The major differences between my vision statement and those of the 4 nominated candidates, and brief observations on the functioning of the selection process.
Pierre Genevier (Draft version of 10-4-26)

1. I would like to briefly examine the major differences between my vision statement and those of the four nominated candidates to help you better assess the relevance and usefulness of my nomination, and share some observations on the workings of the selection process.

A. The visions statement of the 4 candidates: real qualities but lack of specific proposals

2. **The four nominated candidates** (Mr. Grossi, Ms. Bachelet, Ms. Grynspan, and Mr. Sall) do not present, in their vision statements, concrete proposals enabling the UN and its member states to solve specific problems such as the governance of the Internet and AI, the lack of financial resources of the UN, the digital divide, or the implementation of the transformation called for by the GRO 2024. They mainly emphasize their professional experiences, the high-level positions they have held at the UN and at the national level, their ability to lead a large international organization, as well as general guidelines for action in the areas of UN management, peacekeeping, development, and human rights.

3. Mr. Grossi calls for a more effective, credible, and results-oriented UN, drawing on his forty-year diplomatic career and his current position as Director General of the IAEA. He proposes five coherent priorities: acting effectively for peace and security through early engagement and factual assessments; promoting development based on realistic solutions and strengthened partnerships; placing human rights and dignity at the heart of peace; modernizing the Organization's management by reducing duplication and digitizing processes; and defending principled and pragmatic multilateralism.

4. Ms. Bachelet presents a vision centered on human dignity, prevention, and international solidarity. Drawing on her experience as a Head of State and High-Commissioner for Human Rights, she proposes a more proactive UN, closer to the people, and more effective in addressing the crises of the 21st century, based on continuous internal reform, clear communication, better coordination, strategic use of technology, and strengthened action in the areas of peace, sustainable development, and human rights.

5. Mr. Sall highlights his four decades of experience in public administration, including twelve years as President of the Republic, and begins by observing that the world is experiencing a profound crisis and that the UN must be revitalized to remain the center of international dialogue. He wishes to streamline interventions to "avoid duplication and increase overall impact," while supporting investment and trade to supplement insufficient public aid. He proposes an integrated peace, security, and development approach, with an emphasis on prevention, dialogue and coordination with regional organizations, a renewed multilateralism including a realistic reform of the Security Council, and modernized governance based on transparency, discipline, and efficiency.

6. Ms. Grynspan observes a crisis of confidence, legitimacy, and effectiveness at the UN, but affirms her belief in the Organization's capacity to once again become a central actor for peace and global solutions. She proposes refocusing the UN on its core mission through active preventive diplomacy, delivering tangible results by streamlining structures and fully integrating data and AI, and preparing for the future by mastering emerging technologies and supporting vulnerable countries.

B. The limitations of these views and the specificities of my own approach

7. The major differences between their visions and mine — in particular my ability to propose concrete technical, financial and institutional solutions (see section C below) — show that their action would run up against structural limits that the UN has known for decades.

8. **Mr. Grossi** explains that "development cooperation must deliver concrete benefits… and a real opportunity to improve quality of life" (p. 2), but he does not outline the types of cooperation he would implement to achieve his stated objective. In contrast, the cooperation projects I propose—particularly the development of a new legal aid system and a comprehensive pension management system—would produce tangible results for wealthy countries, improving their existing systems at a lower cost while facilitating compliance with their official development assistance obligations and reducing their public spending. They would also offer poor countries access to advanced systems (using AI) at very low cost, enabling them to reduce their public spending while improving the functioning of their administrations (vision, p. 3).

On the subject of peacekeeping, he explains that "credible decisions are based on timely and evidence-based assessments" (p. 2), and he is right: having good information at the right time is essential to helping the UN and the Secretary-General prevent conflicts. But he offers no solutions for strengthening the UN's capacity to obtain such "timely and evidence-based assessments," even though this is a critical and costly issue. The UN's information system in the area of peacekeeping and disarmament is flawed and needs significant improvement, and I offer solutions for doing so (vision p. 3).

On the subject of human rights, he writes, "The UN must reaffirm its commitment to human rights through more concrete means than mere declarations. It must do so through a presence on the ground and through mechanisms enabling more effective responses to discrimination and violence…" (p. 3). But here again, this requires significant resources: for example, guaranteeing respect for the rights of poor people when they appear before the courts worldwide is a complex task, requiring the establishment of specific resources, new and complex systems, and a redesigned organization (vision p. 4–5, proposals no. 1, 2, 3).

