

## Redmine - Defect #7819

### REST API Populating issue field enumerations + Issue list filters

2011-03-09 19:54 - Orcun Gok

<b>Status:</b>	New	<b>Start date:</b>	2011-03-09
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>		<b>% Done:</b>	50%
<b>Category:</b>	REST API	<b>Estimated time:</b>	0.00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>	Candidate for next major release	<b>Affected version:</b>	
<b>Resolution:</b>			
<b>Description</b>			
<p>Our team have been using Redmine for more than two years. We are very happy with Redmine and we have decided to develop small visual studio add-in for Redmine in order to improve our productivity and give something back to the Redmine community.</p> <p>Before beginning the development we have started investigating REST API and found some subjects that needs improvements.</p> <p>The biggest problem that we have found is; REST API does not provide necessary functionality for populating issue property/attribute enumerations.</p> <p>In order to provide useful GUI with bunch of combo boxes. We have to populate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- List of trackers (we can right now)</li><li>- List of categories</li><li>- List of statuses and their transition information</li><li>- List of priorities</li><li>- List of versions</li><li>- List of custom fields of trackers and their meta information</li></ul> <p>If we can not populate these enumerations a proper issue editor GUI can not be developed. However, we can populate these fields from issue lists but if a enumeration is not set in any issue it wont be displayed.</p> <p>In addition to these, to improve responsiveness and usability we have to filter issue list by using;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Assignee</li><li>- Status</li><li>- Priority</li><li>- Category</li><li>- Tracker</li><li>- Start &amp; End Date</li><li>- Affected Version</li><li>- Done</li></ul> <p>It can be done client side but it will reduce usability dramatically in big projects with 1000+ issues.</p> <p>In our point of view, these requirements are necessary in order to develop various front ends for Redmine.</p> <p>Best regards.</p>			
<b>Related issues:</b>			
Related to Redmine - Feature # 7180: List of statuses in REST API		<b>Closed</b>	<b>2010-12-27</b>
Related to Redmine - Feature # 7402: REST API - Enumerations		<b>New</b>	<b>2011-01-21</b>
Related to Redmine - Feature # 11159: REST API for getting CustomField defini...		<b>Closed</b>	

### History

#1 - 2011-03-29 00:34 - Rodrigo Recio

- File restadditions.diff added

This patch contains additions that lists issue statuses and trackers.  
It does exposes assignable users and versions inside the issue.

**#2 - 2011-06-16 07:08 - Bevan Rudge**

- % Done changed from 0 to 50

It would be great to get this reviewed and committed.

**#3 - 2011-06-16 07:18 - Bevan Rudge**

This is related or duplicate of #7180 and/or #4968.

**#4 - 2011-07-22 12:07 - Jean-Philippe Lang**

Bevan Rudge wrote:

| *It would be great to get this reviewed and committed.*

Quick review:

- your patch makes the tracker and status lists accessible to administrators only
- no tests

**#5 - 2011-07-22 12:47 - Etienne Massip**

Jean-Philippe Lang wrote:

| - *your patch makes the tracker and status lists accessible to administrators only*

Actually, lists are already accessible to administrators only (in admin screens) ?

**#6 - 2011-07-22 13:05 - Jean-Philippe Lang**

Indeed. But if the goal is to let users retrieve trackers and statuses in order to fill an issue form or set filters, it doesn't work.

**#7 - 2011-07-22 13:59 - Etienne Massip**

Sure. But it would be illogical to give read-only access to these lists by API and not by application screens, wouldn't it be?

I mean, to keep some consistency, this might be the concern of a second patch which would add a new read access to referential data permission which would also allow direct access to application screens via URLs like /issue\_statuses?

**#8 - 2011-07-22 14:55 - Jean-Philippe Lang**

Etienne Massip wrote:

| *Sure. But it would be illogical to give read-only access to these lists by API and not by application screens, wouldn't it be?*

Not so illogical if you consider that, unlike API users, web users *do not need* to access a simple read-only view of trackers or statuses.

| *I mean, to keep some consistency, this might be the concern of a second patch which would add a new read access to referential data permission which would also allow direct access to application screens via URLs like /issue\_statuses?*

Users with a view\_issues permission already have access to ids/names of all trackers and statuses at /issues (look at the filters). Having a permission to give access to a different *representation* of the same information is far from ideal.

I think that /trackers and /statuses should be open to API calls by non-admin. But what would be the point to have an html view other than for admins?

#### **#9 - 2011-07-23 14:38 - Etienne Massip**

Jean-Philippe Lang wrote:

| *Users with a view\_issues permission already have access to ids/names of all trackers and statuses at /issues (look at the filters). Having a permission to give access to a different representation of the same information is far from ideal.*

Except that they can view issues of visible projects only, that's not exactly the same representation.

| *I think that /trackers and /statuses should be open to API calls by non-admin. But what would be the point to have an html view other than for admins?*

I guess no point, you're right. I was just wondering if it was logical to get a 403 with /issues\_statuses and the full issue statuses list with /issues\_statuses.xml. That somewhat means handling rights depending upon required format.

Anyway, I'm discussing something that is not very useful, I agree with that.

#### **#10 - 2011-07-23 15:32 - Jean-Philippe Lang**

Etienne Massip wrote:

| *Except that they can view issues of visible projects only, that's not exactly the same representation.*

Not matter which issues or projects they can see, they can always see the list of **all** statuses and trackers in the filters.

| *I guess no point, you're right. I was just wondering if it was logical to get a 403 with /issues\_statuses and the full issue statuses list with /issues\_statuses.xml. That somewhat means handling rights depending upon required format.*

Maybe a 406 would be more appropriate :-)

#### **#11 - 2011-07-23 15:58 - Etienne Massip**

Jean-Philippe Lang wrote:

*Not matter which issues or projects they can see, they can always see the list of **all** statuses and trackers in the filters.*

Oh, sorry, I thought they could only see statuses used in workflows tied to trackers of the project.

*I guess no point, you're right. I was just wondering if it was logical to get a 403 with /issues\_statuses and the full issue statuses list with /issues\_statuses.xml. That somewhat means handling rights depending upon required format.*

*Maybe a 406 would be more appropriate :-)*

405 ? :o

**#12 - 2011-07-23 16:28 - Etienne Massip**

Not 405, 406 is right.

**#13 - 2011-08-29 10:13 - Etienne Massip**

- Target version set to Candidate for next major release

Pushed for complement of #7180 and #7402 for custom fields.

**#14 - 2011-11-14 18:50 - Alex Last**

I think this should be moved to version 1.3.0

**#15 - 2013-08-30 10:37 - Jaap de Haan**

Relates to the newer ticket #11159, asking for the implementation of export of custom fields information.

**#16 - 2013-09-09 01:45 - Toshi MARUYAMA**

- Related to Feature #11159: REST API for getting CustomField definitions added

**Files**

---

restadditions.diff	4.05 KB	2011-03-28	Rodrigo Recio
--------------------	---------	------------	---------------