Vision statement

The challenges and opportunities the UN and the next UNSG may encounter (2481 words / 3852)

The Secretary General selection process takes place at a ***special time*** [few months after the SDG adoption and the Paris Agreement] that gives the UN member states a ***unique opportunity*** to **agree** not only on the right person to lead the UN, but also on a *'strategy'* and a *'plate-form'* designed to help the UN member states (and the world) achieve their SDG and Paris agreement objectives. It is also a ***challenge*** **(1) for the UN** because member states will have **only few months** (April through September) to agree on this *strategy* and *plate-form*, and **(2) for the next UNSG** because he/she will have to convince **member states** that *the strategy* and *platform* he/she defends, will help them achieve their different objectives.

Peace and Security.

When we look at the long and difficult work *'you'* [member states representatives, UN countries missions, countries governments, UN employees...] have done during the past four or five years to come up with the universal set of sustainable development goals and to adopt the Paris agreement, it is hard to believe (and **sad** to see) that the conflicts in Libya, Syria, or Ukraine, among others, could **not** be prevented; and it shows that *our approach to conflict prevention* was **not** appropriate. So a ***challenge*** is to develop ***a new and <u>more efficient</u> approach to conflict prevention*** **(1)** that takes into consideration **(a)** the work you do at the UN to negotiate national and international goals to improve the living conditions of billions of people, **(b)** the general situation of the world, and **(c)** the knowledge we have acquired on conflicts' consequences for countries, and **(2)** that **includes** paying a more careful attention to what is going on in rich countries [please see page 4, second proposal].

And the adoption of the SDG and the Paris Agreement are ***opportunities*** because they give the possibility to the UN and its next Secretary General **(1)** to ask the different parties to a potential conflict (and the countries that support them) to evaluate **more carefully** the grave consequences of a violent protest or of a conflict on the people, on the international community, and on the chance to reach the various objectives, and **(2)** to encourage these parties to act in ways that will **not** endanger their countries' (and the world's) chances to achieve their (its) SDG and their (its) Paris agreement objectives [In Libya, Syria..., we went from **a bad situation** to a **disastrous tragedy** that had grave consequences, not just **(1) for the people** there, but also **(2) for the world** because it decreases our chance to reach our global goals to improve people's life; **<u>and it was predictable</u>**, as well as the fact that these countries would be plunged into more poverty and hardship <u>**for 30 years or so**</u> (!)]. Also, opposition *'**parties**'* considering violent protests or conflicts should always try to put back **their disagreements** in the context of your work at the UN, of the objectives you adopt, and of the global actions you support, so that everyone can benefit from their efforts.

Another ***challenge*** is the fight against religious extremism. We would be blind if we did not notice the importance that religious extremism plays in the emergence of certain conflicts [for example in Syria, Iraq, …, in parts of Africa,], and I believe that **religions** <u>necessarily</u> have **a part** of responsibility in religious extremism, this is why I propose to **enlarge the scope** of *interfaith dialog* to address this issue [please see page 5, proposal 6].

Sustainable development

Finding ***a <u>legally bidding</u> agreement*** on climate change related objectives [**with *greenhouse gases emissions reduction objectives <u>sufficient</u>*** to limit the temperature rise **well** below 2° and **<u>with *binding enforcement mechanisms</u>***] will be a ***challenge*** because – to me – it is possible to find such an (honest) agreement **<u>only if</u>** we also find **at the same time (1)** a legally binding agreement on the SDG, and **(2)** an agreement *on the common strategy* to follow and on the ***platform of proposals*** to achieve our various objectives **with a high degree of certainty**.

A *legally binding agreement* - with **<u>sufficient</u> greenhouse gases emissions reductions** and **<u>binding enforcement mechanisms</u>** - is critical **<u>for both</u> (1) rich countries** that will have to disburse **100 billion dollars** a year about starting in 2020, in addition to ODA, to mitigate the consequences of global warming and to help poor countries build low carbon economies [they need to be sure that this money will be well spent and that poor countries will also control their greenhouse gases emissions]; and **(2) poor countries** that need rich countries to respect their financial promises and their greenhouse gases emissions reduction objectives [so that they can take their people out of poverty and transform their own economies into low carbon economies].

But, it is a difficult result to achieve, because to give <u>sufficient assurances</u> (to both groups) that the various objectives will be reached, rich and poor countries **need to agree (a)** on **a fairly precise strategy and sets of actions to help countries achieve both sets of goals** (SDG and climate change objectives) and **(b)** on the use of certain <u>common</u> <u>processes</u> in the economic, justice (…) areas. Again poverty eradication objectives are inseparable from our climate change objectives (if we limit the temperature rise to 2° **by keeping billions** in extreme poverty, **we fail**), so '*we*' all need to be assured that '*everyone*' will reach both sets of objectives (SDG and climate change objectives).

