

C s o D G A
n
u nt o D

n on

1. Each of the Applicants, General staff members of the United Nations Development Programme ("UNDP"), India, in the service of the Organization from a date prior to 1 November 2014, filed a motion for extension of time to file an application against "the decision of [United Nations Office of Human

C s o D G A
n
u nt o D

4. A Comprehensive Local Salary Survey was conducted in New Delhi in June 2013, and the results of the survey were promulgated by OHRM on its website, as reflected in its cable dated 1 October 2014, in the following terms:

Subject: New Delhi (India) local salaries

(2) first language

- a. 29,532 applicable to staff members for whom the allowance becomes payable on or after one November 2014;
- b. 34,104 applicable to staff members for whom the allowance becomes payable prior to one November 2014;

(3) second language

- a. 14,766 applicable to staff members for whom the allowance becomes payable on or after one November 2014;
- b. 17,052 applicable to staff members for whom the allowance becomes payable prior to one November 2014.

5. In the applications, it is stressed that the salary freeze is causing the Applicants grave prejudice and that to allow the Applicants to challenge the survey and the results thereof, the list of comparators interviewed and retained during the 2013 salary survey should be shared with the Applicants.

Concl on

6. As a preliminary matter, since the present individual applications concern identical decisions, rely on common facts and raise the same questions of fact and law, and since all Applicants are staff members of UNDP, India, the Tribunal considers it appropriate to adjudicate upon them jointly. Therefore, a single judgment is issued in respect of the 29 applications.

C s o D G A
n
u nt o D

9. The Tribunal further recalls its recent Judgment *n* UNDT/2014/026, in which it held with respect to the decision to freeze salary scales that:

[the] decision is of a general order, in that it concerns all eligible General Service staff and National Officers in Bangkok on board prior to 1 March 2012. As such, the circle of persons to whom the salary freeze applies is not defined individually but by reference to the status and category of these persons within the Organization, at a specific location and at a specific point in time. Moreover, the decision will apply for a duration which, at the time it was taken and as at today, cannot be determined. Indeed, nobody can predict when the gap flagged by the survey will be closed, hence the actual duration of the salary freeze is unknown ... Accordingly, the Tribunal concludes that in applying the test of *An ono*, the decision to freeze existing salary scales ... does not constitute an administrative decision for the purpose of art. 2.1(a) of the Tribunal's Statute.

10. The Tribunal finds that Judgement *n* and the present application deal with identical matters. Indeed, the main facts of *n* are summarized in the above-referenced Judgment of the Dispute Tribunal as follows:

17. The 2011 Comprehensive Local Salary Survey was

C s o D G A
n
D G A
n

C s o D G A
n
D G A
n

