



Case No.: UNDT/NBI/2012/028

UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

## Introduction

1. The Applicant is contesting the decision of the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management (ASG/OHRM) not to grant him a permanent appointment. The contested ~~decision~~ arose as a consequence of the downsizing of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) following

5. Staff of the ICTR was informed by Information Circular No. 10 from the Chief of the Division of Administrative Support Services on 3 March 2010 that the Human Resources and Planning Section would review the eligibility of ICTR staff members for consideration for conversion to permanent appointment. The Information Circular stated that “in the case of the ICTR, as the appointments are limited to the Tribunal, any permanent appointment will also be limited to the Tribunal”.

6. Staff members were further advised by Information Circular No. 12 dated 8 March 2010, that those who met the eligibility criteria according to the Guidelines should complete the appropriate form and submit it to the Human Resources and Planning Section.

7. Two lists of staff considered eligible for consideration for conversion were submitted to the ASG/OHRM on 20 and 28 July 2010 by the ICTR Human Resources and Planning Section. 229 international staff members and 181 locally recruited General Service staff members were recommended for conversion by ICTR.

8. In a Town Hall meeting on 4 March 2011 the ICTR Registrar informed all ICTR staff that ‘the CRB of New York endorsed the recommendation of the ASG/OHRM not to recommend the staff member of the Tribunals for one time conversion to permanent appointment due to the operational needs of the organisation.’

9. The Applicant was notified by the Registrar of the ICTR on 2 November 2011 that they had received the decision of the ASG/OHRM not to grant him a permanent appointment. The Registrar asserted that this decision was taken with due regard to the interests of the Organization and the operational realities of the Organization.

Applicant’s submissions

10. The ICTR is an integral part of the Secretariat.

- a. Various reports of the Secretary-General on the composition of the Secretariat indicate this fact.
- b. The recognition by the ASG/OHRM of an option to transfer from the ICTR to the Secretariat confirms that the ICTR is an integral part of the Secretariat.
- c. While ST/SGB/2009/10 was relied upon to deny the Applicant a permanent position, it in fact confirms that the ICTR is an integral part of the Secretariat.
- d. The promulgation of 'Guidelines' indicates that the Applicant must have been considered a staff member of the Secretariat. The 'Guidelines' indicate that to be 'eligible' for consideration for conversion to permanent appointment the staff member 'must be in active service with the UN secretariat at the time he or she is considered for conversion permanent appointment'. OHRM agreed with the conclusion of the ICTR that a number of staff members of the ICTR were 'eligible' but not 'suitable'. Therefore OHRM agreed that at the time of consideration the Applicant was in active service with the United Nations secretariat.
- e. The Applicant is a staff member under Chapter XV of the United Nations Charter, to find otherwise would be indefensible.
- f. The relevant clauses in the Applicant's letter of appointment do not indicate that the ICTR is not part of the Secretariat. It is common understanding that staff members of the ICTR and ICTY have in the past been issued letters of appointment that confirm that their appointments are with the Secretariat.
- g. The ICTR is not an 'organization' contemplated in A/RES/51/226.

11. The permanence of an appointment should not be confused with the permanence of a post or position. A permanent post or position is not a requirement for a permanent appointment. Instead, ST/AI/2010/3 (Staff selection

system) contemplates that the ASG/OHRM has the discretion to assign staff affected by post abolition. Thus, the author of the impugned decision should have determined whether the specific skills of the Applicant were transferable to other roles within the Secretariat.

12. In the alternative, assuming that the permanence of posts or positions can be an overriding criterion, the Secretary-General has failed to promulgate proper instructions on how to determine the permanence of posts.

13. The *Alba*<sup>1</sup> case held that all staff should be granted reasonable consideration for career appointment irrespective of the source of funding for their posts. The fact that the Secretary-General might have funds to cover potential termination indemnities but that it would not be in the financial interests of the Secretariat or United Nations to do so, is insufficient to substantiate the alleged distinction between the *Alba* case and the current one.

14. The Respondent's oral submissions regarding *Ademagic et al.* UNDT/2012/131 are misplaced. The Tribunal in that case made the following findings:

- a. The authority delegated to the ICTY Registrar is a valid delegation of authority.
- b. The ICTY Registrar was delegated the authority to grant permanent appointments absent a clear exception.
- c. The former Staff Rules were applicable throughout the relevant

first clearly and formally revoke the delegation before it can exercise its authority again.

e.



- c. as the ICTY had not been granted such delegated authority in line with the new version of the Staff Rules and the relevant Secretary-General's Bulletin, it lacked the power and authority to grant

5041910 -5.33002 T.



[S]taff members on fixed-term appointments upon completion of five years of continuing good service shall be given every reasonable consideration for a career appointment.

28. Resolution 51/226 of 3 April 1997 brought a qualification to resolution 37/126 as follows:

[F]ive years of continuing service as stipulated in its resolution 37/126 of 17 December 1982 do not confer the automatic right to a permanent appointment, and also decides that other considerations, such as outstanding performance, the operational realities of the organizations and the core functions of the post, should be duly taken into account.

29. Former staff rule 104.12(b) on 100-series fixed-term appointments, which was applicable until 30 June 2009, provided that:

(ii) The fixed-term appointment does not carry any expectancy of renewal or of conversion to any other type of appointment;

(iii) Notwithstanding sub paragraph (ii) above, upon completion of five years of continuous service on fixed-term appointments, a staff member who has fully met the criteria of staff regulation 4.2 and who is under the age of fifty-three years will be given every reasonable consideration for a permanent appointment, taking into account all the interests of the Organization.

