



! "# \$ %

applicant was "summed to see" the OSt' UN*P. The applicant's applicant was summed to see on 25 June 200A.

5. The applicant's 26 June 200A (the applicant) was granted another two weeks of additional applicant. The "letter" of applicant stated that the applicant does not have an intention of "benefit" or of "concession" to another of the applicant in the "event" of the United Nations. and that it was "summed to see" the OSt' UN*P.

6. The "letter" dated 1A A" 200B (the "German Cede" : "st" for the "National" (Natural Consequences and Nu)" and 9afet2 e+ "essed to the applicant's)on)ens about the fulfillment of tasks of the C : 9 9e)eta&sat (and some staffing and administrative matters. It requested the applicant's urgent attention and)o&e)t%e measures OSt' regard to the issues indicated.

A. The "letter" dated 2 June 200B (the "German Cede" : "st" for the

the (t) 26* n&onment(Nat&e Co(o t)6()-250(C)-3. 0 078A. C6 2.168(2)20()-TJD-396. 8 4 0n\$# ' U5&(25

6.

11. 82 memorandum dated 1 April 2009 (the "2009 Memorandum") of the Panel of Arbitrators of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS) on 8 October 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009.

12. 82 memorandum dated 15 June 2009 to the Chairman of the Commission of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS) on 8 October 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009.

13. On 5 June 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009.

17. 82 "ette" dated 15 June 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009.

15. 82 "ette" dated 15 June 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009.

16. On 15 June 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009.

1A. On 25 June 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009.

1B. 82 "ette" dated 25 August 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009 (the "2009 ITLOS Decision") of 15 June 2009.

19. On 25 November 2009 (the "1st") ant filed an appeal before the Tribunal.
On 9 December 2009 (the "2nd") the Tribunal requested the respondent to submit 's and '2 to
the "1st") at \$on. On 6 January 2010 (the "3rd") counsel for the respondent submitted 's
& "2. On 12 February 2010 (the "4th") ant submitted 's observations. On
29 April 2010 (the "5th") observations 'easing too6 ("a)e.

20. During the 'easing (the "6th") issued 0e&e d(s)usedD ,1/ the "7th")
!&om\$se of &ene0a"E ,2/ the "8th") t\$on #et0een t'e !&e%\$ous t&ansfe& de)(G4766(&)3.00781()-20(d)

a. The decision to transfer the applicant from Bonn to Naos and the decision not to renew the applicant's assignment to the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) from the German Government (the Government) is not a measure taken in good faith. The applicant's assignment to transfer to the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) is an administrative measure taken by the Government as a result of the need to move to Naos. It is an administrative measure taken by the Government on the basis of the need to move to Naos.

#. The decision (i.e. the proposed transfer and subsequent non-renewal) is not taken in good faith. The applicant's assignment to transfer to the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) is an administrative measure taken by the Government as a result of the need to move to Naos. It is an administrative measure taken by the Government on the basis of the need to move to Naos.

). The cost of the applicant's assignment to the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) is not a measure taken in good faith. The applicant's assignment to transfer to the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) is an administrative measure taken by the Government as a result of the need to move to Naos. It is an administrative measure taken by the Government on the basis of the need to move to Naos.

e. The *+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to& fas"ed to)onsu"t ' \$m &ega&d\$ng t'e t&ansfe&. t Oas a un\$"ate&a" de)\$s\$on O\$t'out mean\$ngfu")onsu"tat\$on. T'e *+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to& d\$d not ta&e \$nto a))ount t'e a!"\$)ant@s)on)e&ns(O'\$)' \$n)"uded t'e edu)at\$on of '\$s ado!ted Gen2an1#o&n)'\$d and t'e d\$ff\$)u"t\$es 'e 'ad O\$t' t'e Gen2an aut'ok&\$t\$es \$n &e"at\$on to a !&o!e&t2 \$n Na&o#E

f. A fo&me& 4ono&a&2 Am#assado& O'o)o"#"a#o&ated O\$t' C : 9 \$nfo&med t'e a!"\$)ant t'at a fo&me&)o"#"eague of t'e Ge&man Cede&a" Go%e&nment 'ad &e%ea"ed to ' \$m t'at du&\$ng a meet\$ng \$n No%em#e& 200B(a 4ead of De!a&tment sa&d t'at t'e a!"\$)ant Oou"d &etu&n to Na&o#\$ to ta&e anot'e& !ost. T'\$s 4ead of De!a&tment 'ad 'e"d a meet\$ng O\$t' t'e *+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to& \$n Na&o#\$ on 22 August 200B. 4en)e(t'e a!"\$)ant dedu)ed t'at t'e *+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to& 'ad \$nfo&med t'e Ge&man Cede&a" Go%e&nment t'at 'e Oou"d #e t&ansfe&&ed to Na&o#\$ at "east t' &ee mont's #efo&e 'e Oas f&\$st \$nfo&med of t'e !otent\$a" &eass\$gnmentE

