



**TESTIMONY OF  
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
KA 'OIHANA O KA LOIO KUHINA  
THIRTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE, 2026**

---

**ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURE:**

H.B. NO. 2137, H.D. 3, RELATING TO ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE.

**BEFORE THE:**

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND TECHNOLOGY

**DATE:** Monday, March 23, 2026 **TIME:** 3:01 p.m.

**LOCATION:** State Capitol, Room 225

**TESTIFIER(S):** Anne E. Lopez, Attorney General, or  
Ashley M. Tanaka, Deputy Attorney General

---

Chair Elefante and Members of the Committee:

The Department of the Attorney General (Department) provides the following comments.

This bill adds two new chapters to the Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) to prohibit certain unauthorized uses of artificial intelligence-generated likenesses, mandate disclosure for the public distribution of such likenesses, and provide civil actions and civil remedies for injured individuals.

In paragraph (3) of section -4, "Exemptions," of the first new chapter to be added to the HRS by section 2 of this bill, the word "artistic" (page 5, line 17) is potentially problematic as its interpretation is subjective and thus renders the word ambiguous in this context. In the same paragraph (3), it is also unclear what the intended scope for "educational use" is. How such content is to be "labeled" also invites ambiguity as the bill does not explain what constitutes "clearly labeled." To mitigate these issues, we recommend deleting paragraph (3) (page 5, lines 17-19).

In the alternative, we recommend amending paragraph (3) by adding "non-commercial" in front of "artistic" and specifying that "clearly labeled" is referring to the disclosure requirement described in the previous section, section -3, "Disclosure; requirement," so that paragraph (3) instead reads as follows (suggested additions highlighted in bold and underlined, and deletions bracketed and stricken):

- (3) **[An] A non-commercial** artistic or educational use, where the content is clearly labeled **pursuant to section -3** and no harm is intended or reasonably foreseeable.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.



**Computer & Communications  
Industry Association**  
Open Markets. Open Systems. Open Networks.



**TECHNET**  
THE VOICE OF AMERICAN INNOVATION

**March 23, 2026**

Senate Labor and Technology Committee  
Hawaii State Capitol  
415 S Beretania St.  
Honolulu, HI 96813

**RE: HB 2137 – “Relating to Artificial Intelligence” (Oppose Unless Amend)**

Dear Chair Elefante, Vice-Chair Lamosoa, and Members of the Senate Labor and Technology Committee:

On behalf of the Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA) and TechNet, I write to raise several concerns regarding HB 2137 in advance of the March 23, 2026 hearing. CCIA is an international, not-for-profit trade association representing a broad cross-section of communications and technology firms.<sup>1</sup> Proposed regulations on the intrastate provision of digital services can have a significant, nationwide impact on CCIA members.

Responsible businesses understand the potential for misuse of ‘digital imitations’ and support robust legal protections and frameworks that balance innovation with the safeguarding of personal rights. Unfortunately, this bill does not provide the right approach. While well-intended, it raises serious concerns about free expression and conflicts with federal law. Legal experts have detailed the constitutional concerns posed by similar legislation.<sup>2</sup> The amendments proposed by CCIA help address the issues we have with the bill, and we urge the Committee to adopt them.

**The bill’s broad scope and vague definitions would create compliance uncertainty and stifle legitimate expression.**

HB 2137 broadly defines “digital imitation” as “AI-generated or computer-synthesized depiction, audio, or video that realistically appears to portray an actual individual’s voice, face, likeness, or performance.” It defines “realistic” as “so lifelike that a reasonable person would believe that a depiction, audio, or video that appears to portray an actual individual’s voice, face, likeness, or performance is authentic.” This definition sweeps in far more than misleading replications, and could capture mere similarity. Our proposed amendments, including refining

---

<sup>1</sup> For more than 50 years, CCIA has promoted open markets, open systems, and open networks. CCIA members employ more than 1.6 million workers, invest more than \$100 billion in research and development, and contribute trillions of dollars in productivity to the global economy. A list of CCIA members is available at <https://www.cciagnet.org/members>.

