

Organisation internationale du Travail
Tribunal administratif

International Labour Organization
Administrative Tribunal

*Registry's translation,
the French text alone
being authoritative.*

M. (No. 2)

v.

BIPM

140th Session

Judgment No. 5005

THE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,

Considering the second complaint filed by Mr P. M. against the International Bureau of Weights and Measures (BIPM) on 29 August 2023, the BIPM's reply of 20 October 2023, the complainant's rejoinder of 20 November 2023 and the BIPM's surrejoinder of 18 December 2023;

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

Having examined the written submissions and decided not to hold oral proceedings, for which neither party has applied;

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

The complainant challenges the decision to apply only a partial adjustment to his salary in relation to inflation.

The complainant, a staff member of the BIPM since 2 October 1991, is employed at the BIPM's Headquarters in Sèvres (France), as a technician in the Chemistry Department.

Article 10.2 of the Regulations applicable to staff members of the BIPM provides that "[t]he value of the *point* [used as the unit of the salaries scale] shall be revised on 1st January every year in accordance with the consumer price index calculated for some categories of civil

servants serving in international organisations based in France, as communicated by the services of the Coordinated Organisations”^{*}.

At its 26th meeting, held in November 2018, the General Conference on Weights and Measures (CGPM) adopted Resolution 4 on the dotation of the BIPM for 2020-2023.

In October 2019, the International Committee for Weights and Measures (CIPM) adopted Decision CIPM/108-49 establishing, in the context of this dotation, a cap of 2 per cent on the annual revision of the value of the point for salaries for the period 2020-2023, “in order to meet the BIPM’s financial obligations and essential operating requirements”. At the same time, it adopted Decision CIPM/108-50 establishing the same cap for the annual revision of pensions during the period 2020-2023. The 2 per cent cap was not reached at the annual salary review of 2020, 2021 or 2022.

On 19 September 2022, the International Service for Remunerations and Pensions (ISRP)^{**} published an explanatory note on the calculation of the annual adjustment indices applicable to salaries for staff of the Coordinated Organizations as at 1 January 2023. The note indicated the consumer price index as well as the wage adjustment index applicable in France for the period, which were estimated to increase to 6.5 and 6.1 per cent, respectively.

By a letter of 2 November 2022 addressed to the Director of the BIPM and the President of the CIPM, several staff members, including the complainant, asked that “the January 2023 adjustment of the value of the Point for salaries be not limited by the decision CIPM/108-49 2 due [to] the unusual geopolitical situation resulting in an exceptional increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) over 2022”. They pointed out that the year-on-year average consumer price index reported by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

^{*} This term refers to a group of six international organizations (of which the BIPM itself is not a member) with a common pay and pensions system.

^{**} The ISRP is a service, under the administrative authority of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which provides support to the six Coordinated Organizations and other international organizations (including the BIPM) concerning their pensions schemes and pay policies.

rose by 9.6 per cent in May 2022 and that “[i]n France the consumer prices increased by 5.8 [per cent] year on year in August 2022 for example (July 6.1 [per cent])”. They also argued that the decision of the CIPM had been adopted in 2019 on the basis of a year-on-year inflation change of approximately 0.7 per cent and that, accordingly, the “maximum adjustment of 2 [per cent] voted in 2019 [was] not coherent and [was] translating into a significant drop in purchasing power for [...] BIPM staff members”. They asked the Director and the President to find an acceptable solution to this situation and to discuss the issue at the next CIPM meeting. A letter worded in similar terms was addressed at the same time to the Director of the BIPM and the President of the CIPM by the pensioners’ representative at the Pension Fund Advisory Board concerning Decision CIPM/108-50. In October and November 2022, the Director of the BIPM met with a number of staff members, including the complainant, to discuss the strategic plan for the Organization’s work programme for 2024-2027 and to present the long-term financial plan for the work programme.

The CIPM Sub-Committee on Finance held an exceptional meeting on 23 November 2022. During the meeting, the Director explained to the members of the Sub-Committee that the increases in the value of the point for 2020 to 2022 had been lower than the 2 per cent cap provided for in Decisions CIPM/108-49 and CIPM/108-50, and proposed that the value of the point be increased by 4.5 per cent in 2023. On 28 November 2022, the Director published Note No. 15 informing staff members of the CIPM Sub-Committee’s decision to accept his proposal and recommend that the CIPM adopt a decision on the matter.

