

JUDGE KANWALDEEP SANDHU, PRESIDING.

1. The Appellant, a staff member of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) in Geneva, appeals the decision of the Secretary-General of the WMO to accept the recommendation of the WMO's Joint Appeals Board (JAB/WMO) to implement the reduced post adjustment multiplier (PAM) for staff members of the WMO. In addition, the JAB/WMO recommended that staff members challenging the PAM pursue their grievances using the United Nations' Internal Justice System, which the Appellant now does.

2. For reasons below, we remand the matter back to the United Nations Dispute Tribunal (Dispute Tribunal or UNDT) to ensure that this case is dealt with in a manner that produces a written decision from a neutral first instance process as required by the Special Agreement between the WMO and the United Nations, dated 20 January 2020 bestowing jurisdiction on the UNDT as the neutral first instance process for the WMO (the Special Agreement).

Facts and Procedure

3. On 4 May 2018, the Appellant, along with other staff

T U N A T

Because of the above, illegal and void as a whole.

11. On or about 20 June 2019, the JAB/WMO issued its report and found it did not have the competence to decide on the decisions taken by the ICSC pursuant to Staff Rule 1111.3(e). It “noted” that the WMO’s seventh congress decided to accept the ICSC Statute and consequently was bound to respect the decisions taken

15. On 20 January 2020, the WMO joined the United Nations' Internal Justice System accepting the jurisdiction of not only the Appeals Tribunal but also the Dispute Tribunal as a result of the

19. The Appellant argues violation of the general principles of law applicable to salaries adjustments as outlined by ILOAT Judgment 4137 in pa

The Secretary-General of the WMO's Answer

23. The Secretary-General of the WMO submits that only if the impugned decision of the Secretary-General is set aside by the

T U N A T

T U N A

II. Does the JAB/WMO process comply with the Requirements of Article 2(10) of the Appeals Tribunal Statute?

38. More fundamentally, we are concerned that the contested "decision", whether that is the JAB/WMO report or the

42. In *Rolli*, the Appeals Tribunal ruled:

43. The Appeals Tribunal further held that JAB/WMO failed to make the necessary factual and legal findings in relation to the evidence produced

T U N A T

Judgment

47. The case is remanded to the UNDT for appropriate consideration.

Original and Authoritative Version: English

Dated this 26 day of June 2020.

(Signed)

Judge Sandhu, Presiding
Vancouver, Canada

(Signed)

Judge Knierim
Hamburg, Germany

(Signed)

Judge Halfeld
Bournemouth, United Kingdom

Entered in the Register on this 14 day of August 2020 in New York, United States.

(Signed)

Weicheng Lin, Registrar