The QUIET Act: How Overregulation Could Hurt AI Innovation

Overview
The U.S. House of Representatives has introduced a new bill—**the QUIET Act**—aimed at reducing robocalls. While the goal of cutting unwanted calls is sensible, the bill's *broad regulations* could have serious unintended consequences, particularly for **artificial intelligence (AI)** and other emerging technologies. Below, we examine how certain provisions in the QUIET Act—especially Sections 2(c), 3(b), 4(e), 5(a), 6(d), and 7(b)—risk hindering AI innovation in the United States. We also explore real-world data and case studies that show how overregulation can stall progress, elevate costs, and shift innovation elsewhere.

1. Overregulation Slows Innovation

The Argument
AI thrives in environments that encourage **experimentation**, **flexibility**, and **iterative testing**. The QUIET Act's strict rules—particularly **Section 3(b)**—could force businesses to spend disproportionate time and money on compliance instead of innovation. Rather than focusing on developing cutting-edge AI applications, companies may have to reallocate resources to meet new, potentially vague regulations that lump many forms of automated communication under "robocalls."

Supporting Research & Examples

- **Impact of GDPR on AI Innovation**: A study by *The Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW)* in Mannheim found that the introduction of the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) correlated with a measurable slowdown in AI-related entrepreneurial activity in Europe, particularly among small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). This demonstrates how broad, one-size-fits-all regulations can inadvertently slow technological progress.
    - *Reference: "GDPR and the Lost Generation of Innovative Apps," ZEW Discussion Paper No. 19-014.*
- **Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) Precedent**: The United States already regulates telemarketing under the TCPA (1991). The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has wrestled with defining what constitutes an "autodialer," leading to substantial legal uncertainty for businesses

using any automated or AI-driven communication tools. *Facebook, Inc. v. Duguid* (2021) narrowed the definition, clarifying that equipment must have the capacity to randomly or sequentially generate phone numbers to be considered an autodialer. If the QUIET Act resurrects broader definitions, it could **reintroduce ambiguity** and disincentivize AI-related communication innovations.

Why It Matters
When companies fear that any automated outreach (even beneficial ones like appointment reminders or urgent healthcare notifications) might be penalized, they scale back on AI adoption. This would stifle progress not just in telemarketing, but across a wide range of AI-driven communication services.

2. Higher Costs Hurt Startups

The Argument
Small businesses and startups often fuel **disruptive innovation**. Under **Section 5(a)** of the QUIET Act, these companies could face higher compliance costs—legal fees, consultation, periodic audits—that established industry players can more easily absorb. This puts an outsized burden on emerging AI firms, potentially pushing innovation overseas.

Supporting Research & Examples

- **Compliance Cost Estimates**: According to the *U.S. Chamber of Commerce*, compliance with complex federal regulations can cost small businesses up to 20% more per employee compared to large corporations. While large tech firms can mitigate these costs by spreading them across multiple product lines, startups operate on thinner margins and limited venture capital funding.

- **Global Competition**: Regions like Southeast Asia and parts of Europe are actively courting AI startups with lower regulatory burdens and targeted incentives. *Singapore's AI Governance Framework* is an example of a clear, sector-specific, and risk-based approach that fosters innovation while maintaining ethical standards. If the QUIET Act disincentivizes AI development in the U.S., American startups may relocate to more innovation-friendly jurisdictions.

Why It Matters
When the barriers to entry become too high, fewer startups can compete, reducing the overall dynamism and diversity of the AI ecosystem in the United States. This can slow breakthroughs across critical sectors, from healthcare and finance to energy and defense.

3. AI Isn't the Enemy

The Argument
The QUIET Act rightly aims to curb robocalls, but **Section 2(c)** risks treating all AI-based communication tools—chatbots, virtual assistants, automated notification systems—as potential threats. AI-driven systems are pivotal in healthcare (e.g., telehealth reminders), customer service (reducing wait times via AI-powered

support), and public safety (automated emergency alerts). Overbroad legislation could erode consumer trust and discourage the development of beneficial AI tools.

Supporting Research & Examples

- **Healthcare Use Cases**: *A 2020 study in the Journal of Medical Internet Research* showed that AI-based telehealth appointment systems increased patient satisfaction by 21% and reduced administrative costs by nearly 15%. Blanket restrictions on automated calls or texts could inadvertently limit these advantages.
- **Customer Service Innovations**: Many businesses use AI chatbots to handle routine inquiries, allowing human representatives to address more complex issues. This leads to faster resolution times and higher customer satisfaction rates—critical benefits that could be scaled back if regulations treat all AI communications as spam.

Why It Matters
AI is a *general-purpose technology* that transcends a single industry. Overly broad regulatory language that labels any AI-based outreach as "robocalling" could set back invaluable innovations across multiple sectors.

4. America's AI Leadership Is at Risk

The Argument
The United States currently **leads the world in AI** in terms of research output, venture capital investment, and top-tier AI talent. However, **Section 6(d)** of the QUIET Act could impose a regulatory ecosystem so stringent that it drives AI innovators to countries with friendlier policies.

