
UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Case No.: UNDT/NBI/2015/132

Judgment No.: UNDT/2016/140

Date: 23 September 2016

Original: English

Before: Judge

Introduction

1. The Applicant is a former staff member of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO). He served at the GS-4 level.
2. On 11 November 2015, he filed an Application contesting the decision not to renew his fixed-term appointment and to separate him from service on

8. Following the Secretary-General's budget proposal to the General Assembly, MONUSCO issued Information Circulars to its entire staff on 6 and 9 March 2015, 14 April 2015, and 20 April 2015, with regard to the proposed budget, the establishment of a Comparative Review Panel (CRP), and the review criteria.

9. Under the proposed new structure for the Mission, which was approved by the General Assembly, the military force ins

Case No.

themselves does not alter the Organization's obligations under paragraph 3.7 of ST/AI/2013/4.

e. Moreover, the decision to essentially convert the Applicant's fixed-

The purported abolition of the Applicant's post was in fact a conversion of his fixed-term contract into an IC contract.

i. The functions of the fixed-term appointment that the Applicant had been encumbering are identical to those of the IC contract that he was offered by UNOPS.

j. By hiring the Applicant on an IC contract following the purported abolition of his post, the Organization enjoys the benefit of obtaining exactly the same services from him that he had previously provided to the Organization under his fixed-term appointment. This state of affairs contravenes the provisions of section 3.7(b) of ST/AI/2013/4 (Consultants and individual contractors).

Unequal treatment of similarly situated staff members

k. Another LA whose post had been abolished was placed against a vacant post in another section and this constitutes unjustifiable and unequal treatment among similarly situated staff members.

Remedies sought

l. Due to his wrongful separation ual coTBJTJETI2wrc11(his)-212(wr)5(on)-9(g)10(ful

improper purposes. The Applicant bears the burden of proving that the discretion not to renew his or her appointment was not validly exercised.

A comparative review was not required and the outsourcing of the LA functions was proper in the circumstances.

h. There was no requirement for the Mission to subject the Applicant and others similarly placed to a comparative review process. The Department of Field Support Downsizing Guidelines provide that locally recruited staff must be comparatively reviewed by duty station. Since all LA posts in the Bukavu and Kinshasa duty stations were abolished, a comparative review was unnecessary.

i. Due to the need for LAs to be more mobile and to effectively interact and liaise with the local population by providing linguistic support during their engagement, it was agreed to engage LAs through individual contractor agreements to be administered by UNOPS.

j. As a result, it was no longer viable to use national General Service posts to provide for LA positions to a force that is highly mobile, that deploys at short notice, and sometimes requires a surge in its numbers for a limited duration. Additionally, there is no suitable allowance for the travel of national staff.

k. MONUSCO decided to outsource the provision of LA functions in response to the recommendation of the Civilian Staffing Review (CSR) report.

l. MONUSCO already outsources a number of services and considers that the outsourcing of language services satisfies the military force's current requirements. Information Circular ST/IC/2005/30 (Outsourcing and impact on staff) issued on 15 June 2005, sets out guidance for programme managers when considering outsourcing.

m. In accordance with that guidance, MONUSCO informed staff representatives that language services would be outsourced and the staff

representatives had an opportunity to respond by engaging in discussions with the National Staff Union representatives under the UNOPS contractual modality.

The Respondent did not violate any provisions of ST/AI/2013/4.

n. The Applicant's claim that the Organization violated section 3.7(b) of ST/AI/2013/4 is inapposite. Section 1.1 of that Administrative Instruction sets out the scope and procedure under which the United Nations Secretariat may directly engage individual consultants and individual contractors for temporary assistance in order to respond quickly, flexibly and effectively to organizational priorities.

o. MONUSCO did not engage LAs under the framework of ST/AI/2013/4. Rather, the Mission decided to engage individual contractors under agreements administered by UNOPS which are governed by the UNOPS Financial Regulations and Rules.

p. Insofar as the Applicant claims that the award of individual contracts by UNOPS violated any rules, such a violation would not render the non-renewal of the Applicant's appointment unlawful. The Applicant was not entitled to be engaged under an individual contract with UNOPS.

q. If indeed the engagement of the Applicant under a UNOPS agreement contravened UNOPS contracting rules as the Applicant claims, the remedy is not monetary compensation for the Applicant, but rather the voiding of the said contract.

Considerations

18. The Tribunal will now consider whether the challenge against the non-renewal decision is receivable and whether there is any merit in the Applicant's other claims.

19. With regard to the issue of the receivability, the Tribunal agrees with the Respondent's submission of law that the Applicant cannot challenge the abolition

of his post by a decision of the General Assembly which by itself is akin to a country's constitution, the higher norm, and the supreme organ of the Organization.

20. By the same token, a decision of the General Assembly is binding on the Secretary-General who has a duty to implement it. The Applicant lacks the capacity to challenge the non-renewal of his appointment in so far as it is properly implemented in consequence of the General Assembly's decision to abolish it.

21. In *Ovcharenko et al*³, it was held that an administrative decision taken as a result of the decisions of the General Assembly is lawful and that the Secretary-General cannot be held accountable for executing such a decision.

22. With regard to the question whether the provisions of section 3.7(b) of ST/AI/2013/4 were contravened by the hiring of the Applicant under an IC contract by UNOPS after the abolition of his post to provide language services to the Mission, the Tribunal finds and holds that the said rules were not contravened.

23. This is because section 3.7(b) does not envisage a situation of post abolishment. The said section contemplates a situation where the post formerly encumbered by a former or retired staff member continues to exist and the separated staff member is reengaged as a consultant or IC to continue to perform the same functions.

24. The mischief that that section seeks to avoid is the continued indirect encumbrance of a post under the guise of a consultancy or individual contract by a staff member who by reason of retirement or other form of separation has left the Organization.

25. In the case of this Applicant, the post he previously encumbered as an LA had ceased to exist at the time UNOPS offered him the new contract as an IC at the Mission following the abolition of his post. Even if the Mission, by itself, had reengaged the Applicant as an IC, the Respondent cannot be said to have breached the provisions of section 3.7(b) of ST/AI/2013/4.

³ 2015-UNAT 530.

Case No. UNDT/NBI/2015/132

Judgment No. UNDT/2016/140

(Signed)

Judge Nkemdilim Izuako

Dated this 23rd day BT1 0 0 1 496.18 734.62 Tu22 Tm 0 T