<sup>2</sup> Re:Create, *Constitutional Concerns with NO FAKES and Similar Acts* (Aug 20, 2024), <https://www.recreatecoalition.org/constitutional-concerns-with-no-fakes-and-similar-acts/>.

the ambiguous language of “realistically appears to portray” to “is derived from or based upon identifying characteristics of an actual, particular individual, and that portrays that,” could help mitigate these concerns. Without further specificity under this definition, it could apply to a broad swath of use cases that are easily distinguishable and could unnecessarily chill other expressive uses given the bill’s enforcement provisions, as discussed below.

HB 2137 would make it unlawful for “any person to knowingly publish a realistic digital imitation of an identifiable individual without that individual’s consent if the imitation” is “used in connection with a commercial transaction or advertisement;” “causes legally cognizable harm;” or “is used to commit fraud, defamation, harassment, or other unlawful acts.” It is not clear what constitutes being “used in connection with,” which may be interpreted broadly; “legally cognizable harm” may be expansive under Hawaiian law; “commercial transaction” is undefined; and “advertisement” is broadly defined as “a message published in any medium that aids, promotes, or assists, directly or indirectly, a product, service, or commercial transaction,” which could capture many common activities for users and businesses online.

An intermediary, like an online service, should only be liable for “publishing” a third-party user’s “digital imitation” if it has *actual knowledge* of a specific instance of a specific digital imitation. To obtain such knowledge, a court order or a sufficiently detailed notice from the individual depicted in the digital imitation or their authorized representative should be required. Under such a notice-and-takedown framework, if an online service promptly removes the digital imitation identified in a notice or reasonably believes that the content qualifies for an exception or otherwise does not meet the definition of digital imitation, there should be a safe harbor and they should not be liable for hosting that third-party content. Allowing online services to make good faith determinations about whether content meets the statutory definition will help limit the misuse of this bill to silence free speech. The potential remedy of “injunctive relief, including an order to remove or cease distribution of the realistic digital imitation,” does not appropriately limit any takedown obligation to a particular instance, and may be read to provide an ongoing “staydown” obligation, which would require expensive and invasive monitoring.

### **Liability should be limited to those who *intentionally* or *knowingly* violate an individual’s intellectual property rights.**

Any liability should be targeted to the individual(s) who committed intentionally or knowingly deceptive acts using a ‘digital imitation,’ rather than tying liability to a product or service that allowed the media to be generated or served as a means for the digital imitation to be shared. This division of responsibility would ensure that liability lies in the most appropriate place — with the actor most capable of mitigating harm and responsible for any harm that ensues. It will ensure that other expressive uses are protected while also holding bad actors accountable for the most high-risk, and likely most harmful, scenarios. As written, the bill may place intermediaries like AI model developers or system deployers in an untenable position, as they could be held liable if a user utilizes their tool to “display, present, or release” unauthorized content featuring another individual—even if done without the service provider’s knowledge or against their terms of service.

Digital services also do not know every nuance of every piece of content users post on their services. While HB 2137 has some narrow exemptions for certain uses protected by the First

Amendment, such as parody or news reporting, a service provider cannot generally determine if output will be used in an excluded manner or not, especially at the time of generation and without the context in which it is used. This will create a chilling effect, resulting in such tools not being made available at all to avoid liability for uses the operator could not possibly detect at the time of creation. Policymakers should hold accountable bad actors who maliciously exploit a person’s likeness without permission, ensuring that liability falls on them rather than intermediaries who lack knowledge or intent, especially when certain digital services may find it difficult or impossible to locate, let alone remove, such harmful content. The responsibility and liability for allegedly offending content should lie with the party that intentionally and knowingly posted the content.

Among other recommendations in the attached amendments, replacing “legally recognizable harm” with “causes a reputational injury, financial loss, emotional distress, or the misappropriation of identity for commercial gain” would help limit the actionable causes of harm to those that can be proven.

