COALITION FOR INNOVATION

AI Blueprint for the Future

Coalition for Innovation, supported by LG NOVA

Jami Diaz, Director Ecosystem Community & Startup Experience
William Barkis, Head of Grand Challenges & Ecosystem Development
Sokwoo Rhee, Executive Vice President, LG Electronics, Head, LG NOVA

Coalition for Innovation Co-Chairs

Alex Fang, CleanTech Chair
Sarah Ennis, AI Chair
Alfred Poor, HealthTech Chair

Authors

Adrien Abecassis, Johnny Aguirre, John Barton, Ann M. Marcus, Olivier Bacs, Taylor Black, Micah Boster, Mathilde Cerioli, Carolyn Eagen, Sarah Ennis, Annie Hanlon, Christina Lee Storm, Andrew Yongwoo Lim, Jess Loren, Refael Shamir, Svetlana Stotskaya

Senior Editor, Alfred Poor
Editor, Jade Newton

October 2025

Preamble

The Coalition for Innovation is an initiative hosted by LG NOVA that creates the opportunity for innovators, entrepreneurs, and business leaders across sectors to come together to collaborate on important topics in technology to drive impact. The end goal: together we can leverage our collective knowledge to advance important work that drives positive impact in our communities and the world. The simple vision is that we can be stronger together and increase our individual and collective impact on the world through collaboration.

This "Blueprint for the Future" document (henceforth: "Blueprint") defines a vision for the future through which technology innovation can improve the lives of people, their communities, and the planet. The goal is to lay out a vision and potentially provide the framework to start taking action in the areas of interest for the members of the Coalition. The chapters in this Blueprint are intended to be a "Big Tent" in which many diverse perspectives and interests and different approaches to impact can come together. Hence, the structure of the Blueprint is intended to be as inclusive as possible in which different chapters of the Blueprint focus on different topic areas, written by different authors with individual perspectives that may be less widely supported by the group.

Participation in the Coalition at large and authorship of the overall Blueprint document does not imply endorsement of the ideas of any specific chapter but rather acknowledges a contribution to the discussion and general engagement in the Coalition process that led to the publication of this Blueprint.

All contributors will be listed as "Authors" of the Blueprint in alphabetical order. The Co-Chairs for each Coalition will be listed as "Editors" also in alphabetical order. Authorship will include each individual author's name along with optional title and optional organization at the author's discretion.

Each chapter will list only the subset of participants that meaningfully contributed to that chapter. Authorship for chapters will be in rank order based on contribution: the first author(s) will have contributed the most, second author(s) second most, and so on. Equal contributions at each level will be listed as "Co-Authors"; if two or more authors contributed the most and contributed equally, they will be noted with an asterisk as "Co-First Authors". If two authors contributed second-most and equally, they will be listed as "Co-Second Authors" and so on.

The Blueprint document itself, as the work of the group, is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (aka "BY") International License: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. Because of our commitment to openness, you are free to share and adapt the Blueprint with attribution (as more fully described in the CC BY 4.0 license).

The Coalition is intended to be a community-driven activity and where possible governance will be by majority vote of each domain group. Specifically, each Coalition will decide which topics are included as chapters by majority vote of the group. The approach is intended to be inclusive so we will ask that topics be included unless they are considered by the majority to be significantly out of scope.

We intend for the document to reach a broad, international audience, including:

- People involved in the three technology domains: CleanTech, AI, and HealthTech
- Researchers from academic and private institutions
- Investors
- Students
- Policy creators at the corporate level and all levels of government

Chapter 14: AI & Entertainment: A Blueprint for Innovation, Integrity, and IP Protection

Authors: Annie Hanlon, Jess Loren, Ann M. Marcus, Christina Lee Storm

Overview

Generative AI (GenAI) can shrink production timelines by creating storyboards in minutes and multilingual dubs in hours, yet that speed surfaces thorny issues of copyright, consent, and credit. The very tools that streamline visual effects, localization, music, and other workflows also introduce profound ethical and legal dilemmas. The industry now sits on a fault line: innovation versus infringement, piracy versus IP protection, and automation versus human creativity.

