

RESEARCH REPORT

Global Regulation of AI Voice Cloning Technology

*Comparative Analysis of Five Major Jurisdictions: China, EU, US,
Japan, and South Korea*



Abstract: This report provides a comprehensive analysis of the regulatory frameworks governing AI voice cloning technology across five major jurisdictions. It examines current laws and regulations, regulatory bodies, notable enforcement cases, and industry self-regulatory standards, offering a cross-jurisdictional comparative analysis and future trend outlook for stakeholders navigating this rapidly evolving legal landscape.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary

2. China

2.1 Current Laws and Regulations

2.2 Regulatory Bodies

2.3 Notable Enforcement Cases

2.4 Industry Self-Regulatory Standards

3. European Union

3.1 Current Laws and Regulations

3.2 Regulatory Bodies

3.3 Notable Enforcement Cases

3.4 Industry Self-Regulatory Standards

4. United States

4.1 Current Laws and Regulations

4.2 Regulatory Bodies

4.3 Notable Enforcement Cases

4.4 Industry Self-Regulatory Standards

5. Japan

5.1 Current Laws and Regulations

5.2 Regulatory Bodies

5.3 Notable Enforcement Cases

5.4 Industry Self-Regulatory Standards

6. South Korea

6.1 Current Laws and Regulations

6.2 Regulatory Bodies

6.3 Notable Enforcement Cases

6.4 Industry Self-Regulatory Standards

7. Cross-Jurisdictional Comparative Analysis

8. Conclusions and Trend Outlook

9. References

1. Executive Summary

Artificial Intelligence voice cloning technology—also known as voice synthesis, voice deepfake, or audio deep synthesis—has advanced rapidly, enabling the creation of highly realistic synthetic voices from minimal audio samples. While this technology offers legitimate applications in entertainment, accessibility, and content creation, it also presents significant risks including fraud, identity theft, defamation, and non-consensual use of individuals' vocal identities.

This report provides a comprehensive analysis of the regulatory landscape governing AI voice cloning across five major jurisdictions: China, the European Union, the United States, Japan, and South Korea. Each jurisdiction has adopted distinct approaches reflecting their legal traditions, technological priorities, and cultural values.

Key Findings

- **China** has implemented comprehensive specific regulations on deep synthesis technology since 2023, with explicit voice protection under the Civil Code.
- **The European Union** addresses voice cloning through the AI Act (2024), with transparency and labeling requirements taking effect in 2026.
- **The United States** relies on a patchwork of state laws, with Tennessee's ELVIS Act (2024) serving as a landmark voice-specific protection.
- **Japan** approaches voice protection primarily through publicity rights doctrine and copyright law, with industry-led initiatives gaining momentum.
- **South Korea** enacted the world's first comprehensive AI Basic Act (effective January 2026), including mandatory deepfake labeling requirements.

2. China

2.1 Current Laws and Regulations

2.1.1 Civil Code (2021)

China's Civil Code provides the foundational legal protection for voice rights as a personality right.

Civil Code of the People's Republic of China, Article 1023

Original Text: "对自然人声音的保护，参照适用肖像权保护的有关规定。"

Translation: "The protection of a natural person's voice shall be governed by reference to the relevant provisions on the protection of portrait rights."

This provision extends portrait rights protections to voice, meaning that unauthorized commercial use, AI synthesis, or manipulation of a person's voice may constitute an infringement of personality rights.

2.1.2 Provisions on the Administration of Deep Synthesis Internet Information Services (2023)

Issued jointly by the Cyberspace Administration of China (CAC), Ministry of Industry and Information Technology (MIIT), and Ministry of Public Security, effective January 10, 2023.

Article 14 (Biometric Data Protection)

Original Text: "深度合成服务提供者和技术支持者提供人脸、人声等生物识别信息编辑功能的，应当提示深度合成服务使用者依法告知被编辑的个人，并取得其单独同意。"

Translation: "Deep synthesis service providers and technical supporters that provide editing functions for biometric information such as faces and voices shall prompt users to inform the edited individual in accordance with law and obtain their separate consent."

