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1. **Glossary**

| **Term/Acronym** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| Additional Software | Additional licensing for XBRL processing software that may be required to meet future requirements. |
| Calling System | “Calling System” means any system which the Bank uses for data collection, data validation, data analysis or plausibility checking and any integration solutions which support such systems or processes. |
| Call-Off Contract | An agreement between the Bank and the Supplier for a defined services (typically professional services) to be governed under the main Contract and its terms. |
| Contract | The terms and conditions the Bank proposes to enter into for the provisions of the Services as provided as part of the Tender Materials. |
| CRDIV | Capital Requirements Directive IV. |
| Data Collection Platform | The Banks data collection web portal and file transfer solution. |
| Dataset | A collection of information (data) that is organised so that it can easily be accessed, managed, manipulated and updated by a computer. |
| Day 1 Requirements | All requirements not listed as Future Requirements. |
| EBA | European Banking Authority. |
| EIOPA | European Insurance Occupations and Pensions Authority. |
| Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) | Implements a communication system between mutually interacting software applications in a service-oriented architecture. |
| Filing Rules | Rules defined and implemented to constrain the XBRL instances. |
| Future Requirements | The requirements set out in section 10. |
| IFRS | International Financial Reporting Standards. |
| iXBRL | Inline XBRL. |
| Minimum Requirements | As defined in the Instructions to Suppliers document. |
| NCA | National Competent Authority. |
| Peak Days | Means those days designated by the Bank upon service (email being sufficient) to the Supplier of two weeks’ notice, limited to 36 days per year. |
| Peak Hours | Means 24 hours a day on Peak Days. |
| PWD | Public Working Draft. A Public Working Draft is a draft release of a taxonomy or XBRL specification that is suitable for public release for review and feedback purposes. |
| REC | Recommendation Status. This is the status given to XBRL specifications that are final and are recommended for use in software and taxonomies. |
| Reporting Entities | Combination of firm and consolidation basis. |
| Reporting Regimes | Examples of reporting regimes include Solvency II, UK Banking, UK Stress Test and UK Insurance. |
| Shared Library | The EIOPA and EBA use different versions of the Eurofiling library, and the Bank have reused EBA dictionaries. |
| Software Modules | Software components forming part of the Solution that provide specific features for example (but not limited to) Filing Rules validation, export to Excel or shredding / extracting data. |
| Solution | The XBRL processing solution, including add-on modules and support tools, proposed by the Supplier to meet the requirements. |
| Solvency II | Solvency II Directive. |
| SQL | Structured Query Language. |
| Technical Minimum Requirements | As defined in the Instructions to Suppliers document. |
| Users | This refers to users internal to the Bank of England, primarily from the Technology division. |
| XBRL | eXtensible Business Reporting Language. A type of XML which is a specification that is used for organising and defining data specifically for business reporting. |
| XBRL Instance | A XBRL instance is an alternative description for a XBRL file received containing data ‘encoded’ in the XBRL format. |
| XBRL well-formedness | A valid XBRL document is defined as a well formed XBRL document compliant with the XBRL specifications. |
| XML | eXtensible Mark-up Language |

1. **Introduction**

The Bank of England (The Bank) is tendering to appoint a Supplier who will provide software and associated services for the validation and processing of XBRL instances. It is anticipated that the Supplier will provide services both off-site at their premises and on-site at The Bank (Threadneedle Street, London EC2R 8AH) and Moorgate (20 Moorgate, London, EC2R 6DA) or the Bank’s contingency site in Debden (Essex).

It is intended that the Contract will be in place for eight years.

* 1. **Background**

The Bank of England, as the United Kingdom’s central bank, exists to ensure both monetary and financial stability. Integral to the Bank’s functions, objectives and statutory commitments is the efficient collection a variety of high quality and timely sets of data from financial institutions so analysis can be carried out with confidence.

The Bank seeks to improve its data collection through enabling stronger data management, greater automation and implementing a standardised and streamlined method for collecting data using XBRL. The intention of this is to make it easier for the Bank to collect data and for financial institutions to supply their data.

The Bank seeks to improve in the it’s XBRL processing as part of achieving comprehensive knowledge of the data the Bank uses, strong data quality assurance, improved analytics and robust data distribution.

The successful Supplier will help architect the Solution, by working with the Bank’s internal team(s), and deliver to the Bank a secure, robust and scalable XBRL processing Solution that delivers the requirements contained in this document. The Supplier must ensure the Solution can easily scale up and down on demand over time. The Solution must also accommodate additional XBRL based data collections of varying size and complexity. Please note, the Bank has a preference for a commercial off the shelf Solution.

The successful Supplier is expected to also keep the Bank up to date with industry developments, including the latest XBRL standards and how they can be leveraged.

* 1. **Overview of the requirements**

The successful Supplier will need to supply and implement a Solution to support the processing of XBRL data as defined in this document. In summary this includes:

* Managing XBRL taxonomies as detailed in section 3.1.
* Integrating with internal system as detailed in section 3.2.
* Parsing of XBRL instances as detailed in section 3.3.
* Conversion of XBRL instances as detailed in section 3.4.
* Validation of XBRL instances as detailed in section 3.5.
* Provision of XBRL support tools as detailed in section 3.6.
* Implementing a scalable and performant Solution as detailed in section 4.5, 6 and 7.
* Provision of maintenance and support services as detailed in section 5.
  + 1. **Day 1 Requirements**

Upon commencement of the services, the Supplier is expected to expediently implement and subsequently support the Solution. Day 1 requirements are to include the following:

* Planning, architecture and design of a scalable Solution.
* Delivery of the platform and implementation of the Day 1 use cases and related capability as detailed in the Functional and Non Functional Requirements.
* Taxonomies required for Day 1 are those published by the Bank and EIOPA, plus any taxonomies extended by these ones. Examples of these are listed in Appendix C.
* Integration with the Bank’s data collection platforms used to collect the Day 1 use cases in conjunction with the data collection solution partners.
* Provision of testing as specified in section 7.2.
* Provision of training as specified in section 7.3.
* Support and maintenance for Day 1 use cases.
* Output to different data storage technologies via data extraction / export / conversion to other formats i.e. CSV, JSON or XML.
* Provision of data input, validation and conversion to XBRL from other formats i.e. Excel, CSV, JSON or XML.
* Execution of business validation rule checks as defined in a XBRL taxonomy. N.B. Some reconciliation and plausibility rule checks will be executed ‘down-stream’ in analytical systems.
* Output of business validation rule results to multiple formats e.g, CSV, Excel, or XML.
* Implementation of Filing Rules.
* Service and maintenance requirements as specified in Section 5.
  + 1. **Future Requirements**

Those requirements that may/may not be needed during the Term of the Contract at the Bank’s request as part of future projects. These may include:

* Future Planning, architecture and solution design.
* Delivery of the platform and implementation of the Future use cases and related capability as detailed in the Future Functional and Future Non Functional Requirements.
* Taxonomies likely for the future are (subject to change):
  + New Bank of England taxonomies (highly likely within 24 months).
  + EBA CRDIV taxonomy (moderately likely within 36 months).
  + IFRS taxonomy (to be confirmed).
* Implementation of future taxonomies including professional services, potentially Additional Software and associated support.
* Decommissioning of no longer used taxonomies.
* Implementation of new Filing Rules in the Solution.
* Implementation of XBRL sub-setting in the Solution.
* Miscellaneous services including , but not limited to:
  + Integration with other parts of the Bank’s infrastructure, including but not limited to an ESB product, middleware and orchestration.
  + Bank driven architectural changes.
  + Training.
  + Testing.

The Supplier must not include any costs for these Future Requirements in the ‘Commercial Evaluation’ worksheet contained within the pricing schedule. Please note the Supplier will still need to provide pricing in ‘Pricing Additional Software’ and ‘Rate card eval.’ worksheet for future activity.

* 1. **Structure of this SOUR**

The SOUR is separated into a number of sections as detailed below:

* Section 3, 4, 6 and 8 detail the Functional, Non-Functional, General and Licensing Requirements for the Solution as at the date of implementation (Day 1 Requirements);
* Section 5 details the Bank’s Service Requirements for the support of the implemented Solution; and
* Section 7 details the Bank’s Requirements in respect of implementing the Solution;
* Section 9 details the Professional services and account management requirements.
* Section 10 addresses the potential Future Requirements (which the Bank may seek the successful Supplier to implement during the Term of the Contract).
  1. **Interaction between the SOUR and Pricing Schedule**

The Pricing Schedule requires that Suppliers submit various charges, which interact with this SOUR as detailed below:

* Commercial Evaluation worksheet
  + The licence charge (including any third party software costs) to meet the licensing requirements set out in section 8.
  + The maintenance and support service charges should reflect the Supplier’s ongoing cost of supporting the Solution.
  + The implementation service charges should reflect the cost of implementing a Solution so as to meet the Bank’s Day 1 Requirements as detailed in this SOUR –excluding all Future Requirements. Implementation of Future Requirements should not be assumed nor included.
  + The initial training charges to cover training which enables the Bank to utilise the Solution in accordance with the Contract from the go live date (as detailed in paragraph 7.3)
* SRC (C,D & E) breakdown worksheet
  + The implementation charges specific to Suppliers proposal where SRC codes C, D or E are put forward for certain Functional and Non Functional requirements.
* Pricing Additional Software worksheet
  + The proposed charges relating to any Additional Software that may be needed to support the Banks Future Requirements.
* Rate Card eval. worksheet
  + The rate card should reflect the day rate costs which will be charged by a successful Supplier if and when the Bank chooses to call off professional services.
  1. **Minimum requirements**

The Bank is following the Competitive Procedure with Negotiation – as defined by section 29 of the Public Contract Regulations 2015 – and as such intends (accordingly with the process set out in the Instructions to Suppliers to negotiate with Suppliers on the Solutions proposed. The Bank, however, will not negotiate on its Minimum Requirements which a successful Supplier must meet.

