SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

"Winning the AI Race: Strengthening U.S. Capabilities in Computing and Innovation"

May 8, 2025 – 10:00 AM

OVERVIEW

On Thursday, May 8, the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee held a hearing titled, "Winning the AI Race: Strengthening U.S. Capabilities in Computing and Innovation." During the hearing, Senators and witnesses discussed export controls and adversarial AI; U.S. competitiveness; infrastructure, data centers, and energy production; regulatory standards; data privacy and security; deepfakes and misinformation; copyright protections; the AI workforce; and wireless connectivity.

OPENING STATEMENTS

- Chairman Ted Cruz (R-TX)
- Ranking Member Maria Cantwell (D-WA)

NOMINEE

- Mr. Sam Altman – Co-Founder and Chief Executive Officer, OpenAI
- Dr. Lisa Su – Chief Executive Officer and Chair, Advanced Micro Devices (AMD)
- Mr. Michael Intrator – Co-Founder and Chief Executive Officer, CoreWeave
- Mr. Brad Smith – Vice Chair and President, Microsoft Corporation

QUESTION AND ANSWER SUMMARY

Export Controls and Adversarial AI

Ranking Member Cantwell argued cloud sources should not be excluded from export controls. She asked how to better monitor exports of U.S. products to ensure there is no diversion to China through other countries, allowing broad access to American industries without threatening national security. Mr. Intrator argued the world wants to broadly build and deploy AI technologies, and if U.S. products are closely restricted, other countries will step into that vacuum. Ranking Member Cantwell advocated for the creation of global export standards driven by the five most sophisticated democracies and tech-forward nations, asserting this approach will give the U.S. more leverage on the international stage. She raised concerns President Trump's tariff agenda is creating more foreign adversaries, rather than enabling a stronger domestic supply chain. Mr. Intrator agreed this type of structure for global standards could be beneficial. Dr. Su argued there is "clear recognition" the U.S. needs an export strategy. She advocated for an approach that provides access to American technology to allies with the appropriate controls in place.

Sen. Andy Kim (D-NJ) asked how the federal government can help accelerate expanded adoption of U.S. technologies globally. Mr. Smith stressed the importance of crafting effective export controls, including reforms to the AI Diffusion Rule (AIDR). He advocated for national security controls that ensure chips are not diverted to China or accessed by the wrong users, but opposed rules like the quantitative caps created for tier two countries, which he argued "sent a message to 120 countries that they could not count on the U.S. to provide the AI they need."

Sen. Jacky Rosen (D-NV) asked how the U.S. should approach AI models developed by adversarial countries like China, and if the U.S. should be concerned about adversaries co-opting AI to promote a particular ideology or collect sensitive American data. Mr. Smith argued the DeepSeek example illustrates this issue well. He explained Microsoft does not allow its employees to use the DeepSeek app, in light of concerns about data security and Chinese propaganda. He noted, however, the DeepSeek model is open-source, allowing developers to analyze the code and remove harmful side effects.

Sen. Dan Sullivan (R-AK) raised concerns about investments by American companies in Chinese AI, which could help make China's military more lethal. He asked about the scope of this problem. Mr. Smith argued lawmakers are right to question where this capital is going, and stressed the importance of advancing efforts to attract talent and investment in the U.S., rather than foreign adversaries.

Chairman Cruz commended reports that President Trump plans to rescind the AI Diffusion Rule, which he argued is overly complex and places unfair restrictions on U.S. trading partners. He recognized, however, rescinding the rule does not mean there should be no restrictions on U.S. AI exports. Chairman Cruz noted Nvidia has argued that American chips should be accessible everywhere, while others favor an approach restricting at least the most advanced processors. He asked what rules should replace the AIDR. Mr. Altman supported recission of the AIDR, but agreed there should be some constraints. He argued the U.S. should be winning diffusion rather than stopping it with the appropriate guardrails, asserting global influence comes from the widespread adoption of U.S. products across the tech stack. Dr. Su agreed export controls are necessary to protect national security, but also supported recission of the rule. She advocated for a more simplified approach to drive adoption of U.S. products. Mr. Intrator echoed Dr. Su and Mr. Altman's perspectives, emphasizing the importance of incorporating the industry's views when crafting new export controls. Mr. Smith recommended eliminating the tier two quantitative restrictions, and enabling the export of advanced GPUs to data centers run by trusted providers. He stressed the importance of both physical and cybersecurity standards for trusted providers, as well as protections against the diversion of chips to prohibited users like the Chinese military.

