







7. On 29 and 30 November 2016, the Applicant spoke with the Director, DHR, to explore her options in anticipation of the proposed reorganization of the Technical Division. The Applicant submitted a detailed note to the Tribunal, which reflects her conversations with the Director, DHR. The Respondent does not dispute the Applicant's record of the conversations but submits that any discussion was informal and exploratory, and no formal offers or promises were made by the Respondent.

8. According to this note, during their first conversation on 29 November 2016, the Director presented three options: the Applicant

10. On the following day, the Applicant spoke to the Director again and she informed him that she definitely wanted to continue in her current capacity. The Director responded that he would not

## **Considerations**

*The applicable legal framework and the issues of the present case*

14. The present case concerns a decision to terminate a fixed-term appointment following the abolition of a post.

15. Staff regulation 9.3(a)(i) and staff rule 9.6(c)(i) provide that the Secretar









28. The Tribunal will first

is one of them.<sup>5</sup> T



36. The Applicant also questions the financial justification of the impugned decision on the ground that the cost saving effect of the termination of her appointment was minimal given that she received a substantial amount of cash at her separation. In response, the Respondent submits that the financial saving from the abolition of the Applicant's post was calculated based on pro forma costs of the post, not based on circumstances of each individual staff to be affected, and presented the



the Applicant's job description and post was decided not to be a match to any available or suitable post within the merged Branch.

42. In respo

