

Report of Group A: The 2025L Organization in Local Government

Susumu Mastumoto
Doshisha University
Faculty of Sociology / Department of Sociology
Fujimoto Laboratory

The 2025L organization is engaged in various initiatives aimed at realizing a smart city, one of which is the active adoption of AI across the entire organization. In addition, the organization places strong emphasis on establishing a framework for safe and appropriate AI utilization through measures such as the enactment of an AI ordinance and the implementation of risk assessments. Prior to full-scale AI adoption, the 2025L organization conducted a pilot trial of generative AI in 2023 to examine its effectiveness and identify potential challenges. Subsequently, in 2024, full-scale use of generative AI was rolled out organization-wide. Based on publicly available materials that describe the details of the pilot trial, usage conditions after full deployment, concrete use cases, and other related initiatives, this interview was conducted.

According to the interview, AI contributes not only to reducing working hours but also to improving the quality of documents and policy measures. One example of AI utilization is the creation of personas, which are fictional citizen models. These personas are used as a form of “idea sparring” to explore how categorized individuals might think in certain situations, allowing staff to easily gather sample perspectives. However, due to limitations related to training data, these personas are not used directly for policymaking. Instead, citizen surveys and online monitoring are conducted, and ultimately, policies are formulated through the independent judgment of staff members. In addition, the 2025L organization is developing applications that incorporate generative AI to promote its institutionalization. These applications are tailored to specific tasks, and the organization is considering expanding such development efforts in the future. At present, AI services directly accessible to citizens have not been introduced. This is because, given the nature of local governments, the risks associated with incorrect usage or erroneous outputs are greater than in the private sector, necessitating a cautious approach. The same concern applies to application development in terms of quality assurance.

From a security perspective, ordinances play a significant role alongside training programs. Staff members are required to comply with appropriate usage rules to avoid violations of the ordinance. While the existence of the ordinance may encourage cautious AI use, the organization has adopted a policy of thoroughly addressing security risks before advancing AI utilization.

Currently, the 2025L organization’s use of AI remains at a basic level, primarily aimed at helping staff become familiar with the technology. While some staff members use AI frequently, others have never used it, resulting in considerable variation in usage frequency. Therefore, it is necessary to move beyond individual-level use and promote AI integration across entire workflow processes, while continuing to provide training on the basic use of generative AI.

Based on this interview, it was striking that the 2025L organization is actively promoting the use of generative AI despite the high level of public responsibility and accountability inherent to local governments. In particular, the establishment of an AI ordinance and the implementation of risk assessments demonstrate a governance

framework that prioritizes risk management over hasty adoption, which can be evaluated as both appropriate and advanced for a public organization.

While the organization's stance of positioning generative AI as a tool to support human judgment is commendable, challenges remain regarding how final decision-making responsibility should be assigned and clarified. Although staff members are expected not to accept AI outputs uncritically, disparities in AI literacy among staff make it difficult to assume that this premise is fully realized in practice. Furthermore, in cases where erroneous decisions occur, the delineation of responsibility between AI outputs and human judgment is not always clearly defined.

Moreover, the fact that participation in DX-related training is voluntary may exacerbate differences in awareness and experience with AI among staff. In order to integrate AI into organizational workflows as a whole, it will be necessary not only to rely on individual motivation but also to establish mechanisms for sharing common standards of judgment and AI literacy across the organization. In this sense, the present case, which seeks to balance caution with innovation, illustrates both the potential and the limitations of human-centered AI utilization in public administration, and offers important insights for future AI adoption by local governments.



The image generated by AI.