U.S. Competitiveness

Chairman Cruz asked about the state of U.S. competitiveness with China, and how the U.S. can win the AI race. Mr. Altman argued American models are the best in the world, but asserted sensible regulation that does not slow innovation and investments in domestic AI infrastructure are necessary to maintain this lead. Dr. Su agreed American AI is leading, and emphasized the importance of consistent government policies to support innovation. Mr. Intrator spoke to the United States' physical infrastructure needs, noting while the U.S. is ahead in AI, the ability to build the large-scale infrastructure and power sources needed to meet computing demands will be a challenge, particularly from a permitting perspective. Mr. Smith argued while the U.S. is ahead, the race will likely remain very close. He asserted the primary factor determining continued leadership is whose technology is most widely adopted. He advocated for carefully crafted controls, alongside efforts to win global trust.

Sen. Tim Sheehy (R-MT) asked how to incentivize companies to invest in the U.S. Mr. Altman highlighted the launch of Project Stargate in January, investing $500 billion in domestic AI infrastructure. He advocated for continued investments in this type of infrastructure, more certainty across the AI supply chain to onshore production, legal clarity on AI guardrails, and investments in the AI workforce. Dr. Su argued more compute must be built in the U.S. by American companies. She also highlighted the need for simplified export controls to encourage greater adoption of AI technologies.

Sen. Ted Budd (R-NC) raised concerns that accessible Chinese models such as DeepSeek might be an attractive option for AI developers to build upon, and asked about the importance of U.S. leadership in both open-source and closed AI models. Mr. Altman agreed the U.S. must lead in both. He noted OpenAI plans to release an open-source model later this year, which will allow people to build on the U.S. AI stack.

Sen. Kim asked if the AI race is about expanding adoption of U.S. tech by other countries, or if competitiveness should be measured more by consumer adoption. Mr. Altman argued the issue is heavily interrelated. He explained the U.S. should want the whole world on the American tech stack, from the chip all the way to the end consumer product. Sen. Kim asked about the competitiveness of U.S. AI related to consumer applications, beyond the overarching models. Mr. Altman argued ChatGPT is the most adopted AI service in the world by a significant margin. He added there are many other U.S. companies building successful products and services seeing global adoption.

Sen. Eric Schmitt (R-MO) noted the AI stack is becoming more vertically integrated, and asked if this may increase the United States' advantage, or if it may allow China to catch up faster. Mr. Altman argued ensuring the U.S. wins on products is essential, in addition to leadership in the tech components and infrastructure, highlighting the value of the positive feedback loops created as consumers use products, ultimately allowing companies to improve them and maintain competitiveness.

Sen. Tammy Duckworth (D-IL) emphasized the value of the U.S. National Labs, and raised concerns about reports the Trump Administration may cut funding for these initiatives. She asked about the importance of the National Lab system in maintaining U.S. competitiveness in research. Mr. Altman argued AI will likely have a significant impact on continued scientific discovery, highlighting OpenAI's ongoing partnership with the National Labs on the intersection of AI and scientific advancement. Mr. Smith asserted the National Labs are the fabric of much of the scientific discovery in the U.S. and should not be taken for granted. Dr. Su also expressed strong support for the National Labs.

Sen. Lisa Blunt Rochester (D-DE) asked what specific policies for tech supply chains would help U.S. companies compete on the international stage. Dr. Su commended efforts to bring manufacturing back to the United States. She advocated for expanding these efforts to include all aspects of the supply chain from end to end, including advanced wafers, packaging, and system testing. Sen. Blunt Rochester questioned whether the interdependence between AI stack sections creates vulnerabilities in the AI supply chain. Mr. Smith argued this creates more opportunities than vulnerabilities, as it allows companies to collaborate and build a more integrated supply chain.

Sen. Sullivan asked what the industry needs from the federal government to enable global leadership in the AI space. Mr. Altman reiterated the importance of continued investments in domestic infrastructure, supply chain stability, re-shoring semiconductor manufacturing, more legal certainty in companies' ability to train their models, and workforce development to ensure the U.S. has the necessary talent pipeline.

