



! "# \$ %

## Introduction

1. In an appeal submitted on 25 November 2009 to the United Nations Dispute Tribunal (the appellant) contests the decision of the Executive Director to the United Nations Environment Programme, UNEP, (not to renew the funding agreement) issued on 26 June 2009.

## Facts

2. The appellant joined UNEP in 2000 as Deputy Director (D1) of the Environmental Monitoring System (at Headquarters, New York). He was promoted to Director of the Environmental Monitoring System on 1 October 2006. He was responsible for the management and coordination of the Environmental Monitoring System, UNEP.

3. In 2007 (the appellant) was transferred to the Executive Director to the United Nations Environment Programme (from his position as Deputy Director to the Executive Director) for the Environmental Monitoring System of the United Nations Environment Programme. The appellant consented to his transfer after discussions with the Executive Director. During these discussions (the appellant and the Executive Director) held a meeting on 15 August 2007 of the appellant's minutes were taken. These minutes recorded the views of the Executive Director to make the appellant a member of the Executive Director's staff. The appellant stated that the Executive Director should be given the right to appoint and dismiss staff members of the Executive Director's staff. The appellant stated that the Executive Director should be given the right to appoint and dismiss staff members of the Executive Director's staff. The appellant stated that the Executive Director should be given the right to appoint and dismiss staff members of the Executive Director's staff.

7. In 2005 (the appellant) was transferred to the Executive Director to the United Nations Environment Programme (from his position as Deputy Director to the Executive Director) for the Environmental Monitoring System of the United Nations Environment Programme. The appellant consented to his transfer after discussions with the Executive Director. During these discussions (the appellant and the Executive Director) held a meeting on 15 August 2007 of the appellant's minutes were taken. These minutes recorded the views of the Executive Director to make the appellant a member of the Executive Director's staff. The appellant stated that the Executive Director should be given the right to appoint and dismiss staff members of the Executive Director's staff. The appellant stated that the Executive Director should be given the right to appoint and dismiss staff members of the Executive Director's staff. The appellant stated that the Executive Director should be given the right to appoint and dismiss staff members of the Executive Director's staff.

applicant was informed to seek the OSt' UN\*P. The applicant's applicant was informed on 25 June 200A.

5. The applicant on 26 June 200A (the applicant) was granted another two weeks of administrative applicant. The "letter" of applicant stated that the applicant does not have an intention of "benefit" or of "concession" to another "type" of applicant in the "event" of the United Nations. and that it was "informed to seek the OSt' UN\*P.

6. The "letter" dated 1A A" 200B (the "German Cede" : "st" for the "Commission (Natural Consequences and Nu)" "event" "to the applicant" "its" "concerns" about the "function" of "tasks" of the C : 9 "event" (and some "staffing" and "administrative" matters. It requested the applicant's urgent attention and "other" measures OSt' "related" to the "issues" "indicated).

A. The "letter" dated 2 June 200B (the "German Cede" : "st" for the

the (t) 26\* n o s s o n m e n t ( N a t u r e C o o t ) 6 ( ) - 2 5 0 ( C ) - 3 . 0 0 7 8 A . C 6 2 . 1 6 8 ( 2 ) 2 0 ( ) - T J D - 3 9 6 . 8 4 0 n s # ' U 5 ( # 2 5

6.

11. 82 memorandum dated 1 April 2009 (the "2009 Memorandum") of the President of the Tribunal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, dated 15 June 2009.

12. 82 memorandum dated 15 June 2009 to the Chairman of the Commission of Inquiry into the Disappearance of the 37 Chinese Workers at the Jagantha Road Site, dated 15 June 2009, and the Secretary-General of the United Nations, dated 15 June 2009.

13. On 5 June 2009 the President of the Tribunal submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations a request for the Secretary-General to refer the matter to the International Court of Justice.

