



UNITED NATIONS APPEALS TRIBUNAL
TRIBUNAL D'APPEL DES NATIONS UNIES

Judgment No. 2025-UNAT-1565

Esraa Samih Aljuju & Eman Saqer Abualainain
(Appellants)

v.

Commissioner-General
of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency
for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
(Respondent)

JUDGMENT

Before: Judge Abdelmohsen Sheha, Presiding
Judge Leslie F. Forbang
Judge Gao Xiaoli

Case Nos.: 2024-1955 & 2024-1958

Date of Decision: 27 June 2025

Date of Publication: 14 August 2025

Registrar: Juliet E. Johnson

Counsel for Appellants: Self-represented

Counsel for Respondent: Stephen Margetts

JUDGE ABDELMOHSEN SHEHA, PRESIDING.

1. Ms. Esraa Samih Aljuju and Ms. Eman Saqer Abualainain, staff members of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA or the Agency), contested several decisions:

a) Ms. Aljuju contested the decision not to reclassify the post she encumbered at a higher grade, i.e. Grade 14 (first non-reclassification decision).

b) Ms. Abualainain contested the decision not to reclassify the post she encumbered at a higher grade, i.e. Grade 18, with the associated title of Head of Treasury or Deputy Chief of Treasury (second non-reclassification decision) and the decision not to provide sufficient staffing support to her post by not assigning additional staff to support her post and by not reclassifying the post encumbered by Ms. Aljuju, her supervisee (non-support decision).¹

2. By Judgment No. UNRWA/DT/2024/026 (impugned Judgment),² the UNRWA Dispute Tribunal (UNRWA DT) dismissed the consolidated applications.

3. Ms. Aljuju and Ms. Abualainain each lodged an appeal of the impugned Judgment with the United Nations Appeals Tribunal (Appeals Tribunal or UNAT).

4. For the reasons set out below, the Appeals Tribunal dismisses the appeals and affirms the impugned Judgment.

Facts and Procedure³

5. At the material time, Ms. Aljuju served as Senior Finance Assistant (Treasury), Grade 12, and Ms. Abualainain, her supervisor, as Senior Treasury Banking Officer, Grade 17, both in the Treasury Division of the Finance Department at the Agency's Headquarters in Amman.⁴

¹ In addition, Ms. Aljuju also contested the decision to retitle her post from Senior Finance Assistant (Treasury) to Finance Associate—Banking and Reporting and Ms. Abualainain contested the decision to retitle her post from Senior Treasury Banking Officer to Senior Finance Officer—Treasury Banking and Reporting but those decisions are not before the Appeals Tribunal on appeal.

² *Aljuju and Abu Alinin v. Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East*, Judgment dated 29 August 2024.

³ Summarized from the impugned Judgment as relevant to the appeal.

⁴ Impugned Judgment, paras. 12 and 23.

6. On 25 August 2021, the Chief of the Treasury Division (C/TD) asked all staff members of the Treasury Division to update their existing post descriptions, have them approved by their supervisors and submit the updated versions no later than 31 August 2021.⁵

7. In September 2021, the Agency put forward a “Concept Note/Business Case” to restructure the Finance Department and Field Finance Offices. By letter dated 14 December 2021, the Commissioner-General endorsed the Finance Department restructuring plan.⁶

8. On 14 October 2021, Ms. Abualainain sent the C/TD updated post descriptions for the post encumbered by Ms. Aljuju and the post encumbered by herself. She requested that Ms. Aljuju’s post be retitled to Senior Treasury Officer and reclassified at Grade 14 or 15, and that her own post be retitled to Chief of Treasury and the grade revised.⁷

9. On 19 December 2021, the C/TD requested that Ms. Abualainain send him the “final” post descriptions for her team. On 21 December 2021, Ms. Abualainain sent Ms. Aljuju’s revised post description to the C/TD.⁸

10. On 15 August 2022, the Human Resources Department (HRD) used the UNRWA job classification tool to assess and assign points to a number of parameters and subparameters of the post of Finance Associate and the post of Senior Finance Officer, including the nature of work, working/enabling environment, partnership and relationships, and results. The Classification Report for the post of Finance Associate showed that the total for that post was 865 points, which placed it at Grade 12. The Classification Report for the post of Senior Finance Officer showed that the total for that post was 1820 points, which placed it at Grade 17.⁹

11. On 31 August 2022, the Agency sent the post description for the post of Finance Associate—Banking and Reporting to Ms. Aljuju for her signature.¹⁰

12. By e-mail of 8 September 2022, HRD informed Ms. Aljuju and Ms. Abualainain of the respective retitling and non-reclassification decisions. Ms. Aljuju’s post, retitled to Finance

⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 8.

⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 9-10.

⁷ *Ibid.*, paras. 13 and 24.

⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 14.

⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 15 and 25.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, para. 16.

Associate—Banking and Reporting, was maintained at Grade 12 and Ms. Abualainain’s post, retitled to Senior Finance Officer—Treasury Banking and Reporting, was maintained at Grade 17.¹¹

13. On 15 September 2022, Ms. Abualainain informed the Agency that she had “raised concerns about [Ms. Aljuju]’s new title and grade, and this [was] still subject to further discussions with management”.¹²

14. On 29 September 2022, Ms. Abualainain informed the Agency that Ms. Aljuju’s post needed to be “upgraded to (...) officer” based on the functions required of this post and also requested that the Agency re-evaluate and “upgrade[]” her own post to Head Treasury Division. On the same day, the Agency responded that post descriptions were standardized and not determined on the basis of the personal capabilities of the individual encumbering a specific post.¹³

15. From 12 to 17 October 2022, the C/TD and Ms. Abualainain continued to discuss by e-mail proposed revisions to the post descriptions of the posts encumbered by Ms. Aljuju and Ms. Abualainain.¹⁴

16. Ms. Aljuju and Ms. Abualainain submitted their requests for decision review (RDR) on 24 and 25 October 2022, respectively.¹⁵

17. On 24 November 2022, they received responses to their RDRs. The Deputy Commissioner-General held that the contested decisions were not administrative decisions subject to decision review.¹⁶

18. On 20 December 2022 and 19 January 2023, respectively, Ms. Aljuju and Ms. Abualainain filed their applications with the UNRWA DT.

19. On 9 June 2024, the UNRWA DT ordered the Commissioner-General to produce “the ‘international standards’ based on which the [Agency] determines the grades for Grade 12, 13 and 14 Finance posts, as well as any internal Agency rules, standards and/or guidance regarding the same”.¹⁷ On 18 June 2024, the UNRWA DT ordered the Commissioner-General to produce “the

¹¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 17 and 26.

¹² *Ibid.*, para. 18.

¹³ *Ibid.*, paras. 19 and 28.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 20 and 29.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, paras. 21 and 30.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 22 and 31.

¹⁷ Order No. 079 (UNRWA/DT/2024) dated 9 June 2024.

‘job classification’ tool or template used by the Agency to classify posts, along with any accompanying guidelines or explanation of how points are assigned”.¹⁸

The impugned Judgment

20. The UNRWA DT dismissed the applications.

21. The UNRWA DT held that the challenges to the decisions to retitle the posts encumbered by Ms. Aljuju and Ms. Abualainain and not provide sufficient staffing support to Ms. Abualainain’s post were not receivable *ratione materiae*. The first part of the non-support decision, i.e., not assigning additional staff to support Ms. Abualainain’s post, was not challenged in the RDR. The second part of the non-support decision, i.e., the decision not to reclassify her subordinate’s post at a higher grade, has not been shown to have any adverse legal effect on Ms. Abualainain’s terms or conditions of employment.¹⁹

22. Turning to the merits in its review of the non-reclassification decisions, the UNRWA DT noted at the outset that while the Commissioner-General had produced the portion of the International Civil Service Commission’s (ICSC) “Master Standard for Classification” (Standard) entitled “Guidelines”, it had not produced the full ICSC Standard or the points matrix itself, nor any UNRWA-specific regulations, policies or guidelines incorporating the ICSC Standard. However, the UNRWA DT noted that, in the absence of these rules, it lies within the broad discretion of the Agency to determine the criteria to be used for the reclassification of posts.²⁰

23. Regarding both Appellants, the UNRWA DT held that the question of whether the updated post descriptions contained significant changes from the prior versions appeared irrelevant. Neither Appellant has shown that being incorrectly reclassified at the wrong grade was the result of the use of the ICSC Standard, nor pointed to anything specific in the Agency’s job classification tool as being unfair or incorrect. The grade of the supervisor of the post does not appear to be a factor the Agency considers in determining the grade of the post.²¹

24. Concerning Ms. Aljuju specifically, the UNRWA DT found in addition that she had not shown that any purported lack of guidance had caused her post to be wrongly reclassified.²²

¹⁸ Order No. 085 (UNRWA/DT/2024) dated 18 June 2024.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 52, 56 and 58.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, paras. 64 and 71.