On 11 December 2022, the CIPM adopted Decision CIPM/111-13 setting the revised value of the point for 2023. Noting that the dotation agreed by the CGPM in 2018 increased by 1 per cent per annum for the period 2020-2023 and that the agreed budget assumed a 2 per cent annual rate of inflation applied to salaries, the Committee recalled that it had then taken Decision CIPM/108/49 setting a 2 per cent cap on the annual revision of the point applicable to salaries for that same period. Noting that it had not proven necessary to apply this cap from 2020 to 2022, it decided to increase the value of the point applicable to salaries

as from 1 January 2023 by 4.5 per cent. The Committee pointed out that this decision would “allow the BIPM to meet its financial obligations and essential operating requirements, while safeguarding the interests of staff given the particularly high inflation rate in France”*. The Committee also adopted Decision CIPM/111-14 which, in the same manner, reviewed the cap established for the annual revision of the point applicable to pensions for the period 2020-2023. Officials were informed of these decisions by the Director’s Note No. 16, published on 16 December 2022. Staff members were notified of the values of the points applicable to salaries and to pensions, as revised for 2023, by the Director’s Note No. 1, published on 3 January 2023.

By emails of 5 and 17 January 2023, the complainant sought clarification from the Director with regard to the adjustment of the point value, complaining of a lack of transparency on the matter. In particular, he requested the Director to indicate the actual changes in the consumer price index “on which the changes to the points were based”*.

By an email of 18 January 2023, Mr R., the organization’s Legal Adviser, replied on behalf of the Director to the complainant’s request for information. Emphasizing first that the process leading to the decisions to increase the percentage of the salary and pensions adjustment beyond the 2 per cent rate initially provided for was transparent and had been conducted fairly and in the interest of all staff. Mr R. explained that these decisions had been adopted in accordance with the applicable rules, and in particular Article 10.2.1 of the Rules, which provides that “[t]he CIPM may, if exceptional or unforeseen circumstances warranting so, phase in the adjustment of the point value, apply it in part, suspend it or defer it if the BIPM cannot, without one of these measures, meet both its financial obligations and essential operating requirements”. Mr R. further advised the complainant of the consumer price and salary adjustment indices applicable in France as from 1 January 2023, communicated by the ISRP in September 2022.

* Registry’s translation.

On 31 January 2023, the complainant received his payslip for January 2023, which reflected the 4.5 per cent adjustment to the value of the point applied to the calculation of his salary. On 20 February 2023, he filed an internal appeal against the decision “to make only a partial adjustment for inflation to the value of the point”*. He argued that the adjustment should have been equal to the actual amount of inflation, namely 6.1 per cent, and expressed the view that the statutory conditions allowing the CIPM to make only a partial adjustment for inflation to the value of the point were not met. The complainant requested the Director to set aside the contested decision, to apply a point value adjustment of 6.1 per cent to him with effect from 1 January 2023, and to award him compensation for the moral injury allegedly suffered. By a letter of 21 March 2023, the Director dismissed the complainant’s internal appeal on the grounds that the value of the point had been adjusted in accordance with the applicable rules and that the complainant was not entitled to a salary adjustment of 6.1 per cent. The complainant filed an appeal with the Appeals Committee on 27 March 2023.

In its unanimous opinion, issued on 24 May 2023, the Appeals Committee held that it was not competent to “rule on the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the impugned decision”*. It considered the adjustment of 4.5 per cent to be “reasonable in view of the current circumstances and comparable to that applied by the Coordinated Organizations”*. However, it noted a lack of transparency in the communication to staff of the data on which the decision was based. The Committee indicated that the salary adjustment rate to be taken into consideration should be the consumer price index communicated by the ISRP, namely 6.5 per cent as from 1 January 2023, and that it was from this point of reference that the mechanism provided for in Article 10.2.1 of the Rules could be applied, under conditions which must, however, be duly justified. The Committee recommended that the Director “review the entire matter”* taking into account the considerations set out in its opinion.

* Registry’s translation.

On 21 June 2023, the Director informed the complainant that he had decided to reject his appeal as unfounded. He emphasized that the decision on the adjustment of the value of the point applicable to salaries and to pensions was taken in accordance with the applicable rules and in the interest of all staff. This is the decision impugned before the Tribunal.