Those Requirements that form the set of Technical Minimum Requirements are identified in this SOUR by either (i) a Must in the ‘MoSCoW’ column in the requirement tables, or (ii) by being noted as a Technical Minimum Requirement within the requirement detail itself.

* 1. **Bank of England software**

The Bank will provide the following software, categorised as below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Product** |
| Anti-virus software | Symantec Enterprise Protection or McAfee |
| Big data technologies | Hortonworks, HIVE, Hawq |
| Databases | SQL Server 2012 R2, Hadoop |
| Desktop operating system | Windows 7 |
| Desktop virtualisation | Citrix |
| Document management | FileSite |
| Internal access management | Microsoft Active directory |
| Monitoring | Microsoft SCOM |
| Operating systems | Windows 2012 R2, Redhat Linux or Solaris |
| Virtualisation | VMWare |
| Web browsers | IE11, Google Chrome |

When proposing its Solution, a Supplier shall make no assumption or use existing knowledge of any Bank licensed or owned software as basis for their answer unless specifically mentioned in the requirements contained in the table above.

Suppliers must detail and provide itemised costs for any software and related licensing not in the above list within the Pricing Schedule required to deliver a Requirement or set of Requirements.

1. **Functional Requirements**

Unless stated otherwise in a requirement, please use no more than 250 words together with any diagrams in your descriptive response. Your descriptive response should clearly articulate how your proposed Solution will meet the requirement defined and support the accuracy of the SRC (if applicable). For clarity, the Bank is not just looking for confirmation from the Supplier that their Solution can meet the Banks’ requirement.

* 1. **Manage taxonomies**

This section sets out the requirements on the XBRL processor for:

* Supporting and processing data against multiple different XBRL taxonomies and their historical versions.
* Supported XBRL specifications.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A.001 | Manage XBRL taxonomies | The Solution must support any XBRL taxonomy built according to the XBRL specifications. | Must |  |  |
| A.002 | Manage XBRL taxonomies | The Solution must be able to support taxonomies published by the Bank of England, EBA and EIOPA (referenced in Appendix B) including the taxonomies they extend.  The following taxonomies must be **installed**:   * UK Banking v2.x.x. * EIOPA Preparatory v1.5.2.C. * EIOPA Full Solvency II v2.0.1 - v2.2.0. * UK Stress Test v1.0.1 – v2.x.x (not publically available).   Examples of taxonomies that are extended by the above include:   * Eurofiling. * EBA CRDIV v2.5.x.x * SRB Ex-Ante | Must |  |  |
| A.003 | Add and remove existing taxonomies | The Solution must allow internal users to add or remove individual or multiple XBRL taxonomies as required via a user interface or a configuration file. | Must |  |  |
| A.004 | Supporting multiple XBRL taxonomies | The Solution must support multiple XBRL taxonomies, including multiple versions of the same taxonomy (i.e. current and historic), in parallel for processing data against various Reporting Regimes. | Must |  |  |
| A.005 | Manage shared libraries | The Solution should support multiple versions of 'Shared Libraries' and / or dictionaries used by a given XBRL taxonomy. | Should |  |  |
| A.006 | Taxonomy specifications (a) | The Solution must support the following XBRL technical specifications including:   * XBRL Version 2.1. * Dimensions. * Table link base. * Calculation link base. * Formula link base. * Presentation ink base. * Taxonomy package. * Assertion severity. * Extensible enumerations. | Must |  |  |
| A.007 | Taxonomy specifications (b) | The Solution should support the following XBRL technical specifications including:   * iXBRL * Open information model. | Should |  |  |
| A.008 | Taxonomy specifications (c) | The Solution should support Public Working Draft (PWD) specifications if they are used by any version of an XBRL taxonomy used by the Bank e.g. CRDIV uses a PWD table linkbase specification or historical versions may use PWD taxonomy package specifications. | Should |  |  |
| A.009 | Taxonomy architecture (a) | The Solution must support XBRL taxonomies architected according to Eurofiling architecture principles. | Must |  |  |
| A.010 | Taxonomy architecture (b) | The Solution should support XBRL taxonomies architected using tuples. | Should |  |  |

* 1. **Integrate with internal systems**

This section sets out the requirements on the XBRL processor for:

* Integrating with internal systems or components of the data architecture using web services / APIs.
* Integrating with database, data storage and / or big data technologies.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B.001 | System Integration | The Solution must provide the ability to integrate with a Calling System via an API / web service call in order for it to send / receive a file for processing and to return a message or result.  E.g. return status codes, return validation results, return original file, return subset file, return a new file or output extracted data to the Calling System.  In your response please provide the following details:   * Describe the web service / API methods by which instance files can be provided to the processor. * If and how the processor supports processing files individually or in batches. * Describe the web service / API methods returning status codes, messages and validation results once a file has been processed. * Describe the methods by which the processor makes outputs available in Excel, CSV, JSON and / or XML.   Where applicable, please also include details of:   * Products, versions, patch levels and service packs. * The outputs, APIs and / or services available and how these are managed and monitored. * How authentication is achieved. * How integration is achieved. * How data is interchanged and industry standard data schemas that are supported.   Please use no more than 800 words. | Must |  |  |
| B.002 | Rendering | The Solution should provide a mechanism, via an API or otherwise, to enable the rendering of XBRL instances according to definitions specified in a related taxonomy, via a user interface.  In your response, where applicable, please include details of the following:   * The outputs, APIs and / or services available and how these are managed and monitored. * How authentication is achieved. * How integration is achieved. * How rendering via a user interface is achieved with supporting example code.   Please use no more than 600 words. | Should |  |  |
| B.003 | Databases, Data Storage and Big Data | The Solution should be able to extract data, including semantic metadata for onward storage and processing.  In your response please provide the following details:   * How data can be output. * The formats that are output i.e. CSV, JSON, XML and /or SQL. * What information from the XBRL instance is contained and how it is represented. * What information from the taxonomy is contained and how it represented i.e. semantic metadata | Should |  |  |

* 1. **XBRL parsing**

This section sets out the requirements on the XBRL processor for Parsing and processing an XBRL instance document.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C.001 | Process XBRL instance | The Solution must have the ability to process an XBRL instance against the correct taxonomy and version of that taxonomy. | Must |  |  |
| C.002 | Asynchronous/multi-threaded processing | The Solution must process multiple XBRL instances received from a Calling System, against different taxonomies if required, in an asynchronous and / or multithreaded manner.  In your response, please provide details on:   * How asynchronous and / or multithreaded processing is achieved. * How brokering client requests to multiple instances in multiple data centres in an active / active manner is achieved. * How the queue works, is managed and if any additional software is required. * Whether load balancing is required and if so how it works in this context. * Whether parallel streaming is supported. * How the queue can be managed to process more urgent client requests quickly over low priority ones. | Must |  |  |

* 1. **XBRL conversion**

This section sets out the requirements on the XBRL processor for:

* Supporting the extraction and conversion of XBRL data to human readable formats.
* Supporting the generation of Excel forms for data entry.
* Supporting the creation of new facts and reports.
* Supporting the bulk extract of data.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D.001 | Export into human readable formats | The Solution must be able to convert / export XBRL instances into human readable formats such as Excel or CSV. This is so the semantic data contained in an instance is viewable in the reporting template format defined in the relevant XBRL taxonomy, including open dimension tables (subject to reasonable limitations in excel). | Must |  |  |
| D.002 | Excel workbooks | The Solution should have the ability to generate Excel workbooks from any XBRL taxonomy (including open dimensions).  The Bank should be able to issue these workbooks to firms to assist in the reporting of data to the Bank. | Should |  |  |
| D.003 | Processing Excel workbooks | The Solution should have the ability to process the Excel workbooks generated by the Solution as completed by a firm or an internal test team, as if they were XBRL instances. | Should |  |  |
| D.004 | Publishing Excel workbooks | The Solution should enable the Bank to generate XBRL enabled Excel workbooks for external publication on <http://www.bankofengland.co.uk>.  In your response please detail any restrictions on publication or use of these generated Excel forms. Please note, if there are no restrictions your response will score 10, if there are restrictions your response will score 0. | Should |  |  |
| D.005 | Bulk Export to SQL | The Solution should have the ability to bulk export data from an XBRL instance to an SQL Structure (preferably based on an SQL Server) according to a given taxonomy. | Should |  |  |
| D.006 | Bulk export to CSV and / or JSON | The Solution should have the ability to bulk export data from an XBRL instance to CSV and / or JSON, retaining all dimension information and metadata from an XBRL instance. | Should |  |  |
| D.007 | Processing OIM based XBRL instances | The Solution should support the processing of XBRL documents received in formats supported by the OIM specification (i.e. CSV and JSON) to support the Bank’s aim to collect granular data or data in a lighter weight format. | Should |  |  |

