

A. G. (No. 4)

v.

WHO

139th Session

Judgment No. 5001

THE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,

Considering the fourth complaint filed by Ms C. A. A. G. against the World Health Organization (WHO) on 24 September 2020 and corrected on 8 October 2020, WHO's reply of 9 February 2021, corrected on 15 February 2021, the complainant's rejoinder of 9 April 2021, WHO's surrejoinder of 12 July 2021, the complainant's additional submissions of 5 August 2021, WHO's comments thereon dated 10 November 2021, the documents produced by WHO following an order for disclosure by the President of the Tribunal, and the complainant's final comments of 28 February 2022;

Considering Articles II, paragraph 5, and VII of the Statute of the Tribunal;

Having examined the written submissions;

Considering that the facts of the case may be summed up as follows:

The complainant challenges the decision to reassign her in the context of the 2019 Mobility Exercise.

The complainant joined UNAIDS – a joint and co-sponsored United Nations programme on HIV/AIDS administered by WHO – in July 2011. Having initially served under temporary appointments, she obtained a fixed-term appointment in August 2012. She was based in Geneva, Switzerland, and her letter of appointment specified that the standard duration of appointment (SDA) for that duty station was five

years. At the material time, she held the position of Executive Officer in the Office of the Deputy Executive Director, Management and Governance, at grade P-4.

Staff Rule 515.1 relevantly provides that “staff members on continuing or fixed-term appointments in the professional category [...] may be subject to reassignment through a mobility exercise [...]”. The mobility policy at UNAIDS is set out in Information Note HRM/IN 2014-4, entitled “Mobility Policy and Procedures”. According to paragraph 9 of the Mobility Policy and Procedures, staff members in the Professional and higher categories serving on fixed-term appointments are normally eligible and due for mobility in the year in which they complete the SDA for their duty station. In 2018, when the complainant had completed the SDA for Geneva, her participation in the annual Mobility Exercise was waived at the request of her supervisor. In 2019, however, she was expected to participate in the Mobility Exercise, as neither she nor her supervisor had requested a waiver. The complainant submitted an application form indicating her preferences amongst the various positions included in the Mobility Exercise. She identified six positions, all of which were based in Geneva. In March 2019, the Mobility and Reassignment Committee (MRC) examined approximately 45 applications received from staff members participating in the 2019 Mobility Exercise, including the complainant’s, and matched them against the positions listed in the compendium of mobility positions. The MRC then submitted its recommendations to the Executive Director of UNAIDS. It recommended that the complainant be reassigned to a position in Malawi, namely the P-4 position of Fast-Track Adviser, noting that she possessed experience which would be useful in that position.

By a letter of 12 April 2019, the complainant was informed by the Director of Human Resources Management (HRM) that the Executive Director had decided to reassign her to the position in Malawi. She was asked to sign and return a copy of the letter by 30 April, indicating when she anticipated being able to report for duty in her new duty station. On 30 April, the complainant asked the Director, HRM, to allow her an additional month to consider whether she could accept this reassignment,

in view of her family circumstances, namely, the fact that she had two young children and that, as mentioned in her mobility application form, her spouse was taking up a new job in Geneva. Having been granted an extension until 10 May 2019, the complainant asked to be provided with a redacted copy of the MRC's report and a copy of the Executive Director's decision concerning her reassignment.

In an email of 10 May 2019 addressed to the Director, HRM, the complainant stated that, after giving serious consideration to the proposed reassignment, she was surprised that the MRC had recommended her for the position in Malawi, as it was not well matched to her expertise, experience and education. She pointed out that, in the context of two recruitment competitions in which she had recently participated, for P-5 positions based in Geneva, although she had ultimately not been selected for the advertised positions, the MRC had recognized her qualifications and had recommended that she be offered career development opportunities. In her view, the position in Malawi was outside her field of work and expertise and did not constitute an opportunity for career development. Referring to earlier communications, the complainant also expressed her fear "that these decisions [were] influenced by other factors and that as a result of these [she] [was] being effectively side-lined from the Organization's work and its senior management". Lastly, the complainant observed that it was highly unlikely that her spouse would be able to secure employment in Malawi and that "[t]his reassignment would also mean dramatic changes for [her] three-year-old twins", who would be starting school in September 2019. The complainant requested an opportunity to discuss alternatives.