g. 4\$s &efusa" to #e t&ansfe&&ed to Na&o#\$ d\$d not entas" t'at t'e *+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to& Oas no "ong& &e5u&&ed to)onside& fa&\$"2 t'e &ene0a" of '\$s a!o\$ntment. 4e 'ad a &easona#"e e+!e)at\$on of &ene0a" of '\$s)ont&a)t #e)ause '\$s !os\$t\$on Oas not a#o"\$s'ed and t'e&e Oas no &e)o&d&ed "a!se \$n '\$s !e&fo&man)e. Cu&t'e&mo&e(at t'e t\$me of '\$s a!"\$)at\$on(UN*P 'ad not a!o\$nted a &e!"a)ement fo& t'e !os\$t\$on of *+e)ut\$%e 9e)&eta&2 and t'e dut\$es Oe&e !e&fo&med #2 an \$nte&\$m a!o\$ntee a)t\$ng as <ff\$)e&1\$niC'a&ge. T'e fas"u&e to a!o\$nt a su))esso& to '\$s fo&me& !ost \$s e%\$den)e t'at t'e&e Oas no "eg\$t\$mate &eason fo& not &ene0\$ng '\$s a!o\$ntment as *+e)ut\$%e 9e)&eta&2E

'. 4e 'ad an e+!e)tan)2 of &ene0a" #ased on t'e m\$notes of t'e meet\$ng 'e"d on 15 A!&\$" 2007 #etOeen '\$mse"f and t'e t'en *+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to&. T'ese m\$notes demonst&ate t'at O'e&eas t'e \$n\$t\$a" !e&\$od as A)t\$ng *+e)ut\$%e 9e)&eta&2 Oou"d ena#"e '\$m to !&o%e '\$s -a#"\$t2. to 'and'e t'e !os\$t\$on('e Oou"d t'en #e a#"e to -)u"m\$rate '\$s)a&ee& \$n C : 9.. Cu&t'e&mo&e(t'e t'en De!ut2 *+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to&)onf&\$&med t'at t'\$s Oas t'e unde&stand\$ng \$n an ema\$" dated 1A August 2009. t Oas a

t'at t'e a!!")ant #e t&ansfe&&ed o& t'at 's f\$+edite&m a!!o\$ntment not #e
&ene0ed(and e%en \$f \$t d\$d(t'e&e \$s not'sng to suggest t'e *+e)ut\$%e
D&e)to& 0ou"d 'a%e a)ted on \$tE

g. T'e *+e)ut\$%e D&e)to& ga%e su\$ta#"e and fa&&)ons\$de&at\$on to t'e
a!!")ant fo& &ene0a" of 's\$)ont&a)t 0\$t' UN*P. 4e offe&&ed '\$m anot'e&
!os\$t\$on at t'e same "e%e"(0 '\$)' 0ou"d 'a%e a""o0ed '\$m to !u&sue '\$s
)a&ee& 0\$t' UN*P #e2ond t'e e+!\$&2 date of 's
f\$+edite&m a!!o\$ntmentE

'. Cont&a&2 to 0 'at \$s a""eged #2 t'e a!!")ant(t'e !os\$t\$on of 9!e)\$a"
Ad%\$so& 0as)&eated due to o&gan\$Fat\$ona" needs &e"ated to
t'e u!)om\$ng nte&nat\$ona" Hea& of 8\$dod\$%e&2.16797(t)-2.16797(\$)-2.16"797('\$)-2.()-10(0a

allocations. The applicant alleged that the #2 signing of the allocation letters in 2005 and 200A. The letter had been #een #om#ses of #ene0a" in 2007 or 2005(the #ou"d not 'ave 'ad an #m!a)t on 21 August 200A 0 'en t'e a!!"\$)ant signed 's "ast f\$+edl#m a! !o\$ntment.

35. The respondent #e stated t'at t'e de)\$\$on of nonl#ene0a" 0as #ased on