An *opportunity* here <u>is again</u> **(1)** the adoption of the SDG which have granted **an important part to the realization of climate change related objective** (obj. 13), and **(2)** the possibility the UN has **(a)** to adopt **in 2016** a <u>general</u> strategy that encourages (*i*) a more efficient use of the Internet and (*ii*) the development of the alternative to market capitalism **to make rapid progress** toward the SDG and the Paris agreement goals, and **(b)** to work during the next few years on a more precise strategy and platform to be able to adopt a more efficient **legally binding agreement** (with binding enforcement mechanisms) for these two types of objectives. This is why I urge you to accept the strategy and the proposals I present below [pages 4 and 5].

Human rights
A *challenge* is **(1)** *the cost of building an efficient justice system that works for everyone,* and in particular a justice system <u>that works well for **the poor**</u>, and also sometimes **(2)** the reluctance (of some countries) to build more efficient justice systems to maintain *some powers and advantages* in place and to facilitate corruption [France and the US have been good examples of these 2 problems, I believe].

As you know it, in the US, the Supreme Court renders <u>about</u> **80 opinions every year**, out 8000 petitions [2008 statistics, I believe], so most of the decisions are summary decisions, which is **not justice;** and federal appeal courts render <u>about</u> 5% of opinions (!) [estimation 2008 for 9th Circuit], so it is not much better than the Supreme Court; and, **of course**, there is no <u>public</u> *legal aid system* in civil (and administrative) matters in the US, and **a very bad one** in criminal matter; so even though the US is the **richest** country in the world, we can say that it still has a long way to go and **a lot of money to spend** to build *an <u>efficient justice system</u>*, and in particular an efficient justice system **for the poor** (in France we have **similar problems too**). And now we have set for objective (no 16) '*to provide **access to justice for all** and to <u>build effective</u>, accountable, and inclusive **institutions at all level**'*, so to achieve this objective, we will need **a lot of money** and an <u>absolutely</u> **perfect** organization and use of information and communication technologies.

An *opportunity* is again the possibility to use the Internet more efficiently and to develop global computer applications that can be used by a large number of countries because it gives us the chance to build *common justice processes* and to develop the supporting computer applications to implement them **at a much lower cost** [a good example is, of course, the development of an **efficient** legal aid system and its supporting applications described in the platform presented below]. This *opportunity* also gives us a better chance to have rich countries fulfil their **ODA obligations** because they will be able to do it while resolving their own problems.   [As M. Ban Ki-moon mentioned it his 2015 report, '*Only 5 of the 29 members of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development **have met** the United Nations ODA target of 0.7 per cent of their gross national income, **while 9** meet the lower bound of the target by providing more than 0.15 per cent of their gross national income as ODA to the least developed countries*', <u>so we need to have rich countries **respect their ODA engagements**</u>].

Humanitarian response
A *challenge* is the difficult situation the next UNSG will find [about **56 million** displaced people because of conflict (according to Mr. Ban Ki-moon's 2015 report, or even 60 million according to M. Guterres, it seems), and the more than **76 million** people from 31 countries needing assistance], with the possibility that the situation worsens in the short term.

And the adoption of the SDG and the Paris Agreement should be ***opportunities*** and encourage us to make more efforts to prevent the conflicts (**<u>and to resolve the ongoing ones</u>**) and to remind everyone and every countries **(1)** that they must focus on the various objectives (SDG, climate change) they have agreed upon, and **(2)** that the survival of the planet depends on it. Obviously, an important number of people need help because of conflicts, so if we make significant progress in lowering the number of conflicts, it will **decrease** the number of people in distress significantly and the spending due to these humanitarian problems so that we can focus (our expenses) on helping the people **in their own home countries**.

A better coherence in our strategy and an agreement on a platform of proposals to achieve our various goals should also provide the hope that the situation will improve shortly, which may help to prevent some conflicts and could help *us* to resolve these humanitarian problems more efficiently; we need to be more efficient in various areas (at the same time) to speed up progress [and Internet can help us to be more efficient in various areas].

Issues pertaining to the management of the Organization

Challenges here are **(1)** '*to harness the potential of ICT to support the wok of the UN* in the field of peace and security, development, human rights and international law' [*a* recommendation of **GA 29-12-14 resolution (69/262)**], and **(2)** to convince the US to let the UN **(a)** present a proposal to create a new Internet IO to replace the *multistakeholder model* and then **(b)** create this new Internet IO. As you know, '*on March 14, 2014 the US announced its intent to transition the stewardship of key internet functions to the global multistakeholder community*' and a proposal was handed over by ICANN in March 2016.