Article 17 (Labeling Requirements for Voice Synthesis)

Original Text: "深度合成服务提供者提供以下深度合成服务，可能导致公众混淆或者误认的，应当在生成或者编辑的信息内容的合理位置、区域进行显著标识，向公众提示深度合成情况：...（二）生成或者编辑的语音信息，或者对重大事件声音进行修改的..."

Translation: "Deep synthesis service providers offering the following services that may cause public confusion or misidentification shall prominently label the generated or edited content: ... (2) Generated or edited voice information, or modification of voice in major events..."

2.1.3 Interim Measures for the Administration of Generative AI Services (2023)

Effective August 15, 2023, these measures require generative AI service providers to implement content labeling and obtain appropriate authorizations for training data involving personal information.

2.2 Regulatory Bodies

Table 1 China's AI Voice Cloning Regulatory Authorities

Agency	Responsibilities
Cyberspace Administration of China (CAC)	Primary regulator for internet information services; algorithm registration and security assessments; content governance
Ministry of Industry and Information Technology (MIIT)	Telecommunications regulation; technical standards development; industry supervision
Ministry of Public Security (MPS)	Criminal enforcement; fraud prevention; public security aspects
People's Courts	Civil litigation for personality rights violations; establishing judicial precedents

2.3 Notable Enforcement Cases

First AI Voice Personality Rights Infringement Case (2024)

Beijing Internet Court | Case No. (2023) Jing 0491 Min Chu No. 12142 | April 23, 2024

Case Elements:

Plaintiff Yin, a professional voice actor (stage name "Qingxia Sufang"), recorded audiobooks for a media company in 2019. Without authorization, the media company provided Yin's voice recordings to a software company, which used AI technology to create a synthetic voice product called "Xiaoxuan." This AI voice was then sold through the "Moyingfang" platform, accumulating over 3.25 billion plays.

Key Rulings and Reasoning:

- **Identifiability Standard:** The court held that AI-processed voice falls within the scope of personality rights protection when the public can identify the specific person through timbre, tone, and pronunciation style.
- **Authorization Scope:** Authorization to record audio products does not extend to AI voice synthesis. The court established that "authorization for recording does not mean authorization for AI transformation."
- **Liability Allocation:** The court distinguished between direct infringers (media and software companies) and secondary parties with reasonable reliance defenses.

Judgment Outcome:

The court ordered the defendants to issue a written apology and pay RMB 250,000 (approximately USD 35,000) in economic compensation. The infringing products had already been removed from the platform.

2.4 Industry Self-Regulatory Standards

China has developed several industry self-regulatory frameworks:

- **Ethical Guidelines for New Generation Artificial Intelligence (2021):** Issued by the Ministry of Science and Technology, requiring AI developers to integrate

ethical considerations into technology development, including respect for personality rights.

- **Joint Pledge on Artificial Intelligence Industry Self-Discipline:** Industry association initiative encouraging voluntary compliance with ethical standards and user protection measures.
- **Platform Content Moderation Guidelines:** Major platforms including Baidu, Tencent, and ByteDance have implemented internal policies requiring voice synthesis consent verification and content watermarking.

3. European Union

3.1 Current Laws and Regulations

3.1.1 EU Artificial Intelligence Act (Regulation 2024/1689)

The EU AI Act entered into force on August 1, 2024, with transparency provisions for deepfakes applying from August 2, 2026.

Article 3(60) - Definition of Deep Fake

"'deep fake' means AI-generated or manipulated image, audio or video content that resembles existing persons, objects, places, entities or events and would falsely appear to a person to be authentic or truthful."

