

AIC decision on appeal #68

CASE NUMBER AI5950 AMS 6.21A, INFORMATION CLASSIFICATION AND CONTROL POLICY (Decision dated January 23, 2019)

Summary of Decision

- As part of its due diligence on appeals, the Access to Information Committee (“AIC”), through its secretariat, seeks the relevant business unit’s views on the possible disclosure of the requested information in light of the respective appeal. In this case, the relevant business unit supported disclosing the requested information; the document has since been made publicly available.
- ***Violation of Policy and Public Interest.*** Based on the above, consideration of the appeal asserting “violation of policy” and “public interest” was not required.

The Decision

Facts

1. On October 1, 2018, the requester submitted a request for “AMS 6.21A – Information Classification and Control Policy” (“Request”).
2. On October 4, 2018, the World Bank (“Bank”) denied public access to the information responsive to the Request based on the *Corporate Administrative Matters* exception under the *Bank Policy: Access to Information*, July 1, 2015, Catalogue No. EXC4.01-POL.01 (“AI Policy”).
3. On October 16, 2018, the requester filed an appeal challenging the Bank’s denial; the appeal was filed on the basis that there is a “violation of policy” and a “public interest” case to override the AI Policy exception that restricts public access to the information (“Appeal”).

Findings and Related Decisions

4. In reviewing the Appeal in accordance with the AI Policy, the AIC sought the relevant business unit’s views on the possible disclosure of the requested information in light of the Appeal.
5. On January 23, 2019, the relevant business unit indicated that the AMS 6.21A, Information Classification and Control Policy, had been made publicly available. The information can be found at:

<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/288241548255246039/AMS-6-21A-Information-Classification-and-Control-Policy.pdf>

“Violation of Policy” and “Public Interest” case

6. Based on the above, consideration of the Appeal asserting a “violation of policy” and a “public interest” was not required.