

Minutes of Meeting #4 of the New Zealand ORCID Consortium Advisory Committee, 13 September 2018; 10am-3.00pm at Royal Society of New Zealand, 11 Turnbull Street, Thorndon, Wellington.

Present:

Committee:

Marie Bradley (chair) (from AgResearch, a member of Science New Zealand's strategy managers group)

Esther Viljoen (from HRC)

Alex Semprini (from MRINZ, representing IRANZ)

Nick Shortt (from MRINZ, also representing IRANZ – supporting Alex in the coming year)

Margaret Leonard (from Ara Institute of Canterbury, representing ITPs) (via videolink)

Giselle Byrnes (from Massey University, representing Universities New Zealand Research Committee–Te Pōkai Tara)

Katharina Ruckstuhl (from University of Otago, bringing a Mātauranga Māori perspective)

Anne Scott (from University of Canterbury, representing CONZUL) (via videolink)

Richard Waldin (from Scion, a member of Science New Zealand's IT group)

Jackie Fawcett (from MBIE).

Apologies:

Marina Dzhelali (from CCDHB, standing in for Mary-Anne Woodnorth, representing District Health Boards)

Secretariat:

Jason Gush (Royal Society Te Apārangi – ORCID programme manager and ORCID Hub product owner)

Jill Mellanby (Royal Society Te Apārangi – ORCID coordinator).

Abbreviations used:

ITPs – Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics

CONZUL – Council of New Zealand University Librarians

VUW – Victoria University of Wellington

CCDHB – Capital & Coast District Health Board

IRANZ – Independent Research Association of New Zealand

NIWA – National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research

HRC – Health Research Council of New Zealand

MBIE – Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment

MFAT – Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

ORCID – Open Researcher and Contributor Identifier

NRIS – National Research Information System

IDI – Integrated Data Infrastructure

USP – University of the South Pacific

Summary of Key Actions

Agenda Item	Action	Who
2 (outstanding from meeting #3)	let AS know which University of Canterbury Marsden fund recipients haven't followed up on the Hub invitation to have this successful funding written to their ORCID IDs.	JG
2 (outstanding from meeting #3)	Follow up with ML to find out date and time of next ITP manager's meeting, in order for the Society to attend, and present/answer questions on ORCID	JG
2	Amend minutes of meeting 3 to respect anonymity of legal feedback	JM
2	Society to disseminate excerpts of 'vision' poster to wider audience, using existing, suitable communication channels	JM
2	Add 'ORCID success story' from one of our more active Hub users in each consortium newsletter	JM
3	Add recurring agenda item for future meetings tracking number of publicly funded NZ researchers with an ORCID ID and number of consortium members using the Hub or having their own ORCID integration	JG/JM
4	Research previous comments from the Privacy Commissioner about ORCID	JF
4	Look for possible contact person with expertise in IP, particularly with regard to Māori and Pacific research, to see if they can advise us on ORCID's Terms & Conditions from their perspective	KR
4	Send Hub invitation wording to all committee members for suggestions of enhancements to message around ORCID's privacy statements	JG
10	Draft feedback to ORCID Board on this committee's thoughts around incentives to encourage smaller organisation to become ORCID members; also the need for ORCID to widen its scope with regards to non-traditional academic research outputs, the humanities, arts and social science sector and use of ORCID as an impact measure in research assessment.	Chair/JM/JG – to be circulated and approved by all committee members
10	Find out if MBIE receptive to including University of the South Pacific in the consortium and report back to JG and JM – who will then follow up with ORCID and then CE of the Society, if positive.	JF, JG, JM
5	Terms of Reference for the Committee to be revised and circulated	JM

7	<p>MBIE – find out what the percentage uptake of ORCID authentication was in the portal for the recent Endeavour application process.</p> <p>Also, determine when MBIE plans to have further ORCID integration built into the application portal to enable them to pull information from ORCID records and then write to successful applicants' ORCID records.</p>	JF
7	Visit IRANZ members to discuss ORCID (ASe) and talk to IRANZ Board (JG)	ASe/JG
11	Major funders to compile a calendar of key fund dates of when they will be requesting ORCID IDs within their bids	EV to coordinate as funder rep
8	Ask at MBIE whether there is any interest in using the Hub's functions, e.g. to write historic funding information to ORCID records	JF
8	Generate more action around ORCID uptake at AgResearch	MB
9	Send information about access token transfer from the Hub to Symplectic Elements to users of this system	JG
9	Find out if the Society's regular reports to MBIE can be shared with another group	JF
12	send around a Doodle poll to determine a time for the next meeting	JM

Several agenda items were altered from the order stated in the agenda. They are listed below in order discussed at the meeting.

