



Murgie Krishnan <murgie@gmail.com>

Your decision re RTI Second Appeal with file no. CIC/SEBIH/A/2017/139953

Murgie Krishnan [redacted]

Wed, Mar 4, 2020 at 6:05 PM

[redacted]

Dear Shri Julka:

Thank you for your ruling as under:

DECISION: Keeping in view the facts of the case and the submissions made by both the parties, the Commission directs the Respondent to disclose the guidelines pursued by the Respondent Public Authority in respect of application of masking together with old and new masks in the public domain within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of this order as agreed. No further intervention of the Commission is required in the matter.

We started trying to get this data for research 15 years ago when the RTI Act first came into force, and went thru countless RTI queries, including RTI queries just to get SEBI to acknowledge its own circular describing the database format used by FII custodians to file the data each evening.

When finally SEBI responded to Rajya Sabha MP Shyam Benegal's query (and his RTI query) by releasing some data and promising to update it, we thought we had succeeded. Only later we realized that SEBI was taking away with one hand what it gave with the other, using changing FII ID masks. Better late than never, and a lot of academics in India will be very grateful to you for this.

I want to make only one note. ***If the SEBI CPIO prefers to simply make a software change so that the mask is stable over time, instead of giving us a dictionary describing how mask changes are related, that would be fine with us, as it is exactly equivalent.*** And given that this data is all in an ORACLE data base at SEBI, it could be marginally simpler -- 5 minutes' work instead of 1 hour -- and so could be more efficient both for SEBI's IT group and for us.

I am copying the SEBI CPIO on this email for your convenience.

Once again, I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Best,
Murgie

CIC-SEBIH-A-2017-139953-BJ.pdf
237K