This chapter traces that collision, from VHS piracy to Stable Diffusion, and offers a blueprint for protecting originality while encouraging innovation. Drawing on historical context, emerging legal cases, ethical frameworks, and sector-specific use cases, we offer a blueprint for how the entertainment and creative sectors can chart a path forward that protects originality, fosters innovation, and upholds the values of consent, attribution, and trust.

How AI is Revolutionizing Entertainment

Human and AI creative partnerships are unlocking new possibilities for artists, filmmakers, creatives, and entertainment professionals by blending human ingenuity with the speed and versatility of GenAI. Often referred to as "human in the loop" (HITL), this collaboration is essential for achieving expressive, nuanced, and emotionally resonant results in entertainment and the arts.

While AI excels at generating content at scale and speed, it lacks the lived experiences, cultural context, and intuitive understanding that define truly impactful creative work. Humans bring judgment, taste, emotion, and a deep sense of narrative to the process. In practice, this means that AI can rapidly generate storyboards, music, or visual assets, but human creators guide the direction, curate the best outputs, and infuse the work with subtlety and meaning. For example, when filmmakers use AI for storyboarding, it is the director's vision and feedback that shape the final sequence, ensuring the emotional beats and visual style align with the story's intent.

GenAI powered tools are revolutionizing the filmmaking process allowing directors to experiment with different styles and camera angles in minutes rather than days. Similarly, musicians who collaborate with AI to remix legacy works rely on their own creative instincts to select, refine, and approve the final versions, preserving the authenticity of their artistic voice.

The result is a powerful synergy that expands creative horizons, democratizes access to advanced tools, and enables artists to push boundaries, reach new audiences, and tell stories in ways that were previously unimaginable.

Human + AI: Real-World Collaborations

Filmmaking: Storyboards in an afternoon. The 2024 research prototype **CinePreGen** lets directors rough-out camera moves and storyboards with a diffusion model that accepts natural-language prompts and real-time camera controls; a 12-participant study showed it *cut pre-*

vis iteration time by more than half while keeping human directors in the loop for framing and tone.

Localization & Access: Auto-dubs at scale. In December 2024, YouTube expanded its AI dubbing tool to "hundreds of thousands" of channels, auto-translating a single upload into up to nine languages. Creators can preview or delete the synthetic tracks before publishing, preserving artistic control while instantly opening new markets.

Legacy Music: Finishing the last Beatles song. *Now and Then* (released Nov 2024) used Peter Jackson's machine-learning audio-restoration system to isolate John Lennon's 1977 demo vocal so Paul McCartney and Ringo Starr could build a new arrangement around it. The single topped charts in 10 countries and won the 2025 Grammy for Best Rock Performance: proof that AI can *extend* rather than replace human artistry.

These snapshots show where AI already extends human effort; the next sections examine where it might undermine it.

Key Takeaway

In each case, AI handles the *heavy lifting* – rapid image synthesis, voice cloning, or signal cleanup – while humans provide narrative intent, editing judgment, and final sign-off. The results: faster workflows, bigger audiences, and renewed value for archival material.

But as the technology evolves, so do risks related to unauthorized use of copyrighted material and the erosion of intellectual property rights. By prioritizing best practices and guidelines, responsible development, and ensuring that GenAI systems are trained on properly licensed data, the industry can foster innovation while protecting the creative contributions and intellectual property that form the foundation of the entertainment industry.

Historical Context and New Parallels

In the 1980s and 1990s, the entertainment industry grappled with the challenge of piracy in the form of unauthorized duplication of VHS tapes and CDs. These breaches undermined creators and disrupted economic models. The solution involved studios, artists, distributors, and the Federal Government responding with copyright crackdowns, the creation of anti-piracy infrastructure, and legal innovations.

