XBRL FRANCE - ESEF MAPPING (update May 2022)

These common practices are proposed by the ESEF Mapping Working Group – part of the XBRL France association – to promote the consistency and comparison of ESEF publications. They have initially been published in French; this is a translation.

PC01 Tag Choice: Right of use

RightofuseAssets or RightofuseAssetsThatDoNotMeetDefinitionOfInvestmentProperty?
[common practice defined on 06/05, published on 02/06/2021]

FINDINGS (MAY 2021)
For the item of Right of Use Assets (IFRS 16) on the balance sheet, there are two possible tags in the IFRS standard taxonomy: RightOfUseAssets and RightofuseAssetsThatDoNotMeetDefinitionOfInvestmentProperty. Can we identify a common practice to retain one or the other?

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE
- The RightofuseAssets tag refers to IFRS 16 and applies in the disclosures (dimensioned, it allows to detail all the rights of use by unit).
- The RightofuseAssetsThatDoNotMeetDefinitionOfInvestmentProperty tag refers to IFRS 16.47(a) which gives the option to present the line "Right of use assets" separately on the balance sheet and is therefore preferably to be used in the balance sheet.
- Both tags can be interpreted by analysts and data repositories.

PC02 Tag Choice: Revenue

Revenue or RevenueFromContractsWithCustomers?
[common practice proposed on 06/05, published on 02/06/2021]

FINDINGS (MAY 2021)
For the item "Revenue" in the income statement, two tags of the IFRS standard taxonomy are used by issuers: Revenue and RevenueFromContractsWithCustomers. Can we identify a common practice to retain one or the other?

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE
- The RevenueFromContractsWithCustomers tag refers to IFRS 15 is preferred when the reported revenue includes only IFRS 15 revenue (revenue from contracts with customers).
- The Revenue tag is to be applied otherwise.
- Both tags can be interpreted by analysts and data repositories.

PC03 Technical choice: Dates

01/01 or 31/12?
[common practice proposed on 02/06/2021, published on 21/01/2022]

FINDINGS (JUNE 2021)
The opening date of the variation tables (cash flows and equity in particular) may appear in the reports on 31/12 or 01/01 (for calendar years), which date should be retained in XBRL?

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE
- XBRL rules are clear on the correct solution. It is not a question of taking the date displayed but of following the convention below.
- The convention is to consider that an instant date without time mention is measured at midnight. Thus, the date is 31/12 midnight (and not 01/01 midnight).
- For a duration period, we go from midnight 0h to midnight 24h, so for a usual reporting period from 01/01 to 31/12.

PC04 Extensions without balance

Subtotals in the CFS for calculations including a P&L tag
[common practice discussed on 08/09, published on 29/10/2021]

FINDING (SEPTEMBER 2021)
The July 2021 update of the Reporting Manual (guidance 1.6.1) confirms that it is possible in some cases to consider that an absence of balance attribute is appropriate (missing attribute or "null" balance). The example given in the Reporting Manual is for the result per share.

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE
- Subtotal extensions in the "operating cash flows" section of the Cash Flow Statement are another case where the balance attribute should be omitted, when the calculation combines elements from P&L and CFS.
- This treatment is consistent with the total operating cash flow characteristics of the ESEF standard taxonomy, which are made available without a balance attribute.
- The indication of a balance attribute prevents the calculations from being performed because sign conventions of P&L and CFS are different.

PC05 Extensions names before standardization

Extension pending a standard concept
[common practice discussed on 08/09, published on 29/10/2021]

FINDING (SEPTEMBER 2021)

In the draft RTS for 2021, the 2021 ESEF taxonomy can be anticipated for the reports related to the 2021 period, especially if new concepts can replace extensions. However, the publication of the RTS could be delayed and the technical files will be made available very late.

In this context, it is likely that few issuers anticipate the use of the 2021 ESEF taxonomy and that most issuers retain the 2020 ESEF taxonomy for 2021 filings, using extensions as they cannot apply the concepts of the 2021 ESEF taxonomy.

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE

- If the latest published IFRS taxonomy is not used, when the issuer creates an extension for an element for which there is a standard concept in the most up to date IFRS taxonomy, the name of the standard concept should be used as the name of the extension, according to guidance 1.2.2 of the ESMA Reporting Manual. The same applies to the wording of the label.
- This is particularly the case in 2021 for the result of the period presented in the balance sheet, for which the name RetainedEarningsProfitLossForReportingPeriod should be used.

PC06 Avoid anchoring to "Other"

Prefer WIDER anchoring to "total" concepts than to "other" concepts
[common practice discussed on 08/09, published on 29/10/2021]

FINDING (SEPTEMBER 2021)

Some tags, whose name and label begins with "Other", should be used only for items that are not detailed neither in the primary financial statements nor in the notes. In this case, the documentation wording generally states "... that the entity does not separately disclose in the same statement or note".

