

Concept Naming in IFRS Taxonomies

Author: Peter Calvert
Date: 13 August 2009

This note responds to the RFI on Concept Naming issued by the IASCF in July.

It reflects experience gained and practices adopted during the development of the XBRL UK taxonomies.

We follow and recommend the option **R2** on naming.

The RFC recently issued by the XBRL International Taxonomy Architecture Working Group and the IASCF RFI adequately summarise the main issues which should be considered on naming.

There are several key points which weigh in favour of option R2:

1. There are a range of tasks and activities related to taxonomy development and the handling of XBRL data in which it is very helpful to have human-readable concept names. Human examination of underlying XBRL files may be required for a host of reasons. Data exported by current tools and stored in files or databases is typically keyed on concept name. It is our experience that in current circumstances some tasks would become extremely difficult if abstract strings were adopted in concept names.
2. The only significant argument in favour of abstract strings appears to be based on the increase in file size caused by the use of human readable names. However, we have not seen any convincing evidence from around the world that this impact on file size has caused a problem for XBRL projects. On the contrary, some 400,000 XBRL accounts have already been filed in the UK, and there is no evidence that the size of concept name has had any adverse impact at all on processing or storage. We understand that other major XBRL projects have had the same experience.

If R2 is followed, a significant question is 'when during a taxonomy life cycle should concept names be frozen'? The answer should be as soon as a final version of a taxonomy is issued which will have significant adoption.

We suggest option **D1** on deletion is preferable. There is no agreed technical approach to deprecation and, in any case, it appears preferable to force the disuse of concepts which it has been decided should not be represented in the taxonomy. Mapping between old and new taxonomies and instances can still be achieved by a variety of means (and it is not clear that retaining old, disused concepts is really a benefit for such mapping).