine the exact title or content of the book. It could be part of a series focused on teaching about history, culture, or traditional practices through engaging stories and illustrations.</p>
	اوصف ما تراه (Describe what you see)	<p>هذه الصورة تظهر تمثالاً عملاقاً يشبه كلاً أو طقم شاي، وهو مثبت على منصة مستديرة. التمثال مصنوع من الرخام الأبيض، ويتميز بتفاصيل زخرفية منقوشة على جوانبه.</p> <p>في الخلفية، يوجد مجموعة من المباني العالية، بما في ذلك برج قرية الدوحة الشهير، والذي يظهر في الوسط. المباني مبنية من الزجاج والصلب، مما يعكس الضوء بشكل جيد ويجعلها تبدو متألقة.</p> <p>في الجانب الأيسر من الصورة، يوجد برج مميز بتصميمه الدائري، بينما في الجانب الأيمن، يوجد برج آخر مميز بتصميمه المثلي.</p> <p>في السطح، يوجد سماء صافية ورائعة، مما يبرز جمال المبنى.</p>	<p>في الصورة، نرى تمثالاً كبيراً ومثيراً للإعجاب يشبه كلاً أو طقمًا لتقديم الشاي، وهو مصنوع من الرخام الأبيض. التمثال محاط بدرجات حجرية مستديرة تؤدي إلى قاعدة كبيرة. في الخلفية، يمكن رؤية مباني عالية الطابق ذات تصميم معاصر. بما في ذلك برجين رئيسيين وبرجاً مميزاً بتصميم دائري. السماء صافية وسنتي، مما يعطي جواً من السعادة والهدوء على المشهد. هناك بعض النباتات والأشجار الخضراء في المنطقة المحيطة بالتمثال، مما يضيف لمسة طبيعية إلى المدينة الحديثة.</p>
	ما المكتوب في اللوحة (What is written on the sign)	<p>اللوحة تحتوي على النص التالي باللغة العربية: الصمت هو أعلى حلم. وهذا يعني أن الصمت هو أعلى وأفضل من الحلم.</p>	<p>اللوحة تحتوي على نص مكتوب باللغة العربية، ويمكن قراءته كما يلي من الأعلى إلى الأسفل: الصمت مناجى المقول حالاً هذا النص (This text appears to be written in Arabic.) [Code-switches to Chinese]</p>

**User Study Results.** We additionally evaluate 3.3K real user scenarios, obtaining macro satisfaction rates of 70% Like, 25% Dislike, and 5% No Reaction. These outcomes align with the generative setting, which better reflects end-user preferences than multiple-choice selection alone (Table 30 provides a qualitative comparison).



(a) MCQ accuracy (Arabic)



(b)

Generative image-understanding (LLM-as-a-Judge)

Figure 11: **MCQ vs. generative evaluation.** (a) MCQ accuracy across Arabic MCQ datasets. (b) Generative image-understanding scores on 3.3K open-ended queries, judged by Gemini 2.5 Flash (1–5). This highlights that models with similar MCQ accuracy can still differ meaningfully in open-ended response quality and Arabic linguistic consistency.

### Oryx-IVU: Main Contributions, Innovations, and Key Wins

**What we built.** Oryx-IVU is an Arabic-first image-understanding model for culturally grounded visual QA and multimodal dialogue in **Arabic and English**, targeting cultural/context awareness, fluent generation, fair evaluation, and basic Arabic fonts/calligraphy recognition.

**Core contributions and innovations (enablers of the gains).**

- **Arabic-centric data at scale (62M examples, ~50/50 AR–EN):** taxonomy-guided cultural crawling (22 countries; 240K internal images → 24M bilingual VQA) + calligraphy/script set (five scripts; 54K AR-only pairs) + grounded object reasoning (1.6M bilingual localization/counting with point-based  $(x, y)$  grounding) + large bilingual captioning (34M; 27 prompt paraphrases/language) + text-only instruction (1.9M).
- **WordNet-style augmentation for robust semantics:** object labels expanded via taxonomic relationships during detection-based data construction, improving coverage of synonyms/hypernyms and long-tail concepts.
- **Faithfulness by design:** explicit *present vs. absent (Null)* fields generate targeted “absence” questions to reduce hallucinations.
- **Evaluation you can trust:** internal benchmarks for **Arabic culture** (Oryx-Almieyar; EN/MSA/dialects with manual review) and **reasoning depth** (Oryx-BloomBench; six Bloom levels), plus TaskGalaxy bilingual regression for general capabilities and MCQ version of CAMEL-Bench for consistent scoring; motivated by observed benchmark sensitivity during model selection.

**Key results and improvements (Oryx-IVU V1).**

- **Cultural understanding:** 48.4% (AR) / 57.0% (EN) on Oryx-Almieyar; **best-in-class on 5/20 countries** in Arabic (Algeria, Jordan, Palestine, Qatar, Sudanese varieties).
- **User testing (LLM-as-a-Judge on 3.3K real queries):** Oryx-IVU achieves the **highest score**

## 9. Fanar Machine Translation: FanarShaheen

**FanarShaheen**, an LLM-based bilingual Arabic-English translation system derived from the Fanar model family, is described. Unlike the offline data-synthesis role of translation in Fanar 1.0, **FanarShaheen** is a first-class platform component offering high-quality English↔Arabic translation across diverse domains.

Machine translation was already an integral component of Fanar 1.0, where it was primarily employed as an offline data synthesis tool to translate large-scale English content — particularly STEM material — into Arabic. In Fanar 2.0, the role of machine translation is extended beyond data preprocessing: **FanarShaheen** is a dedicated modelling capability within the Fanar ecosystem, rather than solely an external pipeline component.

Beyond corpus augmentation, machine translation plays a central functional role in the Fanar ecosystem. A substantial portion of high-quality scientific, educational, and institutional content available globally is authored in English. Translating such material into Arabic was critical for reducing domain gaps during pretraining, particularly in STEM and formal registers where native Arabic resources remain comparatively limited. As a result, translation was not merely a preprocessing convenience but a strategic mechanism for strengthening Arabic-centric modeling. Furthermore, translation remains a high-impact downstream task for end-users, enabling cross-lingual knowledge access, localization, and institutional deployment. These considerations motivated the development of a dedicated translation system within Fanar rather than treating MT solely as an auxiliary component.




Figure 12: Average BLEU scores for English→Arabic machine translation across AraBench domains. Results are grouped by domain and compare **FanarShaheen** v1 against open-source, multi-lingual, and commercial MT systems.

### 9.1. FanarShaheen: an LLM-Based Machine Translation System

Building on the MT pipeline established in Fanar 1.0 [36], we introduce **FanarShaheen**, an LLM-based machine translation system derived from the Fanar model family. Rather than training a translation model from scratch, **FanarShaheen** is obtained by supervised fine-tuning of a pretrained FANAR language model on parallel English–Arabic data. The base checkpoint used for MT fine-tuning corresponds to an intermediate FANAR model trained on a mixture of Arabic-centric pretraining data and MT-augmented corpora. Initializing from this checkpoint provides a strong prior for Arabic language generation, which is subsequently specialized for translation through task-specific fine-tuning on parallel

data. To account for the structural and linguistic asymmetry between English and Arabic, we train two separate translation systems:

- English→Arabic (en→ar)
- Arabic→English (ar→en)

This separation allows each direction to be optimized independently, particularly benefiting Arabic generation quality in the en→ar setting.




Figure 13: BLEU comparison between **FANAR Shaheen v1** (MT-specialized) and the general-purpose **FANAR 27B** model on representative AraBench test sets. While FANAR 27B is capable of zero-shot translation, the MT-specialized Shaheen model consistently achieves substantially higher BLEU across domains, with an average gap of approximately 9 BLEU points.

Although large general-purpose FANAR models (e.g. FANAR 27B) are capable of performing translation via prompting, empirical evaluation demonstrates that zero-shot translation does not meet the adequacy, faithfulness, and cross-domain robustness required for production-grade MT. As shown in Figure 13, FANAR 27B achieves an average BLEU score of 16.1 on AraBench in the English→Arabic direction, compared to 25.1 BLEU for the MT-specialized FANAR Shaheen system, an average improvement of approximately 9 BLEU points. The performance gap is particularly pronounced in high-precision domains such as institutional (UN), news, and educational text, where terminological accuracy and structural fidelity are critical.

Translation is a constrained generation task that requires strict semantic preservation, structural alignment, and terminological consistency, whereas general LLMs are optimized for broader generative flexibility. While FANAR 27B frequently produces fluent outputs, it exhibits greater paraphrasing, structural variation, and occasional semantic drift, which are penalized under adequacy-focused metrics such as BLEU. In contrast, supervised fine-tuning on parallel corpora yields more stable and reference-aligned outputs, reduces hallucinations, and improves domain robustness. These findings motivate the development of FANAR Shaheen as a dedicated MT-specialized variant of the FANAR backbone rather than relying solely on prompted translation from a general-purpose LLM.

## 9.2. Training Setup

**FanarShaheen** models are trained via full fine-tuning of an intermediate of pretrained FANAR model. Supervised fine-tuning is performed on parallel English→Arabic data spanning multiple genres, including spoken language, news, general-domain web text, institutional documents, and medical content. The training corpus combines established MT benchmarks and large-scale parallel resources, with selective sub-sampling applied to very large datasets to ensure domain balance. Training is conducted separately for English→Arabic and Arabic→English translation, with each direction fine-tuned for three epochs. In total, the parallel training data corresponds to approximately **4.5 billion tokens**, providing broad coverage of both general-purpose and domain-specific translation scenarios.

### 9.3. Evaluation and Benchmarking

We evaluate **FanarShaheen** on *AraBench* [83], a curated English↔Arabic machine translation benchmark covering a diverse set of genres, including religious text, spoken language (TED Talks), tourism (MADAR), medical (Mayo Clinic) content, news, educational material, and institutional documents (UN). AraBench aggregates widely used MT test sets and reports results both at the genre level and as an overall average. Specifically, the religious genre is represented by Bible test sets; spoken language by IWSLT TED Talks test sets; tourism by travel-domain benchmarks; medical content by MayoClinic-derived test sets; news by standard WMT/NEWS test sets; educational material by QED datasets; and institutional documents by UN parallel corpora.

**FanarShaheen** is compared against a range of strong open-source, multilingual, commercial, and in-house Shaheen MT systems. These baselines include the Helsinki-NLP English–Arabic models [88], Meta’s NLLB-3.3B multilingual translation model [73], Google Translate (August 2025 snapshot), and the TranslateGemma 27B model [40]. In addition, we include *Shaheen NMT* [83], a prior in-house English–Arabic translation system based on sequence-to-sequence Transformer architectures, representing the previous generation of Arabic MT models developed before the adoption of large language models.

