DR 16-0017 — SML: Calculation of worksheet column widths

Status: Further Consideration Required

Subject: SML: Calculation of worksheet column widths

Qualifier: Request for clarification

Submitter: Francis Cave Organization: (BSI)

Contact Information: [francis@franciscave.com](francis%40franciscave.com)

Submitter’s Defect Number: 2016-18-23

Supporting Document(s): None

Date Circulated by Secretariat:

Deadline for Response from Editor:

IS 29500 Reference(s): 29500-1:2016, §18.3.1.13, “”, p. 1600–1602

Related DR(s): None

Nature of the Defect:

The description of the attributes @bestFit and @width are difficult to interpret, especially when trying to compare what is stored in a document with the way that both manual and automatic setting of column widths are implemented in current implementations. In the case of @bestFit, the Note is particularly confusing. In the case of @width, the method given for calculating the value appears to define a process for converting an internal representation of the width of a column into a standard external representation when serialising a document, but neither the internal nor the external representation is clearly defined. Experiments with an implementation (Excel 2013) simply add to the confusion.

Solution Proposed by the Submitter:

Clarify the description of the @bestFit and @width attributes by removing, or possibly moving to Annex L (see §L.2.2.2), text that relates to implementation-specific behaviours or internal representations, and by replacing these with a more generic description of how to interpret these attributes in documents and when and in what combinations to use them.

Schema Change(s) Needed:

No

**Editor’s Response:**

**2016-09-26/29 Seoul F2F Meeting:**

Some people thought this might be dependent on the screen resolution. It seems possible that we might want to say this is implementation-defined.

Assigned to Aarti for investigation.

**2016-12-07 Rex Jaeschke:**

From MS experts: Our reading of this DR is that the way to calculate worksheet columns is complicated and should be implementation-specific rather than defined in the standard. Our opinion is that we shouldn’t make a change, as the standard is clear on how width should be calculated, even though it is a complex calculation.

Changes to Part 1: N Part 2: N Part 3: N Part 4: N