

Dear Maciej

The SVS has a timetable to adopt IFRS by group companies and the last companies will enter in 2012. This year is the first time that the companies are filling their financial statements prepared under IFRS and XBRL files. The companies have to generate their own XBRL files according to the SVS taxonomy.

In Chile XBRL's knowledge is too little. Now, under the current requirements of the SVS, software companies are offering solutions to market.

Because is mandatory for the companies, they have to prepare their financial statements under IFRS and XBRL files. Therefore they are learning those standards simultaneously.

This year, the SVS taxonomy is an extension from the IFRS-GP 2006 taxonomy, but next year we hope to extend the IFRS taxonomy 2009, and we will make a few changes.

In subsequent years, we would like IFRS taxonomies will not have too many changes, we want to give stability to the companies in the use of the technology.

1. Extending the Use of Dimensions in the IFRS Taxonomy

We have analyzed the alternatives and we don't agree with the IFRS Taxonomy should use dimensions more widely.

Dimensions are very complex and increasing its use will be more difficult to get companies to prepare their financial statements in XBRL. Besides, IFRS Taxonomy's users would need to have a better understanding of dimensional modeling.

We think that the same thing that offer "**L1a. Dimensions for list-oriented disclosures**", it can get using tuples. We use tuples currently and we have more details of information and more control about the elements that the company should disclosures.

It is true that there are a larger number of elements and requires more maintenance of the team. But, we prefer it, because recently the companies are understanding the taxonomy's use and they will be complicate extend it. For us it is a great job, first that accountants accept the information model behind the taxonomy and then they try to understand XBRL. This is a great labor for all teams that achieve to use XBRL in their organizations.

2. Concept Naming and Change Management in the IFRS Taxonomy

a. Renaming of concepts

We agree with options:

R2 Current US GAAP and EDINET Approach: concept names remain unchanged even if labels change; the creation identifier becomes obsolete and is removed.

We think this option permit more stability in the taxonomy and when the label changes but the concept is the same the companies don't need to make a new mapping.

When we analyze all the options, we believe R2 is more benefits and lower costs than another options for companies.

b. Deleting Concepts

We agree with:

D1 Current IFRS Approach: concepts are deleted from the schema if no longer required.

We had experience to extend IFRS-GP 2006, it has about 5000 elements and we use only 2500 elements from it.

We think, in the future when the taxonomy will contain all the obsolete elements, it will be too much. We think the best will be to remove useless items in the taxonomy.

Best regards,

Ana Cristina Sepúlveda
Head XBRL Team
Superintendencia de Valores y Seguros de Chile