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE

- A good practice is to avoid using these "Other" (in the sense of "not otherwise detailed" and if there is a total concept) as a WIDER concept in anchors.
- This is not compatible with the fact that the content is not detailed since the anchored extension is itself a detail of the concept.

PC07 NARROWER anchorage to be specified

Standard NARROWERs to be indicated where possible
[common practice discussed on 08/09, published on 29/10/2021]

FINDING (SEPTEMBER 2021)
The July 2021 update of the Reporting Manual (guidance 1.4.2) clarifies the provisions of the RTS (Annex IV 9 b) regarding NARROWER anchorage and specifies that all NARROWER standard tags included in the concept must be specified (unless they are non-material elements).

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE
• When reviewing mapping updates, a good practice is to complete NARROWER anchors for extensions, for example based on the information given in the disclosures on the composition of the extension.
• Only significant standard concepts should be mentioned, when they are completely part of the extension.
• It is reminded that the same level of information must be provided to users between the written publication ("paper") and the electronic markup.

PC08 Use of the FinanceIncomeCost tag

Use of FinanceIncomeCost for Financial Result
[common practice discussed on 08/09, published on 29/10/2021]

FINDING (OCTOBER 2021)
There are various practices related to the tagging of the Financial Result when presented by issuers, while there is a standard IFRS tag "FinanceIncomeCost" which seems appropriate.

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE
• The use of the tag FinanceIncomeCost is appropriate as a net concept of financial income and costs and should be used to tag the Financial Result.
• It is not a problem that the standard taxonomy doesn't explicitly state (in a calculation link) that FinanceIncome+FinanceCosts=FinanceIncomeCost.

PC09 Tagging Consolidated Reserves

Use dedicated tags rather than "other reserves" where possible
[common practice initiated in January 2022, published on 28/04/2022]

FINDING (JANUARY 2022)

There are mixed practices related to the tagging of reserves within equity, in particular "consolidated reserves" triggering a discussion around the use of RetainedEarnings, AccumulatedOtherComprehensiveIncome and OtherReserves

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE

- The tag RetainedEanings (or RetainedEarningsExcludingProfitLossForReportingPeriod if profit or loss is presented separately) can be used in some cases. In effect, this concept may encompass the reserve for actuarial gains and losses, the share-based payment reserve and the legal reserve.
- If the caption also encompasses the reserve for foreign exchange, IFRS 9 reserves or treasury shares, then it is recommended to use an extension that combines RetainedEarnings and dedicated tags.
- It is generally expected that the tag OtherReserves would be used for captions that encompass neither retained earnings nor accumulated other comprehensive income.

PC10 Block tagging – list to be used

Identification of the list of block tags to be considered
[common practice initiated in December 2021, published on 24/05/2022]

FINDING (DECEMBER 2021)

There are many tags with a "bloc-text" nature within the taxonomy and one needs to know exactly the list that should be considered to perform mandatory block tagging for reporting periods beginning on or after 1st January 2022.

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE

- The 2019 version of the RTS provides the list of block tags ("ESEF list") that should be used to mark up the disclosures at Table 2 Annex II. These block tags are mainly displayed in role [000000] of the ESEF taxonomy and in roles [800500] and [800600] of the IASB taxonomy. The exact list is published on www.xbrl-france.org/mapping (PC10).
- Marking up disclosures with other tags of a bloc-text nature can be done on a voluntary basis but does not permit do meet the block tagging obligation.
- Each content that is displayed at the level of granularity described at PC11 is marked up with a block tag from the ESEF list (unless no block tag from that list is relevant). The block tag should encompass the content and have the closest accounting scope. If two or more block tags seem equally relevant, multiple tagging can be performed.
- The block tags from the ESEF list whose content is not displayed at the granularity described at PC11 are not used.

- Generic block tags such as DisclosureOfSummaryOfSignificantAccountingPoliciesExplanatory (to be replaced by DisclosureOfMaterialAccountingPolicyInformation in the future) and DisclosureOfNotesAndOtherExplanatoryInformationExplanatory can be used to mark up contents for which no relevant block tag exists. Alternatively, an extension that could be anchored to the generic block tag could be used.

PC11 Block tagging – granularity

How to assess the granularity at which contents should be marked up
[common practice initiated in December 2021, published on 24/05/2022]

FINDING (DECEMBER 2021)

The granularity at which contents should be marked up needs clarification, keeping in mind that the AMF has reminded the issuers that block tagging should not modify the way notes to financial statements are displayed.