* 1. **XBRL validation**

This section sets out the requirements on the XBRL processor for:

* Automatically validating XBRL instances against the relevant XBRL specifications, syntax and taxonomy.
* Supporting XBRL Filing Rules and automatically validating XBRL instances against them.
* Managing the enabling and disabling of XBRL taxonomy validation rules and Filing Rules.
* Returning validation messages.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| E.001 | Automatic validation | The Solution must automatically validate an XBRL instance against the correct XBRL taxonomy version for the following:   * XML syntax. * XBRL well-formedness. * XBRL specification validation. * XII formula validation. * Assertion severity.   In your response please describe how validation results include business friendly text form the taxonomy and detail what additional information is provided e.g. row and column co-ordinates.  Please also describe how low level or filing rule errors are converted to user friendly error messages. | Must |  |  |
| E.002 | Filing rules (a) | The Solution must apply the EBA, EIOPA or the Bank specific Filing Rules to a submitted XBRL instance document depending on the requirements for a given taxonomy (see Appendix B). | Must |  |  |
| E.003 | Filing rules (b) | The version of the Filing Rules should be applicable to a given taxonomy version, e.g. EIOPA version 2.1 of the Filing Rules to version 2.1.x of the EIOPA SII taxonomy. | Should |  |  |
| E.004 | Rule checks for taxonomies | The Solution must be able to identify and apply the correct validation rule and filing rule checks as appropriate for different XBRL taxonomies or different versions of the same XBRL taxonomy. | Must |  |  |
| E.005 | Control validation errors | The Solution must be able to control the number of validation error and warning messages produced via a configurable parameter for each taxonomy and taxonomy version. It must also stop processing once this threshold has been reached and return the validation results up to that point. | Must |  |  |
| E.006 | Machine readable validation results | The Solution must have the ability to produce validation results in a machine readable format for use by Calling Systems. | Must |  |  |
| E.007 | Validation rule failures | The Solution should identify which reporting templates in a given taxonomy contain one or more validation rule failures. | Should |  |  |
| E.008 | Disable/enable Filing Rules | The Solution should be easily configurable by the Bank in disabling and enabling of Filing Rules for a given taxonomy and version of that taxonomy. | Should |  |  |
| E.009 | Disable/ enable individual rules | The Solution must have the ability to disable/enable the execution of individual validation rules in a given taxonomy. There is a preference for this to be configurable by the Bank. | Must |  |  |
| E.010 | Disable /enable all rules | The Solution should have the ability to disable/enable the execution of all validation rules in a given taxonomy. There is a preference for this to be configurable by the Bank. | Should |  |  |
| E.011 | Downgrade / Upgrade individual rules | The Solution should have the ability to configure the downgrade / upgrade the execution of individual validation rules in a given taxonomy, where a validation rule has been defined using the assertion severity specification i.e. an ERROR can be downgraded to WARNING or OK, or vice versa. | Should |  |  |

* 1. **XBRL support tools**

This section sets out the requirements for XBRL support tools that allow users to view, validate, diagnose and resolve issues with XBRL instances. The purpose of this tool is to enable the Banks technical teams to provide effective first and second line support and resolution in case of circa 95% of issues with XBRL instances so as to act as a triage and minimise the involvement required by the Supplier. Usage of the tool will include:

* Automatically validating XBRL instances against the relevant XBRL specifications, syntax and taxonomy.
* Supporting XBRL Filing Rules and automatically validating XBRL instances against them.
* Viewing XBRL instances and being able to view and target errors within those instances.
* Managing the enabling and disabling of XBRL taxonomy validation rules and Filing Rules.
* Returning validation messages.
* Exporting XBRL instances to human readable format.

The requirements below are specific to software that can be used for supporting investigations into XBRL instances. Therefore they are not duplicates of previous requirements and should be responded to in the context of software providing this support.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| F.001 | Manage XBRL taxonomies | The Solution must support any XBRL taxonomy built according to the XBRL specifications. | Must |  |  |
| F.002 | Add and remove existing taxonomies | The Solution must allow internal users to add or remove individual or multiple XBRL taxonomies as required, via configuration.  I.e. Configuration may happen be via user interface or a configuration file. | Must |  |  |
| F.003 | Taxonomy specifications (a) | The Solution must support the following XBRL technical specifications including:   * XBRL Version 2.1. * Dimensions. * Table link base. * Calculation link base. * Formula link base. * Presentation ink base. * Taxonomy package. * Assertion severity. * Extensible enumerations. | Must |  |  |
| F.004 | Taxonomy specifications (b) | The Solution should support the following XBRL technical specifications including:   * iXBRL. * Open information model. | Should |  |  |
| F.005 | Taxonomy specifications (c) | The Solution should support Public Working Draft (PWD) specifications if they are used by any version of an XBRL taxonomy used by the Bank e.g. CRDIV uses a PWD table linkbase specification or historical versions may use PWD taxonomy package specifications. | Should |  |  |
| F.006 | Automatic validation | The Solution must automatically validate an XBRL instance against the correct XBRL taxonomy version for the following:   * XML syntax. * XBRL well-formedness. * XBRL specification validation. * XII formula validation. * Assertion severity.   Validation results must be returned in plain English and allow problems to be easily diagnosed. | Must |  |  |
| F.007 | Filing rules (a) | The Solution must apply the EBA, EIOPA or the Bank specific Filing Rules to a submitted XBRL instance document depending on the requirements for a given taxonomy (see Appendix D). | Must |  |  |
| F.008 | Filing rules (b) | The version of the Filing Rules should be applicable to a given taxonomy version, e.g. EIOPA version 2.1 of the Filing Rules to version 2.1.x of the EIOPA SII taxonomy. | Should |  |  |
| F.009 | Control validation errors | The Solution must be able to control the number of validation error and warning messages produced via a configurable parameter for each taxonomy and taxonomy version. It must also stop processing once this threshold has been reached and return the validation results up to that point | Must |  |  |
| F.010 | Validation rule failures | The Solution should identify which reporting templates in a given taxonomy contain one or more validation rule failures. | Should |  |  |
| F.011 | Disable/enable Filing Rules | The Solution should be easily configurable by the Bank in disabling and enabling of Filing Rules for a given taxonomy and version of that taxonomy. | Should |  |  |
| F.012 | Disable/ enable individual rules | The Solution must have the ability to disable/enable the execution of individual validation rules in a given taxonomy. There is a preference for this to be configurable by the Bank. | Must |  |  |
| F.013 | Disable /enable all rules | The Solution should have the ability to disable/enable the execution of all validation rules in a given taxonomy. There is a preference for this to be configurable by the Bank. | Should |  |  |
| F.014 | View instances | The Solution must be able to render XBRL instances on a user interface and allow a user to drill down by template, table part and cell and enable that user to view any errors and / or any XBRL metadata. | Must |  |  |
| F.015 | Export into human readable formats | The Solution must be able to convert / export XBRL instances into human readable formats such as Excel or CSV. This is so the semantic data contained in an instance is viewable in the reporting template format defined in the relevant XBRL taxonomy, including open dimension tables (subject to reasonable limitations in excel). | Must |  |  |

1. **Non Functional Requirements**

Unless stated otherwise in a requirement, in your responses, please use no more than 250 words together with any diagrams. Your descriptive response should clearly articulate how your proposed Solution will meet the requirement defined. For clarity, the Bank is not just looking for confirmation from the Supplier that their Solution can meet the Banks’ requirement.

