

## IFRS Taxonomy Dimensions

**Author:** Peter Calvert  
**Date:** 13 August 2009

This note responds to the RFI on Taxonomy Dimensions issued by the IASCF in July. It reflects the experience gained and practices adopted during the development of the XBRL UK taxonomies – including the UK extension to IFRS.

We recommend the introduction of dimensions, including within major statements, as described in the RFI. We are thus in favour of options L1a, L1b and L2.

Dimensions allow greater flexibility and extended coverage, as well as more efficient taxonomy maintenance. IFRS taxonomies adopted in jurisdictions will typically require broader coverage than that provided by the current IFRS taxonomy. For example, they will have to allow for larger classes of assets and provisions, as well as greatly expanded classes of equity. The only practical way to encompass such increased coverage, in our view, is via dimensions. This is the case whether the IFRS taxonomy expands over time to handle such coverage or whether this is handled by jurisdiction-specific extensions.

The UK extension to the IFRS taxonomy, formally dated 15 June 2009 and available on the XBRL UK website at <http://www.xbrl.org/uk/Taxonomies/>, has already introduced a range of dimensions covering the areas described in the RFI, among others. This involved replacing existing coverage in the base IFRS taxonomy, but we would much prefer to rely on IFRS concepts and dimensions rather than defining our own.

The UK-IFRS taxonomy provides an example of the use of dimensions which the IASCF XBRL team may wish to consider in advancing their plans. It should be noted that the taxonomy is only draft, has some gaps and is still to go through a detailed accounting review, so we are not suggesting it is a finished or perfect example to follow. However, we do not expect the fundamental approach to dimensions shown in the taxonomy to change substantially as we move towards a final version.

The appendix below lists the main additional dimensions defined in the UK-IFRS taxonomy. Some of these dimensions contain large number of domain members. The Equity Classes dimension, for example, contains far more classes than it would be practical to represent via intersection tables. (These classes are based on IFRS model financial statements and a limited number of samples of accounts. The list is probably not exhaustive, even as it stands.) We refer the IASCF XBRL team to the UK-IFRS taxonomy as part of our response to the RFI.

A difficult question is whether all hypercubes should be open or closed – or whether a mixture should be employed as indicated in the RFI. As far as the UK extension is concerned, we are still examining this question. (Hence the dimensional structures in the definition linkbase are incomplete: all hypercubes remain open and primary items are not yet attached.) A detailed discussion of this issue is outside the scope of this response to the RFI. Among other things, we are examining the extent of possible problems of interpretation which may arise from the use of open hypercubes. (So far, these problems appear to be less significant than some have suggested, but we have not concluded our analysis.) We will continue to provide feedback to, and welcome dialogue with, the IASCF XBRL team on this and other related questions as we work on our respective taxonomies.

**Appendix**

Additional dimensions defined in the UK-IFRS extension. (The list shows the dimension standard label and is in alphabetical order.)

Contingent liabilities classes [Dimension]  
Deferred tax asset and liability classes [Dimension]  
Equity classes [Dimension]  
Exceptionals [Dimension]  
Financial instrument value type [Dimension]  
Intangible asset classes [Dimension]  
Intangible assets generation type [Dimension]  
Maturities or expiration periods [Dimension]  
Pension schemes [Dimension]  
Property, plant and equipment classes [Dimension]  
Provisions classes [Dimension]  
Share classes [Dimension]  
Share-based payment schemes [Dimension]

---