

Anthropic	Update California SB 53 SB 53 provides "a blueprint for evidence-generating transparency measures" for governing frontier AI systems. [Carnegie Endowment, 2025] Anthropic publicly endorsed SB 53, calling it a “trust-but-verify” approach that strengthens accountability for frontier AI systems and sets a strong baseline for transparency. The company emphasized that while it still prefers a federal framework, California’s action is necessary given the rapid development of advanced models [Anthropic, 2025; TechCrunch, 2025] Preemption of state-level AI legislation In its endorsement announcement for California SB 53, it stated that "frontier AI safety is best addressed at the federal level instead of a patchwork of state regulations," deviating from its previous stance on state-oriented AI safety approach.	Recap from Summer 2025 EU AI Act N/A US Legislations California SB 1047 Anthropic raised initial concerns about key provisions, but the CEO later expressed cautious support, acknowledging that the benefits of the bill likely outweigh its costs. It also actively shape the final version of the legislation. New York Raise Act N/A Preemption of state-level AI legislation 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.
	Update California SB 53 No public stance Preemption of state-level AI legislation In OpenAI’s letter to Governor Newsom on harmonized regulation, the company urges California to “harmonize” with federal and global frameworks instead of layering its own additional requirements. OpenAI argues that “a patchwork of state rules... could slow innovation without improving safety,” urging California instead to align with “federal and global safety guidelines” to “avoid duplication and inconsistencies between state requirements and the safety frameworks already being advanced by the US government and our democratic allies.”	Recap from Summer 2025 EU AI Act In 2023, OpenAI lobbied EU officials to weaken parts of the AI Act, arguing that foundation models such as GPT-4 should not face strict obligations unless adapted for specific uses. US Legislations California 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 New York Raise Act N/A Preemption of state-level AI legislation 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.
Google DeepMind	Update California SB 53 Industry group TechNet that represents Google opposed SB 53, arguing that the bill’s scope is too broad and that the disclosure and reporting requirements could expose trade secrets or magnify security vulnerabilities. [Citizen Portal, 2025] [San Francisco Standard, 2025]	Recap from Summer 2025 EU AI Act Google DeepMind opposed classifying general-purpose and foundational models as “high-risk,” arguing this would stifle innovation and that regulation should target downstream applications. US Legislations California SB 1047 Google DeepMind opposed California’s SB 1047, arguing that its safety rules would burden developers and stifle innovation and state oversight can fragment regulation. New York Raise Act Industry group with ties to Google opposed RAISE Act, arguing that the legislation could conflict with federal policy and impose overly broad restrictions on AI development. Preemption of state-level AI legislation In its response to the U.S. AI Action Plan in 2025, it called for federal leadership over issues like copyright, export controls, and development standards, warning that state-level rules could hinder innovation
Meta	Update California SB 53 No public stance	Recap from Summer 2025 EU AI Act 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. US Legislations California 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 New York Raise Act In 2025, Meta opposed RAISE Act through multiple affiliated groups, including Tech:NYC, the AI Alliance, and the Computer & Communications Industry Association. Preemption of state-level AI legislation In 2025, Meta advocated for federal preemption of state-level AI regulations, warning that fragmented laws could create compliance challenges and hinder innovation across jurisdictions
xAI	Update California SB 53 No public stance	Recap from Summer 2025 EU AI Act No public stance US Legislations In 2024, xAI CEO Elon Musk publicly supported the bill in an X post. New York Raise Act No public stance Preemption of state-level AI legislation No public stance.
DeepSeek	DeepSeek is among the entities that have drafted the Cybersecurity technology—Basic security requirements for generative artificial intelligence service , which is a voluntary national standard that focuses on safety requirements including corpus safety, model safety, and safety assessment, although it doesn't mention frontier AI risks. [National Service Platform for Standards Information]	
Z.ai		
Alibaba Cloud	Alibaba is among the entities that have drafted the Cybersecurity technology—Labeling method for content generated by artificial intelligence , which is the only binding national standard that requires generative AI services to label AI-generated content both in implicit and explicit ways. [National Public Service Platform for Standards Information]	