FRC Confidential

FRC2023-061.

Development of CODEx Inline XBRL Viewer Beta and Live Phases

Tender Queries & Responses

DATE/TIME	ACTIVITY
05/07/2024	Publication of the Invitation to Tender
15/07/2024 at 13:00	Supplier's Deadline to submit clarification questions to procurement@frc.org.uk
16/07/2024 at 17:00	FRC's Deadline for publication of responses to clarification questions
23/07/2024 at 17:00	Deadline for supplier submission of tender to the FRC – Bid should be submitted to procurement@frc.org.uk
26/07/2024	Suppliers updated / invited to tender clarification session
30-31/07/2024	Supplier tender clarification session (if required) The intention is for these sessions to be held virtually using MS Teams. Provisional dates – times
	30/07/2024 - 10:00 30/07/2024 - 11:30 30/07/2024 - 13:30 30/07/2024 - 15:00
	31/07/2024 – 10:00 31/07/2024 – 11:30
31/07/2024 by 16:00	Tender Outcome
12/08/2024	Latest Contract Start Date

FRC Confidential

	Nature of query / clarification	Query / Clarification	FRC Response
1	Clarification of CODEx Viewer Requirements.	In the CODEx Viewer detailed requirements Excel document, the requirements for row 8 (3.1.2) are nearly identical to those in row 7 (3.1.1). However, the user story for row 8 refers to uploading a report, while row 7 focuses on searching the Companies House and FCA databases. Can you confirm if the requirements for row 8 are correct?	The correct detailed requirements for 3.1.2 are set out below. The <i>Viewer detailed requirements</i> spreadsheet on Contracts Finder has also been updated to reflect this correction. Must have: • The end-user must be able to upload an iXBRL report or a report package. • The end-user must be able to view details of XBRL facts in the report. • The uploaded report must not be stored in the CODEx Viewer or accessible to other users. • When attempting to upload and view an iXBRL report based on a taxonomy package that is not supported by the Viewer, a corresponding exception must be triggered. • The end-users must be clear about how the uploaded data is processed. Should have: • End-user should be able to export data to xBRL-JSON format. • End-user should be able to export data to xBRL-CSV format. Could have: • CODEx Viewer could signpost users to the FCA and CoHo trial load functionality to validate their tagging
2	Open source requirement for XBRL specification compliant processor	We would like to confirm whether the XBRL specification compliant processor that will be used in the development of the Beta and Live phases of the project, needs to also be open-source (like Arelle).	Please note that the solution needs to be hosted in the cloud as a SaaS solution that can be used by the general public. The XBRL specification compliant processor will not only be used in the Beta and Live phases of the project but will also be used for XBRL processing after the project duration. To keep maintenance costs low, the FRC plans to build the CODEx Viewer solution with open-source software packages and libraries as much as possible and develop other functionalities in the Beta phase to avoid having to use software that requires licensing fees.

_	_	_	_						
⊢	ĸ	()	Co	nt	10	וםו	nti	ובו	
	ı١	_	-		ıu			ш	-

lential			
			If the proposed solution consists of using commercial products. Please indicate in your answers what existing product(s) you propose to use during development in the Beta phase, and whether they can be replaced by existing open-source software within project duration or later.
3	2.2 - FCA filing index	Is there an FCA filing index that can be accessed / used for potential pre-processing	The FCA API endpoint is public and sits behind the FCA's National Storage Mechanism search https://data.fca.org.uk/#/nsm/nationalstoragemechanism and is available here: https://api.data.fca.org.uk/search?index=fca-nsm-searchdata
		of filings?	It requires a 'POST' request. Please see the example of request payload below,
			{"from":0,"size":2000,"sort":"publication_date","keyword":null,"sortorder":"desc","criteriation aObj":{"criteria":[{"name":"tag_esef","value":["Tagged"]}]}}
			It returns metadata about the XBRL files, including the file download link (relative path). The added criteria are necessary to only retrieve the iXBRL files. You can extend the array to add more constraints for precise results. For example when we want to enable users to search filings based on LEI number,
			{"from":0,"size":2000,"sort":"publication_date","keyword":null,"sortorder":"desc","criteri aObj":{"criteria":[{"name":"tag_esef","value":["Tagged"]},{"name": "lei","value": ["2138001YYBULX5SZ2H24"]}]}} Or date,
			{"from":0,"size":2000,"sort":"publication_date","keyword":null,"sortorder":"desc","criteriaObj":{"criteria":[{"name":"tag_esef","value":["Tagged"]}],"dateCriteria":[{"name":"publication_date","value":{"from":null,"to":"2023-11-14T11:56:06Z"}}]}}
4	2.2 - FCA filing index API	Is there an API to the FCA filing index?	See response to Q3
5	3.2.1 - Key metric clarification	What are the key metrics FRC would like people to see besides "facts disclosed under the minimum tagging	Companies House requires companies to tag a data item in their company's accounts if it also appears in the minimum tagging list published by the Companies House. 'Turnover' is in the company's profit and loss account also appears in the minimum tagging list, hence the item must be tagged.