²¹ *Ibid.*, paras. 69-71, 73, 74, 78 and 81.

²² *Ibid.*, para. 72.

25. Regarding Ms. Abualainain, the UNRWA DT first noted that her new post description had included the same duties as before, supplemented by detailed descriptions of numerous related duties and tasks, and she had not identified any material task that was missing, mischaracterized or insufficiently described in the new post description such that it led to an error in reclassifying her post.²³

26. Second, the UNRWA DT stated that Ms. Abualainain had not pointed to anything specific as being unfair or incorrect in the Agency's Classification Report reflecting its assessment of the different factors.²⁴

27. Third, the UNRWA DT found that it was not in a position to determine whether classification of a similar post in another agency, such as the World Health Organization, had been correct and, if so, what the implications of that might have been for the reclassification of Ms. Abualainain's post.²⁵

28. Fourth, the UNRWA DT noted that Ms. Abualainain had not produced any evidence showing that the Administration provided HRD with predetermined grades. The Classification Report supports the Commissioner-General's claim that HRD evaluated the posts independently.²⁶

29. Fifth, the UNRWA DT held that by identifying the potential for wrongdoing by the Agency, Ms. Abualainain had not met her burden of showing a specific error or abuse of discretion in the reclassification of her post.²⁷

30. The UNRWA DT concluded that neither Appellant had met her burden of showing that the Agency had erred or abused its discretion by deciding not to reclassify the respective posts at a higher grade and, regarding Ms. Abualainain, at a higher grade with the associated title.²⁸

²³ *Ibid.*, para. 77.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, para. 78.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 79.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 82.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, para. 83.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, paras. 75 and 84.

Procedure before the Appeals Tribunal

31. On 27 October 2024, each Appellant filed an appeal of the impugned Judgment with the Appeals Tribunal. The Commissioner-General filed answers on 6 January 2024.
32. By Order No. 597 (2025), the Appeals Tribunal consolidated the appeals.

Submissions**The Appeals**

33. Each Appellant requests the Appeals Tribunal to reverse the UNRWA DT's decision not to rescind the respective non-reclassification decision and order the Commissioner-General to reclassify her post at a higher grade. Ms. Abualainain also requests that the reclassification of her post at the higher grade be ordered with appropriate title and that the Appeals Tribunal order the Commissioner-General to provide sufficient staffing support to her post.
34. Appellants submit that the UNRWA DT failed to apply the law. The Agency did not provide clear and convincing evidence to support its case. The Agency's evidence is from unknown sources, incomplete, anonymous and lacking signatures and references to the law. As the UNRWA DT noted, the Commissioner-General did not produce full versions of the documents requested. The documents failed to meet the standard of admissible evidence. Consequently, the UNRWA DT could not have rendered a fair judgment.
35. Appellants argue that the non-reclassification decisions may have been based on the decisions to retitle their posts or impacted by those decisions.
36. Appellants submit that the UNRWA DT erred when it did not take any action with regard to the Agency's constant failure to adhere to its orders for the production of documents.
37. Appellants contend that the UNRWA DT erred when it held that even significant changes to a post might not warrant a higher grade. The increase in the responsibilities of both posts was significant. Compared to a similar case,²⁹ the Agency and the UNRWA DT applied a double standard.

²⁹ Appellants cite *Loubani v. Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency of Palestine Refugees in the Near East*, Judgment No. UNRWA/DT/2022/030.

38. Ms. Aljuju submits that the UNRWA DT erred in dismissing her contentions and evidence regarding the technical nature of the functions of her post, an earlier evaluation of her post at Grade 14 in 2016, a comparison to other posts supervised by Grade 17, her supervisor's request for reclassification and prospective demands on the post.

39. Referring to the hierarchy of the Treasury Division before the restructuring, Ms. Abualainain submits that the non-reclassification of her post led to an indirect demotion. After the restructuring, she no longer supervises the other staff members who previously were under her supervision and the remaining supervisee has a lower grade. The UNRWA DT erred when it did not accept relevant documents submitted by her.

40. Ms. Abualainain contends that the UNRWA DT erred when it disregarded her contentions and evidence regarding several points: the fact that the functions of her post involved temporary direct support to the C/TD; the highly technical nature of both posts; the creation of anomalies elsewhere in the hierarchy of posts due to the restructuring; the underlying cause of the restructuring; the inability of the Human Resources personnel to understand and evaluate technical responsibilities of posts; the fact that the incumbents of both posts had been performing "high-level" tasks for years; and prospective demands on both post. The Agency provided contradicting and misleading information to staff members regarding the evaluation process.

