

Description of the Proposals' platform (Version of 21-3-26)

The six proposals are: (1) the creation of a new IO dedicated to computer and network applications (pages 1-3); (2) the development of a new pricing system for domain names (pages 3-4); (3) the development of a new legal aid system (pages 4-8); (4) the development of a new retirement pension management system (pages 8-9); (5) the creation of a new IO for the modernization of armies, disarmament ... (pages 9-10); and (6) the search for an alternative to market capitalism (page 10).

Proposal no. 1: creation of a new international organization dedicated to computer and network (Internet) applications, and in charge of, among other duties, (1) Internet governance, (2) the governance (technical or central) of Artificial Intelligence, (3) the development and maintenance of global Internet applications that could help solve certain specific problems that all countries must address, (4) the development of our global information system, (5) the management of UN data centers, (6) the fight against cybercrime and violations of human rights online in cooperation with Interpol, and (7) the calculation and collection of Internet domain name (and other) fees.

Goals of proposal no. 1

- Create a single organization that will carry out (1) all the tasks currently performed by the various organizations or entities (organizations, businesses, etc.) that govern the Internet and make it possible for the Internet “application” to function [(1) the six organizations (associations, forums) that ensure Internet governance: ICANN, IANA (PTI), ISOC, IETF, NRO, IGF (or organizational groups, since IETF — which includes IAB and IESG — is a subsidiary of ISOC, and NRO, the Number Resource Organization, is composed of five RIRs, Regional Internet Registries); (2) the organizations and businesses that operate the 13 Root Name Servers (Verisign, Cogent Communications, USC, University of Maryland, RIPE NCC, ISOC, ICANN, NASA, Defense Information Systems Agency, US Army Research Lab, Netnod, and WIDE Project); (3) the organizations (associations, businesses) that manage domain names and collect annual fees (Registrars, Registries, Country-code top-level domains (ccTLDs), Generic top-level domains (gTLDs)); and (4) the Internet Service Providers (ISPs)]; and (2) several other new tasks [such as AI (central) governance, running the UN data center, organizing the development and maintenance of new global applications, and the calculation and collection of Internet domain name (and other) fees (to generate greater revenues for the UN)] that are necessary to help the UN address the complex problems it must resolve.
- Address all the problems of the current organization of Internet governance [for example: (1) it is difficult (or impossible) to accurately assess (a) the number of people who operate the Internet “application”, and (b) the cost of operating the Internet, because while the tasks related to Internet operation are performed by a small number of organizations, the tasks related to (i) the collection of annual domain name fees (Internet revenues) and (ii) the management of domain names are performed by a larger number of organizations (of various types: businesses, associations, etc.) spread across the world; (2) it is impossible (a) to optimize (minimize) the costs of operating the Internet, and (b) to define optimized standard working procedures, because some identical tasks are assigned to different organizations and types of organizations (businesses, associations, universities) with different objectives, and resources are lost that could be used to reduce the digital divide or improve the Internet and its operation;

(3) the current domain name pricing system cannot take into account (a) the use of Internet resources by website owners, (b) the revenues and profits generated by this Internet use, and (c) many other essential pieces of information that would be useful to determine the appropriate fee and for the proper functioning of the Internet; (4) the organizations responsible for the sale and registration of domain names generally have neither the authority nor the means to collect and verify the information related to the sale and registration of domain names that is — or should be — collected to better manage the Internet and to establish a fair and appropriate domain name price, so the information system related to the Internet is very imperfect and ineffective, and the organizations responsible for Internet operation do not have the resources they need to improve Internet security and operation and to fulfill their missions; (5) some critical tasks (for the functioning of the Internet) are carried out — and some important decisions are taken — by volunteers employed by companies or organizations other than those responsible for Internet governance (for example, the IAB is composed of people who work, among other entities, in large companies such as Apple, Google, Huawei, Nokia, Cisco, whose primary objective is to make money, and not necessarily to find solutions to Internet problems that are in the interest of humanity, and this (a) creates conflicts of interest, and (b) poses a problem for implementing solutions to certain issues requiring a high level of discretion or secrecy (for example, implementing systems that help secure the Internet or strategies to combat cybercrime and human rights violations online).]

