

# Where are we?

An overview of the data, current practice and opportunities

Neil Renison, JCU, 2007

# The data:

- From web servers or transaction logs
- Collected by us or by them?
- Use only if COUNTER compliant or use all available?

# Comment

The benefit of measurement by provider is that every transaction with that vendor can be measured. The downside is that some providers don't do it or are not COUNTER compliant

The benefits of independent measurement include control, inclusion of all information sources (subscribed or open access) and uniform measuring. The downside is that there are no agreed standards, no robust technologies, limited "things" that can be measured and many opportunities for use to bypass the access route that has a counting mechanism

Looking at usage measurement from a consortial perspective, local (and often idiosyncratic) usage counting practices are problematic, if not unworkable

# Why COUNTER?

- A set of standards and protocols governing the recording and exchange of online usage data
- Makes it possible for Librarians to compare usage statistics from different vendors, make better-informed purchasing decisions and plan infrastructure more effectively
- Widely adopted – there are now over 60 vendors providing COUNTER compliant usage reports for over 9,000 full-text journals, as well as for a growing number of databases

# SUSHI

COUNTER supports a protocol to facilitate the automated harvesting and consolidation of usage statistics from different vendors – SUSHI (Standardised Usage Harvesting Initiative). (Developed by COUNTER in collaboration with NISO)

All this and more at COUNTER website  
<http://www.projectcounter.org>.

# To sum up COUNTER:

- Organisational, governance and funding arrangements provide assurance that COUNTER is here to stay
- It is the products, not the vendors, that are registered as COUNTER compliant and this is only after meeting COUNTER auditing requirements
- COUNTER assists the vendors to improve usage reporting, examples follow . . . .

# COUNTER improves reporting by:

- developing a data filter that can alleviate potential inflation of usage statistics due to interface effects
- providing guidelines strongly discouraging vendors from requiring users to access the html version of a full-text journal article in order to gain access to the PDF of the same article
- imposing a requirement for vendors to "Run the 'double-click-removal' script" i.e. remove misleading requests from the log

# The Practice:

. . . . . as revealed by the CEI RC  
Questionnaire on managing usage  
statistics, Feb. 2007

Of the 46 Australian and New Zealand  
Universities involved 44 responded.  
Another 4 responses were received from  
non-University participants

# Lessons learned - collecting:

- Every institution is collecting, most manually in-house, most will collect all data available
- Most institutions are very interested in learning of ways to improve the efficiency of in-house processing or in finding technological or outsourced solutions
- Almost half, that is 23 respondents, collect statistics from sources other than the Information Providers e.g. EZProxy and SFX

# Lessons learned - utilizing

- The end-products were reported as either the data in tabular or graphical form usually spreadsheet (or in a few instances a database) or the actual use to which data was applied, e.g. Annual report or library promotion
- Nearly all libraries use the data in collection development, but not necessarily in all cases
- It is unclear whether most respondents were confident about their skills in data presentation and analysis

# The Opportunities

1. Greater sharing and cooperation to improve practice for collection and management
2. Further training and economies of scale in sharing training
3. Ideas exchange for presentation and utilization of statistics
4. Form a market for technologies and services
5. Create a standard for a measure of use that is independent of providers