41. Ms. Abualainain submits that there were several "weaknesses" in the evaluation process: there were restrictions on staff members in providing information on major tasks in their update to the post descriptions so that it was not possible to provide explanations; neither Appellant received from the Human Resources personnel any questions for clarification; it is not known how the system for the evaluation of posts can be used to evaluate finance-specific technical tasks nor how accurate the evaluation is; her request to be involved in evaluation-related discussions with the Human Resources personnel was ignored; and staff members had not been given guidance on how to update post descriptions.

The Commissioner-General's Answers

42. The Commissioner-General requests the Appeals Tribunal to dismiss both appeals.

43. The Commissioner-General submits that the UNRWA DT correctly found Ms. Abualainain's claims regarding the non-support decision not receivable *ratione materiae*.

44. The Commissioner-General argues that the UNRWA DT correctly found that neither Appellant had met her burden of showing that the Agency had abused its discretion by deciding not to reclassify her post at a higher grade. The review of all post descriptions within the divisions of the Finance Department followed the same procedure. This process was explained by management to staff. Input on the reclassification was sought from staff, and the ultimate structure and grades were determined by the Organizational Design and Classification (ODC) Division in accordance with international standards based on the respective tasks, activities, and responsibilities of the posts in question. Appellants have failed to show that anything specific in the job classification tool or the Agency's Classification Report was unfair or incorrect.

45. Regarding Ms. Aljuju's arguments, the Commissioner-General submits that she has failed to show that any purported lack of guidance caused her post to be wrongly reclassified or that the grade of the supervisor's post is a factor the Agency considers in determining the grade.

46. Concerning Ms. Abualainain's arguments, the Commissioner-General submits that she has failed to identify any material task that was missing, mischaracterized or insufficiently described in the new post description such that it led to an error in reclassifying her post, produce any evidence that other staff members who were encumbering posts that were reclassified at higher grades received guidance from the Agency, that all other posts reporting to the C/TD have higher grades and associated titles, or that the Administration provided HRD with predetermined grades for posts.

47. The Commissioner-General contends that Appellants have failed to establish any error of fact, law or procedure warranting the reversal of the impugned Judgment. Appellants have failed to demonstrate that the UNRWA DT erred when it relied on the evidence submitted by the Commissioner-General. It was open to the Agency within its broad discretion to apply the United Nations common system's ICSC Standard, as adapted to area staff. Appellants largely seek to re-argue their case. Appellants have not shown that any additional submissions regarding the documents ordered to be produced would have altered the outcome of the case.

48. Concerning Ms. Abualainain, the Commissioner-General further submits that she was given multiple opportunities, both by the Agency and the UNRWA DT, to identify the duties that were missing in her post description, but she failed to do so.

Considerations

49. Before the UNRWA DT, Ms. Abualainain requested that the Dispute Tribunal order the Administration to provide sufficient staffing support to her post. In the impugned Judgment, the UNRWA DT found that Ms. Abualainain's application in respect of the non-support decision was not receivable *ratione materiae*, in part because it had not been subject to RDR, and in part because it did not have any adverse legal effect on her own terms or conditions of employment.³⁰ On appeal, Ms. Abualainain requests that the UNAT reverse the impugned Judgment, and order the Agency to provide sufficient staffing support to her post.

50. We recall that under the consistent jurisprudence of this Tribunal, it is not sufficient for the appellant to disagree with the impugned judgment. It is the appellant's burden to show in what respect and for what reasons the first instance tribunal erred.³¹ In her appeal, Ms. Abualainain does not provide specific reasons supporting her request to reverse the impugned Judgment on this point other than a cursory explanation of the impact of shortage in staffing on the proper functioning of the unit.³² She does not even argue in any specific way that the UNRWA DT erred in its determination that her request was not receivable *ratione materiae*. As such, this part of Ms. Abualainain's appeal must fail.³³

51. We turn now to the other substantive contentions on appeal.

52. In their appeals, Ms. Aljuju and Ms. Abualainain submit that the UNRWA DT erred in law when it issued its Judgment in the absence of clear and convincing evidence. In particular, Appellants hold that the UNRWA DT relied on anonymous and unauthenticated statements and documents presented by the Commissioner-General. Appellants refer specifically to: (i) the Standard, from which the Commissioner-General produced an excerpt, i.e. the "Guidelines"; (ii) the statement from an unidentified source affirming that the Agency had followed the aforementioned guidelines in the reclassification process; and (iii) the table of equivalency between the P-levels for international posts and the grades for area staff posts (equivalency table).