Please note, there are a number of requirements within this section that will also be relevant to section 3.6. These include:

* G.002.
* H.001.
* M.002.
* N.001.
* O.002.
  1. **Compatibility**

This category of non-functional requirements assesses how the Solution is compatible with the Bank’s common infrastructure and software.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| G.001 | Virtualisation | The Bank has a principle of deploying solutions to a virtualised environment currently based on VMWare.  The Solution must be able to run on a virtualised environment (VMWare). | Must |  |  |
| G.002 | Infrastructure & Operating System | The Solution must be compatible with the Bank’s existing infrastructure products, tools and services for hosting, management and security products and operating systems.  Please refer to section 3.6 as basis for your response. | Must |  |  |
| G.003 | SQL Repository | If required, the operational repository used to store data essential to support the operation of the Solution should be Microsoft SQL Server e.g. in case of asynchronous processing.  In your response please describe the layers of integration your Solution can offer with standard relational databases. | Should |  |  |
| G.004 | Monitoring | The Solution must be integrated with Microsoft SCOM for enhanced monitoring. | Must |  |  |

* 2. **Integrity**

This category of non-functional requirements assesses the integrity of the solution.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| H.001 | Integrity | The integrity and accuracy of data in a XBRL instance must be maintained from the point of receipt by the Solution and throughout the processing, handling and output of that data.  Please refer to section 3.6 as basis for your response. | Must |  |  |

* 3. **Disaster recovery**

This category of non-functional requirements assesses how your Solution meets the Bank’s disaster recovery needs.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| I.001 | Disaster recovery | The Bank operates a split site arrangement for contingency purposes.  The Solution must have a disaster recovery solution that supports a mirrored active/active production configuration. Please confirm how your Solution supports this requirement.  The Supplier does not need to provide infrastructure. | Must | N/A |  |

* 1. **Maintainability**

This category of non-functional requirements assesses how easy it is to maintain the Solution i.e. how easy it is to upgrade, apply patching, monitor performance, and test.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| J.001 | Release and Configuration Management | The Solution should provide the capability to manage the release and configuration of all components in an automated manner. | Should | N/A |  |
| J.002 | Changeability & Deployment | The Solution should allow any changes to be packaged up and deployed incrementally and in an automated manner.  In your response using no more than 500 words, please provide particular reference to:   * Deployment into multiple environments. * Deployment of patches. * Permissions / privileges required by components. * Tools required / provided for deployment.     Please also ensure you provide the following details, if applicable:   * Whether your Solution supports deployment in a web farm environment. If applicable, will there be any specific requirements, e.g. for management of session state. * How each tier of the Solution will be deployed. * Whether installation and patching of the software require ‘Administrator Level’ privileges. * Whether the Solution needs to be installed under the credentials of the user that will ultimately use it. * Whether or not it is possible to run multiple versions of your software on the same server. * Whether any tools are provided to the Bank to aid with our administration or deployment. * Please describe how (if) your Solution supports software upgrades without impacting service availability.  This should cover upgrades to operating systems (including patches) and Solution upgrades such as bug fixes or new functional releases. | Should | N/A |  |
| J.003 | Deployment | The Solution should be extendable for new and existing features without having to deploy a new version. | Should | N/A |  |

* 1. **Performance efficiency**

This category of non-functional requirements assesses the performance, speed and efficiency of the solution.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K.001 | Scalability | The Solution must scale to process and validate fluctuating volumes and frequencies of data. The Solution must also not degrade in performance during points of peak usage.  Please refer to Appendix B for known and projected statistics.  Please describe how the Solution would deliver this requirement. In your response please include the following information:   * How individual components of your Solution can be scaled. * Whether they scale best ‘horizontally’ i.e. more servers or ‘vertically’ i.e. more CPUs, memory, processors etc. * The impact on the Bank’s environment hosting the Solution. * If the processor is called synchronously or asynchronously, the outcome when XBRL instances are received for different taxonomies. * Performance metrics that show the performance improvements as the Solution scales horizontally (by server increase) or vertically (by CPU, memory or processor increase). * Performance metrics for varying file sizes, number of validations, sheets (z-axis) and rows (y-axis) to support your response and can be used for benchmarking.   Please use no more than 800 words to support your response. You may use a separate document to evidence any metrics and benchmarks. | Must | N/A |  |
| K.002 | Validation Response Time | The Solution should allow for fluctuating volume of files, such as during peak reporting periods, to ensure there is limited impact on the speed at which incoming files are processed and validated.  Validation must be carried out quickly and efficiently relative to the size of the submission and responses provided back to the Reporting Entity.  In your response please ensure you respond to each of the following.   1. Please confirm if you have already carried out any benchmarking. If yes, please provide your benchmarks. Please also ensure you include details of the time to validate relative to the file size, number of facts, validation rules, open or closed data plus time to extract relative to these dimensions and the maximum file size supported. 2. Please provide details on the recommended memory requirements relative to the file size, number of taxonomies and whether increasing memory will result in the ability to validate faster and / or handle larger file sizes as well as manage more taxonomies. Please include details of your recommended memory requirements and related statistics. 3. If your solution does not satisfy this requirement, please provide any benchmarks you have for processing similar XBRL instances and any testing you have done with instances and the largest file sizes your tool supports for validation and extraction. 4. If you do not have any benchmarks, please describe your approach to benchmarking the processing of EIOPA Solvency II XBRL instances as an example. 5. How the benchmarks vary or validation time for the 1GB EIOPA Solvency II files varies according to different hardware specifications.   Please use no more than 800 words. You may use a separate document to evidence your metrics and benchmarks. | Should | N/A |  |
| K.003 |  | In relation to K.002, as an example, XBRL instances for the Solvency II ARS entry point are estimated to be up to at least 1.5GB in size assuming a large firm with a large number of assets reported.  It is expected approximately 70% of Reporting Entities will submit their data on the last day of a reporting period.  The Solution outputs e.g. derived data, messages, validation results etc. must be available by consuming Calling System(s) within a reasonable timeframe.  Please state the validation response times for a 1.5GB Solvency II ARS file with no validation failures for version 2.1 of the EIOPA Solvency II Taxonomy for the following bounds:   1. <= 30 mins   (*scoring = 10*).   1. > 31 mins – 60 mins.   (*scoring = 7*)   1. > 61 mins – 90 mins.   (*scoring = 4*)   1. > 90 mins (least favourable).   (*scoring = 0*)  N.B. The Bank may request that you provide the file used to support the above response for its analysis. | Should |  |  |
| K.004 | High Availability | The Solution must be a highly available load balanced solution.  It must be able to broker client requests to multiple instances across multiple data centres in an active\active manner. This may be performed by the use of third party network load balancers with appropriate algorithms utilised.  For example “round robin”, “least connection” or via a proprietary load balancing solution within the Solution which must be fully supported by the Supplier.  Please explain your method and if possible provide performance metrics supporting your response.  Please use no more than 400 words. | Must | N/A |  |
| K.005 | Processing | The Solution must support processing of multiple XBRL instances against the same or different XBRL taxonomies received via a Calling System for different Reporting Entities. | Must |  |  |

* 1. **Reliability**

This category of non-functional requirements assesses how reliable the Solution is.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| L.001 | Stability | In the event of a system failure, if the Solution is mid-processing it should be able to restart from the last committed transaction. | Should |  |  |
| L.002 | Data Loss | The Solution should be recoverable from all business and technical failures to prevent any data loss. | Should |  |  |

* 1. **Security**

This category of non-functional requirements assesses how your Solution meets the Bank’s security needs.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| M.001 | Security events and alerting | The Solution should have the ability to identify security breaches and should have the ability to notify / alert. | Should |  |  |
| M.002 | Auditing | The Solution must automatically record an audit trail of all events under its control.  Please refer to section 3.6 as basis for your response. | Must |  |  |
| M.003 | Data Flows | The Solution should be able to clearly articulate the security architecture and data flows. | Should |  |  |

* 1. **Software releases**

This category of non-functional requirements assesses how your software releases will be managed in your Solution.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N.001 | Software Version | The Bank must have control over which version of supported software it uses during the Term of this Contract.  Therefore, the Bank is not obliged to accept every new version of software released by the Supplier, provided that the Bank acknowledges that certain functionality it requires may only be available within a subsequent version of the software. Please be assured that The Bank will endeavour to refrain from falling too far behind the current release so as to not cause significant cost or logistical impact upon the Supplier from a support perspective.  Please refer to section 3.6 as basis for your response. | Must | N/A |  |
| N.002 | Solution Documentation | The Supplier must provide a complete list and description of all the documentation provided with the Solution including its function and target audience. This must include updated technical training guides and design documentation as appropriate for all releases. | Must | N/A |  |
| N.003 | Release Support | When required, the Supplier must provide on-site support for any major upgrade of the Solution. | Must | N/A |  |

* 10. **Usability**

This category of non-functional requirements assesses how easy the solution is to administer and to use for both frequent and non-frequent users.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| O.001 | Error Messages | The Solution must enable distinction between different types of system error message. | Must |  |  |
| O.002 | Error Message Clarity | The Solution must produce clear system error messages.  In your response please provide details around how your Solution would do this and how they can be accessed.  Please refer to section 3.6 as basis for your response. | Must |  |  |
| O.003 | Events and Error Logs | The Solution must allow the Bank to view the error and event logs of all activity to enable incident and problem diagnosis and investigation.  In your response please provide details including how this information is recorded and where and how it can be viewed or extracted. | Must |  |  |
| O.004 | Interface Language | If the Solution has a user interface, it must support British English (en\_GB). | Must |  |  |

# Service Requirements

This section covers the Bank requirements for the support model, support hours, release management, maintenance, error and request management, root cause analysis, performance management, management information, the supplier’s disaster recovery procedures and contents of releases.

