

Distributed Usage Logging: a report on stakeholder demand

By

*Information Power Ltd
5 Stirling Acres Road
Kirkcudbright DG6 4EY*

www.informationpower.co.uk

October 2016

Executive Summary

Distributed Usage Logging (DUL) allows publishers to capture traditional usage activity related to their content that happens on sites other than their own so they can provide reports of “total usage” regardless of where that usage happens. In order to gather stakeholder views on how useful DUL usage statistics would be to them, Information Power Ltd (IPL) held a face-to-face focus group for librarians and ran both an international webinar and an online survey which included publishers. Findings from these activities indicated that stakeholder demand for distributed usage logging (DUL) differed depending upon whether the participants were considering the issues as a provider or user of content.

Regarding academic sharing networks, librarians generally discouraged their use because of the following concerns:

- copyright issues
- reduction of impact by having multiple copies across many sites
- Research Excellence Framework (REF) Open Access (OA) Policy insisting that articles must be in the institutional repository (IR) in order to count towards the REF

Publishers indicated that they accept the use of social networks, but noted that it does impact on usage, hence the need for DUL usage statistics to demonstrate the value of the journal and provide a complete picture. They also agreed that these statistics would be helpful in understanding who recommends a particular author. Society publishers were very interested in DUL usage statistics as they would provide country level and article level data.

In terms of altmetrics, libraries and consortia were interested in these statistics but noted that they are not useful for collection management/ development decisions; however, they can be used for supporting faculty authors. From a consortium perspective, altmetrics are useful background information to understand academic engagement.

It was generally agreed that the multiple models for OA and freely available content would be simplified by standard usage reports and these would help in the implementation of OA policy. With the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) REF policy being picked up by more researchers, comparisons of green OA versus journal subscriptions will become more important.

Some publishers already have to keep track of OA usage as some customers have agreements where the licence fee and the OA publication fees are covered in the same deal.

Given that any COUNTER report can only work with items that have a DOI, there was strong support for all content to have a DOI and it was felt that IRs should be minting them for items that do not have them. The issue of a different price for DOIs used by libraries and IRs was also raised.

Overall, participants in the focus group, webinar and online survey were highly engaged and interested in going beyond just counts of usage to meaningful data on the way users are engaging with the content. Providers of content (whether publishers or IR managers) are generally keen to see

DUL data reported. They want to know and report to consumers and societies about all instances of usage, on their own platforms, social networking sites and IRs. This would provide information about the relative importance of all players [and all versions] in the total usage picture.

Introduction

Distributed Usage Logging (DUL) allows publishers to capture traditional usage activity related to their content that happens on sites other than their own so they can provide reports of “total usage” regardless of where that usage happens. For example, full text downloads that happen at full text aggregator sites or full text requests that take place in IRs and shared social network sites. It also provides a mechanism for capturing other activity related to the content such as altmetrics.

This research explored whether providers of content would wish to produce such DUL reports, and if such reports would be useful to consumers of content.

The data provided provides a snapshot of the current situation regarding DUL, a concept relatively new to many of the participants in the focus groups and respondents to the survey.

Methodology

In order to collect stakeholder views, Information Power Ltd (IPL) held a face-to-face focus group, an international webinar and an online survey. The face-to-face meeting was held in Edinburgh to both understand the current situation and pose questions to help formulate the later webinar and survey. Invitations were sent to librarians, consortia and IR managers in Scotland and Northern England and a very representative group attended which promoted discussion. A further focus group via webinar with a wider, more international group of librarians, IR managers and publishers also examined current practice. This included the usage and distribution of current COUNTER reports, calculations of cost-per-use, and the interaction between libraries and the IRs. Details of this discussion are given in Appendix A: Notes from “Hidden Metrics” Edinburgh Focus Group and Appendix B: Notes from “Hidden Metrics” Webinar. Both groups then went on to discuss the potential of distributed usage logging and the inclusion of data in usage reports including altmetrics and OA types.