All systems are evaluated using BLEU on the English→Arabic direction. Across AraBench domains, **FanarShaheen** consistently achieves the strongest or near-strongest performance, with particularly large gains on spoken language (TED Talks), medical, news, educational, and institutional (UN) text. These results highlight the effectiveness of initializing MT models from an Arabic-centric pretrained LLM and specializing them via supervised fine-tuning on parallel data. While performance varies by genre, reflecting differences in style and domain complexity, **FanarShaheen** demonstrates robust generalization across both high-resource and specialized domains, resulting in the highest overall average BLEU score on AraBench.

A closer examination of Figure 12 shows that the most pronounced improvements are observed in spoken (TED), medical, news, educational, and institutional (UN) domains, where both terminological precision and fluent Arabic generation are critical. Compared to the previous-generation Shaheen NMT system, **FanarShaheen** delivers consistent gains across nearly all genres, reflecting the advantage of initializing from an Arabic-centric pretrained LLM and specializing it via full fine-tuning. While multilingual baselines such as NLLB-3.3B and commercial systems remain competitive in certain high-resource domains, **FanarShaheen** achieves the highest overall average BLEU score across AraBench, indicating robust cross-domain generalization rather than domain-specific optimization.

## 10. Fanar Sadiq: Grounded Islamic Content

**Fanar-Sadiq** is introduced: a multi-agent architecture replacing the earlier single-pipeline Islamic RAG. It routes Islamic queries to nine specialised handlers covering Fiqh reasoning, Quranic retrieval, du’a lookup, zakat and inheritance calculation, Hijri calendar, and prayer times.

**Fanar-Sadiq** is a bilingual multi-agent architecture for grounded Islamic question answering developed as a core component of Fanar 2.0 [1]. The system extends retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) by introducing intent-aware routing and specialized domain tools designed to handle the diversity of real-world Islamic queries. These include canonical text retrieval, jurisprudential reasoning with structured citations, and rule-constrained computations such as zakat and inheritance. Unlike traditional single-pipeline RAG systems, Fanar-Sadiq decomposes user requests into structured execution paths that combine neural retrieval, symbolic reasoning, and deterministic validation to improve factual grounding, reliability, and transparency.

**Motivation and Scope.** While large language models can answer Islamic knowledge queries fluently, they frequently hallucinate or misattribute canonical sources. This poses significant risks in religious settings where users expect answers grounded in authoritative texts such as the Qur’an and Hadith and aligned with established jurisprudential traditions. Standard RAG pipelines mitigate some limitations by




Figure 14: Fanar-Sadiq system pipeline showing hybrid routing, specialized agents, and response verification steps before final answer generation.

retrieving supporting evidence, but they remain insufficient for heterogeneous query types. In practice, users may request verbatim scripture, seek fatwa-style explanations with precise citations, or ask rule-constrained computational questions such as zakat obligations or inheritance distribution. Treating all such queries within a single “retrieve-then-generate” pipeline leads to predictable failure modes, including misquoted verses, incomplete sourcing, and numerically inconsistent outputs.

To address these challenges, Fanar-Sadiq introduces a multi-agent architecture that routes queries to specialized modules. At a high level, user requests fall into three broad categories: (i) text-grounded knowledge questions related to Qur’an, Hadith, or fiqh; (ii) rule- and arithmetic-constrained questions such as zakat and inheritance; and (iii) symbolic time or location queries including Hijri calendar conversion and prayer times. Each category requires distinct reasoning and validation mechanisms, motivating a modular system design.

**Architecture Overview.** Fanar-Sadiq follows an agentic, tool-using architecture illustrated in Figure 14. A hybrid routing classifier first determines the query intent and dispatches the request to an appropriate handler. Each handler integrates specialized retrieval resources, domain-specific prompting strategies, and deterministic validation pipelines tailored to its task. The final response is assembled into a structured output that includes citations, explanations, and uncertainty signals when relevant.

**Classification and Routing.** The entry point to Fanar-Sadiq is a hybrid query classifier responsible for intent detection and execution routing. The classifier is implemented using a structured prompting approach with a large language model that outputs a JSON representation containing: (i) predicted intent label, (ii) confidence score, (iii) short rationale, (iv) optional decomposition sub-questions for complex queries, and (v) a retrieval flag indicating whether external evidence is required.



Figure 15: Fanar-Sadiq: an example of Quranic aya validation and grounding.

The routing system supports nine intent categories aligned with specialized tools, including fiqh reasoning, Quran retrieval, Hadith verification, zakat calculation, inheritance computation, supplication lookup, calendar queries, prayer-time computation, and general knowledge search. The classifier uses both semantic cues and rule-based heuristics to improve reliability, forming a hybrid routing mechanism that combines LLM-based understanding with deterministic constraints.

To evaluate routing quality, we constructed an intent-labeled dataset of 705 anonymized real user queries sampled from the system’s production logs. Each query was independently annotated by multiple reviewers. Inter-annotator agreement measured using Fleiss’  $\kappa$  achieved a score of 0.76, indicating substantial agreement. On this benchmark, the hybrid classifier achieved 90.1% accuracy, outperforming strong zero-shot LLM baselines. These results demonstrate robust intent detection across heterogeneous Islamic query types.

**Fanar-Sadiq Agents and Tools.** The system defines nine primary intent classes aligned with specialized tools:

- Fiqh Reasoning.** This agent addresses jurisprudential questions requiring contextual reasoning and interpretation. It retrieves evidence from a large Islamic corpus indexed in a Milvus vector database containing over two million documents. The agent follows structured prompting based on principles of Usul al-Fiqh, explicitly separating rulings from supporting evidence and explanations. Outputs include structured sections such as Ruling, Evidence, Explanation, and Notes, with deterministic citation tags linking each claim to its source.
- Quranic Verse Retrieval.** This agent handles verse lookup, surah retrieval, interpretation requests, and statistical queries. Textual retrieval is performed over canonical Quran databases, while analytical queries are handled through a specialized natural-language-to-SQL model that translates requests into structured database queries.
- Hadith Retrieval and Verification.** This agent performs hybrid search across more than 51,000 Hadith using both full-text and semantic retrieval. Results are merged and validated through ranking fusion and sequence matching to ensure textual integrity and accurate citation.
- Zakat Calculator.** This module extracts structured financial parameters from user queries and

applies rule-based jurisprudential calculations covering multiple asset types. Outputs include transparent breakdowns of obligations and supporting explanations.

5. **Inheritance Calculator.** This tool computes inheritance distributions using deterministic rule-based logic covering fixed shares, residuary allocations, blocking rules, and proportional adjustments.
6. **Supplication Lookup.** This agent retrieves supplications from a structured database using semantic search and lightweight filtering, returning verbatim Arabic text with translations and references.
7. **Islamic Calendar Tool.** This module handles Hijri date conversion, event lookup, and calendar reasoning using rule-based time computation and curated event ontologies.
8. **Prayer Times and Qibla Direction.** This tool computes location-aware prayer times using established astronomical methods and determines Qibla direction via geospatial calculations.
9. **General Knowledge Retrieval.** Queries that do not match specialized intents are handled by a general retrieval pipeline over a large Islamic knowledge corpus.

Each handler includes fallback mechanisms to ensure graceful degradation when retrieval fails or parameters are incomplete.

**Retrieval Infrastructure and Embeddings.** Text-grounded queries are supported by a large multilingual vector database indexed using dense embeddings. In Fanar 2.0, we migrated from the BGE-Multilingual-Gemma2 embedding model used in Fanar 1.0 to Qwen3-Embedding-4B. This transition was motivated by improved cross-lingual semantic alignment and better coverage of Islamic terminology. Empirical evaluation on Islamic retrieval benchmarks demonstrated improved recall and retrieval accuracy for Arabic-English mixed queries, particularly for jurisprudential and Quranic content.

**Quranic Text Validation.** To ensure quotation accuracy, Fanar-Sadiq includes a dedicated validation pipeline that detects Quranic text in generated responses and replaces it with verified canonical verses. The pipeline combines pattern detection, fuzzy matching, and reference verification to maintain textual integrity (see Figure 15).

**Conversational Support.** The system supports multi-turn dialogue through a query rephrasing component that resolves contextual references using conversation history, enabling coherent follow-up interactions across intent categories.

**Deployment and Impact.** Fanar-Sadiq is deployed in production and integrated into major Islamic information platforms such as IslamWeb and IslamOnline. These services provide educational resources and interactive question answering to a global audience. The system supports bilingual access and has processed millions of user queries, demonstrating scalability and real-world utility.

## 11. Fanar Diwan: Generative AI Arabic Poetry

**Fanar-Diwan** is presented: a generative model fine-tuned on 118K classical Arabic poems with complete metadata (meter, rhyme, topic, era). The model is optimised for the metrical and rhetorical constraints of classical Arabic prosody, with diacritization tightly integrated into the generation process.

Arabic poetry represents both a culturally significant literary tradition and a challenging task for natural language processing due to its strict structural constraints and linguistic complexity. Classical Arabic



poetry is governed by well-defined metrical patterns (Buhur), established by al-Farahidi, and enforced through the rules of prosody (Arud) and rhyme (Qafiya), all of which rely critically on accurate diacritization. While modern prose poetry offers greater structural flexibility, it still preserves rhythmic and expressive characteristics. From a computational perspective, Arabic poetry generation is particularly challenging because of the language’s rich morphology, flexible word order, and the widespread absence of diacritics in written text, which introduces substantial lexical ambiguity. Since diacritics directly influence pronunciation, meaning, meter, and rhyme, poetry generation is tightly coupled with diacritization. Accurate diacritization is therefore essential not only for preserving poetic structure and aesthetic quality, but also for ensuring linguistic correctness, a requirement shared with other NLP applications such as machine translation, speech recognition, and text-to-speech systems.

### 11.1. Data Collection

In April 2025, we crawled AlDiwan website (<https://www.aldiwan.net/>), a large Arabic poetry repository providing poems with metadata such as meter, rhyme, topic, and era. Initial analysis revealed substantial imbalance and missing annotations (only 76% of poems have complete metadata), particularly for meter, topic, and historical era. To reduce era skew, fine-grained labels were mapped to five canonical literary periods following established classifications. Missing metadata were completed using careful prompting of GPT-4o, and manual evaluation by an expert linguist showed high accuracy for rhyme and era prediction, moderate accuracy for topic, and lower accuracy for meter. After cleaning and augmentation, the resulting dataset contains 118K poems (94% of the corpus) with complete metadata, improving its suitability for structured poetry generation and analysis.

