This document was translated from English by machine and may contain mistakes. The English original is at https://www.novaracg.com/2026/07/12/ncg-insight-from-disneys-asl-fragmentation-to-the-slxai-governance-gap/.

NCG Insight: dalla frammentazione ASL di Disney al divario di governance SLxAI

Heather Grizzle · July 12, 2026

Il lancio limitato dell'ASL da parte di Disney è un parallelo efficace per l'IA del linguaggio dei segni: solido nelle demo, frammentato nell'erogazione. Una lettura sistemica del divario SLxAI.

Contenuti

1. What Disney Revealed (Without Intending To)
2. Where This Maps Directly to SLxAI
3. The Shared Failure Mode
4. Why SLxAI Is Higher Risk Than Disney
5. What the Market Is Missing
6. Strategic Position
7. Where Demonstration Becomes Exposure

Disney’s limited ASL rollout is not an isolated execution choice. It is a clean analog for what is currently unfolding across the sign language AI ecosystem. The pattern is identical. The delivery mechanism is different.

From an NCG lens, this is not a story about animation, nor is it a critique of intent. It is a systems narrative about how organizations approach accessibility when it sits outside core architecture. Disney did not fail because it lacked capability. It demonstrated the opposite. The studio invested in Deaf performers, rebuilt animation pipelines, and respected the linguistic structure of ASL as a distinct language rather than a derivative of English. That level of execution requires discipline, budget, and cultural awareness. The issue is what happened after that investment was made.

Accessibility was deployed as a contained enhancement rather than a persistent condition of the product. Three songs were translated and reanimated with care, while the surrounding narrative remained untouched. The result is not inclusion. It is segmentation. A Deaf viewer is invited into moments, then removed from continuity. The system signals access while structurally withholding it. That contradiction is not visible at launch. It becomes visible only through use.

This is precisely the same architectural posture now emerging across the sign language AI market, as observed at the SLxAI Summit 2026. Vendors are not presenting incomplete technology. They are presenting highly refined outputs within tightly controlled boundaries. Avatars sign fluidly in demos. Translations appear coherent in short sequences. The visual layer is persuasive. It creates the impression that accessibility has been operationalized. What is actually being demonstrated is something narrower. These systems can generate accessible moments. They cannot yet guarantee accessible systems.

These systems can generate accessible moments. They cannot yet guarantee accessible systems.

The distinction is not semantic. It is operational. In both Disney's case and SLxAI deployments, accessibility exists as an overlay. It is applied to specific segments, scenarios, or prompts. It is not embedded as a continuous condition that governs the entire communication flow. Once accessibility is treated as an overlay, failure is not an exception. It is inevitable. The only variable is where it occurs. In Disney's model, the break happens between songs and narrative. In SLxAI systems, the break happens between prompts, context shifts, or linguistic edge cases. In both cases, the user experiences a loss of continuity that the system itself does not disclose.

This is where governance enters the frame. Most organizations evaluating these technologies are still operating at the level of output validation. They are asking whether the sign looks correct, whether the motion is natural, whether the translation aligns with expected meaning in a given instance. Those are necessary checks, but they are insufficient. The real question is whether the system can sustain accuracy, context, and linguistic integrity across an entire interaction without degradation. That is not a creative question. It is a systems reliability question.

The market's current fixation on visual fidelity is masking a deeper absence of standards. There is no widely adopted framework for measuring continuity in sign language AI. There is no consistent method for validating context retention across multi-turn interactions. There is no enforced disclosure model that informs users when an avatar's output is probabilistic rather than deterministic. Without those structures, organizations are deploying tools that appear stable in isolation but remain unproven in sequence. This is the same condition Disney inadvertently revealed. High investment does not compensate for fragmented architecture.

The risk profile diverges sharply at scale. Disney's limitation produces an incomplete entertainment experience. It is noticeable, but it is contained. In enterprise and public-facing environments, SLxAI systems mediate information that can carry legal, medical, or financial consequences. A break in continuity is no longer an inconvenience. It becomes a point of potential harm. When a system cannot guarantee that meaning is preserved from one moment to the next, it cannot be positioned as a reliable accessibility solution. It becomes a probabilistic interface presented as a deterministic one.

What makes this moment significant is that both Disney and SLxAI vendors are, in effect, solving the same problem from different directions. Disney is retrofitting accessibility onto a legacy content model. SLxAI vendors are building accessibility into new communication layers from the ground up. Yet both converge on the same structural outcome because they share the same underlying assumption. Accessibility is treated as something that can be applied, rather than something that must be sustained.

A mature model would invert that assumption. Accessibility would not be triggered at specific points. It would be persistent across the entire system, governed by standards that define accuracy, continuity, and failure disclosure. In that model, the question is no longer whether a single output is correct. The question becomes whether the system can be trusted to remain correct over time, across contexts, and under variable conditions. That is the threshold that separates demonstration from deployment.

