AIC decision on appeal #90

CASE NUMBER AI7706
AUDIT INDICATORS
(Decision dated December 13, 2021)

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, after consultations with the relevant business unit, such unit supported disclosing the information responsive to the request; the information has since been made publicly available (click here).

- Based on the above, consideration of the appeal asserting both “violation of policy” and “public interest” was not required.

The Decision

Facts

1. On August 5, 2021, the requester submitted a request, in relevant part for:

   (...) the data on the 10 individual indicators for each country in the World's Bank’s new supreme audit institution index (https://insai.worldbank.org/). (...) The scores for each of the 10 indicators are not available at the link suggested. (...) I am asking for the scores on each indicator. Given that there are 118 countries in the dataset and 10 indicators, that should yield a dataset of 1,180 observations. (…) (“Request”).


3. On August 10, 2021, the requester filed an appeal challenging the Bank’s denial; the appeal was filed on the basis that there is both 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 September 8, 2021, October 7, 2021, and November 17, 2021, the relevant business unit indicated that the information responsive to the Request was in the process of being made publicly available. The information was disclosed on December 10, 2021; it is publicly available by clicking here.

6. Based on the above, consideration of the Appeal was not required.