### 11.2. Diacritization Accuracy

Arabic diacritization is highly error-prone due to syntactic ambiguity, rare word forms, and corpus-wide inconsistency. To improve diacritization quality in AlDiwan, we performed a multi-stage cleaning process combining frequency-based analysis, external corpus comparison, and expert review. Diacritization variants for each word stem were identified and compared against a large, high-quality proprietary corpus to flag abnormal patterns. Character-level unigram and bigram analysis was further used to detect invalid diacritic sequences, enabling automatic correction of deterministic errors and manual review of frequent cases. Additional validation was conducted using Farasa spell checker [69], with expert verification of high-frequency corrections. This process produced a substantially cleaner corpus, reducing diacritization word error rate from 35.27% to 13.76%. The diacritization benchmark consists of random 200 poems (2,000 verses) spanning different eras, poets, and topics created and subsequently verified by two expert linguists via independent sequential review.

### 11.3. Diwan: Poetry Generation Model

We build our Arabic poetry generation system on AraGPT2 [12], a decoder-only Transformer architecture optimized for Arabic text generation. Experiments are conducted using two model scales, AraGPT2-Large (792M parameters) and AraGPT2-Mega (1.46B parameters), allowing us to study the effect of model capacity on poetic quality and controllability. We apply a continuous pretraining stage, in which the model is further trained on a collection of approximately 47 million words of Arabic literary texts crawled from literature-focused websites (e.g., [adab.com](http://adab.com), [adabworld.com](http://adabworld.com)). Then, poems from the curated AlDiwan corpus are converted into a structured representation that explicitly encodes meter, topic, era, poet, and rhyme letter for supervised fine-tuning (SFT). Specifically, poems were represented as:

**Hemistich1 [meter][topic][era][poet] Hemistich2 [rhyme\_letter]**

**Table 31** Human evaluation results for Arabic poetry generation across models.

Mean  $\pm$  standard deviation of expert linguist scores (0–10) for poeticness, meaning, coherence, and fluency. Best results for each criterion are written in bold, and the second best results are underlined.

**Fanar-Diwan** is our best poetry generation model (AraGPT2-Mega with continual pretraining on Arabic literature and fine-tuned on AlDiwan corpus).

Criteria	Models						Upper Bound
	ALLaM-7B	Fanar-9B	Fanar-27B	Jais-13B	GPT-4o-mini	<b>Fanar-Diwan</b>	GPT-4o
Poeticness	0.50 $\pm$ 0.97	0.08 $\pm$ 0.35	0.77 $\pm$ 1.13	0.06 $\pm$ 0.24	<u>1.70 <math>\pm</math> 0.76</u>	<b>4.81 <math>\pm</math> 1.57</b>	5.73 $\pm$ 1.81
Meaning	0.50 $\pm$ 0.74	2.21 $\pm$ 1.17	2.74 $\pm$ 1.22	0.52 $\pm$ 0.82	<u>3.70 <math>\pm</math> 1.15</u>	<b>4.83 <math>\pm</math> 1.14</b>	5.52 $\pm$ 1.30
Coherence	0.54 $\pm$ 0.85	2.83 $\pm$ 1.43	3.45 $\pm$ 1.70	0.67 $\pm$ 1.08	<u>3.92 <math>\pm</math> 1.08</u>	<b>5.52 <math>\pm</math> 1.27</b>	6.31 $\pm$ 1.39
Fluency	1.44 $\pm$ 1.44	4.12 $\pm$ 1.65	<u>5.06 <math>\pm</math> 1.41</u>	1.88 $\pm$ 2.13	3.82 $\pm$ 1.16	<b>6.88 <math>\pm</math> 1.12</b>	6.25 $\pm$ 1.06

**Table 32** Human evaluation results for Arabic poetry generation and diacritization. Mean  $\pm$  standard deviation of expert linguist scores (0–10) for poeticness, meaning, coherence, and fluency. Best results for each criterion are written in bold. \*WER and DER for Bi-LSTM and the Joint models are not comparable.

Criteria	Models		
	Fanar-Diwan	Bi-LSTEM Diac	Joint
Poeticness	<b>4.81 <math>\pm</math> 1.57</b>	-	4.10 $\pm$ 1.64
Meaning	<b>4.83 <math>\pm</math> 1.14</b>	-	4.58 $\pm$ 1.20
Coherence	<b>5.52 <math>\pm</math> 1.27</b>	-	5.04 $\pm$ 1.29
Fluency	<b>6.88 <math>\pm</math> 1.12</b>	-	6.34 $\pm$ 1.26
WER* (%)	-	12.45	<b>3.35</b>
DER* (%)	-	3.95	<b>1.02</b>

## 11.4. Poetry Generation Benchmarking

We benchmarked poetry generation by prompting models to complete 50 poems from five core eras, preserving meter, rhyme, and poet style. Two expert Arabic linguists independently rated outputs on poeticness, meaning, coherence, and fluency (0–10 scale), showing high inter-annotator agreement. Table 31 lists results from our best model and other Arabic-centric and multi-lingual LLMs.

## 11.5. Joint Generation and Diacritization

We compare the cascaded approach - where Fanar-Diwan first generates undiacritized poems and a BiLSTM model subsequently restores diacritics - with the joint model that generates fully diacritized poems in a single step. The joint poetry generation and diacritization model produces metrically and rhythmically correct Arabic verse in fully diacritized form. The model is fine-tuned on the automatically diacritized poems with a Bi-LSTM model (WER 12.45%), enabling it to jointly learn poetic structure and diacritization patterns. Comparative results against cascaded approaches are reported in Table 32. While the joint model achieves substantially lower diacritization error (WER 3.35% vs. 12.45%), its generated poems are slightly lower in poeticness and coherence, likely due to quality issues and the relatively small size of the original corpus. We plan to add more poems from The Poetry Encyclopedia (<https://poetry.dct.gov.ae/>), The Poets Gate (<https://poetsgate.com/>), etc., improve poems metadata and diacritization, and increase the poetry generation model size. Sample generated poems from the cascaded approach is shown in Figure 16.

لَا وَالْعَرَامِ وَمَا نُجِنُ الْأَصْلَحُ      مِنْ مُهْجَةٍ بِيَدِ الْهَوَى تَنْقَطَعُ  
 وَدُمُوعِ عَيْنِي فِي هَوَاكِ غَزِيرَةٌ      وَعَلَى جُفُونِي مِنْ جُفُونِكَ تَدْمَعُ  
 يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّشَاءُ الَّذِي قَلْبِي لَهُ      فِي كُلِّ جَارِحَةٍ مَتَيْمٌ مَصْرَعُ  
 إِنْ لَمْ تَكُنْ لِي مِنْكَ يَا رَشَاءُ الْحَمَى      عَيْنٌ فَأَنْتَ لِكُلِّ صَبٍّ مُوجِعُ  
 لَوْلَاكَ مَا ذَابَ الْفُؤَادُ وَلَا عَدَا      لِلْعَاشِقِينَ جَمِيعَهُمْ يَتَضَعَعُ  
 مَا كُنْتُ أَعْلَمُ أَنَّ حُبَّكَ قَاتِلِي      حَتَّى رَمَيْتَ بِسَهْمٍ لِحَاظِكَ فَأَصْعَعُ  
 إِنِّي لِأَعْجَبُ كَيْفَ تَصْبِرُ عَاشِقًا      عَنْ حَيْهٍ وَهُوَ الْكُنَيْبُ الْمَوْجِعُ  
 كَيْفَ التَّصْبِرُ عَنْ حَبِيبِ قَلْبِهِ      بِفُؤَادِي أَبَدًا عَلَيْهِ مَوْزَعُ  
 لَمْ أَنْسَ لَيْلَةَ زَارِنِي مَتَلْتِمًا      مُنْبَسِمًا وَالذَّمْعُ مِنْهُ يَنْبَعُ  
 وَبِكِي فَظَنَنْتُهُ بَدْرًا طَالِعًا      أَوْ غُصْنًا بَانَ نَابِتًا يَنْتَفَعُ

Figure 16: Generated poem from Fanar-Diwan then diacritized (cascaded).

Human Evaluation: Poeticness=6, Meaning=5, Coherence=7, Fluency=6.

## 12. Fanar Agentic Framework

The Fanar agentic tool-calling framework is described. **Fanar-27B** is extended with structured function-calling capability, enabling it to invoke external services — including translation, speech, image generation, and Islamic knowledge — through a Fanar MCP server.

Tool-calling empowers LLMs to interact with external systems and applications by generating structured requests in response to a user’s natural language prompt [64], allowing LLMs to perform tasks beyond their intrinsic capabilities. Typically, an LLM is provided with a prompt alongside a predefined set of tools (or functions), complete with their descriptions, arguments, and expected output. The LLM then analyzes the prompt to determine if invoking an external tool is necessary to fulfill a user’s request. If a tool call is identified, the LLM generates a structured tool call request, in accordance with what the tools expect. The output generated by the execution of the external tool is subsequently fed back to the LLM to be incorporated into the final response of the LLM, thereby creating a dynamic and iterative problem-solving loop [64]. Consequently, an LLM must be explicitly trained to understand tool descriptions, recognize when they are needed, generate structured function calls, and handle their output.

In this section, we describe and evaluate our Agentic Fanar framework.

### 12.1. Training Agentic Fanar

We trained the Fanar LLM specifically for tool-calling allowing it to access external tools [35]. To do so, we utilized four distinct datasets (shown in Table 33). We adapted two prominent open-source function-calling datasets, namely **Glaive**<sup>20</sup> and **xLAM** [61], where we translated them into Arabic using Gemini-2.5-Flash-no-thinking [39] following the prompt templates described in [35]. In our experiment, we use the Arabic and English versions of the datasets in isolation or in combination. We split both datasets into training and test splits, where the English and Arabic train and test splits are direct translations of each other.

To address specific use cases, we curated two novel datasets. The first, **CustomTools**, is a collection of unique tools synthetically generated using Gemini. It includes both positive examples, where a function call is required, and negative examples, where a function call is not required or not present in the list of provided tools. We synthesized Arabic and English examples. The tools cover functions such as translation, image generation, speech generation, speech recognition, text diacritization, Islamic knowledge, recent news, and person biography lookup.

<sup>20</sup><https://huggingface.co/datasets/glaiveai/glaive-function-calling-v2>

The second, `IslamicRAGTool`, was built from real question-answer pairs obtained from the Fanar Arabic and English Islamic question-answering service API<sup>21</sup>. `IslamicRAGTool` is different from the other calls in three ways, namely: the dataset is based on actual logs instead of being synthetic; it involves specific topic/genre classification; and, unlike the other tools the LLM needs to pass either the user input or sequence of interactions as is without argument extraction. For a comprehensive overview of the datasets and their statistical properties refer to [35].

**Table 33** Summary of Function-Calling Datasets. Language denotes the language of the dataset (AR = Arabic, EN = English). FC indicates whether the examples include function calls (Y = Yes, N = No). Turns specifies whether interactions are single-turn (S) or multi-turn (M), while Calls denote whether a single (S) or multiple (M) function calls occur per turn. The Train and Test columns report the number of samples in each split. The datasets `Glaive`, `xLAM`, `CustomTools`, and `IslamicRAGTool` contain 972, 3,179, 8, and 1 unique tools, respectively, distributed across their examples.

