Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

IN FOCUS

Competition and Antitrust Concerns Related to Generative AI

Updated November 17, 2026

Artificial intelligence (AI) technologies used to generate synthetic content, such as text, images, audio, video, and computer code, are broadly referred to as *generative AI* (GenAI). One type of GenAI is a large language model (LLM), which can generate responses to prompts in natural language format once it has been trained on a massive amount of text (e.g., text from millions of web pages) and defined by billions of model parameters.

Developing and operating a large-scale GenAI model may require significant computing resources, such as hardware, software, and other information technology (IT) infrastructure, which can be costly. Some antitrust enforcers have raised concern about who may be able to develop such models, whether companies with substantial resources may have a competitive advantage, and whether some companies that own IT infrastructure might be engaging in anticompetitive conduct. Some stakeholders have argued that competition is thriving in each component of GenAI development.

Some U.S. companies—including Amazon, Google, Meta, and Microsoft—own IT infrastructure used to train and deploy GenAI models and have invested billions of dollars in the development of their own models and in companies developing competing models. Some companies and researchers are exploring methods to reduce computing resources and energy needed to develop AI models. Some Members of Congress have considered whether congressional action could help promote competition to ensure America's global leadership in the development of GenAI.

This In Focus discusses some potential concerns about competition in the development of GenAI in U.S. markets and potential issues raised by antitrust enforcers. It also provides some considerations for Congress.

Development of GenAI Models

Although the terminology of AI is still evolving, an *AI model* generally refers to a computer program that uses algorithms and mathematical functions to process inputs (e.g., data and prompts) into outputs (e.g., predictions and decisions). The AI model is trained on sample datasets to recognize certain types of patterns and "learn" from the data, optimizing its performance over time to create outputs such as text that mimics human language. For an overview of GenAI models, see CRS In Focus IF12426, *Generative Artificial Intelligence: Overview, Issues, and Considerations for Congress*, by Laurie Harris.

Foundation models are general-purpose AI models pretrained on large datasets. Foundation models can be used for various downstream purposes, such as user-facing AI applications and services (e.g., OpenAI's ChatGPT model, which supports its AI chatbot), or further fine-tuned using smaller datasets of specialized knowledge for work in specific domains. If a limited number of foundation models are available, the companies that deploy these models might have market power and significant influence over GenAI developers, particularly if it is difficult for others to enter the market by developing their own foundation models.

Foundational Model Costs and Competition

Developing a GenAI model, especially a foundation model, demands significant time, effort, and computing resources. To train a foundation LLM, for example, an AI developer may acquire a large dataset from a third party or create one by scraping text from publicly available web pages. Before training, the developer cleans the data (e.g., removes incorrect, inaccurate, or duplicate texts) and preprocesses the data into *tokens*—the basic units of text that the LLM can process. The training can involve trillions of tokens to develop foundation models with billions of parameters, which require millions of hours of computer chip processing time (e.g., DeepSeek claimed that one of its LLMs required 2.8 million graphics processing unit [GPU] hours—equal to about 57 days—to complete its training on a cluster of 2,048 high-performance chips). To conduct AI training at this scale, the developer typically either purchases high-performance chips or leases computing resources from a cloud computing service provider.

While AI developers rarely disclose exact cost information, some AI researchers have calculated training costs "based on hardware depreciation and energy consumption over the duration of model training." Using this method, they estimated the training cost of 225 AI models in 2023 U.S. dollars. For example, the estimated cost of Grok 4, which has about 3 trillion parameters and was released by xAI in July 2025, could be around $390 million (excluding other costs, such as data acquisition and labor).

The high costs and resources needed to develop large foundation models, particularly during the pretraining phase, may limit the number of companies that are able to develop these models. Some companies might be able to leverage resources that they have been investing in for years (e.g., data, cloud computing services) to try to obtain a competitive advantage. Some companies, such as DeepSeek, claim that they have developed AI models cost-effectively, which may raise questions about the necessity of large AI investments and U.S. global leadership, although some analysts question the comprehensiveness of DeepSeek's cost estimates.

Multiple companies making large investments in developing foundation models may suggest that the market is currently competitive, albeit small. Other characteristics, such as users' ability to switch models, can help indicate whether a market will remain competitive. Some companies offer tools that enable users to access and switch between competitors' models, although some articles indicate that the process can take weeks.