The complainant asks the Tribunal to set aside the impugned decision and to order the BIPM to apply a 6.5 per cent adjustment to the value of the point to his salary with effect from 1 January 2023. He also claims damages in the amount of 2,700 euros in compensation for the moral injury he considers he has suffered, as well as an award of 200 euros in costs.

The BIPM asks the Tribunal to dismiss the complaint as unfounded.

CONSIDERATIONS

1. The complainant challenges before the Tribunal the decision of 21 June 2023 whereby the Director of the BIPM dismissed his internal appeal challenging the decision to apply, with effect from 1 January 2023, an increase of only 4.5 per cent to his salary. This increase, resulting from Decision CIPM/111-13 of 11 December 2022 whereby the International Committee for Weights and Measures (CIPM) set salary revisions at this level for 2023, amounted in fact to only a partial adjustment in relation to inflation – which was very high, due in particular to the consequences of an international conflict arising in Europe – recorded in France in 2022.

The complainant considers that the salaries of Bureau staff should in fact have been reassessed, in accordance with the applicable provisions, in line with changes in the consumer price index communicated by the ISRP for the revision of salaries for 2023, namely 6.5 per cent. He therefore challenges the lawfulness of Decision CIPM/111-13, mentioned above.

2. The principles governing the limits on the discretion of international organizations to set adjustments in staff pay have been clearly established in the Tribunal's case law (see, in particular, Judgments 4842, consideration 10, 3324, consideration 16, 2081, consideration 8, 1912, consideration 13, and 1821, consideration 7).

Under the terms of consideration 7 of Judgment 1821 – which are reproduced in the various other precedents cited above – those principles may be concisely stated as follows:

“(a) An international organisation is free to choose a methodology, system or standard of reference for determining salary adjustments for its staff provided that it meets all other principles of international civil service law: Judgment 1682 [...] in 6.

(b) The chosen methodology must ensure that the results are ‘stable, foreseeable and clearly understood’: Judgments 1265 [...] in 27 and 1419 [...] in 30.

(c) Where the methodology refers to an external standard but grants discretion to the governing body to depart from that standard, the organisation has a duty to state proper reasons for such departure: Judgment 1682, again in 6.

(d) While the necessity of saving money may be one valid factor to be considered in adjusting salaries provided the method adopted is objective, stable and foreseeable (Judgment 1329 [...] in 21), the mere desire to save money at the staff's expense is not by itself a valid reason for departing from an established standard of reference: Judgments 1682 in 7 and 990 [...] in 6.”

3. With regard to the BIPM, the rules governing salary adjustments are set out in Articles 10.2 and 10.2.1 of the Regulations and Rules applicable to staff members.

Article 10.2 of the Regulations reads as follows:

“The unit of the salaries scale [...] shall be the *point*. The value of the *point* shall be revised on 1st January every year in accordance with the consumer price index calculated for some categories of civil servants serving in international organisations based in France, as communicated by the services of the Coordinated Organisations.”

Article 10.2.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“The CIPM may, if exceptional or unforeseen circumstances warranting so, phase in the adjustment of the *point* value, apply it in part, suspend it or defer it if the BIPM cannot, without one of these measures, meet both its financial obligations and essential operating requirements.”

Read together, these provisions mean that the CIPM, which is responsible for setting the value of the point every year, is required to adjust the point value on the basis of the consumer price index communicated by the ISRP, unless, as a result of exceptional or unforeseen circumstances, it is impossible to make this adjustment in full (or to do so immediately on 1 January) without jeopardizing the BIPM's ability to meet its financial obligations and essential operating requirements.

4. These provisions define a methodology for salary reviews which – although relatively brief – can, in itself, be considered to meet the requirements for such a methodology under the case law referred to above.

The question which arises in this case is, however, whether, in the light of the rules established by the aforementioned Articles 10.2 and 10.2.1, the CIPM could lawfully decide that the salaries of staff members would be increased on 1 January 2023 by only 4.5 per cent rather than tracking the 6.5 per cent change in the consumer price index calculated by the ISRP.

For the reasons set out below, the Tribunal considers that the answer to this question is no.