Dataset	Language	FC	Turns	Calls	Train	Test
	AR	Y	M	S	37,684	1,953
	AR	N	M	S	38,678	1,000
	EN	Y	M	S	37,684	1,953
	EN	N	M	S	38,678	1,000
xLAM	AR	Y	S	M	58,999	1,001
	AR	N	S	M	19,361	1,077
	EN	Y	S	M	58,999	1,001
	EN	N	S	M	19,361	1,077
	AR	Y	S	S	4,528	1,000
	AR	N	S	S	4,313	1,000
	EN	Y	S	S	5,133	1,000
	EN	N	S	S	5,983	1,000
IslamicRAGTool	AR	Y	S	S	10,000	1,000
	AR	N	S	S	10,000	1,000
	EN	Y	S	S	10,000	1,000
	EN	N	S	S	10,000	1,000

## 12.2. Evaluation

**Experimental Setup.** We designed five experiments, where each evaluates a different configuration of supervised fine-tuning of Fanar-C (9B) [36] and tool-calling training strategies.

- **Experiment 1:** Fine-tuning of the **base** Fanar model using English tool-calling data drawn from a combination of the `Glaive` and `XLAM` datasets.
- **Experiment 2:** A direct replication of Experiment 1, but using the translated Arabic versions of the tool-calling examples from `Glaive` and `XLAM`.
- **Experiment 3:** Continued fine-tuning of **instruction-tuned** Fanar using a mix of English tool-calling examples from `Glaive` and `XLAM`.
- **Experiment 4:** Similar to Experiment 3, but using bilingual tool-calling data (English and Arabic) from the `Glaive` and `XLAM` datasets.
- **Experiment 5:** Similar to Experiment 4, where we fine-tuned the instruction-tuned Fanar model with the bilingual training sets of `Glaive` and `XLAM` along with the training splits of the `CustomTools` and `IslamicRAGTool` datasets.

In Experiments 3–5, we used the instruction-tuned Fanar model that differs from the base pre-trained model used in Experiments 1 and 2.

<sup>21</sup><https://api.fanar.qa/docs>

**Fine-Tuning Setup.** We fine-tuned all models using supervised learning with LLaMA-Factory [99]. The training setup is the same for all models: we use a cosine learning rate schedule with a peak learning rate of  $5.0 \times 10^{-7}$  and a minimum of  $5.0 \times 10^{-8}$ , and a batch size of 640. We fine-tune two public models: Fanar-1-9B, a pre-trained base model, and Fanar-1-9B-Instruct, its post-trained variant [36] to measure the effect of SFT on tool calling capabilities.

**Evaluation Methodology.** We fine-tuned the models to produce one of two outputs: a dedicated `<no_tool_call>` tag when no action is required, or a function call, with tool name and arguments, encapsulated within `<tool_call></tool_call>` tags. For evaluation, each model is tested on all test splits detailed in Table 33. To ensure a fair comparison with single-turn datasets, we decompose the multi-turn conversations from the **Glaive** test set into individual turns. We report the weighted-average precision and recall across all available tools, where the weighting reflects the relative importance of each tool based on its frequency in the test set.

Our evaluation methodology employs two complementary approaches: function name detection and end-to-end argument accuracy. First, we calculate the precision ( $P_T$ ) and the recall ( $R_T$ ) for each tool  $T$  based on function name matching only. For each tool/class, precision measures the fraction of predicted tool calls that are correct, while recall measures the fraction of actual tool calls that are correctly identified. Notably, we treat the absence of a tool call as its own tool, representing cases where no function tool is invoked:

$$P_T = \frac{\text{True Positives}_T}{\text{True Positives}_T + \text{False Positives}_T}$$

$$R_T = \frac{\text{True Positives}_T}{\text{True Positives}_T + \text{False Negatives}_T}$$

These individual scores are then aggregated using a weighted average, where each tool’s contribution is weighted by its support ( $N_T$ )—the number of true instances in the test set. The final weighted-average metrics are defined as:

$$\text{Precision}_{\text{weighted}} = \sum_{T \in K} \frac{N_T}{N_{\text{total}}} \cdot P_T$$

$$\text{Recall}_{\text{weighted}} = \sum_{T \in K} \frac{N_T}{N_{\text{total}}} \cdot R_T$$

where  $K$  is the set of all tools and  $N_{\text{total}}$  is the total number of instances.

Beyond function name detection, we assess end-to-end performance through Argument Population Accuracy (ArgA), which quantifies the proportion of function calls where both the function name and all parameter values are correctly predicted. This comprehensive metric evaluates the model’s capacity to not only select the appropriate tool but also furnish it with accurate argument values:

$$\text{ArgA} = \frac{\text{Exact Matches}}{\text{Total Positive Cases}}$$

where Exact Matches denotes instances with perfect correspondence in both function name and arguments, and Total Positive Cases encompasses all cases requiring function calls (excluding `<no_tool_call>` instances). ArgA delivers a holistic evaluation of the model’s practical effectiveness in real-world function calling applications.

To ensure reliable ArgA computation, we implement standardized normalization protocols for both ground truth and predicted function calls prior to assessment. These normalizations include lowercase normalization, elimination of extraneous whitespaces, and standardization of date formats and numerical representations. This preprocessing is essential because models may generate semantically identical outputs with minor formatting discrepancies (e.g., “2024-01-15” versus “2024/01/15” for dates, or “John Smith” versus “john smith”). By applying uniform normalization rules to both reference and predicted outputs, we focus evaluation on semantic accuracy rather than superficial formatting differences, yielding a more precise assessment of functional performance.

**Table 34** Performance evaluation across five training configurations showing precision (P) and recall (R) for the function call detection task (measuring whether function names match), and argument population accuracy (ArgA) for end-to-end correctness requiring both correct function names and argument values. Training setups: (1) English-only tool-calling data, trained with a random mix of Glaive EN and xLAM EN; (2) Arabic-only tool-calling data, trained with a random mix of Glaive AR and xLAM AR; (3) Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) followed by training on a random mix of Glaive EN and xLAM EN; (4) SFT followed by a bilingual (EN + AR) random mix of Glaive and xLAM; (5) SFT followed by a bilingual (EN + AR) random mix of Glaive and xLAM, IslamicRAGTool and CustomTools. Test sets are evaluated in Arabic (AR) and English (EN). Function Calling (FC) indicates whether the test set contains positive cases requiring function calls (Yes) or negative cases without function calls (No).

Dataset	Language	FC	Exp. 1			Exp. 2			Exp. 3			Exp. 4			Exp. 5		
			P	R	ArgA	P	R	ArgA	P	R	ArgA	P	R	ArgA	P	R	ArgA
Glaive	AR	Yes	1.00	0.99	0.69	1.00	0.99	0.78	1.00	1.00	0.71	1.00	0.99	0.77	1.00	0.99	0.77
		No	1.00	0.95	-	1.00	0.98	-	1.00	0.96	-	1.00	0.99	-	1.00	1.00	-
	EN	Yes	1.00	0.99	0.90	1.00	0.99	0.88	1.00	0.99	0.91	1.00	0.99	0.91	1.00	0.99	0.91
		No	1.00	0.99	-	1.00	0.98	-	1.00	0.99	-	1.00	0.99	-	1.00	0.99	-
xLAM	AR	Yes	0.97	0.97	0.61	0.98	0.98	0.75	0.98	0.98	0.62	0.99	0.98	0.76	0.98	0.98	0.76
		No	1.00	0.98	-	1.00	0.98	-	1.00	0.97	-	1.00	0.99	-	1.00	0.99	-
	EN	Yes	0.98	0.98	0.85	0.98	0.99	0.82	0.98	0.98	0.86	0.98	0.98	0.87	0.99	0.99	0.86
		No	1.00	0.98	-	1.00	0.97	-	1.00	0.98	-	1.00	0.99	-	1.00	0.99	-
CustomTools	AR	Yes	0.98	0.66	0.45	0.97	0.82	0.77	0.98	0.86	0.58	0.98	0.86	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00
		No	1.00	0.97	-	1.00	0.90	-	1.00	0.74	-	1.00	0.89	-	1.00	1.00	-
	EN	Yes	0.97	0.70	0.56	0.96	0.80	0.56	0.96	0.80	0.64	0.96	0.81	0.63	1.00	0.99	1.00
		No	1.00	0.98	-	1.00	0.92	-	1.00	0.87	-	1.00	0.94	-	1.00	1.00	-
IslamicRAGTool	AR	Yes	1.00	0.25	0.14	1.00	0.47	0.36	1.00	0.69	0.42	1.00	0.63	0.49	1.00	0.99	0.99
		No	1.00	0.98	-	1.00	0.94	-	1.00	0.90	-	1.00	0.95	-	1.00	1.00	-
	EN	Yes	1.00	0.44	0.33	1.00	0.58	0.33	1.00	0.71	0.54	1.00	0.62	0.51	1.00	0.99	0.99
		No	1.00	0.97	-	1.00	0.95	-	1.00	0.95	-	1.00	0.95	-	1.00	1.00	-

**Results and Analysis.** Table 34 presents the comprehensive results of all the experiments conducted. As expected, models achieve nearly perfect precision and recall when evaluated on test examples drawn from the same domain as the training data. This pattern is consistently observed across the Glaive and xLAM test sets, where all models were trained on the respective training portions of these datasets, regardless of whether they used Arabic, English, or bilingual training data.

We examine the transferability of tool-calling capabilities between English and Arabic by comparing the results of Experiment 1 and Experiment 2. The results indicate that models trained on tool-calling data in one language (English or Arabic) can effectively transfer this ability to the other language. However, when evaluating on previously unseen tools, particularly domain-specific ones such as CustomTools and IslamicRAGTool, we observe a significant drop in recall, where the LLM should have invoked a tool but did not. This highlights a broader generalization gap in tool invocation for previously unseen tools, especially those with niche or specialized behavior.

As for argument population accuracy (ArgA), the results show that a mismatch in the language of training versus testing data adversely affects the ability of the model to guess the correct arguments, particularly for unseen tools. This underscores that the model struggles not only with deciding when to call a tool, but also with correctly populating its arguments.

The addition of Arabic tool-calling data to the English fine-tuning dataset (transitioning from Experiment 3 to Experiment 4) produces notable improvements in non-function-calling performance. A more significant trend is visible in argument population accuracy, which improves markedly for Arabic test cases in both CustomTools (from 0.58 to 0.80) and IslamicRAGTool (from 0.42 to 0.49), while slightly decreasing for the corresponding English cases.

The effect of general SFT data is most evident when comparing Experiment 1 and Experiment 3, revealing contrasting impacts on function-calling (FC) and non-function-calling cases across different datasets. For function-calling cases, the General SFT data produces substantial improvements in recall performance.

