

FOI DOF/2026-0375

Request

Re: Competition IRC321664 – SPTO Planning Officer.

I would like to request further information relating to the attached.

1. How many panels interviewed for IRC321664 SPTO Planning Officers?
2. The following information was supplied under DOF/2026-0275 FOI Response, as attached:
 1. There are 55 candidates who applied for this competition comprising:
 - a. 13 NICS applicants; 6 of whom are currently working in DfI.

For the 13 NICS applicants, excluding the six applicants who are currently working in DfI, please indicate the Department and Group/Branch in which each of the remaining seven applicants is currently employed.

3. Please provide the marking framework used to assess Eligibility Criterion 3, including the descriptors and scoring criteria associated with each score on the 1–5 marking scale?

DoF response

I can confirm the department holds the information requested.

1. One panel interviewed for IRC321664 SPTO Planning Officers.
2. I can confirm the department holds the information requested. However, some of the information has been withheld as it falls within an exemption.

Some personal information has been withheld because it is exempt under Section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act. Section 40(2) exempts personal information from disclosure if that information relates to someone other than the applicant, and if disclosure of that information would contravene one of the data protection principles in schedule 1 of the Data Protection Act.

The remaining seven applicants are currently employed in DAERA and DOF.

3. The mark framework used to assess Eligibility Criterion 3, including the descriptors and scoring criteria associated with each score on the 1–5 marking scale can be found at Annex C.

Annex C

Rating	Brief Descriptor	Relation to Job Performance
5	Outstanding	Evidence provided by the candidate consistently exceeded the requirements for effective performance in this post. Answers/examples demonstrated the selection criteria/competences to an exceptional degree.
4	Very Good	Evidence provided by the candidate frequently exceeded the requirements for effective performance in this post. Answers/Examples demonstrated the selection criteria/competences to a very high degree.
3	Good	Evidence provided by the candidate met, and in some cases exceeded, the requirements for effective performance in this post. Answers/examples demonstrated the selection criteria/competences to a high degree.
2	Just below standard	Evidence provided by the candidate only partially met the requirements for effective performance in this post. Answers/examples did not always demonstrate the selection criteria/competences to a satisfactory degree. Continued development is required.
1	Well below standard	Evidence provided by the candidate clearly did not meet the requirements for effective performance in this post. Answers/examples did not demonstrate the selection criteria/competences to a satisfactory degree. A great deal of further development is required.