5. The Tribunal first observes that the BIPM misconstrues the applicable provisions when it argues, in its written submissions, that Article 10.2 of the Regulations requires it only to “consider a salary review taking into account the consumer price index” communicated by the ISRP, that Article 10.2.1 of the Rules “only recalls [the] principle” that “the periodic adjustment of staff salaries is [...] a matter for the discretion of international organizations” and that “[n]one of these provisions requires the Organization to index salaries to inflation automatically”^{*}.

^{*} Registry's translation.

Contrary to the view apparently held by the defendant organization, the consumer price index does not, in the legal framework arising from the provisions in question, constitute a mere factor for consideration that it should take into account as a guideline when determining salary reviews. While there is no such requirement in the particular situation provided for in Article 10.2.1, Article 10.2 clearly requires the BIPM to adjust staff salaries in accordance with changes in this index. In this regard, the ruling in question is distinct from the legal framework applicable in some of the cases to which the case law cited above referred.

Furthermore, Article 10.2.1 allows the Bureau to waive the requirement to align salaries with the consumer price index only when the specific conditions set out therein are met. Far from merely reaffirming the organization's discretionary authority regarding salary adjustments, this Article substantially circumscribes the exercise of this discretion, as the Tribunal has, besides, already had occasion to emphasize in judgments – relating to the challenge to the BIPM Pension and Provident Fund pension point – where it was called upon to interpret the same Article (see Judgments 4278, consideration 15, and 4277, consideration 19).

6. In order to limit the salary adjustment granted as from 1 January 2023 to 4.5 per cent despite the higher inflation rate recorded in France, the CIPM relied, according to the grounds for Decision CIPM/111-13, on Decision CIPM/108-49, adopted in October 2019, whereby it set a 2 per cent cap that it would apply at each annual salary review during the period from 2020 to 2023. This cap was purportedly consistent with the dotation of the Bureau, approved by the General Conference on Weights and Measures (CGPM), for the corresponding quadrennium in November 2018, which increased by 1 per cent per annum. The cap in question was determined on the basis of the assumption, also used by the CIPM in establishing the organization's annual budgets and, further upstream, by the CGPM itself in setting the dotation, that the inflation rate during that period would be 2 per cent per annum.

Since the actual inflation initially proved lower than this estimate, there were no grounds to apply the cap so defined from 2020 to 2022, and the overall increase in the value of the point granted over these three years amounted to only 3.5 per cent. It was in view of the fact that only this portion of the total amount of the projected increase for the quadrennial cycle in question, namely 8 per cent, had been consumed that the CIPM decided in 2023 – the final year of the cycle – to make a salary adjustment of 4.5 per cent, corresponding to the remainder of the amount in question.

7. However, while the reasoning of the CIPM is certainly understandable in terms of expediency, the capping mechanism for the reappraisal of salaries established by Decision CIPM/108-49 and, in turn, the consequences thereof for the adjustment made in respect of 2023, are not consistent with the applicable rules.

The Tribunal in no way disregards the fact that the Bureau is under an obligation to limit the amount of its staff expenditure in accordance with the budgetary dotation allocated to it by the CGPM. Moreover, it is of course a matter of sound management for an organization to adopt, prospectively, a multi-annual programme for staff salary movements based on an estimate of inflation rates likely to be recorded over the period ahead.

However, in deciding to use the initially estimated amount of the increase in remuneration expenditure as a cap which, on principle, prevents the full adjustment of salaries in the event that inflation is higher than forecast, the CIPM adopted a mechanism incompatible with the provisions of Articles 10.2 and 10.2.1, quoted above. Article 10.2 normally requires, on the contrary, as has been stated, the value of the point to be adjusted in full in relation to the consumer price index communicated by the ISRP, and the circumstance that the change in this index exceeds the cap defined above does not in any way imply, in itself, that the conditions under which this requirement may be waived on the basis of Article 10.2.1 are met. Such a circumstance is not necessarily indicative that a situation exists in which the BIPM would

be unable to meet its “financial obligations” or “essential operating requirements” within the meaning of the provisions of the latter Article.

The CIPM therefore erred when it deemed it necessary to set the salary increase for 2023 by reference to the cap in question.

8. It would have been no less possible to set a salary adjustment lower than the rate of 6.5 per cent corresponding to the change in the consumer price index had there been evidence that full alignment with the index would in fact have led to placing the BIPM in the situation of financial difficulty referred to in Article 10.2.1. But apart from the fact that the CIPM’s choice of the 4.5 per cent rate of increase was, in any case, without legal basis for the reasons set out above, there is no evidence that a full salary adjustment would have had such an effect in the present case.