However, non-function-calling cases show a concerning decline in performance after applying general SFT data. This suggests that the general training data may be introducing a bias toward function-

calling behavior. To address whether fine-tuning LLMs on tool-specific data is necessary, Experiment 5 involves training on all available datasets simultaneously. This accounts for substantial performance gains observed when comparing Experiment 5 to all previous experiments, with nearly perfect precision, recall, and ArgA.

### 13. Orchestrator

The redesigned Fanar orchestrator is described: a multi-layer framework providing intent-based routing, defense-in-depth validation through **FanarGuard**, and a Fanar MCP server for agentic tool orchestration. The transition from a simple model wrapper to a sophisticated routing and validation framework is detailed.

The Fanar platform follows a modular, multi-layered architecture, as illustrated in Figure 17. The Fanar orchestrator serves as the platform’s central nervous system, transitioning from a simple model wrapper to a sophisticated routing and validation framework. It manages the request lifecycle through three primary architectural patterns: intent-based routing, defense-in-depth validation, and agentic tool orchestration.




Figure 17: High-level architecture of the Fanar platform showing the orchestrator’s request routing, validation, and service coordination.

### 13.1. Intelligent Routing and Topic Classification

A core design principle of Fanar is *specialized delegation*. Rather than relying on a single monolithic model to handle all queries, the orchestrator employs a high-speed classification pipeline to route requests to domain-specific experts. This approach mitigates hallucination and ensures cultural alignment.

The routing logic follows a multi-step process:

- **Context Reconstruction:** Incoming prompts are first rephrased using context-aware models (Gemma-3) to resolve ambiguities from previous chat turns.
- **Intent Disambiguation:** Parallel classifiers analyze the prompt to detect specific intents—such as religious inquiries, poetic composition, or current events.
- **Expert Routing:** Based on classification, the request is directed to the most appropriate execution engine: *Fanar-Sadiq* for Islamic content, *Fanar-Diwan* for poetry, or *Fanar-Oryx* for visual reasoning.

### 13.2. Defense-in-Depth Validation

To satisfy the strict requirements of “Sovereign Governance,” the orchestrator implements validation at both the input and output stages. Unlike standard safety filters, Fanar introduces domain-specific validators:

- **Input Interception:** Prompts undergo blocklist filtering and embedding-based semantic analysis to detect adversarial patterns before inference.
- **Output Verification:** Generated content is scrutinized by *Fanar-Guard* for general safety and the specialized *Fanar-Sadiq Validator* to ensure the accuracy of Quranic citations and religious context. Non-compliant outputs are intercepted and replaced with calibrated safe responses.

### 13.3. The Agentic Loop

The orchestrator extends beyond single-turn generation into multi-step reasoning via an *Agentic Loop*. Utilizing the Model Context Protocol (MCP), the system decouples the reasoning engine from tool implementation.

In this loop, the *Fanar-C-1 Tool Calling* model iteratively assesses the conversation context and decides whether to generate a final response or execute an external tool (e.g., Web Search, RAG retrieval, Image Synthesis). This iterative cycle allows the platform to compose complex answers that require data from multiple disparate sources, maintaining a unified conversational thread for the user.

In summary, the Fanar orchestrator demonstrates that for culturally sensitive regions, orchestration must be an active participant in intent disambiguation and output verification. By isolating domain expertise and enforcing dual-layer safety, the architecture scales efficiently while maintaining strict adherence to regional values.

## 14. Summary and Lessons Learned

Fanar 2.0 demonstrates that a small, resource-constrained team can build a competitive, sovereign Arabic AI stack by prioritising data quality over quantity, leveraging open-weight model foundations, and investing in culturally grounded specialised components. Directions for Fanar 3.0 are outlined.



**AI sovereignty through an Arabic AI stack.** Fanar 2.0 is Qatar’s national generative AI platform comprising a fully integrated Arabic AI stack designed and operated by a domestic team. The motivation is strategic: dependence on foreign AI infrastructure exposes nations to access risk, misalignment with cultural and linguistic values, and a widening technology gap. Fanar demonstrates that *sovereign AI is achievable even under significant resource constraints*, provided that design decisions are made deliberately and that effort is concentrated where it creates the most leverage. The platform covers the full generative AI spectrum: language understanding and generation, speech recognition and synthesis, image generation and understanding, Islamic knowledge retrieval, Arabic poetry, machine translation, agentic reasoning, and a production orchestration layer that ties these capabilities together for end-users.

**Quality over quantity in language model development.** The Fanar 2.0 language model (**Fanar-27B**, 27B parameters) is built by continual pre-training on Gemma-3-27B using only ~120 billion carefully curated tokens, a fraction of the multi-trillion-token budgets used in frontier models. Rather than scaling data volume, we invested in three distinct pre-training recipes targeting different quality–diversity trade-offs, and then merged the resulting checkpoints through a weighted model-merging strategy. *The central lesson is that data quality, recipe diversity, and principled merging can substitute for raw data scale, making competitive Arabic language modelling accessible to resource-constrained teams.* Post-training follows the same discipline: selective filtering of instruction data, targeted augmentation for Arabic-specific reasoning and cultural knowledge, and iterative safety alignment with **FanarGuard**.

**Open-weight models across the entire stack.** A deliberate choice throughout Fanar 2.0 is to build each component on top of open-weight model foundations rather than training entirely from scratch. The language model adapts Gemma-3-27B; the image generation system fine-tunes FLUX.1-schnell; the image understanding model extends Oryx; and the speech systems are derived from Whisper and related open ASR backbones. This strategy dramatically reduces compute requirements, transfers strong general capabilities to the Arabic domain, and keeps the team’s effort focused on the cultural and linguistic adaptation that cannot be inherited from existing models. *Open-weight foundations are not a shortcut — they are an enabler of sovereignty for teams that cannot match frontier compute budgets.*

**Specialised components and cultural grounding.** Beyond the core language model, Fanar 2.0 invests in a suite of culturally grounded specialised systems. **Aura** is a long-form speech-to-text system capable of transcribing extended Arabic audio with dialect-aware robustness, complemented by a personalised text-to-speech module. **Oryx** covers both image generation, driven by a taxonomy-based data collection pipeline that systematically identifies and fills gaps in culturally relevant visual concepts, and image and video understanding, evaluated through BloomBench, a cognitive-complexity-grounded benchmark. **Fanar-Sadiq** is a multi-agent Islamic content system that grounds responses in authoritative Arabic sources, reducing hallucination on religiously sensitive queries. **Fanar-Diwan** generates Classical Arabic poetry with attention to metre and diacritisation. **FanarShaheen** provides high-quality English↔Arabic machine translation as a first-class platform component, motivated by both pretraining data needs and end-user demand. Underpinning continuous improvement across all components is Fanar-MLOps, a semi-automated feedback-driven framework that closes the loop from user interaction and model evaluation back to targeted data acquisition and retraining.

**Looking ahead: Fanar 3.0.** Fanar 2.0 establishes a strong foundation, but several directions remain open. First, the current architecture inherits the dense transformer design of its base model. *Fanar 3.0 will explore a Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) architecture trained from scratch*, enabling greater parameter capacity at manageable inference cost and removing architectural constraints inherited from external checkpoints. Second, while the quality-over-quantity strategy proved effective, the ceiling of continual pre-training on a small token budget is becoming visible. A systematic, sustained investment in collecting and curating a much larger, high-quality Arabic corpus spanning diverse domains, registers, and dialects is essential for the next generation. Third, safety and alignment in Fanar 2.0 are primarily evaluated on single-turn interactions. *Multi-turn safety* — ensuring that models remain aligned across extended dialogues, resist gradual jailbreaking, and maintain cultural and religious appropriateness through adversarial conversation — will be a deep focus of Fanar 3.0, alongside richer alignment datasets that reflect the breadth of Arabic-speaking communities. Taken together, these directions chart a course from a resource-efficient sovereign stack towards a genuinely frontier Arabic AI platform.

## A. Author Contributions

Fanar 2.0 is a collaborative effort of the Qatar Computing Research Institute (QCRI), Hamad Bin Khalifa University. The project spans the following contribution areas; all team members contributed to discussions, paper writing, and the overall platform design.

- **Project Leadership and Coordination:** Mohamed Eltabakh (lead), Sanjay Chawla, Ahmed Elmagarmid, Mohamed Hefeeda, Mourad Ouzzani
- **Large Language Model — Pre-training:** Fahim Dalvi (lead), Tasnim Mohiuddin, Sabri Boughorbel, Abdulaziz Al Homaid, Mohammed Qusay Hashim
- **Large Language Model — Post-training and Alignment:** Husrev Taha Sencar (lead), Enes Altinisik, Masoomali Fatehkia, Ji Lucas
- **Data Collection and Curation:** Hamdy Mubarak (lead), Mohammad Shahmeer Ahmad, Sabri Boughorbel, Abubakr Mohamed, Tasnim Mohiuddin, Ahmad Musleh, Zan Naeem, Omar Sinan, Yifan Zhang
- **Hallucination Mitigation:** Husrev Taha Sencar (lead), Enes Altinisik, Masoomali Fatehkia, Nadir Durrani, Majd Hawasly
- **Safety and FanarGuard:** Husrev Taha Sencar (lead), Enes Altinisik, Masoomali Fatehkia
- **Speech Models (Aura):** Shammur A Chowdhury and Kareem Darwish (leads), Houssam E. Lachemat, Mohammed Shinoy, Ahmad Musleh, Yifan Zhang
- **Image Understanding (Oryx-Understanding):** Ehsaneddin Asgari (lead), Omid Ghahroodi, Dorratosadat Dastgheib, Mohammed Shinoy, Anas Madkoor, Mohammad Mahdi Abootorabi, Marzia Nouri, Hamza Aldaghstany, Minhaj Ahmad.
- **Image Generation (Oryx-Gen):** Mohammad Amin Sadeghi (lead), Keivin Isufaj, Anas Al-Nuaimi, Rouhollah Abolhassani, Parham Zilouchian, Rachida Zegour.
- **Agentic Framework:** Kareem Darwish (lead), Asim Ersoy, Enes Altinisik, Husrev Taha Sencar
- **Islamic AI (Fanar-Sadiq):** Ummar Abbas (lead), Omar Sinan, Mohammed Qusay Hashim, Mus'ab Husaini, Mohammed Shinoy, Mourad Ouzzani
- **Arabic Poetry (Fanar-Diwan):** Hamdy Mubarak (lead), Abubakr Mohamed
- **Translation (FanarShaheen):** Nadir Durrani and Fahim Dalvi (leads), Basel Mousi
- **Orchestrator:** Soon-Gyo Jung and Mohamed G Elfeky (leads)
- **MLOps:** Anas Al-Nuaimi (lead), Keivin Isufaj, Yifan Zhang
- **Benchmarking:** Majd Hawasly (lead), Hamdy Mubarak, Abubakr Mohamed, Ehsaneddin Asgari, Raghad Mousa, Anas Madkoor
- **Infrastructure and Systems:** Anastasios Fragkopoulos and Mohamed Elfeky (leads), Mus'ab Husaini
- **External User Study and System Testing:** Hamdy Mubarak (lead), Majd Hawasly

## A.1. Acknowledgments

A project of this scope would not have been possible without contributions from a diverse array of individuals and partner organizations. We would like to express our heartfelt gratitude to all who have helped support Fanar’s development. We would like to thank Qatar’s Ministry of Communications and Information Technology (MCIT) for their sponsorship of the project.