Chairman Cruz asked about the significance of the DeepSeek model to the broader tech industry. Mr. Altman argued it was "not a huge deal." He explained DeepSeek made a good open-source model and a consumer app, competing with ChatGPT as the most downloaded AI tool, but argued there will be many good open-source models on the market as the industry evolves. Mr. Intrator explained DeepSeek raised the profile of China's AI capabilities to a broader audience, which then reverberated through the financial markets. Mr. Smith noted the DeepSeek model itself was not shocking, but recognized the small size of the company and the young demographic of its workforce was surprising.

AI Infrastructure, Data Centers, and Energy Production

Sen. Bernie Moreno (R-OH) noted there seems to be widespread agreement that the U.S. needs "dramatically more" power generation. He asked if the semiconductor fabs under development by AMD and TSMC are high energy users. Dr. Su agreed the manufacturing plants are high energy users and stressed the need for more power for both manufacturing and data centers.

Sen. Moreno asked if the AMD fabs are powered by solar power and windmills. Dr. Su explained they are not currently powered by solar or wind, but noted there are opportunities to do so moving forward. Sen. Moreno raised concerns 90 percent of new power generation in the U.S. last year was driven by windmills and solar panels, due to previous Biden Administration policies. He asserted this "absolutely knee-capped American energy," noting there are "a thousand years of natural gas sitting in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia." He questioned whether this makes the U.S. more or less competitive. Mr. Smith agreed the U.S. needs more electricity. He explained today, 56 percent of the U.S. electricity source comes from carbon and 44 percent from carbon-free energy – nuclear, wind, solar – and asserted a broad approach with a diversity of sources is critical. Sen. Moreno reiterated concerns about relying primarily on solar and wind, which he argued is not, "abundant, affordable, or reliable."

Sen. Budd argued the United States' ability to deploy new energy generation capacity and update its grid is key to the race against China. He raised concerns permitting in the U.S. takes too long, while China's command and control system ensures it will not fail to deploy the energy needed to achieve the scale necessary to develop advanced models. He noted he is working with Sen. Cynthia Lummis (R-WY) on the Full Responsibility and Expedited Enforcement (FREE) Act (S.238), which would establish a permit-by-rule system and streamline the permitting process. He asked about CoreWeave's experience in contracting power, and if the U.S. permitting system makes it harder to achieve capital investment at the scale needed to win the AI race. Mr. Intrator agreed access to power at scale is key to winning the race. He argued the size and magnitude of the infrastructure required to advance U.S. AI at the speed necessary will be an increasing challenge. He raised concerns the existing infrastructure will be rapidly consumed, and once it is consumed, the industry must figure out how to get power online immediately, which will be difficult within the existing regulatory environment.

Sen. Budd asked how Microsoft is planning to power its data centers, and what federal policy should focus on to support broader energy needs. Mr. Smith explained Microsoft helps bring more electricity generation onto the grid, then brings it through the grid to its data centers. He identified the primary permitting challenge in the U.S. as the federal wetlands permit administered through the Army Corps of Engineers, which typically takes 18 to 24 months, and argued solving this issue could significantly accelerate U.S. innovation.

Sen. Budd asked how federal policy could encourage increased AI development in the U.S. Mr. Altman noted Sen. Budd touched on an important point with energy. He argued the cost of AI will converge to the cost of energy, and the abundance of AI will be limited by the abundance of energy. As the U.S. evaluates what long-term strategic investments to make, he asserted energy must be a top priority, alongside broader domestic chips production.

Sen. John Hickenlooper (D-CO) asked about the next frontier of chip technology related to energy efficiency, including how the U.S. can improve direct-to-chip (DTC) cooling for high-performance computing. Dr. Su argued there is a tremendous amount of innovation happening in the chips ecosystem, in part driven by the CHIPS Act. She noted AMD is using AI to help accelerate the development of faster, more energy-efficient chips. She added there are many new technologies, including cooling technologies, to help build more large-scale systems.

Sen. John Curtis (R-UT) asked what makes states attractive for AI projects like Stargate. Mr. Altman explained power, cooling, fast permitting processes, and labor are all key factors for states to attract investments.

Sen. Curtis noted energy demand remains a challenge in the U.S. and asked how policymakers can protect ratepayers. Mr. Altman advocated for more supply and power generation. He argued energy is critical to both AI and quality of life for consumers more broadly, and stressed the need to make energy cheaper. In the short term, he recommended using more natural gas, alongside applications in solar. He also cited advanced nuclear fusion as an opportunity in the longer term.

