





7. By memorandum dated 31 December 2009, the Chief, Human Resources Section, UNAMI, informed the applicant that his appointment would not be extended beyond 31 December 2009 due to “unavailability of the function of Interpreter/Language Assistant at the FS-5 level”.
8. By letter dated 14 January 2010 to the Secretary-General, the applicant requested a management evaluation of the decision not to renew his appointment.
9. By memorandum dated 18 January 2010, the Chief, Human Resources Section, UNAMI, informed the applicant that his date of close of business with the Organization had been changed to 3 February 2010.
10. By letter dated 26 January 2010, the applicant completed his initial request for management evaluation.
11. By letter dated 11 March 2010, the Under-Secretary-General for Management replied to the applicant’s request for a management evaluation and informed him that the Secretary-General had decided to uphold the contested decision.
12. On 15 March 2010, the applicant filed an appeal before the Tribunal.
13. On 16 March 13.





(a) A temporary appointment shall be granted for a period of less than one year to meet seasonal or peak workloads and specific short-term requirements, having an expiration date



reassignment to UNAMI, and after that, as a staff member of UNAMI on temporary assignment whose post had been abolished.

28. The former United Nations Administrative Tribunal has consistently held that “a good faith effort must be made by the Organization to find alternative posts for permanent staff members whose post are abolished” (see UNAT Judgement No. 910, Soares (1998), citing Judgement No. 447, Abbas (1989); Judgement No. 85, Carson (1962); Judgement No. 1128, Banerjee (2003)). The Tribunal has stated that such a duty is strictly speaking limited to staff members





successful in a selection process for a vacant post. Furthermore, it has been the long-standing jurisprudence of the former United Nations Administrative Tribunal that a legal expectancy of renewal would not be created by efficient or even outstanding performance (see UNAT judgement No. 980, Baldwin