### **The private right of action would result in the proliferation of frivolous lawsuits and questionable claims, and exorbitant statutory damages.**

HB 2137 permits users to bring legal action against persons that have been accused of violating new regulations. The bill would enable not only statutory damages of \$50,000 per violation, but also actual damages, including for reputational injury and emotional distress; punitive damages, where malice is proven; and reasonable attorney’s fees and court costs. By creating a new private right of action, the measure would open the doors of Hawaii’s courthouses to plaintiffs advancing frivolous claims with little evidence of actual injury. As lawsuits prove extremely costly and time-intensive, it is foreseeable that these costs would be passed on to individuals in Hawaii, disproportionately impacting smaller businesses and startups across the state.<sup>3</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

CCIA acknowledges the significance of this policy issue and agrees that there is potential for misuse across various sectors. We welcome the opportunity to collaborate on refining the language of this proposal to further establish a framework that our members can adhere to while ensuring strong protections are in place.

Respectfully submitted,

Aodhan Downey  
State Policy Manager, West Region  
Computer & Communications Industry Association

On Behalf of:  
Robert Boykin, TechNet

---

<sup>3</sup> Trevor Wagener, *State Regulation of Content Moderation Would Create Enormous Legal Costs for Platforms*, Broadband Breakfast (Mar. 23, 2021), <https://broadbandbreakfast.com/trevor-wagener-state-regulation-of-content-moderation-would-create-enormous-legal-costs-for-platforms/>.

## PART I

SECTION 1. The legislature finds that deepfake technology enables the realistic digital imitation of an individual's voice, face, likeness, and performance. The legislature further finds that malicious uses of deepfake technology have been documented in identity theft, fraud, election interference, cyberbullying, and non-consensual pornography. Victims often face reputational, financial, and emotional harm, with detection rates for the use of deepfake imitations as low as sixty-two per cent even among experts.

The legislature additionally finds that federal law addresses limited scenarios of the malicious use of deepfake technology, including explicit content targeting minors, but leaves broad gaps in consumer and reputational protection. Furthermore, the legislature finds that the State has a compelling interest in preventing fraud, identity theft, defamation, and emotional distress while also protecting lawful speech. Moreover, the legislature finds that it is important to protect Hawaii residents from identity-based harm caused by the malicious use of artificial intelligence (AI) and synthetic media while safeguarding constitutional rights to free expression, parody, satire, and journalism.

Therefore, the purpose of this part is to:

- (1) Prohibit certain harmful uses of AI-generated likenesses; **and**
- (2) ~~Mandate disclosure for realistic AI depictions; and~~

(3) Provide civil remedies for individuals injured by unauthorized uses of AI.

SECTION 2. The Hawaii Revised Statutes is amended by adding a new chapter to be appropriately designated and to read as follows:

**"CHAPTER**  
**ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE; DIGITAL IMITATION; PERSONAL**  
**LIKENESS; PROTECTIONS**

§ -1 **Definitions.** As used in this chapter:

"Advertisement" means a message published in any medium ~~that aids, the primary purpose of which is to promote, or assists,~~ directly or indirectly, a product, service, or commercial transaction.

"Artificial intelligence" or "AI" means a machine based system that can, for a given set of human-defined objectives, make predictions, recommendations, or decisions influencing real or virtual environments, and that uses machine and human-based inputs to:

- (1) Perceive real and virtual environments;
- (2) Abstract perceptions of real and virtual environments into models through analysis in an automated manner; and
- (3) Use model inference to formulate opinions for information or action.

"Consent" means express, written permission from a depicted individual or the depicted individual's authorized representative.

"Digital imitation" means any highly realistic AI generated ~~or computer synthesized~~ depiction, audio, or video that ~~realistically appears to portray~~ is derived from or based upon identifying characteristics of an actual, particular individual and that portrays that individual's voice, face, likeness, or performance.

"Harm" includes reputational injury, financial loss, emotional distress, or the misappropriation of identity for commercial gain.

"Publish" means to display, present, or release to the public, or cause to be displayed, presented, or released to the public.

"Realistic" means so lifelike that a reasonable person would believe that ~~at the~~ depiction, audio, or video ~~that appears to portray~~ portraying an actual, particular individual's voice, face, or likeness, ~~or performance~~ and is authentic.