9. **Ms. Bachelet** writes, "The future of the UN should be built as a space where states not only solve immediate problems, but collectively imagine and design a more just, peaceful, and sustainable world…" (p. 5, top). But the UN and its member states already have the opportunity and the capacity to collectively imagine and design such a world, provided that the incumbent Secretary-General—the candidates in the election—presents them with a strategic vision and proposals enabling them to do so. This is precisely what I am doing by presenting a strategic vision and a platform that proposes: (1) the creation of a new international organization for the governance of the Internet and AI, the development of global Internet applications, and the management of UN data centers; (2) the significant improvement of legal aid (and, eventually, justice) and pension systems; and (3) the strengthening of the UN's capacity in the areas of peacekeeping and disarmament; and (4) the resolution of "certain immediate problems" by contributing to the transformation described in the GRO 2024 (see no. 12).

Ms. Bachelet also writes, "Emerging technologies such as AI, biotechnology, and advanced data analytics offer unprecedented opportunities to improve education, health, and climate resilience. The UN can play a key role as a global forum for dialogue to ensure that innovation benefits everyone, promotes sustainable development, and respects human rights" (p. 7). The UN can—and should—be much more than a global forum for dialogue, at least with regard to AI and advanced data analytics.

That is why I propose assigning it new functions: governance of the Internet and AI, development of global Internet applications, and management of data centers.

The UN is uniquely positioned to: (1) improve the functioning and security of the internet and assume governance of central AI and AI in several key areas (justice, health, education, military, etc.); and (2) help Member States use AI more effectively to solve problems in many fields. Regarding biotechnology, the UN and its specialized agencies (WHO, FAO, UNESCO) are already active in this area, and the new functions and responsibilities I propose to assign to them will help strengthen their work.

10. **Mr. Sall** writes: "We all know that development financing needs far exceed the capacity of both bilateral and multilateral public aid," and he is right. He commits "to further promoting investment and trade to foster growth-generating partnerships" (p. 3), which is helpful. But we must also address the issue of wealthy countries fulfilling their development aid obligations and find ways to generate additional revenue so that the UN can carry out its missions more effectively. Therefore, I propose several solutions: (1) generate new funds (**$30 billion per year**) without soliciting Member States; (2) help wealthy countries meet their development aid obligations; (3) bridge the digital divide, which is essential to enabling developing countries to strengthen their capacity to trade with other countries; and (4) significantly improve justice and pension systems worldwide, including in poor countries.

He also explains that "peace and security cannot be sustained when the foundations of development are undermined by poverty, inequality, exclusion, and climate vulnerability," and this is true. That is why we must tackle these serious problems from several different angles, as I do by proposing (a) to reduce the digital divide, (b) to improve legal aid systems (among other things), including in poor countries, (c) to develop alternatives to market capitalism, and, as explained in no 12, (d) to help achieve the transition mentioned in the GRO.

11. **Ms. Grynspan** explains that the UN must use AI and data in its various areas of activity (p. 3 and 5) and writes, "AI is progressing faster than any other technology in history, reshaping economies (…). We must accelerate its spread to prevent the digital divide from worsening (…). Cyberspace has become a crucial area of activity for all nations, yet attacks against hospitals, power grids, and financial systems are now frequent. The gap between the pace of threats and that of diplomacy is deepening. The UN must create a space for dialogue to find constructive solutions.".

Her analysis is relevant, but it doesn't explain precisely how she would use AI to help the UN work more effectively. Conversely, my platform shows that giving the UN governance of AI and the internet, the development of global internet applications, and the management of UN data centers would allow it to acquire essential skills in the field of AI, as well as new resources needed to: better use AI within the UN, reduce the digital divide, and facilitate the use of AI by all member states, including the poorest.

Regarding the fight against cybercrime, new approaches are also needed, and entrusting internet governance to the UN is the best way to advance the internet and combat cybercrime more effectively. Again, the UN must be much more than a forum for dialogue: it must offer concrete solutions to member states, especially when it can draw on high-level experts. Reports produced by UN experts — GRO 2024, Governing AI for Humanity (2023 and 2024), Innovating Justice: Needed and Possible (2019), the UN Global Study on Legal Aid (2016), etc. — are essential tools for defining a global strategy. They must be used to propose solutions to Member States.

12. Ms. Bachelet writes, “It is essential to strengthen existing multilateral mechanisms, simplify access to climate funds, and promote innovative financial instruments to effectively combat **the triple global crisis**.” But she—like the other three candidates—does not mention the recommendations of the GRO 2024, nor the urgency it highlights. Yet this report proposes a complex transformation that requires simultaneous action in several areas. I do not offer all the necessary solutions, but I am at least trying to contribute to resolving some of the problems that need to be addressed to facilitate the transition it describes.

Below you will find an independent (non-scientific) analysis based solely on the arguments of my vision, my platform and the GRO, highlighting the points of convergence between my proposals and the objectives of the GRO 2024.

