UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE TRIBUNAL

Case No.:	UNDT/GVA/2015/1 0
!"#g$e%& No.:	UNDT/201'/00(
Da&e:	)e*+"a+, 201'
O+-g-%a.:	E%g.-s/

1.   The Applicant contests the decision not to extend her temporary reassignment to the position of Legal Officer, Office of the Director, United Nations Logistics Base/United Nations Global Service Centre (UNLB/UNGSC).

2.   The requests as remedy that the impugned decision be set aside.

5.   The Applicant initially served as a Procurement Officer (P-3) with the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) on a fixed-term appointment.

:.   Effective 2 July 201:, she was temporarily reassigned to UNLB/UNGSC as Legal Officer, Office of the Director. This position (the post) had become vacant following the temporary reassignment of its incumbent (the incumbent) to New York.

5.   In March 2015, the incumbent's temporary reassignment to New York was extended until 50 June 2015, and so was the Applicant's temporary reassignment with UNLB/UNGSC. Subsequently, the incumbent's temporary reassignment to New York was further extended until the end of 2015.

6.   By email of 11 June 2015, the Director, UNLB/UNGSC, informed the Applicant that he did not intend to extend her temporary reassignment beyond 50 June 2015. In the same email, he offered a furth

d.   In t!is %onne%t$on÷ a num-e' of $n%ons$sten%$es su""o't a prima facie %ase of un#a7fu#ness÷ as a 'esu#t of 7!i%! t!e -u'den to s!o7 t!at t!e de%$s$on 7as not -ased on nefa'$ous o' %a"'$%$ous 'easons s!$fts to t!e Aes"ondent. To 7$tF

    $.   T!e $n%um-ent>s tem"o'a'('eass$gnment to Ne7 <o'= !ad -een e&tended unt$# 51 De%em-e' 2015G

    $$.   *n#(one)ega# *ff$%e' "ost e&$sts 7$t!$n t!e)ega# *ff$%e÷ UNG.C÷ and t!$s "ost>s 'es"ons$-$#$t$es %annot s$m"#(-e t'ansfe''ed to anot!e' un$tG

    $$$.   T!e'e a""ea's to -e no $ssue as to t!e fund$ng of t!e)ega# *ff$%e' "ostG

    $/.   As t!e A""#$%ant #ea'nt f'om t!e 8;U 'es"onse÷ $t 7as on#(at t!e management e/a#uat$on stage t!at t!e Adm$n$st'at$on ad/an%ed "oo' "e'fo'man%e as an e&"#anat$on fo' t!e %ontested de%$s$onG and

    /.   As 8;U 'a$sed÷ t!e 'eass$gnment to Umoᴃa of t!e "ost $s $n and of $tse#f un#a7fu#G

e.   T!e .tanda'd *"e'at$ng P'o%edu'e on .taff$ng Ta-#e and Post 8anagement of UN Pea%e *"e'at$ons 01.*P23 $s not a""#$%a-#e to UN),. A#-e$t -e$ng an essent$a# %om"onent of t!e De"a'tment of E$e#d .u""o't 01DE.23÷ UN), $s not a "ea%e=ee"$ng msson -ut 'at!e' a su""o't st'u%tu'e used -(t!e De"a'tment of Pea%e=ee"$ng *"e'at$ons 01DPJ*23. H!$#st "a't of DPJ*÷ $t 'eta$ns $ts o7n -udget and staff$ng st'u%tu'e÷ as 7e## as $ts o7n un$4ue fun%t$ons and 'es"ons$-$#$t$es÷ 7!i%! s!ou#d not -e %onf#ated 7$t! a%tua# "ea%e=ee"$ng o"e'at$onsG

f.   No s"e%f% 'u#es e&$st "e'm$tt$ng t!e 'eass$gnment o' 'e"u'"os$ng of a "ost to an un'e#ated fun%t$on. An $nst'u%t$on -(t!e Cont'o##e' s!ou#d not -e %onfused $n an(7a(7$t! an Adm$n$st'at$/e 9nst'u%t$on o' ot!e' no'mat$/e $nst'ument. .u%! an $nst'u%t$on does not e/en featu'e $n t!e #ega# !$e'a'%!(of t!e *'ganIaton>s no'ms. P'a%t$%e and -e!a/$ou' s!ou#d not 'e"#a%e

of the current financial period and the post should return to its original office in then;

e. The contested decision was justified by the operational circumstances within UNOG. The post at stake was used after deciding to have an UNOBA State Coordinator to support the UNOBA department. Without this measure, UNOG/UNOCA's readiness to meet the UNOBA 1 November 2015 deployment deadline would have been compromised, potentially jeopardising the entire Cluster 2 deployment. In his memorandum dated 2 June 2015, the Secretary-General directed all Heads of Mission to dedicate appropriate level of resources to UNOBA deployment readiness. This direction was reiterated by the Assistant Secretary-General for Field Support by email of 8 June 2015. The UNOBA State Coordinator temporary post was filled as of 1 September 2015;

f. The Applicant wrongly argues that the burden is on the Administration to prove that the refusal to extend her temporary assignment was motivated by an improper reason. Instead, the burden rests with the Applicant to adduce evidence that the decision was improperly motivated or otherwise capricious. She has failed to proffer any such evidence; and

g. The Applicant has already been paid compensation in the amount of U.SD5,000 as 8;U concluded that UNOG/UNOCA had not adequately substantiated that the Applicant had been afforded proper due process.

