



1. The Applicant contests his non-selection for the post of Chief of Vehicle Regulation and Transport (non)ation \*e#t"on +P\$5, - "th the Transport D")'s on United Nations .onom"# Comm"ss"on fo .uo e +/UN .C .0, ad)e#t"sed unde Jo1 2 en"ng +/J20, 13\$.C2\$.C.\$33201\$ '\$Gene)a + ' ,.

2. As remedied the Applicant sees to benefit from a fair merit-based and transparent selection process at each stage as well as from financial compensation.

3. The post of Chief of \*e#t"on +P\$5, Transport D")'s on UN .C . - as published from 15 May to 13 July 2013 under J2 13\$.C2\$.C.\$33201\$ '\$Gene)a + ' ,. The Applicant applied on 17 June 2013.

3. Pending recruitment under the aforementioned J2 the post - as also advertised under Tem o#a#6 Va#a#6 Announ#ement +/TVA0, TVAS13\$.C.\$037. On 17 July 2013 the Applicant - as selected for the TVA effect)e 28 July 2013 and discharged his duties until December 2013. The Director of Transport D")'s on UN .C . & the Applicant's superior and : "ng 5 anage fo the f"ing of the J2 stated in a memorandum of 17 July 2013 that she had made it clear to the Applicant that his selection on the TVA did not constitute a promise for his selection for J2 13\$.C2\$.C.\$33201\$ '\$Gene)a + ' ,.

5. Ten candidates - e#e sho#t"sted regard"ng J2 13\$.C2\$.C.\$33201\$ '\$

"ns .%t.9.78436Gene5a.23,364#t#689 (the 474.794#t) - The 206 (under 0-ent 8949(a) t#n 0165314352.528772(.).8488( ) ]







Case No. UNDT/GVA/2015/130

Judgment No. UNDT/2016/203

#and"dates - e%e tho%ough!6 assessed and the %o#edu

to inform his of the subsequent functions. Under the more the A !ant - as  
made a - a e that his selection on the TVA - as no "om"se o "nd"at"on of  
his eventual selection under the J2; and

h.







same definition. : en#e& no mean"ngfu! #on#!us"on #an 1e d%a - n f%om the f"gu%es  
ad)an#ed 16 e"the% a%t6.

2A. (n an6 e)ent& 16 he% o - n statements and 16 he% att"tude and he% staff"ng

o en"ng& the a !"#at"ons of #and"dates -ho ha)e su##essfu!!6  
assed the %e\$s#%een"ng %o#ess& togethe% - "th the names of  
%e\$a %o)ed e!"g"1!e #and"dates& fo% #ons"de%at"on fo% se!e#t"on.

32. Pu%suant to these %o)"s"on& the e!"g"1!"t6 %e\$s#%een"ng of #and"dates "s  
s&stemat"#a!!6 #a%%"ed out 16 the human %esou%#es off"#e "n #ha%ge of the  
%e#%u"tment "n Buest"on. (t fo!!o- s that the :"%ng 5 anage% - as not "n)o!)ed and  
had no #ont%o! o)e% the %e\$s#%een"ng. The T%"1una! "s& ho -e)e&& of the )e - that  
"f the :"%ng 5 anage% 4ne- that "n the ast the% had 1een an "ssue - "th the  
%e!ease of the A !"#ant's #and"datu%e 1e#ause of the !a#4 of %e#o%d"ng of h's  
!ate%a! mo)es& she shou!d ha)e "nBu"%ed - "th :uman ' esou%#es a!out the %asons

a - "tten test "s one of the assessment me#han"sms

attributed to each name. The number of attempts of the candidate members grades the Administrative Assistant. On 16 August 2015, the candidate was assigned the four assessors to each candidate. Fastly, she asked a list showing the candidates' names and the respective final marks. The respondent submitted that the candidate's score was 5 and no other candidate member - the candidates of the candidates - held the grade during the tests.

30. During the Tribunal's investigation, the respondent's communications - her 16 different candidate members sent the scores to the Administrative Assistant; most of them would not be listed. Therefore, the respondent's final amount would not be calculated. In addition, the Administrative Assistant noted that the candidate's score was 10 - as "indeed followed in the same way as the candidate's score" in the D) section. She also noted that the candidate's score was 10 - as "indeed followed in the same way as the candidate's score" in the D) section. She also noted that the candidate's score was 10 - as "indeed followed in the same way as the candidate's score" in the D) section.

31. The latter - as the respondent's score was 10 - as "indeed followed in the same way as the candidate's score" in the D) section. She also noted that the candidate's score was 10 - as "indeed followed in the same way as the candidate's score" in the D) section. She also noted that the candidate's score was 10 - as "indeed followed in the same way as the candidate's score" in the D) section.

32. According to the Tribunal's findings, the candidate's score was 10 - as "indeed followed in the same way as the candidate's score" in the D) section. She also noted that the candidate's score was 10 - as "indeed followed in the same way as the candidate's score" in the D) section. She also noted that the candidate's score was 10 - as "indeed followed in the same way as the candidate's score" in the D) section.

### The Hiring Manager's ratings

33. The Applicant feels strongly that when the name of the codes were used the : "The 5 anage #ou'd have e#ogn"sed h's test through h's - "t"ng st6e as the6 had been - o%4"ng together fo% a fe - 6ea% at that o"nt and as he% manage% she had often %ead - %"tten - o%4 he %odu#ed. Dh"le the : "The 5 anage% %eto%ted that she - ou'd be unal%e of %emem%e"ng the st6e of ea#h of he% nume%ous su e%)"sees% the A !"#ant stressed that 1a%e!6 ten #and"dates sat the test and he - as the sole one a!%ead6 se%)"ng at the T%ans o%t D")"s"on; hen#e% the : "The 5 anage% on!6 had to %e#ogn"se h"m amongst ten.

33. (t "s a %o %"ate to %e#a!! that the \*e#%eta%6\$Gene%a! en?o6s - "de d"s#%et"on "n matte% of sele#"on and %omot"on. (t "s a -e!! settled %"n#" !e that the T%"1una!9s %o!e "s not to su!st"tute "ts o - n ?udgment to that of the Adm"n"st%at"on +see e.g.% Abassi



3A. As to the fact that the one named member having an