Agenda item 1 – Welcome and introductions

Round-table introductions and welcome to new committee members.

Agenda item 2 – Minutes and action points from previous meeting

Minutes from meeting #3 had been approved via email circulation and are on the public webpage for the Advisory Committee. Outstanding actions points from the previous meeting were discussed and are noted on the summary table. Unsuccessful attempts were made to engage with the Māori librarians' group and Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga, implying that ORCID is possibly seen as low priority at present. The Society is currently in discussion with their internal communications team about disseminating short pieces from the committee's 'vision' poster via social media. (ACTION JM)
A success story from an active Hub user will be included in the Society's next, and subsequent consortium newsletters. (ACTION JM)

Agenda item 3 – Discussion on new Work Programme Agreement (WPA) between MBIE and the Society

The Society and MBIE have signed a new Work Programme Agreement, running until 30th June 2020. The emphasis is now on developing a stable and sustainable consortium. Development of the Hub will concentrate on ensuring its robust performance for the future. New key performance indicators are in place, including the desire to have all consortium members either using the Hub or developing their own integration by the end of June 2020, and to have 80% of all New Zealand's publicly funded researchers having an ORCID ID. There was some discussion around the names of the key ORCID contact people at MBIE, and clarification of the role of the MBIE representative person on the committee: as consortium funder, as research funder, also bringing an NRIS perspective to the discussions.

An agenda item will be added to further committee meetings, reporting on numbers for the WPA KPIs (ACTION JM), and a report will be given on actions/strategies taken by the Society to work towards supporting these outcomes.

Agenda item 4 – Discussion on comments received from one consortium member organisation regarding ORCID's Terms and Conditions

Extensive discussion took place around clause 4 of ORCID's [Terms & Conditions](#), 'Depositing data in the repository'. The statement: ...'This license continues even after you stop using the Registry' was of particular concern. The distinction between member organisations having signed the consortium license agreement, and individual researchers signing up for personal ORCID IDs was discussed. The Privacy Commissioner had previously examined ORCID's privacy terms: the Commissioner had expressed no particular concern in a New Zealand context because individuals have the right to set privacy settings in their own records, and ORCID is not mandated by any New Zealand organisation. However, data sovereignty sentiments may have changed in the time since this assessment was made; concerns were expressed around data protection within a Māori and Pasifika perspective. It may be appropriate for the Society to have a separate webpage explaining, in plain English, what ORCID's legal terms and conditions mean, and also link to information about ORCID and privacy in the Hub invitation sent to researchers.

ACTIONS – MBIE to seek out the previous correspondence from the Privacy Commissioner (JF); KR to seek appropriate person with expertise in IPO from a Māori perspective who may be able to advise the Society on appropriate wording for information to make available to individual ORCID

subscribers. JG to send committee members the Hub invitation wording to seek recommendation on additional/supplementary messaging regarding ORCID's terms and conditions.

Agenda item 6 – Presentation on ORCID Board's Activities (Linda O'Brien, ORCID Board member, via videolink)

Brief introductions were made from all present. Linda presented some statistics on ORCID uptake and membership worldwide and explained that much of this year's focus has been on funders. Both the New Zealand and Australian consortia are seen as exemplars by ORCID in the way that they operate. ORCID has revised its pricing and membership model and are looking at how to encourage the long tail of small organisations towards membership, including smaller publishers. New Zealand has solved this issue with our government funded consortium and national Hub approach.