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE

- The ESEF block tags (i.e. the list in RTS 2019, table 2 Annex II) primarily define the granularity. If the content of such a block tag is presented in the report, then it should be marked up unless immaterial
- The way contents are displayed in the report further assists to identify the correct granularity at which they should be marked up (titles, subtitles, paragraphs…), and it does not seem necessary to look for contents that are not easily apparent in the document. iXBRL "continuation" and "exclusion" functionalities are used when contents are displayed in multiple locations of the report.
- Accounting principles and detailed notes are dealt with separately: there are two separate sets of block tags.
- The split between accounting principles and detailed notes may not be perfect (eg. some figures may be displayed as part of accounting principles). A change in the way information is displayed in the notes is acceptable if this is done to improve quality and relevance of financial statements, but it should not be made just to facilitate ESEF mark up.

PC12 Block tagging – overlapping block tags

How to deal with overlapping block tags
[common practice initiated in December 2021, published on 24/05/2022]

FINDING (DECEMBER 2021)

In the ESEF list, some block tags refer to overlapping contents (for instance fair value and financial instruments; or intangible assets, goodwill, and a combined tag for intangible assets and goodwill). There is no obligation in the RTS to apply multiple block tags as it is stated that the block tag with the closest accounting meaning or scope should be used. It therefore appears useful to clarify how to prioritize the selection of block tags.

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE

Selection of block tags should be considered primarily at the granularity specified at PC11. This permits to meet the ESEF obligation.

- • Use of multiple block tags for a single section (or embedded in a tagged section) is not recommended except as indicated in PC10.
- • Nonetheless detailed tagging of monetary or non monetary data can be included in a section that is marked up with a block tag.
- • Double tagging can be used to combine a block tag from the ESEF list and another block tag from the IFRS taxonomy outside the ESEF list.
- • When no block tag from the ESEF list is relevant for a given content (which could be the case for some sectors), an extension can be used. Anchoring of such extension is strongly recommended.

PC13 Tagging restated comparative data

How to tag comparative data when restated
[common practice initiated in February 2022, published on 28/04/2022]

FINDING (FEBRUARY 2022)

In case of full retrospective change (change in accounting policy, application of IFRS IC interpretation…), comparative data differ from data that were issued at the end of the previous reporting period. In the human readable layer of the report, this is usually identified with a footnote attached to the restated column (or restated figures).

Specific guidance exists in such cases for the table of changes in equity (with a specific dimension for previously stated equity and for the impact of the retrospective change) but not for other statements.

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE
- • When restated data only are presented as comparative data (without previously stated data and restatement being presented), in the electronic layer of the report, it is necessary to identify the fact that the comparative data in the report for year Y are restated compared to those for year Y-1
- • It is not possible to achieve such identification through a dimension. In effect, the member RestatedMember, which appears relevant, cannot be used as it the default member for dimension RetrospectiveApplicationAndRetrospectiveRestatementAxis.
- • Moreover, adding a dimension to comparative figures would impair the arithmetical relationships between various statements.
- • Therefore, it is generally expected that restated comparative data are identified through XBRL footnotes.

PC14 Tagging Property Plant and Equipment

How to tag property plant and equipment with/without ROU
[common practice initiated in December 2021, published on 24/05/2022]

FINDING (DECEMBER 2021)

IFRSs (IFRS 16.47) explicit permit to present Right Of Use Assets (ROU) either as part of Property Plant and Equipment or in a separate line in the statement of financial position.

In the IFRS taxonomy, there is a single concept for Property Plant and Equipment which is PropertyPlantAndEquipment.

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE

- The documentation for PropertyPlantAndEquipment provides no indication as to whether this concept includes or excludes ROU.
- Pending such indication, this tag should be used in both cases depending on the presentation option selected by the issuer: it may therefore correspond to either Property Plant and Equipment including or excluding ROU.
- A clarification in the taxonomy in this regard would be much helpful to put an end to this ambiguity and avoid having a single concept for different contents.

PC16 Tagging Length of life of entity

When to use the tag relating to the length of life of the entity
[common practice initiated in May 2022, to be validated in June 2022]

FINDING (MAY 2022)

The tag LengthOfLifeOfLimitedLifeEntity is included in the ESEF list of mandatory tags for reporting periods beginning on or after 1 January 2022. The way it should be used needs clarification.

PROPOSED COMMON PRACTICE

- This tag's documentation indicates that this tag applies when the entity "is a limited life entity".
- In France S.A. (Société Anonyme) and SCA (Société en Commandite par Actions) have a default legal life of 99 years. This length can however be extended as long as need be at the discretion of the entity. Therefore, it is considered that such entities are not "limited life" entities.
- In such cases, the tag LengthOfLifeOfLimitedLifeEntity should not be used.