

- **Additional qualification not required for a post will not give an applicant an edge over other candidates.**
- **The Tribunal has no jurisdiction concerning Schemes of Service.**

Appellant claimed that he should have been appointed for a higher position in the light of the recommendation of the PRB Report 2003. He averred that he had embarked on further studies to enhance his potential and suitability for higher positions. He claimed that he even had additional qualification other than the diploma required for the post but that he did not have his BSc degree yet at the time of application. Appellant stipulated that Respondent had not followed the PRB report's recommendation and had skipped the qualifications requirement. Also, he expressed his disagreement with the revised Scheme of Service which was implemented without consultation with the Trade Union and claimed that since he was more experienced, he should have been promoted.

Respondent acknowledged the PRB recommendations but averred that the government departments concerned had functional difficulties in implementing the recommendation and had, as is the procedure in such cases, referred the matter to a High Powered Committee chaired by high ranking public officers of the Ministry of Civil Service Affairs and the Director of the PRB. A decision was

then taken to implement the criterion of higher qualifications in 2013 and everyone concerned was informed. Respondent reported that Trade Unions were consulted and made no comments on the draft Scheme of Service, which was then prescribed. As regards the claim of Appellant that his diploma should have given him an edge over other candidates, Respondent retorted that qualifications were only one of the many criteria for the assessment of the candidates.

The Tribunal has determined that it has no mandate to investigate into what happened between the publication of the PRB Report and the revision of the Scheme of Service for the higher position. Appellant had no reason to claim priority of consideration merely on the ground that he possessed that diploma as qualification, an element which did not appear in the revisited Scheme of Service which is binding on Respondent. Respondent could not possibly flout its own Scheme of Service. The Tribunal has set aside the appeal.