9. A comparison, made by the complainant in his written submissions, shows that, on the one hand, the budget forecasts used in 2018 to determine the amount of the dotation allocated by the CGPM for 2020-2023 and, on the other hand, the statement of actual expenditure for this period contained in the working document drafted in October 2022 for the adoption of the dotation for 2024-2027, that the funds used each year were considerably lower than initial estimates. With regard, in particular, to current staff costs, savings had been made, in 2019 to 2021 alone, amounting to a cumulative total of over 2.4 million euros – and there is no evidence to indicate that the figures for 2022, which were not known at the date on which the working document was drafted, followed a different trend.

The complainant argues that the additional cost of a salary adjustment of 6.5 per cent, over 2023, in comparison with the 4.5 per cent adjustment decided, would only amount, by his reckoning, to around 0.12 million euros, so that the available budgetary funds of the BIPM would have been amply sufficient, in his view, to fund this full adjustment.

10. The BIPM replies that this argument is merely the complainant's "personal opinion" and that it "cannot substitute itself for the Organization's discretion"*.

However, the Tribunal finds that the complainant's assertions are based on quantitative data and that the BIPM, which admits having made some savings in relation to budget forecasts, does not submit that these data are, in themselves, wrong, or provide any alternative calculations to those provided by the complainant. The defendant organization merely challenges the conclusion, which the complainant draws from the figures in question, that its financial situation was such as to allow a full salary adjustment. But the BIPM's argument that it has discretionary authority and that its assessment must therefore prevail on this point is not in itself sufficient. The Tribunal is not persuaded by any of the BIPM's other submissions in support of its argument.

11. In this regard, the BIPM first raises objections on grounds of accounting, since the use of the funds saved in order to cover a salary increase would have required their transfer to another budget line, and any funding allocation should be made on the basis of previously audited data.

However, these objections cannot be accepted.

On the one hand, the change of budget line does not really seem to be an issue in this case since the savings made on current staff costs involve specifically expenses of the same kind as salaries. The Tribunal further notes that, even supposing that a transfer of budget chapter were indeed necessary, a procedure for making such a transfer is laid down in Article 11 of the BIPM Financial Regulations.

On the other hand, the Bureau cites no specific difficulty that would have prevented it from submitting the expenditure corresponding to a salary increase of 6.5 per cent to the required authorization procedure. Maintaining, as it does in its written submissions, that such an increase would not be possible were it not initially scheduled once again calls

* Registry's translation.

into question the salary adjustment system itself provided for by Articles 10.2 and 10.2.1, quoted above.

12. The BIPM then argues, referring in particular to an observation made by the Appeals Committee in its opinion of 24 May 2023, that “noting costs and setting a budget are not the same thing”*. It points out, in this respect, that the consumption of funds for staff costs may vary due to variables – such as the time taken to fill a vacant post, or the difference in wage costs between recruited staff depending on their expatriation status – so that the fact that a budget surplus is recorded does not necessarily imply that it can be used to increase salaries.

The Tribunal does not overlook these realities. But, pursuant to the provisions quoted above, they do not obviate the requirement that the Bureau adjust salaries on the basis of the consumer price index if it turns out that it is able to do so with the available budgetary funds without failing to meet its financial obligations or compromising its essential operating requirements. Furthermore, it should be noted that the BIPM offers no evidence, and does not even appear to allege, that the savings made on staff costs during the period prior to 2023 were specifically due, in this case, to variables such as those mentioned above. There is every indication that it was, essentially, more a matter of structural savings in relation to initially scheduled current staff costs.

13. Lastly, the defendant organization argues that a 6.5 per cent salary adjustment in 2023 would have had budgetary implications in the following years, since it would have been incorporated, by definition, in the remuneration paid in future years. It maintains that this would, further, have jeopardized the overall salary adjustment of 10 per cent scheduled for the period from 2024 to 2027.

