

Identification of ICT Specifications

Submission form

Specification XBRL 2.1

DRAFT 2014-04-10

Part I: Information

I.i (To be provided by the submitter): Information on the submitter:

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | Name, First name | |
| 2 | Organisation | |
| 3 | Position / Role | |
| 4 | Contact information: - Address - Phone number - e-Mail | |
| 5 | Date of submission | |

I.ii (To be provided by the submitter): Information on the submission:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | Title of the specification (including precise version number) | <i>XBRL eXtensible Business Reporting Language</i> The specification is described in a series of XBRL Recommendations. The base specification is <u>XBRL 2.1</u> . |
| 7 | Address where the version of the specification can be obtained/downloaded | http://specifications.xbrl.org/work-product-index-group-base-spec-base-spec.html The full set of XBRL Recommendations is published at http://specifications.xbrl.org/specifications.html |
| 8 | Name, identifier and website of the originating organisation | XBRL International, a non-profit organization registered in USA. http://xbrl.org/ XBRL European non-profit organization registered in Belgium. http://www.xbrleurope.org/ |
| 9 | Describe the reason for the submission, the need and intended | There is a need for standardization of reports based on financial and business regulatory frameworks. |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | <p>use for the specification</p> | <p>Recent financial crises have uncovered one of the major deficiencies of the existing financial system: the lack of transparency. More specifically, transparency in the European Union is hampered by the absence of harmonisation in financial regulatory reporting. For that reason, XBRL, as a global standard for financial and business reporting, and based on XML, shows great promise to create transparency in regulatory reporting.</p> <p>When financial and business reports are made public (particularly Business Registers or Securities), it is important to have them in a structured format such as XBRL. This helps to reduce the information asymmetry (“efficient-market hypothesis”, by E. Fama, Nobel Prize 2013), and fosters concepts such as Open Data, Information Intermediaries or Market Discipline (Pillar III of the Basel agreements).</p> <p>The European Banking Authority (EBA), as well as the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions (EIOPA), are both developing XBRL formats for the mandatory “Implementing Technical Standards, binding both at the European level as well as at National level.</p> <p>A number of European Business Registers are being interconnected using XBRL formats.</p> <p>The European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) have been mandated by the European Parliament to publish a report on a “European Single Electronic Reporting Format” to the European Commission in 2016.</p> <p>Some national Business Registers, and also Securities and Tax Authorities, are using XBRL as their reporting format. Another relevant supply chain is the Public Sector, including municipalities.</p> <p>Relevant examples of non- regulatory (or voluntary) reporting are the carbon disclosure project, microfinance, integrated reporting and corporate social responsibility.</p> |
| 9a | <p>Are you aware of any other specifications or standards covering the same technical area, and, if so, which specifications or standards are these</p> | <p>NOT for eXtensible Languages for Business Reporting, similar to XBRL.</p> <p>Another language based on XML, but for <u>statistics</u>, is the SDMX (Statistical Data and Metadata Exchange). In fact, the SDMX has been used for many years, in parallel with XBRL, at National and European Central Banks for reporting and statistics respectively, without any detected interferences.</p> |
| 9b | <p>If the response to 9a is “yes”, please give information on the specific need for the specification submitted, especially taking into account the aspect of interoperability</p> | |

I.iii (To be provided by the platform secretariat): Information on the specification and the organisation

| N° | Question | Response | Relevance for Assessment |
|-----|--|----------|---------------------------|
| 10 | <p>Contact information/contact person (should include email addresses and phone information)</p> <p>4.1 for the organisation (mandatory)</p> <p>4.2 for the specification in question (optional)</p> | | |
| 11 | <p>State whether the submission concerns:</p> <p>A) Identification of an ICT specification ¹</p> <p>B) a revision of an already identified ICT specification T standard</p> <p>C) a proposed withdrawal of identification from an ICT specification</p> | A | Maintenance |
| 11a | <p>If 11, Case B, applies:</p> <p>please provide information on backward and forward compatibility with the version already approved.</p> | | Maintenance, Quality |
| 11b | <p>If 11, Case C applies:</p> <p>explain why the ICT specification no longer complies with the requirements for identification</p> | | Maintenance, Quality |
| 12 | <p>In addition to the information provided by the submitter in Part I, question 9a, are you aware</p> | | Relevance, Neutrality and |

