V - 1

: Jua_b

: ry: Nairobi

.e ← rar: Abena Kwakye-Berko

KRA

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

JUDGMENT

Coun for the Applicant:

Self-E esented

Coun forthe Respondent: Nicola ynn, AAS/ALD/OHR Rosan a Adamo, AAS/ALD/OHR

Judgment No.: UNDT/2019/133

Introduction

1. The Applicant is a former staff member of the United Nations - African Hybrid

Operation in Darfur (UNAMID), where he served as a Child Protection Officer, at the

P-3 level.¹

2. On 26 June 2018, he filed an application contesting the decision to terminate

his fixed-term appointment (FTA) following the abolition of the post which he held.

He seeks compensation for the loss suffered; in the alternative, he prays to the Tribunal

to find that the procedure followed to terminate his appointment was defective and thus

order for his reinstatement at an equivalent post within UNAMID.²

3. The Respondent filed a reply on 2 August 2018 in which it is argued that the

claim is not receivable *ratione materiae* in part. If found receivable, then the contested

decision was lawful.

Facts

4. The facts laid out below are uncontested and supported by the parties' pleadings

and submitted documents.

5. Since 15 May 2016, the Applicant served as a Child Protection Officer with

UNAMID at the P-3 level.³

6. On 18 May 2017, the United Nations Secretary-General and the Chairperson of

the African Union Commission submitted their joint report on the strategic review of

UNAMID to the United Nations Security Council.⁴ The report took note of the

improved security situation in Darfur, recommended a drawdown of the mission and

called for a comprehensive civilian staffing review (CSR) with a view to implementing

Page 2 of 8

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2018/067

Judgment No.: UNDT/2019/133

personnel.

Judgment No.: UNDT/2019/133

11. On 24 December 2017, the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on staff

changes and the reductions at UNAMID. 13

12. On 28 March 2018, the Applicant received a response to his management

evaluation request upholding the decision to terminate his fixed-term appointment.¹⁴

On 2 April 2018, the Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO), UNAMID notified the

Applicant that his appointment would end on 8 April 2018.¹⁵

Submissions

Applicant's submissions

13. The Applicant maintains that the termination of his appointment was vitiated

by bias, which extended against the whole Child Protection Section. Moreover, the

CSR recommendation to reduce the mandate of the Child Protection Section was in

violation of the relevant Resolutions of the United Nations Security Council on

children and armed conflicts and, in particular,

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2018/067

Judgment No.: UNDT/2019/133

find that the procedure followed to terminate his appointment was defective and thus order for his reinstatement at an equivalent post within UNAMID.

Respondent's submissions

Receivability

16. To the e

Judgment No.: UNDT/2019/133

20. The Applicant's claim that the 4 December 2017 formal notice does not meet the required time frame of 30 calendar days is without merit. The Applicant was separated effective 9 April 2018, four months after UNAMID had given him official notice of the issue.

21. The Organization had no obligation to laterally re-assign the Applicant. The comparative review considered the type of appointment that each staff member held, giving priority for retention to those holding a continuing or permanent appointment in accordance with staff rule 9.6(e). The USG/DFS has the discretion to place staff members outside the normal recruitment process, but is not required to do so. 18 The USD/DFS may reassign staff affected by downsizing "with priority to those holding a permanent or continuing appointment, to suitable positions in the existing missions outside of the regular recruitment exercise." In this case, given the number of staffing reductions, it was not possible to retain the Applicant, who held a fixed-term appointment.

Considerations

22. Regarding the question of receivability, the Tribunal agrees that the CSR Report and its Final Recommendations including recommendation on reducing staff in the Child Protection Section, no matter how possibly controversial as a policy decision, did not produce direct effect on the Applicant's terms and conditions of service. The application, however, although the CSR Report is in the centre of the argument, is

rg 0.9981 036(a)3(t)-226,duce direct effect rg 0.9981 036(a)3(t)-226,du31(duc)8d no16df 0.0 0ne

Judgment No.: UNDT/2019/133

In the process, the Applicant's post was so selected, which entailed the decision on

termination of his appointment. The Tribunal's cognizance extends over reviewing the

appropriateness of the steps which led to this decision, however, in so far only as they

are attributed to the Secretary-General.

24. In line with the aforesaid, the question boils down to whether the comparative

review was carried out in accordance with the applicable law and in a rational and fair

manner. In this regard, it is apparent that the review had been undertaken in anticipation

of the General Assembly's endorsement of the CSR Report and its recommendations,

which however does not render its results unlawful. Prima facie, the Tribunal finds no

reason to question the composition of the panel, the criteria used and the points

assigned, which appear to have properly favoured seniority and performance

evaluation. In this regard, it is noteworthy that the Tribunal twice called upon the

Applicant to provide his submissions regarding the matter of comparative review,

however, to no avail. The Tribunal accepts thus that the Applicant had scored the

lowest in his category and, accordingly, selecting him for reduction was meritorious.

25. The Tribunal further agrees with the argument presented by the Respondent

that the Organization was not under the obligation to re-assign the Applicant through

a lateral move. The Tribunal finds, moreover, that the notice of the final date of

separation given to the Applicant was appropriate under the circumstances.

Conclusion

26. The application is dismissed.

(Signed)

Judge Agnieszka Klonowiecka-Milart

Dated this 31st day of July 2019

Entered in the Register on this 31st day of July 2019

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2018/067

Judgment No.: UNDT/2019/133

(Signed) Abena Kwakye-Berko