Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2013/10/08	Document: CWA_XBRL_WI001-1 (E)	Project: **XBRL**

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
EBA		Introduction, under subheading “General”,	4th para	ed	Data point models are typically created by *banking* specialists who are highly skilled in understanding supervisory reporting frameworks	Generalise phrase (e.g. EIOPA does not address “banking”)	
EBA		2.2.6		ed	Only one example of the use of tablegroup is given (i.e. the grouping of logical tables into business templates).	The tablegroup concept has further uses e.g. "arbitrary" grouping of tables for logical, presentational or other semantic reasons. (See for example EBA taxonomy which uses tablegroups to group tables by subject area).	
EBA		2.2.7		ed	"In the DataPointModel a Hierarchy *forms* are sets of DefinedMembers of an EnumerableDimension arranged in a hierarchical disposition" Not sure what the wording here is intended to convey, is it perhaps an editing error?	Perhaps “ a Hierarchy forms a set of” or “a Hierarchy is a set of”	
EBA				te,ed	Modelling of “ IsDefault” attribute on DefinedMember : although this is a common approach to model this feature , and has potential advantages re versioning, alternatives could be considered	It might be conceptually better to have "DefaultMember" be a property of the enumerable dimension, since this more clearly conveys the essential DPM characteristic that there can only be one default for a dimension (and indeed that in theory different dimensions over the same domain could legitimately have different default members). N.B. I believe this is currently a deficiency in the EBA model...	

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2013/10/08	Document: CWA_XBRL_WI001-1 (E)	Project: **XBRL**

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
EBA			Figure 4 Hierarchical perspective	te	Some of the multiplicities seem questionable.	Would a hierarchy of dimensioned elements have a domain or dimension (i.e. should these be 0..1)? Why can a dimension not have multiple parallel hierarchies? Might a hierarchy belong to multiple dimensions over the same domain (i.e. should that actually be "0..*")? (N.B.. this may be my misunderstanding of the UML cardinality specifiers, as I am more comfortable with ERD cardinality notation).	
EBA		2.5.2 2.6 or Fig 5		Ed,te	RuleRelationship : Possibly the modelling provided could usefully be extended to describe relationships of the form parent >=, >, < , <= (sum of) children etc? (though simply +/-) this may be sufficient information for a general primer? Actually, I'm not sure that the description is particularly clear on what is being described here (i.e. what would a rule relationship between a parent and a child with a sign of "-" actually mean - I assume the implication of a summation of sibling children checked against the parent, but the text is not explicitly clear and is open to "interpretation". Table presentation - hierarchy of axis elements (row, column, sheet) might be worth modelling? (i.e. explicit arbitrary (possibly mulit-aspect) ordinate hierarchy rather than generated from member hierarchy) - although having said that, the ordering of elements is also unspecified/unmodelled?		

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2013/10/08	Document: CWA_XBRL_WI001-1 (E)	Project: **XBRL**

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
		2.6.2 2.6			Also, from the description of the Axis, it would appear to be reasonable to have a x-axis element (column) even in a one column list (if nothing else to enable a header for the column). I think this probably means that axis elements with no dimensionalproperties are required (since all the properties may vary by e.g. row, leaving nothing commmon on the column), implying the cardinality should be 0..* . I'm not completely sure if the modelling is intended to have concrete objects for both the concept of the axes themselves, and for the individual discrete co-ordinates on each axis (which seems to fit part of the text best), or only to make concrete the discrete co-ordinates on each axis (having the axis itself implied by the existence of one or more appropriate co-ordinate objects), which fits the more structured text and the UML diagram better (inheritance relationhip between axis & row,colum,sheet, so a row is an axis). I presume the latter, but think the text could be tightened up/clarified.		
EBA		Rule 1.14 & 1.15		ge	How would a "flat list of members" be represented in the hierarchy, given that hierarchyrelationship elements require both a parent and child dictionaryelement? Additionally, It appears the suggestion of a “flat list of members” is contradicted by "in case a natural root can (should be *cannot*?) be derived ..." at Rule 1.15).		

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2013/10/08	Document: CWA_XBRL_WI001-1 (E)	Project: **XBRL**

MB/ NC[1]	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
EBA		Rule 1.16		ed	N.B. some data warehouse technologies are perfectly capable of handling aggregation over hierarchies with minus signs (and those that are not can usually be manipulating into coping wif necessary by clever design) (so this rule should probably be a SHOULD)		