18.   The Tribunal will first address the grounds for challenge pertaining to formal aspects of the impugned decision, i.e., matters of authority and the nature of the Applicant's administrative line to the litigious post. It will later turn to substantive aspects, notably those concerning the reasons behind the impugned decision, that is, the failure to share with the Applicant the reasons for the end of her reassignment and the propriety of the motives thereto.

The Applicant's administrative link to the Legal Officer's post

1 .   Pu'suant to staff 'egu#at$on 1.20%3F

.taff mem-e's a'e su-ße%t to t!e aut!o'$t(of t!e .e%'eta'(6Gene'a#
and to ass$gnment -(!$m o' !e' to an(of t!e a%t$/

25.   T!e A""#$%ant₊ t!us₊ !ad no ent$t#ement o' #ega# e&

2.   H !$#st t!e t$t#e of t!e . *P e&"#$%$t#(a##udes to 1UN Pea%e * "e'at$ons2₊ no def$n$t$on of t!$s te'm $s "'o/$ded. 9t $s not$%ea-#e₊ ne/e't!e#ess₊ t!at $ts te&t 'e"eated#('efe's to 1mssons2 as $ts o-ᴮe%t/add'essees. T!e T'$-una# ana#(sed at #engt! t!e not$on of 1m$ss$on2 $n elpignano UNDT/2015/075 and₊ 7 !$#e o-se'/$ng a 'eg'etta-#e #a%= of %#a'$t($n def$n$ng t!$s %on%e"t₊ $t %on%#uded t!at UN）, 7as not to -e %ons$de'ed as su%!. Ae#e/ant#(₊ t!e Aes"ondent !$mse#f %#a$ms t!at 1t!e UN）, $s su""o'ted₊ adm$n$ste'ed an

Adm§n§st'at§on and t!ose su-Be%t to §ts aut!o'§t(7ou#d -e dee"#(un-a#an%ed and fundamenta##(une4u§ta-#e.

:1.   9n t!e %ase at !and+ §t §s "#a§n t!at t!e 7'§tten %ommun§%at§on0s3 %on/e(§ng t!e %ontested de%§s§on to t!e A""#§%ant d§d not e&"'ess an('easons t!e'efo'+ and t!e'e §s no e/§den%e t!at s!e 7as ot!e'7§se §nfo'med a-out t!em+ des"§te !e' %#ea' 'e4uest of 25 June 2015+ unt§# s!e 'e%e§/ed a 'e"#(to !e' 'e4uest fo' management e/a#uat§on. To t!§s e&tent+ t!e Adm§n§st'at§on fa§#ed to fu#f§# §ts o-#§gat§on to "'o/§de t!e A""#§%ant+ as t!e staff mem-e' affe%ted -(t!e de%§s§on at §ssue+ 7§t! t!e 'easons not to e&tend !e' tem"o'a'('eass§gnment.

:2.   T!e T'§-una# §s m§ndfu#+ ne/e't!e#ess+ t!at t!e Adm§n§st'at§on d§d 'e/ea# t!e 'easons fo' not e&tend§ng t!e A""#§%ant›s 'eass§gnment to UN),/UNG.C 7!en 8;U 'e4uested §t §n t!e %onte&t of fo'ma# "'o%eed§ngs.

:5.   9t §s o-/§ous t!at+ f'om t!e A""#§%ant›s "o§nt of /§e7+ !a/§ng to fo'ma##(%!a##enge t!e de%§s§on §n 4uest§on to f§nd out t!e 'easons affe%t§ng !e' ass§gnment+ des"§te !a/§ng s"e%§f§%a##(as=ed fo' t!em+ %annot .1264(d)-0.6220.95 8 92(u)-0.95 8 9211.5331(+)-16.4

*P*ropriety of the motives alleged

:6.   T!e T'$-una# notes t!at t!e A""#$%ant does not -'$ng s"e%f% a##egat$ons of "e'sona# "'e&ud$%e o' ot!e' undue mot$/at$ons. .!e 'at!e' suggests t!at t!e de%$s$on must !a/e -een -ased on $m"o"e' g'ounds -e%ause t!e'e 7e'e no o-&e%t$/e $m"ed$ments 0su%! as una/a$#a-$#$t(of t!e "ost o' -udget3 fo' !e' to 'ema$n #onge' $n UN) ,/UNG.C+ and a'gues t!at+ as a 'esu#t of t!e fa$#u'e to "'o/$de !e' t!e 'easons -e!$nd t!e de%$s$on+ t!e -u'den to demonst'ate t!at $t 7as not $##6mot$/ated s!$fts to t!e Adm$n$st'at$on.