A copy of the MRC's recommendations, which included a page showing the Executive Director's decisions, was sent to the complainant on 14 May 2019. A meeting took place on 15 May 2019 between the complainant, the Director, HRM, and another official from HRM. At the end of that meeting, after the complainant had again voiced her concerns over the reassignment, she was handed a letter signed by the Director, HRM, indicating that she was to take up her duties in Malawi on 12 July 2019. The complainant was asked to sign and return a copy of the letter the following day, confirming her acceptance of the

reassignment. However, on 16 May 2019, the complainant was placed on sick leave by her doctor, and at this juncture she did not indicate whether she accepted or refused the reassignment.

Towards the end of May 2019, the complainant contacted WHO's Office of Compliance, Risk Management and Ethics (WHO/CRE) seeking guidance about what she viewed as acts of retaliation by senior managers at UNAIDS. She chose to contact WHO/CRE rather than the UNAIDS Ethics Office, because she had grave concerns about the confidentiality of UNAIDS processes. In a memorandum dated 23 July 2019, addressed to an official of WHO/CRE to whom she had spoken by videoconference on 9 July, the complainant explained that she believed certain members of senior management wanted her removed from Headquarters, or even from UNAIDS altogether, because of the stance she had taken in relation to allegations of sexual harassment against a senior official of UNAIDS, which were then the subject of an external investigation. As examples of the retaliation she believed she was suffering, she pointed to the decisions not to select her for the two P-5 positions mentioned above, for which she had emerged as the best internal candidate, the refusal of a request to receive "acting pay" for having performed duties at a higher level and, finally, the decision to reassign her to a position in Malawi for which she lacked the requisite skills, experience and educational background. WHO/CRE informed the complainant that, in order for the alleged retaliation to be established, it would be necessary to refer the matter to the Office of Internal Oversight Services (IOS), but the complainant indicated that she preferred not to seek an investigation and to pursue informal resolution efforts instead.

On 20 November 2019, the Director of WHO/CRE sent a memorandum to the Executive Director of UNAIDS recommending that the complainant be protected preventatively from retaliation. He explained that the complainant had participated, as a witness, in the abovementioned external investigation, and that "[WHO]/CRE ha[d] established a prima facie linkage between [the complainant]'s concern of continued and intensifying backlash and her refusal to sign a letter of support in the context of allegations of sexual harassment, which would

indicate a high likelihood of further retaliation in connection with her on-going collaboration with a duly authorized investigation into the same". That same day, the complainant's counsel also wrote to the Executive Director concerning the complainant's situation, mentioning, in particular, the retaliation she believed she was suffering. Both communications went unanswered, though UNAIDS explains, in its submissions before the Tribunal, that the memorandum from the Director of WHO/CRE was not seen by HRM until November 2020.

Meanwhile, on 31 May 2019, the complainant submitted a request for administrative review of the decision of 12 April 2019 reassigning her to the position in Malawi. This request was rejected by a decision of 17 July 2019 and the complainant then lodged an appeal with the Global Board of Appeal (GBA). The GBA issued its report on 29 May 2020, recommending that the appeal be dismissed. It concluded that the reassignment process had been correctly followed, that the position to which the complainant had been reassigned was at the same level of responsibility as her previous position and was commensurate with her skills, experience and qualifications, and that the bias, retaliation, disrespectful treatment and humiliation alleged by complainant were not established.

By a decision of 26 June 2020, the Executive Director accepted the recommendation of the GBA and dismissed the complainant's appeal. That is the impugned decision.

The complainant asks the Tribunal to set aside the impugned decision and to order UNAIDS to reinstate her in a position commensurate with her experience, skills and education, preferably at Headquarters. She claims moral damages of at least 100,000 Swiss francs, costs, and interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum on all amounts awarded. Lastly, she seeks any other relief deemed necessary, just and fair.

WHO asks the Tribunal to dismiss the complaint as without merit.