Special thanks goes to *Rayyan Abu-Dayya* for her effort in project management, *Vrunda N. Sukhadia* for her valuable contribution towards training Aura Speech Models and benchmarking, *Rouhollah Abolhassani*, *Parham Zilouchian* and *Rachida Zegour* for their valuable contributions towards building the MLOps pipeline for the Image Generation component, *Omid Ghahroodi* and *Dorratosadat Dastgheib* for their significant contributions to both the Image Understanding training pipeline and benchmarking, and *Anas Madkoor*, *Mohammad Mahdi Abootorabi*, *Marzia Nouri*, *Hamza Aldaghstany*, and *Ahmed Ezzat* for their contribution primarily to Fanar Oryx benchmarking, *Rouhollah Abolhassani*, *Parham Zilouchian* for their contribution to image generation, *Fatih Deniz*, *Mohammad Raza* and the aiXamine team for their contributions to the safety evaluation and hallucination mitigation components, *Hadeel Atrees* and *Shazia Afzal* for their contributions to Fanar’s UI/UX design, *Raghad Mousa* for her contributions in Almieyar linguistics benchmarking, *Anastasios Fragkopoulos* and *Anurag Shrivastava*, for their effort setting up and maintaining the training compute infrastructure. AI tools were used to standardize the layout of the figures and tables across this report and to harmonize the text across different sections.

Finally, we would like to express our gratitude to numerous volunteer testers across different Arab countries whose valuable feedback has enabled us to improve Fanar.

## B. Detailed Benchmark Descriptions

Detailed descriptions of the benchmarks introduced or used in Fanar 2.0 are provided, including Al-Mieyar, PalmX (Arabic and Islamic culture) and *Nahw*-MCQ (Arabic grammar).

### B.1. Nahw

We construct a dataset for Arabic grammar understanding [70] focusing exclusively on Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) given its standardized grammar and consistent instructional use across Arabic-speaking countries [2]. Grammar questions were collected from <https://www.alnahw.com>, a widely used educational platform, under formal licensing for research use. We focus on multiple-choice questions (MCQs) as a structured and pedagogically appropriate format. The raw data, originally distributed across over 200 inconsistently formatted text files, were automatically normalized into a unified MCQ schema with four options, a single correct answer, and an explanation. After deduplication and cleaning, the final dataset comprises 5K MCQs (*Nahw*-MCQ), which were subsequently reviewed and validated by a trained linguist.

In addition to the MCQ dataset, we construct a test set for grammatical error detection, correction, and explanation. The dataset comprises 100 short Arabic passages collected from an instructional book on <https://www.alnahw.com>, each containing approximately five grammatical or morphological errors with corresponding corrections and concise linguistic explanations. The raw data were automatically extracted and structured using a Python script, then manually reviewed and validated by a senior linguist. The resulting *Nahw*-Passage<sup>22</sup> test set contains 4,771 words and 511 annotated errors (5.11 errors per passage on average).

<sup>22</sup><https://github.com/qcri/nahw-arabic-grammar-benchmark>

## B.2. Al-Mieyar Language

**Almieyar-Language:** *Almieyar-Language* is an Arabic benchmark for evaluating linguistic understanding. It is derived from a linguistic taxonomy covering the five core layers of language: phonology/orthography, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. The taxonomy is grounded in general linguistic theory while accounting for Arabic-specific phenomena [47]. Figure 18 summarizes this taxonomy.




Figure 18: Hierarchical representation of Almieyar-Language categories and sub-categories in Arabic: Phonology/Orthography, Morphology, Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics.

The benchmark covers a broad range of Arabic varieties, including around 20 dialects, and captures both standard and dialect-sensitive phenomena. It consists of around 1,000 questions that were manually reviewed by multiple annotators to ensure linguistic quality and consistency. Overall, Almieyar-Language provides a concise and structured benchmark for assessing Arabic linguistic capabilities.

### B.3. PalmX

We used the dataset of the PalmX shared task [10] which has two subtasks. For Subtask 1 (General Arabic Culture), data were compiled using two complementary strategies: (1) converting existing culturally-inclusive training data from the Palm corpus [9] into multiple-choice questions (MCQs), yielding 4,000 samples, and (2) crawling diverse online resources about Arab cultural knowledge and using GPT-4o-mini to generate 1,000 culturally relevant MCQs. All items were independently reviewed by two professional linguists to ensure correctness, remove low-quality or trivial questions, format the content appropriately, and shuffle answer options to reduce positional bias; the final dataset comprises training, development, and test splits balanced across topics and countries.

For Subtask 2 (General Islamic Culture), data were created using (1) publicly available Islamic competition questions and university sources (900 samples) and (2) crawling Islamic content from Mawdoo3 (<https://mawdoo3.com/>) and generating diverse MCQs with GPT-4o-mini (1,000 samples). These were likewise reviewed by two professional linguists for semantic accuracy, quality control, formatting, and bias reduction, resulting in curated training, development and test splits covering key aspects of Islamic cultural knowledge.

## C. Fanar MLOps: Automating Model Development and Updates

Fanar-MLOps is a semi-automated, feedback-driven framework for managing the full lifecycle of model development across the Fanar platform. It covers data management with interactive analytics, automated deduplication and data lifecycle management, streamlined data acquisition guided by coverage analysis, and continuous model improvement driven by production user feedback.

Fanar is a complex platform comprising several machine learning models. Each of these models requires large-scale datasets for training. Collecting and curating representative and high-quality datasets are time- and resource-intensive tasks. For example, large datasets may have a level of duplication, which leads to wasting computing and storage resources and may even impact the model accuracy. In addition, it is challenging to analyze the coverage of such datasets to the various distributions and concepts that the models should be exposed to during training. Blindly collecting more data may not necessarily improve the performance of machine learning models. Instead, the data collection process should be guided to only gather new data that would likely improve the model performance by complementing the existing datasets.

Moreover, when talking about live systems with broad user reach like Fanar, it is beneficial to incorporate user prompts and feedback into a loop of continuous improvement. To establish such a loop, it is imperative to streamline and automate the individual components including data acquisition, training, and deployment.

We present an end-to-end framework (called Fanar-MLOps) for effectively managing the entire process of preparing, training, deploying, and updating large-scale machine learning models, including tools for collecting, analyzing, and visualizing datasets. Fanar-MLOps strives to streamline the continuous process of developing and updating machine learning models from feedback in practice. The goal is to translate this laborious process to a **streamlined**, highly-**automated** process with minimal efforts facilitating fast incorporation of feedback for continuous model improvement.

Fanar-MLOps works on facilitating the objective above through implementing solutions to achieve the following sub-objectives:

1. Effective Data Management,
2. Streamlined Data Acquisition,
3. Semi-Automated Feedback-Driven Model Improvement.

In the following, we provide some details on each component. While Fanar-MLOps is a general framework, we will focus our discussion on the Image Generation model as a concrete case study.

## C.1. Effective Data Management

Taking Image Generation as an example and as explained in Section 7.1, we obtain visual image properties as part of the *extrinsic* properties of the image. As opposed to Fanar 1.0, in Fanar 2.0 we use a no-SQL document store with the primary key being the image content hash to manage the collection of images. This allows us to derive analytics in an interactive way helping us in multiple important aspects:

**Validating the large-scale automated labeling:** As explained in Section 7.3, we annotate each acquired image in terms of a set of relevant properties such as city, country, number of humans, buildings visible in the image, etc. This annotation is large-scale and error-prone. We use the metadata store to do verification of sanity. For instance, we view the city/country cross-correlation and identify potential mislabeling. The power of using a metadata store as opposed to classical scripting is the interactive nature of exploration of data deficiencies allowing us to create filters on the fly and zoom in on critical cases.

**Debugging data-related model performance issues:** The metadata store coupled with insightful graphs allows us to interactively poke the dataset for deficiencies and uncovering misrepresented entities relatively easily and very quickly. As an example, it is very easy to use country filters coupled with views of the top X entities (such as top X monuments) to determine whether some important landmarks are being missed. In Figure 19, we show a relevant example when it comes to Islamic landmarks. This provides for a powerful tool to patch up the model’s capability by acquiring a dataset increment with images of a particular scene that was determined to be missing or underrepresented. This is particularly applicable in our case since diffusion-based models are known to be very good at creating compositions [59]. In essence, they do not need to observe complex combinations of objects (“A man wearing a black trouser and a white shirt posing in front of the Eyup Mosque in Istanbul in the evening”). Instead, exposing the model to many elementary objects (the mosque alone, a scene of an evening sky, a man wearing trouser and shirt) is sufficient to give the model such a capability.

Moreover, the in-database script allows running LLM operations on different fields of the documents to derive new complex properties ad-hoc. As an example, if you notice a deficiency in generating images showing kids flying kites, it is possible to add the property “kids flying kites” on the fly. This allowed us to have continuously enriched dataset without running preprocessing again.

**Effective de-duplication:** The metadata store inhibits insertion of a document with the same primary key. Making the metadata store an intrinsic part of data download ensures that no image is added to the dataset twice. From practical perspective, the metadata store presents an effective means for disallowing duplicates in a large-scale distributed data acquisition as no joint information about already downloaded images has to be maintained by different downloading nodes. All that needs to be ensured is joint access to the same database. With this approach, we were also able to determine that a whopping 25% of the training images obtained in older data collection campaigns were duplicates as well as hinder creation of any new duplicates in subsequent data collections.

**Maintaining data-sample life-cycle information for better annotation of crawled images:** As explained in Section 7.3, we capture information related to the source of acquired images including the URL, the image name therein, the query that resulted in that image. This represents very rich information when




Figure 19: An example how we use interactive data analytics to determine underrepresented scenarios: filtering on the city of Istanbul, we identify the top X buildings seen in the collected images allowing us to determine missing iconic buildings. In this example, the famous Eyup Sultan Mosque is not captured.

it comes to annotating the image using a VLM. The metadata store allows us to keep track of adjunct metadata as we revisit the image in different collection campaigns or even during the same data collection campaign as our data pipeline facilitates large scale parallel data acquisitions as shown in Figure 20. This ensures enriching the annotation process with more context for even better annotation.

