March 15, 2025

Faisal D'Souza
NCO/NITRD
National Science Foundation
2415 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22314

Re: Request for Information (RFI) on the Development of an Artificial Intelligence (AI) Action Plan ("Plan")

Submitted by email to ostp-ai-rfi@nitrd.gov*

Dear Mr. D'Souza:

We are pleased to provide these comments regarding the Trump-Vance administration's AI Action Plan.[1]

Introduction

Part I of this document addresses the need to ensure that advanced AI systems are designed and governed in service of American values. That specifically includes removing barriers to the development and widespread adoption of Western open-source models, as well as prioritizing accuracy, free speech, transparency, and explainability in model development, training, and outputs. Part II outlines ways that a strategic use of AI can supplement and restore reproductive health for the sake of human flourishing, including improving fertility outcomes, protecting the centrality of the doctor/patient relationship, data accountability, and promoting human-centered AI diagnostic tools.

Part I: Prioritize American values in AI design and governance

EO 14179 calls for sustaining and enhancing "America's global AI dominance in order to promote human flourishing, economic competitiveness, and national security."[2] As Vice President Vance recently articulated in Paris, achieving that vision will require U.S. AI companies to maintain their technological edge while ensuring that the social diffusion of AI lifts all boats—in service of fundamental freedoms, American workers, and families.[3] On the one hand, America must enact policies that help our leading edge AI firms exponentially enhance the

*This document is approved for public dissemination. The document contains no business-proprietary or confidential information. Document contents may be reused by the government in developing the AI Action Plan and associated documents without attribution.

[1] *Federal Register*, Vol. 90, No. 24 (Thursday, February 6, 2025), pp. 9088-9089. 2025.

[2] *Federal Register*, Vol. 90, No. 20 (Friday, January 31, 2025), 8741-8742.

[3] Wesley Hodges, "Vance Outlines an Open, Forward-Looking AI Agenda," *Daily Signal*, February 12, 2025, https://www.dailysignal.com/2025/02/12/vance-outlines-open-forward-looking-ai-agenda/ (accessed March 15, 2025).

performance (e.g., 'intelligence') of their models.[4] We must promote widespread adoption and integration of Western AI across a vast range of applications and use-cases. But we must also work to ensure that the AI of the future reflects American values like openness, competition, transparency, and free speech.

In pursuit of that shared vision, we offer the following recommendations for the administration's consideration in developing their Plan.

1. Bolster the development and proliferation of U.S. open-source AI

Growing dependence on a handful of closed-source foundation models threatens to undermine openness, decentralized control, and permissionless innovation.

AI foundation models power a growing number of applications. However, closed-source models are highly opaque—preventing dependent users' from identifying the ideological biases and value-sets that underly model reasoning and outputs.[5] This dearth of transparency and explainability could enable OpenAI or Google, for example, to "shape a company's practices, values, and public image in ways that are virtually impossible to detect, much less resist."[6]

Closed-source model opacity presents similar concerns for free speech. AI agents, search engines, or other applications built on top of those models reflect their biases—in terms of both the content they prioritize and exclude.[7] Google's experimental "AI mode," for example, directly answers user prompts in the overview box instead of directing users to third-party websites.[8] AI search, chatbots, and agents have the potential to enable greater productivity and free expression. But anchoring them to ideologically biased, closed-source AI models is further entrenching Big Tech's power to shape public discourse.[9] Without transparent and explainable open-source AI

