

---

## Sublibrary Z305s (Z305s with sublibrary code as Z305-SUB-LIBRARY)

- **Article Type:** General
  - **Product:** Aleph
  - **Product Version:** 20
- 

### Description:

Some of our Circ librarians have created sublibrary Z305s (that is, Z305s with sublibrary code as the Z305-SUB-LIBRARY), in addition to the xxx50 z305. Are these records necessary? Are they updated by the PLIF?

### Resolution:

These records are necessary only if the values (z305\_bor\_status, z305\_bor\_type, etc.) in the sublibrary-code z305 are *\*different\** than the values in the xxx50 z305.

Though such records *\*could\** be updated by p\_file\_20 (by creating a BOR-REC with the sublibrary code as the BOR-REC-SUB-LIBRARY in addition to the BOR-REC with the xxx50 ADM library as the BOR-REC-SUB-LIBRARY), this could get *\*very\** complicated for the staff producing the p\_file\_20 PLIF input files....

Note: assuming that there's an xxx50 z305 record for the patron with the same values as the sublibrary-code z305, a sublibrary-code z305 can be deleted without any consequence -- even if there are active loans, hold requests, etc., for the patron.

---

## Additional Information

In one case, a site had z305 sublibrary-code records in addition to the xxx50 z305 record for each patron. The xxx50 z305 records had a 2013 expiration date while the sublibrary-code z305's had a 2099 expiration date. They were finding that the 2013 expiration date was taking precedence over the individual sublibrary z305 date (which should *\*not\** have been happening). "Since the xxx50 date was overriding the individual sublibrary settings we decided to resolve this issue by changing the xxx50 expiration date to 2099, which now allows a more restrictive sublibrary expiration-date to take precedence."

**Category:** Circulation

---

- **Article last edited:** 1/7/2014