CONSIDERATIONS

1. In her internal appeal to the Global Board of Appeal (GBA), the complainant challenged the administrative decision, dated 17 July 2019, which confirmed her reassignment to the position of Fast-Track Adviser, in Lilongwe, Malawi. Her reassignment was made under the 2019 Mobility Exercise as her standard duration of appointment of five years in Geneva, Switzerland, had expired in 2018, but her participation in the 2018 Mobility Exercise was waived at the request of her supervisor. In October 2018, the Director, Human Resources Management (HRM), informed the complainant that she was expected to participate in the 2019 Mobility Exercise and that any request for a personal or managerial waiver should be submitted by 28 October 2018. No waiver request was submitted and the complainant submitted an application form for the 2019 Mobility Exercise on 4 December 2018. In it, she listed her preferences for four grade P-5 and two grade P-4 positions in Geneva, which she stated she was most qualified to fill. Under the heading “Personal Considerations”, she stated that her husband was expected to commence work in Geneva in March 2019, after he had tried for a number of years to find employment there, and that they wished to remain in Geneva for the time being. Eventually, the Executive Director decided to reassign her to Malawi. Her internal challenges to that decision were unsuccessful, culminating in this complaint requesting the Tribunal to set aside the impugned decision. The complainant also seeks an order that UNAIDS reassign her to a position commensurate with her experience, skills and education, preferably at its Geneva Headquarters, as well as moral damages, costs and interest at 5 per cent on all amounts awarded.

2. As the complainant challenges a reassignment decision, the Tribunal recalls its case law which recognizes the wide discretion of an executive head of an international organization to reassign staff in the interest of the organization. So far as concerns UNAIDS, the discretion is enshrined in Article 1.2 of the Staff Regulations, which states that all staff members are subject to the authority of the executive head of the organization and to assignment by her or him to any of the activities or

offices of the organization. The Tribunal has therefore stated that it may interfere with a decision to reassign a staff member only on the limited grounds that the decision was taken *ultra vires* or shows a formal or procedural flaw or mistake of fact or law, if some material fact was overlooked, if there was misuse of authority or an obviously wrong inference was drawn from the evidence. The Tribunal has however emphasised that the organization must show due regard, in both form and substance, for the dignity of the official concerned, particularly by providing her or him with work of the same level of responsibilities as she or he performed in the previous post and matching her or his qualifications (see Judgment 4599, consideration 19). The Tribunal has also stated, in consideration 2 of Judgment 4595, for example, that an international organization must carefully take into account the interests and dignity of staff members when effecting a transfer to which the staff member concerned is opposed. It is incumbent upon an international organization to prove that a procedure which it has put in place has been duly followed, particularly if the implementation thereof is disputed. The Tribunal has also stated that every international organization is bound by a duty of care to treat its staff members with dignity and avoid causing them undue and unnecessary injury. While the head of an international organization must take into account the organization's interests as well as the staff member's abilities and interests in the exercise of the discretion to transfer a staff member, in cases where the two are at odds, greater weight may be accorded by the decision-maker to the interests of the organization.

3. Regarding the applicable rules, in addition to Article 1.2 of the Staff Regulations, Article 4.2 relevantly states that the paramount consideration in the reassignment of staff members shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. The complainant states that this provision, and paragraph 29 of Information Note HRM/IN 2014-4 (Mobility Policy and Procedures), require the Mobility and Reassignment Committee (MRC), in its advisory role in matters of reassignment under the Mobility Policy, to take into account the needs of the Secretariat and that reassignment decisions must be taken in good faith.

Staff Rule 510.1 relevantly states that staff members in the Professional category are subject to assignment to any activity or office of the Organization throughout the world. Staff Rule 515.1 relevantly states that, further to Staff Regulation 1.2 and Staff Rule 510.1, staff members on fixed-term appointments in the Professional category may be subject to reassignment through a mobility exercise conducted by a global mobility committee.

As well, paragraph 1 of the Mobility Policy and Procedures then in force, states that the effective implementation of UNAIDS' evolving mandate requires a dedicated, country-oriented, multi-skilled, versatile, diverse, and mobile workforce. Paragraph 2 states that all staff members are subject to the authority of the Executive Director and to assignment by him or her to any of the activities or offices of UNAIDS. Paragraph 3 states that with timely placement of qualified staff in positions around the world, mobility helps to ensure that UNAIDS' workforce is fit for purpose. It further states that mobility is implemented through an assessment of the interests, operational needs and priorities of the Secretariat, staff qualifications, experience, performance, and, to the extent possible, career aspirations, individual preferences and personal considerations. Under paragraph 17, the MRC was mandated by the Executive Director to be the principal mechanism to facilitate the Mobility Exercise and to serve as a reassignment committee to coordinate the reassignment process for qualifying staff members.