[4] Performance benchmarks for LLMs—some of which are also classified as foundation models and frontier models—are key indicators of model "intelligence." See LiveBench, A Challenging, Contamination-Free LLM Benchmark, https://livebench.ai/#/details (accessed March 15, 2025); Specific definitions and thresholds for classifying "frontier" and "foundation" models vary. However, a 2024 survey of AI model use for "intelligent transportation systems" helpfully defines and distinguishes the two. "Foundation models… are large, general-purpose AI models that provide a base for a wide range of applications. They are characterized by their versatility and scalability." In broad terms, "[f]rontier AI refers to the forefront of AI technology, encompassing the latest advancements, innovations, and experimental techniques in the field, especially AI foundation models and [large language models] LLMs." See Mohamed R. Shoaib, Heba M. Emara, and Jun Zhao, "A Survey on the Applications of Frontier AI, Foundation Models, and Large Language Models to Intelligent Transportation Systems," January 12, 2024, https://arxiv.org/html/2401.06831v1 (accessed March 15, 2025).
[5] Jake Denton, "Big Tech's AI Power Grab," March 11, 2024, https://www.heritage.org/big-tech/commentary/big-techs-ai-power-grab (accessed March 15, 2025).
[6] Ibid.
[7] Daniel Cochrane, and Autumn Dorsey, "'Green Computing' and Woke AI Is a Gift to China," March 7, 2025, https://www.heritage.org/china/commentary/green-computing-and-woke-ai-gift-china (accessed March 15, 2025).
[8] Robby Stein, "Expanding AI Overviews and introducing AI Mode," March 5, 2025, https://blog.google/products/search/ai-mode-search/ (accessed March 15, 2025).
[9] Daniel Cochrane, and Hans Von Spakovsky, "Don't Let Big Tech Influence the Elections Yet Again This Year," May 3, 2024, https://www.heritage.org/election-integrity/commentary/dont-let-big-tech-influence-the-elections-yet-again-year (accessed March 15, 2025); Brian Chau, "ChatGPT's score system shows political bias is no accident," *UnHerd*, December 20, 2022, https://unherd.com/newsroom/chatgpts-score-system-shows-political-bias-is-no-accident/ (accessed March 15, 2025).

models to power these and other applications, Big Tech censorship could become even more prevalent and less detectable.

In addition, a predominantly closed-source AI ecosystem undermines American dynamism by creating built-in advantages for Big Tech incumbents over "little tech" disruptors.[10] Martin Casado and Katherine Boyle of Andreessen Horowitz point to how open-source technologies like Linux powered the internet revolution of the 1990s and 2000s.[11] But they warn that Silicon Valley giants like Microsoft and Alphabet are attempting to "suppress open-source innovation and deter competitive startups" under the guise of "safety" and "national security."[12]

Open-source models democratize access to AI capabilities, foster innovation across sectors, and enhance America's technological resilience against foreign competitors. To unlock AI's full potential and ensure diffuse control of the technology, the administration should implement the following recommendations:

- Counter threats to open-source and "little tech:" The administration should specifically address the most direct threats to open-source AI from domestic policies and foreign governments. On the domestic front, proposed laws such as California's SB 1047—vetoed in 2024 by Governor Newsom—would have imposed liability on AI model developers for "modifications [or misuse] of their AI models" by third parties.[13] Colorado enacted a similar law last year.[14] That law—and proposed legislation in other states—risk subjecting model developers to ruinous liability if third parties modify or misuse their models for illicit purposes. Such broad, unpredictable liability discourages companies from developing powerful AI models for public use. But it particularly disincentivizes open-source AI. The liability associated with releasing open-source foundation models under those conditions is so great that few if any companies could afford the risk. The administration should foreclose that eventuality by calling on Congress to pass federal legislation preempting state regulation of large, general purpose foundation models.[15]

---

[10] Martin Casado, and Katherine Boyle, "AI Talks Leave 'Little Tech' Out," *Wall Street Journal*, May 15, 2024, https://archive.is/Jb5OE (accessed March 15, 2025).
[11] Ibid.
[12] Ibid.
[13] See Alliance for the Future, "Newscard - SB 1047 Vetoed," September 29, 2024, https://www.affuture.org/research/6-sb1047newscard/ (accessed March 15, 2025); Dean Ball, "AI and accountability: Policymakers risk halting AI innovation," *Orange County Register*, April 5, 2024, https://archive.is/48PHj (accessed March 15, 2025); Jake Denton, "California's Gift to Big Tech," *Compact Magazine*, June 10, 2024, https://www.compactmag.com/article/californias-gift-to-big-tech/ (accessed March 15, 2025).
[14] Alex Siegal, and Ivan Garcia, "A Deep Dive into Colorado's Artificial Intelligence Act," October 26, 2024, https://www.naag.org/attorney-general-journal/a-deep-dive-into-colorados-artificial-intelligence-act/ (accessed March 15, 2025).
[15] Federal legislation should preempt state laws that subject large foundation model developers to liability if a third party uses or modifies a general-purpose foundation model for illicit activities. Policymakers could further tailor the measure to protect open-source AI models. For example, Congress could specifically preempt state laws that create liability for developers of open-source foundation models based on potential use or modification of those models by a third party. At the same time, federal preemption should strike an appropriate balance—preserving states' authority to pursue good-faith AI regulation in connection with specific contexts and use-cases.