Today, we're facing a digital version of that same problem but with GenAI. Instead of duplicating VHS tapes, GenAI systems are trained on vast datasets of creative content, films, scripts, music, and art often without consent or compensation. These models can then generate new works that borrow heavily from the originals, sometimes with striking similarity to the source material. The issue isn't just technological; it's foundational. Creators risk losing control over their work and intellectual property, while companies face legal exposure and financial loss if they don't ensure the content they use or distribute is responsibly sourced. Without clear provenance and disclosure, creative teams and studios may struggle to trace the origin of content or its underlying components, which will impact the foundational pillar of the chain of title. Fast-forward four decades, and the VHS tape duplicator is now a training dataset.

The New Landscape of Risk

Key risks associated with GenAI in entertainment and creative domains include:

- **Source Misappropriation:** GenAI models trained on copyrighted or proprietary material often generate content that resembles original works in tone, structure, or style.
- **Attribution Confusion:** Human-AI collaborations raise questions about authorship, rights, and recognition. Who owns the output? Who deserves credit?
- **Legal Exposure:** From copyright infringement to trade secret violations,

organizations using AI-generated content risk legal action if training data or outputs lack proper provenance or licensing.

Recent lawsuits, such as The New York Times v. OpenAI/Microsoft illustrate how unresolved questions of fair use, consent, and replication could redefine copyright law.

Archival vs. Piracy: A Core Tension

Not all unlicensed reuse is nefarious. The Archival Producers Alliance (APA) and other documentary filmmakers argue that preservation and transparency sometimes presents a tension; when does use of a work preserve history and truth, and when does it exploit the labor and voice of a creator without consent?

The APA calls attention to the "inherent obligation to reality" in documentary work (a term first used by G. Roy Levin), underscoring the societal value of preserving and referencing materials that might otherwise be lost. That is particularly relevant when these references serve the public interest, such as revealing abuses of power or challenging dominant historical narratives. In such cases, using GenAI or traditional methods to archive, reference, or reproduce vulnerable content must be accompanied by clear sourcing, responsible attribution, and contextual integrity to avoid confusion or distortion.

The APA notes that GenAI use may be seen as particularly problematic when *simulating truth-based narratives*. They suggest that documentary content disclose all synthetic contributions and ensure audiences are not misled by machine-generated interpretations of factual events. Ultimately, "ethical reuse" is rooted in *purpose, context, and acknowledgment*.

This makes it vital to distinguish between:

- Malicious plagiarism or cloning (e.g., voice deepfakes, song imitations),
- Transformative reuse for public interest (e.g., archival storytelling, education, parody), and
- Tool-assisted creation where AI is used transparently (e.g., CGI or Photoshop).

Key Principles for Responsible AI in Entertainment

A responsible AI ecosystem must prioritize:

- **Transparency**: Disclosure when AI has been used in content creation or enhancement
- **Clean Source Data**: Licensing, attribution, and documentation of training datasets
- **Attribution**: Clear credit given to creators whose works are reused or remixed
- **Consent**: Creative assets should not be used without approval.
- **Provenance**: Technological tracking of content origin (e.g., C2PA, blockchain)
- **Fair Compensation**: Royalty structures for creators whose work fuels GenAI outputs
- **Standardization**: Adoption of shared frameworks for watermarking, metadata, and model disclosures

Sector Use Cases and Responses

Visual Arts: Artists are suing platforms Stability AI, DeviantArt, Midjourney, and Runway ML, alleging these companies used their work in training datasets without licensing and that the outputs closely replicate their distinct styles, constituting copyright infringement and unfair competition.

Music: AI-generated tracks that mimic real artists without approval (e.g., "Heart on My Sleeve") have prompted pushback from performers and unions seeking voice rights protections.

Literary: Authors sued Anthropic, claiming it illegally used their copyrighted books to train its Claude AI model. This landmark ruling marks one of the first major federal interpretations of fair use

in AI training. It affirms transformative use of lawfully acquired texts but clearly draws a legal line against using pirated content.

Code: GitHub Copilot has sparked backlash for producing uncredited code snippets from open-source repositories.

Academia: AI-generated essays and paraphrasing tools are challenging norms of citation and originality.

Enterprise: Proprietary information leaked via AI tools (e.g., chatbots trained on internal documentation) creates new risks for data governance.

