NOVARA
CONSULTING GROUP

The Governance Gap at Scale: Institutional Trust, Commercial Transformation, and the Sorenson Question

Heather Grizzle · July 12, 2026

As Sorenson moves from VRS provider to AI translation developer, the governance gap grows. Who evaluates risk, accountability, and Deaf rights?

Contents

1. A Strategic Transformation, Clearly Signaled
2. Scale as a Governance Variable
3. Intent, Market Behavior, and the Substitution Problem
4. The Unresolved Institutional Questions
5. Trust as Responsibility

For decades, Sorenson occupied a distinctive position within the Deaf community's institutional landscape. Its reputation was not built on product innovation in the conventional sense. It was built on interpreters, relay infrastructure, and the operational architecture that enabled Deaf individuals to communicate across a hearing world. For many consumers, Sorenson did not register primarily as a technology company. It registered as a constitutive part of the accessibility ecosystem itself. That distinction is not incidental. Institutional trust of that kind accumulates slowly, over years of consistent service delivery, and it becomes one of the most consequential assets an organization can possess. It also creates obligations that ordinary commercial enterprises do not bear.

When an organization carrying that level of accumulated trust moves aggressively into artificial intelligence, the public conversation cannot remain confined to product announcements. It must ask governance questions.

A Strategic Transformation, Clearly Signaled

Sorenson's directional shift has not been ambiguous. In January 2025, the company acquired both OmniBridge and Hand Talk, explicitly framing both transactions as strategic investments in AI-driven sign language translation. OmniBridge was characterized as a platform enabling bi-directional, real-time communication between ASL (American Sign Language) users and English speakers. Hand Talk contributed avatar-based AI sign language generation capabilities. Neither acquisition was presented as exploratory research. Both were described as components of a deliberate effort to accelerate automated sign language translation and establish Sorenson's position in the next generation of accessibility technology.

The trajectory continued. In April 2026, Sorenson publicly unveiled two AI Sign Language Translation proof-of-concept systems. The first converts text and video content into American Sign Language through a human-like avatar. The second performs real-time recognition of ASL and renders it as English text. Sorenson's own characterization of these systems describes them as enabling fluid conversation between Deaf signers and hearing individuals without requiring a human interpreter. Identified deployment contexts include customer service counters, retail locations, transportation hubs, hospitality environments, and workplace communications.

The marketing register is familiar: inclusion, efficiency, expanded access, reduced communication barriers. Sorenson has also stated, consistently, that professional interpreters remain essential for complex and context-rich communication, positioning AI as supplementary rather than substitutive. That framing may be entirely sincere. The problem is that governance frameworks cannot be constructed on the premise of sincerity. They must be constructed on the premise that intentions and outcomes diverge, that markets behave according to incentives rather than assurances, and that the gap between a company's stated position and an institution's procurement decision can be substantial.

Scale as a Governance Variable

The governance challenge posed by Sorenson is not equivalent to the challenge posed by smaller AI signing ventures. Sorenson is not a startup navigating an emerging market. It is one of the largest organizations ever constructed around Deaf communication access, facilitating hundreds of millions of interpreted and captioned interactions

annually and employing thousands of interpreters across its operational infrastructure. Few organizations in any sector possess comparable institutional knowledge of how Deaf and hearing individuals communicate across the full range of real-world contexts. Fewer still possess comparable operational experience at that scale or comparable influence within accessibility procurement markets.

Scale, in this context, is not merely a commercial variable. It is a governance variable. The larger and more influential an organization within a particular institutional ecosystem, the more significant the implications of its strategic decisions, and the more inadequate individual assurances become as a substitute for independent oversight. A smaller vendor entering the sign language AI space raises legitimate governance questions. A vendor of Sorenson's institutional footprint entering the same space raises those questions at a qualitatively different level of urgency.

Scale, in this context, is not merely a commercial variable. It is a governance variable.

The critical question is no longer whether Sorenson possesses the technical and organizational capacity to develop AI translation systems. That question has been answered. The critical question is whether sufficient independent governance infrastructure exists to evaluate the implications of those systems before widespread deployment occurs across the environments Sorenson has identified as target markets.

Intent, Market Behavior, and the Substitution Problem

Sorenson's stated position that AI supplements rather than replaces human interpreters deserves neither reflexive acceptance nor reflexive dismissal. It deserves structural analysis.