Article 50(2) - Provider Obligations for Synthetic Content

"Providers of AI systems, including general-purpose AI systems, generating synthetic audio, image, video or text content, shall ensure that the outputs of the AI system are marked in a machine-readable format and detectable as artificially generated or manipulated. Providers shall ensure their technical solutions are effective, interoperable, robust and reliable as far as this is technically feasible..."

Article 50(4) - Deepfake Disclosure Requirements

"Deployers of an AI system that generates or manipulates image, audio or video content constituting a deep fake, shall disclose that the content has been artificially generated or manipulated."

Exception: "This paragraph shall not apply where the use is authorised by law to detect, prevent, investigate or prosecute criminal offences..."

3.1.2 Penalties

Under Article 99(4), violations of transparency obligations may result in fines of up to EUR 15 million or 3% of worldwide annual turnover, whichever is higher.

3.2 Regulatory Bodies

Table 2 EU AI Voice Cloning Regulatory Framework

Authority	Responsibilities
European Commission	Overall enforcement coordination; development of codes of practice; issuing guidelines
European AI Office	Centralized expertise and coordination for AI governance across member states
National Market Surveillance Authorities	Primary enforcement at member state level; complaint handling; inspections
Data Protection Authorities	Enforcement where voice cloning involves personal data processing under GDPR

3.3 Notable Enforcement Cases

European Commission v. X (Twitter) - DSA Transparency Violation

European Commission | December 2025

Case Elements:

The European Commission issued its first fine under the Digital Services Act against X (formerly Twitter) for breaching transparency obligations related to AI-generated content, including deepfake audio and video disseminated through the Grok AI system.

Key Rulings:

- Platforms must implement effective systems to detect and label AI-generated content, including synthetic audio.
- Transparency mechanisms must be accessible and understandable to users.

Outcome:

EUR 120 million fine imposed, with additional investigation ongoing regarding Grok deepfake generation capabilities.

Irish Presidential Election Deepfake Incident (October 2025)

Electoral Context | October 2025

Case Elements:

A deepfake video featuring presidential candidate Catherine Connolly circulated on social media, demonstrating the urgent need for effective enforcement of AI content labeling requirements.

Significance:

This incident highlighted gaps in pre-election enforcement mechanisms and accelerated EU discussions on strengthening real-time detection and removal obligations.

3.4 Industry Self-Regulatory Standards

- **EU Code of Practice on AI-Generated Content (2025):** Voluntary framework under Article 50, establishing technical standards for content watermarking, metadata labeling, and disclosure mechanisms.
- **Digital Services Act Transparency Database:** Platform-reported data on AI content moderation actions, enabling public scrutiny.
- **C2PA (Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity):** Industry consortium establishing technical standards for content authentication, adopted by major EU platforms.

4. United States

4.1 Current Laws and Regulations

4.1.1 Federal Level

FCC Declaratory Ruling on AI-Generated Voices (February 2024)

FCC Ruling on TCPA Application

The Federal Communications Commission unanimously ruled that calls made with AI-generated voices constitute "artificial" voices under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA), making AI voice cloning in robocalls subject to existing consent requirements and penalties.

NO FAKES Act (Proposed)

The Nurture Originals, Foster Art, and Keep Entertainment Safe Act was re-introduced in April 2025, proposing federal protection against unauthorized digital replicas of voice and likeness. Key provisions include:

- Prohibition on producing or distributing unauthorized digital voice replicas
- Right of action for individuals whose voice is replicated without consent
- Platform liability provisions with safe harbors for compliant intermediaries

4.1.2 State Level - Tennessee ELVIS Act (2024)

Tennessee ELVIS Act - Voice Definition

Enacted: March 21, 2024 | **Effective:** July 1, 2024

"Voice" means a sound in a medium that is readily identifiable and attributable to a particular individual, regardless of whether the sound contains the actual voice or a simulation of the voice."

