

Redmine - Defect #36278

Required field does not marked as required when user has multiple roles with different rules

2021-12-03 09:31 - salman mp

Status:	New	Start date:	
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:		% Done:	0%
Category:	Issues workflow	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:		Affected version:	4.2.3
Resolution:			
Description			
In workflow permissions, when someone has multiple roles, suppose for a desired field, at least one rule is 'empty' (means default permission), and one is 'required'. We expect this field to be required when editing, but it does not.			

History

#1 - 2021-12-03 09:34 - salman mp

- File workflow.diff added

Please remove invalid attachment. This is the true one

#2 - 2021-12-10 01:40 - Go MAEDA

salman mp wrote:

In workflow permissions, when someone has multiple roles, suppose for a desired field, at least one rule is 'empty' (means default permission), and one is 'required'.

We expect this field to be required when editing, but it does not.

I don't think it is a defect. In my understanding, an empty value does not mean that there are no **permissions**, but means there are no **restrictions**. In other words, there are all permissions.

In the case you have illustrated, the user has all permissions, so the field must not be marked as required.

#3 - 2021-12-13 10:46 - salman mp

Go MAEDA wrote:

*I don't think it is a defect. In my understanding, an empty value does not mean that there are no **permissions**, but means there are no **restrictions**. In other words, there are all permissions.*

In the case you have illustrated, the user has all permissions, so the field must not be marked as required.

I think in this case it is necessary to display the field as required, because it seems that the priority of "required" should be more than "no restriction" and the priority of "no restriction" should be more than "read only".

Note that when a user has multiple roles, he or she should have the highest permissions set on each field. Is that right?

Now (implemented):

read_only + required -> required

Based on that, we expect:

no-restriction + required -> required

no-restriction + read_only -> no-restriction

Files

patch.diff	1.33 KB	2021-12-03	salman mp
workflow.diff	667 Bytes	2021-12-03	salman mp