the Executive Director, UNOPA, by which she was notified that OAIS decisions were outside the scope of review by UNOPA management..

6.   The Applicant filed her application with the Tribunal on 1 January 2015, and the Respondent submitted his reply on 17 February 2015.

7.   By Order No. 128 (GVA/2015) of 17 June 2015, the Tribunal requested the Respondent to file additional documentation with regard to the complaints filed to OAIS by the Applicant, which he did on 25 June 2015.

7.   By Order No. 188 (GVA/2015) of 29 June 2015, the Tribunal informed the parties that the case would be decided on the papers, without further hearings or submissions.

Parties' submissions

8.   The Applicant's principal contentions are:

    a.   The refusal of OAIS to launch the requested investigation is unfounded, as her complaint was duly documented and the improper behaviour of Mrs. A. is evident based on all the proof she already submitted on many occasions;

    b.   Her case is not being treated seriously by UNOPA, and her managers treated her badly as well instead of showing her support and integrating her into the PSB team; and

    c.   She seeks compensation for the damage suffered, and a recognition that she had been subject to harassment and abuse of authority when working at UNOPA.

10.   The Respondent's principal contentions are:

    a.   The contested decision of OAIS was taken in compliance with UNOPA 2014 Charter of OAIS, according to which OAIS has to operate independently and has discretionary authority with respect to the matters it investigates;

2.   T$e ($a&llenged adm'n'st!at'0e de('s'on 's fu!t$e!mo!e &a 3 fu& as 't 3 as taEen 'n (om%&'an(e 3 't$ t$e !eAu'!ements %!o0'ded fo! 'n t$e 2018 UN , PA Po&'(" on 4 a!assment# /e<ua& 4 a!assment and A2use of aut$o!'t"�territory 'ndeed# OA=/ dete!m'ned t$at t$e 'n('dents des(!'2ed 2" t$e A%%&'(ant 'n $e! (om%&a'nt !e&ated to -'nte!%e!sona& !e&at'ons$'%s amongst (o&&eagues 'n0o&0'ng (!'t'('sm and d'sag!eements.# $en(e t$e" d'd not fa&& 'nto t$e

Timelinessp

15.

20.   Based on the above, the Tribunal concludes that the Applicant's complaint against Ms. A. was not received by OA=/# and that OA=/ refusal to conduct an investigation into this complaint did not result in a breach of any of the