

Pierre GENEVIER
18 Rue des Canadiens, App. 227
86000 Poitiers
Phone: 09 80 73 50 18 ; Mob.: 07 82 85 41 63; Email: pierre.genevier@laposte.net.

Mr. Philemon Yang, President, and Representatives of member countries of the General Assembly (UNGA, opga@un.org)
Judge Tomoko Akane, President, and the Judges and Prosecutors of the ICC
Mr. Antonio Guterres, Secretary General of the UN
Mr. Volker Türk, High Commissioner for Human Rights
Mr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, Director General of WHO
Mr. Gilbert Hougbo, Director General of ILO (ilo@ilo.org)
Mrs. Kristalina Georgieva, Managing Director of IMF (ngoliaison@imf.org)
Mr. Ajay Banga, President of the World Bank Group
Mr. Mark Rutte, Secretary General of NATO
Mr. Kurtis Lindqvist, President and Chief Executive Officer of ICANN (kurtis.lindqvist@icann.org)
Mrs. Carol Folt, President of USC (president@usc.edu)
Mr. Darryll Pines, President of University of Maryland (president@umd.edu)

Poitiers, April 18th, 2025

Copy: Mrs. Salazar, Mr. Dhesi, Mr Tolstoy, Mrs. Nishimura, Mr. Sachs, Mrs. Goldberg, Mrs. Creese, Mr. Flaxman, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Grolier, the IRP members, Mrs. Heather Gerken, Mr. Alexander Golichenkov, and Mr. Ryuji Yamamoto.

Subject: Project proposal ([Att. 2](#), FR [Att. 2.2](#)) and my last letter of July 10th, 2024 ([Att. 1](#), FR [Att. 1.2](#)).

Dear Mr. Philemon Yang, and Dear Representatives of UNGA Member Countries,
Dear Ms. Tomoko Akane, and Dear Judges and Prosecutors of the ICC,
Dear Mr. Antonio Guterres,
Dear Mr. Volker Türk,
Dear Mr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus,
Dear Mr. Gilbert Hougbo,
Dear Mrs. Kristalina Georgieva,
Dear Mr. Ajay Banga,
Dear Mr. Mark Rutte,
Dear Mr. Kurtis Lindqvist,
Dear Mrs. Carol Folt,
Dear Mr. Darryll Pines,

1. Referring to my last letter of July 10th, 2024 ([Att. 1](#)) addressed to most of you, I take the liberty of writing you **(1) to present** a project proposal that I already presented to members of 4 parliaments (US, UK, Russia and Japan) and to several universities around the world (no 23), and **(2) to ask** for your support and eventual cooperation for the project whose purpose is to present a detailed proposal platform (to help the UN and its member countries solve certain complex problems they have to solve, see first draft of the detailed description of the 6 proposals at [Att. 2](#)) to the member countries of the UN General Assembly as part of the selection process for the next Secretary General, which is expected to formally begin in late 2025 and continue for approximately the first 8 months of 2026.

A The objectives of the project and a brief description of the sub-projects.

1) The objectives and a brief description of the project.

2. **The platform of proposals**, on which I have worked for the last 30 years or so, (1) presents proposals in the three main areas of action of the UN: peacekeeping, human rights, and development, and (2) proposes **(a) to make a special effort in the fields of the Internet and Artificial Intelligence (AI)** to reduce the digital divide and to make all countries and all inhabitants of the planet, including

the poorest, benefit from the many benefits that these two technologies can bring, and **(b) to strengthen the capacity of the UN** to help countries *(i)* maintain peace and international security, *(ii)* respect human rights, and *(iii)* resolve certain specific global problems. I have made general descriptions (or more precise for some) of these proposals in my various letters sent to the UN, the most recent being the letter of 7-10-24 ([Att. 1](#), FR [Att. 1.2](#)) which gives details on the recent proposals and summarizes the older proposals (see no. 30-59, see also [Att. 2](#), FR [Att. 2.2](#)); and **the aim of the project** that I am presenting to you here is to go into much more detail in the description of each of the proposals **(a) to facilitate decision-making for the UN member states and for the UN**, and, indirectly (b) to help them resolve peacefully the different ongoing conflicts around the world.