**§ -2 Prohibited acts.** It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly publish a realistic digital imitation of an identifiable individual ~~without~~ with the knowledge that ~~individual's~~ the individual did not consent if the imitation:

(1) Is used in connection with ~~a commercial transaction or an~~ advertisement;

~~(2) Causes legally cognizable harm; or~~

(2) Causes a reputational injury, financial loss, emotional distress, or the misappropriation of identity for commercial gain, as defined in section -1; or

(3) Is used to commit fraud, defamation, harassment, or other ~~unlawful~~criminal acts.

~~§ -3 Disclosure; requirement. (a) Any realistic digital imitation that is published without the depicted individual's consent shall include a clear and conspicuous disclosure that it is generated or altered by artificial intelligence, unless exempted by section -4.~~

~~(b) The disclosure required under subsection (a) shall be:~~

~~(1) Visible for video depictions or images;~~

~~(2) Audible for audio recordings; and~~

~~(3) Expressed in plain language, such as "This is an AI-generated depiction and not an authentic recording of [person]."~~

~~§ -4 § -3 Exemptions.~~ This chapter shall not apply to content generated or altered by artificial intelligence that is:

(1) A form of parody, satire, commentary, or political expression, ~~as permitted by law; provided that the content is not intended to deceive a reasonable person into believing that it is authentic;~~

(2) News reporting, where the content generated or altered by artificial intelligence is used to illustrate a story ~~and is clearly disclosed as altered or simulated; and;~~

(3) An artistic or educational use, ~~where; or~~

~~(4) Any other use protected by the content is clearly labeled and no harm is intended or reasonably foreseeable~~First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America or Article I, Section 4 of the Hawaii Constitution.

~~§ -5~~

**§ -4 Civil actions; civil remedies.** (a) If:

(1) A realistic digital imitation of an individual is published in violation of section -2 without the individual's consent; and

(2) The realistic digital imitation is not exempted under section ~~43~~,

the individual or the individual's estate, for up to ten years after the death of the individual, may bring an action for civil remedies pursuant to subsection (b); provided that nothing in this section shall be construed to extend the period of limitation under chapter 657 applicable to the action in this subsection. (b) In accordance with subsection (a), an individual or an individual's estate may bring a civil action for:

(1) Injunctive relief, including an order to remove or cease distribution of the realistic digital imitation;

~~(2)~~ (a) Monetary damages of up to \$~~5025~~,000 per ~~violation~~;

~~(3)~~ ~~advertisement~~; or (b) Recovery of actual damages, including for reputational injury and emotional distress;

~~(4)~~ Punitive damages, where malice is proven; and

~~(5)~~ Reasonable attorney's fees and court costs.

(c) A cause of action for injunctive or other equitable relief may be brought by the attorney general in instances in which the distribution of realistic digital imitations involves broad public interest or

widespread harm. This subsection shall not be construed to limit the right of an individual or individual's estate, if applicable, to bring a civil action pursuant to subsection (b).

(d) This section shall not limit or preclude the individual or individual's estate, if applicable, from pursuing any other available remedy. (e) This chapter shall apply to the fullest extent permitted by federal law~~."~~.

§ -5 Non-applicability of this chapter. (a) This chapter shall not apply to any medium used for the publication or dissemination of third-party content, including but not limited to newspapers, magazines, television networks and stations, streaming services, cable television systems, and transit advertisements, by whom any advertisement in violation of this chapter is published or disseminated; provided that this subsection shall only apply to activities of the medium in publishing or disseminating such third-party content, and shall not be construed to exempt the underlying conduct regulated by this chapter.

(b) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to limit or expand the protections conferred by title 47 United States Code section 230 on an interactive computer service for content provided by another information content provider."

PART II

SECTION 3. The Hawaii Revised Statutes is amended by adding a new chapter to be appropriately designated and to read as follows:

**"CHAPTER  
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE; SYNTHETIC PERFORMERS;  
ADVERTISING; DISCLOSURE**

**§ -1 Definitions.** ~~As used in this chapter:~~

As used in this chapter:

"Advertisement" means a message published in any medium the primary purpose of which is to promote, directly or indirectly, a product, service, or commercial transaction.

"Artificial intelligence" means a machine-based system that can, for a given set of human-defined objectives, make predictions, recommendations, or decisions influencing real or virtual environments, and that uses machine and human-based inputs to:

- ~~-(1)-Perceive real and virtual environments;~~
- ~~-(2)-Abstract perceptions of real and virtual environments into models through analysis in an automated manner; and~~

~~-(3)-~~Use model inference to formulate opinions for information or action.