Sen. Curtis asked about Microsoft and other tech leaders' roles in energy generation. Mr. Smith argued the tech industry has a "tremendous responsibility" to help contribute to the solution. He highlighted Microsoft's recent work in Wisconsin, noting the company's new site quickly became the largest industrial user of electricity in the state. He explained Microsoft worked with the local utility to expand their electricity generation and deliver it through the grid to the data center; to do so, Microsoft went to the Public Utilities Commission and proposed a rate increase on the company, recognizing the importance that Microsoft pay for the improvement to the grid, rather than the local community.

Sen. Ben Ray Luján (D-NM) argued data centers place a strain on local energy and water resources, but "do not necessarily introduce any long-term jobs or community benefits." He asked what initiatives Microsoft and CoreWeave have in place to reduce water use when building a new data center. Mr. Smith argued this issue is a top priority for Microsoft, especially in data centers in the southwestern U.S. where water is in short supply. He explained Microsoft data centers currently run on liquid cooling with a closed-loop system – once it starts running, the water is almost entirely recycled. Mr. Smith also highlighted Microsoft's commitment to water replenishment, noting the company aims to be completely water-positive, currently running more than 90 water replenishment projects. Mr. Intrator argued the ability to extract more computational power out of any megawatt is of "paramount importance" to CoreWeave. He explained the company spends an enormous amount of time integrating leading-edge tech, which is increasingly more efficient in terms of computational output than legacy technologies. He noted moving to liquid cooling has been an incredible improvement in efficiency.

Sen. Cynthia Lummis (R-WY) asked how the U.S. permitting process has impacted Microsoft and CoreWeave's ability to rapidly deploy AI infrastructure. Mr. Intrator argued discussions around permitting are "excruciating," making it extremely difficult to rapidly deploy the large-scale infrastructure projects necessary to power AI.

Sen. Lummis raised concerns about the instability between administrations on natural gas policy, which could impact the development of data center projects. Mr. Smith agreed consistency in this space is needed. Sen. Lummis asked if Microsoft is exploring the use of small modular nuclear power. Mr. Smith responded affirmatively.

Sen. Rosen noted last Congress, her bipartisan Federal Data Center Enhancement Act was signed into law, which established cybersecurity and resiliency standards for federal data centers. She asked how the U.S. can make chips cooler and data centers more secure, and expand interoperability. Dr. Su explained AMD is focused on making its chips more efficient every year, alongside improved chips security.

Sen. Sullivan argued one of the United States' greatest advantages against China is energy. He noted Alaska has a very large LNG project that should be off the ground shortly, providing a hundred years of natural gas. He asked about the United States' comparative advantage in energy. Mr. Smith agreed the U.S. has massive energy resources, but cautioned against underestimating China's ability to rapidly build electrical power plants. He asserted the top comparative advantage of the U.S. is bringing the best talent to the country and providing access to venture capital.

Sen. Ed Markey (D-MA) raised concerns about the environmental impact of data centers. He asked if the federal government should conduct a comprehensive study on this issue. Mr. Smith agreed, and suggested updating the study periodically. Mr. Altman also agreed, and noted AI could be used to help in this effort. Sen. Markey highlighted his Artificial Intelligence Environmental Impacts Act of 2024, and raised concerns the Trump Administration seeks to reverse Biden-era regulations on clean energy sources.

Sen. John Fetterman (D-PA) highlighted his interest in a variety of energy sources – renewables, fossils, and nuclear – as well as ensuring ratepayers are not significantly impacted by increased energy demands by data centers. Mr. Smith agreed this issue is critical, noting Microsoft is committed to contributing to the amount of energy available on the grid and preventing rate increases for consumers.

Regulatory Standards

Ranking Member Cantwell asked if the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) should develop standards for AI. Mr. Smith, Dr. Su, and Mr. Intrator responded affirmatively. Mr. Altman agreed standards could be helpful, but argued they may not be necessary. Ranking Member Cantwell questioned whether NIST standards could accelerate U.S. innovation. Mr. Smith agreed the AI sector will need standards, and recognized efforts by the federal government are necessary to ensure widespread adoption of American-led standards. Mr. Intrator explained standards can help drive the adoption of a common vocabulary among developers, which may enable acceleration.

Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-MN) asked about the merits of a risk-based approach to AI regulation, placing guardrails on the technology without stifling innovation. Mr. Altman agreed this strategy "makes a lot of sense." Sen. Klobuchar raised concerns AI hallucinations are becoming more prevalent and asked what standards OpenAI uses to evaluate the quality of its training data and model outputs for accuracy. Mr. Altman argued while OpenAI has not solved the problem entirely, AI hallucinations are beginning to improve. He added consumers' understanding of how to best use AI tools is also improving, recognizing these systems may not be accurate 100 percent of the time.