In addition, they should address similar threats from abroad such as the European Union's recently implemented AI Act.[16] Like some of the state proposals, the AI Act requires "general purpose AI" providers to identify and mitigate "systemic risks."[17] This may force foundation model developers to implement Orwellian censorship measures (to address systemic risks) and keep their models closed-source.[18] In response, the administration should seek full repeal of the AI Act or at least, a broad exemption for U.S. open-source models.[19] The administration should also consider including language in U.S. negotiated trade and technology agreements to explicitly protect open-source AI firms from burdensome foreign regulations.

- Create a level playing field: Consider implementing a government-wide framework to remove barriers to the purchase and use of open-source AI by federal entities, private vendors, contractors, and government-supported research institutions. The framework could achieve this, in part, through the following policies and directives: First, require every federal department, agency, and commission to regularly identify and audit all policies or regulations that impact government, vendor, and federal grant recipients' use of AI. That includes IT policies, procurement practices, and grant requirements. Identify any that prohibit or discourage the use of open-source AI technologies.[20] Second, for each barrier identified, require a detailed cost-benefit analysis justifying the restriction. Include potential cost savings, an assessment of technical benefits, and any cyber security-related implications of switching to open-source for specific applications. Require additional expert validation of potential cyber security or national security risks flagged.[21]

  Third, for low-moderate risk applications (as defined by the framework), consider requiring covered entities to identify and eliminate barriers preventing the use or integration of open-source AI—subject to reasonable security assurance standards. Fourth, for higher-risk/sensitivity areas (e.g., defense or national security applications), create a streamlined process to propose and certify use-case-specific sandboxes authorizing use of or

---

[16] Jake Denton, "The U.S. Shouldn't Go the Way of Europe on AI," May 8, 2024, https://www.heritage.org/big-tech/commentary/the-us-shouldnt-go-the-way-europe-ai (March 15, 2025).
[17] "The AI Act defines systemic risk as 'a risk that is specific to the high-impact capabilities of general-purpose AI models, having a significant impact on the Union market due to their reach, or due to actual or reasonably foreseeable negative effects on public health, safety, public security, fundamental rights, or the society as a whole, that can be propagated at scale across the value chain.'" See Jordi Calvet-Bademunt, and Joan Barata, "The Digital Services Act Meets the AI Act: Bridging Platform and AI Governance," May 29, 2024, https://www.techpolicy.press/the-digital-services-act-meets-the-ai-act-bridging-platform-and-ai-governance/ (accessed March 15, 2025).
[18] Ibid.
[19] An exemption for open-source would help ensure that "little tech" AI competitors are not penalized by EU rules when they create AI models that compete directly with Big Tech closed-source foundation models.
[20] The Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP) is a key example. See FedRAMP, Program Basics, https://www.fedramp.gov/program-basics/ (accessed March 15, 2025).
[21] Some of the purported risks attributed to open-source AI may be overblown, and potential benefits under-explored. See for example Rishi Bommasani, Sayash Kapoor, Kevin Klyman, Shayne Longpre, Ashwin Ramaswami, Daniel Zhang, Marietje Schaake, Daniel E. Ho, Arvind Narayanan, and Percy Liang, "Considerations for Governing Open Foundation Models," December 13, 2023, https://hai.stanford.edu/policy/issue-brief-considerations-governing-open-foundation-models (accessed March 15, 2025); Jasmin Léveillé, "Embrace Open-Source Military Research to Win the AI Competition," October 16, 2019, https://warontherocks.com/2019/10/embrace-open-source-military-research-to-win-the-ai-competition/ (accessed March 15, 2025).

experimentation with open-source AI—under specific conditions. Similar affordances could be extended to government vendors, contractors, and affiliated research institutions subject to federal cyber security standards and other rules. Fifth, consider how and to what degree the U.S. Government can leverage its purchasing power, grant-making, and other tools to invest in open-source, dual-use AI technologies with national security and commercial/civilian applications.

Finally, the framework should require a broader cost-benefit analysis for rulemaking, regulatory guidance, and "soft" technical standards issued by government entities such as the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM), and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)—to ensure a fair, open, and competitive playing field for open-source AI technologies.

- Address Big Tech's anti-competitive practices: Direct the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to investigate whether Big Tech companies are engaged in anti-competitive practices to undermine competition from open-source competitors. For example, the FTC and DOJ should consider whether Big Tech's privileged membership on government advisory bodies—or their coordination via industry associations and NGOs to oppose open-source AI—constitute illegal collusion and/or anti-competitive practices.