Respondents

The librarians focus group, which was held on 31st August 2016 in Edinburgh, had 12 participants. The international webinar held on 21st September 2016 attracted 15 participants including both librarians and publishers.

The online survey was posted on a range of library and publishers listservs and between 18th September and 17th October 2016, 284 people responded in full and 6 skipped the question about their role. Online survey respondents identified themselves as follows:

Table 1: Role	percentage	number
Library	67.63%	188
Library consortia	9.35%	26
Institutional Repository	7.91%	22
Publisher	11.51%	32
Aggregator	3.6%	10

Shared social network sites

As background information, IPL was keen to understand stakeholder views about the use of shared social network sites such as Mendeley, Research Gate, etc. IPL had already been involved in 2015 with research led by The University of Tennessee, Center for Information and Communication Studies (UT CICS), under the leadership of Professor Carol Tenopir. The international scholarly communication research team explored the life of articles after download and found that email was the most usual way for scholars to share.ⁱ However, other research suggested that scholars increasingly use social networking sites to upload their publications and share them with othersⁱⁱ.

At the focus groups librarians told us that they do not positively encourage the use of social network sites. Copyright issues are important and one librarian said they discouraged use of Research Gate etc. as authors kept adding their published version and they could not be seen to condone that. Furthermore, authors do not realise that they reduce impact by having multiple copies across many sites. UK librarians were concerned about compliance with the Research Excellence Framework (REF) OA policy which states that articles must be in an IR in order to count towards the REF.

Publishers taking part in the international webinar accepted the use of social network sites, but recognised that such usage does impact on COUNTER usage data, hence the need for DUL usage data to demonstrate the full value of the journal and provide a complete picture. They also felt that these statistics would be helpful in recognising who recommends a particular author. Society publishers are very interested in DUL usage statistics, especially country and article level data.

The online survey asked consumers of content: “How positive are you about the use your academics make of shared networks (e.g. Research Gate, Mendeley)”. The response was:

Table 2	percentage	number
Encourage use	42.61%	75
Don't care	51.14%	90
Discourage use	6.35%	11

An open question about attitudes to social network sites which followed this question elicited 51 responses. Some expressed concern about intellectual property rights (IPR) infringement and the sustainability of such sites and the need to prioritise the IR, for example:

“Authors don't always know if they have rights to upload their articles to these networks. Additionally, these are generally corporate entities who may not share the same motives. They could also go out of business, be purchased, or sold. I advise our authors to use the institutional repository first, and then share with those networks secondarily.”

Others encourage, and in one case at least, provide training because these sites are helpful with citation and referencing. However, some respondents reported concern that use of such sites could undermine libraries:

“On one hand, why shouldn't they, especially if they are the authors of the publications themselves. On the other hand, it undermines the work libraries do in buying content and negotiating with publishers.”

“I neither promote or discourage the use of ResearchGate (and Academic.edu) but it has gained traction within our institution over the last 12-18 months. More academics are using it. I have big concerns about the uploading and sharing of articles on these sites because their usage is not recorded. I think we're already seeing the impact of this in our library because our journal usage has plateaued over the last 12 months. So my concerns mean that I would lean towards discouraging their use if they are mainly used as a platform to (illegally?) share articles.”

The online survey asked *providers* of content: “How positive are you about the use your users make of shared networks (e.g. Research Gate, Mendeley). The response was:

Table 3	percentage	number
Encourage use	35.42%	17
Don't care	43.75%	21
Discourage use	20.83%	10

A number of respondents shared concerns about copyright infringement with reference in particular to Research Gate. However, it was recognised that the sharing of the content, and awareness of the journal/society/publisher is positive, if usage can be attributed back to the article or author. One provider of content said:

“My preference would be to work with these platforms, for example, by feeding them with metadata so that content is, in effect, pre-loaded and ready to be shared and commented upon by users.”

