

## Pulp - Task #6475

### Write docs about Pulp users using DRF browseable API and not django-admin

04/09/2020 08:51 PM - bmbouter

<b>Status:</b>	CLOSED - WONTFIX	<b>Start date:</b>	
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>		<b>% Done:</b>	0%
<b>Category:</b>		<b>Estimated time:</b>	0:00 hour
<b>Sprint/Milestone:</b>		<b>Tags:</b>	Documentation
<b>Platform Release:</b>		<b>Sprint:</b>	
<b>Groomed:</b>	No	<b>Quarter:</b>	
<b>Sprint Candidate:</b>	No		

#### Description

Pulp docs are deficient in two ways, and they are related because of the similar value they create for users.

1. We don't have docs that recommend the DRF browseable API. It's a well kept secret! Let's document it.
2. We don't have docs that explain why django-admin is discouraged from being used. To recap the reasons
  - pulp is highly aligned with DRF, e.g. data validation, and django-admin side-steps all this
  - Pulp data is highly relational so making a complete django-admin interface is non-trivial. For example you can create a repo version, but populating it with data would be almost impossible.
  - the read-functionality is redundant with the DRF browseable API
  - any gap in APIs that prevent users from creating the objects they need should be addressed as RFEs against the Pulp API itself

#### History

#1 - 08/18/2020 09:15 PM - bmbouter

- Status changed from NEW to CLOSED - WONTFIX

Actually we are enabling django-admin just with read-only models. We need an easy way for users to manage object-level permissions and Django admin provides that.