  The DOJ and FTC should also investigate whether Big Tech firms are engaged in unfair or deceptive trade practices by claiming that certain models (e.g., Meta's Llama) are "open-source" while continuing to maintain model guardrails, using licenses to restrict use or modification, and refusing to disclose training data.[22] They should further examine how AI companies restrict users from modifying or utilizing partially open-source or closed-source AI tools for certain use-cases through their acceptable use policies (AUPs).[23] Specifically, whether model developer AUPs constitute illegal restraints on trade that undermine competition and hinder the use of AI to engage in expression protected by the First Amendment.[24]

[22] Ed Gent, "The tech industry can't agree on what open-source AI means. That's a problem," March 25, 2024, https://www.technologyreview.com/2024/03/25/1090111/tech-industry-open-source-ai-definition-problem/ (accessed March 15, 2025); The Economist, "A battle is raging over the definition of open-source AI," November 6, 2024, https://archive.is/YKNFC (accessed March 15, 2025); Stefano Maffulli, "Meta's LLaMa license is not Open Source," July 20, 2023, https://opensource.org/blog/metas-llama-2-license-is-not-open-source (accessed March 15, 2025).

[23] For example, the Open Source Initiative, a key standard-setting body for open-source software, pointed out that Meta's Llama AI model did not meet their standard for open-source, in part, because "it puts restrictions on commercial use for some users (paragraph 2) and also restricts the use of the model and software for certain purposes" under its AUP. See Stefano Maffulli, "Meta's LLaMa license is not Open Source," July 20, 2023, https://opensource.org/blog/metas-llama-2-license-is-not-open-source (accessed March 15, 2025).

[24] Kevin Klyman, "Acceptable Use Policies for Foundation Models," (date omitted from publication), https://crfm.stanford.edu/2024/04/08/aups.html (accessed March 15, 2025).

2. Champion the freedom of expression and open-source AI in global standard-setting

Prioritize the freedom of expression in the development of international AI standards backed by the U.S. Whereas the prior administration emphasized "AI safety," reining-in "bias," and ensuring "fairness," the current administration should lead in the creation and dissemination of international standards and best practices that drive open, transparent, and explainable AI.[25] That could include the following:

- Establish criteria for classifying AI models on a spectrum from "maximally" open-source to fully closed-source.[26]

- Create a framework to encourage and guide leading-edge Western AI companies to open-source elements of their advanced foundation models.[27] This could include recommendations for the creation of regulatory safe harbors and sandboxes for open-source AI technologies.

- Develop transparency frameworks for model reinforcement learning from human feedback (RHLF), fine-tuning, and the datasets used in those processes to identify and disclose ideological biases introduced into foundation models by developers.[28]

- Explore cutting-edge technical methods for enhancing model explainability without sacrificing accuracy or performance.

- Create transparency and explainability benchmarks both for foundation models and more granular AI applications/use-cases.[29]

Part II: Positive applications of AI in promoting fertility and reproductive health

The administration's prioritization of human flourishing as the vehicle through which global AI dominance may be achieved points to an important reality. There are two possible paths before the United States today: one path prioritizes AI innovation and dominance in ways that

---

[25] Kara Frederick, and Jake Denton, "The U.S., Not China, Should Take the Lead on AI," October 11, 2024, https://www.heritage.org/big-tech/commentary/the-us-not-china-should-take-the-lead-ai (accessed March 15, 2025).
[26] David Gray Widder, Sarah West, and Meredith Whittaker, "Open (For Business): Big Tech, Concentrated Power, and the Political Economy of Open AI," August 18, 2023, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4543807 (accessed March 15, 2025); https://opensource.org/osd; https://arxiv.org/pdf/2302.04844.
[27] An early example of this was "[OpenAI's release]" of "a smaller version of their large language model GPT-2 in 2019." See https://www.heritage.org/big-tech/commentary/the-us-not-china-should-take-the-lead-ai; The framework could specifically address national and cyber security concerns, as well as new prospects for economic growth, technological innovation, and competition driven by an open-source AI ecosystem. It could also address the role of open-source in fostering greater transparency and explainability in advanced AI systems.
[28] See for example Angèle Christin, "Tuning Our Algorithmic Amplifiers: Encoding Societal Values into Social Media AIs," October 20, 2023, https://hai.stanford.edu/news/tuning-our-algorithmic-amplifiers-encoding-societal-values-social-media-ais (accessed March 15, 2025); https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288; https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/de8ba9b01c9ab7cbabf5c33b80b7bbc618857627/Model_Card_Claude_3.pdf.
[29] A primary goal of AI transparency and explainability must be to ensure users have reasonable knowledge of whether the automated systems and the outputs produced by those systems align with their interests and values.

circumvent or substitute the human person, and the other path channels AI innovation and dominance in ways that restore human health and supplement the human doctor/patient relationship by treating AI as a "decision support tool."[30] By placing human flourishing at the center of AI innovation and development, the administration signals that AI should be utilized as a tool in service of human flourishing, specifically as it relates to family formation and fertility outcomes in the United States. We couldn't agree more.