How Are Audiences Reacting to AI-Made Media?

Skepticism in the U.S. More than half of Americans (54%) say generative-AI systems *must* credit the sources they draw from, while only 14% think attribution is unnecessary. Pew Research Center

Demand for Clear Labels in Music. A 2025 survey of U.K. listeners found 81.5% want AI-only tracks clearly labelled and over 80% still "value human-made music more. "DJ

Advertising Backlash. NielsenIQ's neuroscience study showed viewers flagged most AI-generated ads as "annoying," "boring," or "confusing," triggering weaker memory activation than conventional spots: evidence that poorly disclosed AI can corrode brand equity. NIQ

Global Trust Gap. Trust is not uniform; in the 2025 Edelman Trust Barometer, 72% of Chinese respondents trust AI versus 32% in the United States, with India (77%) topping the league. Axios

Why This Matters:

Audience acceptance shapes everything from box-office returns to award eligibility. Data show that transparency (crediting and labelling) and perceived human authorship dramatically influence trust, recall, and engagement across formats: music, film, ads, and even social feeds. Studios that embed provenance signals (e.g., C2PA watermarks) and disclose AI involvement early stand to build goodwill, whereas opaque releases risk backlash or reduced commercial impact.

Audience perception is only half the puzzle; the other half is how platforms choose to disclose, or hide, AI involvement.

Platform Responsibility & Disclosure

Why the Distribution Layer Matters. Streaming and social-video platforms now act as first-line gatekeepers for AI-made media; they can require labelling, redirect royalties, or quietly amplify synthetic works with no context at all. The policy choices they make therefore shape both creator livelihoods and audience trust.

- **YouTube: Mandatory Labels.** Since Q1 2025, YouTube has required any uploader who uses "realistic altered or synthetic media" to tick an AI-use box. The platform then auto-attaches a visible *"altered or synthetic"* label, and, for sensitive topics such as news or finance, a second onscreen banner. YouTube
- **Spotify: Training Ban, No Tag (Yet).** Spotify now forbids AI companies from scraping its catalog and removes deep-fake tracks, but it still lacks a consumer-facing tag for synthetic songs, leaving listeners to guess whether a track is human-made. Descript Further, The "Velvet Sundown" incident, an AI band that quietly racked up 1 million Spotify plays, triggered calls from industry bodies for mandatory tagging so fans "know what they're hearing." The Guardian
- **Deezer: First Mover on Tagging.** In June 2025, Deezer became the world's first digital service provider (DSP) to display an *AI-generated* badge on every album that contains fully synthetic tracks; its detection tool already flags about 18% of daily uploads and excludes fraudulent streams from royalty pools. Deezer Newsroom

Audience Backlash Drives Change

What should platforms do next?

- **Universal "AI-Created" Disclosure Tag** visible at play-time (not buried in metadata).
- **Attribution and Royalty Sharing Panels** that let rights-holders claim a cut when licensed stems or likeness models power a release.
- **Dataset-Opt-Out Registries** so creators can block future training on their uploads.
- **Content-ID for Personalities**, extending YouTube's synthetic-voice detection to faces and brand mascots.
- **Transparent Recommendation Throttles** — as Deezer does — when streams appear bot-inflated.

Open Question for the Industry: If labels and audiences increasingly expect up-front disclosure, should the *absence* of an "AI-created" badge eventually count as consumer deception? The precedents above suggest that proactive labelling will soon move from *nice-to-have* to *regulatory baseline*.

Legal and Policy Trends

Lawsuits against GenAI platforms will likely define the boundaries of fair use, copyright, and derivative work protections, but traditional regulatory frameworks with multi-year judicial processes are ill-suited to address the real-time challenges and opportunities posed by AI. The lawsuit filed by Disney and Universal against Midjourney over copyright infringements is expected to be a lengthy process because of the complexity of AI and copyright law and the high stakes outcome of this case, which could significantly influence the future of both AI development and the entertainment industry's approach to intellectual property rights.

The accelerating pace of AI development demands proactive, coordinated action from the legal, policy, and entertainment sectors. Only through collaboration can they ensure that AI is harnessed responsibly and ethically.

