Introduction

1. On 6 February 2020, the Applicant filed an application contesting the Administration's decision to terminate his continuing appointment following the abolishment of his post.

2. In the Respondent's reply dated 9 March 2020, the Respondent submits that the application is not "ready for adjudication" because the Administration has suspended the termination decision pending management evaluation.

3. For the reasons stated below, the application is rejected as non-receivable.

Consideration

Relevant facts

4. As the United Nations Mis2.24 0 Td[I)-7 (B62 (e)4 (nt)-20 (c)4 a03 Tw 2.38 0 Td[9 M)9 (a)6 (

I2. on is r,ect ejn(e)2p9Td5 1.1 0 Td( )T1 1 Na

decision to separate him or, in the alternative, he seeks payment of adequate compensation.

8. The Respondent argues that the present matter is not ready for adjudication because the Administration has suspended the decision to terminate the Applicant's appointment and continues, to this day, to make good faith efforts to find the Applicant a suitable position.

Discussion

9. Article 2.1(a) of the Tribunal's Statute states that the Dispute Tribunal has jurisdiction to pass judgment on:

> … an administrative decision that is alleged to be in non-compliance with the terms of appointment or the contract of employment. The terms "contract" and "terms of appointment" include all pertinent regulations an0 0 122 Td-2 (on t)(oym)-20 1227s