

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for ensuring transparency and accountability in financial operations. This section also highlights the role of internal controls in preventing errors and fraud, and the need for regular audits to verify the accuracy of the data.

2. The second part of the document focuses on the implementation of a robust risk management framework. It outlines the various risks that can impact an organization, such as market volatility, credit default, and operational inefficiencies. The document provides a detailed analysis of these risks and offers practical strategies to identify, assess, and mitigate them. It stresses the importance of a proactive approach to risk management, where potential threats are identified and addressed before they become significant problems.

3. The third part of the document addresses the challenges of managing a large and diverse portfolio of assets. It discusses the need for effective asset allocation and the importance of diversification in reducing risk. The document also explores the role of technology in asset management, particularly in the use of data analytics and artificial intelligence to optimize investment decisions. It provides a comprehensive overview of the various factors that influence asset performance and offers insights into how to maximize returns while minimizing risk.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining strong relationships with key stakeholders, including investors, regulators, and the public. It emphasizes the need for clear communication and transparency in all interactions. The document provides a detailed analysis of the various channels through which organizations can engage with their stakeholders and offers practical advice on how to build trust and credibility. It also discusses the role of corporate social responsibility in enhancing an organization's reputation and long-term success.

5. The fifth part of the document addresses the challenges of managing a large and diverse portfolio of assets. It discusses the need for effective asset allocation and the importance of diversification in reducing risk. The document also explores the role of technology in asset management, particularly in the use of data analytics and artificial intelligence to optimize investment decisions. It provides a comprehensive overview of the various factors that influence asset performance and offers insights into how to maximize returns while minimizing risk.

6. The sixth part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining strong relationships with key stakeholders, including investors, regulators, and the public. It emphasizes the need for clear communication and transparency in all interactions. The document provides a detailed analysis of the various channels through which organizations can engage with their stakeholders and offers practical advice on how to build trust and credibility. It also discusses the role of corporate social responsibility in enhancing an organization's reputation and long-term success.

JUDGE KANWALDEEP SANDHU, PRESIDING.

1. The Applicant had disputed his non-selection for the P-4 position of Senior Protection Officer for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (“UNHCR”) in Rabat, Morocco (the “Position”). On 28 June 2019, the United Nations Appeals Tribunal (Appeals Tribunal) issued Judgment No. 2019-UNAT-944 (the “UNAT Judgment”) dismissing the appeal and confirming the United Nations Dispute Tribunal’s determination that the Applicant had received full and fair consideration for the Position.

2. The Applic

13. On 23 January 2020, the Applicant filed this application for revision.

Submissions

Applicant's Application for Revision

14. The Applicant reiterates that, contrary to the Appeals Tribunal's finding that "the

18. The Applicant seeks leave to submit additional pleadings “closely” related to the new facts and to refer the matter to the Secretary-General for accountability enforcement, an award of costs against the Respondent fo90.0019 e

of a final judgment rendered by the Appeals Tribunal can only succeed if it fulfills the strict and

13 May 2019 Answer to the Appeal submitted to the Appeals Tribunal, the Respondent argued "... The IGO reviewed the allegations and did not find that the Hiring Manager's actions amounted to harassment, abuse of authority or any other form of prohibited conduct. Consequently, the IGO informed the Appellant that his complaint would be more suited for a management evaluation request." This was before the Appeals Tribunal. In addition, the Applicant stated in his appeal filed on 13 March 2019 before the Appeal Tribunal that: "[the IGO] never opened an investigation and never determined whether or not the conduct of [the Hiring Manager] amounted to misconduct".

28. Also, he argued before Appeals Tribunal (as summarized in the UNAT Judgment) as follows:

The UNDT erred in fact in finding that an investigation had taken place into [the Hiring Manager's] misconduct. The Office of the Inspector General (IGO) never opened an investigation because it considered that management evaluation was the appropriate avenue. It therefore never determined whether or not [the Hiring Manager's] conduct amounted to misconduct. The decision by the IGO was

30. In applying the test required for revision, we do not accept that the Applicant first became aware of this fact in January 2020 and as such this cannot be a “newly discovered fact” as required by Article 11 of our Statute to warrant a revision of the UNAT Judgment.

31. Not only is the fact that the IGO did not conduct a formal investigation not a newly discovered fact, but

35. In order to succeed in a request for revision, the “strict and exceptional criteria” established by Article 11 of our Statute must be met to review a final judgment rendered by the Appeals Tribunal. That has not been done here. The application for revision is refused.

II. Relief and Remedies sought by the Applicant

36. As we refuse the application for revision, the relief and remedies sought by the Applicant are also refused.

37. In particular, we refuse the Applicant’s request for leave to submit additional pleadings in order to respond to the Secretary-General’s comments to his application for revision for the following reasons.

38. Article 10(1) of the Rules provides that “(i)n exceptional circumstances and where the Appeals Tribunal determines that the facts are likely to be established with such additional documentary evidence, it may receive the additional evidence from a party”.

39. In his motion for additional pleading, the Applicant seeks to address paragraph 10 of the Secretary-General’s comments which he says is false. However, as we determined above, the Applicant possessed this information in the various communications before the Dispute Tribunal and the Appeals Tribunal. He had the opportunity to respond to these statements, including the “ambiguous” e-mail from the IGO, which he did. He made submissions on this point. The Applicant was aware the IGO did not conduct a formal investigation which fact he is dissatisfied with. He should have anticipated the Respondent’s comments on his application for revision. These are not exceptional circumstances and the motion for additional pleadings is refused.

is by no means an abuse of process". There is no jurisdiction to reconsider these determinations.