Unless stated otherwise in a requirement, in your responses, please use no more than 500 words. Your descriptive response should clearly articulate how your proposed Solution will meet the requirement defined. For clarity, we are not just looking for confirmation from the Supplier that their solution can meet the Banks’ requirement.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **Descriptive Response** |
| P.001 | Support Model | The Supplier must align with the Bank’s support model in order to provide the maintenance and support services detailed in Schedules 2 (in particular sections 4 – 10) and 6 of the Contract.  Please describe your ability to align with the Bank’s support model in order to provide the maintenance and support services. | Must |  |
| P.002 | Support Hours | With respect to the support model detailed Schedules 2 (particularly sections 4 – 10) and 6 of the Contract, the Supplier must provide support from 0800 to 1800 on UK workdays only but with the ability (on 2 weeks’ notice) to call off 24 hour support for one or more UK workdays. These days are known as Peak Days. The Supplier must be able to provide 36 Peak Days support per year which is to be priced into the initial option. The Supplier must roll over these Peak Days at the end of the year to the following year or provide a refund should they not be used.  The Supplier must provide the ability for the Bank to purchase additional Peak Days should it look like we will we exceed the available Peak Days in any one year.  Please describe your ability to align with the Bank’s support model, specifically in relation to this support hours requirement in order to provide the maintenance and support services. | Must |  |
| P.003 | Extended Support Hours | The Bank at its discretion may at some point the Bank may want to move to 24 X 5 (i.e. workdays & work nights) or 24 x 7 on a continual basis. Please confirm how much notice you will require in order to flex maintenance and support services up to 24 x 5 and up to 24 x 7 on a more permanent basis. | Should |  |
| P.004 | Release Management | The Supplier must provide at least 24 months’ written notice of the termination of support for the version of the software the Bank is using in its production environment.  The Supplier must align to the release management model detailed in Schedule 2 (particularly sections 7 and 8) and 6 of the Contract.  Please describe your ability to align with the Bank’s release management model as part of the maintenance and support services.  Where relevant, please also ensure that your answer refers to the Bank’s Requirements for change control detailed at Schedule 7 of the Contract. | Must |  |
| P.005 | Maintenance | The Supplier must maintain the Solution in accordance with the Schedule 2 (particularly sections 4 – 10) and 6.  Please describe your ability to maintain the Solution in accordance with Schedule 2 and 6 of the Contract, particularly in respect of patching, planned outages and the associated change management processes.  Where relevant, please also ensure that your answer refers to the Bank’s Requirements for change control detailed at Schedule 7 of the Contract. | Must |  |
| P.006 | Error & Request Management | The Supplier must manage errors and requests in accordance with Schedule 2 (particularly sections 4 – 10) and 6 of the Contract.  Please describe your ability to manage errors and requests in accordance with Schedule 2 and 6 of the Contract.  Where relevant, please also ensure that your answer refers to the Bank’s Requirements for change control detailed at Schedule 2, section 7 of the Contract. | Must |  |
| P.007 | Root Cause Analysis | The Supplier must provide root cause analysis in accordance with Schedule 2 (particularly sections 4 – 10) and 6 of the Contract.  Please describe your ability to carry out root cause analysis and associated problem management processes in accordance with Schedules 2 and 6 of the Contract. | Must |  |
| P.008 | Performance Monitoring and Management Information | The Supplier must provide service performance monitoring, management information and reporting in accordance with Schedules 2, 6 (particularly sections 4 and 4) and 8 of the Contract.  Please describe your ability to report, performance monitor and provide management information in accordance with Schedules 2 and 6 of the Contract. | Must |  |
| P.009 | Disaster Recovery Procedures | The Supplier must ensure continuity of the service, through appropriate disaster recovery and business continuity procedures.  Please describe your ability to meet the Bank’s Requirements relating to business continuity and disaster recovery detailed in Schedule 9 of the Contract with particular reference to:   * Invocation. * Communication. * Time to invoke. * Time to recover. | Must |  |
| P.010 | Release Content | The Supplier must provide maintenance releases for the Solution.  Please provide details on the scope of what maintenance releases cover and how often they are provided.  In your response please include details on:   * Specification updates. * New features. * Performance improvements * Module updates including Filing Rules | Must |  |
| P.011 | Taxonomy specifications (a) | The Supplier must keep the Solution maintained and up to date with any new or updated REC XBRL specifications. | Must |  |
| P.012 | Taxonomy specifications (b) | The Supplier should keep the Solution maintained and up to date with any new or updated PWD XBRL specifications if required by the Bank as per requirement A.008. | Should |  |
| P.013 | Taxonomy specifications (c) | The Solution should support, within no more than 6 months from notification from the Bank, any new or updated REC or PWD XBRL specifications.  Please provide details on the process by which new REC or PWD XBRL specifications would be added to your software and the associated timeline.  Please note, that on the assumption that the requirement may be met, scores will be allocated as follows:   1. < 2 months   (*scoring = 10*)   1. 2 month - <= 4 months   (*scoring =7*)   1. 4 months - <= 6 months   (*scoring =4*)   1. > 6 months)   (*scoring = 0*) | Should |  |
| P.014 | Filing rules (a) | The Supplier must keep the Solution maintained and up to date with Filing Rules published by the EBA, EIOPA, Bank of England and the FCA.  For information: Currently the Bank of England publishes Filing Rules related to Solvency II submissions and has minor deviations to that of EIOPA. The FCA publishes Filing Rules related to CRDIV submissions that have minor deviations to that of the EBA. | Must |  |
| P.015 | Filing rules (b) | The Supplier should confirm the Solution would be maintained and kept up to date on all filing rule updates within 4 months from notification of the Bank.  Please supplement your response with your proposed timeframe. Please note, scores will be allocated as follows:   1. < 1 months   (*scoring = 10*)   1. 1 month - <=2 months   (*scoring = 7*)   1. 2 months - <= 4 months   (*scoring = 4*)   1. > 4 months)   (*scoring = 0*) | Should |  |
| P.016 | XBRL Investigation | In the event a Reporting Entity’s XBRL cannot be processed and the Bank cannot determine the cause and resolve the issue, the Supplier should provide support services to investigate and resolve, either by applying a fix or providing documented instructions to fix to the Bank.  Please describe your ability and approach to investigating, resolving and providing documented feedback on issues with XBRL instances.  The Supplier should be able to provide 30 XBRL Instance Investigation Days support per year, consumed in half-day increments, which is to be priced into the initial option. The Supplier must roll over these XBRL Instance Investigation Days at the end of the year to the following year or provide a refund should they not be used.  The Supplier should provide the ability for the Bank to purchase additional XBRL Instance Investigation Days to supplement an existing allowance or in order to obtain XBRL Instance Investigation Services if an allowance has been exhausted. | Should |  |
| P.017 | Housekeeping | The Supplier should provide details on maintenance of databases or internal file stores used by the Solution. | Should |  |

# General Approach

## Architecture

The Bank is seeking to understand the Supplier’s architectural approach to designing and evolving the Solution and how it integrates with the Bank’s Day 1 and Future Requirements to ensure it continues to fulfil the Bank’s needs.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement** | **Descriptive Response** |
| Q.001 | The Bank requires a clear and understandable architectural design that:   * Is readily scalable with minimal configuration that also includes adding new versions of the required taxonomies. * Is resilient. * Is stable (high availability). * Is efficient. * Contains overflow capability. * Is able to support Day 1 taxonomies. * Contains asynchronous and/or multi-threaded processing. * Includes the required CPUs & RAM by environment and operating system. * Includes the required number of XBRL processors. * Details how administration tasks are accomplished, e.g. adding a new taxonomy, configuring maximum number of validation errors reported.   The Bank is keen to:   * Understand what role each component performs. * Understand a typical deployment pattern in order to demonstrate the high availability options.   With reference to Sections, 2.2.1, 2.6, 3, 4, Appendix B and C, please propose an architectural design supplemented by a logical and high-level physical diagram displaying this in an on-premise environment.  Where you have made assumptions about components the Bank will provide, such as authentication and authorisation services via active directory, please show these as well.  Please use no more than 1000 words. |  |
| Q.002 | The Bank requires logical rationale behind your architectural design. With reference Q.001 to your answer above, please provide details of any advantages, disadvantages, limitations and capacity issues.  Please also include any trade-offs you may have made relating to dictionary versioning or other conflicts within the taxonomies.  Please use no more than 300 words. |  |
| Q.003 | The Bank requires an architectural design that can support conflicting release and deployment cycles which ensures a thoroughly tested, high quality deliverable whilst retaining our ability to respond quickly to change.  Please provide your rationale, as well any advantages and disadvantages, drawing particular attention to the scalability of this approach.  Please use no more than 500 words. |  |

# Implementation Approach

The Bank is seeking to understand the Supplier’s approach to delivering the proposed Solution from the responses to the questions in this section. All responses to the questions in this section will be considered and an overall mark for delivery and project management, testing approach and training respectively will be awarded based on the responses (rather than an individual score being provided to each individual Requirement).

The Bank views the Supplier’s approach and project management as being very important to the successful implementation of the Solution. To that end the Bank would expect to see in the responses evidence of the intent to use best practice and recognisable industry standard methodology.

