



## Introduction

1. By a decision of the Tribunal dated 22 May 2014 (the *Appeal Decision*) regarding the Office of the Auditor General (the *Office*), the Tribunal (the *Office*) has found that the Office's decision to award a contract to the respondent for the provision of services under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (the *Convention*) is based on the respondent's offer of the lowest priced bid (the *Offer*) as of 14 October 2014 and that the Office's decision to award the contract to the respondent is in accordance with the provisions of the Convention. The Tribunal also found that the Office's decision to award the contract to the respondent is in accordance with the provisions of the Convention. The Tribunal also found that the Office's decision to award the contract to the respondent is in accordance with the provisions of the Convention.

## Facts

2. As stated in the *Appeal Decision*, the Tribunal found that the Office's decision to award the contract to the respondent is in accordance with the provisions of the Convention. The Tribunal also found that the Office's decision to award the contract to the respondent is in accordance with the provisions of the Convention. The Tribunal also found that the Office's decision to award the contract to the respondent is in accordance with the provisions of the Convention.

6. By the *Appeal Decision*, the Tribunal found that the Office's decision to award the contract to the respondent is in accordance with the provisions of the Convention. The Tribunal also found that the Office's decision to award the contract to the respondent is in accordance with the provisions of the Convention. The Tribunal also found that the Office's decision to award the contract to the respondent is in accordance with the provisions of the Convention.

e%#023er"%g =o0!d 3e d"s#o%"%0ed as of 1 40%e 2014' +"% !"%e ="\$( a reg"o%a!  
re\*"e= of e9"s%"%g #a a#"s"es, a%d +"% a##orda%#e ="\$( rele\*a%"\$ s\$" 0!a\$"o%\$ of  
BO&/0<1/2007:8O&/0<4/2007,.

>. By e2a"! a%d 2e2ora%d02 of 14 4a%0ary 2014' \$(e A !"#a%"\$ re50es\$ed  
2a%age2e%"\$ e\*a!0a\$"o% of \$(e de#"s"o% #o2 20%"#a\$ed \$o (er 3y !e\$\$er of  
1? No\*e23er 2016.

7. By e2a"! of 2? 8e3r0ary 2014' s(e =as "%for2ed 3y \$(e Off"#e of \$(e  
De 0\$y 1"g( Co2 2"ss"o%er' UN1C-' \$(a\$ (er re50es\$ for 2a%age2e%"\$  
e\*a!0a\$"o% =as 0%der #o%"s"dera\$"o%.

?



8O&/0>7/2012 (Co2 ara\$"\*e -e\*"e= Po!"#y for )o#a!!y -e#r0"\$ed ;\$aff

#. ; (o0!d \$(e Tr"30%a! %e\*er\$(e!ess #o%s"der \$(e re50es\$ o% "\$s 2er"\$s' "\$  
"s s03 2 "\$sed \$(a\$ \$(e #o%\$essed de#"s"o% "s %o\$ prima facie 0%!a=f0!D 3ased  
o% r0!"%gs 3y \$(e A ea!s Tr"30%a!' "\$ "s =e!! se\$\$!ed F0r"s r0de%#e \$(a\$ a%  
B%\$er%a\$"o%a! Orga%"Ha\$"o% (as %e#essar"!y \$(e o=er \$o #o%d0#\$  
res\$r0#\$0ra\$"o%' "%#!0d"%g \$(e a3o!"\$"o% of os\$s' \$(e #rea\$"o% of %e= os\$s  
a%d \$(e rede !oy2e%\$ of s\$aff. B% \$(e rese%\$ #ase' \$(e a3o!"\$"o% of \$(e os\$  
e%#023ered 3y \$(e A !"#a%\$ =as ar\$ of a res\$r0#\$0r"%g e9er#"se 3y \$(e



20. The Tribunal considers that the decision of the Administrative Tribunal is not supported by the evidence. The Administrative Tribunal has found that the applicant is a member of the category of "other staff", for which the salary scale is set at a level that is not commensurate with the applicant's qualifications and experience. The Administrative Tribunal has also found that the applicant's qualifications and experience are not commensurate with the level of the position. The Administrative Tribunal has therefore found that the applicant is not qualified for the position. The Administrative Tribunal has also found that the applicant's qualifications and experience are not commensurate with the level of the position. The Administrative Tribunal has therefore found that the applicant is not qualified for the position.

21. The Administrative Tribunal has found that the applicant is not qualified for the position. The Administrative Tribunal has also found that the applicant's qualifications and experience are not commensurate with the level of the position. The Administrative Tribunal has therefore found that the applicant is not qualified for the position.

22. The Administrative Tribunal has found that the applicant is not qualified for the position. The Administrative Tribunal has also found that the applicant's qualifications and experience are not commensurate with the level of the position. The Administrative Tribunal has therefore found that the applicant is not qualified for the position.

26. The Administrative Tribunal has found that the applicant is not qualified for the position. The Administrative Tribunal has also found that the applicant's qualifications and experience are not commensurate with the level of the position. The Administrative Tribunal has therefore found that the applicant is not qualified for the position.

a3o!"\$"o% de#"s"o% =ere s0s e%ded' \$(e A !"#a%\$ 2ay "%\*ar"a3!y 3e #o%fro%\$ed  
="\$( \$(e "2 !e2e%\$a\$"o% of \$(e \$er2 "%a\$"o% of (er a o"%\$2e%\$ =("#( \$(e Tr"30%a!  
#a%%o\$ s0s e%d "% \$(e fra2e=or7 of \$(e rese%\$ ro#eed"%gs. B\$ fo!