



ir
ie

ir
vi
te

The Application and Procedural History

1. The Applicant is contesting changes to his conditions of service as a result of General Assembly Resolution 65/8 (United Nations common system: report of the International Civil Service Commission) on the “harmonization of conditions of Service for Internationally Recruited Staff in Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions”, of 24 December 2010, which he maintains resulted in the arbitrary discontinuance of his temporary assignment to family duty station as of 1 October 2011, and thus breaching his acquired rights.
2. The Respondent filed his Reply to the Application on 16 January 2012. The Respondent’s principal contention is that the Application is not receivable as the “implementation of an administrative policy mandated by the General Assembly does not constitute a reviewable administrative decision under art. 2.1(a) of the Statute of the Dispute Tribunal” As an ancillary point, the Respondent submits that the Applicant “has no acquired right to unchanged conditions of service”
3. On 22 February 2012, the Tribunal issued Order No. 31 (NBI/2012) directing the Applicant to advise on: a) the completeness of the case record, as filed by the Parties respectively; b) the need for further disclosure pursuant to article 18 of the Rules of Procedure; c) whether an oral hearing on the matter is considered necessary, and the number and location of witnesses to be called if a hearing is thought necessary.
4. Both Parties responded to Order No. 31 (NBI/2012), indicating their

14. Under the provisional Staff Rules, former staff rule 103.21 was abolished and replaced with staff rule 4.8(b) which provides that “[a] change of official duty station shall take place when a staff member is assigned from a duty station to a United Nations field mission for a period exceeding three months”.

15. The provisional Staff Regulations and Rules also included transitional measures relevant to the continuation of FSO TDY assignments beyond 1 July 2009.

As an exception to staff rule 4.8, staff rule 13.7(c) provided that staff members serving as FSOs on o s7.04 Tm 16/(t)--230(s)8(t) s7.04 Tm [J27(s)-1p19()-50(2009.)-10()] TJ-1

19. On 31 December 2010, the Secretary-General informed all staff in a broadcast message that the General Assembly had approved, inter alia, the International Civil Service Commission's recommendations on a harmonized approach to the compensation, allowances and benefits of staff under the United Nations common system assigned to non-family duty stations effective 1 July 2011. This included the designation of duty stations as family or non-family duty stations based on security criteria, payment of additional hardship allowance for staff serving in non-family locations, and paid travel for rest and recuperation purposes.

20. Given the apparent changes in the conditions of service for reappointed FSOs on long-term TDY assignments, requests for agreed termination of appointments were made an option for existing FSOs. The Applicant did not avail himself of this option neither did he sign for or agree to any changes in his conditions. This is contested by the Respondent. The Respondent submits, and the Applicant does not accept, that at the same time, all FSOs were allowed to remain on 'travel status' with payment of MSA from 1 July until 30 September 2011, pursuant to staff rule 4.8(b). This gave all FSOs time to consider whether to request an agreed termination or continue to serve the Organization under the new conditions of service.

21. The Respondent submits, and the Applicant does not accept, that transitional arrangements were likewise put in place to allow staff in the Professional category on detail assignment to a non-family mission on 30 June 2009 to remain on travel status with payment of MSA for the duration of the assignment period in effect on 30 June 2009. From 1 July 2009, with the exception of FSOs, all other staff members serving in non-family missions for a period exceeding six months were assigned in the non-family duty station with payment of post adjustment and related allowances and benefits applicable to the assigned duty station. The payment of MSA was discontinued.

22. The Respondent submits, and the Applicant does not accept, that the changes in the conditions of service of FSOs, including the Applicant, reflected the decisions

of the General Assembly which resulted in amendments to the Staff Rules, particularly staff rules 4.8(b) and 13.7.

23. On 27 May 2011, in order to implement the newly revised Staff Regulations and Rules, the Department of Field Support (DFS) issued "Guidelines for Implementation of General Assembly Resolution 65/248 on Harmonization of Conditions of Service for International Recruited Staff in Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions" (Guidelines). The Guidelines mandated the termination of the FSO terms and conditions as well as their link with the family duty station where they had been previously assigned and ended their MSA.

24. On 31 May 2011, the Applicant received an e-mail from the Chief Civilian Personnel Officer (CCPO) of MONUSCO, informing him that his MSA payment was to be discontinued, following the implementation of the Guidelines.

25. On 21 July 2011, the Applicant filed a request for management evaluation asserting that the Guidelines violated his acquired rights insofar as it changed the conditions of service for FSOs in relation to their mission assignments, his travel status, and MSA payment while he received post adjustment, salary and related allowances applicable to his parent duty station.

26. On 9 September 2011, the Management Evaluation Unit informed the Applicant that his request for management evaluation was not receivable.

DEL

28. This provision must be read together with article 8.2(e) of the Tribunal's Rules of Procedure, which requires an applicant to state "when and where the contested decision, if any, was taken (with the contested decision attached)"

29. The Respondent's principal contention is that the Applicant's challenge to the changes in his conditions of service is not receivable by the Tribunal. The implementation of an administrative policy mandated by the General Assembly does not constitute a reviewable administrative decision under article 2.1(a) of the Statute of the Dispute Tribunal.

30. The Applicant contends that the payment of MSA formed part of the terms and conditions of his contract. The abolition of the payment of MSA was at the discretion of the Secretary General; payment of it was not proscribed by, or as a consequence of, General Assembly resolution 65/248.

31. The Applicant further asserts that

constitutes a contestable administrative decision as these decisions have a direct impact on the terms of appointment or contract of employment of the individual staff member.

In other instances, administrative decisions might be of general application seeking to promote the efficient implementation of administrative objectives, policies and goals. Although the implementation of the decision might impose some requirements in order for a staff member to exercise his or her rights, the decision does not necessarily affect his or her terms of appointment or contract of employment.

What constitutes an administrative decision will depend on the nature of the decision, the legal framework under which the decision was made, and the consequences of the decision.

34. What the Applicant is seeking to challenge is the Secretary-General's implementation of General Assembly resolution 65/248, which led to the discontinuation of payment of the MSA.

35. Decisions regarding the conditions of service and entitlements for all staff serving in the United Nations common system are within the exclusive domain of the General Assembly?

36. In this case, the General Assembly made a decision to harmonise the terms and conditions of service of staff members across the United Nations system. Resolution 65/248 approved

the recommendations of the Commission on the harmonization of the conditions of service of staff of the organizations of the United Nations common system serving in family duty stations, as contained in its annual report for 2010, subject to the provisions of the present resolution.

37. The new tem.

38. This General Assembly decision was binding on the Secretary-General, and its implementation affected staff across the Organization.

39. These changes included the introduction of permanent appointments for eligible staff members, which Applicant was offered and signed on 23 June 2011.

40. The Tribunal finds that the Applicant is seeking to challenge a change to his terms and conditions of service, which the Secretary-General implemented pursuant to the General Assembly's directions.

41. The Tribunal has examined the papers in this matter from as many angles as has been raised by the Parties, and finds that this matter is materially outside its jurisdiction.

42. The Tribunal therefore cannot continue to adjudicate this matter and dismisses the Application in its entirety.



Judge Vinod Boolell