¹ The term “ICT specification d” is currently used in the Regulation), Article 9, for specifications in the field of ICT that have been identified following the process of assessment against the Requirements and criteria laid down in Annex II to the draft Regulation.

| | | | |
|-----|--|----|--|
| | of any other specifications or standards covering the same technical area and, if so, which specifications or standards. | | Stability, Quality |
| 12a | If the responses to questions 9a and 12 is “Yes”, have the other specifications already been submitted via this process; if so, which ones? | | Relevance, Neutrality and Stability, Quality |
| 13 | If any International or European Standard is identified in responses 9a or 12, are you aware of any relevant information publicly available regarding the interoperability between corresponding implementations. | | Market Acceptance, Relevance, Neutrality and Stability, Quality |
| 14 | Are you aware of any plans to transpose the specification into a deliverable from a European or International Standards Organisation | No | Availability Maintenance |
| 15 | Is the submission: A) a first submission for the organisation B) a submission concerning an organisation whose specifications have previously been identified and which has undergone the same development and approval processes in the organisation (go to 17 unless there are any material changes) | A | Relevance |
| 16 | Is the information on the organisation, its policies, directives, procedures and membership A) Publicly available (e.g. on the organisation's website) | A | Openness, Consensus, Transparency |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|
| | B) Available on request C) Unavailable | | |
| 16a | <p>Please provide information (links or electronic documents) on the following topics (including possible summary versions):</p> <p>A) Financing of the organisation</p> <p>B) Membership and participation arrangements</p> <p>C) Development and maintenance processes Consensus-building processes</p> | <p>A) XBRL International, as well as XBRL Europe and the national XBRL jurisdictions, are all non-profit associations, financed primarily by membership fees.</p> <p>See XBRL International financial statements at http://xbrl.org/financial-statements-0</p> <p>B) XBRL International is composed of XBRL national jurisdictions (non-profit associations) and direct members (companies).</p> <p>Each XBRL national jurisdiction is composed of members from both the public sector and commercial companies, and is financed primarily by membership fees, as determined by each country. One third of the XBRL national jurisdiction membership fees is then transferred to XBRL International.</p> <p>XBRL Europe is a non-profit association which is composed of XBRL members representing their national jurisdictions in Europe, in addition to direct members (companies).</p> <p>XBRL International is governed by the General Assembly (XBRL national jurisdictions and direct members) and the Board of Directors² (representing the General Assembly). The Board of Directors nominates the Chair and CEO³.</p> <p>By decision of the XBRL International General Assembly, the Board of Directors is recruited by balancing EMEA, Americas and Asia-Pacific candidates, as well as various sectors of activities. This balanced arrangement is also applied to the different Committees and Working Groups of XBRL International. All the candidates are unpaid volunteers, serving for a maximum of two consecutive terms of four years each.</p> <p>C) The development and maintenance of the XBRL Specifications is the responsibility of the XBRL International Standards Board⁴ and its working groups.</p> | Openness, Consensus, Transparency |

² Members, Board of Directors: HE Mohammed Al Hadari (Emirates), Cees De Boer (the Netherlands), John Dill (Bermuda), Conor O'Kelly (Ireland), Paul Penler (USA), Michal Piechocki (Poland), Arleen Thomas (USA, Chair), Yoshiaki Wada (Japan), Ms. Ying Wei (China), Andreas Weller (EU). Source: <http://xbrl.org/BoardofDirectors> visited 2014/04/03

³ XBRL International key staff: John Turner (UK, CEO), Paul Warren (UK, Technical Director)