National Artificial Intelligence Research Resource Pilot Program

As part of an effort to "democratize access to critical resources necessary to power responsible AI discovery and innovation," the National Science Foundation (NSF) launched a two-year pilot program in January 2024 called the National AI Research Resource (NAIRR), as directed under Executive Order 14110. The NAIRR pilot program, informed by January 2023 report findings from a statutorily created NAIRR Task Force, provides access to advanced computing, datasets, models, software, training, and user support for U.S.-based researchers and educators. This can provide opportunities for individuals and entities to use resources that they might not otherwise be able to access. Smaller businesses and start-ups might benefit, which could increase competition, as asserted by some Members of Congress. Further, previous studies have estimated that more than 14,000 start-ups were formed on the basis of academic research between 1996 and 2017. Supporting academic research through the NAIRR pilot program may subsequently encourage start-ups and future innovation and competition.

On September 1, 2026, NSF established a NAIRR Operations Center to lead the transition from a pilot program "into the long-term national infrastructure." As of November 2026, at least 14 federal agencies and 26 private sector partners were participating and contributing resources to the NAIRR pilot program, including a NAIRR Secure focus area to support AI research requiring privacy and security-preserving resources.

Antitrust Concerns

Antitrust enforcers in the United States and other countries have raised concerns about competition related to the development of GenAI. In July 2024, the Department of Justice (DOJ), Federal Trade Commission (FTC), UK Commission on Markets Authority (CMA), and European Commission released a joint statement that specifies three concerns: (1) concentrated control of key inputs, such as specialized chips, computing power, and technical expertise; (2) the ability of large incumbent digital firms to entrench or extend power in AI-related markets; and (3) arrangements among key players that might reduce competition and steer market outcomes in their favor. In January 2025, FTC published a report investigating partnerships between certain U.S. based cloud providers and AI developers. The report highlights some areas of potential concern, including whether contractual terms and technical barriers may make it difficult for AI developers to switch cloud providers and whether cloud providers have access to sensitive technical and business information.

Some news articles have reported on antitrust authorities investigating companies for potential anticompetitive conduct related to GenAI. For example, DOJ was investigating whether Nvidia, a company that produces chips, made it difficult for buyers to switch suppliers and penalized those that did not exclusively use its AI chips. FTC was examining Microsoft, including its partnership with the AI start-up OpenAI and the licensing terms of its cloud computing business, specifically whether the licensing terms prevented customers from moving their data from its Azure cloud service to competitors' services. Some investigations may be ongoing. As of November 13, 2026, neither FTC nor DOJ had filed a lawsuit against a company for anticompetitive conduct related to GenAI.

Federal antitrust laws—which seek to promote competition by prohibiting certain anticompetitive conduct—may be applicable to some of the companies' actions. For example, in some instances, an exclusive contract that prohibits a firm's counterparties from dealing with its rivals might be considered a violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, which prohibits unreasonable restraints of trade. While these types of contracts are often lawful, they might violate Section 1 if, for example, they are used by a company with market power to foreclose competition.

Considerations for Congress

Competition in the development of GenAI models might spur innovation, reduce prices, and provide more options for developers and users, among other potential benefits. Efforts to increase competition may have different trade-offs. For example, providing open access to foundation models and their weights can broaden AI research and development, potentially increasing competition. However, it can also raise concerns about public safety and misuse. Providing greater access to data might expand the number of firms that are able to develop foundation models, although it might also raise concerns about data privacy, copyright, and other issues.

Congress might choose not to pursue legislative action. It could determine that there is sufficient competition in GenAI development. Congress could also pursue nonlegislative action, such as hearings on methods to help increase competition in GenAI development or letters to FTC and DOJ about concerns of anticompetitive conduct.

If Congress determines that additional legislation is needed, one option could involve support for GenAI research, such as codifying NAIRR as a permanent program. By providing access to AI resources, NAIRR might provide opportunities for researchers and start-ups to develop AI models and potentially increase competition. However, NAIRR could further entrench incumbent firms providing AI resources such as advanced computing services or foundation models. Developers may need to continue relying on these incumbent firms if it is difficult to switch resource providers. Congress might consider additional measures, such as interoperability or uniform standards.

Another option might be to create requirements for GenAI companies providing foundation models to maintain competition in the downstream market. Depending on the specific provisions, a consideration might be whether companies would continue to have an incentive to invest in developing foundation models. Other options might include increasing funding for antitrust enforcement or amending antitrust laws. While these options might increase antitrust enforcement related to GenAI, enforcers might also determine that the companies are not violating antitrust laws.

Clare Y. Cho, Specialist in Industrial Organization and Business Policy
Laurie Harris, Analyst in Science and Technology Policy
Ling Zhu, Specialist in Science and Technology Policy

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.