:7.   9n t!$s 'es"e%t+ t!e a-o/e6'efe''ed Obdei)n

proof shifts to that staff member who must show through clear and convincing evidence that he/she was denied a fair chance of promotion.

50.   In this context, it is appropriate for the Tribunal to examine the reasons alleged by the Respondent, bearing in mind the principle that when a justification is given by the Administration for the exercise of its discretion it must be supported by the facts (Islam 2011-UNAT-115).

51.   Concretely, in the present case two different justifications have been put forward throughout the different litigation phases, namely:

    a.   The need to temporarily hire a dedicated person to work on the deployment of Umoja by 1 November 2015 in UN(...)/UNG.C (Umoja Site Coordinator); and

    b.   Some performance shortcomings by the Applicant, notably in terms of consultation and cooperation with colleagues.

52.   The Tribunal will consider each of them separately.

<u>Need to secure an Umoja Site Coordinator</u>

55.   Umoja uncontestably went live Secretariat-wide for the staff at large in November 2015, and it is well-known that its deployment required significant preparation and had enormous repercussions on the Organization's functioning. Likewise, it is on record that the Secretary-General had specifically urged the Organization's management to take appropriate measures and allocate adequate resources to enable Umoja to be successfully deployed, an instruction that was later relayed and reiterated by the Assistant Secretary-General for Field Support.

57.   In addition, the Respondent submitted material indicating that an Umoja Site Coordinator was indeed recruited shortly after the discontinuation of the Applicant's temporary reassignment. Although he served for a few months only, the short duration of this arrangement seems coherent with the circumstances of the case, since the deployment of Umoja to the staff at large was, by its very nature, a punctual exercise. Consistently, the o(d 8 892(a)-3.66523(a)-14.3239(t)0C)-4.49925(o)-0.9

Coo'd$nato' 7as "'esented f'om t!e outset as a t'ans$to'(measu'e C nota-#(+ t!e "os$t$on 7as ad⁄e't$sed t!'oug! tem"o'a'(⁄a%an%(announ%ements C and $t $ndeed #asted "'e%$se#(f'om t7o mont!s $mmed$ate#("'e%ed$ng t!e UmoẞBa

'eass$gnment of a staff mem-e'+ t!e Adm$n$st'at$on !as to 1"'o/$de a "e'fo'man%e6'e#ated Bust$f$%at$on fo' $ts de%$ss$on2 and+ $n 'ea%!$ng $t+ t!e Adm$n$st'at$on must 'es"e%t t!e 1'u#e of #a7 and standa'ds of due "'o%ess $n de%$ss$on6ma=$ng2. Eu't!e'+ 8 ;U o-se'/ed t!at t!e A""#$%ant>s "e'fo'man%e a""'a$sa# fo' 201:62015 !ad not -een %om"#eted at t!e t$me t!e $m"ugned de%$ss$on 7as made and e/en $m"#emented. Eu't!e'mo'e+ no 'e%o'd e&$sts s!o7$ng t!at s!e !ad -een "'e/$ous#(not$f$ed of t!e %on%e'ns 7$t! !e' "e'fo'man%e and offe'ed an o""o'tun$t(to 'es"ond to t!em o' to 'e%t$f(!e' s!o't%om$ngs -efo'e end$ng !e' 'eass$gnment.

5 . 9n t!$s /$e7+ 8 ;U %on%#uded t!at t!e Adm$n$st'at$on !ad not 1ade4uate#(su-stant$ated t!at t!e A""#$%ant !ad -een 'ede%$ded !e' 'eass$gnment.

organization and was assigned back to the original duties, which were appropriate for her in terms of background and grade. For this, it is not warranted to award her a higher compensation.

62.   In conclusion, having scrutinised the two purported justifications for the non-extension of the Applicant's reassignment (i.e., performance shortcomings and use of the post for the duties of Umoja State Coordinator) the Tribunal finds that although one (performance) was not properly documented, this shortcoming was already acknowledged and adequately addressed. As to the second one (reposting), there is nothing to indicate that it is manifestly unreasonable or arbitrary, or else belied by the facts.

63.   In this light, the Tribunal is satisfied that the Organization has minimally shown that the contested decision was not improperly motivated. Accordingly, the onus fell on the Applicant to demonstrate otherwise. However, the Applicant has not adduced any tangible evidence, let alone clear and convincing one, that the end of her reassignment was due to extraneous factors. The fact that the post was funded and its incumbent remained assigned to New York until the end of 2015 does not suffice to make an inference that the decision was capricious or ill-motivated.

64.   This Tribunal is thus unable to find that the impugned decision was tainted by improper motives.

65.   For all the above, the Tribunal finds that:

   a.   The Applicant's due process rights concerning her purported performance shortcomings were violated, but this breach was detected and redressed by the MEU; and

   b.   The Administration did not respect its duty to provide the affected staff member with the reasons behind the impugned decision, although it later mitigated its responsibility in this respect by disclosing such reasons at the management evaluation stage. Notwithstanding the initial breach of the

neither warranted to rescind the decision nor to award additional compensation to the Applicant on this account.

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

The application is dismissed.

(Signed)

Judge Teresa Bravo

Dated this 6