

6. On 20 April and 6 May 2009, the first reporting officer met with the Applicant to discuss her work plan; this was follow

15. On 2 July 2010, the Applicant submitted a request for management evaluation of the decision of the DESA Executive Office not to prepare a new job description for Post No. UNA-009-03050-EP3-0010/IMIS 7408, which she held.

16. On 6 July 2010, the Applicant submitted a request for management evaluation of the failure of the DESA Executive Office to pursue the e-PAS rebuttal process for the 2008-2009 cycle, and of the Executive Office and the Statistics Division to prepare her performance appraisal for the 2009-2010 cycle in accordance with established procedures.

17. On 26 Jul JayK,yvI OLM,L-FyK,yvIeOLçvMyI OLKFéç,yKIpOLçFMYt

b. Contrary to the Applicant's assertions concerning the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 cycles, the documents on record show that her work plans were developed. The Applicant's first and second reporting officers observed all the requirements of administrative instruction ST/AI/2002/3 on the Performance Appraisal System when preparing her work plans, and it was she who prevented them from being finalized;

c. As to the question of whether the rebuttal process for the 2008-2009 cycle was pursued, that process was completed, contrary to the Applicant's assertions, and the rebuttal panel's report was sent to the Applicant. The rebuttal process was delayed for several reasons, including the Applicant's failure to sign her e-PAS and her submission of additional materials;

d. With regard to her performance appraisal for the 2009-2010 cycle, the application is not receivable because the Applicant failed to file her rebuttal statement concerning this appraisal within the time limits in accordance with section 15 of ST/AI/2002/3, and she has not proved that she was prevented from doing so. The Applicant's performance was evaluated without using the e-PAS owing to her uncooperative behaviour and the first and second reporting officers signed her appraisal on 20 April 2010 using a paper form, which is not prohibited since it was the only way to appraise the Applicant's performance;

e. With regard to her e-PAS for the 2010-2011 cycle, the application is not receivable because the Applicant is contesting only the preliminary steps in the appraisal process and not the final outcome thereof;

f. With regard to the job description, the Applicant's claims have no basis in fact because, contrary to her assertions, she received the contested job description on 26 July 2010 and simply refused to sign it despite repeated requests from the Statistics Division.

Consideration

28.

e-PAS for the 2007-2008 cycle. Therefore, her application is not receivable with regard to that cycle in any event.

33. The Applicant then requests annulment of the rating that she was given for the 2008-2009 cycle. To that end, she maintains that the rebuttal process that she initiated was not completed. However, the Respondent has shown with documents placed on record that the rebuttal panel's report was sent to the Applicant on 29 April 2011. While the Applicant also maintains that the appraisal process was delayed, it is clear from the documents on record t

37. It follows from the foregoing that all of the Applicant's claims must be rejected.

Conclusion

38. In view of the foregoing, the Tribunal DECIDES:

The application is rejected.

()

Judge Jean-François Cousin

Dated this 30th day of April 2012

Entered in the Register on this 30th day of April 2012

()

René M. Vargas M., Registrar, Geneva