3. For example, for the 2 new international organizations that I propose to create, I would like to describe, among other things, their detailed organization (the functions of each department,), estimate the number of employees in each department and the cost of creating and operating these international organizations (...); for the 3 new systems to be designed and the 4 global Internet applications to be developed to make them work all over the world, it would be necessary to write the 1st specifications [analysis of data and functions, estimation of volumes of data managed, and of the development and maintenance costs of the systems, description of the advantages and gains generated (...)]; and for the development of the alternative to market capitalism, I would like to propose a strategy to develop the alternative to market capitalism and implement it [define the necessary steps and a timetable; estimate the costs, the advantages; determine the needs in terms of improving our economic and financial information system (...)]; and, of course, **we must also propose solutions to finance the implementation of each of these proposals.**

2) *The proposals to create a new IO to replace ICANN (...) and to develop 3 new systems.*

4. **The first proposal** is the proposal to create a **new international organization** dedicated to *computer and networks (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, which could help us solve certain specific problems that all countries have to solve, (4) the development of our global information system, and (5) the management of the UN data centers [to manage the data of the Internet and the countries which will be shared in certain areas, to operate the global systems for which this IO will be responsible, and to make available to the poorest countries resources necessary or useful for research and companies in the field of AI]. This organization would have, among other things, (1) all the functions of *ICANN, IANA, IAB, IETF, ISOC, registries, registrars (...)*, (2) a department in charge of governance (central or technical) of AI, (3) a department responsible for data centers, and (4) a department in common with Interpol to better combat Cybercrime and human rights violations on the Internet... (see [Att. 1](#), no. 44-50.2, the references to my other letters on this subject, no. 46, 47, 50.1, and [Att. 2](#)).

5. Ultimately, this organization should have (1) expertise and resources in the field of AI equivalent to those of companies such as OPEN AI and Google DeepMind to be able to develop and operate the AI systems used by the 4 global applications that I propose to develop (...), (2) expertise in data center management equivalent to those of the leaders in the sector, and (3) capacities and resources reserved to help companies and universities in the field of AI in poor and less poor countries. It would also be responsible (a) for setting up a new pricing system for domain names

(websites) that takes into account several parameters including the use of Internet resources, the revenues and profits generated by the Internet (by websites), and (b) for developing (...) and maintaining the computer and network system necessary to manage this new pricing system for domain names.

6. **This new domain name pricing system** (and the IT system to manage it) is crucial for several reasons, including the fact that it would allow us (a) to generate much greater revenues than ICANN and other related organizations generate [one could envisage generating 30 billion euros or (much) more per year (without stealing from anyone and providing significant benefits to those who pay)], and thus (b) to improve the functioning and security of the Internet, (c) to reduce the digital divide, and (d) to finance, in part, the development and maintenance of global Internet applications that are useful to all; and (e) to improve our Internet information system (which also brings many benefits). I have spoken about this proposal to the UN and its member countries in 2005, 2016, 2021 (...), and most recently on 7-10-24 to add the responsibility for the governance (central or technical) of AI. Unfortunately, the debates on Internet governance at the UN and the US Congress have been distorted; in 2005 the proposals for Internet governance presented by the UN were not appropriate, and they were rightly rejected by the US; and, in 2016, the US Congress considered only one proposal, so the many benefits (for the US and the world) associated with the creation of this new IO part of the UN system were never properly and publicly presented to the US Congress and the UNGA (!).

7. In addition to developing a new domain name pricing system and the global Internet application to implement it, I propose to develop 2 other systems and the global Internet applications to implement them worldwide so that all countries that wish to use them can do so. For example, I propose to develop **a new legal aid (LA) system** that is more efficient (that respects human rights...) and less expensive for countries, and the 2 global Internet applications to implement it worldwide, applications that would use, among other things, AI to help (a) judges, who will judge the applications for LA, to write their decisions, (b) lawyers, who will help the poor, to write their briefs, and (c) the poor to formulate their legal aid request [I describe in more detail the functionalities of this new system in the letter of 23-5-21 (see [Att. 1](#), no. 53, FR [Att. 1.2](#), and [Att. 2](#), FR [Att. 2.2](#))]. I also propose to develop **a new pension management system** and the computer application to implement it that could be used by all countries that wish to do so, and that would take into account much more information than what current pension systems take into account (in France, among others) to make the pension management body an expert **in life expectancy** and an advisor to governments in the areas of work, health, education [...]; see a more detailed description in [Att. 1](#), no. 35-38.1, and the reference to no. 30, and [Att. 2](#)].