Key provisions of the ELVIS Act:

- **Expanded Protection:** Explicitly covers AI-generated voice simulations, not just actual recordings

- **Secondary Liability:** Prohibits distributing algorithms or tools whose primary purpose is producing unauthorized voice replicas
- **Industry Enforcement:** Record companies may bring actions on behalf of artists
- **Remedies:** Injunctive relief, impoundment, actual damages plus profits

4.1.3 State Level - California AB 2602 and AB 1836 (2024)

California AB 2602 - Contract Voidability

Signed: September 2024 | **Effective:** January 1, 2025

Provisions in performance contracts allowing use of digital replicas of a performer's voice or likeness are voidable if the performer was not represented by legal counsel or a union representative during negotiations.

California AB 1836 - Deceased Performers

Extends protection to deceased performers, prohibiting unauthorized use of digital replicas of their voice or likeness without consent from the estate.

4.2 Regulatory Bodies

Table 3 U.S. AI Voice Cloning Regulatory Authorities

Agency/Level	Responsibilities
Federal Communications Commission (FCC)	Regulating AI-generated robocalls; TCPA enforcement
Federal Trade Commission (FTC)	Consumer protection; deceptive practices enforcement; Voice Cloning Challenge initiative
U.S. Copyright Office	Policy guidance on AI and intellectual property; Digital Replicas Report (2024)
State Attorneys General	State-level consumer protection enforcement; right of publicity cases
State Courts	Civil litigation for right of publicity violations

4.3 Notable Enforcement Cases

FTC Voice Cloning Challenge (2024)

Federal Trade Commission | April 2024

Initiative Elements:

The FTC launched an exploratory challenge to encourage development of solutions to protect consumers from AI voice cloning harms, particularly in fraud contexts. Americans lost nearly \$3 billion to imposter scams in 2024 alone.

Outcome:

Four winning submissions announced in April 2024, focusing on detection technologies and consumer protection mechanisms. The FTC indicated potential Section 5 enforcement actions against companies enabling voice cloning fraud.

Lovo Voice Actor Class Action (2024)

Federal Court | Proposed Class Action

Case Elements:

Multiple voice actors filed a proposed federal class action against AI voice generation company Lovo, alleging the company cloned their voices without authorization or proper compensation, breaching contracts and violating right of publicity protections.

Significance:

This case represents one of the first major class actions specifically targeting commercial AI voice cloning services, with potential to establish precedent for industry-wide practices.

4.4 Industry Self-Regulatory Standards

- **SAG-AFTRA AI Agreements:** The union has negotiated comprehensive AI protections including:
 - Sound Recording Code (April 2024): Consent and compensation required for AI voice replication
 - Interactive Media Agreement (July 2025): Consent/disclosure for digital replica use in video games
 - Definition requirements: Terms like "artist" and "singer" may only refer to humans
- **Human Artistry Campaign:** Coalition of entertainment industry organizations advocating for human-centered AI policies
- **RIAA Guidelines:** Recording industry standards for AI voice model training and consent

5. Japan

5.1 Current Laws and Regulations

5.1.1 Publicity Rights (Paburishiti-ken)

Japan protects voice through the doctrine of publicity rights, established through case law rather than statute.

Publicity Rights Doctrine

The Supreme Court's Pink Lady case (2012) established that publicity rights protect the commercial value of a person's identity. While primarily applied to visual likenesses, legal scholars argue this protection extends to distinctive voices when used commercially.

Three Protected Uses: (1) Goods featuring the individual; (2) Advertising using the individual; (3) Commercial exploitation of the individual's attractive power.

5.1.2 Unfair Competition Prevention Act

Potential Application to Voice Cloning

Article 2(1)(i) prohibits acts that cause confusion with another's goods or business. AI-generated voices that mislead consumers about the identity of a speaker may constitute unfair competition.

5.1.3 Copyright Law and AI

The Agency for Cultural Affairs issued draft guidelines in January 2024 addressing AI and copyright. While primarily focused on visual content, the guidelines inform the approach to voice-related intellectual property.