"Artificial intelligence" includes but is not limited to systems that use machine learning, large language model, natural language processing, and computer vision technologies, including generative artificial intelligence.

~~-"~~Generative artificial intelligence" means a class of artificial intelligence models that are self supervised and emulate the structure and characteristics of input data to generate derived synthetic content, including but not limited to images, videos, audio, text, and other digital content.

~~—~~"Materially deceptive manner" means the presentation of a synthetic performer in an advertisement in a manner that:

(1) Deceptively presents the synthetic performer as a real person using their name or biographical details and recounting that person's own personal experience with a product or service; or

(2) Deceptively states that the synthetic performer holds a specific professional license, certification, degree, or institutional affiliation, including but not limited to stating that the synthetic performer is a licensed

physician, attorney, scientist, or financial advisor.

"Synthetic performer" means a highly-realistic digital asset created, reproduced, or modified by computer, using generative artificial intelligence or a software algorithm and that is intended to create the impression that the asset is engaging in an audiovisual or visual performance of a human performer who is not recognizable as any identifiable natural performer.

~~§§~~-2-Advertising.-Any person engaged in the business of dealing in any property or service who, for any commercial purpose, produces or creates an advertisement with respect to the property or service, in any medium or media in which the advertisement appears, shall conspicuously disclose in the advertisement that a synthetic performer is in the advertisement, where the person has actual knowledge that a synthetic performer is used in a materially deceptive manner in the advertisement.

~~§§~~-3-Non-applicability of this chapter.-(a)-This chapter shall not apply to ~~advertisements and promotional materials~~any medium used for expressive works~~the publication or dissemination of third-party content,~~ including but not limited to motion pictures, television programs, streaming content, documentaries, video games, or other similar audiovisual works; provided that the use of a synthetic performer in the advertisement or

promotional material is consistent with its use in the expressive work.

(b) ~~This chapter shall not apply to advertisements and promotional materials under any of the following conditions:~~

(1) ~~Audio advertisements; or~~

(2) ~~Where the use of artificial intelligence solely involves the language translation of a human performer.~~

(c) ~~This chapter shall not apply to any medium used for advertising the publication or dissemination of third party content, including but not limited to newspapers, magazines, television networks and stations, streaming services, cable television systems, and transit advertisements, by whom any advertisement in violation of this chapter is published or disseminated; provided that this subsection shall only apply to activities of the~~

medium in publishing or disseminating such third-party content, and shall not be construed to exempt the underlying advertising conduct regulated by this chapter.

(d) ~~Nothing~~ in this chapter shall be construed to limit or expand the protections conferred by title 47 United States Code section 230 on an interactive computer service for content provided by another information content provider.

~~§ 4~~ -4-Civil penalties.-The attorney general shall enforce and assess civil penalties against any person who violates this chapter as follows:

(1) ~~\$1,000~~ for a first violation; and

(2) ~~\$5,000~~ for a second or subsequent violation."

### ~~PART III~~

SECTION 4. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the invalidity does not affect other provisions or applications of the Act that can be given



effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Act are severable.

SECTION 5. This Act does not affect rights and duties that matured, penalties that were incurred, and proceedings that were begun before its effective date.

SECTION 6. This Act shall take effect on July 1, 3000.



March 22, 2026

Position: **SUPPORT** of **HB2137 HD3**, Relating to Artificial Intelligence

**To:** Senator Brandon J.C. Elefante, Chair  
Senator Rachele Lamosao, Vice Chair  
Members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Technology

**From:** Llasmin Chaîne, LSW, Executive Director, Hawaii State Commission on the Status of Women

**Re:** Testimony in **SUPPORT** of **HB2137 HD3**, Relating to Artificial Intelligence

Hearing: Monday, March 23, 2026, 3:01 p.m.  
Conference Room 225, State Capitol

The Hawaii State Commission on the Status of Women is committed to advancing the rights, safety, and dignity of women and girls across the state. The Commission **supports HB2137 HD3**, as it **addresses the growing risks posed by artificial intelligence-generated digital imitations, which can be used to harm, exploit, or misrepresent individuals, especially women, without their consent.**