The takeaway is not that Disney fell short or that SLxAI is premature. It is that both are operating within a transitional architecture where capability has outpaced governance. The market is now at the point where visual proof of concept is no longer sufficient. The next phase requires structural accountability. Without it, accessibility will continue to appear in moments while failing in motion.



What Disney Revealed (Without Intending To)

Disney approached ASL integration with a level of seriousness that most organizations never reach. The work reflects an understanding that sign language cannot be treated as a visual overlay of English, and that meaning in ASL is constructed through spatial grammar, timing, and full-body expression rather than isolated hand movements. That understanding translated into operational decisions. Deaf performers were involved in shaping how language was conveyed, not simply brought in to validate it after the fact. Animation workflows were restructured to support non-manual markers, pacing shifts, and the physicality required to carry meaning accurately. The system adapted to the language instead of compressing the language into existing constraints. At the level of execution, this is not symbolic accessibility. It is technically competent, culturally aware, and intentionally built.

That is precisely why the outcome carries weight beyond the immediate project. When an organization demonstrates that level of capability, the evaluation shifts away from effort and toward reliability. The question is no longer whether accessibility can be produced. It becomes whether accessibility is sustained. The user is not interacting with isolated outputs. The user is moving through an experience that either holds together or does not.

What emerges in Disney's implementation is a break in that continuity. Accessibility appears in defined segments and then recedes as the broader narrative resumes without adaptation. The system does not maintain a consistent state. It transitions between accessible and inaccessible conditions without preserving comprehension across those transitions. From the user's perspective, meaning is established and then interrupted, requiring repeated reorientation. This is not experienced as partial inclusion. It is experienced as instability within the communication layer itself.

The source of that instability is not a deficiency in production quality. The accessible segments meet a high standard. The issue sits at the architectural level, where accessibility has been treated as something that can be applied at specific points rather than maintained as a constant property of the system. A production-focused model evaluates whether individual components meet quality expectations, and by that measure the work succeeds. A systems-focused model evaluates whether those components persist across the full interaction without degradation, and by that measure the design does not hold.



This distinction determines whether the user can rely on the system. When accessibility is continuous, it becomes part of the infrastructure of the experience, requiring no additional effort from the user to maintain understanding. When accessibility is intermittent, the burden shifts back to the user, who must continuously adjust to changes in access and reconstruct meaning as those changes occur. The organization has invested in solving accessibility, but the way it is deployed prevents that solution from functioning as a stable condition.

The broader implication is that optimizing visible elements of accessibility does not guarantee a usable system. Without continuity, those elements remain isolated successes that do not aggregate into a reliable experience. The failure is not in the quality of what was built, but in how what was built is allowed to function over time.

Where This Maps Directly to SLxAI

At the SLxAI Summit 2026, vendors presented avatar-based signing systems as functional accessibility solutions, and at the level of demonstration the systems delivered what the market currently rewards. The outputs were visually persuasive, motion fidelity was high, and the signing sequences appeared coherent within the boundaries of the scenarios being shown. These demonstrations were not careless or incomplete. They were tightly controlled environments designed to highlight where the systems perform best, and within those constraints the results aligned with expectations for technical progress in this space.

The issue becomes visible when the frame expands beyond the demonstration environment. What is being validated in those moments is not the system's ability to sustain communication, but its ability to produce accurate outputs under predefined conditions. The signing appears contextually correct because the context itself is stable, limited, and known in advance. Once that stability is removed, the question shifts from whether the system can generate a correct sequence to whether it can maintain linguistic integrity as context evolves. That is the point at which the current generation of systems remains unproven.

There is no consistent evidence that these systems can preserve meaning across extended interactions where topics shift, references accumulate, and prior context must be retained to interpret subsequent inputs. There is no standardized framework in place to measure how accuracy degrades over time or across domains. There is no required disclosure mechanism that signals to the user when the system's confidence drops or



when translation moves from reliable to probabilistic. These gaps are not edge cases. They define the boundary between a controlled demonstration and a real-world communication environment.

As a result, the systems perform convincingly within isolated segments while lacking verified continuity across full experience flows. The visual layer reinforces the perception of completeness, but the underlying structure does not yet support sustained, reliable communication. This creates the same condition observed in Disney's implementation, where accessibility is present within defined moments but is not maintained as a continuous property of the system. The difference is that, in the context of SLxAI, this condition extends beyond content consumption into active communication, where breaks in continuity affect not just engagement but the integrity of the information being exchanged.

