**SUSHI and LibInsight listserv responses February 18, 2016**

1. We heavily rely on SUSHI here at Wheaton and have setups running for about 40 different vendors, but:

* after all these years, it is still sometimes fraught with difficulty in setting up and maintaining in your ERM (we use CORAL)
* SUSHI is nowhere near universal so yes, we still have to manually download many vendor stats
* COUNTER is great but SUSHI implicitly relies upon homogenous reports and frankly, some vendors claim COUNTER compliance but their reports aren’t really compliant

I think SUSHI remains promising but I am quite frustrated that it can be difficult to coordinate setup for a variety of reasons. Just because a vendor offers SUSHI reports does not mean it’s straightforward to get it going. Sometimes there are significant hurdles to overcome to get it working properly. And perhaps most importantly, it has not reached anywhere near the saturation point in terms of vendor provision that COUNTER has.

These are some off-the-cuff responses.
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2. We use EBSCOnet Usage Consolidation here, which allows us to use SUSHI to collect usage data. However, I still have to use an Excel spreadsheet, because so many vendors are not COUNTER compliant. I have found that SUSHI is not super helpful as of yet. Some vendors say you can collect their usage using it, but then it fails to work. And you can only use it with compliant vendors or course, so you have to go in by hand for everyone else. I’d say try to use it if you have a tool that can manage it for you, and if you only need to collect stats from compliant vendors. But I think it has a long way to go before it’s truly a time saver.
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3. Steve has pretty well summed up what I was going to say. We need to push back on vendors to be truly COUNTER compliant (if their content is able to be “counted” in that way) and encourage SUSHI participation as well.
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4. Please share.

We subscribe to EBSCO's UCP but I find that we do more collecting on our own and creating those dreaded spreadsheets.
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5. We have the Proquest Inota product, but also find myself doing collecting & spreadsheet creating.

Thank you!
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6. We tried to get SUSHI running here in III’s Sierra, but in the end the project was cancelled. Hurdles included:

* Low vendor participation
* Lack of compliance for participating vendors (we got constant errors whenever we tried to pull reports from some vendors who claimed compliance, and none of these vendors were able to help troubleshoot)
* Ingestion problems (“Title not found” errors sprinkled throughout the harvest log for reports we were able to pull successfully)

I think after three months of working on setups, I had three or four vendors working sporadically. We are collecting stats for about 250 products/publishers; this incredibly low success rate doomed the project. I was also unhappy with the quality of the data that came in for multi-product vendors (such as EBSCO). I am reluctant to try again unless: a) vendor compliance and active participation increases dramatically; and/or b) we acquire so many products that gathering statistics manually becomes unreasonably onerous (I am just putting the finishing touches on this year’s stats, which I started a month ago).
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7. We have a SUSHI service, but we also collect all of our usage manually because our SUSHI service doesn't collect all of the reports we need for evaluation.
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8. We  had a very similar experience as Mandi.  We tried SUSHI via SerialsSolutions 360Counter for a couple of years,  but it returned so many failed results and problematic reports that we've stopped using it.  We now rely on the Serials Solutions Demand Retrieval Service (DRS) coupled with good old fashioned manual report pulls.
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9. My library uses the Ex Libris Ustat platform for usage stats, and we have SUSHI set up for gathering JR1 reports from many vendors. It has gotten somewhat more reliable over the years, and setup is a bit easier now than it used to be. There are still many vendors, especially smaller publishers with their own platforms, that we can't get through SUSHI at all. As Mary Ann said, there are also many vendors for which we'll want additional reports, like a JR5, that can't be handled through SUSHI. That said, I find SUSHI very useful. It means that if I have a basic question regarding usage for one journal or platform, I often don't need to gather new stats to answer that question. It doesn't live up to the dream of making manual usage gathering a thing of the past, but it is still helpful.
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10. We are using SUSHI collection of data (EBSCO) -- I'm a believer in taking advantage of any automation that can actually save a little time. We do still have to collect some stats manually for reasons that Chris Bulock stated in his reply.  I too would like to hear from anyone who has experience with COUNTER compliant reports (whether gathered via SUSHI or not) and LibInsight.
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11. We are using EBSCO’s UC service at the current time.  Been very useful for some major journal reviews (although some manipulation is still required with the report in hand for the review). We just migrated to ALMA, and looking to take advantage of Ustats (but as we are in the early “burn in” period, this implementation may be a bit of a ways away). Very interested in the Libinsight platform.
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