Demand for DUL Reports

In the focus group, librarians (i.e. consumers of content) were generally keen to have separate reports for what is being paid for (either direct or to the aggregator) and for what is being accessed but not paid for. Information about turn-aways on a particular platform versus Journal Report 1 on a different platform would also be welcomed. This would be important where a library receives information about turn-aways from a provider but where access is available because of a subscription elsewhere.

Publishers participating in the international webinar were more cautious, asking about incentives for publishers to provide third-party statistics, as it is flagging to libraries where they are getting usage, but not paying the publisher for it.

In the online survey, consumers of content were asked if they would want metrics for full text usage that occurred on aggregators such as EBSCO, ProQuest or IRs or scholarly network sites like Mendeley, and if so, the type of reports they would require. The response was:

Table 4	percentage	number
Separate Reports	70.11%	122
Combined Reports	28.16%	49
No Report	1.72%	3

Respondents indicated that this would be valuable data for academic faculty who need new ways to survey or summarize the increasingly complex landscape of information discovery and consumption in order to demonstrate their research impact.

One librarian said: “I would like the complete picture, but I want to be able to identify x amount of activity occurs on the vendor's platform and y amount of activity occurs off the vendor's platform. I could see this data included on my library's dashboard of activity”

Some respondents felt that having the usage on a single report would be easiest but overall the demand was for separate reports.

Calculating cost per use

In the focus groups librarians were keen to have separate reports for what is being paid for (either direct or to the aggregator) and for what is being accessed but not paid for. They indicated that cost-per-use would only be calculated against what is being paid for, and would be separate for different sources.

As indicated above, publishers in the international webinar were more cautious about third-party statistics, as it is flagging to libraries where they are getting usage, but not paying the publisher for it.

The online survey asked *consumers* of content if they would use the higher number of consolidated usage across multiple platforms to calculate cost-per-use for the content they license from the publisher? The response was:

Table 5	percentage	number
Yes	53.09%	86
No	46.91%	76

We received 65 free field comments on this subject. Some of these respondents said that they did not fully understand the question, or that they required sample data in order to make an informed decision. However, some respondents wanted information on hidden metrics as an indicator of return on investment:

“A use is a use, and the consolidated figure would seem a more accurate count of actual use. For example, if one of my students downloaded an article and then shared it with her three groupmates for a project, I'd want to count that as at least 4 uses. My current reporting structure would only allow me to see 1 download, but the use could clearly be higher than that.”

Others were clear that they only wanted to calculate cost per use for content they had paid for, when it was used on the publisher's or vendor's platform. One respondent said:

“Cost-per-use does what it says - if the use is from a free site it doesn't count, as it didn't cost anything - if it's from an aggregator it counts for that database, not the journal subscription.”

One respondent could see the value of calculating cost-per-use both ways as a point of reference and to better understand how their collections are being used.

The online survey asked *providers* of content if they would want to include in their reports full text usage of their content that occurred on aggregators such as EBSCO, ProQuest or activity that occurred on IRs or scholarly network sites like Mendeley? The response was:

Table 6	percentage	number
Yes	95.83%	46
No	4.17%	2

One provider of content said: “We would want to include ALL instances of usage of ALL versions of the output. Yes, the SCNs, yes IRs and SRs but also primary publisher sites like ScienceDirect, SpringerLINK etc. In fact, the primary publisher sites would be the most interesting. We would be very interested to know the relative importance of all players [and all versions] in the total usage picture.”

In summary, librarians are generally are interested in this data, particularly from the perspective of understanding where access happens to better support their users and faculty. However, in terms of collection building and renewal decisions many librarians said that they are not sure how, or if, they would use the data in their current cost-per-use calculations. Certainly, the majority would want to see DUL reports separated from the main COUNTER usage reports.