17. 82 "letter" dated 15 June 2009 (the "2009 Letter") of the President of the Tribunal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, dated 15 June 2009, and the Secretary-General of the United Nations, dated 15 June 2009.

15. 82 "letter" dated 15 June 2009 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations (the "2009 Letter") of the President of the Tribunal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, dated 15 June 2009, and the Secretary-General of the United Nations, dated 15 June 2009.

16. On 15 June 2009 the President of the Tribunal submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations a request for the Secretary-General to refer the matter to the International Court of Justice.

1A. On 25 June 2009 the President of the Tribunal submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations a request for the Secretary-General to refer the matter to the International Court of Justice.

1B. 82 "letter" dated 25 August 2009 (the "2009 Letter") of the President of the Tribunal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, dated 25 August 2009, and the Secretary-General of the United Nations, dated 25 August 2009.

19. On 25 November 2009 (the "1st") ant filed an appeal before the Tribunal.  
On 9 December 2009 (the "2nd") the Tribunal requested the respondent to submit 's and '2 to  
the "1st") at the session. On 6 January 2010 (the "3rd") counsel for the respondent submitted 's  
and '2. On 12 January 2010 (the "4th") ant submitted 's observations. On  
29 April 2010 (the "5th") the Tribunal's decision was issued.

20. During the hearing (the "6th") issued the decision, 1/ the appeal was  
dismissed on the basis of the respondent's failure to provide the requested information (G4766(3).00781( )-20(d))

a. The decision to transfer the applicant from Bonn to Namibia and the decision not to grant the applicant's application for a permanent residence permit are not to be reviewed by the Administrative Tribunal of the German Government (the Tribunal) as they are not subject to judicial review.

#. The applicant's claim that the transfer and subsequent non-granting of a permanent residence permit are unlawful is not well-founded. The applicant's claim that the transfer was an abuse of power is also not well-founded. The decision not to grant the applicant's application for a permanent residence permit is not subject to judicial review. The applicant's claim that the transfer was an abuse of power is also not well-founded.

). The cost of the applicant's application for a permanent residence permit in Namibia is not subject to judicial review. The applicant's claim that the cost of the application is an abuse of power is also not well-founded. The applicant's claim that the cost of the application is an abuse of power is also not well-founded.

e. The \*+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to& fas"ed to )onsu"t ' \$m &ega&d\$ng t'e t&ansfe&. t Oas a un\$"ate&a" de)\$s\$on O\$t'out mean\$ngfu" )onsu"tat\$on. T'e \*+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to& d\$d not ta&e \$nto a))ount t'e a!"\$)ant@s )on)e&ns( O'\$)' \$n)"uded t'e edu)at\$on of '\$s ado!ted Gen2an1#o&n )'\$d and t'e d\$ff\$)u"t\$es 'e 'ad O\$t' t'e Gen2an aut'ok&\$t\$es \$n &e"at\$on to a !&o!e&t2 \$n Na&o#E

f. A fo&me& 4ono&a&2 Am#assado& O'o )o""a#o&ated O\$t' C : 9 \$nfo&med t'e a!"\$)ant t'at a fo&me& )o""eague of t'e Ge&man Cede&a" Go%e&nment 'ad &e%ea"ed to ' \$m t'at du&\$ng a meet\$ng \$n No%em#e& 200B( a 4ead of De!a&tment sa&d t'at t'e a!"\$)ant Oou"d &etu&n to Na&o#\$ to ta&e anot'e& !ost. T'\$s 4ead of De!a&tment 'ad 'e"d a meet\$ng O\$t' t'e \*+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to& \$n Na&o#\$ on 22 August 200B. 4en)e( t'e a!"\$)ant dedu)ed t'at t'e \*+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to& 'ad \$nfo&med t'e Ge&man Cede&a" Go%e&nment t'at 'e Oou"d #e t&ansfe&&ed to Na&o#\$ at "east t' &ee mont's #efo&e 'e Oas f&\$st \$nfo&med of t'e !otent\$a" &eass\$gnmentE

