



USER DOCUMENTATION

Diagnosing Location Display Problems

Ex Libris

© Ex Libris Ltd., 2004

All Releases

Last Update: February 24, 2004

Contents:

1. Location field doesn't display
2. Text of location display is not what you want
3. Locations Display Twice
4. Locations in Wrong Order
5. Location field not included in Web Holdings Detail display

Section 1. Location field doesn't display

The location field doesn't display in the bib display.

Is the problem in the:

- Web Full only? – Check the “W” section in Col.14 of your `xxx01/tab/edit_doc_999.eng`
and, if using PST/LOC, the WEB-FULL section of `tab_expand`
 - GUI Full only? – Check the “G” section in Col.14 of your `xxx01/tab/edit_doc_999.eng`
and, if using PST/LOC, the GUI-DOC-D section of `tab_expand`
 - Web Brief only? – Check your `xxx01/tab/www_tab_short.eng`
and the WEB-BRIEF section of `xxx01/tab/tab_expand`
 - GUI Brief only? – Check your `xxx01/tab/pc_tab_short.eng`
and the GUI-BRIEF section of `xxx01/tab/tab_expand`
 - Web Holdings Detail? See section 5 below.
- ▼
- All of the above

Does the location display in util f/4?

(To test, you need to make sure that your `xxx01/tab/tab_expand` has the same location lines expand lines in the “U39-DOC” section as you have specified for WEB-FULL, etc.,)

- Yes – Is the location tag (LOC`xx`, PST`xx`) you see in util f/4 the same as that which you are specifying in the `edit_doc_999.eng`, `www_tab_short.eng`, etc.?

No – Change the WEB-FULL, etc., to use the field you see in util f/4.

Yes – Doesn't make sense; contact Ex Libris Support.

- No – Do util f/12 for this doc number.
Do the expected HOL and item records show up as linked records?
 - No – This indicates that the Z103 link records are missing. If it's just a few records which have this problem, resend them to the server. If it's many or all records, then do this:

```
s+ xxx01
```

```
select count(*) from z13 where Z13_TITLE is not null;
```

```
select count(*) from z103;
```

Is the count of Z103 records less than the count of Z13's?

- Yes – This indicates that Z103s have been erroneously deleted or p_manage_12 has been run incorrectly or incompletely (so that the necessary links for the ADM and HOL libraries have not been included). Contact Ex Libris Support so we can confirm this diagnosis. If so, then p_manage_12 will need to be re-run.
- No – Try resending one of the records to the server. If the links still don't show up in util f/12, then contact Ex Libris Support.
- Yes (the links are present in util f/12). For 14.2-up:
 - Are the locations which don't display in util f/4 from:
 - HOL records?
 - make sure that this line is present in the xxx01 tab_expand:
U39-DOC expand_doc_bib_loc_1_a
 - Item records connected via ADM record?
 - make sure that this line is present in the xxx01 tab_expand:
U39-DOC expand_doc_bib_loc_1_b
 - Item records connected via ITM link (LKR ANA field in bib record)?
 - make sure that this line is present in the xxx01 tab_expand:
U39-DOC expand_doc_bib_loc_1_b2
 - (If such a line was missing and you add it, the location should then show up in util f/4.)

(For 12.4, contact Ex Libris Support.)

Section 2. Text of location display is not what you want.

Is the field you are using for location display:

* PST? – Make sure you have included expand_doc_bib_loc_3_a in the xxx01/tab/tab_expand. It adds the display forms (\$\$3 for material type; \$\$4 for sublibrary; \$\$5 for collection; \$\$6 for item status; and \$\$7 for item process status).

And check the xxx01/tab/edit_field.eng for the PST field. (See below.)

* LOC in 15.2-up or in 14.2 when generated by expand_doc_bib_loc_n_x - expand_doc_bib_loc_4_a? -- See PST (immediately preceding). But note that the LOC doesn't include the item status or item process status.

And check the xxx01/tab/edit_field.eng for the LOC field. (See below.)

* LOC in 14.2 when generated by expand_doc_bib_loc_usm? – Check LOC field in exu01 or usm01. And check the xxx01/tab/edit_field.eng for the LOC field. (See below.)

* ITMH? -- Check the relevant xxx01/tab/edit_field.eng for the **852** field. (See below.) (Note: The edit_field entry which is used for the ITMH field is the **852** field.)

edit_field.eng

Which subfields from each location field display and the order of display is controlled by the xxx01/tab/edit_field.eng entry. If you have:

```
## PST##          L LLibrary Info          Y L     E         W
```

in your edit_doc_999.eng, then the subfields will be controlled by the:

```
1 L PST## L B          ##
```

entry in edit_field.eng.

Section 3. Locations Display Twice

[Note the following diagnosis is taken from master US PRB record 2013. That record includes the numbers of more detailed individual PRB records.]

1. Do you have more than one location field specified in edit_doc_999, www_tab_short, etc., for the same bib format?

* Yes - This will result in each location displaying twice.

2. Are there more than 1,000 items?

* Yes - The expand_doc_bib_loc_1_c eliminates cases where only the item status or item-process-status differ for items for the same HOL (see cause #6 for more on this) and the sort_doc_loc_b de-duplicates cases of other non-critical differences. But, if there are more than 1000 items and you don't have the following rep_changes in place, then complete de-duping will not occur.

Corrected by 14.2 rep_change 3806, included in patch 7. (Change to expand_doc_bib_loc_1_b.) Equivalent 15.2 rep_change: 881 (included in patch 4).

[If you have this problem even though you don't have causes #1 or 2, then the duplication is occurring because there is something different about the HOL record vs. the items or about one item vs. another. Causes 3-7 address some such possible differences.]