## C.2. Data Pipeline

Once we evaluate the culture-relevant quality criteria, we can determine aspects of deficiency related to lack of data as explained in Section C.1. This in turn allows us to re-trigger data acquisition using relevant search queries. In order to streamline and scale the data acquisition, we built an Airflow Data Pipeline that have the following characteristics:

- per-Task<sup>23</sup> state to allow for failure recovery and reuse of artifacts produced by a failed run of the DAG<sup>24</sup>. This is crucial in large-scale data acquisition as there is a myriad of reasons that can lead to failure such as sudden network outage, unreachable hosts, etc. Restarting collection and pre-processing from scratch leads to huge waste of resources and blockage of compute computer otherwise usable for other purposes. This is achieved by creating an artifact storage model that facilitates recovery from failure and parallel data acquisition as explained in Figure 20. Also shown in the figure is how the Data Pipeline effectively leverages our on-prem compute cluster incl. GPU cluster;
- Scalability: the pipeline can be triggered on batches of queries to run in parallel on multiple nodes allowing the bulk acquisition of large amounts of data samples. This is achieved through enabling the distribution of different Tasks on different SLURM nodes on our on-prem cloud. This does not only allow to do simultaneous triggering of the DAG for different batches of data but also ensures that Tasks occupy compute resources they really need. For example, only pre-processing tasks that need a GPU are dispatched to the relevant node and only occupy it while the task is running and otherwise free up the resource immediately and automatically. In effect, we achieve efficient, scalable and demand-driven resource usage.

<sup>23</sup>Task is an Airflow terminology identifying a piece of code that runs as an independent block, which belongs to the directed acyclic graph of tasks.

<sup>24</sup>DAG or Directed Acyclic Graph is the terminology Airflow uses to refer to a pipeline composed of a set of tasks chained together in directed acyclic fashion.




Figure 20: The raw image to training image relationship is a 1-to-N relationship since we derive different versions of training images per raw image using different preprocessing functions. The implemented Data Pipeline DAG supports this by using three different stores: The *raw dataset* stores an image using its hash as filename to ensure subsequent re-downloads of the image does not result in duplicates by detecting the name clash early on; The *temp dataset* maintains the non-persistent/intermediate artifacts using the Airflow Dag ID, the Airflow Task ID and the Airflow Run ID as sub directories. This structure allows effective reuse of already produced artifacts in the case of recovery from failures which is hardly avoidable in the case of long-running large-scale data acquisitions (think of network issues, unreachable servers, etc.); The *training dataset* store maintains derived training images in different folders named using the *chain hash*, a unique key derived from the set of airflow tasks and run parameters, to ensure that different chains of processing tasks result in different training images. We implemented an Airflow Slurm Operator that allows Airflow to schedule a task in our on-prem compute cluster on a node that has sufficient compute capacity left and that has the right hardware. Moreover, each node can communicate with the central Metadata DB to catch duplicates at processing time. This way we ensured we can run multiple DAGs at once for large-scale data acquisition.

### C.3. Semi-Automated Feedback-driven Model Improvement

As explained in Section 7.1, we use a taxonomy tree as a hierarchical representation of our knowledge of cultural concepts to drive the generation of targeted queries for data crawling. In Fanar 2.0 we are working on automating the update of the taxonomy tree through user prompts and feedback for generated images as a basis for an automated or semi-automated model improvement cycle that leverages the built pipelines and solutions described in this section. This is schematically depicted in Figure 21.





Figure 21: Our loop starts with a taxonomy tree that defines a knowledge representation of cultural concepts. This feeds into our Data Pipeline DAG that generates a set of queries per leaf node of the taxonomy tree and requires no human intervention to collect and index the data as explained in Figure 20. The training is furthermore automated using its own DAG to ensure a new dataset increment triggers a new fine tuning. The CICD (here we want to leverage Github Actions) retrieves the KPIs from the experiment tracker, for which we leverage W&B to ensure only deploying a model that outperforms the one in production. Once the model is deployed, the user feedback and prompts feed into a new cycle of taxonomy tree refinement which in turn re-triggers the loop. Major parts of this loop have already been implemented and a few automations are being worked on.

## References

- [1] Abbas, U., Ouzzani, M., Eltabakh, M.Y. et al (2026). Fanar-sadiq: A multi-agent architecture for grounded islamic qa. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.08501*.
- [2] Abdelali, A., Mubarak, H., Chowdhury, S.A. et al (2024). LAraBench: Benchmarking Arabic AI with Large Language Models. In Graham, Y. and Purver, M., editors, *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 487–520, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [3] Al-Khalifa, S., Durrani, N., Al-Khalifa, H. et al (2025). The landscape of arabic large language models (allms): A new era for arabic language technology. *Communications of the ACM*. Online First.
- [4] Alam, F., Shahroor, A.E., Hasan, M.A. et al (2025). Everydaymmqa: A multilingual and multimodal framework for culturally grounded spoken visual qa.
- [5] Ali, A., Bell, P., Glass, J. et al (2016). The MGB-2 challenge: Arabic multi-dialect broadcast media recognition. In *2016 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop (SLT)*, pages 279–284. IEEE.
- [6] Ali, A., Chowdhury, S., Hussein, A. et al (2021). Arabic Code-Switching Speech Recognition using Monolingual Data. In *Proc. of the 22nd Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association (INTERSPEECH)*, pages 3475–3479, Brno, Czechia.
- [7] Altakrori, M.H., Habash, N., Freihat, A. et al (2025). DialectalArabicMMLU: Benchmarking dialectal capabilities in Arabic and multilingual language models.
- [8] Altinisik, E., Fatehkia, M., Deniz, F. et al (2026). Do i really know? learning factual self-verification for hallucination reduction.
- [9] Alwajih, F., El Mekki, A., Magdy, S.M. et al (2025a). Palm: A culturally inclusive and linguistically diverse dataset for Arabic LLMs. In Che, W., Nabende, J., Shutova, E. et al, editors, *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 32871–32894, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [10] Alwajih, F., El Mekki, A., Mubarak, H. et al (2025b). PalmX 2025: The first shared task on benchmarking LLMs on Arabic and Islamic culture. In *Proceedings of The Third Arabic Natural Language Processing Conference: Shared Tasks*, pages 774–789.
- [11] AMC (2023). American mathematics competitions 2023.
- [12] Antoun, W., Baly, F. and Hajj, H. (2021). AraGPT2: Pre-trained transformer for Arabic language generation. In Habash, N., Bouamor, H., Hajj, H. et al, editors, *Proceedings of the Sixth Arabic Natural Language Processing Workshop*, pages 196–207, Kyiv, Ukraine (Virtual). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [13] Anwar, M., Freihat, A., Ibrahim, G. et al (2025). Jais 2: A family of Arabic-centric open large language models. Technical report, IFM.
- [14] Applied Innovation Center (2026). Karnak Model Card. <https://huggingface.co/Applied-Innovation-Center/Karnak>. Accessed on Mar 9, 2026.
- [15] Bai, S., Chen, K., Liu, X. et al (2025). Qwen2. 5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*.
- [16] Bandarkar, L., Liang, D., Muller, B. et al (2024). The belebele benchmark: a parallel reading comprehension dataset in 122 language variants. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 749–775, Bangkok, Thailand and virtual meeting. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [17] Bari, M.S., Alnumay, Y., Alzahrani, N.A. et al (2024). ALLaM: Large Language Models for Arabic and English. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.15390*.
- [18] Bhargava, A., Witkowski, C., Looi, S.Z. et al (2023). What’s the magic word? a control theory of llm prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04444*.
- [19] Biderman, S., Schoelkopf, H., Anthony, Q. et al (2023). Pythia: a suite for analyzing large language models

- across training and scaling. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML'23*. JMLR.org.
- [20] Bisk, Y., Zellers, R., Gao, J. et al (2020). PIQA: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7432–7439.
- [21] Boughorbel, S. and Hawasly, M. (2023). Analyzing multilingual competency of LLMs in multi-turn instruction following: A case study of Arabic. In Sawaf, H., El-Beltagy, S., Zaghouani, W. et al, editors, *Proceedings of ArabicNLP 2023*, pages 128–139, Singapore (Hybrid). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [22] Bredin, H. (2023). pyannote.audio 2.1 speaker diarization pipeline: principle, benchmark, and recipe. In *Proc. INTERSPEECH 2023*.
- [23] Chen, G., Chai, S., Wang, G. et al (2021). Gigaspeech: An evolving, multi-domain ASR corpus with 10,000 hours of transcribed audio. In *Proc. Interspeech 2021*.
- [24] Chen, J., Zhang, T., Liu, C. et al (2025a). Taskgalaxy: Scaling multi-modal instruction fine-tuning with tens of thousands vision task types. In Yue, Y., Garg, A., Peng, N. et al, editors, *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 92969–93019.
- [25] Chen, Y., Niu, Z., Ma, Z. et al (2025b). F5-TTS: A fairytaler that fakes fluent and faithful speech with flow matching. In Che, W., Nabende, J., Shutova, E. et al, editors, *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6255–6271, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [26] Clark, P., Cowhey, I., Etzioni, O. et al (2018). Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*.
- [27] Cobbe, K., Kosaraju, V., Bavarian, M. et al (2021). Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- [28] Conneau, A., Khandelwal, K., Goyal, N. et al (2020). Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. In Jurafsky, D., Chai, J., Schluter, N. et al, editors, *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8440–8451, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [29] Deitke, M., Clark, C., Lee, S. et al (2025). Molmo and pixmo: Open weights and open data for state-of-the-art vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 91–104.
- [30] Deniz, F., Popovic, D., Boshmaf, Y. et al (2025). aixamine: Simplified llm safety and security. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14985*.
- [31] Ding, N., Chen, Y., Xu, B. et al (2023). Enhancing chat language models by scaling high-quality instructional conversations. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3029–3051.
- [32] Doan, K., Waheed, A. and Abdul-Mageed, M. (2024). Towards zero-shot text-to-speech for Arabic dialects. In *Proceedings of the Second Arabic Natural Language Processing Conference*, pages 123–129.
- [33] El Filali, A., ALOUI, M., Husaain, T. et al (2025). Open arabic llm leaderboard 2. <https://huggingface.co/spaces/OALL/Open-Arabic-LLM-Leaderboard>.
- [34] Elfilali, A., Alobeidli, H., Fourrier, C. et al (2024). Open arabic llm leaderboard. <https://huggingface.co/spaces/OALL/Open-Arabic-LLM-Leaderboard>.
- [35] Ersoy, A., Altinisik, E., Darwish, K.M. et al (2025). Tool calling for Arabic llms: Data strategies and instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of The Third Arabic Natural Language Processing Conference*, pages 347–358.
- [36] Fanar Team, Abbas, U., Ahmad, M.S. et al (2025). Fanar: An Arabic-Centric Multimodal Generative AI Platform. *arXiv:2501.13944*.
- [37] Fatehikia, M., Altinisik, E. and Sencar, H.T. (2025). FanarGuard: A culturally-aware moderation filter for arabic language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.18852*.

