

Redmine - Feature #5011

Limit Visible Issue Fields Based on Permissions

2010-03-08 23:45 - Edward Krufka

Status:	Closed	Start date:	2010-03-08
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:		% Done:	0%
Category:	Issues permissions	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:			
Resolution:	Duplicate		
Description <p>Allow the ADMIN to configure which fields appear when creating/viewing/editing an issue, based on the permissions of the logged in user.</p> <p>A coy should only copy the fields that the user copying the issue can see in the display.</p> <p>For instance, allow the developers to enter comments in fields on an issue but do not have these fields appear for the client.</p> <p>Adding a feature like this would negate the need for Redmine to instruct folks entering issues to not use the Assigned-To field, as that field should not be visible to all folks reporting issues or requesting features.</p>			
Related issues:			
Related to Redmine - Feature #5037: Role-based issue custom field visibility		Closed	2010-03-10
Related to Redmine - Feature #12005: Mightful workflow field enhancement: hide		New	
Has duplicate Redmine - Feature #9700: Allow to configure the visibility of t...		Closed	

History

#1 - 2010-07-14 10:46 - Walther Lalk

Doing the much hated +1 here.

I would love to see this feature in a future version of Redmine. We are currently incorporating Redmine into our project workflow and the only thing that is missing is the ability to set which fields a user can access when creating a new issue.

In our case we don't want our clients to be able to set the 'assign to', due dates, % done, etc.

#2 - 2010-08-26 00:51 - Eric Davis

- Category changed from Administration to Issues permissions

- Priority changed from High to Normal

#3 - 2011-05-07 18:48 - pasquale [:dedalus]

+1

We have various related\dupes tickets on this: it's seems that more users want to manage "native\custom field by role"!

#4 - 2011-05-07 21:59 - anonymous incognito

What, the issue has been there for a whole year yet nobody has bothered to fix it? Not cool, people, there's lots of serious organisations using this software, can't just ignore everyone, you know?

#5 - 2011-05-08 04:12 - Terence Mill

dupes some parts of [#8050](#)

#6 - 2012-11-19 04:15 - @ go2null

Should be considered a duplicate of Feature [#12005](#).

#7 - 2012-11-19 04:16 - @ go2null

- Status changed from New to Resolved

Should be considered a duplicate of Feature [#12005](#).

#8 - 2012-11-19 12:14 - Daniel Felix

Closed as duplicate of [#12005](#). Thanks!

#9 - 2012-11-19 12:15 - Daniel Felix

- *Status changed from Resolved to Closed*

- *Resolution set to Duplicate*