8. The 3 new systems and the global applications that will be developed to run them (...) are **a good start**, they would allow to start classifying and codifying (and standardizing) our data in some important areas, and they help to justify the usefulness of the new IO. For example, for the LA system, justice for the poor is very expensive because they cannot afford a lawyer (...), so this system would not only help poor countries, but also countries like the USA and France, which are among the richest; moreover, this system will eventually facilitate the development of a system to improve our justice systems (i.e. not only limited to the judgment of LA requests); and for the pension management system, it has considerable advantages because, among other things, billions of people in the world are not covered by a pension management system.

3) The creation of a new IO to replace NATO and the search for the alternative to market capitalism.

9. I also propose to dismantle NATO and **create**, in its place, **a new international organization** *responsible for the modernization of armies, disarmament, and maintenance of peace and international security'* (...), which would include the current UN entities responsible for peacekeeping, disarmament (...), and which would have in addition the following responsibilities: (1) to inform itself (and to create databases) (a) on the composition of the armies of each member country of the UN (and others), (b) on the types and stocks of weapons of each country, (c) on the activity of the arms industry in each country which 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, and (b) controls on the use of AI in the military field (and legal mechanisms to prevent abuse 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 sales of all armaments (including new armaments) to, among other things, comply with Article 26 of [the UN Charter](#) , (5) to encourage all countries to reduce their defense budgets (while allowing the modernization of their armies), and (6) to act in favor of disarmament, and the maintenance of peace and international security (...).

10. The war in Ukraine and the 50 other ongoing conflicts in the world leave no doubt that the UN needs to be strengthened in the area of peacekeeping, I think, and that NATO has become a source of conflict, not an organization to help maintain peace in Europe (...). But the existence of NATO facilitates the creation of this new IO, in a way; indeed, its member countries finance it, so we already have a source of funding for the new IO that will replace NATO; then, the rapid progress in the field of Artificial Intelligence requires us to implement greater transparency in the military field, and, as explained in the letter of 7-10-24 ([Att. 1](#), no 39-43, FR [Att. 1.2](#)), the UN Charter has forced us since its creation to minimize military spending, even if countries, and in particular, the richest and most advanced (and the USA in particular) have clearly ignored this directive. In order to be able to respect the UN Charter in the field of maintaining peace and international security, it is necessary to create new tools, to have an organization that has the means to monitor what is happening around the world, and also to develop the alternative to market capitalism.

11. As for the **proposal to develop the alternative to market capitalism**, I have presented many arguments to the member countries of the UN for at least 15 years that support the merits of this proposal, but it is a complicated task (and very political, the rich countries derive many advantages from the current economic system as explained in the last letter of 10-7-24, no 75-79). The UN IRP experts recent report (GRO 2024, mentioned in the letter, [Att. 1](#), at no. 53-55), mentioning that '*High-income countries use six times more materials per capita and are responsible for ten times more climate impacts per capita than low-income countries.*', the fact that '*10 people own as much property and wealth as the 40% of the world's population who are the poorest*', globalization, recent progress in the field of AI, the urgency of more strictly respecting the UN Charter and human rights, and the increasingly important role that the Internet plays in the functioning of our economy, must also encourage us to rethink our economic system, and justify, among other things, the merits of this proposal.

B The timing of the project, the usefulness of the project for the UN (...), UNGA (...), your possible interest for and role in the project, and the organization and financing of the project.

1) The project is timely and useful to have a more efficient UNSG selection process and to help all countries decrease the cost of developing more efficient LA and justice systems using extensively AI.

12. **The selection process for the new UN Secretary General** is expected to start in December 2025 (if everything goes as it did in 2016), and countries will present candidates between January and March 2026 probably, who should have presented their vision, and/or their platform of proposals, to help the UN and its member countries, by the end of March or so (last time Mrs Georgieva entered the race in September, I believe); and the UNSG selection process has always been a moment during which the candidates explain to the states' Representatives how they would resolve the complex problems the UN and world have to resolve, so **this is the right time** (1) to discuss **the long term strategy of the UN** (like the creation of new IOs to strengthen the UN in various areas), and (2) to discuss **the ongoing issues** of great or critical importance [like how can we best use AI to improve the well-being of all the people around the world]. And the platform would present you not just a vision on how to resolve certain **specific problems** the UN (...) has to solve, but also (a) detailed solutions to resolve these problems and (b) detailed solutions to finance the project (and its sub-projects); and the problems, for which we will propose solutions (with this platform), are all problems that need to be solved urgently and of critical importance, so to facilitate the decision making process on these proposals is important for everyone, and **the project is timely and useful to have a more efficient UNSG selection process.**

