



Before: Judge Sun Xiangzhuang

Registry: Geneva

Registrar: René M. Vargas M.

HASSAN

v.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

**ORDER
ON CASE MANAGEMENT**

Counsel for Applicant:

Self-represented

Counsel for Respondent:

Fatuma Mninde-Silungwe, AS/ALD/OHR

Introduction

1. By application filed on 12 August 2023, the Applicant contests the decision not to select him for the P-4 post of Chief Finance and Budget Officer, United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei (“UNISFA”), advertised under “Recruit from Roster” Job Opening No. 198446.
2. The Respondent filed his reply on 14 September 2023.
3. By Order No. 153 (GVA/2023) of 13 November 2023, the Tribunal ordered the Applicant to file a rejoinder by 13 December 2023. It also instructed the parties to explore resolving the dispute amicably and revert to the Tribunal in this respect by 20 December 2023.
4. On 5 December 2023, the Respondent filed a motion for leave to submit new evidence.
5. On 13 December 2023, the Applicant filed his rejoinder.
6. On 19 December 2023, the parties filed a joint submission informing the Tribunal that their discussion on a possible amicable settlement failed. They thus requested the Tribunal to proceed with the adjudication of the case and allow them the opportunity to file closing submissions.
7. By Order No. 5 (GVA/2024) of 17 January 2024, the Tribunal granted the Respondent’s motion to submit new evidence.

Consideration

8. Having reviewed the parties’ submissions to date, the Tribunal noticed that the explanation in the “Candidates Review Matrix” for longlisting the Applicant was that he has “experience primarily in finance, not budget”. However, the Applicant’s Personal History Profile (“PHP”) shows years of experience as a Finance and Budget Officer, plus several detailed duties in budget.

9. Furthermore, all candidates that were considered at the last stage of the selection process had the same title of “Finance and Budget Officer” as the Applicant.

10. In view of the foregoing, the Tribunal considers it appropriate to instruct the Respondent to clarify why the Applicant’s experience was deemed primarily in finance and not budget, whereas that of the other candidates was not.

11. Given this apparent contradiction, the Respondent is instructed to clarify how the shortlisting assessment was done and to present all the evidence related to said assessment. More specifically, the Respondent shall clarify the following:

- a. What were the pre-determined criteria for shortlisting candidates; and
- b. Explain how the Applicant had less budget experience than the other candidates given the work experience described in his PHP.

Conclusion

12. In view of the foregoing, it is ORDERED THAT the Respondent shall file the information indicated in para. 11 above by **Monday, 3 June 2024**.

(Signed)

Judge Sun Xiangzhuang

Dated this 23rd day of May 2024

Entered in the Register on this 23rd day of May 2024

(Signed)

René M. Vargas M., Registrar, Geneva