A pivotal example of this is the recent removal of the proposed federal moratorium on state-level AI regulation from the "One Big Beautiful Bill Act." The original provision would have blocked states from enacting new AI laws for up to a decade, effectively freezing local responses to emerging risks and stifling the ability to protect creative professionals and the public. By removing the moratorium, Congress preserved states' authority to enact timely protections, an outcome widely regarded as a win for the creative community and advocates for responsible AI.

Despite this legislative progress, significant policy gaps remain in regulating AI-generated content, particularly deepfakes and digital replicas. The U.S. Copyright Office has called for new federal protections that would prohibit the distribution of unauthorized digital replicas, mandate prompt takedown mechanisms on online platforms, and provide statutory damages and injunctive relief for victims. Similarly, the proposed NO FAKES Act (for Nurture Originals, Foster Art, and Keep Entertainment Safe) – a U.S. Congressional effort to protect personal identity and creative intellectual property from unauthorized AI reproductions commonly known as "deepfakes" – would introduce a federal right of action, require platforms to implement strong takedown and repeat-offender policies, and leverage digital fingerprinting to prevent re-uploads.

Importantly, the Act aims to balance protection with creative freedom by recognizing the role of transformative or creative modifications, as highlighted in the U.S. Copyright Office's AI reports, which emphasize that copyright law protects original, human-authored contributions while allowing for fair use and transformative works. This distinction seeks to ensure that legitimate artistic reinterpretations and documentary uses are preserved, while unauthorized, exploitative reproductions are curtailed.

While the U.S. Copyright Office's three-part series on Copyright and Artificial Intelligence (published Part 1 on July 31, 2024, Part 2 on January 29, 2025, and pre-publication version of Part 3 on May

9, 2025) provides valuable analysis and highlights key challenges at the intersection of AI and copyright law, the reports remain broad in scope and stop short of offering specific, enforceable standards. The Office acknowledges that many questions, such as the boundaries of fair use in AI training, the definition of human authorship, and the mechanisms for protecting digital replicas, are far from settled and will require further legislative, judicial, and policy development. As a result, stakeholders in the creative and technology sectors must navigate a landscape marked by significant legal ambiguity, with much depending on future court decisions and potential new legislation.

Across the Atlantic, transparency is becoming law. In February 2025 the EU formally adopted the AI Act, European Union, EU AI Act Transparency Mandate**,** the first comprehensive framework of its kind. While generative models are not classed as "high-risk," they must (i) label AI-generated media, (ii) design systems to prevent illegal content, and (iii) publish "sufficiently detailed" summaries of all copyrighted works used in training. By forcing disclosure at the dataset level, the EU has created a de-facto provenance standard that goes further than any U.S. proposal to date.

Meanwhile, UK litigation is expanding the definition of infringement, In January 2025 the U.K. High Court United Kingdom, Getty Images v. Stability AI**.** allowed Getty's multi-count infringement suit against Stability AI to proceed, rejecting the developer's bid to narrow the case. Getty alleges wholesale scraping of its licensed catalog to train Stable Diffusion, plus trademark dilution in downstream outputs. The ruling signals that training-phase ingestion itself can constitute primary infringement under U.K. law, a point still unsettled in U.S. courts. Courts and Tribunals Judiciary

Concurrently, the U.K. Intellectual Property Office closed a nationwide consultation that floats a "reserve-your-rights" mechanism; right-holders could opt out of AI training unless paid, while developers gain a safe harbor for unreserved works, but only with dataset transparency baked in. GOV.UK

Asia-Pacific is leaning on registration. In June 2025, the Korean Copyright Commission issued dual guides on (1) registering AI-assisted works and (2) preventing AI-related disputes. Purely machine-made outputs receive no copyright, but creators can secure protection for "GAI-utilization works" by documenting their human contributions. Studios rushing into the K-Drama boom now treat the registration filing as a green-light checklist item, similar to chain-of-title clearance in Hollywood.