13. Also, as you can see it in the first draft of the project proposal ([Att. 2](#), p. 6-7), the project will point out the grave problems (a) of the French legal aid (LA) system [that France has been dissimulating or ignoring for years to continue robbing the poor (I have written often to the UN Secretariat (2016), OHCHR (2019,), ECHR (2016,), Council of Europe (2020) and, more recently, ICC (2021-2024) to talk about the LA system in France and to bring obvious evidences of its unconstitutionality but unfortunately they remained silent also)], and, indirectly, (b) of many LA systems around the world; and several countries have already started developing AI systems to help the judges and prosecutors in their work, so **it is urgent to act now and together on this LA subject** if we want (1) to develop the best possible AI system for everyone (every countries,), and to minimize the cost of developing a new LA system for everyone as much as possible, in an area, justice, that is already **very costly** for everyone, and (2) to correct grave injustices everywhere [as I have mentioned it also, developing an efficient LA system will make it easier to develop a more general justice system which could help judge all the cases (not only cases involving a poor)], and **the timing of the project is right also for these reasons.**

[14. On this subject, the 7-10-24 letter ([Att. 1](#), no. 2-28, FR [Att. 1.2](#)) gave you **additional reasons why an ICC preliminary investigation of the crime against humanity of persecution** linked to the unconstitutional French LA system (voted in 1991) **was and is pertinent** [among other subjects, I (a) talked about the recent SAPIN II law to fight more efficiently corruption, and (b) explained why it could be used to justify the preliminary investigation (no 2-8.1), (c) made a comparison between the ICC and the French LA systems and brought additional proof of the well-founded of my ICC complaint (no 9-14), and (d) described you my ongoing proceeding to obtain a carrier reconstruction from a former employer, the Department of Essonne (CG91), where I worked from 1991 to 1993 and who threatened me to have problems for the rest of my life (no 15-28)], so I must talk briefly here about what happened in this case in which I used the SAPIN II law and my accusations of crime against humanity linked to the unconstitutionality of the legal aid law.

15. As explained at no 25-28 ([Att. 1](#)), the [emergency proceeding](#) to obtain the career reconstruction filed on 12-11-24 was rejected on 3-22-24 by an administrative court [decision without addressing any of the factual and legal issues and arguments](#) I presented, and, in particular, the fact that I am a **whistleblower** and I was victim of 3 **unfair treatments** [including the one linked to the fact that the CG91 benefited from (and used) **the crime against humanity** linked to **the unconstitutional LA law** (to avoid reconstructing my career)], and which, according to the SAPIN II law, justifies the career reconstruction. [The appeal filed on 3-4-24](#) was also rejected by the AAC [decision](#) dated 12-11-24, **without addressing any of the arguments** I presented, because the request for legal aid was rejected [on 9-3-24 by the LA office](#), and [on 11-29-24 by the President of AAC](#) (for the appeal), with two LA decisions that did not address either any of the factual and legal arguments presented (!). So I filed another [\(last\) appeal on 12-24-24](#) to the administrative supreme court (Conseil d'Etat, CE), and a [request for legal aid](#) because of the obligation to have a lawyer, and again the LA request was rejected twice (by [the LAO](#) and by [the President of the litigation section](#) of the Conseil d'Etat) **without addressing any of the factual and legal arguments presented**, so even though I have argued in the [\(last\) appeal of 12-24-24](#) that it would be very unfair (a violation of art. 6 and 13 of the ECHR) to reject the appeal because of the obligation to have a lawyer, the 3rd Chamber of the CE **could** reject the appeal **again** without addressing any of the factual and legal arguments I presented (including the fact that I am a **whistleblower** for denouncing the unconstitutionality of the LA law and the *crime against humanity* linked, among other accusations) and which justify the career reconstruction. I have explained to 3rd Chamber that the 2 legal aid decisions were and are very dishonest and unfair, but I am still under the threat that the court use the obligation to have a lawyer to reject the petition summarily and without addressing the merits of the case.