The Shared Failure Mode

Across both cases, the underlying issue is not execution quality but how accessibility is positioned within the system itself. Accessibility is implemented as a discrete layer that can be applied to selected segments of content rather than established as a continuous, governed condition that persists across the full communication flow. That design choice determines how the system behaves over time. It allows accessibility to appear complete within controlled moments while remaining structurally incomplete across the broader experience.

When accessibility is treated as a layer, the system inevitably develops breakpoints. These are not random failures but predictable transitions between states where accessibility is present and states where it is absent or degraded. In practical terms, the user moves through an experience that does not maintain a consistent level of access. Comprehension is built within supported segments and then interrupted when the system exits those segments. The burden of navigating those transitions shifts to the user, who must continuously adjust to changing conditions rather than relying on the system to remain stable.

This instability directly affects trust. A system that performs well in isolated instances but does not signal when or where it may fail creates uncertainty for the user. The issue is not simply that failures occur, but that they occur without clear boundaries or disclosure. The user cannot anticipate when the system will maintain accuracy and when it will not. Over time, this unpredictability reduces confidence in the system as a



whole, even in areas where it performs correctly. Trust is not built on peak performance. It is built on consistency.

The same structural condition introduces a measurable liability for organizations deploying these systems. When accessibility is intermittent, there is no clear basis for demonstrating that communication was accurate and complete across an entire interaction. Without continuity, organizations cannot reliably audit or verify outcomes. This becomes particularly significant in environments where communication carries legal, medical, or operational consequences. The absence of a governed framework for accessibility means that performance cannot be consistently measured, documented, or defended.

The distinction between a layered approach and a continuous system is therefore not conceptual. It determines whether accessibility functions as a dependable component of the environment or as a set of isolated capabilities that do not aggregate into a reliable experience.

Why SLxAI Is Higher Risk Than Disney

The difference in risk profile between Disney's ASL implementation and current SLxAI systems is not a matter of scale or sophistication. It is a matter of context. Disney's limitation produces an incomplete experience within an entertainment environment. The impact is perceptual and experiential. A viewer loses continuity, misses portions of narrative meaning, and disengages from the content. While that outcome reflects a structural accessibility gap, it remains contained within a domain where the consequences are limited to comprehension and user satisfaction.

SLxAI systems operate in a fundamentally different context. They are being positioned as intermediaries in live or near-live communication environments, where meaning is not simply consumed but exchanged, acted upon, and relied upon. In these settings, the system is not augmenting content. It is functioning as part of the communication channel itself. Any instability in that channel directly affects the integrity of the information being transmitted.

When continuity is not guaranteed, the system introduces the possibility of misinterpretation at points that may not be visible to either the user or the organization deploying it. A shift in context, a domain-specific term, or a change in tone can alter how meaning is constructed in sign language, particularly given its reliance on spatial and



non-manual markers. If the system does not maintain that context accurately, the resulting output may appear structurally correct while conveying a different meaning than intended. This is not a failure that presents as an obvious error. It presents as a plausible but incorrect interpretation.

The same dynamic applies to intent and tone. Communication is not limited to literal translation. It carries nuance, emphasis, and relational context. When a system lacks the ability to preserve those elements consistently, it can alter the perceived intent of a message without signaling that alteration. In environments such as customer service, workplace communication, or public-facing interactions, that shift can affect decision-making, compliance, and interpersonal outcomes.

There is also a representational dimension that extends beyond functional accuracy. Sign language is closely tied to identity and community. When a system produces outputs that are inconsistent, contextually inappropriate, or misaligned with cultural norms, it does not simply introduce error. It introduces representational harm. That harm is not abstract. It affects how individuals are perceived, how they are understood, and how they are included within communication systems that claim to serve them.

Taken together, these factors move SLxAI out of the category of user experience optimization and into the domain of governance and compliance risk. The issue is no longer whether the system provides a smooth or engaging interaction. It is whether the system can be relied upon to convey information accurately, consistently, and in a manner that can be audited and defended. In environments where communication carries legal or operational consequences, that distinction becomes material.

What the Market Is Missing

The current state of the market reflects a concentration of effort on output quality without a corresponding investment in the structures required to evaluate and govern that quality over time. Organizations are demonstrating increasingly sophisticated signing capabilities, but those capabilities are being assessed in isolation, without a shared framework that defines what reliable performance actually means across a full interaction. This creates a condition where systems can appear mature at the surface level while remaining unstandardized and difficult to compare at a structural level.



One of the most immediate gaps is the absence of a widely adopted standard for benchmarking sign language accuracy. At present, accuracy is often inferred through visual plausibility or limited expert review within controlled scenarios. That approach does not scale, and it does not provide a consistent basis for evaluating performance across different systems, domains, or use cases. Without a defined benchmark that accounts for linguistic structure, context, and meaning preservation, accuracy remains a subjective measure rather than an auditable one.