But the *multistakeholder model* is **not** a good governance model for the Internet. For example, **(1)** with this model, it is impossible to put in place *a fair and coherent global Internet fee system* that is based on the use of the Internet resources and on the revenues generated by this use. Now, the site fees are collected by various organizations [registry, registrar] that cannot ask for the **appropriate fee** or even compute it because for that you need **(a)** to have access to some information that private organizations (or non-profit organizations) should **not** be able to access and **(b)** to have a global picture of what is going on, not just a tiny bit of it. Also, **(2)** the *multistakeholder model* prevents us from having a *coherent and performant information system on the Internet* **with all the benefits** that the Internet, the countries and the people **could gain**. There are now more than 3 billion Internet users and more than a billion websites (¾ of which are not active according to the statistics I read), and these numbers continue to increase, so we need **to improve our Internet information system** as soon as possible to know **precisely**, who operates these more than 300 million active websites, for what purpose, how much money is made with these sites, how many employees are working on them (if any), how many users visit them, how much Internet resources they are using, etc. (the more we wait, the more difficult it will be to create this efficient information system).

This is important **(a)** for the development of the Internet, **(b)** for security reasons, and **(c)** for economic reasons, **among other reasons**, and *the multistakeholder model* does **not** allow us to do that. Again, the registries and registrars that collect the information from websites owners **do not** and sometimes are **not** allowed **to collect** certain important information, and they cannot **verify its accuracy**. A new Internet IO [that would perform the Internet functions of ICANN, IANA, IAB, registries, registrars ...] could do all this (in cooperation with countries) and for everyone's benefits. Finally, **(3)** the cost to govern the Internet, to manage the various tasks and to improve its functioning **is not optimized** [for example certain functions are redundant in different organizations (registries operators like Afnic, Denic, do very similar work), so a new Internet IO could do a more efficient work], and there is no possibility to have a coherent and common strategy on the use of the Internet to help UN members states (and the world) achieve their goals. This is why **the UN must** absolutely and urgently **(a)** present a coherent proposal that points out the many benefits of creating a new Internet IO **for the US**, for the Internet, and for the World, and **(b)** convince the US to facilitate the creation of this new Internet IO.

'To harness the potential of ICT to support the wok of the UN', we must develop **new** global computer applications that will help us resolve specific **global** problems [*in the field of peace and security, development, human rights and international law...*] and that can help many people around the world at the same time, and this will be a *technical and financial challenge* because, **even if** there are several worldwide applications with millions or even a billion of users (in the private sector), the UN is not **yet** equipped to do that, obviously. The US willingness to give up some of its control over the Internet should be an *opportunity* for the UN, **even if** the US favors the *multistakeholdder model* at this time, it seems.

The general strategy and the plate-form of proposals (for this section: **1348 words / 3852**)

The UNGA should '*adopt*' **in 2016** a general strategy and a set of actions to help member states achieve their various goals. The first **three points** I would like to make are '*general strategy'* proposals:

- **First,** we must ***put the Internet at the center of our effort*** to resolve our global problems and to achieve the SDG and Paris agreement objectives; this may not be an original recommendation, but it is still a critical recommendation, and **many of you** have underlined the importance of ICT to resolve our problems in various areas <u>during your SDG preparation work</u>.

- **Second**, we must pay a **more** careful attention to what is going on in rich countries than we have done it in the past. This is important **because** we need to build on what rich countries have achieved to develop and implement **improved** administrative, justice,, economic systems and processes everywhere ; **because** rich countries are the only ones that can launch certain complicated initiatives or develop certain global computer applications that could be used by every other countries; and **because** countries act according to their own interest, which may include acting to stay (much) richer than other countries [or benefiting from destabilization of other countries], and this is often in contradiction with the international community's interests and **slows us down** in our effort to defeat poverty; and a way to diminish this negative situation, is to be picky with rich countries and to ask them to take this reality into consideration in all relevant decisions.

- **Third**, we must use ***our information society*** more efficiently, while tackling both ***the psychological issues*** and ***the systemic issues*** that cause poverty. If we maintain global systems that are truly unjust [as we do for our economic system, and for some legal aid systems like in the US and France, for example], then we let the society have a wrong perception of ***what is wrong*** and ***what is right***, and this has **grave negative consequences** in many areas that we could avoid with appropriate changes [for example, certain unjust and disproportionate revenues or salaries **(1)** amounts to ***degrading treatments*** for the rest of billions human beings, and **(2)** creates psychological problems, **<u>corruption</u>** …, **<u>inequalities</u>**, but still **we do nothing to change** our global economic system, market capitalism, that creates this situation mostly, and this is wrong; **we must <u>show</u> the people** that we are **(a)** resolving the global systemic problems and **(b)** building **a fairer** society].