16. At the same time about, the administrative court refused to stay the main proceeding until the supreme court rules on the emergency proceeding and rejected on 6-2-25 the [main request](#) for career reconstruction and the other factual and legal arguments that justified it, again with [a judgment](#) misrepresenting and distorting most of the facts and legal arguments I presented and ignoring the others facts and arguments, so I was forced to file [an appeal](#) also in this proceeding on 4-5-25 which explains again and more clearly, why the career reconstruction is justified by 3 other legal remedies (other than *the 3 appeal against a retaliatory measure* based on the SAPIN II law presented in the emergency proceeding). And I also found a new legal remedy justifying the career reconstruction, so I wrote [a letter on 4-2-25](#) to the CG91 to ask it also to grant the career reconstruction on this new ground or legal remedy also. This new legal remedy is based on the fact that ***the administrative act obtained by fraud can be retired or abrogated by the administration itself at any time*** and **without any restriction from a statute of limitation**; and if the administration refuse to do so, then one can file a request at the administrative court to force them to do so and to compensate the prejudice caused by the fraudulent act.

17. The process which consists of using the dishonest obligations to have a lawyer and the dishonest decisions of the legal aid office, which do not address any of the factual and legal arguments of the case, to reject summarily a request, an appeal and a petition at the supreme court and to rob a poor of his chance to obtain justice without addressing the factual and legal questions of his case, is very dishonest, especially when the poor has a problem with the lawyer who is designated to help him and refuse to help on some of the issues of his case. And the refusal of the lawyers and judges to address the question of the unconstitutionality of the legal aid law and its consequences, as well as the silence of the French politicians on these LA problems, is also a grave injustice, not just for the French poor, but also for the poor in other countries, which would benefit from the development of new and more efficient LA system using extensively AI to help the judges, the prosecutors and the lawyers for the poor.].

2) The usefulness of the project for the UN (...) and your possible interest for, and role in, the project.

18. In my previous letters (including the 7-10-24 letter, [Att. 1](#), no 33-59, and here no 4-11), I talked about the importance and usefulness of the 6 proposals for the UN member states, the UN Secretariat,

OHCHR, WHO, and ILO, and you can also find other positive arguments I am sure, so I will make only brief comments on this subject. On the proposal to create a new IO to replace ICANN, the September 2024 final UN report on AI governance explains (at no 191, 194, 195): ‘*We are also **mindful of the practical challenges to international institution-building on a larger scale.**’ ... ‘*We conclude the present report with some reflections on the issue, **although we do not currently recommend establishing such an agency.**’ ‘*If the risks of AI become more serious, and more concentrated, it might become necessary for Member States to consider a more robust international institution with monitoring, reporting, verification, and enforcement powers.*’; but the UN experts have a narrow vision of AI governance, and it is a mistake to dissociate the two technologies, Internet and AI (as seen in [Att. 1](#), no 44-48), and ‘you’ (UN, member states,) must have a **long term vision** on the AI governance subject and cannot wait until *the risks become more serious* (a) because building a new IO is not something that is done overnight, and (b) because **the urgency** of taking advantage of the benefits that the Internet and AI can bring to the world **is obvious** and **justifies** the creation of this new IO **now**, especially in the actual international situation or context.**

19. Also, it is true that it is a **challenge** to build a new international institution and **that it is costly**, especially at a time in which countries spend so much on the military because there is not much left to spend on technological and institutional improvements, **but**, here, **the possibility** to create a new domain name pricing system gives us a chance **to finance the building and functioning of the new IO**, and, at the same time, it gives us reasons to end the many ongoing wars around the world, and to start spending less in the military area, and more in the improvement of people’s life, so the benefits of building this new institution are worth the challenge. Then on **the subject** of the development of a new and more efficient and less costly LA system that can be used everywhere around the world, the UN Secretariat, OHCHR, and ICC [which I contacted often to talk about this problem (including in 2015, 2017, 2019 and more recently for the ICC 2020, 2021 ..., no 13)] should have also a very special interest in this sub-project which brings them many benefits.

