Status:	Open	Priority:	Normal
Author:	David Alves	Category:	Custom Fields
Created:	2011-02-04	Assignee:	
Updated:	2013-01-31	Due date:	
Remote issue URL:	http://www.redmine.org/issues/1189		
Affected version:			
Description:	<ul> <li>Hello,</li> <li>There is a long awaited feature for redmine that many people would like to see in ChiliProject, it's a 3 years old issue on the redmine official tracker.</li> <li>The objective is to allow multiselect option for Custom Fields. We are using it extensively but in 3 years, the patch has never made it to upstream.</li> <li>That would be awesome to have this feature upstream on ChiliProject</li> <li>The Redmine issue is here : http://www.redmine.org/issues/1189</li> </ul>		
	Thanks you.		
	David.		

# ChiliProject - Feature # 141: Multiselect custom fields

### History

### 2011-02-04 03:17 pm - Holger Just

- (deleted custom field) set to http://www.redmine.org/issues/1189

- Category set to Custom Fields

#### 2011-02-14 08:21 am - Felix Schäfer

I had a look at the patch, and I'm a little underwhelmed. Currently @CustomField has\_many CustomValues@ and @Customizable has\_many CustomValues@, so in essence @CutsomValues@ is a fat join table between customizables and custom\_fields. The patch introduces a new type of @CustomValue@ that wraps an array and tries to be smart about saving the individual values to single custom fields. This does make searching a tad easier, but feels very brittle to me, as well as a problem that already has a solution in the form of serialization.

So I guess what I'm saying is that I'd rather have @CustomValue@ accept multiple values than try to emulate that behavior by storing each selected value in a separate @CustomValue@. Thoughts?

(and while we're at it: do we have something like a "needs a design/implementation decision" state?)

#### 2011-02-14 11:02 pm - Eric Davis

Felix:

I remember that patch and it felt a tad complex. Especially since Custom Fields are already pretty complex.

I wonder if we could just serialize the custom value's value? If it stores YAML in the database, then search can still pick it up (it's just plain text). (e.g. @---\n-- "Foo"\n-- "Bar"@ is close to the raw values)

# 2011-03-28 09:48 pm - Marcelo Fernandes

+1

#### 2011-04-01 05:46 pm - Steffen Gebert

I'd love to have this possibility, too! Optimal would be to have it connected versions (e.g. affected versions/branches, fixed in version, etc).

## 2011-08-31 10:23 am - Matteo Giaccone

Hi all, i tried to patch the last version of Redmine (http://www.redmine.org/issues/1189#note-66) and i'm interested too in this feature, let me know if i can be of any help.

# 2011-12-09 09:48 pm - Brian Jacobi

+1 we continue to have use cases come up that could utilize multi-select fields.

### 2012-01-30 07:27 am - Kurt Klinner

we would love to have that feature.

Our old system supported multi select cusom fields, so our customers are used to have that feature.

# 2012-01-30 08:20 pm - David Alves

the upstream redmine has now support for multiselect custom fields.

http://www.redmine.org/issues/1189

Thanks !

This ticket may be closed.

### 2012-10-26 08:32 pm - David Prothero

Just curious if this is implemented in redmine, if/when we can expect to see it come down to ChiliProject?

#### 2013-01-31 09:37 pm - Felix Schäfer

David Prothero wrote:

> Just curious if this is implemented in redmine, if/when we can expect to see it come down to ChiliProject?

We don't follow the development of Redmine anymore, so this would probably be integrated if someone adapted the change to ChiliProject and made a pull request/patch.