de&%s%on (en&e' t(at (%s +e?uest &ou$d not 4e ente+ta%ned. =o+eo8e+' (e st+essed t(at %f UN/C0- a&t%ons 7e+e &ons%de+ed to 4e one o+ mo+e %m#$%ed adm%n%st+at%8e de&%s%ons' t(e A##$%&ant (ad fa%$ed to +es#e&t t(e

15. The Respondent's principal contentions are:

a. Since the Applicant failed to identify a contestable administrative decision in his request for management evaluation, UN/C0- was correct in dismissing the request, and this imprecision cannot be repaired on appeal;

b. The Respondent understands that in the application, the Applicant advances that UN/C0- took three "implied" administrative decisions, as follows:

i. the inaction on the part of "UN/C0-" in not timely invoking provisions of Charter of the UN, Staff Regulations/Rules, and Geneva Convention;

ii. "UN/C0-" not having taken any decision on providing the safety and protection at the workplace and timely inaction on the criminal and civil litigation against the Applicant; and

iii. the deployment of the Applicant by UN/C0- to a hardship and risky environment.

c. Without prejudice to the question whether the three above decisions referred to by the Applicant in his application constitute implied administrative decisions, the request for management evaluation was manifestly time-barred, since the Applicant was aware of the alleged inaction prior to the closure of the proceedings before national courts in 2012;

d. Even if the assertion that the proceedings before national courts

5T/A//266 +ead 7\t(5T/5G!/168 to #+o8\de safet" and #+ote&t\on to fun&t\ona$ \mmun\t" of staff mem4e+s' and as g\8en unde+ t(e 1646 Gene8a Con8ent\on1.

1 .   As stated a4o8e' t(e A##$\&ant fu+t(e+ +efe+s to t(e)\na&t\on on t(e #a+t of *UN/C0-3 \n not t\me$" \n8o@\ng #+o8\s\ons of C(a+te+ of t(e UN' 5taff Aegu$at\ons/Au$es and Gene8a Con8ent\on1 and UN/C0-)not (a8\ng ta@en an" de&\s\on on #+o8\d\ng t(e safet" and #+ote&t\on at t(e 7o+@#$a&e and t\me$"

considers that the application must be rejected as irreceivable   on this ground alone.

21.   Even if appealable administrative decisions could be identified, it is clear that in submitting his request for management evaluation only on 24 March 2014 relating to issues which at the very latest, came to an end in November 2013, the Applicant failed to respect the 60-day statutory time-limit to request management evaluation under staff rule 11.2.c2. The failure to file a timely request for management evaluation renders the application equally irreceivable,

          E   2014-UNAT-4022.

22.   In view of the foregoing, the Tribunal DECIDES

     The application is rejected.

                                                        .   2

                                             Judge Thomas Laker

                            Dated this 20th day of October 2014