5.1.4 Government Warnings (2024)

METI Advisory on Voice Actor AI (2024)

The Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry issued guidance warning that unauthorized use of voice actors' voices for AI synthesis likely violates existing laws, potentially including criminal penalties of up to 5 years imprisonment or fines up to 5 million yen under unfair competition provisions.

5.2 Regulatory Bodies

Table 4 Japan's AI Voice Regulation Authorities

Agency	Responsibilities
Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI)	Industrial policy; unfair competition enforcement; AI governance guidelines
Agency for Cultural Affairs (ACA)	Copyright policy; AI and intellectual property guidelines
Personal Information Protection Commission	Data protection aspects of voice synthesis
Consumer Affairs Agency	Consumer protection in AI services

5.3 Notable Enforcement Cases

Japan has not yet produced landmark court decisions specifically on AI voice cloning. However, industry disputes have emerged:

NijiVoice Platform Inquiry (2024)

Japan Actors Union (Nippairen) | 2024

Case Elements:

The Japan Actors Union (日本俳優連合) submitted an inquiry to the NijiVoice AI voice generation platform regarding 33 character voices allegedly similar to union members' voices.

Significance:

While not a formal legal proceeding, this action demonstrates the entertainment industry's active monitoring of AI voice platforms and willingness to pursue remedies.

5.4 Industry Self-Regulatory Standards

- **Three Audio Industry Groups Joint Statement (November 2024):** The Japan Actors Union (日俳連), Japan Entertainment Management Association (マネ協), and Japan Voice Actor Business Association (声事協) jointly called for:
 - Mandatory consent for any AI voice synthesis using voice actors' voices
 - Clear labeling of AI-generated audio content
 - Establishment of licensing and compensation frameworks
- **"No More Unauthorized Generative AI" Campaign (2024):** 26 prominent Japanese voice actors launched a public campaign encouraging dialogue on appropriate AI voice usage
- **Voice Actor Rights Organization (2025):** Industry initiative announced to establish a formal organization protecting voice actors from AI misuse

6. South Korea

6.1 Current Laws and Regulations

6.1.1 AI Basic Act (Framework Act on the Development of Artificial Intelligence and Establishment of Trust)

Enacted December 2024, effective January 22, 2026. South Korea became the first country to enact comprehensive AI legislation.

Article 2(5) - Definition of Generative AI

Original (Korean): "생성형 인공지능"이란 입력 데이터의 구조와 특성을 모방하여 텍스트, 사운드, 이미지, 비디오 및 다양한 기타 출력물을 생성하는 인공지능 시스템을 말한다.

Translation: "Generative AI" means an AI system that generates text, sound, images, video, and various other outputs by imitating the structure and characteristics of input data."

Article 31 - Obligation to Ensure AI Transparency

Paragraph 1: AI business operators must notify users in advance that products or services are AI-based when using high-impact AI or generative AI.

Paragraph 2: Users must be notified in advance that products and services are generative AI-generated.

Paragraph 3 (Deepfake Labeling): "AI business operators must clearly notify or indicate to users when virtual sounds, images, or videos are AI-generated and may be difficult to distinguish from authentic ones."

Exception: For artistic or creative works, notification may be made in a way that doesn't hinder exhibition or enjoyment.

6.1.2 Penalties

Under the AI Basic Act, failure to label generative AI content may result in fines of up to KRW 30 million (approximately USD 20,400).

6.1.3 Criminal Law Amendments for Deepfake Sexual Crimes

In September 2024, the National Assembly passed amendments criminalizing the creation, distribution, and possession of sexually explicit deepfake content.

