

Infrastructure - Task #1332

Story # 1329 (Closed): ^^^^ Items To Discuss ^^^^

Possibly remove MN_crud.update()

2011-02-09 22:39 - Roger Dahl

Status:	New	Start date:	2011-02-09
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:		% Done:	0%
Category:		Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:		Story Points:	
Milestone:			
Product Version:	*		
Description In the current GMN implementation, MN_crud.update() is simply MN_crud.delete() followed by MN_crud.create(). If that will be true for all implementations, we may want to remove MN_crud.update() and have MNs implement only create() and delete(), and, if necessary, support update() in the D1 libraries.			

History

#1 - 2011-02-09 22:50 - Matthew Jones

I think that algorithm is missing critical semantics. First, I think we decided that delete shouldn't actually delete an object -- rather, it should move it out of search indices.

Second, update is not equivalent to delete then create, because the second create should only be allowed if the caller has write permission on the original object. Plus there is system metadata (obsoletes/obsoletedBy) that needs to be changed for both objects, and that should only be changed if the caller has appropriate permissions. That is why the obsoleted id is in the method signature for update(), making it wasy for implementers to do this access check. MN implementations need to be very careful about what sysmeta they accept during these operations.