30. ST/SGB/2009/10 set out specific criteria for conversion to permanent appointments and these are: i) the interests of the Organization; ii) eligibility of the staff member as regards qualifications, performance, conduct, and suitability as an international servant; and iii) high standards of efficiency, competence and integrity.

31. It is the responsibility of the department or office where the staff member is serving to ascertain whether these criteria are satisfied, on the basis of which determination a recommendation to grant a permanent appointment is then transmitted to the ASG/OHRM.

32. Section 3.3 of ST/SGB/2009/10 provides that

[i]n order to facilitate the process of conversion to permanent appointment under the present bulletin, recommendations to grant a permanent appointment that have the joint support of the

Resources Management or local human resources office shall be submitted to the Secretary-General for approval.

33. A recommendation was sent for conversion to permanent appointment in regard to several staff members, including the Applicant, serving at the ICTR by Ms. Ana Maria Machaki of the ICTR (then) Human Resources and Planning Section (HRPS/ICTR). This was necessitated by S/RES/1503/2003 which endorsed the ICTR Completion Strategy and urged the organisation to take all possible measures to complete its work in 2010. This was followed by S/RES/1996/2010, which established the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals. This resolution also urged the ICTR to complete all remaining work by 31 December 2014.

34. The recommendation of HRPS/ICTR was not accepted by OHRM. The staff members were informed. But this is not the end of the matter.

35. Section 3.4 of ST/SGB/2009/10 provides that:

In the absence of joint support for conversion to permanent appointment, including cases where the department or office

38. At a Town Hall meeting on 4 March 2011, the ICTR Registrar informed all staff that the CRB in New York had endorsed the recommendation of the ASG/OHRM not to recommend the staff member of the Tribunals for conversion to permanent appointment due to the operational needs of the Organization.

39. Subsequently, the matter was resubmitted to the CRB for review because the ASG/OHRM discovered additional information that should have been made available to the CRB. On 27 May 2011, the CRB informed the ASG/OHRM that it had endorsed the views of the ASG/OHRM that no conversion should take place.

40. In this second decision by the CRB, the Board concluded that as the appropriate procedures had been followed when considering candidates of the ICTR for permanent appointment “the recommendation of [OHRM] on non-suitability for conversion of all recommended staff to permanent appointments, due to the limitation of their service to their respective Tribunals and the lack of established posts” was correct.

41. Following that second review and recommendation, the Applicant was informed on 2 November 2011 that he would not be granted a permanent appointment.

42. The task of the CRB is to determine whether a staff member recommended for permanent appointment satisfies the criteria prescribed in section 2 of ST/SGB/2009/10. Section 2 lists a number of criteria that have to be considered by OHRM and the CRB when the matter is referred to them.

43. Section 2 of ST/SGB/2009/10 refers to rule 104.12 and 104.13 on permanent appointments and its interrelation with the interest of the Organization. Further, Resolution 37/126 of 17 December 1982 refers to operational realities of the Organization and the core functions of the post. The recommendation of the CRB after the second submission by ASG/OHRM makes no mention of the personal attributes of the candidates like efficiency for permanent appointment. It appears from the decision that the exercise was limited to ascertaining whether it

would be in the interest of the Organization or not to confer permanent appointments to the staff members concerned including the Applicant.

44. The exercise in the determination of whether candidates should be granted a permanent appointment is two-fold. The responsible officers in OHRM and the CRB should first consider whether the candidates satisfy the test of personal attributes. Then the interest of the Organization comes into play. From a reading of the correspondence between OHRM and the ICTR as well as the CRB it seems that there was no dispute on the personal attributes of the candidates. The Tribunal concludes that in the absence of any specific contention to the contrary, the CRB accepted that there was no dispute or controversy as to these personal attributes. While the Tribunal observes, that it would have been more appropriate to address this issue definitively, the absence of such a discussion is not sufficient ground to nullify the decision.

45. The Applicant's letter of appointment states that he was recruited by the ICTR. The ICTR is in the process of downsizing. The Tribunal concludes that the ASG/OHRM and the CRB correctly determined that it cannot be in the interest of the Organization nor of its operational activities to grant permanent appointments under the circumstances in force. The impetus to rescind the decision of the Respondent not to grant him permanent appointment is therefore rejected.

#### Delegation of Authority to HR of ICTR

46. The other issue is whether the decision to recommend conversion to permanent appointment should have been taken by the ASG/OHRM or the officer in charge of HR in ICTR. There is no indication that ICTR was afforded delegation of authority to convert a staff member to a permanent appointment. Section 3.3 of SGB/2009/10 only gives power to the responsible officer of HR at a duty station to recommend a staff member for permanent appointment. This recommendation has to be approved by the ASG/OHRM, which approval can then be reviewed by the CRB. This procedure was correctly applied in this case.

Recommendation of the CRB of 27 May 2011.

47. The recommendation made by the CRB was properly acted upon by the Respondent. The necessary elements of the conversion process were correctly adhered to.

48. It was also appropriate for the CRB to recommend that OHRM and the Administration of both the *ad hoc* Tribunals continue their joint efforts to place the staff of these two Tribunals within the offices of the Secretariat offices using established procedures. The CRB also recommended that once such placement was made on an established post, the administration should bear in mind the acquired rights of the staff of both Tribunals when considering conversion to a permanent appointment and to convert the appointment of such staff to permanent without further reference to a CRB, if such placement, including reinstatement, occurs one year before or after the abolition of their post.

#### CONCLUSION

49. For the foregoing reasons, the Application is dismissed.

*(Signed)*

Judge Vinod Boolell

Dated this 30<sup>th</sup> day of April 2013

Entered in the Register on this 30<sup>th</sup> day of April 2013

*(Signed)*

Abena Kwakye-Berko, OiC Registrar, Nairobi Registry