6.2 Regulatory Bodies

Table 5 South Korea's AI Regulatory Framework

Agency	Responsibilities
National AI Committee (Presidential)	Strategic direction; policy coordination; high-impact AI designation
Ministry of Science and ICT	AI industry development; implementation oversight; standards development
Korea Communications Commission (KCC)	Broadcasting and telecommunications; content regulation
National Police Agency	Criminal enforcement; deepfake crime investigation
Korea Fair Trade Commission	Consumer protection; advertising standards for AI-generated content

6.3 Notable Enforcement Cases

Telegram Deepfake Sex Crime Crackdown (2024)

National Police Agency | 2024

Case Elements:

Korean authorities announced 682 arrests related to deepfake sexual crimes following investigations into Telegram chat rooms distributing AI-generated intimate imagery. Deepfake sex crime suspects increased dramatically, with 60% of suspects in their teens.

Enforcement Actions:

- Investigation of Telegram for platform liability
- Call for INTERPOL collaboration on cross-border enforcement
- Over 3,557 arrests in yearlong crackdown on online sexual exploitation

Significance:

This enforcement action demonstrated Korea's aggressive approach to deepfake-enabled crimes and contributed to the accelerated passage of the AI Basic Act.

6.4 Industry Self-Regulatory Standards

- **AI Labeling Standards:** The AI Basic Act requires invisible digital watermarks for AI-generated text, images, sound, and video, with implementation details to be specified by Presidential Decree.
- **Platform Content Policies:** Major Korean platforms including Naver and Kakao have implemented AI content detection and labeling systems ahead of regulatory requirements.
- **Entertainment Industry Guidelines:** Korean entertainment agencies have begun developing internal policies for AI voice synthesis in K-pop and drama production.

7. Cross-Jurisdictional Comparative Analysis

Table 6 Comparative Analysis of AI Voice Cloning Regulation Across Five Jurisdictions

Dimension	China	European Union	United States	Japan	South Korea
Primary Legal Framework	Civil Code + Deep Synthesis Regulations (2023)	AI Act (2024) + GDPR + DSA	State laws (ELVIS Act, CA AB 2602) + FCC rulings	Publicity rights doctrine + Unfair Competition Act	AI Basic Act (2024, effective 2026)
Voice Protection Basis	Personality rights (explicit statutory protection)	Data protection + transparency obligations	Right of publicity (state-specific)	Publicity rights (case law)	Transparency requirements + criminal law
Consent Requirements	Mandatory separate consent for biometric editing	Implicit through GDPR + disclosure obligations	Varies by state; explicit in TN/CA	Implied through publicity rights	Notification required; consent for high-impact AI
Labeling/Disclosure	Mandatory prominent labeling for voice synthesis	Mandatory machine-readable marking + user disclosure	No federal requirement; platform-specific	No statutory requirement	Mandatory for AI-generated content difficult to distinguish
Maximum Penalties	Administrative + civil damages (RMB 250K+ precedent)	EUR 15M or 3% global turnover	Civil damages; TCPA penalties for robocalls	Up to 5 years imprisonment (unfair competition)	KRW 30M fine; criminal penalties for sexual deepfakes
Regulatory Approach	Comprehensive specific regulation	Risk-based horizontal framework	Sectoral and state-level patchwork	Industry-led with government guidance	Comprehensive framework with strong enforcement

Industry Self-Regulation	Government-guided platforms + ethics guidelines	Code of Practice + C2PA technical standards	SAG-AFTRA agreements; industry coalitions	Voice actor unions; "No More Unauthorized AI" campaign	Platform policies; entertainment industry guidelines
Enforcement Maturity	Active (landmark case 2024)	Early stage (first DSA fines 2025)	Developing (class actions emerging)	Limited (industry disputes only)	Aggressive (criminal enforcement active)

7.1 Key Comparative Observations

Regulatory Philosophy

- **China** adopts a prescriptive approach with specific technology-focused regulations, emphasizing state control over information services.
- **The EU** employs a risk-based, principles-driven framework that integrates AI governance with existing data protection infrastructure.
- **The U.S.** reflects its federalist structure with innovation-friendly federal approach supplemented by activist state legislation.
- **Japan** favors industry self-regulation and soft law, with the government providing guidance rather than prescriptive rules.
- **South Korea** balances comprehensive legislation with innovation promotion, positioning itself as a global leader in AI governance.