Chairman Cruz raised concerns standards are often "code for regulations," and argued the EU's approach has "killed tech in Europe." He asked how mirroring the EU's strategy of a more "heavy-handed" regulatory strategy could impact AI innovation in the United States. Mr. Altman argued this would be "disastrous." He explained compute, infrastructure, and algorithms are the three key inputs to AI systems, and strict regulations on these inputs that are not competitive with the rest of the world, such as rules governing what data models can be trained on or rules restricting the construction of new infrastructure, will hinder U.S. leadership. Mr. Altman argued the industry is moving quickly to identify best practices for AI development, and cautioned lawmakers against setting mandatory standards too early. Mr. Smith agreed, stressing the need to avoid any prescriptive preapproval requirements. Mr. Intrator added a patchwork of regulatory overlays would also cause friction in the industry's innovative capacity.

Sen. Brian Schatz (D-HI) questioned whether self-regulation is sufficient in the AI space. Mr. Altman argued some policy would be beneficial, but cautioned against going too far. Sen. Schatz asked if a labeling or disclosure regime would be helpful for consumers. Mr. Smtih agreed, noting the industry has been working to develop labeling mechanisms for AI-generated content.

Sen. Schmitt asked what the U.S. can learn from the AI regulatory environment in Europe. Mr. Altman raised concerns about the long process in the EU before a new product can be released. He asserted there can be great models and services that are safe and robust, but unable to be used in certain regulatory regimes, which ultimately hurts companies' competitiveness. Sen. Schmitt also raised concerns about the "censorship regime" coming out of Europe, including the policing of misinformation. He added NIST's most recent voluntary standards highlighted the risks of misinformation, and questioned how to prevent the expansion of censorship in the U.S. Mr. Intrator raised concerns about the "balkanization" of the flow of information with the European approach. He noted, however, CoreWeave is primarily focused on the investment side of the AI industry, rather than the content level. Mr. Altman advocated for an approach that gives adult users the freedom to use AI how they wish, while still maintaining guardrails in wide bounds.

Sen. Hickenlooper asked about Microsoft's internal processes to evaluate the accuracy and performance of its copilot models before release. Mr. Smith noted the copilot models are developed by OpenAI, which conducts its own internal processes before OpenAI and Microsoft's joint deployment safety board (DSB) evaluates the models. Following DSB evaluation, Mr. Smith explained Microsoft's applications team also has an internal deployment safety process, utilizing a variety of engineering tools and red team testing. Sen. Hickenlooper emphasized the value of evidence-based technical standards and asked if independent evaluations conducted on a voluntary basis could help validate the testing performed internally by Microsoft, OpenAI, and other AI companies. Mr. Altman agreed testing is extremely important, including external red teams.

Sen. Todd Young (R-IN) questioned whether a failure to develop American-led standards for AI would prompt other nations to adopt their own standards without consulting the U.S. Mr. Smith agreed. He highlighted a similar pattern with privacy regulations, noting while the U.S. did not adopt a national privacy law, many U.S. companies comply with European standards for the sake of efficiency. He asserted the U.S. must participate in these discussions internationally to influence the rest of the world on this issue. As policymakers consider these standards, Mr. Smith also recommended ensuring they create a basis for reciprocity and interoperability.

Sen. Luján asked why federal investments in foundational research and standards bodies are crucial for the tech sector. Mr. Altman argued standards can help increase the rate of innovation, but emphasized the need to let the industry identify those standards first.

Sen. Lummis noted over the last year, several states have begun to consider their own AI frameworks. She asked how a patchwork of regulatory standards could impact U.S. competitiveness. Mr. Altman stressed the need to prevent this patchwork from developing, asserting it would slow down innovation in AI. He advocated for a light-touch framework that allows the industry to accelerate innovation.

Sen. Gary Peters (D-MI) asked about the benefits of open standards and system interoperability at the hardware level, and the potential national security and innovative implications of open source. Dr. Su argued there are a tremendous amount of advantages to an open system, noting collaboration across the ecosystem will help identify the best solution at every level. She also highlighted the value of open standards from a security standpoint, ensuring there are many different choices of products and services, rather than dependence on a single ecosystem.