The Bank would value Supplier responses that include (but are not limited to) the following:

* A description of the approach including the advantages to the Bank.
* An outline of the project management method and tools to be used and a statement of why this method is most likely to be successful. This should include a visual plan and also an explanation of the key stages, including non-technical steps.
* A description of how risks, actions, issues and decisions will be managed.
* A description on the management of resources, e.g. skills required, optimum size of team, key players and any key dependencies.
* Management of risks and opportunities, identifying and managing these, particularly in relation to those that could materially affect the Bank’s successful implementation.
* Communications and progress reporting between the Supplier and the Bank so as to give confidence to the Bank that the implementation is managed in a controlled manner with clear deliverables and including the tracking of the progress of these in an easy to view way.
* In planning for this implementation the following assumptions can be made:
  + The Bank will provide a development environment in which the Supplier can install and test the Solution.
  + The Supplier will provide full training to the Bank’s technical teams involved in the implementation to enable them, with initial support from the Supplier to independently install the Solution into the Bank’s system testing, UAT and production environments prior to these activities taking place.
  + The Bank considers one of the key factors critical to the successful delivery of this project is the co-location of key Supplier resources with the Bank’s own project team at the Bank’s premises, working alongside each other. Supplier staff will be sufficiently expert and experienced in the Solution so as not to require major support from teams back at the Supplier’s base.
  + The Bank expects the same implementation approach to be followed by the Supplier in the delivery of Future Requirements.

**Roles and Responsibilities**

The Bank has identified the following as the key roles and responsibilities, divided and shared between the Bank and the Supplier throughout the implementation of the project.

*Roles and Responsibilities Table*

| **Role** | **Responsibility** |
| --- | --- |
| Provide the correct level of resource, expertise and cooperation as required to achieve an agreed Solution within the timelines agreed in the delivery plan. | Bank / Supplier |
| Provide all relevant resources as required for the implementation identified outside of the delivery plan on a best endeavour basis. | Bank / Supplier |
| Provide a requirements document detailing the initial use cases as specified in A.002. | Bank |
| Production of all necessary solution design documentation for approval by the Bank’s Architecture Review Board. | Supplier |
| Production of a delivery plan agreed by both the Bank and the Supplier. | Bank / Supplier |
| Specify the Bank resources required for the Solution delivery in reference to the use cases. | Supplier |
| Provisioning of the required infrastructure specified during the design phase within the timelines agreed in the delivery plan. | Bank |
| Installation and configuration of the Solution in line with the approved plan. | Supplier |
| Provide status updates as defined in the delivery plan. | Supplier |
| Advising of required material changes from the agreed plan and seeking prior approval from the Bank before progressing associated work. | Supplier |
| Maintaining and assuring compliance with the Bank’s change management processes and procedures when implementing technology change. | Supplier |
| Production of a comprehensive training and upskilling programme for Bank subject matter experts that will be responsible for internal implementation of the toolset, agreed by the Bank and the Supplier. | Supplier |
| Underpinning the above, please be aware the Bank will provide as required the following resources:   * Project manager (throughout). * IT delivery manager. * Test manager. * Technology delivery resources. * Service introduction manager. | Bank |

Unless stated otherwise in a requirement, in your responses, please use no more than 250 words together with any diagrams. Your descriptive response should clearly articulate how your proposed Solution will meet the requirement defined. For clarity, the Bank is not just looking for confirmation from the Supplier that their Solution can meet the Banks’ requirement.

## Delivery and project management

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement** | **Descriptive Response** |
| R.001 | Please provide a high level overview of your proposed approach and project methodology to delivering the proposed Solution.  In your response please:   * Explain your reasons for choosing this approach. * Explain the benefits of this approach vs. others.   Please include details on how your propose to support the Bank during the following delivery stages:   * System and integration testing. * User acceptance testing. * Implementation dress rehearsals. * Live migration and implementation. * Warranty period.   Please use no more than 500 words. |  |
| R.002 | Please provide an indicative high-level project plan in order to successfully deliver your Solution.  Also as part of the project delivery, the Bank prefers that a number of Supplier roles are working on the Bank’s premises with the Bank’s own project team:   * Supplier’s project/implementation manager Supplier’s Solution/technical designer. * Supplier’s Business analyst/functional expert Supplier’s Trainer for business and technical training during training. * Supplier’s Testers.   Your plan should include the following information:   * Indicative milestones showing the breakdown of work. * The resource types required and associated man-day effort for the implementation. * The estimated effort (‘man days’) and milestones for the project including details of roles to be undertaken, by whom, when and where the work will be carried out, this should take into account the Bank’s Minimum Requirements above. * Identify the roles undertaken by the Bank, Supplier and third party resources if different from the Roles and Responsibilities table above. * What assumptions you have made in creating the plan. * What assumptions you have made about the involvement of Bank resources at key stages in the project.   Please use no more than 700 words. Inclusion of table or Gantt chart would be acceptable with commentary.  Please note your response to this question should be in line with Section 4(a) within the ‘Commercial Evaluation’ worksheet of the Pricing Schedule. |  |
| R.003 | Please provide details on what you see as the key risks to achieving a successful delivery of the Bank’s Requirements and include any mitigation that you would employ to reduce the likelihood of these risks arising. |  |
| R.004 | Please provide details on how you will provide regular assurances to the Bank’s project manager that the Requirements listed in the SOUR are being met, to time, cost and specification, at each stage of the development/configuration life cycle. |  |
| R.005 | Please provide details on how you will manage the delivery of this project in conjunction with your other current or future customer commitments e.g. new projects, significant product launches etc.  In your response, please also indicate:   * How you would manage resourcing contentions with other project commitments that may arise in the event of project delays and slippages. * Provide details and explanation for any conflicts of interest that being appointed would create for you. |  |
| R.006 | Please confirm whether your:   1. Development resources are located within the EEA and 2. Whether the maintenance and support services will be provided from within the EEA.   If either will not be located within the EEA then please provide details of the locations and please note that the Bank values low risk, in terms of IT and information security, locations for both development resources and maintenance and support services; particularly high risk locations for either may not be acceptable to the Bank.  Please also provide details of the risk mitigations you have in place to manage development and support across multiple sites, if applicable.  Please note that, the Bank will not allow remote access into its network or systems or permit data uploaded by end users on to the Solution to be held on non-Bank premises. |  |
| R.007 | Please provide details of your project change management processes. |  |

## Testing approach

The Bank is seeking to understand the Supplier’s approach to testing, ensuring quality in the Solution(s) provided to the Bank and how they will work with the Bank during testing phases in accordance with Schedule 4 of the Contract.

Please align each descriptive response with the requirements in Schedule 4 of the Contract.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| S.001 | Please provide details to explain how the testing you will carry out will cover the full set of Requirements before your product is handed over to the Bank for our own testing.  In your response please provide details on:   * The test artefacts you will produce for the Bank. * Your internal governance and sign off processes.   **N.B.** The Bank has no preference on what development methodology the Supplier uses in their own environment in order to deliver the Solution, but would like information on what this is.  On completion of the Supplier’s testing, as a minimum, the Bank requires the Supplier to provide a test summary report which should include:   * Identifying the testing executed. * The results and number of errors found, including any failed tests. * Remaining open errors in accordance with the Contract.   A summary report should be completed each time there is handover of software to the Bank, be it a release, a software drop or one or more fixes to issues found. |  |
| S.002 | The Bank has a strong desire for the Supplier to use test tools and test packs.  In your response please include information on whether:   * You use any test management tools, and if so how. * You carry out regression testing, and if so how. * You will produce the test and regression-test packs as part of the project and whether these will be made available for the Bank (post-implementation).     Please use no more than 500 words. |  |
| S.003 | The Bank has decided upon Axe by Odin, HP UFT, Selenium and Coded UI as its standardised test automation tools.  Please indicate if your Solution is compatible with Axe by Odin, HP UFT, Selenium and Coded UI to help the Bank automate its testing.  If your Solution is not compatible with the above, please indicate how test automation may work and the tool you would be using. |  |
| S.004 | Please explain how engagement during the testing phase with the Bank will operate (e.g. methodology / processes, meetings, contacts, procedures and tools / websites / support portals).    In your response, please detail how rapid turnaround of defects, issues and queries will be managed / achieved. |  |
| S.005 | Please explain your planned testing approach with the Bank.  In your response please:   * Provide example of the processes / procedures to be followed. * Detail the pre-requisites and expectations the vendor has of the bank for this activity. * Summarise how a high quality deliverable will be ensured / certified. |  |
| S.006 | Please detail the pre-requisites and expectations the Supplier has of the Bank to support testing of the Solution. |  |

## Training

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement** | **Descriptive Response** |
| T.001 | The Supplier is to provide a glossary for the Solution to the Bank, consisting of common and consistent terminology. |  |
| T.002 | The Supplier is to provide detailed user and technical guides, including standard training material.  Please list and describe the materials to be provided. |  |
| T.003 | The Supplier is to provide details of its proposed user training with content and format described. Proposals should reflect the Bank’s preference being a classroom based training on the Bank’s premises.  Please provide examples of any user/technical guides/web-based training that would support the Bank’s requirement.  Initially training will be for 10 individuals consisting of architects, developers, technical support teams and testing teams. |  |

# Licensing requirements

This section details the Bank’s requirements in respect of the licence to be provided by Suppliers. The Suppliers Licence Charges should be included in section 1 of the ‘Commercial Evaluation’ worksheet in the Pricing Schedule.