Data about altmetric

In the focus group, librarians said that while altmetrics such as tweets and shares are not useful in reporting against the impact agenda, items such as news stories, government reports and policy documents do need to be tracked

In the webinar, librarians indicated that tweets would be interesting to know but pointed out that they are not useful for collection management/ development decisions. The potential use of these metrics would be in supporting faculty authors. From a consortium perspective, altmetrics are useful background information to understand engagement.

However, librarians noted two areas of caution. The first was about data overload, with concerns that at the moment, it might take more time to understand the data than we might gain from it. The second was about consistency and reliability. Concerns were expressed in the focus group and webinar about the longevity of some of the measures, and their reliability as a marker. Librarians said that it is important to know how altmetrics are calculated, and, in order to understand long-term trends, to know if methodology changes. A desire for an altmetrics COUNTER standard was voiced.

In the webinar a number of publishers said that they already provide altmetrics or plan to do so in the near future. They pointed out that Kudos is helping libraries and publishers to see altmetrics via a dashboard. IRs are also interested in providing altmetrics but not yet so advanced in implementing them.

In the online survey, *consumers* of content if there any other metrics e.g. likes; shares; tweets; citations on Wikipedia they would like to be collected. The response was:

Table 7	percentage	number
Yes	58.02%	94
No	41.98%	68

We received 65 free field comments on this subject. One librarian echoed the findings of the focus group and webinar by saying “From the viewpoint of collection development purchasing, these metrics would not be particularly relevant. From the viewpoint of IR management, these metrics are very pertinent.”

Other respondents were concerned about managing and analysing the data and the reliability of the data: “A "like" or "share" can have many different values, and not all social media activity is equivalent.”

In the online survey, *providers* of content were asked if there are any other metrics e.g. likes; shares; tweets; citations on Wikipedia they would like to be collected. The response was:

Table 8	percentage	number
Yes	93.33%	42
No	6.67%	3

Both publishers and repositories indicated that they would like to see as much data as possible.

Data about access types

In the focus group and webinar, consumers of content in particular were keen to know how many accesses were to the OA version versus the paid-for version of an item of content. One librarian was particularly interested in use of unsubscribed titles which appear JR1 with usage.

Others noted that given the multiple ways to discover and access OA material it is important to make sure that an institutions content is accessible, and where it was accessed from. Some indicated that if the majority of access is not through the publisher site, it would cast a different light on the value of subscription prices.

One publisher in the focus group said that they already keep track and report on access types because some customers have agreements where the licence fee and the OA publication fees are covered in the same deal.

Another publisher expressed concerns about the impact such data might have on OA if reporting on access types led to fewer renewals (since most content was seen as free). This might result in journals or societies moving this back behind a paywall.

In the online survey, *consumers* of content were asked about what they want to know about access types such as green and gold OA and other free-to-read material such as promotions of articles. Respondents were able to select more than one of the three options. The response was:

Table 9	percentage	number
Green open access	95.27%	141
Gold open access	94.59%	140
Other free-to-read	55.41%	82

One respondent said: “Green gives an indication of the value of our systems, gold indicates that paying for open access reaches a wider audience, free-to-read information helps show whether promotional access increases the impact of an article.”

In the online survey, *providers* of content were asked about what they want to know about access types and were also able to select as more than one of the three options. The response was:

Table 10	percentage	number
Green open access	92.11%	35
Gold open access	92.11%	35
Other free-to-read	78.95%	30

One respondent said: “I want the specific licence for such content (CC-BY 4.0, for example) to be present within the content, within the landing page for the content, and as part of the DUL payload”.

Another would like to see access type information provided in the article metadata delivered by publishers.

Content without a DOI

In the focus group the issue of content without a DOI was a subject of concern for librarians who pointed out that many items in IRs do not have a DOI as they may be accepted manuscripts or pre-prints. The concern was shared by participants in the webinar; however some thought that DUL statistics might provide an impetus to encourage the minting of DOIs by IRs. Indeed, one respondent reported that their repository is already registering DOIs. One participant hoped that a price for universities rather than publishers might be developed. Another asked if DOIs are not

available whether it might be possible to use a limited number of other identifiers instead of the DOI.

