

**Subject: the European Ombudsman’s decision on how the European Personnel Selection Office (EPSO) dealt with requests for review of the results in two selection procedures
EPSO/AST/151/22 and EPSO/AD/398/22 (case 1455/2024/VS)**

In the above-referenced decision, the European Ombudsman formulated the following suggestion: *EPSO should ensure that, in future, candidates who have filed a request for review, receive a clear, accurate and complete reply that informs them whether the selection board has reviewed their performance and, if not, the reasons why.*

*

EPSO has taken careful note of the Ombudsman’s remarks. The Office is taking efforts to improve its complaint forms. The current IT platform for handling candidates’ complaints (*JIRA*) is being phased out. EPSO is working on integrating new complaint forms into the new platform: *HR Agent Workspace*. These forms will be gradually introduced in the course of 2026.

The platform will enable more efficient complaint handling. For example, the system will sort requests for review into the following categories:

- requests concerning eligibility;
- requests concerning *test results*;
- requests concerning disqualification.

The general rules governing open competitions¹ already explain that candidates’ disagreement with the Board’s evaluation does not necessarily imply an error of assessment. EPSO will make that point explicit on its website. Thus, before filing a request for review, candidates will be better informed that requests concerning *test results* cannot be reliably constructed on mere disagreements with the Board’s value judgment.

As we already explained in reply to this complaint, an administrative act (such as a decision of a Selection Board) enjoys a presumption of legality and the burden of proof weighs, in principle, on the party that makes the allegation, so that the onus is on the applicant to at least provide sufficiently precise, objective and consistent evidence to support the veracity or likelihood of the facts in support of its contention. Therefore, an applicant who does not have any proof or, at the very least, a body of evidence must accept the presumption of legality attached to decisions taken with regard to competitions.²

In parallel, EPSO has advised its *Request-for-Review* team to update its procedures and provide candidates with clear, accurate and complete information on whether the Selection Board reviewed their performance and, if not, the reasons why.

¹ For example, [OJEU C/2025/5881, Annex I, point 7.2.2\(4\)](#).

² Judgment of 4 February 2010 in Case F-15/08 *Wiame v Commission*, EU:F:2010:7, paragraph 21.