Protection Scope

- China and South Korea provide the most explicit voice protection through statutory provisions.
- The U.S. provides strong protection in states with specific legislation (TN, CA) but lacks federal uniformity.
- The EU focuses on transparency rather than absolute prohibition, with GDPR providing backstop protection.
- Japan's protection remains uncertain, relying on judicial interpretation of publicity rights.

Enforcement Effectiveness

- China has demonstrated active judicial enforcement with significant precedent-setting.
- South Korea shows strong criminal enforcement capacity, particularly for deepfake crimes.
- The EU is building enforcement infrastructure but remains in early stages.
- U.S. enforcement is fragmented but private litigation is emerging as a key mechanism.
- Japan relies primarily on industry pressure rather than formal enforcement.

8. Conclusions and Trend Outlook

8.1 Key Conclusions

1. **Convergence Toward Transparency Requirements:** All jurisdictions are moving toward mandatory disclosure of AI-generated content, with varying implementation timelines and specificity.
2. **Voice as Protected Attribute:** Voice is increasingly recognized as a protectable personal attribute, whether through personality rights (China), publicity rights (Japan, U.S.), or transparency frameworks (EU, Korea).
3. **Industry Self-Regulation as Complement:** Professional organizations, particularly in entertainment (SAG-AFTRA, Japanese voice actor unions), are playing crucial roles in establishing practical standards ahead of or alongside legislation.
4. **Enforcement Challenges:** Cross-border enforcement, attribution of AI-generated content, and balancing innovation with protection remain significant challenges across all jurisdictions.

8.2 Trend Outlook (2026-2028)

Regulatory Developments

- **U.S. Federal Legislation:** The NO FAKES Act or similar federal legislation is likely to pass by 2027, establishing baseline voice protection standards.
- **EU Implementation:** Article 50 transparency requirements will be tested through enforcement actions, with potential strengthening based on practical experience.
- **Japan Statutory Reform:** Government is likely to introduce specific voice protection legislation by 2027, responding to industry pressure.
- **Global Harmonization:** International coordination efforts through OECD and bilateral agreements will increase, though full harmonization remains distant.

Technological Developments

- **Detection Technologies:** AI voice authentication and deepfake detection tools will become more sophisticated and widely deployed.
- **Watermarking Standards:** Technical standards for invisible audio watermarking will mature, enabling more effective content provenance tracking.

- **Real-Time Detection:** Platforms will increasingly implement real-time AI voice detection at the point of upload or streaming.

Industry Practices

- **Licensing Frameworks:** Formal voice licensing and royalty systems for AI synthesis will emerge, similar to music rights organizations.
- **Consent Verification:** Technological solutions for obtaining and verifying consent for voice synthesis will become industry standard.
- **Insurance Products:** Specialized insurance products for voice identity protection and deepfake liability will develop.

8.3 Recommendations

For organizations operating across multiple jurisdictions:

1. Implement the most protective consent and labeling standards across all markets to ensure global compliance.
2. Establish robust voice rights clearance procedures for any AI voice synthesis applications.
3. Monitor regulatory developments actively, particularly EU Article 50 implementation and U.S. federal legislative progress.
4. Engage with industry self-regulatory initiatives to help shape practical standards.
5. Invest in detection and authentication technologies to protect against unauthorized voice cloning.