As many people struggle to find romantic partners or conceive children, advances in technology from AI and robotics to assisted reproductive technology promise men and women technological solutions to these innate desires. AI's use in human biological reproduction presents as many positive opportunities as it does possible abuses. Given this, it is important to consider ways that a strategic use of AI can supplement and restore human health for the sake of human flourishing.

Promote AI diagnostic tools to identify, diagnose, and treat infertility

Infertility is a heartbreaking condition affecting 16% of couples in the United States. Oftentimes, infertility doctors define infertility as a "disease" based on a couple's inability to conceive children after 6-12 months of barrier-free intercourse. Infertility, however, is not a disease in itself; it is a *symptom* of underlying reproductive health conditions. For women, reproductive health conditions include endometriosis, adenomyosis, polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS), blocked fallopian tubes, and hormonal imbalances. For men, they include low sperm count, low sperm motility, erectile dysfunction, and diet, lifestyle, and environmental factors. Men and women on the whole bear the burden of infertility equally, with one-third of cases due to women, one-third due to men, and the remaining one-third due to combined causes.[31] Moreover, studies estimate that a couples' diagnosis of infertility results from four or more reproductive health conditions, underscoring the need for comprehensive diagnostic approaches. There is no one-size-fits-all solution to infertility.[32]
As Dr. Casey Means notes, since the 1970's, there has been a 1% *increase* in miscarriage[33] and erectile dysfunction[34] and a 1% *decrease* in sperm count[35], testosterone[36], and total fertility *per*

---

[30] Simon Coghlan, et al, "Ethics of artificial intelligence in prenatal and pediatric genomic medicine." *Journal of community genetics* vol. 15, 1 (2024): 13-24. doi:10.1007/s12687-023-00678-4
[31] "*How Common Is Male Infertility, and What Are Its Causes?*" Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 18 Nov. 2021. www.nichd.nih.gov/health/topics/menshealth/conditioninfo/infertility#:~:text=Overall%2C%20one%2Dthird%20of%20infertility,combine%20with%20a%20woman's%20egg.
[32] Stanford JB, Parnell T, Kantor K, Reeder MR, Najmabadi S, et al, International Natural Procreative Technology Evaluation and Surveillance of Treatment for Subfertility (iNEST): enrollment and methods. Hum Reprod Open. 2022 Aug 9;2022(3):hoac033. doi: 10.1093/hropen/hoac033. PMID: 35974874; PMCID: PMC9373967. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9373967/.
[33] Lang, Kevin, and Ana Nuevo-Chiquero. "*Trends in self-reported spontaneous abortions: 1970-2000*." Demography vol. 49,3 (2012): 989-1009.
[34] Ayta, I A et al. "*The likely worldwide increase in erectile dysfunction between 1995 and 2025 and some possible policy consequences*." BJU international vol. 84,1 (1999): 50-6.
[35] Levine, Hagai et al,. "*Temporal trends in sperm count: a systematic review and meta-regression analysis of samples collected globally in the 20th and 21st centuries*." Human Reproduction Update, Volume 29, Issue 2, March-April 2023, Pages 157–176.
[36] Harding, Anne. "*Men's Testosterone Levels Declined in Last 20 Years | Reuters*." Reuters, 9 Aug. 2009, www.reuters.com/article/idUSKIM

year.[37] Moreover, an individual's reproductive health is strongly correlated with their overall metabolic and cardiovascular health. Prioritizing treatments for reproductive conditions ensures that persons are not only able to have the children they desire, but also live longer, healthier lives.[38]

The complexity of these reproductive health conditions, and the lack of research and development devoted to them, means that 15% - 30% of cases are due to "unexplained infertility," making this the leading diagnosis doctors give men and women. Given advancements in AI, this diagnosis should be unacceptable. The administration should prioritize uses of AI as a diagnostic tool that can analyze large data sets to identify, diagnose, and offer personalized treatment plans to heal reproductive health conditions and infertility, all while using AI as a "decision support tool" that promotes human-centered AI.