- Decrease the current cost of running the Internet by taking advantage of the synergies and cost savings resulting from the merger of the Internet-related activities of all these organizations.
- Generate new possibilities and technical benefits due (1) to the merger of the organizations and entities running the Internet, and (2) to the additional (a) responsibilities and duties (AI governance, development and maintenance of global computer and network applications, joint task force with Interpol to fight cybercrime and human rights violations online), (b) expertise (AI, data center management, software development), and (c) resources (data centers) of the new IO. [For example, the technical benefits would include (1) improvements in Internet functioning, Internet security, and the Internet information system (due to the AI expertise, resources given to the new IO, collecting more information on the use of Internet resources by website owners and other Internet users, human or non-human, and on site owners and internet users, human and non human, than is currently known), and (2) the possibility (a) of generating much higher revenues than ICANN and the other organizations and entities concerned, (b) of decreasing the operational cost of running the Internet, and (c) of determining a more accurate fee for each site and each user, more closely linked to resource usage (...), and of linking non-human users to the human users who benefit from them.]
- Generate economic and other benefits (including political benefits) resulting (a) from the creation of this new IO, its data centers around the world, and its new AI capacities, and (b) from the development and maintenance of global computer and network applications such as those presented in proposals no. 3 and 4 [for example, these new global applications would help rich countries fulfill their ODA obligations and help all countries achieve the SDGs, ... see p. 4].
- Put in place an efficient Artificial Intelligence (AI) (central or technical) governance. [The UN Report outlines several institutional functions](#) [page 15 to 19, (1) *Assess regularly the future directions and implications of AI*, (2) *Reinforce interoperability of governance efforts emerging*

around the world and their grounding in international norms through a Global AI Governance Framework endorsed in a universal setting (UN), (3) Develop and harmonize standards, safety, and risk management frameworks, (4) Facilitate development, deployment, and use of AI for economic and societal benefit through international multistakeholder cooperation, (5) Promote international collaboration on talent development, access to compute infrastructure, building of diverse high-quality datasets, responsible sharing of open-source models, and AI-enabled public goods for the SDGs, (6) Monitor risks, report incidents, coordinate emergency response, and (7) Compliance and accountability based on norms], some of which are identical or closely aligned with those assigned to the International AI Agency in the [Gladstone AI Action Plan](#) [in particular functions (1), (3), (6) and (7), I think]. It is therefore appropriate to assign these functions to our new IO (see also on this subject, [PJ no 1 no 44-49](#)).

Difficulties associated with proposal no. 1

- The one-time high cost linked to (or resulting from) the merger of all Internet-related organizations and the migration toward the new system. For example, this solution would (1) necessarily entail a kind of “nationalization” (or transfer) of (a) associations (non-profit) or some of their activities (linked to the functioning of the Internet), and (b) the activities of (i) private companies, (ii) universities, (iii) private organizations (RIPE NCC), and (iv) US and other government agencies that enable the Internet to function, particularly activities linked to the operation of DNS root servers, the management of domain names, and the collection of fees for the purchase of domain names, in order to regroup these entities — or their activities — within the same organization; (2) certainly represent a significant cost (Verisign had a capitalization of \$20 billion in 2020, a turnover of \$1.2 billion in 2019, a profit of \$612 million in 2019, and 872 employees in 2019, I believe, although not all of its activity is necessarily directly linked to the functioning of the Internet); and (3) probably lead to job losses, even if a significant number of employees could be hired immediately by this new IO. The possibility to generate more important revenues will attenuate some of these difficulties.
-

Proposal no. 2: development (1) of a new pricing system for domain names that takes into account several parameters, including the use of Internet resources and the revenues and profits generated through the Internet (by websites), and (2) of the computer and network application necessary to manage this new pricing system for domain names.

Goals of proposal no. 2

- Collect more information on the use of Internet resources (by website owners and other Internet users, human or non-human), on site owners and on Internet uses (human and non human) than is currently known, and improve our Internet information system related to the use of resources by all types of users, not just site owners, but also other Internet users (human, non human), in order to determine a more accurate fee for each site (...), more closely linked to its use of resources and to the benefits derived from this use of Internet resources.
- Create the possibility to register all human Internet users, and also to link all non-human Internet users (IoT, robots/bots, etc.) to the human users who benefit from them, and to charge an appropriate fee (even if symbolic, or zero for most) to all Internet users.