The Bank’s preference is for a comprehensive, but competitive and cost effective licensing model for the Bank’s ‘Day 1’. The licensing model should allow the Solution to be installed on multiple environments and also be flexible to accommodate Future Requirements.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| U.001 | Term | Please state your proposed licensing model for the Bank for XBRL processing software.  In your response please describe any restrictions on term within your licensing model.  Your attention is drawn to tables 8 and 9 in section 12 of the Instructions to Suppliers document as basis for how responses will be evaluated.  Please use no more than 250 words. |  |
| U.002 | Volume | Please state your proposed licensing model for the Bank for XBRL processing software.  In your response please describe any restrictions on data volumes within your licensing model.  Your attention is drawn to tables 8 and 9 in section 12 of the Instructions to Suppliers document as basis for how responses will be evaluated.  Please use no more than 250 words. |  |
| U.003 | Taxonomies | Please state your proposed licensing model for the Bank for XBRL processing software.  In your response please describe any restrictions on the installation and usage of taxonomies for reporting regimes within your licensing model.  Your attention is drawn to tables 8 and 9 in section 12 of the Instructions to Suppliers document as basis for how responses will be evaluated.  Please use no more than 250 words. |  |
| U.004 | Environments | Please state your proposed licensing model for the Bank for XBRL processing software.  In your response please describe any restrictions on the installation of the software and related Software Modules in environments for reporting regimes within your licensing model.  Your attention is drawn to tables 8 and 9 in section 12 of the Instructions to Suppliers document as basis for how responses will be evaluated.  Please use no more than 250 words. |  |
| U.005 | Software Modules | Please state your proposed licensing model for the Bank for XBRL processing software.  In your response please describe any restrictions on the use and application of supporting Software Modules and their features within your licensing model.  Your attention is drawn to tables 8 and 9 in section 12 of the Instructions to Suppliers document as basis for how responses will be evaluated.  Please use no more than 350 words. |  |
| U.006 | Support Tools - Term | Please state your proposed licensing model for the Bank for XBRL support tools.  In your response please describe any restrictions on term within your licensing model for XBRL support tools.  Your attention is drawn to tables 10 and 11 in section 12 of the Instructions to Suppliers document as basis for how responses will be evaluated.  Please use no more than 250 words. |  |
| U.007 | Support Tools - Taxonomies | Please state your proposed licensing model for the Bank for XBRL support tools.  In your response please describe any restrictions on the installation and usage of taxonomies for reporting regimes within your licensing model.  Your attention is drawn to tables 10 and 11 in section 12 of the Instructions to Suppliers document as basis for how responses will be evaluated.  Please use no more than 250 words. |  |
| U.008 | Support Tools - User Licenses | Please state your proposed licensing model for the Bank for XBRL support tools.  The Bank requires 10 licenses for XBRL support tools.  In your response please describe any restrictions on named user, transferability of named user licenses or pooled licenses.  Your attention is drawn to tables 10 and 11 in section 12 of the Instructions to Suppliers document as basis for how responses will be evaluated.  Please use no more than 250 words. |  |
| U.009 | Support Tools - Software Modules | Please state your proposed licensing model for the Bank for XBRL support tools.  In your response please describe any restrictions on the use and application of supporting Software Modules and their features within your licensing model.  Your attention is drawn to tables 10 and 11 in section 12 of the Instructions to Suppliers document as basis for how responses will be evaluated.  Please use no more than 350 words. |  |

# Professional services and account management

## Professional Services

In addition to the expected implementation, testing, training and general support services under the Contract, there may be times when the Bank wishes to acquire from the Supplier additional professional services (consultancy). This may be for general consultancy exercises or to implement Future Requirements.

All responses to the questions in this section will be considered and an overall mark for Professional Services and account management respectively will be awarded based on the responses (rather than an individual score being provided to each individual Requirement).

For all professional service requirements, the Supplier will be required to:

* Undertake project delivery on site at the Bank of England (Threadneedle Street, London EC2R 8AH and 20 Moorgate, London) with possible requirement to attend other Bank sites e.g. Debden in Essex. Off-site work may be appropriate and acceptable depending on the nature of the work.
* Respond to work requests quickly and efficiently, and where appropriate providing a range of resourcing options relative to the requirement and delivery deadline with recommendation on the most cost effective option for the specific requirements.
* Ensure that the work undertaken meets the highest possible quality standards.
* Manage its key person risk and provide suitable replacement resource to cover absence e.g. in the event of long-term sickness.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| V.001 | The Bank requires full transparency in how a price for a given piece of work i.e. delivery of a future requirement or general consultancy, has been calculated, with preference to a fixed price wherever possible.  This includes transparency on the number of professional services days for the work, grades of the individuals deployed (see Appendix A) and the number of days by individual on each assignment and accompanying rationale.  Please confirm you accept these principles. | Must | Y/N |
| V.002 | Please provide examples as to how you would enhance the Bank’s value for money from the Solution. This may include, but not limited to:   * Efficiency gains. * Innovative ways of working.   Please include within your response examples of work you have completed to this effect with existing/previous customers. | N/A |  |

The Supplier must ensure that all professional services delivered to the Bank are in line with the scope of requirements defined in a contract amendment. For any additional services beyond the scope of an agreed contract amendment, the Supplier must have prior written approval from the Bank before proceeding.

## Account management

The Bank desires a proactive relationship with the Supplier, ensuring a balance between service and ongoing critique. As part of this, the Bank not only expects the Supplier to work with the Bank to monitor performance (see below), but also to proactively identify developments in the market and provide appropriate advice and insight.

Monitoring the performance of the Supplier and assessing the health of the working relationship are key requirements with a twofold purpose:

* To ensure that the Supplier is meeting the performance criteria, e.g. service levels and quality, defined in the Contract.
* To identify service improvements.

The Bank believes that it is important to hold regular review meetings where both parties will collectively seek to understand how improvements in terms of Service performance can be attained. Meetings will be two-way, with both parties feeding back and learning from each other.

The Bank’s performance monitoring process is also part of the Bank’s supplier relationship management activity (both are detailed within the Contract). The purpose of the parties investing in the relationship should at all times have the intention of encouraging and enabling the Supplier's performance to continuously improve beyond mere contractual compliance.

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| W.001 | Please provide the names and CVs of the individual and his/her deputy that will be the lead accountable person for the commercial and technical relationships. |  |
| W.002 | Please state your internal escalation route for dispute resolution in relation to the Solution. |  |
| W.003 | Please provide an overview of a previous experience of a dispute between any existing or previous clients that you believe clearly demonstrates your willingness to strive for a successful relationship.  Please include details of the situation, the tasks and activity that took place to resolve the situation and the end result. |  |
| W.004 | The Bank is looking for a Supplier to proactively provide insight into developments in the marketplace and identify any limitations/opportunities of the Solution including, but not limited to public taxonomy updates.  Please provide details as to how you would achieve this, with specific attention to internal practice relating to market releases. |  |

# Future Requirements

The requirements in this section are included to assess the Solution’s future capability. The Supplier must not include costs related to these requirements in the ‘Commercial Evaluation’ worksheet of the Pricing Schedule. Pricing should only be inserted in the ‘Pricing Additional Software’ worksheet of the Pricing Schedule which will indicate the cost of any potential future processors and associated support and maintenance the Bank wishes to purchase.

These requirements are in four areas:

* Future Functional Requirements.
* Future Non-Functional Requirements.
* Future Architecture.
* Supplier innovation and product roadmap.

Unless stated otherwise in a requirement please use no more than 250 words together with any diagrams in your descriptive response. Your descriptive response should clearly articulate how your proposed Solution will meet the requirement defined. For clarity, the Bank is not just looking for confirmation from the Supplier that their solution can meet the Banks’ requirement.

## Future Functional Requirements

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| X.001 | Manage XBRL taxonomies | The Solution should support any XBRL taxonomy, in particular (but not limited to) those published by the Bank of England, EBA, EIOPA, ESMA, ECB, IFRS & SRB foundation.  Future Requirements encapsulating the following taxonomies are expected to be supported (in no particular order):   * EBA: CRDIV 2.0.x and above to latest at the time. * UK Insurance 1.x.x including capability to support subsequent releases. * IFRS. | Should |  |  |
| X.002 | Subsetting XBRL instances | The Solution should support translation from one taxonomy to another, also known as 'subsetting'.  An example of this is when an instance supplied by a firm is different to one that EIOPA expects to receive data in from the NCAs in the case of submissions containing ECB add-ons. | Should |  |  |
| X.003 | New reports | The Solution should support the automatic creation of derived data from processed XBRL instances using XBRL formula i.e. new cells from a combination of reported cells to create a new report. | Should |  |  |
| X.004 | Write XBRL Formulae | The Solution should allow the Bank to create XII formulae for use in taxonomies for validation purposes or to create ‘subset’ formulae to support requirements X.002 and X.003 via a user interface to abstract any technical complexity. | Should |  |  |
| X.005 | Support Tools – Edit XBRL instances | The Solution should be allow users to edit XBRL instances in a user friendly manner via user interface. | Should |  |  |

## Future Non-Functional Requirements

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement Category** | **Requirement** | **MoSCoW** | **SRC** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Y.001 | Enterprise Service Bus | The Solution should support integration with an Enterprise Service Bus (ESB).  Please provide details on the following:   * Which ESB solutions are supported. * The outputs, APIs and / or services available. * How these are managed and monitored. * How integration is achieved. * How data is interchanged (when implemented in the Bank's environment). * The industry standard data schemas that are supported. * Whether authentication is required. If so, how authentication will be achieved, and how the application and data tiers are authenticated. | Should |  |  |