In the online survey all respondents, both *consumers* and *providers* of content, were asked “How concerned they are you about this limitation of DUL not being able to report on content for which a DOI has not been allocated.” The response was:

Table 11	percentage	number
Very concerned	32.14%	63
Slightly concerned	59.69%	117
Not at all concerned	8.16%	16

A publisher said: “We understand that content we publish that does not have a DOI will not be counted, and that's fine and expected. However, we are concerned about use (and capture of use) of content by disseminators that might not report on use: SciHub, ResearchGate, etc. We'd also like to track use of stray PDFs. If Crossmark could send a signal back to Crossref each time it is viewed, that would be fantastic”.

A consumer of data highlighted the danger of providing statistics which have "exceptions". And commented: “It's hard to instill confidence in statistics to our community when I always have to make exceptions for missing data, how data is counted, what is being counted. I have colleagues who have grown to discount all usage stats as suspect due to the amount of exceptions I have to account for.” Another pointed that the exclusion of grey literature that has a value to non-academic audiences (for example government reports) could be a negative in policy research.

Opinion was divided about the value of DUL statistics if material lacking DOIs is excluded. One respondent said: “Distributed usage logging is not important to us at this time, but if it's done, it should be done for all publications”. Another said, “[The exclusion of content without DOIs] will skew the numbers. I'm not interested in skewed usage data”. However, others took a more positive view, indicating that DUL statistics would encourage the use of DOIs. One pragmatic respondent said “It's most important to just get started with something & make changes based on user feedback. Tracking of other identifier types can be added”.

Acknowledgements

IPL wish to thank Edina for their help in organising the Edinburgh focus group.

References

ⁱ Carol Tenopir, Gabriel Hughes, Lisa Christian, Suzie Allard, Dave Nicholas, Anthony Watkinson, Hazel Woodward, Peter Shepherd, and Robert Anderson, "To Boldly Go Beyond Downloads: How Are Journal Articles Shared and Used?" (2014). Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284315614>

ⁱⁱ Nández, G. and Borrego, Á. (2013) 'Use of social networks for academic purposes: A case study', *The Electronic Library*, 31(6), pp. 781–791. doi: 10.1108/el-03-2012-0031

Appendix A: Notes from “Hidden Metrics” Edinburgh Focus Group, Wednesday, 31st August 2016

1. What metrics do you collect, what do you with them and who do you share with?

	JUSP/JR1	Cost per use	Share with	Comments
University of St Andrews	y	y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic liaison Research policy office VC Research Researchers for OA papers 	<p>Differentiate back file from current subscription</p> <p>Include COUNTER compliant data from IR</p> <p>Inform collection management decision</p> <p>Calculate cost per use</p>
Glasgow School of Art (Library)	y	y	SCONUL	<p>Generate reports in summer to inform collection development</p> <p>Try to collective qualitative data as well as quantitative as art is a difficult subject to track</p>
Glasgow School of Art (IR)				<p>RADAR - Lots of different media, have stats package and IRUS</p> <p>Check on author accepted manuscripts.</p> <p>Repository staff provide monthly and termly reports to research committee</p> <p>They make stats available on their website</p>
Dundee	Y		<p>SCURL</p> <p>SHEDL</p> <p>Tend only to share when asked.</p>	<p>IR = PURE, will interface with IRUS soon.</p> <p>Measure turnaways , information used mainly in negotiations</p>
Queen Margaret University (Library)	Y	Y	SHEDL	<p>Stats collected annually</p> <p>Proactively look at cost:ILL</p> <p>Collect usage for negotiations</p>