- Develop and implement a global computer system (1) that can collect all the necessary information (including confidential information) from site owners and other Internet users to calculate the appropriate annual fee (a) for domain name owners [based on the use of Internet resources by site owners, the revenues and profits generated through Internet sites, the number of employees for businesses, etc.], and (b) for other Internet users; and (2) that can verify the accuracy of the data it collects on site owners and other Internet users with the help of national administrations.
-

Proposal no. 3: development of a new legal aid system that is more efficient (that respects human rights...) and less expensive for countries, and of the three global Internet applications necessary to implement it worldwide. These applications would use, among other tools, AI to help (a) judges, who will adjudicate legal aid (LA) applications, to write their decisions, (b) lawyers assisting the poor to write their briefs, and (c) the poor to present their legal aid requests.

The proposed solution and its goals

- The project consists of developing (1) a new, more efficient and less costly legal aid (LA) system, based on the creation (a) of a group of civil servant judges specializing in the adjudication of LA requests, and (b) a group of civil servant lawyers specializing in legal aid missions [these two groups would be under the hierarchical responsibility of the State and the OHCHR]; (2) a classification and codification of all types of cases tried each year around the world; and (3) three global Internet applications necessary to implement this new LA system in all countries wishing to use it.

The two applications helping judges to adjudicate and manage LA requests, and lawyers to defend and manage the cases of the poor, would also make it possible to record (1) the time spent (a) adjudicating LA requests (and possibly resolving cases amicably through mediation), and (b) defending the cases of the poor, and (2) all costs associated with adjudicating LA requests and defending the poor. The third application would help the poor formulate their legal aid requests.

The objectives of the new system are, of course:

- (1) to correct all the imperfections of the French LA system;
- (2) to avoid the systematic destruction of the rights and freedoms of the poor;
- (3) to fight more effectively against corruption and the clogging of justice;
- (4) to make better use of the most advanced technologies [AI..., see Task Force on Justice report, [PJ no 83, ch. 5](#)], and to provide new functionalities allowing us (a) to optimize the legal aid and justice systems, and (b) to fight more effectively against organized and transnational crime and terrorism;
- (5) to transfer knowledge and advanced computer systems (and technologies) to poor countries; and
- (6) to allow rich countries to fulfill part of their ODA obligations while solving one of their own important problems, and, of course, to help all countries achieve the SDGs (especially targets 1, 5, 8, 10, 16, and 17, [PJ no 3, no 5](#)).

This solution has many advantages both at the level of the legal aid offices (LAO), which adjudicate legal aid requests, and at the level of the lawyers who defend the poor. I will summarize some of them here.

Advantages of using a single LAO under the responsibility of the State and the OHCHR

- For the legal aid office (LAO), having a single national LAO will make it possible to have judges specialized (1) in adjudicating LA requests and (2) in mediation, and judges (a) who help resolve cases through mediation before they are presented to the courts or the prosecutor's office in criminal matters, and (b) who, if mediation is not possible, monitor cases before the various courts and throughout the proceedings.

This means that it will often be the same judge who adjudicates the LA request for a first-instance procedure (TA,), and then for a possible appeal (CAA,), a supreme court petition (CE, CC, CCo), and even possibly a request to the ECHR. [The judge should also try to resolve cases amicably before the appeal, the supreme court petition, etc., whenever possible.]

Such an organization should:

- (a) help decrease the workload of the various jurisdictions by using mediation as much as possible to resolve disputes [22% of cases tried in France each year involve at least one party receiving LA];
- (b) allow the use of a unified working methodology for judges (and advanced technologies);
- (c) simplify the adjudication of LA requests at higher levels of jurisdiction, because the judges who will adjudicate LA requests for an appeal or a supreme court petition will already have studied the files and cases of the LA applicants when they adjudicated the LA requests at lower levels;
- (d) reduce or minimize the operating cost of LAOs, in particular by pooling management and IT expenses with other countries.

Another objective of the national LAO is to significantly improve the quality of LA decisions. LA judges can and should do what is currently planned but never done: conduct an instruction of the LA request (collect documents and information, hear the parties, etc.) to try to resolve cases amicably if possible, and, if not, render LA decisions that are well-motivated and precise, reducing the risk of losing attorneys' fees for the State and of having a poor defending himself alone in court.

Another important advantage of creating a national LAO (and a group of lawyers specializing in LA) is linked to:

- (a) the improvement of our LA and justice information system in general;
- (b) the improvement of the evaluation of LA costs [currently we cannot calculate the total cost of the legal aid system in France, nor can we determine the detailed costs (management, fees, transport, etc.) or the cost of adjudicating legal aid; in fact, we know almost nothing, except that lawyers supposedly give billions of euros in gifts to the State and the poor every year, which is of course false];
- (c) better coordination with other information systems of the Ministry of Justice; and
- (d) better use of expenditure-mitigation mechanisms.

