

AIC decision on appeal #52

**CASE NUMBER AI4495
CERTAIN INFORMATION RELATED TO
THE SAFE MIGRATION FOR BANGLADESHI WORKERS PROJECT
(Decision dated December 1, 2016)**

Summary of Decision

- The Access to Information Committee (“AIC”) found that the appeal is not properly before the AIC for consideration. The appeal in this case does not assert that the Bank has violated the AI Policy by denying access to information, but rather clearly states that the information requested is publicly available. For this reason, the appeal is dismissed for failure to provide sufficient information that would reasonably support the appeal.

The Decision

Facts

1. On September 7, 2016, the requester submitted a public access request (“Request”) for certain information related to the Safe Migration for Bangladeshi Workers Project, namely the following:

[...]

1/ Procurement plan, procurement notices and contract data of this project as nothing is visible in url at the time of writing this request. <http://www.worldbank.org/projects/PI25302/bangladesh-safemigration-bangladeshi-workers?lang=en&tab=details>

2/List of 80 Upzilas as mentioned in PDO and in ISR20659

3/ Contact details and list of CBOs across all project locations as mentioned in ISR20659

2. On October 27, 2016, the World Bank (“Bank”) replied to the Request, by: (a) providing access to the procurement plan for the Project; and (b) denying access to the remaining requested information on the basis of the *Deliberative Information* exception under the Bank Policy: Access to Information, July 1, 2015, Catalogue No. EXC4.01-POL.01 (“AI Policy”).

3. On November 5, 2016, the secretariat to the Access to Information Committee (“AIC”) received an application (“Application”), which states, in relevant part, the following:

[...]

1)I am emerging Social Entrepreneur having interest and concern migration of Poor worker in various part of the world.

2) I requested 3 information per case no AI4495.

3) I received answer for procurement plan from AI per response dated October dated 27,2016 and than you for the same.

4) I was denied the other 2 requested information in response dated 27th October and allowed to make 1st appeal.

5) While checking the document once again before appealing I am please to see that denied 2 information were made available in Aide Memoir dated 29th sept 2016.

[...]

I am please get information in a very transparent and accountable way for this case and project and appeal the same pattern for other case and project too.

Findings and Related Decision

4. In reviewing the Application in accordance with the AI Policy, the AIC considered:

(a) the Request;

(b) the Bank's denial of access; and

(c) the Application.

5. The *Bank Directive/Procedure: Access to Information*, July 1, 2015, Catalogue No. ECR4.01-DIR.01 ("AI Directive/Procedure") provides that appeals can be dismissed for "for failure to provide sufficient information that would reasonably support the appeal." (see AI Directive/Procedure, at Section III.D.1, sub-paragraph a (ii)).

6. In this case, the AIC found that the Application does not assert that the Bank has violated the AI Policy by denying access to information, but rather clearly states that the information requested is publicly available. For this reason, and pursuant to sub-paragraph a (ii) of Section III.D.1 of the AI Directive/Procedure, the Application is dismissed for failure to provide sufficient information that would reasonably support the appeal.