3. It may be that the item location fields don't match the HOL location fields: The `expand_doc_sort_loc_b` routine uses the `aleph_start_505 "setenv correct_852_subfields"` to get the call number subfields and compares these subfields in the item record to those in the HOL record. If the records match, the one will be eliminated as a duplicate. ****This presumes that the item is linked to the right HOL record****.

4. The items have different material types: The `expand_doc_bib_loc` routines also compare the PST subfield "o" (material type code from `z30_material`). If it's different, that will generate a second PST.

4b. Are the items bound items (material type ISSBD)?

* Yes - This is also corrected by 14.2 `rep_change 3806`, included in patch 7. (Change to `expand_doc_bib_loc_1_b`.) Equivalent 15.2 `rep_change: 881` (included in patch 4).

5. The item call number class type doesn't match the HOL: While the HOL record had a class type (852 indicator 1) of "0" the item record had a `z30_call_number_type` of " ". (If the item is linked to the HOL record, then this "0" will be propagated to the item when it is updated. But since this was a newly-converted item which had never been updated, this inconsistency existed.)

6. Are the two location displays the same except the second includes an item status, such as, "Regular Loan", while the first does not?

Yes - The first LOC (or PST) field is coming from the HOL record and the second from the item. Normally, if these are for the same item, this should result in just a single LOC (or PST). The `expand_doc_bib_loc_2_a` program which matches the items with the HOLs has found that these don't match. The common reason for this is incorrect item-HOL linkage. This may take two forms:

a) When the item is associated (via the `xxx50` doc record) with bib record x while the `z30_hol_doc_number` in the item record points to an HOL record which is associated with bib record y. The conversion program which created these records has created improper connections. Or

b) When there are multiple HOL records and the one to which the item is matched is not the "right" one, is not the one whose "correct_852_subfields" (see PRB 2013) match those of the item. Or when there are multiple HOL records with the exactly the same location: the expand does not de-dup **across** HOL records; it de-dups items associated with HOL records.

Section 4. Locations in Wrong Order

For PST field: *(Generally, the locations listed for a particular title in the Web Brief List and in the Web Full display are in alphabetical order, but you find that these ordered locations are sometimes preceded by a few out-of-order locations.)*

The `expand_doc_sort_loc_b` sorts the intermediate PS1 entries to eliminate duplicates and to order them by location. But the `expand_doc_sort_loc_b` includes only the PS1's which are coming from item records (z30's). Thus, an HOL which does not have any items is not included in this sort and is simply placed at the top of the list. (Looking at the PST's generated in the util f/4 display for the title shows this clearly: the \$0HOL PST's are first; followed by the (sorted) \$0Z30 PST's.)

As is noted in the "How To Use Location Expands" document, the `expand_doc_sort_loc_a` does include both the HOL and the Z30 PST's in its sort. So the combination of `expand_doc_bib_loc_1_c2` and `expand_doc_sort_loc_a` does result in all the PST's being in order by sublibrary/location, but the problem is that in the case where there are item records the PST which is generated by `expand_doc_sort_loc_a` is based on the HOL PS1 and lacks the item processing status and other info from the item record -- which, of course, is one of the main reasons for using the PST.

If this seems to be a significant problem, it's possible that something could be done to further sort these PST's -- see the info on ITMH sorting below.

For ITMH field: *Starting with version 15.2, the `tab_sub_lib_sort` and `tab_item_list_order` tables were added to control location order.*

Certain item/location display functions use the `./xxx01/tab/tab_sub_lib_sort` table. These include:

- * the WWW-SHORT (Web Brief List display -- for PST or LOC or ITMx)
- * the WWW-FULL (Web Full display for ITM1, ITM3, ITM4, and ITMH. The Web Full for the PST and LOC do not currently use the `tab_sub_lib_sort` and `tab_item_list_order` tables)
- * the PC-FULL-ITM (the GUI Full display for ITEMS -- this does not currently include the PST or LOC)

If an `./xxx01/tab/tab_sub_lib_sort` entry has a "02" value, then the `./xxx01/tab/tab_item_list_order`, defining an exact order of sublibraries (--whatever you wish, not necessarily alphabetic--), is consulted. One can have a different

tab_item_list_order for each base, if one wishes (since the program first looks for a base-suffix-ed version).

2) The "profile" referred to in tab_sub_lib_sort is the z61_bor_search_sub_library value in the z61 profile record. The 15.2 Znn/ z61.doc has this information about the z61_bor_search_sub_library field:

The sub-library code for the user's selected 'search' sub-library. If full record display has been set up with ITM5 for link to list of items (display of items of a single sub-library at a time), when the user requests the item list, the system will automatically display the items that exist in the selected library. The default sub-library is the first sub-library listed in the Web short table (ITM and ITM+), in Web full display (ITM3 and ITM4) and in Web list of items display (ITM5).

Section 5. Location field not included in Web Holdings Detail display

(Field doesn't display in the Location information from the HOL record above the Item List on the "Holdings Detail" screen in the Web.)

*** Frames OPAC (www_a)**

What fields display in the Holdings Detail in Frames is determined by the value in the xxx60/edit_doc.eng line "101", which points to an xxx60/tab/edit_paragraph.eng number. The fields specified for that number in edit_paragraph.eng are the fields which will display. Which subfields display and the order of display is controlled by the xxx60/tab/edit_field.eng entry. (See the last paragraph of section 4, above.)

*** Frameless OPAC (www_f)**

What fields display in the Holdings Detail in Frameless is determined by the value in the xxx60/edit_doc_999.eng table. Which subfields display and the order of display is controlled by the xxx60/tab/edit_field.eng entry. (See the "edit_field.eng" paragraph at the end of section 2, above.)