- Improve fertility outcomes: In partnership with the Food and Drug Administration, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institutes for Health, the administration should fund AI research for improving fertility outcomes and early diagnostics, specifically by a) analyzing large data sets that incorporate a person's overall health and biomarkers to assess the underlying reproductive health conditions resulting in a diagnosis of infertility. This would include prioritizing AI diagnostics in fields such as endometriosis research where it takes, on average 6-11 years to receive a diagnosis and is a leading cause of infertility for women. Moreover, the administration should direct these entities to b) develop accessible tools that provide fertility insights using AI-powered reproductive health tracking and early fertility diagnostics, while ensuring strict privacy protections. Currently, analogous devices include the Oura Ring, and health tracking devices.

- Establish an AI ethics board to evaluate applications combining AI and reproductive health: In partnership with the Food and Drug Administration, the National Science Foundation, or another relevant entity, the administration should establish an ethics board to review potential risks and benefits to the use of AI in treating reproductive health, including concerns such as patient privacy, informed consent of data, maintaining the centrality of doctors in the diagnostic process, and ensuring that reproductive health prioritizes treatments that heal the underlying root causes of infertility. Using an ethical framework established by Dr. Joshua Mitchell of Georgetown, AI innovations in line with human flourishing must prioritize developments that supplement human health and fertility, rather than uses of technology that substitute the human person altogether.

- Prohibit the sale of reproductive data: Utilizing the Federal Trade Commission, the administration should ensure that AI-driven reproductive health applications, fertility tracking devices, genetic testing companies, and fertility clinics do not sell or misuse consumer data. Moreover, such entities should provide clear and understandable information for the purpose of informed consent on how a user's/patient's data may be used prior to collecting or using such insights.

---

[37] "*Fertility Rate, Total (Births per Woman)*." World Bank Open Data, data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.DYN.TFRT.IN. Accessed 27 Feb. 2025.
[38] Kurt T. Barnhart, *Introduction: Fertility as a window to health*, Vol. 110 Fertility and Sterility, p. 781-782 (2018).

- Promote human-centered AI diagnostic tools: The administration should pursue developments in AI diagnostics and treatment plans for reproductive health conditions and infertility that reinforce, rather than replace, licensed medical professionals. In partnership with the Food and Drug Administration, applications for genomic AI research and device development should require the verifiable involvement of qualified medical professionals who can verify and review the conclusions of AI diagnostic tools. While humans and AI may make mistakes, it is essential for human flourishing that humans remain at the center of AI diagnostic tools. AI diagnostics should promote patient-centered informed consent, resources to find the best doctor for their specific condition and reinforce the importance of the patient/doctor relationship to maintain the human element of medicine. In this way, the use of AI as a diagnostic tool will aid doctors in their ability to identify and diagnose reproductive health conditions such that they have additional time to prioritize the patient relationship and overall health.

By enacting these policies, we can harness AI's potential to revolutionize restorative medicine that promote human flourishing, especially in the realm of family formation and fertility.

Conclusion

The Trump-Vance administration has the opportunity to ensure that AI innovation remains firmly rooted in American values—openness, competition, free speech, and transparency—while also advancing AI applications that meaningfully enhance human flourishing. By prioritizing policies that foster the development of open-source AI, promote fair competition, and counteract ideological censorship, the administration can cement America's leadership in AI innovation and governance.

At the same time, AI's transformative potential extends beyond governance and economic growth; it can also play a crucial role in restoring and supplementing human health, particularly in the realm of reproductive medicine. By strategically leveraging AI to improve fertility outcomes, protect the doctor-patient relationship, ensure data accountability, and promote human-centered diagnostics, the administration can align AI policy with the fundamental goal of strengthening families and ensuring that technology serves, rather than supplants, the human person.

The administration's commitment to AI as a tool for human flourishing signals a vision for a future in which innovation and ethics go hand in hand. By enacting policies that both defend American technological leadership and harness AI's capabilities to support strong families and better health outcomes, we can build an AI ecosystem that upholds our deepest values while securing a more prosperous and humane future.

Thank you for inviting and considering our comments.

Sincerely,

Daniel Cochrane*
Senior Research Associate, Tech Policy Center
The Heritage Foundation
214 Massachusetts Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Daniel.Cochrane@heritage.org

Emma Waters*
Policy Analyst, Tech Policy Center
The Heritage Foundation
214 Massachusetts Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Emma.Waters@heritage.org

* I file this comment in my individual capacity rather than as an employee of the Heritage Foundation; information regarding my institutional affiliation is provided for informational purposes only.