Queen Margaret University (IR)			Academics REF working group	Use Google Analytics and Almetric Donut (if have a DOI) IRUS stats OA papers and access status Look at trends over time
Bradford University	Y			Look at turnaways to see which physical journals are not being used Current vs backfiles Science Direct swap in/out Academics don't care about usage
Edinburgh Napier University	Y	y	SHEDL SCONUL Subject librarians	Manually consolidate multiple usage reports e.g. EBSCOnet Cost:ILL Input to collection development and promotional activity
Glasgow University	Y	y	Senior Mgt Research Office	Produce IR reports monthly for usage and compliance Monitoring OA journal usage They claim to be data driven
Edinburgh University	Y + 1A 2 & 5	y	Academic support Dashboard include # downloads	Very proactive. On JUSP Advisory Group Input to collection development and renewals Swap packages

2. Sharing Networks

In most cases the Library doesn't get involved or promote in sharing networks. Reasons include:

- No transparency in ResearchGate score
- Unofficial resource discovery
- If anything encourage Google Scholar rather than social network

Dundee encourages the use of official networks, and the use of the IR where use can be measured and systems supported

Some have prepared FAQs on social networks pointing out the advantages of the IR

Edinburgh has an initiative to “claim your digital space” in Scholarly Communications

Institution as content consumer and content producer

Collection development vs. promoting research

Subject repositories

3. Aggregation of traditional metrics

Libraries want both journal level and article metrics. Journal level informs collection management/development, article level to inform academics. Essential to see where usage was.

4. Altmetrics

Varies depending on whether content consumer or producer

E-prints does a certain amount of altmetrics as does Plumprint in the discovery layer.

In an impact agenda, it does change the methodology for collecting statistics so items such as news stories, government reports and policy documents need to be tracked.

It is also important to know exactly what altmetrics packages include in their statistics and whether it is only items with DOIs.

Important to know how altmetrics are calculated, and (for trends over time) to know if methodology changes.

5. Open Access

Given the multiple ways to discover and access OA material it is important to make sure that an institutions' content is accessible, and where it was accessed from. If it turns about that the majority of access is not through the publisher site, it casts a different light on those subscription prices.

There is a distinct difference between research light and heavy institutions because of the impact of APCs and their administration and discounts.

RCUK (?) is producing case studies and smarter tools for handling these.

SHEDL needs these statistics to discuss offsets.

6. Why would publishers want DUL metrics?

To log unauthorised usage

To increase prices

Target individual academics

For marketing and targeted promotions

To work out APCs vs. subscriptions

Strategic acquisitions

Takedown notices

7. DOIs

If metrics can only be applied to items with DOIs, this impacts on those journals which don't have DOIs (especially in the arts).

Many items in repositories don't have DOIs as they may be accepted manuscripts or pre-prints.

Items may have multiple identifiers, from Figshare or IR identifiers.

What would be useful would be licence information included in an identifier.

Appendix B: Notes from “Hidden Metrics” Webinar, Wednesday 21st September 2016

What metrics do you currently provide or collect on journals and what do you do with the usage reports?

At a recent Focus group held in Edinburgh, librarians told us that JR1 was the most used COUNTER usage report, with use also being made of JR1A, JR2 and JR5. They also said that they used the Journals Usage Statistics Portal (JUSP) on a regular basis. Are there any other reports that participants produce or collect and what are they used for? Is JUSP important to librarians? Can we hear from the publishers as well?

Webinar library participants said that in addition to the above reports, one had started using JR1 GOA and subtracting from JR1 for hybrid journals. Another said that they are now collecting JR3 reports but have not started using the data yet. Cost per use versus the cost of ILL is used as a tool when reviewing subscriptions. One participant said that they do not find JR2 as useful as ILL borrowing data, and another added that from their IR they report item level, author level and department level usage, but not at the journal level. IR usage is used by faculty authors as they make their case for promotion and tenure.