However, apart from the fact that the question of whether an organization has the financial capacity to make a salary adjustment in a given year must, in principle, be assessed essentially in light of its

* Registry’s translation.

situation in the year in question (see Judgment 3324, consideration 20), the BIPM provides no evidence whatsoever, in this case, that a 6.5 per cent salary increase in 2023 would, during the following years, have impaired its budgetary prospects to the point of endangering its financial viability. Moreover, it appears that the organization is not in a particularly difficult situation in this respect since the file shows that, by Decision CIPM/112-28 adopted in October 2023, the value of the point was increased by 5.3 per cent with effect from 1 January 2024.

14. Overall, the Tribunal finds that, while the economic consequences of the international conflict mentioned above undoubtedly constituted “exceptional or unforeseen circumstances” within the meaning of Article 10.2.1 of the Rules, the BIPM does not support its claim to have found itself in a situation where a full salary adjustment in relation to the consumer price index communicated by the ISRP would have rendered it unable to “meet both its financial obligations and essential operating requirements”, as also required by this Article for only a partial salary adjustment lawfully to be made.

The plea of unlawfulness against Decision CIPM/111-13 is therefore well founded, with the result that the individual application of that decision in the complainant’s case must be censured.

15. It follows from the foregoing, there being no need to rule on the remainder of the complainant’s submissions, that the impugned decision of 21 June 2023 must be set aside, with all legal consequences. The same applies to the decision, reflected in the complainant’s payslip for January 2023, to apply only a 4.5 per cent adjustment to the value of the point to the calculation of his salary, rather than 6.5 per cent, and the decision of 21 March 2023 dismissing the complainant’s internal appeal against that decision.

16. As a consequence of the setting aside of these decisions, the BIPM shall pay the complainant the sums corresponding to the additional remuneration that he would have received each month, as from 1 January 2023, had his salary been adjusted by 6.5 per cent on that date.

The organization shall also draw up new monthly payslips, taking into account this increased adjustment, which will replace those initially issued.

It should be noted that the fact – already mentioned above – that the value of the point was increased by 5.3 per cent, with effect from 1 January 2024, pursuant to Decision CIPM/112-28 has no bearing on the obligations set out above. While the BIPM indicates, in its reply, that this increase aimed to “add the remaining 2 per cent from 2023 to the 3 per cent salary adjustment for 2024”*, the file shows that the sole purpose of the increase, as the explanations provided by the Bureau itself in its surrejoinder indicate, was to apply the 5.3 per cent increase in the consumer price index communicated by the ISRP with a view to adjusting the value of the point for 2024. The salaries paid to the complainant as from 1 January 2024 therefore do not, as it stands, include an adjustment for the 2 per cent increase that was not granted on 1 January 2023.

Moreover, in the absence of a claim from the complainant in this respect, interest on arrears on the sums due to him will not be payable.

17. The complainant seeks compensation for the moral injury allegedly caused to him by the impugned decision. But the injury to which he refers specifically in support of this request, namely the fact that he had to devote part of his spare time to defend his interests in connection with the case, does not justify the award of such compensation. Furthermore, the Tribunal considers that, in view of the nature of the impugned decision, the consequences of which are exclusively financial, ordering the BIPM to pay the sums corresponding to the additional remuneration determined above constitutes sufficient redress to the complainant for all the injury caused by that decision. This claim for moral damages will therefore be rejected.

18. However, as the complainant succeeds for the main part, he is entitled to the award of 200 euros which he claims in costs.

* Registry’s translation.

DECISION

For the above reasons,

1. The decision of the Director of the BIPM of 21 June 2023, as well as that of 21 March 2023, and the decision, reflected in the complainant's payslip for January 2023, to apply to his salary only a 4.5 per cent adjustment to the value of the point, are set aside.
2. The BIPM shall pay the complainant, as indicated in consideration 16 above, the sums corresponding to the additional remuneration that he would have received had his salary been adjusted by 6.5 per cent as from 1 January 2023.
3. The Bureau shall pay the complainant 200 euros in costs.
4. All other claims are dismissed.

In witness of this judgment, adopted on 21 May 2025, Mr Patrick Frydman, President of the Tribunal, Mr Jacques Jaumotte, Judge, and Mr Clément Gascon, Judge, sign below, as do I, René M. Vargas M., Registrar.

Delivered on 3 July 2025 by video recording posted on the Tribunal's Internet page.

(Signed)

PATRICK FRYDMAN JACQUES JAUMOTTE CLEMENT GASCON

RENÉ M. VARGAS M.