A company can maintain, in good faith, a public commitment to the primacy of human interpretation while simultaneously producing tools that procuring institutions treat as substitutes. These are not contradictory outcomes. They reflect the distinction between a vendor's stated intent and a market's response to available products. Healthcare systems, educational institutions, government agencies, and private employers operate under persistent cost pressures. When an automated solution becomes available at a fraction of the cost of human interpreting services, institutional



incentives toward substitution do not require vendor encouragement. They emerge from procurement logic.

The governance gap is therefore not located in Sorenson's intent. It is located in the space between that intent and the behavior of the institutions that will deploy the technology. Once AI signing systems become sufficiently familiar within low-stakes environments, institutional pressure to expand deployment into higher-stakes contexts is a predictable rather than speculative outcome. Retail and hospitality deployments create organizational comfort with the technology. That comfort generates advocacy for expanded use. Procurement officers ask whether a system performing adequately at a transportation hub can be adapted for a clinical intake conversation or an employment dispute proceeding. The history of technology adoption across sectors offers little evidence that this expansion dynamic can be reliably managed through vendor assurances alone.

Governance frameworks designed for this environment must be calibrated to actual incentive structures and probable market trajectories, not to the most optimistic interpretation of current deployment intentions.

The Unresolved Institutional Questions

The governance vacuum at the center of the sign language AI ecosystem is not primarily a technical problem. It is an institutional problem, and it is reflected most clearly in the questions that remain without satisfactory answers.

- Who independently evaluates the accuracy and reliability of AI sign language translation systems across the full range of deployment environments being proposed?
- Who establishes minimum performance thresholds for deployment in healthcare, legal, educational, and government contexts?
- Who investigates failures when communication breakdowns occur in consequential settings?
- Who audits performance claims made in procurement contexts?
- Who represents the interests of Deaf consumers in the policy conversations that will shape deployment standards?

- Who ensures that organizations experiencing the commercial benefits of AI signing deployment are not also the primary voices defining what constitutes adequate performance?

These questions are not abstract. They are the operational prerequisites for responsible deployment at scale. Their absence from the current public discourse is not a minor oversight. It is the central governance problem facing the field.

Sorenson's participation in SLxAI-related industry events and its visible positioning within broader sign language AI ecosystem conversations adds a dimension of complexity that the field has not yet adequately addressed. As with the structural concern raised by other commercial actors in the governance space, the issue is not participation itself. The issue is whether the institutional forums shaping the normative and policy landscape for sign language AI are sufficiently independent of the commercial interests that stand to benefit from the conclusions those forums reach.

Trust as Responsibility

Sorenson's transformation from the world's largest Video Relay Service provider into an active AI sign language translation vendor is not, on its own terms, evidence of institutional failure. It is evidence of something more precisely described as institutional complexity: a landscape in which some of the most trusted organizations in Deaf communication history are simultaneously becoming vendors of the technologies whose governance remains unsettled.

That complexity does not foreclose positive outcomes. It does, however, make independent governance more urgent rather than less. The trust Sorenson has accumulated within the Deaf community over decades is a genuine institutional asset. It is also a genuine governance responsibility. Organizations that have benefited from that trust carry an obligation to support the development of oversight structures capable of evaluating their products independently, establishing accountability mechanisms that operate at the same scale as their commercial ambitions, and ensuring that the communities who depend on accessible communication retain meaningful influence over the conditions under which that communication is mediated.

The future of sign language AI will not be determined by the quality of any single product. It will be determined by the quality of the governance structures surrounding the ecosystem in which those products operate. Those structures should be built by

the communities expected to live with the consequences, not solely by the organizations positioned to profit from deployment.

TIPS

Know something about a sign language AI system that the public should know? Send it to tips@novaracg.com. Every tip is read by me and kept confidential. If you work in the UK, writing to us is not by itself a protected disclosure under the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, so before you share employer information, check your options with Protect (protect-advice.org.uk), the free whistleblowing advice line.

SUPPORT NCG

NCG does this work without vendor money, so our findings stay ours. If it has been useful to you, you can support NCG's independent work here. NCG is a for-profit company, not a charity. Contributions are not tax-deductible and buy no service or influence.

How to cite

Grizzle, H. M. (2026, July 12). The Governance Gap at Scale: Institutional Trust, Commercial Transformation, and the Sorenson Question. Novara Consulting Group. https://www.novaracg.com/2026/07/12/the-governance-gap-at-scale-institutional-trust-commercial-transformation-and-the-sorenson-question/