

Redmine - Feature #3819

Issue Tracking box on the project overview isn't clear

2009-09-04 20:04 - Alex Last

Status:	Closed	Start date:	2009-09-04
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:		% Done:	0%
Category:	Projects	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:			
Resolution:	Fixed		

Description

anyways, here's the problem. this is "Issue tracking" panel of the Project Overview I see:

- Bug: 28 open on 30
- Task: 181 open on 226
- Discussion: 3 open on 3

what is this? what does it mean "... open on..." ?
this should be more clear and obvious.

History

#1 - 2009-09-04 20:06 - Alex Last

dammit, hit enter before finished entering all the info. how can I change the summary now?

anyways, here's the problem. this is "Issue tracking" panel I see:

- Bug: 28 open on 30
- Task: 181 open on 226
- Discussion: 3 open on 3

what is this? what does it mean "... open on..." ?
this should be more clear and obvious.

#2 - 2009-09-05 23:32 - Stavros Korokithakis

"28 of 30 open" would be clearer indeed.

#3 - 2009-09-06 01:08 - Eric Davis

- Subject changed from "issue tracking" to Issue Tracking box on the project overview isn't clear

alexey skor:

Good eye, that is a bit confusing. On the latest version it reads a bit better but still looks off:

Issue tracking

- Feature: 36 open / 71
- Task: 0 open / 7
- Bug: 7 open / 28
- Support: 0 open / 6

Source: <https://projects.littlestreamsoftware.com/projects/redmine-timesheet>

I think "x of y open" would make the most sense. What do you think?

(P.S. I also updated the subject and description for you.)

#4 - 2009-09-08 10:12 - XXX XXX

I agree with you completely!

#5 - 2013-04-10 20:18 - Dipan Mehta

This is fully implemented now. Or at least it makes sense now!

Should this issue be closed?

#6 - 2013-04-13 07:40 - Toshi MARUYAMA

- *Category set to Projects*

#7 - 2013-04-13 07:40 - Toshi MARUYAMA

- *Status changed from New to Needs feedback*

#8 - 2014-12-02 10:11 - Go MAEDA

- *Status changed from Needs feedback to Closed*

- *Resolution set to Fixed*

Dipan Mehta wrote:

This is fully implemented now. Or at least it makes sense now!

Should this issue be closed?

Indeed. I close this issue.