Here is how proposals 1, 2 and 6 specifically align with the GRO objectives:

1. Improvement of the global information system (Proposals 1 and 2)

The GRO 2024 emphasizes that what cannot be measured cannot be managed. It calls for increased global monitoring of resource flows and the creation of coordinating agencies.

• Data Centralization and Governance (Prop. 1): The creation of an International Organization (IO) dedicated to IT applications, the management of UN data centers, and the development of a global information system directly addresses the GRO's need for reliable, harmonized, and real-time data. This IO could host the modeling tools and hardware footprint monitoring platforms necessary to manage the transition.

• Information system financing (Prop. 2): The proposed new domain name pricing system for collecting royalties offers a concrete solution to the problem of financing global public goods. These funds could finance the digital infrastructure required to measure transition indicators (such as SDG indicators 12.2.1 and 12.2.2 cited in the GRO) without placing a sole burden on national budgets.

• AI for efficiency (Vision): The integration of AI advocated by the platform would optimize the "supply systems" (energy, mobility, food) described in the GRO by analyzing complex data masses to identify resource-saving opportunities.

2. Alternative to market capitalism and systemic transition (Proposal 6)

The GRO 2024 report is very clear: the current growth model based on infinite extraction is unsustainable. It calls for "Bend the Trend" through profound structural changes.

• Moving beyond productivism: The search for an alternative to market capitalism aligns with the GRO's observation that current prices do not reflect environmental costs. A new economic system, as suggested by the platform, would allow a shift from a logic of short-term profit to one of sufficiency and well-being, which is the essential condition for reducing resource consumption in high-income countries.

• Internalization of costs: By seeking a system that does not lead to human rights violations or environmental degradation, the platform proposes a framework where the economy serves sustainability, which facilitates the application of the GRO recommendations on green taxation and the end of fossil fuel subsidies.

3. Synergy for the transition of "Supply Systems"

The GRO identifies four key systems (Food, Buildings, Mobility, Energy). The platform's proposals act as catalysts for these systems:

• Global applications (Prop. 1): The development of global applications could facilitate resource

sharing (shared mobility), the optimization of food supply chains to reduce waste, or even the intelligent management of energy networks.

• Global governance: By strengthening the role of the UN through these new IOs, the platform provides the necessary political framework so that the GRO recommendations do not remain mere pious wishes but become global operational standards.

In summary, while the GRO 2024 identifies technical and environmental needs, the platform of six proposals and the vision offer the institutional and financial tools (digital infrastructure and the new economic framework) to achieve them. The approach puts the Internet and AI at the service of a resource-based economy rather than a consumption-based one.

C. The major differences between my vision and those of the four candidates, as well as the seriousness and feasibility of my proposals, establish the usefulness and relevance of my nomination.

13. The major differences between my strategic vision and those of the four candidates establish the necessity of my nomination. The six concrete proposals I advocate are serious and achievable. Assigning new responsibilities to the UN — (i) the governance of the Internet and AI, (ii) the development of global Internet applications to solve problems common to all states (I propose the development of three specific applications, propositions 2, 3, and 4), and (iii) the management of UN data centers — and generating new revenue (approximately **$30 billion** per year without soliciting member states) (proposals 1 and 2) would improve the functioning and security of the Internet and help the UN fulfill its various missions more effectively. These are achievable proposals, even if they have never been discussed before the US Congress and the UN.

14. Strengthening the UN's capacity in the area of peacekeeping and disarmament, in particular by creating a new agency specializing in these areas and the governance of AI in the military field, and the proposal to develop an alternative to market capitalism allowing, among other things, for better rewarding the contribution of each individual to collective progress, and providing solutions to major challenges such as global warming and environmental degradation (mentioned in the GRO 2024 …) (proposals 5 and 6) are also serious and feasible proposals if we create the new international organization in charge of the governance of the Internet and AI (etc.).

15. The long and difficult intellectual work that I have carried out for more than thirty years, as well as the knowledge and experience that I have acquired in devising, presenting and defending my proposals, confirm that these are the result of a serious and rigorous effort and that they are based on solid practical experience and on the views of high-level experts.

16. For example, the 1997 proposal to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data at the global level — presented with five partners in the European Inco-Copernicus programme and supported by many national and international experts — highlighted the importance and usefulness of developing global computer applications (Internet) to solve specific problems common to all countries.

The fact that it was not funded, despite a positive evaluation, led me to work on Internet governance and, as early as 2004–2005 (when the WGIG was created by the UN), to write to the then Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, and to the UN Member States, to emphasize the importance of creating a new UN agency dedicated to Internet governance and the development of global Internet applications (Proposal 1). This proposal was not far-fetched, since the European Union itself created, in

2012, the European Agency for the Operational Management of Large-Scale Information Systems (eu-LISA), which developed IT systems used by the 27 countries of the European Union. Developing an IT system for 192 countries is certainly more complex, but not necessarily much more expensive and certainly not impossible.