Supporting Research & Examples

- **National Security Commission on AI Report (2021)**: The bipartisan commission emphasized the importance of maintaining a regulatory environment conducive to AI innovation. The report warned that *"unnecessarily broad or ambiguous regulatory frameworks risk ceding America's AI leadership to strategic competitors."*
- **Venture Capital Trends**: According to *CB Insights*, U.S. AI startups attracted nearly $23 billion in venture funding in 2022. If the QUIET Act's compliance hurdles deter investors—who fear litigation or uncertainty—this figure could drop, redirecting capital overseas.

Why It Matters
Losing AI leadership means losing out on **high-paying jobs**, **economic growth**, and **technological leverage**. It also reduces America's ability to set global standards for AI ethics and governance.

5. Unintended Consequences

The Argument
Legislation that is too broad or vaguely worded can create **legal uncertainty**, inhibiting progress. **Section 4(e)** of the QUIET Act is notably imprecise about what constitutes a prohibited AI-driven communication. When regulations lack clarity, businesses hesitate to invest in new technologies for fear of future legal battles.

Supporting Research & Examples

- **Case Study: FCC's TCPA Rulings**: Over the years, shifting interpretations of what constitutes an illegal "autodialer" have led to numerous class-action lawsuits against companies—some of which were using automated systems primarily for benign purposes. The legal ambiguity cost businesses millions in settlements and forced them to scale back on innovative communication solutions.
- **Innovation Chilling Effect**: A *Stanford University Law School* paper on *"Legal Ambiguity and Innovation"* found that startups often choose safer, less disruptive projects when faced with regulatory uncertainty, leading to a measurable decline in "high impact" innovations.

Why It Matters
When laws are not narrowly tailored, they can create more problems than they solve. The unintended result: A chilling effect on AI research, investment, and deployment—even in areas that have nothing to do with telemarketing or spam.

6. Stifling Progress Across Industries

The Argument
AI is revolutionizing **healthcare** (diagnostics, telemedicine), **finance** (fraud detection, algorithmic trading), **public safety** (automated emergency alerts), and many other sectors. Overregulation—even if it targets a specific form of AI-driven communication—often becomes a **blueprint** for future, broader restrictions. **Section 7(b)** of the QUIET Act could set a precedent that eventually spills over into other sectors, curbing AI adoption and stalling industry-wide innovations.

Supporting Research & Examples

- **Cross-Industry Applications**: *McKinsey & Company's Global AI Survey (2021)* found that more than 50% of companies worldwide adopted AI tools in at least one business function. A sudden clampdown in one domain—like automated communication—can discourage investment in related AI systems, causing ripple effects across multiple verticals.
- **Legal Precedents**: Regulatory spillover is common. For instance, the broad interpretation of "data controllers" under the GDPR has led many non-EU companies to adopt Europe-centric compliance frameworks globally, sometimes limiting the rollout of advanced AI analytics even where they pose minimal risk.

Why It Matters
When investment decisions hinge on regulatory clarity, sweeping legislation can have a domino effect across different AI applications and industries. Progress in key sectors—like automated vehicles, smart manufacturing, and precision medicine—risks a slowdown if companies perceive overregulation as inevitable.

The Bottom Line

The QUIET Act addresses a real consumer concern—**robocalls**—but its **broad scope** risks serious unintended consequences:

- **Stalled Innovation**: Tying up resources in compliance diminishes R&D for AI advancements.
- **Barriers to Entry**: High legal and compliance costs disproportionately affect startups.
- **Mislabeling AI**: By targeting AI-based communication too broadly, the QUIET Act risks suppressing beneficial technologies.
- **Eroded U.S. Leadership**: Overregulation could push AI talent and investment overseas.
- **Uncertainty & Chilling Effect**: Vague language may stifle innovation in multiple industries.

The National Artificial Intelligence Association (NAIA) and its members request that policymakers reviewing the QUIET Act pursue more targeted solutions that protect consumers without stifling technological progress. Legislation must be carefully drafted, relying on *narrow definitions* of prohibited conduct, *risk-based assessments*, and *sector-specific regulations* that **distinguish malicious robocalls from legitimate AI-powered services**. Striking the right balance between consumer protection and innovation-friendly policies is crucial to maintaining America's competitive edge in artificial intelligence.

About the Author

Andrew Loposser is President and CEO of APL Consulting and Senior Advisor to the National Artificial Intelligence Association's Advisory Council.

About NAIA

The National Artificial Intelligence Association is a 501(c)6 business coalition that engages government on AI legislation and policy to ensure a prosperous world and an advocate for American dominance as we build the future together. Website: www.TheNAIA.org

Contact:

Caleb Max
Co-Chair of NAIA
E: caleb@thenaia.org
P: 540-422-5604

Ron Wright
Senior Advisor of NAIA
E: ron@thenaia.org
P: 703-663-0757