One librarian said that they are beginning to give more weight to trends over time rather than just looking at the last year or two. Another added that they have been looking at 5 years of usage, and looking at the average over that time to see if usage is at a level worth continuing a subscription, or if ILL would be sufficient. One librarian said they had been thinking about how to dig into the JR5 to see if there are trends for what is being used – is it primarily older articles, or primarily newer articles? They noted that the tools for consolidating those reports are not very good and this is holding them back,

Regarding JUSP, two participants from Jisc Collections noted that (i) JC is now trying to combine JUSP data with IRUS-UK data to give an overall picture of usage at consortium level, although one issue they have come across is that IRUS-UK data includes green and gold access and JR1-GOA is gold only. It would be useful to separate these and it would be useful to librarians and publishers alike. Secondly (ii) the JUSP Community Survey from late 2015 adds further information about reports used and how reports are used. [<http://jusp.mimas.ac.uk/docs/JUSP-Community-Survey-2015.pdf>].

A publisher noted pointed out that it was very important for them to be able to report back to their society publishers and that the societies are very interested in article level metrics. Another publisher added that they often provide ad hoc reports to institutions, typically giving more details than the COUNTER reports provide, for example, identifying reasons for peaks in usage.

At the Focus Group, librarians told us that they shared usage data with faculty, specifically faculty liaison officers; the research policy office; VC research; and Research Excellence working group. Who do webinar participants share data with?

One US librarian said that they were an OA policy university and they have begun to share IR participation and usage data with other OA policy universities in North America and another added that they had been thinking about how to determine if certain usage was good or not. One UK librarian noted that SCOUNL statistics can be a good news story on overall usage and another that they have begun to share high level data with senior management – but it is early days.

Two publishers noted that they sometimes share usage data with the general public for promotional purposes, for example, “This articles had over xxx downloads”.

Sharing Networks

At the focus group librarians told us that they do not positively encourage the use of Social Network Sites such as Mendeley, Research Gate, etc.? Are participants aware of the use that their researchers are making of Scholarly Network Sites? Are you aware of the usage academics make of these sites? As providers and consumers of content, do you encourage their use?

Copyright issues are important and one librarian said they discouraged use of Research Gate etc. as authors kept adding the published version and they could not be seen to condone that.

Furthermore, authors do not realise that they reduce impact by having multiple copies across many sites.

As far as the REF OA Policy is concerned, articles must be in the IR in order to count towards the REF.

Publishers have to accept the use of social networks, but it does impact on usage, hence the need for DUL usage statistics to demonstrate the value of the journal and provide a complete picture. These statistics will also be helpful in understanding who recommends, which author, etc. Society publishers are very interested in DUL usage statistics, they require country level and article level data too.

Some attempts have been made to do this before, but without standardisation, it is a difficult task.

Usage Metrics

*As a **consumer** of content would you want to include full text usage of that publisher’s content that occurred on aggregators such as EBSCO, ProQuest or activity that occurred on Institutional Repositories or Scholarly Network Sites like Mendeley? Would you use the higher number that consolidated usage across multiple platforms to calculate cost-per-use for the content you license from the publisher?*

Separate reports for what is being paid for directly (either direct or to the aggregator) and for what is being accessed but not paid for. Cost-per-use would only be calculated against what is being paid for, and would be separate for different sources.

Total usage is important for authors, and does give the bigger picture.

Turnaways on a particular platform vs JR1 on a different platform would be useful. E.g. we get turnaways from a provider but we have it subscribed elsewhere.

We have found that even when an article is in an IR or on ResearchGate, we do not have a decline in ILL requests for that item. So, I don't think distributed usage will inform collections decisions. When the IR is the first distributor/publisher of a work, yes ... I'd like to know what happens when it's reposted on Mendeley, et al.

*As a **provider** of content, would you want to include full text usage of your content that occurred on aggregators such as EBSCO, ProQuest or activity that occurred on Institutional Repositories or Scholarly Network Sites like Mendeley?*

This and other so called "long tale" usage has always been a challenge for us (publishers) to quantify.