Chairman Cruz asked if federal regulations should preempt state AI frameworks to create an even playing field for AI developers. Mr. Altman agreed one federal, light-touch approach would be beneficial. Mr. Smith also agreed, and stressed the importance of giving the federal government the ability to lead in this space, particularly related to product safety.

Data Privacy and Security

Sen. Jerry Moran (R-KS) asked how to give consumers more control over the data used by AI companies while still preserving the utility of AI systems. Mr. Altman argued consumers are beginning to share more information with AI systems than ever before, noting the maximum utility of AI systems is reached when the model can get more personalized to each user. He explained while this is a wonderful tool for users, it also presents new privacy challenges.

Sen. Moran noted while AI can be used to launch more effective cyber-attacks, it can also increase detection and response capabilities. He asked what Congress should consider related to AI as it decides what resources to allocate for cybersecurity. Mr. Smith asserted the U.S. must remain at the forefront of cybersecurity capabilities, ensuring the federal government is well-funded in this space.

Deepfakes and Misinformation

Sen. Klobuchar asked how developers can build AI models capable of detecting harmful deepfakes. Mr. Smith explained there are two goals in this space: first, identifying content that is generated by AI, and second, identifying whether that content is harmful. He argued the industry has made “great strides” in its ability to do both. Mr. Smith also highlighted work between the private sector and organizations like the National Center of Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) to identify and remove harmful content.

Sen. Rosen raised concerns about reports of major generative AI models perpetuating antisemitic stereotypes and conspiracy theories. She asked what steps the AI industry is taking to ensure models do not perpetuate this type of content. Ms. Altman explained OpenAI collaborates with civil society on this issue. He emphasized the importance of ensuring users have the freedom to use models as they wish, while also preventing damage to society and discrimination against certain groups.

Sen. Markey raised concerns AI is “supercharging” bias and discrimination, particularly in systems deployed to evaluate mortgage applications, job applications, and insurance claims. Mr. Altman and Mr. Smith agreed AI companies should work to prevent discriminatory outcomes.

Sen. Klobuchar asked how to protect people from having their likeness replicated with AI without consent, raising concerns about the harms caused by unauthorized deepfakes. Mr. Smith noted this became a growing area of concern during the last presidential election, and highlighted Microsoft’s work with campaigns from both political parties to address the issue. He emphasized the importance of building capabilities to identify when content is AI-generated, noting AI is often more effective at spotting it than the human eye, especially as deepfakes become more sophisticated. Mr. Smith added some voluntary guardrails could also be helpful, as well as legislation clarifying particularly harmful uses that should be unlawful. Mr. Altman argued it will likely be impossible to prevent the generation of deepfakes, but highlighted opportunities to implement some guardrails. He also stressed the importance of the consumer education side of this conversation, ensuring users are equipped to spot fake content and scams.

Copyright Protections

Sen. Klobuchar asked about the evolving dynamics between AI developers and content creators, and the importance of ensuring creators are properly paid for their work. Mr. Smith stressed the importance of ensuring newspapers flourish, especially in rural communities. He advocated for increased opportunities for newspapers to negotiate collectively, including related to the copyright debate with AI model training. He argued lawmakers must strike the right balance between enabling AI innovation, while also ensuring content creators can make a living in their fields.

Sen. Schatz asked how to balance innovation in AI models while also paying original creators for their inputs. Mr. Smith asserted intellectual property and the creation of it should be rewarded. He stressed the need to draw the line between copyright protection and fair use.

AI Workforce

Sen. Kim asked about AI talent development in the U.S. Dr. Su argued while the country has a great base of talent, more personnel is needed, including software and hardware developers. She added this includes both domestic and international talent, emphasizing the value of high-skilled immigration.

Sen. Peters asked how the tech industry can help mitigate job loss caused by expanded deployment of AI systems. Mr. Altman recognized while technological revolutions have always impacted jobs and the economy, the speed at which AI is developing and expanding is unique. He emphasized the importance of improving AI literacy as soon as possible to ensure people can adapt, smoothening the transition.

Wireless Connectivity

Sen. Moran raised concerns rural communities often lack access to high-speed broadband, which may impact their ability to engage with new AI technologies. He asked how the federal government can support the development and availability of AI systems that do not rely on constant connectivity. Mr. Altman highlighted opportunities to offload a significant amount of the processing to the cloud, supporting AI use in regions with lower connectivity. He also advocated for efforts to invest in expanded connectivity more broadly.

--
Please click here for the archived hearing.