⁴ Members, Standards Board: Conor O'Kelly (Ireland, Chair), Olive Browne (UK), Herm Fischer (USA), Victor Morilla (Spain), Maciej Piechocki (Germany), Trevor Pyman (Australia), Paul Warren (UK). Source: <http://xbrl.org/StandardsBoard> visited 2014/04/03

| | | | |
|-----|---|--|---|
| | | <p>The XBRL International Best Practices Board⁵ also creates deliverables. Both Boards are populated by volunteers in a balanced composition and limitation of terms served. The Specifications and Best Practices deliverables are to be ratified by the Board of Directors.</p> <p>The process for creating a new specification is usually based on identified needs coming from business cases. The appropriated working group is then formed and work is started on the new Specification. Years later, and after implementation by at least two different vendors, the Specification is finally approved as “Recommended”. This has been the process for European business cases such as XBRL Dimensions, XBRL Formulae and XBRL Tables, the basic components of EBA and EIOPA regulatory frameworks.</p> <p>The CEN (European Normalization Centre) convened the 2012 workshop CEN WS XBRL⁶ and is publishing their deliverables, which are to be officially in effect in the EC. The goal of this CEN Workshop was to prepare a series of standardised CWAs to make the XBRL deliverables widely known in Europe. See http://cen.eurofiling.info/</p> | |
| 16b | If 16, Case C, applies, please ask the submitter to justify why the specification is needed, how it contributes to interoperability and give an assessment of the risks related to the specification's use given the unavailability of information on the organisation and its policies, directives, procedures and membership. | | Openness, Consensus, Transparency |
| 17 | <p>Is the specification</p> <p>A) Available for everyone for free (e.g. download from the web)</p> <p>B) Available for everyone for purchase</p> | A | Availability |

⁵ Members, Best Practices Board: Ian Hicks (UK, Chair), Brad Monterio (USA), Thomas Boemoser (USA), Ignacio Boixo (Spain), Gianluca Garbellotto (USA), Eric Jarry (France), Chao Li (China), Yossi Newman (USA), Rita Ogun-Clijmans (IFRS), Richard Plotka (USA). Source: <http://xbrl.org/BestPracticesBoard> visited 2014/04/03

⁶ Project Core Team: Ignacio Boixo (EU), Derek De Brandt (EU), Allyson Ugarte (USA), Maarten Peelen (NL), Katrin Heinze (DE), Thierry Declerck (DE), Roland Hommes (NL), Anna-Maria Weber (DE), Ignacio Santos (ES), Emile Bartolé (LU), Javi Mora (ES), Elina Koskentalo (FI), Eduardo González (ES), Iñaki Vazquez (ES), Aitor Azcoaga (EU), Pieter Maillard (BE), Pablo Navarro (ES). Source: <http://cen.eurofiling.info/background/> visited 2014/04/03

| | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|
| | C) Other (please describe) | | |
| 18 | Which IPR policy applies to the specification? If there are different options in the organisation's IPR policy please specify which option applies. Provide information (e.g. via a website link) to the organisation's IPR policy and, if available, associated IPR databases. | <i>(XBRL International) will maintain the XBRL standards to ensure royalty-free usage.</i> Bylaws, art 1.2. See XBRL International Bylaws and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Policy at http://xbrl.org/GoverningDocuments | Intellectual Property Rights |
| 19 | If no information is provided by the submitter, is information publicly available regarding implementations of the specification?: A) The specification has been implemented in two or more competitive products on the market or in independent implementations B) There is just one implementation available for the specification. C) The specification has not yet been implemented. D) There is no information available whether the specification has been implemented and to what extentd. | A | Market Acceptance, Relevance, Neutrality and Stability, Quality |
| 19a | If 19, cases B, C or D, apply please add relevant information why the specification is needed and to what extentd it contributes to interoperability (it is likely to be required to check with the submitter on this). | | Relevance, Neutrality and Stability, Quality |
| 20 | Are you aware of public references of the respective specification by public authorities (especially in policies or in procurement) | EBA December 2013: <i>The European Banking Authority (EBA) published today its XBRL taxonomy to be used for remittance of data under the Implementing Technical Standards (ITS) on supervisory reporting.</i> http://www.eba.europa.eu/-/eba-publishes-xbrl-taxonomy-for-remittance-of-supervisory-reporting-by-competent-regulatory-authorities | Market Acceptance, Relevance, Neutrality and Stability, |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---------|
| | | <p>EIOPA, January 2014: <i>The documents in this section present the data modelling and XBRL taxonomy design, supporting the implementation of the Guideline on Submission of Information to National Competent Authorities</i> https://eiopa.europa.eu/publications/eu-wide-reporting-formats/index.html</p> <p><i>The European Parliament resolution of 10 March 2009 on the Small Business Act</i></p> <p><i>The European Parliament, Committee of Legal Affairs - Reports of 25 and 27 September 2012.</i></p> <p>See <i>Rolling plan for ICT standardisation</i> (2013), on point 3.3.4. <i>eXtensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL)</i>, pages 54-55, at http://ec.europa.eu/DocsRoom/documents/4122/attachments/1/translations/en/renditions/pdf</p> | Quality |
|--|--|---|---------|

