The jurisprudence of international administrative tribunals has been the most relevant element in the development of international administrative law. Moreover, that jurisprudence allows the identification of two particular features in the development of international administrative law that significantly distinguish it from other areas of international law. First, principles and rules of international administrative law are not set out in a framework convention or even in a system of international treaties. The existing written rules are produced by the internal administrative bodies of international organizations based on the explicit or implicit powers that arise from the charters of such organizations.

From this situation results the second feature of international administrative law, namely, its character as a body of universal principles and rules set forth by the action of judicial bodies that have no institutional bonds among them – the very administrative tribunals of international organizations. These courts – and not legislative or administrative international bodies – have been responsible for establishing international administrative law as a broad-ranging and coherent set of rules. The integration between administrative tribunals is materialized through the intensive use that each court makes of the jurisprudence issued by other similar tribunals. This particularity of international administrative law is reflected in the deepest and most comprehensive work on Law that governs employment relations within international organizations based on the product of the administrative tribunals, and even in its title – *The law of the international civil service (as applied by international administrative tribunals)* by C.F. Amerasinghe, who served for a long time as Executive
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* A first version of this essay was presented in the form of comment on the keynote address of Professor Robert Gorman, at the symposium on “The Development and Effectiveness of International and Administrative Law”, held in Washington, DC in 23 March 2010.
Secretary in the World Bank Administrative Tribunal.\(^1\) This peculiar origin did not prevent the consolidation of international administrative law as a specific branch of international law.

The founding and consolidation of the abovementioned World Bank Administrative Tribunal (created in 1980) and the majority of the similar tribunals took place during a time that could be considered as the third wave in the process of evolution of the role and relevance of international administrative tribunals, starting in the 1960s and gaining dimension in the 1980s and 1990s. In 1927, the establishment of the League of Nations Administrative Tribunal, which was taken over by the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization (ILO) in 1946, was the inaugural moment of this type of court. The creation of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal in 1949 could be considered the beginning of a second wave, a high point of which was the advisory opinion rendered by the International Court of Justice in 1954 in the case concerning the *Effect of awards of compensation made by the United Nations Administrative Tribunal*.

In that advisory opinion, the International Court of Justice stated that the General Assembly was fully competent to establish an administrative court under the authority granted by the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, considering the formal validation of the establishment of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal, the Court examined the merits of the creation of such a judicial body, and corroborated it under such standpoint as well, understanding it fitted the administrative performance requirements necessary for the proper development of the activities of such organization, besides being coherent with the efforts of the United Nations in human rights promotion.

Thus, the International Court of Justice granted full support and recognized the competence of an international organization to establish an administrative tribunal, and, moreover, the convenience of such judicial body. Consequently, in subsequent years administrative tribunals grew in number, resulting in the third wave mentioned above, leading to the conclusion of agreements conferring jurisdiction on the administrative tribunal of one international organization over labour disputes of other organizations. The ILO Administrative Tribunal, for instance, has jurisdiction over
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