_	_	_	_						
⊢	ĸ	()	Co	nt	10	וםו	nti	ובו	
	ı١	_	-		ıu			ш	-

dential			
		requirement for the Companies House"	The FRC will provide concepts that are part of the Companies House minimum tagging requirement. In addition, the FRC will provide more concepts for FCA filings during implementation of the requirement.
6	3.2.1 - Document outline display	What does "view the document outline" mean? Do you want to display the presentation linkbase to the user?	Yes, we wish to display the presentation linkbase to the user.
7	3.3.3 - Web browser searching and filtering	Would using search capabilities from the web browser suffice for this requirement if the iXBRL viewer will be web browser based? Assuming the web browser search capabilities meet the requirements?	The functionality must be implemented in the CODEx Viewer and must meet all must have requirements. Vendors can choose different ways to implement this, such as using open source libraries that may also support some filtering options.
8	4.2 - Hosting post live phase	Who is responsible for hosting the viewer after the live phase ends?	This still needs to be decided but the supplier is not responsible for hosting the Viewer after the Live phase end.
9	4.2 - Infrastructure ownership	Who owns the infrastructure of the services and storage?	Infrastructure and storage services will be managed by the vendor during project implementation and should be transferred to the FRC during the Live phase. If your proposed solution requires a specific infrastructure or storage service, please mention that in your responses.
10	4.3 - Performance definitions	Can you be more specific with regard to "high performance", "quick responses" and "efficiently handle"?	As the performance would depend on a number of various factors (e.g., size of taxonomy, number of taxonomies loaded in the memory, complexity of instance document, number of requests from end users, latency in getting results from FCA and CoHo's database), the FRC doesn't want to put specific numbers here but expects the Viewer to perform at an acceptable level and not leave the end user with

-	ь.	<u> </u>	<u>-</u>		: 4		40.41
ы	к	U	LΟ	ПT	ıa	er	ntial

ential			
			excessive waiting times. We expect the vendor to explore different ways at the beginning of the Beta phase to arrive at an acceptable solution.
11	4.3 - Processing filings upon request	Do filings need to be pre- processed or can they be processed at the time of request from the viewer?	In the Alpha phase, we worked to develop an architecture without the need for preprocessing the iXBRL reports. We plan to preprocess the published taxonomies (e.g., FRC Taxonomy, ESEF Taxonomy) to generate the output with required metadata information from the taxonomy and use the output while opening iXBRL reports in the Viewer. This approach involved some processing at run time with a processor compliant with the XBRL specification. For example, processing of the iXBRL instances (e.g., extract the fact value according to the Transformation Registry specification) and processing of taxonomy extension packages. Due to time limitation we have not tested the complete approach. As the taxonomy extension packages can be complex, there is a risk that they can reduce the performance. We need to further assess this approach before making a decision. We will work with the vendor to finalise the architecture at the beginning of the Beta phase. We want to avoid the need for pre-processing for the majority of submissions to Companies House (plain iXBRL instance documents based on the FRC taxonomy) and find an alternative, high-performance way for the remaining submissions (e.g., submissions with taxonomy extensions, multi-target documents).
12	4.12 - External links	Does this requirement include filer created links to external resources within an iXBRL report?	No, this requirement affects only the links in the Viewer functionalities.
13	Documentation	Could you provide step by step guidance to setup a local or hosted iXBRL filing in the Alpha phase viewer?	Yes. This will be shared with all bidders who register an interest.
14	Documentation	Is there any further documentation you can provide to help understand the Alpha phase viewer?	Yes. This will be shared with all bidders who register an interest.

-	_	$\overline{}$	$\overline{}$				- 1					
۰	ĸ	C	(i	n	n	tı		Δ	n:	н	ıal	

dential_			
15	Maintenance	Does the FRC intend to create a mechanism to request future maintenance, enhancements or support from the tender winner?	This is under consideration; however, no decision has been made yet nor will be prior to completion of this procurement for the Beta and Live phases.
16	Open source	Is this a strict requirement for all of the code to become open source or could existing products be used for parts of the solution?	To keep maintenance costs low, the FRC plans to build the CODEx Viewer solution with open-source software packages and libraries as much as possible and develop other functionalities in the Beta phase to avoid having to use software that requires licensing fees. Further as per TCoP we are required to make the developed code open source. If the proposed solution consists of using commercial products. Please indicate in your answers what existing product(s) you propose to use during development in the Beta phase, and whether or not they can be replaced by existing open source software within project duration or later.
17	Page Limit	Would the FRC kindly consider increasing the page limit for Question 1 and Question 2 (Section 2: Cultural Fit) It currently stands at a maximum response length of 2 x A4 pages (excluding images) A page count of 3 to 4 pages per question would ensure all suppliers can produce detailed responses that cover off the points being asked.	We have considered the page count limits and believe these to be in line with our expectations for responses. For this reason we will remain with our original limits as follows: Total maximum response length is 17 x A4 pages, excluding images, broken down as follows: Section 1 - 1 x A4 Section 2 - 12 x A4 Section 3 - 2 x A4 Section 4 - 2 x A4