The more specific actions
And, these three general suggestions lead us to the more specific proposals:

- The **first** proposal is the creation of **a new *Internet International Organizatio*n** responsible for, among other duties, **(1)** the governance of the Internet [an organization that performs the ICANN, IANA, IAB, registries, registrars (...) 'Internet' functions], **(2)** the development and maintenance of **global** computer (Internet) applications that could help us resolve certain specific global problems, and **(3)** the transfer of Information's technologies to poor countries.

- The **second** proposal is the search for and the development and implementation of ***the alternative to market capitalism;*** the **goals** are, <u>among others</u>, to design and implement an economic system that **(1) remunerates** each person (more) in relation with his/her relative contribution to society's progress; **(2) helps** us eradicate poverty, decrease the inequalities, and fight global warming; and **(3) facilitates** the convergence.

[In 2012, **M. Lamy** qualified ***the search for an alternative to market capitalism*** to be ***a fundamental question***, and, for me, this was also **a fundamental question in 2005** when I presented my platform to defeat poverty ; and the improvement of our international information systems makes it possible to realize this project with an important chance of success (**the improvement** of our information system is even <u>the key</u> to succeed in the this area, and **only the UN** can lead and organize such complicated project because **every country in the world** must participate and give its point of view)]

- The **third** proposal aims at improving ***our justice system*** in rich countries (<u>and **indirectly everywhere else in the world**</u>), and in particular at building on what rich countries have achieved to create **better** justice processes and systems that could be used by all countries that want it; this includes, of course, **(1)** the **design** and the implementation of a new ***legal aid system*** that respects the poor fundamental rights and **(2)** the development of the global computer applications needed to implement it [**we absolutely need an efficient legal aid system** <u>if we want to eradicate poverty by 2030 and to make all the justice systems accessible to everyone and efficient</u>].

- The **fourth** proposal is the development of several global computer applications that will help us resolve certain specific problems [this is consistent with the 'recommendation' of the GA 29-12-14 resolution (69/262) that stresses '*the need to harness the potential of ICT to support the work of the UN in the areas of peace and security, development, human rights and international law*'], including:

(a) The applications necessary to implement a fairer *Internet fee system* based on (*i*) the use of the resources and (*ii*) the revenues generated by the use of the Internet.

(b) The applications necessary to implement the *newly developed alternative to market capitalism*.

(c) The applications necessary to implement our *new legal aid system*; including **(1)** an application to manage the legal aid application and **(2)** an application to help the lawyers make their legal aid missions and to evaluate the time spent for each mission and per type of mission.

(d) The applications necessary to improve *the transfer and integration of statistical data* at the world wide level.

- The **fifth** proposal is to <u>start</u> working on a *legally binding agreement,* **not only** on climate change objectives, **but also** on the **related** SDG (<u>with binding enforcement mechanisms</u>) and to start preparing the platform of proposals that will make this legally binding agreement in both areas possible. The legally binding agreement on climate change is inseparable from the efforts we all must do **(a)** to eradicate extreme poverty (and decrease the % of people living under the poverty line) and **(b)** to bring decent living and working condition for all, and this requires having a clear and common strategy to achieve our different objectives. So the platform I present here is only a beginning that must be 'refined' (expended) during the next few years to finally reach this legally binding agreement (on both sets of goals).

- The **sixth** proposal is to strengthen and **to enlarge the scope** of *interfaith dialog.* For example, we need **religious <u>leaders</u>** (and religions) to start thinking **(1)** about the *role* of religions **in a <u>modern</u> society (a)** that is **free of poverty** and **(b)** that **respects human rights** and **the knowledge we have acquired** (over the years), and **(2)** about **a path** between the actual role of religions and their new role in a modern society. We need to build on King Abdullah II's initiative that created the '*world interfaith harmony week*' to encourage **religious <u>leaders</u>** and (religious) intellectuals to find a way to take more into consideration **(1) the progress we have** made (scientific and other) during the past 2000 years or so, **(2) the knowledge we have acquired** during this time also, and **(3) the common values we have embraced** (human rights,), to adapt the different religions '*philosophies'* and to change practices that are dangerous for the world and for peace.

Conclusion.

As you see, the proposals aim **mostly** at resolving *complex <u>technical</u> and <u>organizational</u> problems* that are common to many countries including rich countries, and if I may say so, problems of a *less divisive nature* and/or in which **politics** should **not** be as important (at first at least) as in certain other areas.

And the proposals will also build **tools** that will be very important to design a more precise strategy **necessary** to adopt an efficient and **legally binding** agreement on climate change and on the SDG (with binding enforcement mechanisms) and to reach our various goals.