Advantages of creating a group of civil servant lawyers specializing in LA missions

- The creation of a group of civil servant lawyers specializing in LA would first of all guarantee respect for the constitutional rights of the poor — which is currently not the case — while (1) minimizing total LA expenditure and management expenditure, and (2) maximizing (or optimizing) the use of expenditure-mitigation mechanisms and revenues to reduce public expenditure.

Respect for the constitutional rights of the poor will result from, among other things:

- (a) the establishment of a unified working methodology for lawyers in charge of LA missions, a system to control the quality of the work done by lawyers, and a computer system allowing the recording and detailed monitoring of this work;
- (b) the possibility of having the work of lawyers with less than five years of experience supervised by an experienced lawyer;
- (c) the allocation of more difficult cases to more experienced lawyers, and therefore the possibility of having several levels of unit value, which is impossible with the current (old) French LA system (and of paying lawyers according to their skills and experience);
- (d) the creation of a grid of the time necessary to resolve the different types of cases, much more precise than the one we have now (and which takes into account the competence and experience of lawyers and the factual and legal difficulties of cases);
- (e) reducing conflicts of interest linked to the use of independent lawyers; and
- (f) the fact that lawyers (paid regularly) will not have to advance money to LA clients.

The optimization of total LA expenditure will result from, among other things:

- (a) the possibility of precisely establishing the total cost of LA [all management costs (including travel expenses, secretarial work, IT), the costs of adjudicating LA requests (judges' salaries, etc.), and lawyers' fees to the nearest cent], which the Court of Auditors rightly recommends evaluating ([R2 PJ 33](#));
- (b) the possibility of pooling management expenses more effectively (IT, etc.), in particular by developing the IT system to help lawyers defend the poor, and the system for monitoring the work of lawyers that I recommend, and by using advanced technologies (AI) and videoconferencing systems to communicate with courts and judges (as is already happening in the US) and with offenders in prisons to minimize costs and travel expenses;
- (c) the possibility of generating income with certain cases (by taking a percentage of the compensation obtained, as is done in the US in certain cases) and maximizing the use of expenditure-mitigation mechanisms [more mediation; more frequent reimbursements of LA by the losing party];
- (d) the possibility of simplifying the payment of lawyers [in France, instead of 1 million LA assignments paid to more than 25,000 lawyers, we would have 12 salaries per year paid to around 8,000 lawyers].

Advantages linked to the development of the two global IT applications

- The development of two global IT applications — (1) an application to manage LA requests and help judges adjudicate them, and (2) an application to help lawyers manage their LA cases — would allow us to record the time spent on each LA request and case by the LA judge of the national LAO and by the LA lawyer specializing in LA, and therefore calculate the average time that judges take to adjudicate an LA request and to resolve the poor's cases through mediation, and that lawyers take to resolve the poor's cases for each type of case (taking into account the skill and experience of lawyers and judges and the factual and legal difficulty of the cases).

The development of these two global applications would also allow us to create:

- (1) an international classification and codification of all cases presented to justice (in each country and each year);

(2) databases (a) of cases tried and (b) of poor parties to cases, including delinquents and criminals (which are essential to more easily control the work done by LA judges and lawyers and to fight against organized and transnational crime and terrorism);

(3) management data (which are essential for improving our justice and police systems, etc.).

It is therefore a cross-pillar data action that fits well into the UN Data Strategy ([PJ no 55](#)).

If we want (1) to verify and control the quality of the work done by LA judges and lawyers, (2) to find the best way to optimize our justice and police systems and better fight against corruption and the clogging of justice, (3) to make useful comparisons with other countries, and (4) to allow researchers and experts to analyze the harmful behavior of delinquents (and criminals) and find the best ways to correct them, we need to:

– save the documents related to each case,

– record the time spent adjudicating cases, and

– have (a) a classification and international codification of types of cases, (b) a database of all LA cases, and (c) an accurate estimate of the average time that LA judges spend adjudicating LA requests or resolving each type of case through mediation, and that lawyers spend defending each type of case (depending on the experience and knowledge of the LA judge and lawyer, and the legal and factual complexity of cases).

More generally, and in the longer term, we need an accurate estimate of the average time that all judges spend adjudicating claims for each type of case (depending on the experience of the judge and the technical and factual complexity of the cases).

And, of course, given the considerable cost of justice, the possibility of reducing justice costs by pooling significant management expenses (IT, etc.) and by using AI is also an obvious advantage of developing the same computer system used by a large number of countries.