4. The complainant advances three grounds to challenge the impugned decision. She submits, in effect: (1) that the GBA did not duly consider her allegation that the decision to reassign her to Malawi was tainted by bias and abuse of authority; (2) that the GBA wrongly concluded that the position of Fast-Track Adviser in Malawi was comparable to the position she held at the material time in terms of qualifications, experience and educational requirements; and (3) that the GBA erred by concluding that the Director, HRM, had not treated her with disrespect.

5. As a precursor to considering these grounds, an issue raised by WHO concerning the receivability and scope of the complaint will be addressed. WHO states that it does not object to the receivability of this complaint insofar as it pertains to the complainant's claims relating to UNAIDS' decision to reassign her to the position of Fast-Track Adviser in Malawi in the context of the 2019 Mobility Exercise. However, it asks the Tribunal to disregard, as outside the scope of this complaint, other claims or references the complainant makes relating to her request for acting pay, her challenge to two decisions not to select her for P-5 level posts (already considered in Judgments 4866 and 4865), and a decision concerning home leave. It also points out that her reference to her absence on sick leave as "service-incurred" is incorrect in light of the Director-General's decision of 10 December 2020 accepting the recommendation of the WHO Advisory Committee on Compensation Claims that the complainant's illness was not to be recognized as having been service-incurred. Whilst the Tribunal agrees with WHO that claims concerning these matters are outside the scope of the present complaint, it notes the complainant's statement which suggests that such pleas may be relevant to support her allegations that the decision to reassign her to Malawi was tainted by bias, retaliation and abuse of authority. The Tribunal may only consider these pleas as such.

6. Regarding the first ground, in her internal appeal, the complainant submitted that her reassignment to Malawi was a disguised disciplinary sanction motivated by bias and retaliation, including because of "her reticence to sign a letter of support for the alleged sexual harasser". In its report, the GBA noted that the complainant did not provide documents to support these allegations but observed that she stated that she was ready to provide them "should [the GBA] find it necessary". The GBA then recalled the case law in consideration 6 of Judgment 3748 and consideration 9 of Judgment 3380 to the effect that the complainant bears the burden to prove allegations of bias and to establish that the actions or conduct complained of were retaliatory and the evidence produced must be of sufficient weight to persuade the Tribunal, and, further, that reasonable inferences can only be drawn from known facts and cannot be based on suspicion or unsupported

allegations. By reference to consideration 14 of Judgment 4863, the Tribunal confirms that these are the applicable principles, including to prove allegations of abuse of authority, and notes, further, the statement in that consideration that the existence of a hidden disciplinary measure cannot be inferred from mere conjecture and could not be accepted unless it were proven.

Having referred to the principles, the GBA observed that the statements the complainant made to support the allegations were general and unsupported by evidence. It concluded that there was no evidence of bias or retaliation on the part of the complainant's supervisor, who had recommended the complainant as a second choice for two other positions under her supervision during her feedback to the MRC, one of which was a P-5 position which the complainant had listed amongst her preferences and the other a position for which she did not apply. In light of this, the GBA further concluded that the allegations were not established.

7. The complainant states, in effect, that she argued throughout the internal proceedings that the decision to reassign her to Malawi was tainted with bias and abuse of authority because she had refused to support the position of senior managers, some of whom were members of the MRC, concerning a widely-publicised case of sexual harassment involving a senior UNAIDS official. In her view, the Administration's bias against her was also manifested in several other adverse decisions, namely her non-selection for two posts for which she was well qualified, the refusal to grant her acting pay for having performed functions at a higher level, and the refusal of her request for home leave. The Tribunal discerns nothing in these statements that casts doubt on the GBA's conclusion that the complainant did not discharge the required burden to prove the allegations. However, the complainant points out that the decision on her request for administrative review simply rejected her subject allegations as being beyond the scope of the review, and she was encouraged to seek guidance from the UNAIDS Ethics Officer. She adds that the GBA noted that she had volunteered to provide further evidence to support these allegations, but concluded that they were not established, without even inviting her to produce such

evidence: a conclusion that was endorsed by the Executive Director in the impugned decision.