I don't see a direct incentive for publishers to provide third party stats, as it is flagging to libraries where they are getting usage, but not paying the publisher for it. However there are indirect incentives such as (as just said) indicating the value of the journal outside of the website, and it is useful information for publishers about the reach of a journal.

For the publisher trying to consolidate usage reports we get a mixture of good COUNTER compliant reports vs some other reports vs nothing.

PubMed Central would be good to get in COUNTER compliant format.

Alternative metrics

*As a **provider** of content, would you want to include full text usage of your content that occurred on aggregators such as EBSCO, ProQuest or activity that occurred on Institutional Repositories or Scholarly Network Sites like Mendeley?*

Librarian and Consortium feedback: Tweets would be interesting to know; they are not useful for collections decisions. But useful for supporting faculty authors. From a consortium perspective, altmetrics is all useful background information to understand engagement etc.

However, caution about data overload, at the moment, it might take more time to understand the data than we might gain for it.

There needs to be an altmetric COUNTER **standard!**

*As a **provider** of content, would you want to include full text usage of your content that occurred on aggregators such as EBSCO, ProQuest or activity that occurred on Institutional Repositories or Scholarly Network Sites like Mendeley?*

The publishers are already providing altmetrics or plan to implement altmetrics in the near future.

Institutional repositories are not so advanced, but working to implement altmetrics tools.

Kudos is helping libraries and publishers to see [atmetrics] via a dashboard - is there a link up with this discussion possibly?

Access Types

*As a **consumer** of content what do you want to know about access types: (e.g. green, gold, other free-to-read material such as promotions) of articles?*

Yes, this helps in the implementation of our OA policy. With the HEFCE REF policy being picked up by more researchers, I think comparisons of green OA vs. our journal subscriptions will become very interesting.

It would be great to see the impact of the OA articles we pay for.

For hybrid journals we [already] subtract Jr1GOA from JR1

I would very much like to know what is free or green OA among our usage data. I get the sense that there is more than I know, particularly when titles we don't subscribe to appear on our JR1 with usage. It would useful to know how many accesses to the OA version versus the paid-for version.

With the HEFCE REF policy being picked up by more researchers, I think comparisons of green OA vs. our journal subscriptions will become very interesting.

This helps Jisc collections support its community - so yes please!

Access Types

*As a **provider** of content would it help you to know about access types: (e.g. green, gold, other free-to-read material such as promotions) of articles?*

Yes, it helps to rights clearing immensely!!

Difficult for Publisher to keep track when the DOI was open for free due to marketing and closed for subscription

Access type needs to be recorded at time of use.

A large number of journals have a significant proportion of content freely available (but not OA). If reporting on this led to fewer renewals (since most content was seen as free), then I might see some journals or societies moving this back behind a paywall. As a publisher we do track this (free/paid) and could report on it (though this would not be easy for all publishers).

We actually have to keep track because some customers have agreements where the license fee and the OA publication fees are covered in the same deal.

Usage via the use of pre-paid for token would also be helpful

About DOIs

The Distributed Usage Logging that will enable a publisher to capture usage from other sites will only report on usage of content with a DOI. This means the content for which a DOI has not been allocated or the DOI was not captured will not be reported. How concerned are you about this limitation?

Ideally all content should have DOIs and IRs should be minting them for items that don't. Is there a possibility of a special rate for universities rather than publishers?

We're now registering DOIs in the IR for this reason. And our authors are asking for them. We're using both CrossRef and EZID for DOIs. Depending on the item.

There is still inconsistency about what gets a DOI but as long as the scope of what is being reported is understood, that seems reasonable.

All post-publication repositories should have a DOI. We should encourage authors to add DOIs to pre-publication versions. How we can encourage all to mint DOIs for grey literature etc.

If DOIs are not available, it might be possible to use a limited number of other identifiers instead of the DOI.