ENTITY-SPECIFIC DISCLOSURES

PAUL WARREN

Entity-specific Disclosure

Disclosures included in a report that are specific to the reporting entity, or to a small number of reporting entities. Such disclosures require special handling in XBRL as it is not always possible for the base taxonomy to include the concepts and dimension members needed to report all such disclosures for all entities. In order to facilitate the tagging of such disclosures, mechanisms such as entity-specific extension taxonomies may be used.

Source: XBRL International glossary

Extensions ≠ Entity-specific Disclosures

Extension taxonomies are one technical solution to the business problem of **Entity-specific Disclosures**

ESDs vs structured data

If I were you I wouldn't start from here

- ESDs are easily consumed by humans
- ESDs hamper automated consumption and comparison
- Technology can help, but it can't solve the problem of different data points in different reports

ESDs vs structured data

Operating costs are stated after charging/(crediting):		
Employee benefits expense	3	2,058
Amortisation of non-operating intangibles	8	55
Amortisation of operating intangibles	8	26
Profits less losses on disposal of non-current assets		(8)
Depreciation of owned property, plant and equipment	9	401
Exceptional impairment of non-current loans and receivables		98

Base taxonomy defines “Amortisation of intangible assets”

Preparer reports two concepts not in base taxonomy

To a human consumer, it’s clear that the base taxonomy concept is the sum of these two

Simplest solution would be to report against the base concept too, but is this an additional disclosure?

High-level approaches to ESDs

1. Don’t tag
2. Generic structures
3. Entity-specific extensions

Not mutually exclusive

Approach 1: Don't tag

+ Simple!
+ Having data in iXBRL may be good enough
- Data is not available (in structured form)

- May be more viable in "many to one" filing (e.g. tax regulation)
- Is detail required, or is a block tag sufficient?

Approach 2: Generic structures

- Allows “rows” to be repeated as many times as needed
- Technical approaches:
  - Typed dimensions
  - Generic dimension members (e.g. Segment 1, Segment 2, Segment 3)
- “Name” of row is reported as a fact value

Generic structures example

Id	Product Name	Product Revenue
1	iPhone	$155,041
2	iPad	23,227
3	Mac	25,471

Typed Dimension = Product ID

Concept = Product Name

Concept = Revenue

Identifier for product defined in report, not taxonomy

Approach 2: Generic structures

+ No need to prepare or submit extensions
- Can hinder cross-period comparison, depending on choice of identifiers

  (is product ID 1 always “iPhone”?)

- Appropriate when a good “primary key” identifier is available (e.g. LEI)
- Data vs Meta-data

Approach 3: Entity-specific extension

- Preparer provides a taxonomy that extends the base taxonomy to provide the necessary reporting points

Extensions example

Product Name	Product Revenue
iPhone	$155,041
iPad	23,227
Mac	25,471

Dimension = base:Product
Member = ext:IPhone, ext:IPad, ext:Mac

Concept = base:Revenue

Members for each product defined & labelled in extension taxonomy

Approach 3: Entity-specific extensions

+ Very flexible: can represent any disclosure
+ Can provide consistent, cross-period tagging
- Very flexible: difficult to consume
- Complex for preparers

ESD Guidance

- XBRL International guidance on ESDs & extensions is very limited
- Details of approach to ESDs should be re-evaluated in the light of iXBRL

ESDs: XII Initiatives

1. ESD-TF recommendations
   - Provide overall report context for tagged or untagged items by using Inline XBRL
   - Ensure that tagged ESDs are provided with a base taxonomy relationship, i.e., ‘anchor’.
2. Calculation inference mechanisms
3. Text tags and iXBRL
4. Extent of re-use of base taxonomy by extension taxonomies
5. Typed dimensions as an alternative to extension taxonomies

2. Calculation inference mechanisms

- Current calculation mechanism is limited:
  - No dimensions
  - No cross-period support
  - Tied to “inconsistency reporting”

- Users want to be able to infer values that aren’t reported explicitly

- Initiated within Base Spec WG

3. Text tags and iXBRL

- iXBRL should make tagging of textual information simpler and more useful
- Requires a different approach to that taken by existing projects using escaped HTML.
- Planned for IGTF, not yet initiated.

4. Extent of base taxonomy re-use

- iXBRL reduces the need to customise labels for base taxonomy elements, as the preparer's line item descriptions are available in the HTML
- Guidance provides recommendations on which components of a base taxonomy should be retained
- Early draft ready for submission to IGTF

5. Generic structures (“open tables”) guidance

- Typed dimensions allow table rows to be repeated without introducing extension taxonomy elements
- As identifiers for rows are defined with the XBRL report, care must be taken to avoid hampering cross-report (time series) comparison
- Draft being reviewed by TAG-TF

Questions?