Part II: (To be provided by the ICT platform): Statement of Advice from the ICT Platform

The ICT Platform has assessed the above specification against the set of Requirements for the Recognition of Technical Specifications in the Field of ICT laid down in the Regulation on European Standardisation 2025/2012 , Annex II, and gives the following statement of advice:

Statement of advice:

[The detailed process of how the assessment will be carried out, what the consensus rules are, etc. will be laid down by the ICT Platform once it is in place.]

Date:

Annex: Requirements for the Identification of Technical Specifications in the Field of ICT – copy from the Regulation on European Standardisation Regulation 2025/2012 Annex II:

1. The technical specifications have market acceptance and their implementations do not hamper interoperability with the implementations of existing European or international standards. Market acceptance can be demonstrated by operational examples of compliant implementations from different vendors.
2. The technical specifications are coherent as they do not conflict with European standards, that is to say they cover domains where the adoption of new European standards is not foreseen within a reasonable period, where existing standards have not gained market uptake or where these standards have become obsolete, and where the transposition of the technical specifications into European standardisation deliverables is not foreseen within a reasonable period.
3. The technical specifications were developed by a non-profit making organisation which is a professional society, industry or trade association or any other membership organisation that within its area of expertise develops standards in the field of information and communication technologies and which is not a European, national or international standardisation body, through processes which fulfil the following criteria:

| | |
|---|---|
| a | Openness: the technical specifications were developed on the basis of open decision-making accessible to all interested operators in the market or markets affected by the standard. |
| b | Consensus: the standardisation process was collaborative and consensus based and did not favour any particular stakeholder. Consensus means a general agreement, characterised by the absence of sustained opposition to substantial issues by any important part of the concerned interests and by a process that involves seeking to take into account the views of all parties concerned and to reconcile any conflicting arguments. Consensus does not imply unanimity. |
| c | Transparency: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) all information concerning technical discussions and decision making was archived and identified. (ii) information on (new) standardisation activities was widely announced through suitable and accessible means. |

- (iii) participation of all interested categories of interested stakeholders was sought with a view to achieving balance.
- (iv) consideration and response were given to comments by interested parties.

3. the technical specifications reflect the following requirements:

| | |
|---|--|
| a | Maintenance: Ongoing support and maintenance of published specifications are guaranteed over a long period. |
| b | Availability: Specifications are publicly available for implementation and use on reasonable terms (including for a reasonable fee or free of charge). |
| c | Intellectual Property Rights essential to the implementation of specifications are licensed to applicants on a (fair) reasonable and non-discriminatory basis ((F)RAND), which includes, at the discretion of the intellectual property rightholder, licensing essential intellectual property without compensation. |
| d | Relevance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the specifications are effective and relevant; (ii) specifications need to respond to market needs and regulatory requirements. |
| e | Neutrality and stability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) specifications whenever possible are performance oriented rather than based on design or descriptive characteristics; (ii) specifications do not distort the market or limit the possibilities for implementers to develop competition and innovation based upon them; (iii) specifications are based on advanced scientific and technological developments. |
| f | Quality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the quality and level of detail are sufficient to permit the development of a variety of competing implementations of interoperable products and services; (ii) standardised interfaces are not hidden or controlled by anyone other than the organisations that adopted the technical specifications. |