8. In July 2021, after WHO had filed its surrejoinder, the President of the Tribunal granted the complainant's request for leave to file additional submissions. She states that she made that request as there appeared to be some confusion on the part of UNAIDS as to whether it was informed by WHO's Office of Compliance, Risk Management and Ethics (WHO/CRE) about her retaliation allegations, and, if so, when. The complainant submits that as she has consistently claimed that retaliation was the basis for the decision to reassign her to the post in Malawi for which she was not qualified, this information is essential to her claims of bias and retaliation. In her additional submissions, she chronicles exchanges concerning these allegations. In its comments on the additional submissions, WHO states that UNAIDS' HRM Department had been contacted by WHO/CRE concerning the complainant's claims of retaliation case in November 2020, and it was only then that it became aware that the Director of WHO/CRE had written to the Executive Director of UNAIDS a year earlier, on 20 November 2019, recommending that the complainant be protected from future retaliation that she might suffer as a result of her participation in the investigation into alleged sexual harassment by a senior UNAIDS official.

9. In its submissions before the Tribunal, WHO makes no comment about whether the Executive Director of UNAIDS saw the memorandum from the Director of WHO/CRE at the time when it was sent (in 2019). There is also in the file a letter from the complainant's counsel to the Executive Director of UNAIDS, likewise dated 20 November 2019, in which the complainant's concerns about retaliation were clearly mentioned. Again, there is no comment from WHO as to whether the Executive Director saw this letter at the time. The complainant appears to have rejected the proposal of WHO/CRE that her allegations be referred to the Office of Internal Oversight Services (IOS) for investigation, preferring to seek an informal solution. This may explain to some extent why the action taken by

WHO/CRE in response to the reporting of her concerns remained limited. So far as concerns UNAIDS, the Director of HRM pointed out, in a memorandum of 18 November 2020, that the recommendation from WHO/CRE was moot, having regard to subsequent events. However, neither by this account of events, the documents submitted with the additional submissions by the parties, nor indeed the evidence in the record, has the complainant provided evidence of sufficient quality or weight to persuade the Tribunal that the decision to reassign her to Malawi was taken because of bias, bad faith, retaliation, as a hidden disciplinary sanction and/or abuse of authority, as she alleges. In particular, although it is significant that WHO/CRE recommended that the complainant be “protected preventatively” from retaliation based on a *prima facie* assessment of her allegations, this does not, in itself, establish that the alleged retaliation occurred. Moreover, the complainant’s assertion that the former Executive Director and members of the MRC were well aware that she could not accept the reassignment on account of her spouse’s precarious employment situation, viewed in the context of the purpose of the Mobility Exercise and the interest of the Organization, advances her case no further. The first ground is therefore unfounded.

10. Regarding the second ground, in its report the GBA noted the complainant’s contention that the duties and responsibilities of the position to which she was reassigned did not match her qualifications, experience and educational background, whereas her own reassignment preferences and personal considerations had been disregarded. The GBA stated that it reviewed the regulatory framework related to the Mobility Exercise, including Staff Regulations 1.2 and 4.2; Staff Rules 510 and 515; Information Note HRM/IN 2014-4 on “Mobility Policy and Procedures”, particularly paragraph 3 (referred to in consideration 3 of this judgment) as well as Information Note HRM/IN 2014-5 on “[MRC] terms of reference”. The GBA further noted the procedure by which the complainant was eventually reassigned to the position in Malawi in light of paragraphs 27, 29, 39 and 42 of HRM/IN 2014-4, as well as the discretionary power of the Executive Director to reassign staff. It noted particularly that the Organization is required to

provide work of the same level of responsibilities matching the staff member's qualifications. It then stated that it compared the post descriptions of the position the complainant encumbered and the one to which she was reassigned and concluded that, although not identical, they were at the same level of responsibilities and matched her qualifications having common duties related to collaboration, coordination and supporting partnerships with governments, donors and civil society, which the GBA stated corresponded to the complainant's experience highlighted in her motivation statement that accompanied her mobility application. The GBA further stated that having reviewed the post descriptions for the complainant's preferred positions, it observed that they were either not identical to those of the position she encumbered or did not match well with her qualifications and experience. In the GBA's view, the MRC had thoroughly considered her qualifications and personal circumstances and experience in gender, networking and change management in recommending her reassignment to the position in Malawi and balanced the different factors in recommending her reassignment as required by paragraphs 29 and 30 of HRM/IN 2014-4.