- [38] Fox, J.D., Raj, D., Delworth, N. et al (2024). Updated corpora and benchmarks for long-form speech recognition. In *ICASSP 2024 - 2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 13246–13250.
- [39] Gemini Team, Anil, R., Borgeaud, S. et al (2023). Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*.
- [40] Gemma Team (2024). Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295*.
- [41] Gemma Team (2025). Gemma 3.
- [42] Ghaboura, S., Heakl, A., Thawakar, O. et al (2025). Camel-bench: A comprehensive Arabic lmm benchmark. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2025*, pages 1970–1980.
- [43] Goddard, C., Siriwardhana, S., Ehghaghi, M. et al (2024). Arcee’s MergeKit: A toolkit for merging large language models. In Dernoncourt, F., Preotiuc-Pietro, D. and Shimorina, A., editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Industry Track*, pages 477–485, Miami, Florida, US. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [44] Gunasekar, S., Zhang, Y., Aneja, J. et al (2023). Textbooks are all you need.
- [45] Gupta, K., Thérien, B., Ibrahim, A. et al (2023). Continual pre-training of large language models: How to (re)warm your model?
- [46] Gururangan, S., Marasović, A., Swayamdipta, S. et al (2020). Don’t stop pretraining: Adapt language models to domains and tasks. In Jurafsky, D., Chai, J., Schluter, N. et al, editors, *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8342–8360, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [47] Habash, N.Y. (2010). *Introduction to Arabic natural language processing*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [48] Harper, J. and NVIDIA NeMo Team (2019–2026). NeMo: a toolkit for building AI applications using Neural Modules. <https://github.com/NVIDIA/NeMo>.
- [49] Hawasly, M., Mohiuddin, T., Mubarak, H. et al (2025). ArabicWeb-edu: Educational quality data for Arabic LLM training. In Darwish, K., Ali, A., Abu Farha, I. et al, editors, *Proceedings of The Third Arabic Natural Language Processing Conference*, pages 436–447, Suzhou, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [50] Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Basart, S. et al (2020). Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [51] Hoffmann, J., Borgeaud, S., Mensch, A. et al (2022). Training compute-optimal large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35 (NeurIPS 2022)*, NIPS ’22, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- [52] Huang, H., Yu, F., Zhu, J. et al (2024). AceGPT, localizing large language models in Arabic. In Duh, K., Gomez, H. and Bethard, S., editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8139–8163, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [53] Ilharco, G., Ribeiro, M.T., Wortsman, M. et al (2023). Editing models with task arithmetic. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [54] Ito, K. and Johnson, L. (2017). The lj speech dataset. <https://keithito.com/LJ-Speech-Dataset/>.
- [55] Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., Henighan, T. et al (2020). Scaling laws for neural language models.
- [56] Koto, F., Li, H., Shatnawi, S. et al (2024). ArabicMMLU: Assessing massive multitask language understanding in Arabic. In Ku, L.W., Martins, A. and Srikumar, V., editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 5622–5640, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [57] Li, X., Takamichi, S., Saeki, T. et al (2023a). Yodas: Youtube-oriented dataset for audio and speech. In *2023 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, pages 1–8. IEEE.
- [58] Li, Y., Bubeck, S., Eldan, R. et al (2023b). Textbooks are all you need ii: phi-1.5 technical report.
- [59] Liang, Q., Liu, Z., Ostrow, M. et al (2024). How diffusion models learn to factorize and compose. In Globerson, A., Mackey, L., Belgrave, D. et al, editors, *Advances in neural information processing systems*, volume 37, pages 15121–15148. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [60] Lightman, H., Kosaraju, V., Burda, Y. et al (2024). Let’s verify step by step. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [61] Liu, Z., Hoang, T.Q., Zhang, J. et al (2024). APIGen: Automated Pipeline for generating verifiable and diverse function-calling datasets. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- [62] Lozhkov, A., Ben Allal, L., von Werra, L. et al (2024). Fineweb-edu. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/HuggingFaceFW/fineweb-edu>.
- [63] Luo, Y., Yang, Z., Meng, F. et al (2025). An empirical study of catastrophic forgetting in large language models during continual fine-tuning.
- [64] Masterman, T., Besen, S., Sawtell, M. et al (2024). The landscape of emerging ai agent architectures for reasoning, planning, and tool calling: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.11584*.
- [65] Meta AI (2024). The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- [66] Mohamed, A. and Mubarak, H. (2025). Advancing Arabic diacritization: Improved datasets, benchmarking, and state-of-the-art models. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 16718–16730.
- [67] Mousi, B., Dalvi, F., Chowdhury, S. et al (2026). Once correct, still wrong: Counterfactual hallucination in multilingual vision-language models.
- [68] Mousi, B., Durrani, N., Ahmad, F. et al (2025). AraDiCE: Benchmarks for dialectal and cultural capabilities in LLMs. In Rambow, O., Wanner, L., Apidianaki, M. et al, editors, *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 4186–4218, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [69] Mubarak, H. and Darwish, K. (2014). Automatic correction of Arabic text: A cascaded approach. In Habash, N. and Vogel, S., editors, *Proceedings of the EMNLP 2014 workshop on Arabic natural language processing (ANLP)*, pages 132–136, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [70] Mubarak, H., Hawasly, M. and Mohamed, A. (2026). Nahw: A comprehensive benchmark of Arabic grammar understanding, error detection, correction, and explanation. In *19th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- [71] Mubarak, H., Hussein, A., Chowdhury, S.A. et al (2021). QASR: QCRI Aljazeera Speech Resource. A Large Scale Annotated Arabic Speech Corpus. In Zong, C., Xia, F., Li, W. et al, editors, *Proc. of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 2274–2285, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [72] Musleh, A., Zhang, Y. and Darwish, K. (2026). More data, fewer diacritics: Scaling Arabic TTS.
- [73] NLLB Team, Costa-jussà, M.R., Cross, J. et al (2022). No language left behind: Scaling human-centered machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04672*.
- [74] OpenAI (2024). Multilingual massive multitask language understanding. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/openai/MMMLU>.
- [75] Ostris (2025). ai-toolkit: The ultimate training toolkit for finetuning diffusion models. <https://github.com/ostris/ai-toolkit>. Accessed: 2026-02-26.
- [76] Panayotov, V., Chen, G., Povey, D. et al (2015). Librispeech: an ASR corpus based on public domain audio

- books. In *2015 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5206–5210. IEEE.
- [77] Park, S.J., Salazar, J., Jansen, A. et al (2024). Long-form speech generation with spoken language models. *CoRR*, abs/2412.18603.
- [78] Peng, Y., Sudo, Y., Shakeel, M. et al (2024). OWSM-CTC: An open encoder-only speech foundation model for speech recognition, translation, and language identification. In Ku, L.W., Martins, A. and Srikumar, V., editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 10192–10209, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [79] Perez, E., Huang, S., Song, F. et al (2022). Red teaming language models with language models. In Goldberg, Y., Kozareva, Z. and Zhang, Y., editors, *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3419–3448, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [80] Plaquet, A. and Bredin, H. (2023). Powerset multi-class cross entropy loss for neural speaker diarization. In *Proc. INTERSPEECH 2023*.
- [81] Qwen Team (2025). Qwen3 technical report.
- [82] Rana, A. (2010). Common crawl—building an open web-scale crawl using hadoop. <https://commoncrawl.org/blog/slideshare-building-a-scalable-web-crawler-with-hadoop>. Accessed on Dec 1, 2024.
- [83] Sajjad, H., Abdelali, A., Durrani, N. et al (2020). AraBench: Benchmarking dialectal Arabic-English machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 5094–5107, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- [84] Silero Team (2024). Silero vad: pre-trained enterprise-grade voice activity detector (vad), number detector and language classifier. <https://github.com/snakers4/silero-vad>.
- [85] Siuzdak, H. (2024). Vocos: Closing the gap between time-domain and fourier-based neural vocoders for high-quality audio synthesis. In Kim, B., Yue, Y., Chaudhuri, S. et al, editors, *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2024, pages 25719–25733.
- [86] Sukhadia, V.N. and Chowdhury, S.A. (2025). HARNESS: Lightweight distilled Arabic speech foundation models.
- [87] Sukhadia, V.N., Lachemat, H.E.O., Bhatti, H.H. et al (2026). Toward robust long-context arabic ASR: A real-world benchmark. Technical report, Qatar Computing Research Institute, Doha, Qatar.
- [88] Tiedemann, J. and Thottingal, S. (2020). OPUS-MT – building open translation services for the world. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation*, pages 479–480, Lisboa, Portugal. European Association for Machine Translation.
- [89] Veaux, C., Yamagishi, J. and MacDonald, K. (2017). CSTR VCTK Corpus: English multi-speaker corpus for CSTR voice cloning toolkit.
- [90] Wei, A., Haghtalab, N. and Steinhardt, J. (2023). Jailbroken: How does llm safety training fail? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:80079–80110.
- [91] Wei, J., Tay, Y., Bommasani, R. et al (2022). Emergent abilities of large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- [92] Wolf, Y., Wies, N., Avnery, O. et al (2024). Fundamental limitations of alignment in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’24*. JMLR.org.
- [93] Wortsman, M., Ilharco, G., Gadre, S.Y. et al (2022). Model soups: averaging weights of multiple fine-tuned models improves accuracy without increasing inference time. In Chaudhuri, K., Jegelka, S., Song, L. et al, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 23965–23998. PMLR.
- [94] Yadav, P., Tam, D., Choshen, L. et al (2023). TIES-merging: Resolving interference when merging models. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.

- [95] Zbib, M., Hammoud, H.A.A.K., Mukalled, S. et al (2025). AraLingBench: A human-annotated benchmark for evaluating arabic linguistic capabilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.14295*.
- [96] Zellers, R., Holtzman, A., Bisk, Y. et al (2019). HellaSwag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In Korhonen, A., Traum, D. and Màrquez, L., editors, *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4791–4800, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [97] Zhang, Y. and Math-AI Team (2024). American Invitational Mathematics Examination (AIME) 2024.
- [98] Zheng, L., Chiang, W.L., Sheng, Y. et al (2023). Judging LLM-as-a-judge with MT-bench and chatbot arena. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- [99] Zheng, Y., Zhang, R., Zhang, J. et al (2024). LlamaFactory: Unified efficient fine-tuning of 100+ language models. In *ACL*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [100] Zhou, J., Lu, T., Mishra, S. et al (2023). Instruction-following evaluation for large language models.
- [101] Zhu, J., Huang, H., Lin, Z. et al (2025). Second language (Arabic) acquisition of LLMs via progressive vocabulary expansion. In Che, W., Nabende, J., Shutova, E. et al, editors, *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2025–2042, Vienna, Austria. Association for Computational Linguistics.