

Sub-Indicator	Anthropic	DeepSeek	Google	Meta	OpenAI	x.AI	Zhipu AI
<i>EU AI Act</i>	No publicly available information found	No publicly available information found	Between 2022 and 2023, DeepMind lobbied EU institutions not to classify general-purpose AI and foundational models as "high-risk" technologies, a designation that would have triggered stricter safety obligations [Tranberg, 2023 ; TIME, 2023]. Google argued that the classification would hinder innovation, and regulations should attach further down the value chain [POLITICO, 2025 ; Data Ethics, 2023].	Between 2022 and 2023, Meta lobbied EU institutions to limit safety rules in the AI Act, opposing strict obligations for general-purpose models and seeking exemptions for open-source systems [Open Letter, 2023]. The company argued that strict obligations could hinder innovation and pushed for open-source models to be excluded from high-risk classification [Politico, 2025]. Chief AI Scientist Yann LeCun also criticized the EU’s approach as overly restrictive [X, 2023].	In 2023, OpenAI lobbied EU officials to weaken parts of the AI Act, arguing that foundation models like GPT-4 should not face strict obligations unless adapted for specific uses [TIME, 2023 ; The Verge, 2023]. The company also pushed to delay transparency requirements and limit liability for general-purpose models.	No publicly available information found	No publicly available information found
<i>Comprehensive US State-Level Regulation US</i>	California’s SB 1047 In 2024, Anthropic initially raised concerns about California’s SB 1047, influencing changes to the bill that softened key provisions [TechCrunch, 2024]. While the company opposed aspects of the original text, CEO Dario Amodei later expressed cautious support, stating in a letter to the governor that the bill’s “benefits likely outweigh its costs” [Sanity.io, 2024]. Anthropic’s involvement shaped the final version of the legislation [Vox, 2024].	No publicly available information found	California’s SB 1047 In 2024, Google DeepMind opposed California’s SB 1047, arguing that its safety rules would burden developers and stifle innovation. The company warned that requirements like pre-deployment evaluations and state oversight could fragment regulation and urged alignment with federal efforts instead [DocumentCloud, 2024 ; Carnegie Endowment, 2024]. Responsible AI Safety and Education (RAISE) Act In 2025, industry groups with ties to Google DeepMind—including Tech:NYC and the Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA)—opposed New York’s Responsible AI Safety and Education (RAISE) Act. They argued the legislation could conflict with federal policy and impose overly broad restrictions on AI development [Gothamist, 2025]. Both groups urged Governor Hochul to veto the bill, warning it could hamper innovation and create regulatory fragmentation [CCIA, 2025].	California’s SB 1047 In 2024, Meta lobbied against California’s SB 1047, arguing that its AI safety requirements—especially pre-deployment risk assessments and licensing—were overly broad and could hinder innovation [DocumentCloud, 2024 ; TechCrunch, 2024]. Alongside other tech firms, Meta urged lawmakers to adopt more flexible, federally aligned policies [Carnegie Endowment, 2024]. Responsible AI Safety and Education (RAISE) Act In 2025, Meta opposed New York’s Responsible AI Safety and Education (RAISE) Act through multiple affiliated groups. Tech:NYC, a trade group co-founded by Meta, warned the bill could restrict innovation and conflict with federal policy [Gothamist, 2025]. The AI Alliance also sent a letter to state leaders opposing the bill’s scope and regulatory approach [AI Alliance, 2025]. The Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA), whose members include Meta, urged Governor Hochul to veto the legislation [CCIA, 2025].	California’s SB 1047 In 2024, OpenAI opposed California’s SB 1047, arguing that its safety requirements—such as third-party evaluations and incident reporting—would hinder innovation and disadvantage U.S. firms [DocumentCloud, 2024 ; Carnegie Endowment, 2024]. The company also argued that the bill could raise national security risks by driving advanced research abroad [The Verge, 2024 ; Financial Times, 2024].	California’s SB 1047 In 2024, xAI CEO Elon Musk publicly supported the bill in an X post, stating: "This is a tough call and will make some people upset, but, all things considered, I think California should probably pass the SB 1047 AI safety bill. For over 20 years, I have been an advocate for AI regulation, just as we regulate any product/technology that is a potential risk to the public.” [Tech Crunch, 2024].	No publicly available information found
<i>Preemption of state-level AI legislation</i>	In 2025, Anthropic opposed federal efforts to preempt state-level AI laws. CEO Dario Amodei argued that states should retain authority to set transparency and safety standards, warning that federal preemption could weaken oversight [New York Times, 2025]. The company also lobbied against the Trump-backed “Big Beautiful Bill,” which aimed to override state AI regulation [WinBuzzer, 2025 ; Semafor, 2025].	No publicly available information found	In 2025, Google DeepMind supported federal preemption of state AI laws, urging a unified national framework to avoid regulatory fragmentation. In its response to the U.S. AI Action Plan, it called for federal leadership over issues like copyright, export controls, and development standards, warning that state-level rules could hinder innovation [Google Policy Response, 2025 ; TechCrunch, 2025].	In 2025, Meta supported federal preemption of state-level AI regulations, warning that fragmented laws could create compliance challenges and hinder innovation across jurisdictions [Meta, 2025]. The company’s position aligned with broader industry efforts to shift AI governance to the federal level, drawing criticism from digital rights groups who argued this would weaken stronger state protections [X, 2025].	In 2025, OpenAI supported federal preemption of state-level AI laws, arguing that a unified national framework would better promote innovation and avoid regulatory fragmentation [OpenAI, 2025]. The company expressed concern that inconsistent state regulations could impose conflicting requirements and slow progress in the field [Bloomberg Law, 2025 ; Masood, 2025].	No publicly available information found	No publicly available information found