Some feedback on ORCID perspectives was given by two of the committee's representatives from smaller member organisations. The challenges that exist for such organisations are the perceptions that ORCID is geared towards 'traditional' academic publications from people working in the academic sector, and the difficulty in fitting ORCID's model into outputs from the arts, humanities and social sciences research sector. There are also resourcing issues at smaller organisations around implementing/ encouraging ORCID Uptake. The outputs of the Māori research sector are also difficult to capture within ORCID.

The use of Permanent Identifiers (PIDs) for works other than traditional academic publications is being looked at by ORCID.

There was a conversation around the measurement of impact of research and how ORCID could contribute to this; also about people's concerns around privacy and intellectual property, particularly within the context of indigenous people. It was suggested that ISRIA (International School on Research Impact Assessment) might be a useful group for ORCID to tap into. University of Queensland may have some materials on privacy and control that our consortium might find useful.

Agenda item 10 – Update on ORCID's license agreement

ORCID's new license band charges were described. Individual researchers/contributors are not charged for getting an ORCID iD and ORCID supports its operations through membership fees for organisations. Our consortium is currently being 'grandfathered' into the new pricing structure over the coming years until we reach the flat fee of (currently) USD3500 per member. Only non-profit organisations are able to join a consortium, with ORCID having a tiered pricing fee for profit-making organisations; we have an exemption to this for our IRANZ members, allowing them to be part of our consortium. The committee agreed that the cost per member would be too much for our smaller research organisations if government ceased funding the consortium, as any benefits may not outweigh the cost. Some discussion took place on whether the committee should feedback to ORCID that it might be more appropriate for ORCID to have more price bands for the profit-making organisations and a pricing tier for non-profits based on the number of researchers at an organisation.

It was suggested that we may want to consider asking the University of the South Pacific (USP) if they are interested in joining our consortium, given that ORCID appear to be more receptive to this proposal than when it was initially put to them at our consortium launch.

ACTION – JF to ask within MBIE whether they would be willing to include USP in the consortium; if so, to contact MFAT. If there is support for inclusion of USP in the consortium and ORCID are receptive JG/JM will consult the Royal Society Chief Executive to obtain the name of a suitable person to contact at USP with the proposal.

ACTION: Chair, JM, JG (on behalf of the Committee) to send a message to the ORCID Board via Linda, on suggested amendments to ORCID's pricing tiers.

Agenda item 5 – Discussion/ approval of new Terms of Reference for the committee

Some amendments were requested:

Rearrange bullet points in 'purpose and functions of the committee' such that 'Act as an information conduit ...' be moved to top of list;

Move the final sentence in committee membership section, 'It is an important principle that members of the committee are able to work effectively together...' to the section on 'Purpose and functions of the committee';

Broaden the sentence in 'Membership': 'The committee will comprise....' to include broadening MBIE's role within the committee from that of 'funder' to include 'funder of the consortium' and add an NRIS perspective;

Add additional bullet points of possible committee membership to include a person who can represent the Māori and Pacific research sector; also a practicing academic. These roles can be undertaken by current committee members, if appropriate current membership permits.

Agenda item 7 – Round table feedback on ORCID In each sector

CONZUL – Many members are waiting on integrating ORCID into their own IT systems. There is progression in this sector with regards to ORCID and members are committed to making it work.

IRANZ – a general lack of response from members was noted. However, the file upload system via the Hub is liked by users. One of the best functions of ORCID is that of being able to import publications, and single sign-on into author profile systems for publisher systems. One DHB member who provided feedback noted a lack of support from general management as being prohibitive to driving ORCID engagement. It may be better to target engagement at an early career/student level rather than with mature clinical staff. ACTION: ASe will endeavor to visit IRANZ members in person to discuss ORCID and the Society has an invitation to join an IRANZ board meeting.

UNIVERSITIES – one barrier to ORCID uptake is that it is not mandatory. Not all staff understand what ORCID is or what the benefits are to them, personally. Many universities use Symplectic Elements as their management system but Symplectic has no interface for students.

CRIs – Many are making good progress in their use of the Hub. Recently, we have seen an increase in ORCID uptake for individual researchers, but not all of these have had affiliations written by the organisation, through the Hub. Anecdotal evidence implies that people don't see the need for ORCID other than from their publications activity and more may be driven if funders drive interest. Momentum for ORCID is gathering but still slow. It is unclear whether one organisation is using a different ORCID integration from the Hub to write to users' ORCID records. ACTION – JM follow up to find out.