The proliferation of AI technologies capable of creating highly realistic digital imitations raises significant concerns regarding privacy, consent, and the potential for reputational harm. Women and girls are disproportionately targeted by nonconsensual digital imitations, including deepfakes and synthetic media, which can lead to harassment, defamation, emotional distress, [sextortion](#), and assault. By prohibiting unauthorized uses of these technologies and mandating clear disclosure, **this bill provides critical safeguards, enabling and empowering individuals to seek remedies when their likeness is misused.**

**By establishing civil remedies for individuals harmed by unauthorized digital imitations, HB2137 HD3 provides an essential legal avenue for recourse**, which is especially important given the documented use of AI technologies to target and exploit women online. This aligns with best practices recommended by advocates for digital rights and gender equity, who emphasize the need for clear standards and accountability in the use of emerging technologies.

The Commission respectfully encourages ongoing review of these protections as AI technologies evolve, to ensure that the law remains effective in addressing new threats to privacy, dignity, safety, and well-being. We respectfully urge this Committee to **pass HB2137 HD3**. Thank you for this opportunity to submit testimony.

### **HB-2137-HD-3**

Submitted on: 3/20/2026 7:08:26 PM

Testimony for LBT on 3/23/2026 3:01:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
William Caron	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Chair, Vice Chair, and Members of the Committee,

I am writing in **strong support** of HB2137, a crucial and timely measure that addresses the rapidly evolving challenges posed by artificial intelligence. This bill establishes necessary protections for individuals whose likenesses can now be realistically replicated by AI, and it ensures transparency when synthetic performers are used in advertising.

#### **Why Is This Important?**

Artificial intelligence has advanced at a breathtaking pace, and with it comes the capacity to create "realistic digital imitations"—convincing depictions of real people doing or saying things they never actually did or said. While this technology may have some limited creative potential, it also opens the door to significant harm. Without clear legal protections, any individual—whether a public figure or a private citizen—could have their face, voice, or likeness used without consent in ways that cause reputational, emotional, or financial injury.

HB2137 addresses this gap head-on. Part I of the bill prohibits the most harmful uses of unauthorized AI-generated digital imitations, providing civil remedies for individuals who have been injured by such exploitative practices. It establishes that your likeness belongs to you, not to whoever has the most sophisticated AI software. The bill also includes important exemptions—such as for bona fide news reporting or public interest broadcasts—ensuring that the law targets harmful conduct without stifling legitimate speech or creativity.

Equally important is Part II, which requires disclosure when synthetic performers are used in advertising. Consumers have a right to know whether the person they see endorsing a product, delivering a message, or appearing in a commercial is real or AI-generated. This is not just about honesty; it is about preserving trust in the marketplace. When a viewer cannot tell whether a performer is human or synthetic, the line between reality and fabrication blurs, and the potential for deception grows. By requiring clear disclosure, HB2137 empowers consumers to make informed judgments about the media they consume.

#### **A Balanced Approach**

This bill is carefully constructed. It does not ban AI technology, nor does it stifle innovation. Instead, it sets basic, common-sense guardrails: you cannot use someone's likeness without their

permission in ways that cause harm, and you must be transparent when you use AI-generated performers in advertising. These are modest, reasonable requirements that bring AI into alignment with existing privacy and consumer protection principles.

Other states are already moving in this direction, recognizing that the law must evolve alongside technology. Hawai‘i has the opportunity to join them in getting ahead of this issue before harmful practices become entrenched. By passing HB2137, we send a clear message: in Hawai‘i, we value individual autonomy, consumer trust, and transparency over unchecked technological exploitation.

### **A Matter of Dignity and Transparency**

When a person's face or voice is used without their consent to create content they never agreed to, it is a violation of their fundamental dignity. When consumers are shown an advertisement featuring a synthetic performer with no disclosure, it is a violation of their right to know what—and who—they are seeing. HB2137 addresses both harms in a single, thoughtful piece of legislation.

I urge this committee to pass HB2137 and provide Hawai‘i residents with the protections they need and deserve in the age of AI.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.