³⁰ Impugned Judgment, para. 58.

³¹ *Ahmad Shukri Safi v. Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East*, Judgment No. 2024-UNAT-1443, para. 70 (internal citations omitted).

³² Appeal brief, para. 11(b).

³³ *See, Abu Ata et al. v. Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East*, Judgment No. 2020-UNAT-1016, para. 27.

53. We find this argument unconvincing.

54. We first note, with serious concern, the total absence of the Agency's internal regulations, policies, or guidelines governing matters related to post classification. We highlight the risk of recurring disputes between the Agency and its staff members, and urge the Agency to provide sufficient basic rules to govern this important matter.

55. However, as rightly noted by the UNRWA DT, in the absence of these rules, it lies within the broad discretion of the Agency to determine the criteria to be used for the reclassification of posts.

56. As we held in *Sanwidi*:³⁴

(...) When judging the validity of the Secretary-General's exercise of discretion in administrative matters, the Dispute Tribunal determines if the decision is legal, rational, procedurally correct, and proportionate. The Tribunal can consider whether relevant matters have been ignored and irrelevant matters considered, and also examine whether the decision is absurd or perverse. But it is not the role of the Dispute Tribunal to consider the correctness of the choice made by the Secretary-General amongst the various courses of action open to him. Nor is it the role of the Tribunal to substitute its own decision for that of the Secretary-General.

57. Further, in matters of reclassification of posts, we held in *Al Rifai*:³⁵

(...) On the standard of judicial review of classification decisions, we note and endorse, in principle, the jurisprudence of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization (ILOAT) which repeatedly held that[:] [it] will not undertake an exercise to classify or reclassify posts in an organisation's structure ..., since decisions in this sphere lie within the discretion of the organisation and may be set aside only on limited grounds. Such is the case, for example, if the competent bodies breached procedural rules, or if they acted on some wrong principle, overlooked some material fact or reached a clearly wrong conclusion[.] ... In the absence of such grounds, the Tribunal will not remit the case to the organisation, nor will it substitute its own post evaluation for that of the competent bodies.

58. In the present case, the Commissioner-General claimed before the UNRWA DT that the Agency had relied on "international standards" to reclassify the posts. In response to Order No. 079 (UNRWA/DT/2024), the Commissioner-General specified that the Agency "uses and adapts

³⁴ *Sanwidi v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2010-UNAT-084, para. 40.

³⁵ *AlRifai v. Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East*, Judgment No. 2016-UNAT-653, para. 16 (internal citation omitted).

the New Master Standard for job classification established by the ICSC for Area staff”,³⁶ and produced what appears to be the guidelines of the Standard, dated March 2009. Based on the above, the record shows that the Agency: (i) built its own model of job classification tool that seems to have internalized the methodology specified in the guidelines of the Standard, (ii) established an equivalency table, and (iii) assigned a point matrix for each of the eight grades comprising the area staff grades (12-20).³⁷ The job classification tool together with the point matrix was ultimately used to reclassify the Appellants’ posts.

59. Therefore, the ultimate question before the UNRWA DT was whether the reclassification based on the job classification tool and the associated point matrix the Agency had established and used was an appropriate exercise of its wide discretion. To answer this question, we find no need to examine whether the Agency had meticulously applied the Standard. The Standard is recommendatory in nature and is not binding law for the Agency until and unless it is internalized in the Agency’s legal framework. Until such time, the Standard remained, at best, an instrument of soft law, and the Agency had discretion to apply it to the extent that it considered appropriate for the reclassification exercise. As such, we do not find that the UNRWA DT erred when it issued its Judgment in the absence of the full document of the Standard.

60. As to the other unidentified and unauthenticated statements and documents, we agree with Appellants that the equivalency table was untitled and undated. However, the veracity of the information contained in it could be verified on the basis of the 15 August 2022 Classification Reports regarding the Appellants’ posts. We note that according to the equivalency table, a total of 739 to 880 points classified the post at Grade 12, while a total of 1761 to 1980 points classified the post at Grade 17. In light of the Classification Reports, that are not in dispute, the total number of points assigned to the posts encumbered by Ms. Aljuju and Ms. Abualainain were 865 and 1820, and the percentiles were 89.36% and 26.94%, reflecting grades of 12 and 17, respectively. In sum, the total number of points for each post together with the percentiles confirm the correctness of the information provided in the equivalency table. Therefore, we agree with the Commissioner-General that the Classification Reports of 15 August 2022 were relevant and sufficient documents that demonstrated that the reclassification exercise had a rational connection with the equivalency table and the guidelines. Appellants’ argument cannot, therefore, succeed.