11. The complainant submits, in effect, that the GBA's reasoning and conclusion were wrong because her experience was not in public health; the Malawi post was clearly outside her field of work and expertise, and it is hard to see how reassigning her to that post could possibly be in the best interests of UNAIDS. She also submits that had the MRC duly considered her experience and education, it would have realized that she did not meet the minimum requirements of the Malawi position and that her assignment to that post would have been in breach of Article 4.2 of the Staff Regulations, which relevantly requires that the paramount consideration in the reassignment of staff members shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity in the interest of the Organization. The complainant further states that she listed the posts for which she considered herself to be qualified and the fact that she had exhausted her standard duration of appointment (SDA) in Geneva was not a legitimate reason to assign her to a post for which she was not qualified.

In response, WHO submits, in effect, that the complainant, who did not list any field positions in her application, had exhausted her SDA in Geneva; the MRC legitimately determined that she was unsuitable for another Geneva-based position and, under the applicable rules, particularly paragraph 30 of HRM/IN 2014-4, it was entitled to identify suitable positions for which she had not applied and the position identified for her reassignment was considered to be a good fit for the complainant and to be in the best interests of the Organization.

12. The Tribunal is satisfied that the GBA correctly assessed the posts and reasonably concluded that the position to which the complainant was reassigned, although not identical to her previous position, was at the same level of responsibilities and matched her qualifications, and that the post descriptions for the positions she had listed in her mobility application were either not identical to those of the position she encumbered or were not well matched to her qualifications and experience. Accordingly, the second ground is unfounded.

13. Regarding the third ground, in its report, the GBA noted the complainant's contention that she was humiliated and treated disrespectfully by the way the effective date of her reassignment was communicated to her and that the Director, HRM, acted in bad faith by handing her a pre-prepared letter at the end of the meeting of 15 May 2019. The GBA noted the case law which states, in consideration 14 of Judgment 4178, that "[a]n organisation must care for the dignity of its staff members and not cause them unnecessary personal distress and disappointment where this could be avoided". The GBA then noted that the reassignment decision was first communicated to the complainant on 12 April 2019, as well as the other steps the Administration took in relation to her reassignment, which culminated in the handing over of the letter at the meeting of 15 May 2019. The GBA further in effect noted that as the complainant neither confirmed the reassignment nor suggested a date to take up her duties at the duty station in Malawi, it was reasonable for the Administration to set the date in consultation with her current and future supervisors, thereby complying with paragraph 42 of HRM/IN 2014-4, which required staff to relocate

normally within three months of being notified of a reassignment decision. Briefly explaining what transpired at the meeting of 15 May 2019, the GBA concluded that it did not discern any disrespect or bad faith on the part of the Director, HRM, in explaining management's position on the matter and handing over the signed letter to the complainant. Thereby, the Administration had discharged its normal functions respectfully, appropriately and not subjecting the complainant to unnecessary personal distress or humiliation.

14. The Tribunal finds that the GBA's assessment and conclusion was open to it in all of the circumstances. This finding is not obviated by the complainant's submission to the effect that the GBA ignored or missed the point of her account of her meeting of 15 May 2019 with the Director, HRM, and another Human Resources official, who showed no empathy for her situation. Neither is it obviated because, as the complainant suggests, handing her a signed letter with a predetermined start date for the reassignment at the end of the meeting shows that there was never any intention to consider alternatives or to engage in any meaningful consultation with her, and the attitude of the Director, HRM, was dismissive and disrespectful, causing her unnecessary distress. The third ground is also unfounded.

15. The complainant sought oral proceedings, but the Tribunal is satisfied it is in a position to make a fair and balanced decision having regard to the written material provided by the parties.

16. Based on the foregoing findings, the complaint will be dismissed.

DECISION

For the above reasons,
The complaint is dismissed.

In witness of this judgment, adopted on 18 October 2024, Mr Michael F. Moore, Vice-President of the Tribunal, Sir Hugh A. Rawlins, Judge, and Ms Hongyu Shen, Judge, sign below, as do I, Mirka Dreger, Registrar.

Delivered on 6 February 2025 by video recording posted on the Tribunal's Internet page.

MICHAEL F. MOORE

HUGH A. RAWLINS

HONGYU SHEN

MIRKA DREGER