

Reframing AI Governance Through Experience from Practice — Reflections on Participation in the GPAI Student Gathering —

Hitomi Tachikawa
University of Tokyo
Graduate School of Public Policy / Public Management Program

This report organizes reflections gained through participation in a university project as well as the GPAI Student Gathering held on 13 January 2026. The Global Partnership on AI (GPAI) is an international initiative promoting the responsible development and use of artificial intelligence, addressing multifaceted policy issues including ethics, labor, governance, and privacy. Its working groups engage with questions of inclusive growth, human-centered AI, data governance, and future labor transitions. The student gathering provided a forum in which these international discussions were reinterpreted and shared from student perspectives. Through participation, I came to recognize more clearly that issues surrounding AI extend beyond technological considerations and relate fundamentally to the redesign of social structures, institutional norms, and human expectations about work and responsibility.

During the 2025 academic year, I participated in a project at Ema Lab. focusing on “The Future of Manufacturing and Work.” Through factory visits and discussions, we examined how the introduction of AI and robotics influences work experiences and value systems. In practice, I observed efforts to utilize technology while maintaining human relationships as a foundation, supporting skill development and motivation. Rather than replacing human agency, technological systems were often integrated into collaborative environments where tacit knowledge, interpersonal trust, and accumulated experience remained essential. This experience underscored that technological adoption cannot be evaluated solely in terms of efficiency or output metrics. Furthermore, discussions exploring the relationship between manufacturing industries and changing lifestyles deepened my understanding that the future of work is shaped not only by institutions and technologies but also by shifts in individual values, family structures, and expectations regarding professional continuity.

At the same time, as a working professional enrolled in graduate study, I experienced complex feelings toward student-led discussions. There were moments when narratives about the future of work appeared premised on perspectives distant from lived workplace experience, revealing what might be described as a “logic of advantage.” Yet this discomfort became an opportunity to re-examine the positioning of my own perspective. International discussions on AI governance similarly risk abstracting ideals away from grounded experience. Frameworks developed at the policy level often rely on conceptual clarity and generalizability, whereas practical settings demand adaptation to context, ambiguity, and competing constraints. This sense of distance highlighted structural gaps between policy and practice, prompting renewed reflection on where my own standpoint resides within these tensions.

Viewing the gathering through this lens, discussions on generative AI use illustrated the gap between ideals and reality in concrete terms. Participants shared both benefits—such as assistance in drafting text and organizing thought—and challenges including increased verification work and risks of misinformation. These exchanges suggested that trustworthiness in AI is not merely a question of technical accuracy but a social process dependent on users’ judgement and responsibility allocation. Trust emerges through iterative interaction, oversight, and contextual interpretation rather than through technical reliability alone. I was reminded that AI governance cannot be realized through institutional design alone; it becomes meaningful only through interaction with human literacy, operational capacity, and practical knowledge embedded in everyday workflows.

Presentations from other universities raised questions about how human roles should be repositioned as technology advances. While outcomes such as productivity and safety are measurable, creativity, personal

growth, and well-being often remain absent from evaluation metrics. This observation strongly reinforced my awareness that decision-making risks overlooking experiential human value when outcomes are framed narrowly in quantifiable terms. Balancing efficiency with human-centered perspectives requires reconsidering what counts as meaningful success and recognizing that value creation may include elements that resist standardization or measurement. Additionally, discussions on privacy in public data collection highlighted concrete practices such as immediate deletion of facial images and transparent notification. These debates demonstrated that technological acceptance depends not only on regulation but on socially credible operation and trust formation. AI governance, therefore, is not merely regulatory but relational, emerging through sustained engagement between institutions, developers, and communities.

Participation in the gathering ultimately prompted me to reconsider my own position within AI-related discourse. International policy conversations inevitably operate at high levels of abstraction, whereas experience from practice is context-specific and concrete. The tension between these domains cannot easily be resolved, nor should it necessarily be eliminated. Instead, productive engagement may lie in sustaining dialogue across these boundaries. I came to recognize that a central challenge of AI governance lies not in institutional design alone but in whether abstract principles can incorporate experiential knowledge from practice. In this sense, I view my role as situated between these spheres — translating principles into practice while feeding grounded insight back into conceptual debate. Without actors capable of sustaining this reciprocal movement, governance risks becoming hollow. As AI diffusion continues irreversibly, engagement must extend beyond theoretical or institutional arenas toward ongoing accumulation of experience within one's own field of practice, where governance is enacted rather than merely articulated.



Image generated using AI (Tool: nano banana)