

# **United Nations Dispute Tribunal**

Case No.:

Judgment No.: Date: English Original: UNDT/GVA/2009/18 JAB/2007/108 UNDT/2009/044 16 October 2009

French

Before: Judge Jean-François Cousin

Registrar:

Víctor Rodríguez

## MUTUTA

v.

## SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

# JUDGMENT

**Counsel for applicant:** Ulrich Garms and Ugo Cedrangolo

**Counsel for respondent:** Shelly Pitterman, DHRM/UNHCR

Notice: The format of this judgment has been modified for publication purposes in accordance with article 31 of the rules of procedure of the United Nations Dispute Tribunal.

-1-

# Application

27

1. In his appeal to the Joint Appeals Board (JAB), registered on 10 December 2008, the applicant requested it to recommend that:

- The decision of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

session should be rescinded;

- He should be promoted to the P-5 level;

- He should be awarded compensation equivalent to the additional

Promotions Board is required to pay due regard to gender parity. The UNHCR gender policy requires the Board to ensure that, at the grade levels where parity has not been achieved, half of all promotions will be awarded to women, which is in line with the policy advocated by the General

#### 2007.

L.

Δ.

9. In 2006 women made up only 30 per cent of UNHCR staff at the P-5 level. The approach applied in order to achieve the goal of parity is legitimate and falls within the discretionary authority of the High Commissioner, although he is expected to respect certain parameters in exercising that authority. In particular, women may be given preference only if they are guerallies quelified as their role counterparts which was

the case in this instance with respect to promotion to the P-5 level, based on performance appraisals.

10. A comparison of the male and female candidates shows that, in terms of competence, the women who were promoted were at least on a par with, if the provide the time. The last five women promoted and the first five

against the Board's decision not to recommend him during the first session does not visitate his promotion, nor does it visitate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Deard has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assess his situation on the two of the postings and Promotions Board assess his situation on the two of the postings and Promotions Board assess his situation on the	h ———	App <u>rintmonto Dectivos</u> and Drametians Dased. The fact that and of the n		 
against the Board's decision not to recommend him during the first session does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Annointments Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the				
against the Board's decision not to recommend him during the first session does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Annointments Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the				 
against the Board's decision not to recommend him during the first session does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the				 
against the Board's decision not to recommend him during the first session does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Anpointments Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the				
against the Board's decision not to recommend him during the first session does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has used its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has isituation on the	·			 
against the Board's decision not to recommend him during the first session does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments. Postings and Promotions Board has issued the				
does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the	_12	ť		
does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the				
does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the				
does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the				
does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the	,			
does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the				
does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the				
does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the				
does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the				
does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the	<u>.</u>			
does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its recommendations. 17. The applicant alleges that there is no documentary evidence that the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the				
Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the	-	does not vitiate his promotion, nor does it vitiate the overall P-5 promotions procedure for the 2007 promotion session, since the High Commissioner has the authority to award promotions once the Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board has issued its	: •	
		Appointments, Postings and Promotions Board assessed his situation on the		

-4-

	-5-
	the goal was to achieve gender parity at all grade levels by 2010 and notes
-	
_	
· · ·	
·	Board to ensure that, for all grade levels at which parity had not been
	achieved, the number of female staff recommended for promotion was equal to that of male staff, provided that the women had the required
:	qualifications. Accordingly, the High Commissioner is justified in claiming
	that the system put in place, whereby equal numbers of women and men would be premated to the D.5 level in order to achieve sender parity was
· 	would be promoted to the P-5 level in order to achieve gender parity, was
·	· · · · · · · ·
<u> </u>	
<b>.</b>	
	s
	enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, namely merit-based
•	promotion. Nevertheless, in seeking to achieve that goal, the High

promotion. Nevertheless, in seeking to achieve that goal, the High Commissioner had a duty to set clear rules for promotion, reconciling the

¢

**n** . .

	Administration may choose either to carry out the judge's order to rescind	· · ·
l		
 [ )		
), ■		
2- <u>-</u>		
<u> </u>		
<u>) ) (</u>		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	_	
	specified above. In the first case, the High Commissioner will have to	
	in the according of the applicant who if he is promoted will be	
·		
ł		
i. J c		
ł		
· 		
: : :		
s- <u>↓</u> <u>−</u> ↓ − ↓		
;		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
: : :		
' 	Line we does not to a November 2007 and thus will not	
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
' 	114 1 to realize addresses 1 November 2007 and thus will not	
' 	1 1 - 4 200% and thus will not	
' 	1 1	
' 	<u>la de la constanta estima te 1 Novembre 2007 oud thus will not</u>	
' 	1 1 - 4 1	
' 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
' 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
' 	I de la construction de la Maranakar 2007 and thua will not	
' 	Interview of the setting to 1 Managements 2007 and thus will not	

6