g. 4\$s &efusa" to #e t&ansfe&&ed to Na&o#\$ d\$d not entas" t'at t'e \*+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to& Oas no "ong& &e5u&&ed to )onside& fa&\$"2 t'e &ene0a" of '\$s a!o\$ntment. 4e 'ad a &easona#"e e+!e)tat\$on of &ene0a" of '\$s )ont&a)t #e)ause '\$s !os\$t\$on Oas not a#o"\$s'ed and t'e&e Oas no &e)o&d&ed "a!se \$n '\$s !e&fo&man)e. Cu&t'e&mo&e( at t'e t\$me of '\$s a!"\$)at\$on( UN\*P 'ad not a!o\$nted a &e!"a)ement fo& t'e !os\$t\$on of \*+e)ut\$%e 9e)&eta&2 and t'e dut\$es Oe&e !e&fo&med #2 an \$nte&\$m a!o\$ntee a)t\$ng as <ff\$)e&1\$niC'a&ge. T'e fas"u&e to a!o\$nt a su))esso& to '\$s fo&me& !ost \$s e%\$den)e t'at t'e&e Oas no "eg\$t\$mate &eason fo& not &ene0\$ng '\$s a!o\$ntment as \*+e)ut\$%e 9e)&eta&2E

'. 4e 'ad an e+!e)tan)2 of &ene0a" #ased on t'e m\$notes of t'e meet\$ng 'e"d on 15 A!&\$" 2007 #etOeen '\$mse"f and t'e t'en \*+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to&. T'ese m\$notes demonst&ate t'at O'e&eas t'e \$n\$t\$a" !e&\$od as A)t\$ng \*+e)ut\$%e 9e)&eta&2 Oou"d ena#"e '\$m to !&o%e '\$s -a#"\$t2. to 'and'e t'e !os\$t\$on( 'e Oou"d t'en #e a#"e to -)u"m\$rate '\$s )a&ee& \$n C : 9.. Cu&t'e&mo&e( t'e t'en De!ut2 \*+e)ut\$%e D\$&e)to& )onf&\$&med t'at t'\$s Oas t'e unde&stand\$ng \$n an ema\$" dated 1A August 2009. t Oas a







t'at t'e a!"\$)ant #e t&ansfe&&ed o& t'at 's f\$+edite&m a! !o\$ntment not #e  
&ene0ed( and e%en \$f \$t d\$d( t'e&e \$s not'sng to suggest t'e \*+e)ut\$%e  
D&e)to& 0ou"d 'a%e a)ted on \$tE

g. T'e \*+e)ut\$%e D&e)to& ga%e su\$ta#"e and fa&& )ons\$de&at\$on to t'e  
a!"\$)ant fo& &ene0a" of 's\$ )ont&a)t 0\$t' UN\*P. 4e offe&&ed '\$m anot'e&  
!os\$t\$on at t'e same "e%e"( 0 '\$)' 0ou"d 'a%e a""o0ed '\$m to !u&sue '\$s  
)a&ee& 0\$t' UN\*P #e2ond t'e e+!\$&2 date of 's  
f\$+edite&m a! !o\$ntmentE

'. Cont&a&2 to 0 'at \$s a""eged #2 t'e a!"\$)ant( t'e !os\$t\$on of 9!e)\$a"  
Ad%\$so& 0as )&eated due to o&gan\$Fat\$ona" needs &e"ated to  
t'e u!)om\$ng nte&nat\$ona" Hea& of 8\$dod\$%e&2.16797(t)-2.16797(\$)-2.16"797('\$)-2.( )-10(0a





allocations. The applicant alleged that the second signing of the allocation letters in 2005 and 2006. The letter had been issued in 2007 and 2005 (the respondent would not have had an impact on 21 August 2006 when the applicant signed the first allocation letter).

35. The respondent cannot be stated that the decision of non-allocation was based on