## Future Architecture Approach

| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement** | **Descriptive Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Z.001 | Using the same structure as in your response to requirements Q.001 and Q.002 in section 6.1, please provide an updated logical and high-level physical diagram displaying this in an on-premise environment for this potential future scenario.  Please also indicate in words the difference between the Day 1 architecture from the future architecture proposed in this question. The Bank is keen to understand whether any extra processors may be required, including extra supporting modules, increases in servers required and increases in RAM.  Please use no more than 1200 words. |  |

## Supplier innovation and roadmap

The Bank requires the Solution and its future to be supported by an innovative roadmap, with an enterprise focus, relevant to how the consumption and exploitation of XBRL data may change over time or new use cases for XBRL taxonomies emerge.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirement Reference** | **Requirement** | **Descriptive Response** |
| AA.001 | Please describe how you see the way XBRL’s use is changing, the opportunities it might present and how this is influencing your roadmap to deliver new services.  Please describe any potential risks related to the use of XBRL in the future.  Please use no more than 400 words. |  |
| AA.002 | Please describe in detail, including the benefits of, the key items in your Solution and its roadmap that have the following two characteristics and the benefits:   * Integration with Big Data technologies for straight through processing for analytics. * Provides technology and / or business efficiency gains.   In your response please also detail how your system’s roadmap addresses continuous innovation and how this will ensure that the system, particularly in respect of these two examples but also, more generally, remains cutting edge.  Please ensure you have provided a response to each of the points listed here. Failure to respond to each point will mean your response is scored lower than if a response is provided for each point.  Please use no more than 400 words. |  |
| AA.003 | Please indicate the processes, if any, by which the Bank could expect to influence the future direction of your Solution and its roadmap. |  |

Grade Definitions

| **Grade** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| Partner | Extensive experience in their specialist field in which they are nationally or internationally renowned as an expert. Extensive experience of leading major, complex and business critical projects, bringing genuine strategic insight.  In- depth knowledge of the financial services and/or regulatory sector and of current policy and political issues affecting it. |
| Director | Extensive experience in their specialist field in which they are nationally or internationally renowned as an expert. Extensive experience of directing major, complex and business critical projects, bringing genuine strategic insight.  In- depth knowledge of the financial services and/or regulatory sector and of current policy and political issues affecting it. |
| Managing Consultant | Substantial experience of at least 15 years in their specialist field with a minimum of 6 years in a consultancy role. In depth knowledge of the financial services and/or regulatory sector and of current policy and political issues affecting it. Previous experience in managing at least five major projects, preferably in the financial services and/or regulatory sector using the PRINCE or equivalent methodology. |
| Principal Consultant | Substantial experience of at least 10 years in their specialist field with a minimum of 4 years in a consultancy role. Previous experience in managing at least three major projects, preferably in the financial services and/or regulatory sector using the PRINCE or equivalent methodology. |
| Senior Consultant | Substantial experience of at least 7 years in their specialist field with a minimum of 2 years in a consultancy role. Familiarity of the issues and problems facing financial services and/or regulatory organisations. Experience of working in a wide range of relevant projects. |
| Consultant | Substantial experience of at least 5 years and an in-depth knowledge of their specialist field. |
| Junior Consultant | Minimum 3 years’ experience in a wide range of projects in their specialist field. |

Processing statistics for known / developed XBRL taxonomies

This section details statistics for volumes, frequency, resubmission rates and file sizes for existing and planned XBRL based data collections. Statistics cannot be provided for future taxonomies that are in the planning stage and have not been built yet.

CRDIV is included to support a future requirement to process XBRL data received from the FCA.

Line items marked with a \* indicate projected / assumed statistics.

**Estimated population of reporting entities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Firm Type** | **Count** |
| Banks, building societies and investment firms | 250 |
| Insurance firms | 450 |

*N.B: The population of firms is included for guidance only and is expected to vary over time.*

**Solvency II**

|  |  |  |  |  |  | **File sizes (x) as % of reporting period count** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Entry point** | **Reporting period count** | **Reporting frequency** | **Total original submissions received to date from January 16** | **Total resubmissions received to date from January 16** | **Resubmission rate to date from January 16** | **x < 10MB** | **11 <= x < 50MB** | **51 <= x < 200MB** | **201 <= x < 500MB** | **x >= 501MB** |
| ARG | 70\* | A | - | - | 0% | 38% | 31% | 25% | 5% | 1% |
| ARS | 396\* | A | - | - | 0% | 38% | 31% | 25% | 5% | 1% |
| D1B | 14 | A | 14 | 3 | 21% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| D1G | 72 | A | 72 | 24 | 33% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| D1S | 375 | A | 375 | 106 | 28% | 38% | 31% | 25% | 5% | 1% |
| QFG | 17 | Q | 51 | 10 | 20% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| QFS | 6 | Q | 16 | - | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| QRB | 14 | Q | 43 | 4 | 9% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| QRG | 70 | Q | 226 | 59 | 26% | 42% | 33% | 25% | 0% | 0% |
| QRS | 396 | Q | 1,201 | 173 | 14% | 38% | 31% | 25% | 5% | 1% |

Largest file expected: 1.5 GB for an ARS entry point.

*N.B.: This is assumed as the Bank has not received any ‘ARS’ submissions at the time of writing.*

**Capital+ (UK Banking Taxonomy v1.0.0)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **File sizes (x) as % of reporting period count** | | | | |
| **Entry point** | **Reporting period count** | **Reporting frequency** | **Total original submissions received to date** | **Total resubmissions received to date** | **Expected resubmission rate** | **x < 10MB** | **11 <= x < 50MB** | **51 <= x < 200MB** | **201 <= x < 500MB** | **x >= 501MB** |
| PRA101 | 270\* | M | - | - | 15% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| PRA102 | 270\* | M | - | - | 15% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| PRA103 | 270\* | M | - | - | 15% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

Largest file expected: 2 Mb

**Stress Test 2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **File sizes (x) as % of reporting period count** | | | | |
| **Entry point** | **Reporting period count** | **Reporting frequency** | **Total original submissions received to date** | **Total resubmissions received to date** | **Expected resubmission rate** | **x < 10MB** | **11 <= x < 50MB** | **51 <= x < 200MB** | **201 <= x < 500MB** | **x >= 501MB** |
| ST001 | 8 | A | - | - | - | 0% | 25% | 50% | 25% | 0% |
| ST002 | 8 | A | - | - | - | 0% | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% |
| ST008 | 8 | A | - | - | - | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| ST009 | 8 | A | - | - | - | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| ST018 | 8 | Q | - | - | - | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% |
| ST020 | 8 | Q | - | - | - | 0% | 75% | 25% | 0% | 0% |
| ST054 | 8 | Q | - | - | - | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% |

Largest file expected: 350Mb

**CRDIV**

|  |  |  |  |  |  | **File sizes (x) as % of reporting period count** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Entry point** | **Reporting period count** | **Reporting frequency** | **Total original submissions received to date from June 14** | **Total resubmissions received to date from June 14** | **Resubmission rate to date from June 14** | **x < 10MB** | **11 <= x < 50MB** | **51 <= x < 200MB** | **201 <= x < 500MB** | **x >= 501MB** |
| COR001 | 536 | Q | 5,993 | 2,295 | 38% | 86% | 14% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| COR002 | 438 | Q | 5,017 | 700 | 14% | 92% | 5% | 2.5% | 0.5% | 0% |
| COR003 | 250 | Q | 2,930 | 180 | 6% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| COR004 | 238 | M | 8,032 | 589 | 7% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| COR005 | 534 | Q | 4,370 | 172 | 4% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| COR009 | 40 | A | 40 | 79 | 198% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| COR010 | 25 | A | 47 | 66 | 140% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| COR011 | 244 | M | 788 | 112 | 14% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| COR012 | 243 | M | 724 | 31 | 4% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| FRP001 | 33 | Q | 300 | 118 | 39% | 85% | 15% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| LIQ001 | 6 | A | 17 | 13 | 76% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

Largest file expected: 350Mb

Useful Links

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Taxonomy** | **URL** | **Applicable Filing Rules** |
| EBA CRDIV (all versions) | <https://www.eba.europa.eu/risk-analysis-and-data/reporting-frameworks> | EBA |
| EIOPA Solvency II (all versions) | <https://eiopa.europa.eu/regulation-supervision/insurance/reporting-format> | EIOPA |
| SRB | <https://srb.europa.eu/en/content/2017-ex-ante-contributions> | EBA |
| UK Banking XBRL Taxonomy (all versions) | <http://www.bankofengland.co.uk/pra/Pages/regulatorydata/crdfirmstaxonomy.aspx> | EBA |
| UK Stress Testing | Not published publically | EBA |

Filing rules are published on the above links and are updated by the EBA or EIOPA on these periodically if new rules are required for a given taxonomy version.

The Bank of England has a generic principle of re-using Filing Rules published by the EBA or EIOPA.