One CRI is currently implementing a new management system, PURE, which has built-in ORCID functionality; they are waiting until the system is live before exploring its integrational ability with ORCID.

FUNDERS – HRC are launching ORCID as an optional field in applications for one of their smaller funding rounds next year. It will be an option in their large funding round from 2021.

MBIE – ORCID was offered as an option in the recent Endeavour round. Good communications will be needed from MBIE when they roll out further functionality of ORCID use in addition to collecting IDs (i.e. writing to ORCID records). *ACTION* – JF to find out within MBIE what the percentage uptake was of this; also, the timeline for further ORCID integration in the portal such that information can be pulled from and pushed to the ORCID records of applicants/recipients.

ITPs- Much of people's time has been taken up by PBRF recently. However, Otago Polytechnic have been engaged with Hub use recently. New member, EIT, are keen to get started. It is noted that Ara is no longer a REANNZ member and can no longer use Tuakiri for the Hub. *ACTION* – ML to formally invite JG to their October ITP Managers' meeting.

Note: Māturanga Māori sector feedback was incorporated into the discussion in other agenda items.

Agenda item 8 – Update on the NZ ORCID Hub

Version 4 of the Hub has been released. The Hub can now write everything offered by ORCID's API 2.1, being Education, Employment, Funding, Works, Peer-review. Improved documentation for the Hub is now available, explaining how to write each of the activities to ORCID records. Currently, members are only using the Hub to write affiliations, with the exception of the Society who have used the Hub to write funding. Peer-review activity in ORCID cannot be written by an individual researcher but only asserted in an ORCID record by the organisation who convened the review. One issue with the design of ORCID's peer-review function is the need for everything to have a persistent identifier. Use of the new section in API 3 (coming soon), which offers a section called 'Membership and Service' will likely work better for the Society to write Marsden Panel members' service. Until consortium members start using additional functions of the Hub other than writing affiliations we won't get feedback on functionality.

It may be that organisations will actually need to write use-cases for ORCID within their business processes before they start to explore using other features of the Hub/ORCID.

The Society can work with early adopters of the Hub to communicate its full functionality in order to drive further Hub use.

It is possible for MBIE to use the Hub to write historic funding. *ACTION* – JF to follow up internally at MBIE and ask whether there is interest in using some of the Hub's functions. *ACTION* MB to encourage more interest at AgResearch internally around ORCID generally.

Agenda item 9 – Comments from the committee on the Society's most recent report to MBIE (still in draft format)

The Society's new webpages were complimented. Some discussion took place over the turnover of staff in the research sector and its effect on ORCID engagement. The Society's main touchpoints for ORCID at member organisations are likely to be the libraries/knowledge advisor sector so our efforts to send communications out could be centered around these.

A map of where ORCID touches the NZ research infrastructure would be useful so that people can see that ORCID appears in multiple places. For those universities that use Symplectic as their research management system, currently people need to both link their Symplectic account with ORCID as well as go through the Hub. It was stated that the Hub can pass ORCID tokens to Symplectic, if required. *ACTION* – JG to inform all Symplectic users of this fact.

It was asked whether this Society report to MBIE could be shared with another group. *ACTION* – JF to ask MBIE's permission to share the report once it is in its final form.

Agenda item 11 – AOB

A quick update on the state of NRIS was requested:

New staff have recently come on board the NRIS team. The team is split between technical and communications/business process. More communications will be going out to the sector in the coming months and a new, regular, newsletter will be part of this. Many questions still exist around data security and sovereignty and MBIE are looking at the balance between open data and protecting that which needs to be kept closed. Researchers need to know what will happen to their information in NRIS, particularly with regard to information crossover. IDI was mentioned as a concern.

The advisory committee might benefit from knowing NRIS timeframes as this may affect ORCID Uptake. A joint funders' calendar showing key dates for ORCID implementation would be useful for this group.

Agenda item 12 – Summary of key actions – (presented as table above)**Agenda item 13 – Date and time of next meeting**

A Doodle poll will be sent around by the Society to determine a suitable time in March/April 2019