

AI Appeals Board Decision
Case Number AI4459
Country Policy and Institutional Assessment Dataset
(Decision dated October 11, 2017)

Decision of the AI Appeals Board

1. Reference is made to the above-mentioned case number. The Access to Information Appeals Board (AIAB) has reviewed the application for appeal regarding the above case number and decided to dismiss the application in its entirety because it fails to establish a *prima facie* case (i.e., does not provide sufficient information that would reasonably support the appeal).

Background

2. The original request was for all the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) data, including the individual CPIA criteria scores, for both IDA and IBRD countries, from 2000 to date. It should be noted that the Bank does, in fact, make some of the data requested publicly available (principally, the CPIA data for IDA countries from 2005 onwards). The Bank also used its prerogative to disclose overall aggregated data for the period up to 2004 in response to this request.
3. Nevertheless, as the Bank's Access to Information Committee (AIC) properly construed the request as an external request for disclosure of the complete CPIA Dataset as *a whole*, it was properly restricted by the *Deliberative Information* exception.

Reasons for the Non-Admission of the Appeal

4. A requester who is denied access to information by the Bank may only file an appeal if the requester is able to establish a *prima facie* case that the Bank has violated the World Bank's Access to Information Policy ("AI Policy") by improperly or unreasonably restricting access to information that it would normally disclose under the AI Policy (AI Policy Section III.8.(a)(i) and Section III.8.(b)(ii)).
5. In the appellant's grounds of appeal, dated May 9, 2017, the requester does not assert a violation of the AI Policy. Instead, the appellant complains about unfairness, asserting that the records requested have been accessed by "World Bank researchers" collaborating with outside co-authors for articles in publicly available academic journals; that the requester has been working for the Bank on a contract basis for over seven years; and that s/he needs access to "perform a more accurate statistical analysis".
6. The appellant also invites the AIAB to grant access on the basis that s/he will agree not to release the records. Finally, in the appeal to us s/he asks "Lastly, even if you can't release the

whole CPIA dataset to me, could you release at least more of it? Specifically, the overall CPIA average rating for each country in each year”.

7. As the AIC correctly noted as a preliminary matter, the AI Policy governs the disclosure of information to the public, which is distinct from internal access. Like the AIC, we do not have authority to examine whether and how World Bank employees have or have not gained access to Bank data. In this respect, the appellant may misapprehend the purpose and scope of the AI Policy and the legal process it establishes. Our duty is limited to determining whether or not there has been a violation of the AI Policy in relation to public access.
8. None of the complaints constitute a ground of appeal that alleges a violation of the AI Policy or provides sufficient information that would reasonably support a claim that the AI Policy has been violated. Further, the invitation to grant access to the requested records on condition that the appellant does not release them does not fall within our purview to grant. Nor do we have authority to scope the request to a more limited set of records.

AI Appeals Board Findings

9. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal. The AI Appeals Board’s decision is final.