17. Moreover, the many years I spent fighting in court in France and the USA, among other places, have allowed me to: (1) analyze in depth the functioning of the French and American justice and legal aid systems; (2) denounce the unconstitutionality of the French law on legal aid, and more generally, to note the ineffectiveness of most legal aid systems in the world; (3) highlight an alleged crime against humanity linked to its dysfunction, committed by France; and (4) propose the creation of a new international legal aid system, more efficient and less costly, usable by all countries that wish to use it (proposal 3 of the platform). Furthermore, my jobs from 1987 to 2001 allowed me, among other things, to organize or participate in the development of computer applications, including at an international level, and gave me the necessary skills to imagine the three specific global applications of my platform (platform proposals 2, 3 and 4).

18. Finally, regular monitoring of the work carried out by the UN since 1993 — in particular, reading from its official reports and certain reports from its member states — has: (1) led me to work on several problems that the UN should help to solve, such as the inefficiency of legal aid systems, inequalities within and between countries (mainly due to our economic system, market capitalism), as well as the challenges of climate change and environmental protection, and to formulate proposals on several key issues; and (2) allowed me to develop my proposals in light of recent reports such as the GRO 2024, Governing AI for Humanity (2023 and 2024), Innovating Justice: Needed and possible (2019), the Global study on legal aid UN (2016), in order to meet the current needs of the UN and its member countries.

19. My nomination is useful and important for several reasons. It allows my six proposals to be examined at the General Assembly level, including through informal dialogues broadcast worldwide, and to determine the level of support they garner from different groups of countries. It will also help Member States assess certain shortcomings in the visions of the four nominated candidates, as discussed above, confirm Member States' commitment to a transparent and open selection process, and, should you decide to implement some or all of the proposals I am advocating, potentially allow you to choose a Secretary-General who has dedicated 30 years of his life to championing these proposals. More generally, it will provide an indication of the integrity and effectiveness of the selection process.

D. Other remarks on the integrity and effectiveness of the selection process for the Secretary-General.

20. The world is not perfect and there are still serious injustices that must be denounced. I myself have been confronted with one of these serious injustices, the unconstitutionality of the law on legal aid in France, and more generally, the inefficiency of many legal aid systems around the world.

21. As explained in the letter of December 12, 2025, I made considerable efforts (from 1998 to 2001, and then from 2012 to the present) to denounce the dishonesty of the legal aid law before the courts, political leaders, and relevant government departments in France, as well as before international courts and institutions. However, these efforts — which made me **a whistleblower** (or human rights

defender) and, in theory, granted me additional rights (or protections) — resulted in reprisals and unfair treatment. Combined with the political scandal in the Essonne Department and the threats I received during my dismissal in 1993, these efforts prevented me from pursuing a career and being considered "a strong candidate" to use the term employed by the Swiss mission (which I thank here for its response).

22. The UN, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Council of Europe, and the French justice system (even more so since 2016 and 2022 with the Sapin II law, which I mentioned in my letter of July 10, 2024) protect whistleblowers. However, in my case, these protections were denied to me despite the numerous and compelling pieces of evidence I presented to support my accusations and the gravity of the problem for the planet. In France, just over 14 million people rely on legal aid; globally, billions of people living in poverty are affected. The value of my work and efforts for the international community is therefore considerable. And it would be unfair to deprive the international community of my nomination as Secretary-General and of the opportunity to see me defend my six proposals during informal dialogues on the grounds that I have not made a career within the UN or a national administration in such a context [the letter of 12-12-25 at no. 4-13, and the complaint to the ICC of 10-2-21 at no. 57 give details on this subject; the letter of 5-3-26 to the LA County Board of Supervisors and to the President of Northwestern University gives details on similar difficulties encountered in the USA.].

23. The selection process would also be more effective if the various country groups at the UN (G77, LDCs, SIDS, LLDCs, European Union, etc.), which I contacted to present my proposals, provided brief comments indicating whether or not they support these proposals. This would allow the Security Council, as well as the General Assembly, to more effectively assess the candidates and specific proposals submitted (a new situation, it seems) within the selection process. If these groups did so, the world's inhabitants could also learn about the position taken by their respective country groups to improve their living conditions and build a better world.

In conclusion, I hope that the analyses and other information presented above will help you in evaluating my nomination application and encourage you to nominate me so that I can defend my vision and my candidacy in the interest of all.

Done at Poitiers, on 10-4-26

Pierre Genevier