India convened an eight-member expert panel in May 2025 to modernize the 1957 Copyright Act. Mandates under review include a formal definition of AI-generated works, liability for unlicensed training, and a new remuneration right for datasets sourced from Indian publishers and broadcasters. The panel's report, due early 2026, will shape rules for Bollywood and the country's ₹2-trillion streaming market. Lexology

At the same time, some companies are already demonstrating what responsible data use can look like. In essence, Industry is not waiting for courts. For example, OpenAI has entered into a series of licensing agreements with major publishers, including The Financial Times, Associated Press, Le Monde, and others, allowing their content to be used for AI training in exchange for compensation and attribution.

Producers are being asked to make critical decisions without the benefit of clear industry standards or government regulation. In this interim period, while formal policy and legal guardrails continue to take shape, resources such as the Academy of Television Arts & Sciences (TV Academy) "KEY CONSIDERATIONS Before Using GenAI on Your Next Project" focus on three key principals: *Creative Integrity to Professionals, Creators, Performers, Craftspeople; Permissions, Licenses: Legal & Commercial Viability; and Accountability, Transparency, Sustainability*. The Key Considerations are designed for the nearly 30,000 members across the 31 peer groups of the Television Academy.

In addition, the Producers Guild of America created a document, **Fine Print of AI: Top 10 Questions Producers Should Ask**, for producers to reference. These frameworks help television professionals and producers navigate the evolving landscape by identifying potential legal, ethical,

and creative risks, and offering practical questions to ask when evaluating GenAI's role in a project. As the industry seeks clarity, these tools empower producers to move forward responsibly, protecting themselves, their teams, and their work.

In July 2025, Asteria and Moonvalley released Marey, a clean, production-grade AI video model designed to give filmmakers creative control while avoiding the legal and ethical pitfalls of systems trained on scraped, unlicensed content. Fully licensed and commercially safe, Marey was developed in partnership with creators, ensuring that innovation is built on collaboration, not exploitation.

Also, through their 2025 partnership, Independent Studio Services (ISS) – the world's largest full-service prop house stewarding more than five million items with lineage tracked since the 1970s – and Global Objects (GO) – a 3D-scanning and digital-asset company specializing in photorealistic digital replication for media, entertainment, and enterprise applications , are converting each screen-used prop into an IP-cleared, DRM-watermarked digital twin with full provenance metadata, making the collection safely licensable for metaverse platforms, real-time game engines, and GenAI training pipelines.

As this new digital landscape unfolds, Playbook AIR's platform is designed to capture and verify human authorship in GenAI workflows, providing clear documentation to support copyright, protect creators, and ensure accountability. It also provides a secure API, allowing seamless integration into other platforms and systems. Platforms like this are helping to lay the groundwork for responsible and scalable adoption of GenAI in professional production pipelines.

These approaches also address growing concerns from independent and marginalized creators, such as Indigenous artists and emerging youth artists, about AI models exploiting cultural works and traditional knowledge without permission. These communities are especially vulnerable to having their art and cultural expressions scraped for AI training without consent or compensation, leading to cultural appropriation and loss of control over their own narratives.

These initiatives don't just set a precedent; they establish a working model for how transparency, consent, and intellectual property rights can be integrated into scalable AI solutions. As the industry evolves, studios must take an active role in ensuring these standards are upheld throughout the content pipeline.

The Studio's Role in Provenance and GenAI

Studios and distribution platforms play a critical role in ensuring that content can be legally distributed and monetized. Without a clear chain of title, studios can't greenlight projects, and distribution platforms risk liability by hosting content built on unlicensed or scraped data. And with GenAI, that "chain" is increasingly complex. The traditional "kick the can down the road" approach is no longer viable.

Studios must take an active seat at the table to ensure that the data used to train AI tools is commercially licensed and traceable, ensuring it meets copyright and attribution standards. These conversations must also address downstream implications, such as whether projects that include AI-generated content should be eligible for prestigious awards like the Grammys, Emmys, or Oscars: questions that further underscore the need for clarity, accountability, and industry-wide alignment.