³⁶ The Commissioner-General’s response to Order No. 078 (UNRWA/DT/2024), para. 5; response to Order No. 079 (UNRWA/DT/2024), para. 4.

³⁷ As contended by the Agency, there is no Grade 19 for the professional category of area staff (see *ibid.*).

61. In respect of the Appellants' other arguments, we affirm the UNRWA DT's conclusion that it was the Appellants' burden to identify a specific error or abuse of discretion in the reclassification of their posts.³⁸ This is not because the initial burden was on Appellants, as the impugned Judgment appears to imply. Rather, it is because the burden shifted to Appellants after the Agency had met its initial burden of minimal showing.³⁹ It was, therefore, the Appellants' burden to show by clear and convincing evidence that the Agency had erred. In this regard, we agree that Appellants failed to show anything *specific* that was unfair or incorrect in the Agency's job classification tool or its application to their cases.⁴⁰ Further, and notwithstanding the various anomalies in the reclassification process that the UNRWA DT noted, Appellants had failed to identify a *material* impact of the lack of guidance on the updated post descriptions,⁴¹ or a *material* task that was overlooked or mischaracterized by Human Resources personnel during the reclassification process.⁴²

62. Instead of identifying material errors in the reclassification process, Appellants reengage in generic arguments that have already failed before the UNRWA DT because of their irrelevance or insufficiency.⁴³ In so doing, Appellants appear to be rearguing their cases without showing in what respect and for what reasons the UNRWA DT erred. Their arguments are, therefore, deemed to be dismissed.

63. Finally, we address the Appellants' argument that the UNRWA DT erred when it held that "even significant changes to a staff member's post description may not warrant a higher grade".⁴⁴ Appellants submit that the UNRWA DT contradicted its prior Judgment in *Loubani* where increased duties and responsibilities were found to be a valid reason justifying the payment of a special allowance or an upgrade of the staff member's post.⁴⁵ However, Appellants seem to drag this section of the impugned Judgment out of its context. In the relevant part of the impugned Judgment, the UNRWA DT rightly found that comparing the previous and current post

³⁸ Impugned Judgment, para. 71.

³⁹ *Rolland v. Secretary-General of the United Nations*, Judgment No. 2011-UNAT-122, para. 26.

⁴⁰ Impugned Judgment, paras. 73 and 78.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, para. 72.

⁴² *Ibid.*, para. 77.

⁴³ Ms. Abualainain's appeal brief, paras. 8, 9, 11(a), 11(c), 12, 12bis(c), 12bis(d), 12bis(e), and 15; Ms. Aljuju's appeal brief, para. 7.

⁴⁴ Impugned Judgment, para. 69.

⁴⁵ *Loubani* Judgment, *op. cit.* Although Appellants referred to the *Loubani* Judgment by number UNRWA/DT/2020/030 as a relevant case of reclassification of the post, this reference is incorrect. The number refers to a case of another staff member in a different and irrelevant matter. We agree with the Commissioner-General that the relevant case of *Loubani*, on which Appellants sought to rely, is Judgment No. UNRWA/DT/2022/030.

descriptions had no bearing on the correctness of the reclassification.⁴⁶ The reclassification exercise was conducted according to the updated post descriptions provided by the staff members and approved by their supervisors, using the UNRWA job classification tool to issue the Classification Reports. The reclassification involved an independent assessment of each post according to the most up-to-date job description, and the former job description was not taken into consideration. Therefore, any difference between the previous and the most up-to-date job descriptions was not relevant in determining whether the reclassification exercise itself was performed in a lawful manner. In so deciding, we find that the UNRWA DT did not err.

64. For these reasons, the appeals must fail.

⁴⁶ Impugned Judgment, para. 69.

Judgment

65. The appeals are dismissed, and Judgment No. UNRWA/DT/2024/026 is hereby affirmed.

Original and Authoritative Version: English

Dated this 27th day of June 2025 in New York, United States.

(Signed)

Judge Sheha, Presiding

(Signed)

Judge Forbang

(Signed)

Judge Gao

Judgment published and entered into the Register on this 14th day of August 2025 in New York, United States.

(Signed)

Juliet E. Johnson,
Registrar