20. The proposal will encourage and help every countries in the world respect human rights by giving judges, prosecutors, and lawyers for the poor the best possible tools (AI and computer and network systems,) to do their job efficiently and for the less cost possible [giving an efficient **AI** and computer systems to help judges, prosecutors (...) is one of the best (if not the best) way to help every countries in this area of justice], and the result of the analysis of the different AI systems (designed to help judges and prosecutors) used around the world would help us develop the best possible **AI (...) systems** (at the lowest cost possible) to help countries in this matter. And, if the project is selected by the UNGA, the OHCHR will play a more active role in the effort to help countries improve their justice systems since it would oversee with countries the day to day operation of the LA system, and it will play a critical role in improving constantly **the AI system** that helps judges, prosecutors, and lawyers for the poor. The ICC judges and prosecutors would also benefit from the new LA (and then justice) system powered by an efficient AI system because it would help them in their daily work, and improve all justice systems around the world, which should decrease the commission of most severe crimes they judge.

21. Sub-project no 4 will be useful to WHO and ILO, who would be the (functional) project leaders for the development of new retirement pension management system, because it would give them incredible new information and possibilities to do their job more efficiently, if the UNGA decided to develop this new system, so these IOs should have a particular interest on this sub-project and their support and cooperation would be of great importance to write a good proposal and to obtain

the financing of the project. For sub-project no 5, the UN Secretariat and NATO's employees are very much concerned by the maintenance of peace and international security around the world, and our objective is to give the UN Secretariat and UN member states, including NATO member countries, **an alternative solution to the present UN system's organization** to maintain peace and international security, so Mr. Guterres and Mr. Rutte should be interested in the project and may accept to cooperate with us, in the form of sharing some information, for example, to develop the best possible proposal in the interest of humanity, even if there no guarantee that UN member states will select this project. Sub-project no 6 would also be useful to the World Bank and the IMF, so they may accept to support this sub-project and to cooperate with us to write the best possible proposal on this subject.

22. ICANN, who plays a central role in the functioning of the Internet, and USC and University of Maryland's, who operate Internet root name servers, (1) should also have a particular interest in sub-projects no 1 and 2, which, among other advantages, would generate more fund to improve the Internet functioning and security, and (2) could be of great help to present a good platform of proposals by sharing some of their experience and some of the information they have, for example. And, if the sub-projects no 1, 2, and 5, are selected by UNGA, and the two new IOs to replace ICANN (...) and NATO were created, they (ICANN, USC, University of Maryland, UN and NATO) would participate in the transition process, so their interest in project should be multiple. Of course, your eventual expression of interest for the project does not engage you (and the countries or organizations you represent) in any way to vote for or support the final proposal that will be presented in March 2026 about; and presenting a good platform of proposals does not guarantee (1) that UN member countries will accept all the proposals or even just one, and (2) that I will be selected, or even nominated, to be UNSG [as you all know, there is very little chance that I will be elected to be, or nominated for the position of, UNSG (for various reasons like the geographical rotation for UNSG, ...)], but, of course, if one country offered to nominate me for the UNSG position, I would gladly accept the honor to defend the proposals in front of the UNGA, and if one or more project were selected, I would also gladly accept to work for the UN to realize the selected project (s); and, if I were not nominated, presenting a good platform would still be useful to the UN (...) and to the UNSG selection process (no 12).

3) The organization and the financing of the project.

23. I have presented the project to (1) Mrs. Salazar at the US Congress, (2) Mr Dhesi at the UK parliament, and (3) Mr. Sachs at Columbia University, **in January 2025**; then **at the beginning of March** I wrote the first draft of the detailed description of the project ([Att. 2](#)), and I contacted (4) Mrs. Goldberg, Mrs. Creese, and Mr. Flaxman at Oxford's Department of computer science, (5) Professor Kramer at LSE, Mr Grolier at TSE and the members of the IRP (**on March 11th about**), and then I wrote (6) to Mr Tolstoy at the Douma, and (7) to Mrs Nishimura at the Japanese parliament, and to Mrs Heather Gerken (Yale), Mr. Alexander Golichenkov (MSU), and Mr. Ryuji Yamamoto (UoT) **on March 19th about** (I also presented the project to the French Conseil d'Etat and a French administration). Most of these persons and organizations have not had much time to study the project, but they are experts in their given fields, so they should have a position on the project and their eventual participation soon. The project is not reserved to just 4 or 5 countries, so you may have received a copy of the project proposal and some other parliaments, governments and universities may have been informed also.