Benefits of a global approach to improving the justice system for the poor

- There are many advantages to developing a global legal aid system. I have described several in my letters, and I will summarize a few of them here.
- Some countries do not have the expertise or resources to develop such advanced AI systems, so there is an obvious advantage in developing a system (in a rich country with the necessary expertise) that could be used everywhere — including in poorer countries that do not yet have the required expertise.
- Also, if we have just one system for all countries, it will be easier to control the behavior of this AI system (possible biases, etc.) than to control the behavior of 180 different systems developed separately in each country.
- Several rich countries have already developed, or are currently developing, AI systems to help judges and prosecutors render their decisions, and to help lawyers. (For example: in China, “System 206” to analyze files and assist judges and prosecutors, and “Judge AI” to decide simple cases; in the US, Lex Machina and Ross Intelligence to analyze millions of legal decisions; in Estonia, “Judge AI” for small cases; in France, Case Law Analytics to predict chances of success based on previous cases; in the UK, AI tested to help draft judicial decisions; in Canada, AI tested to speed up judges’ work; in Russia, algorithms developed to analyze previous cases and suggest verdicts for similar cases.) We can therefore use their

experience to build a better and more advanced system. Also, since several advanced countries are now beginning to develop their own AI systems, if we wait longer, billions of dollars or euros will be spent and wasted, and the solutions found may not be as efficient as they should be — and as they would be if we worked together to develop the best possible AI system.

- The UN (OHCHR) is encouraging countries to respect human rights and is helping them do so. Developing the best possible AI system — to help judges and prosecutors render honest and well-motivated decisions that respect human rights, and to help legal aid lawyers defend the poor — and then maintaining and updating this system over time, is one of the best ways for the UN to achieve this.

Proposal no. 4: development of a new retirement pension management system and of the computer and network application necessary to implement it, (a) that could be used by all countries wishing to do so, and (b) that would take into account far more information than current pension systems (in France, among others), in order to make the pension management body an expert in life expectancy and an advisor to governments in the areas of work, health, education, justice, etc.

Reasons for collecting more information and improving our retirement pension system

- (a) The concern for justice;
- (b) the importance of (i) improving the operation and efficiency of the retirement pension management system and the Retirement Insurance [the single body that should be responsible for operating the retirement pension system and the supplementary retirement pension system for all schemes], (ii) reducing its operating costs, (iii) increasing the revenue (contributions) and the benefits that the pension system brings to society, and (iv) making the Retirement Insurance Administration a driving force for progress in society;
- (c) the importance of assessing more precisely (i) the work done by each person (including during unemployment), (ii) the arduousness of this work at the individual level, (iii) the living conditions of each person, and (iv) the life expectancy (and life expectancy in good health) of insured persons;
- (d) the importance of correcting the inequalities created by our imperfect and unjust (and even dishonest for some) economic, justice, health, and education systems, and in particular reducing the differences (inequalities) in life expectancy between different socio-professional categories; and
- (e) the possibilities for progress brought by advanced technologies such as artificial intelligence, all highlight the importance of collecting more information and improving our retirement pension information system.

For example, the following information should be collected by the retirement pension body:

- (1) the work done during unemployment (work done on unemployment projects, work done to defend oneself in court, training, etc.), and studies and training done outside unemployment;
- (2) health problems (illnesses), whether work-related or not, and the arduousness of the work done at the individual level that can affect the well-being and life expectancy of future retirees;
- (3) living conditions (type of housing) and events (accidents, layoffs, criminal records) that can affect the well-being and life expectancy of future retirees;

- (4) for women in particular, and for men who stop working to raise children, the children they have given birth to and raised;
- (5) all pay slips (in addition to pension contributions);
- (6) for each insured and retired person, the assets and savings accumulated and the income they generate each year;
- ... are some of the types of information that should be collected by the retirement pension body.

Benefits of a global approach to developing a retirement pension system

- Like for the development of unique legal aid system, there are many advantages to developing a global retirement pension system ([PJ no 1 no 35-38.1](#)).
- Some countries do not have the expertise or resources to develop such advanced AI systems, so there is an obvious advantage in developing (in a rich country with the necessary expertise) a system that could be used everywhere — including in poorer countries that do not yet have the required expertise. And, as explained in [PJ no 1 no 31](#), a study published in 2000 by the ILO noted that “90% of the world’s working-age population is not covered by pension schemes capable of guaranteeing them an adequate income.” Therefore, developing a new pension system for all countries that is efficient, less costly, and beneficial to society could help all countries, including low-income countries as long as it is implemented alongside Proposals 1 and 2, which provide the required computing and network infrastructure.
- Also, the more data we have on certain subjects, the better the life-expectancy predictions made by the AI will be, and the more efficient the policy advice given to politicians will become. The system will also help WHO, ILO, UNESCO and other international organizations carry out their work, and it will help cure diseases (including the most serious) and react more quickly and more efficiently to epidemics such as Covid-19.