A related gap exists in how context retention is validated. Sign language, like any language, relies on continuity of meaning across exchanges. Current systems are rarely evaluated on their ability to maintain that continuity over extended interactions. Instead, they are assessed on discrete outputs, each treated as an independent event. This obscures how performance changes as conversations evolve, references accumulate, and prior context becomes necessary to interpret new information. Without a method for measuring context retention, there is no clear understanding of when or how systems begin to degrade.

The market also lacks a consistent classification framework for the underlying technologies being presented. Systems that rely on fundamentally different mechanisms, including generative models, motion-driven or puppeteered avatars, and video-to-video transformations, are frequently grouped under the same category. This conflation makes it difficult to evaluate capabilities, limitations, and appropriate use cases. Each approach carries distinct performance characteristics and risk profiles, but those distinctions are not being clearly communicated or standardized.

In parallel, there are no broadly enforced disclosure requirements that define how synthetic communication should be presented to users. When a system generates sign language output, there is often no indication of the confidence level, the potential for error, or the conditions under which performance may decline. This lack of transparency prevents users from making informed decisions about how much to rely on the system and limits an organization’s ability to demonstrate that communication was handled responsibly.

The same classification gap was visible at the SLxAI Summit 2026, where systems with different underlying architectures and capabilities were presented under a single label. The result is a market signal that suggests uniformity where none exists. Without clear standards for benchmarking, validation, classification, and disclosure, or-



ganizations are left to evaluate systems based on surface-level performance rather than structural reliability.

Strategic Position

From an NCG perspective, accessibility cannot be evaluated solely on whether it appears in isolated outputs or performs convincingly under controlled conditions. The defining criterion is whether accessibility is sustained as a continuous, reliable property of the system across the full lifecycle of an interaction. Anything short of that creates a gap between what is presented and what is actually delivered to the user.

Current implementations across both legacy media and emerging SLxAI systems demonstrate a consistent pattern. Significant investment is directed toward producing high-quality accessible outputs, and those outputs often meet or exceed expectations when assessed individually. However, the surrounding system does not maintain that level of accessibility over time. The result is a fragmented experience in which access is intermittently available rather than persistently ensured. This fragmentation is not always visible at the point of demonstration, but it becomes evident through use, where continuity of understanding depends on continuity of access.

The distinction between intermittent and continuous accessibility is not a matter of degree. It is a categorical difference in how the system functions. When accessibility is continuous, it operates as infrastructure. It does not require user intervention, does not introduce uncertainty, and does not degrade without signaling. When accessibility is intermittent, it behaves as a feature. It can be activated, showcased, and validated in specific contexts, but it does not provide a stable foundation for communication.

This distinction carries direct implications for how organizations design, evaluate, and deploy accessibility solutions. Systems that deliver accessibility in moments may satisfy immediate visibility goals, but they do not meet the requirements for reliability, auditability, or trust. Systems that embed accessibility as a governed, continuous condition are the ones that can support real-world communication without transferring risk or burden back to the user.

The position is therefore not a critique of current capabilities but a clarification of what constitutes a complete solution. Accessibility that is not continuous does not function as accessibility in an operational sense. It functions as demonstration of potential rather than delivery of a dependable outcome.



Where Demonstration Becomes Exposure

Disney's implementation surfaces the limitation within a controlled, low-stakes environment where the consequences are largely confined to user experience. The system reveals that accessibility can be executed with precision at the segment level while still failing to persist across the full experience. That constraint is visible, but it remains contained within a context where fragmentation affects comprehension rather than outcomes.

SLxAI systems extend that same structural limitation into environments where communication is active, continuous, and consequential. The transition is not simply from content to interaction. It is from a bounded experience to a live communication layer that users depend on to exchange information, make decisions, and interpret intent. When continuity is not maintained in that context, the impact is no longer limited to disruption. It affects the integrity of the communication itself.

As this limitation scales, the risk profile changes accordingly. Breaks in accessibility are no longer confined to moments of disengagement. They become points where meaning can shift, degrade, or be lost without clear indication. Systems that perform reliably in demonstration settings may not sustain that reliability when exposed to variable inputs, evolving context, and real-world conditions. The absence of continuity becomes an operational risk that is difficult to detect and more difficult to audit.

The significance of this transition lies in how the limitation moves from being observable to being embedded. In a controlled environment, fragmentation can be identified and analyzed. In a live system, it can occur without visibility, affecting outcomes in ways that are not immediately traceable. The same structural issue is present in both cases, but its consequences are amplified when it becomes part of an active communication channel rather than a curated experience.



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.

Come citare

Grizzle, H. M. (2026, July 12). NCG Insight: dalla frammentazione ASL di Disney al divario di governance SLxAI. Novara Consulting Group. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23003362