24. And if you were not informed, you all know very well the subjects I am addressing in the project proposal or the specific area of the sub-project which concerns you, and you can inform the government of your country of origin if you are a representative of a member state, so you should be able to analyze rapidly the project proposal. In addition to finishing the detailed description of the project with a more precise estimation of the cost and a more detailed list of participants (and the work they will do), we must also (a) find the financing for the project [the project cost should be in the neighborhood of ten to twelve millions dollars, may be a little bit more] and (b) hire some help, so the objective is to finish the detailed description of the project, to find the financing and to hire some collaborators between April and June 2025 to have between 9 to eleven months of work to write the detailed proposals platform and to give you a chance to discuss the final proposal between April and September 2026.

C Conclusion.

25. The project presented in no 2-11 (and in [Att. 2](#), FR [Att. 2.2](#)) proposes **(a) to make a special effort** in the fields of **the Internet** and **Artificial Intelligence (AI)** to reduce the digital divide and to make all countries and all inhabitants of the planet, including the poorest, benefit from the many benefits that these two technologies can bring, **(b) to strengthen the capacity of the UN** to help countries (i) maintain peace and international security, (ii) respect human rights, and (iii) resolve certain specific global problems, and **(c) to present a strategy** to improve our economic system, so it would be useful for the UN member states, and the UN Secretariat, OHCHR, ICC, WHO, ILO, IMF, and World Bank, among other IOs, and, of course also, to all the inhabitants of the planet.

26. And **the timing of the project is right (1) because** the presentation of the detailed platform of proposals mentioned here would give a chance to UN member states (a) to discuss, and agree on, the long term strategy of the UN during the UNSG selection process and, therefore, (b) to have a more efficient UNSG selection, and **(2) because** the proposal to develop a new LA system would give us a chance to develop the best possible **AI system** to help judges, prosecutors and lawyers for the poor for all the countries, at the lowest cost possible (no 12-13).

27. The project gives you a different perspective on the issues of the AI governance and the Internet governance and presents different solutions to address these two important issues than the ones the recent UN report on AI governance and the previous UN report and proposals on Internet governance have given you, so, independently from the many benefits the project brings, it is useful also for this reason. The sub-projects no 3 and 4 would be of tremendous help to the OHCHR, ICC, WHO and ILO, since it would significantly improve their capacity to do their work efficiently and to help the UN members in their respective areas of specialty, and sub-project no 6 would also be useful to the IMF and the World Bank, so these IOs may accept to support the project (express their interest ...) and to cooperate with us in various forms (information sharing,) to help us write a good platform of proposals if the project is financed.

28. I have contacted experienced high level experts in the field mentioned in the project proposals (no 23), but the final and more precise (a) description of the project (including the list of experts who want to participate and the description of the work they would do) and (b) estimation of the cost of the project, remain to be done; and we must also find the financing for the project and hire the necessary collaborators. The objective is to do this remaining work between April and June 2025

to have between 9 to 11 months to prepare the detailed platform of proposals so that ‘you’ (the Representatives of UN members states) can discuss it between April and September 2026 during the UNSG selection process, and take the appropriate decisions for everyone’s benefits.

29. I would be grateful to Mr. Yang if he could ask his colleagues if they could forward a copy of this letter (1) to the Representatives of member states so that they can get the letter faster [it always take me at least 10 days to send the more than 190 emails to each one of them, the French version of the letter will be at <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/let-to-UNGA-UN-proj-prop-FR-18-4-25.pdf>], and (2) to Mr. Guterres, Mr. Türk. Mr. Banga, Mr. Ghebreyesus, and Judge Akane. I followed fairly closely the last (2016) UNSG selection process, including the debates (or questioning sessions) between the candidates and the representatives of member states, and the previous one in 2006, so I understand that this project proposal may seem unusual to you, but it is not a profound change, just a small (and useful) change that will give you eventually the possibility (a) to reform slightly the future UNSG selection processes, or simply (b) to encourage some of the future UNSG candidates to come a little bit better prepared.

30. In the hope that this project will interest you and the countries and organizations you represent, and that you will be able to support it (individually or in groups) and eventually to cooperate with us during the next twelve months to write a good platform of proposals, I look forward to reading your response and I remain

Yours sincerely,

Pierre Genevier

Att. 1: Letter of 7-10-24, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/let-to-UNSC-UNGA-ICC-EN-10-7-24.pdf>].

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

Att. 2: First draft of a detail description of the proposals, 7-3-25, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/Project-description-7-3-25.pdf>].

(2.2) FR version [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/Project-description-7-3-25.pdf>] (Google translation not verified).