Proposal no. 5: creation of a new international agency for the modernization of armed forces, disarmament, peacekeeping, and the governance of AI in the military field, tasked, among other missions, with collecting information in these areas that the UN does not collect, and conducting studies in these areas that the UN does not, in addition, of course, to ensuring the governance of AI in the military field (see details below and structure in [vision statement on page 5](#)).

Proposal’s goal

The war in Ukraine and the 50 other ongoing conflicts in the world leave no doubt (1) that the UN needs to be strengthened in the area of peacekeeping, and (2) that NATO is more a cause of conflicts than it helps maintain peace in Europe and elsewhere. In addition, the rapid progress in the field of Artificial Intelligence (AI) requires us to implement greater transparency in the military field. Finally, the UN Charter has required us since its creation to find ways to use as little as possible of the world’s human and economic resources for armaments, in order to establish and maintain peace and security around the world, and it will not be possible (or it will be much more difficult) to do that if we do not create a new international organization that can monitor the development and production of armaments in all countries and that can put in place strategies and mechanisms that help countries to reduce the production and use of armaments (see also more information at [PJ no 1 no 39-43](#)).

Therefore, we need a new IO capable of addressing these problems and strengthening the UN in the area of peacekeeping, and having, among others, the following responsibilities:

1. To gather information (and create databases) (a) on the composition of the armies of each UN member country (and others), (b) on the types and stocks of weapons of each country, and (c) on the activity of the arms industry in each country that has one.
2. To conduct independent studies on the threats faced by different countries.
3. To help establish (a) regulations on the use of artificial intelligence and other advanced technologies in the military field, (b) control mechanisms to verify that these new regulations are respected, and (c) legal mechanisms to prevent abuses and violations of the regulations.
4. To coordinate the efforts made by all countries in the field of armaments, and to control the production and sale of all armaments (including new armaments), in order, among other things, to comply with the UN Charter [[art. 26 of the Charter](#) : ' *In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security by **diverting only the minimum of the world's human and economic resources to armaments*** , the Security Council, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee provided for in Article 47, shall be responsible **for developing plans for submission to the Members of the Organization for the establishment of a system for regulating armaments.** ' , this has never been done seriously and effectively because it is complicated and **it takes much more than a staff committee to do it well**].
5. To encourage all countries to reduce their defense budgets (while allowing the modernization of their armies).
6. To act in favor of disarmament and the maintenance of peace and international security.

Proposal no. 6: the search for an alternative to market capitalism.

Goals of Proposal no. 6

(1) To design an economic system (a) that rewards everyone in proportion to their relative contribution to society's progress, and that does not create such large differences in income that they lead to human rights violations (as market capitalism does), (b) that helps us find ways to use as little as possible of the world's human and economic resources for armaments, in order to establish and maintain peace and security around the world, (c) that helps us protect our environment, fight global warming more efficiently, and achieve the transformation toward global sustainable resource consumption and production presented in the GRO 2024, and (d) that takes into consideration (and takes advantage of) recent technological progress, namely the Internet and AI (see also [PJ no 1 no 53-55](#)).

(2) To improve significantly our international economic and financial information systems, in order to help us develop the new economic system.

Poitiers, 21 March 2026

Pierre Geneviev

PJ no 1: Letter of 7-10-24, [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf3-2-21/let-to-UNSC-UNGA-ICC-EN-10-7-24.pdf>].

(FR ver, 1.2) [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf3-2-21/let-to-UNSC-UNGA-ICC-FR-10-7-24.pdf>].

PJ no 2: Letter of 4-18-25, [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf3-2-21/let-to-UNGA-UN-proj-prop-EN-18-4-25.pdf>].

PJ no 3: Letter of 12-12-25, [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf3-2-21/let-UN-EU-ios-poli-EN-12-12-25.pdf>].

(FR ver, 1.2) [<http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf3-2-21/let-UN-EU-ios-poli-FR-12-12-25.pdf>].