
STA vs. 902 for suppressing records

- **Article Type:** General
 - **Product:** Aleph
 - **Product Version:** 16.02
-

Description:

We are getting reports on a regular but erratic with suppressed records showing up.

We have had the convention since v12 of defining a local 9xx field (902) to suppress and have not used the STA field convention.

Do we need to move from 902 to STA for this to be reliably fixed? I know some expand programs only consider the STA field. Also, we have not set up /ndu01/tab/tab_fix_z103, and I am wondering if we might need to add fix_z103_filter_suppress to this table?

Resolution:

There is a special processing associated with "STA \$\$aDeleted" (the record is not indexed), but there is no special processing associated with other STA values, such as, "Suppressed". It doesn't matter whether the value is in an STA field or a 902: as long as the base is set up properly (in tab_base.eng), the result should be the same.

The z103 has to do with links to *HOL* records, whereas the 902 has to do with *bib* record display. tab_fix_z103 could be relevant only if the problem relates to HOL display/non-display.

Additional Information

z103, STA, suppress, deleted, tab_base, tab_fix_z103

- **Article last edited:** 10/8/2013