Gaps and Open Questions

Lack of Consensus on Attribution Standards: Who gets listed in credits when AI contributes?

Absence of Enforceable Provenance Tech: How can we reliably track AI-generated content origins?

Insufficient Legal Definitions: What constitutes a "derivative" work in AI?

Need for International Coordination: IP laws vary across countries; how do global platforms ensure compliance?

Next Steps and Calls to Action

- **Mandate** AI-use disclosure and provenance tech in all guild, union, and platform contracts.
- **Build** creator-led licensing frameworks and opt-out registries so rights-holders control how their works train future models.
- **Carve out** public-interest exceptions that let archivists and documentarians reuse material ethically without chilling speech.
- **Partner** with tech vendors to clean training datasets, verify sources, and watermark synthetic outputs.
- **Train** creatives, producers, and legal teams on AI risks, responsibilities, and emerging best practices.

***Goal**:* These actions safeguard original voices, support working professionals, and keep innovation grounded in consent, attribution, and fair compensation.

Conclusion

Generative AI offers unprecedented opportunities for creativity, but also significant risks to the foundational principles of artistic authorship and intellectual property. The entertainment industry now stands at a critical crossroads. Will it repeat the mistakes of past technological shifts, or can it build a new, transparent, ethical framework that is based on licensed data for creation in the AI age?

Trust, consent, and attribution are the new currencies of creativity. Without them, AI-generated content may be prolific, but it will lack soul, legitimacy, and the cultural credibility that comes from honoring the human story behind the work.

Author (In order of contribution)

Annie Hanlon, Co-Founder/Partner, Playbook PLBK
Annie Hanlon is Co-Founder/Partner of Playbook PLBK, focused on AI, storytelling, and innovation. An accomplished entertainment executive and award-winning producer, she is recognized for her impact at Netflix, Lytro, and Here Be Dragons. Annie is also Co-Founder of Playbook AIR, a platform designed to capture and verify human authorship in GenAI workflows, providing clear documentation to support copyright, protect creators, and ensure accountability. She is a sought-after industry speaker, a member of the Visual Effects Society, the Academy of Television Arts & Sciences, and a board member of the Infinity Festival. Annie is a 2024 graduate of Space Camp (Huntsville, AL).

Jess Loren, CEO, Global Objects
Jess Loren is the CEO of Global Objects and a leader in AI-driven 3D scanning. She serves on the Television Academy's Governors Board for Special Visual Effects and the Board of Managers for the Los Angeles Visual Effects Society. A Producers Guild of America member, Jess is also a proud wife and mother of three.

Ann M. Marcus, Director, Ethical Tech & Communications, WeAccel Ann M. Marcus is a Sonoma-raised, Portland-based communications strategist and ethical technology analyst focused on smart cities, community resilience, and public-interest innovation. She leads the Marcus Consulting Group and serves as director of ethical technology and communications at WeAccel.io, a public-good venture advancing mobility, communications, and energy solutions for communities. Ann has advised public and private organizations—including Cisco, the City of San Leandro, Nikon, AT&T, and InfoWorld—on trust-based data exchange, digital public infrastructure, resilience strategy, AI and more. Her current

projects include a California senior evacuation program, a Portland robotics hub, and digital energy resource initiatives with utilities in Portland and the Bay Area.

Christina Lee Storm, Co-Founder/Partner, Playbook PLBK
Christina Lee Storm is Co-Founder/Partner of Playbook PLBK, a consultancy specializing in AI, innovation and storytelling, and an award-winning producer and executive recognized for her work at major studios including Netflix, Universal, and DreamWorks Animation. She is also Co-Founder of Playbook AIR, a platform built to document and authenticate human authorship within GenAI workflows. Christina holds many leadership roles including Governor of the Television Academy's Emerging Media Programming peer group, Lead for the Academy's Responsible AI & Production Standards Working Group, sits on the Producers Guild of America's Production Innovation Task Force, and is a newly inducted member of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts & Sciences, Class of 2025.

For more information about the Coalition for Innovation, including how you can get involved, please visit coalitionforinnovation.com.

View the Next Chapter