9. References

1. Cyberspace Administration of China. (2022). Provisions on the Administration of Deep Synthesis Internet Information Services (互联网信息服务深度合成管理规定). *CAC Official Publication*. High Reliability
2. National People's Congress of China. (2020). Civil Code of the People's Republic of China, Article 1023. *Official Gazette*. High Reliability
3. Beijing Internet Court. (2024). Yin v. AI Technology Company et al., Case No. (2023) Jing 0491 Min Chu No. 12142. *First AI Voice Personality Rights Infringement Case*. High Reliability
4. European Parliament and Council. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (AI Act). *Official Journal of the European Union*. High Reliability
5. European Commission. (2025). Code of Practice on AI-Generated Content under Article 50 of the AI Act. *Digital Strategy Publications*. High Reliability
6. Tennessee General Assembly. (2024). Ensuring Likeness Voice and Image Security Act (ELVIS Act). *Public Chapter No. 615*. High Reliability
7. California Legislature. (2024). Assembly Bill 2602 - Contracts: Personal Services: Digital Replicas. *California Legislative Information*. High Reliability
8. Federal Communications Commission. (2024). Declaratory Ruling on AI-Generated Voices in Robocalls. *FCC Document*. High Reliability
9. SAG-AFTRA. (2024-2025). AI Bargaining and Policy Work Timeline. *SAG-AFTRA Official Website*. High Reliability
10. Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, Japan. (2024). Advisory on Generative AI and Voice Actor Rights. *METI Press Release*. High Reliability
11. Japan Actors Union (日本俳優連合). (2024). Statement on Generative AI from Three Audio Industry Groups. *Nippairen Official Website*. Medium Reliability
12. National Assembly of the Republic of Korea. (2024). Framework Act on the Development of Artificial Intelligence and Establishment of Trust (인공지능 기본법). *Korean Law Information Center*. High Reliability
13. CSET Georgetown. (2025). Framework Act on the Development of Artificial Intelligence (English Translation). *Center for Security and Emerging Technology*. High Reliability
14. Korean National Police Agency. (2024). Announcement of Deepfake Sex Crime Enforcement Actions. *NPA Press Release*. High Reliability
15. European Commission. (2025). First DSA Fine Against X for Transparency Violations. *EC Press Release*. High Reliability
16. Federal Trade Commission. (2024). Voice Cloning Challenge Winners Announcement. *FTC News*. High Reliability
17. Kim & Chang. (2024). Analysis of China's First AI Voice Infringement Case. *China Law Insight*. Medium Reliability
18. Latham & Watkins. (2024). The ELVIS Act: Tennessee Shakes Up Its Right of Publicity Law. *Client Alert*. Medium Reliability

9. References

19. WilmerHale. (2024). Limited-Risk AI—A Deep Dive Into Article 50 of the EU AI Act. *Privacy and Cybersecurity Law Blog*. Medium Reliability
20. Reuters. (2026). South Korea launches landmark laws to regulate AI. *Reuters News*. High Reliability
21. Ministry of Science and Technology, China. (2021). Ethical Guidelines for New Generation Artificial Intelligence (新一代人工智能伦理规范). *MOST Official Publication*. High Reliability
22. Mori Hamada & Matsumoto. (2024). Generative AI and Protection of Voice Rights in Japan. *MHM Newsletter*. Medium Reliability
23. JIPITEC. (2024). Article 50 AI Act: Do the Transparency Provisions Improve Upon the Legal Situation? *Journal of Intellectual Property, Information Technology and Electronic Commerce Law*. Medium Reliability
24. Consumer Reports. (2025). More than 75,000 consumers urge FTC to crack down on AI voice cloning fraud. *Consumer Advocacy Report*. Medium Reliability
25. Information Technology and Innovation Foundation. (2025). One Law Sets South Korea's AI Policy. *ITIF Policy Brief*. Medium Reliability

Reliability Rating Methodology

Rating	Criteria
High Reliability	Official government publications, court decisions, statutory texts, major international organizations
Medium Reliability	Major law firm analyses, reputable industry publications, academic journals, established news organizations
Low Reliability	Blog posts, opinion pieces, unverified sources (not used in this report)