

**Minutes of Meeting #3 of the New Zealand ORCID Consortium Advisory Committee, 9 April 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)

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

Kate McGrath (from VUW's Research Committee, 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)

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

Clinton Watson (from MBIE).

No apologies.

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

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

ORCID – Open Researcher and Contributor Identifier

NRIS – National Research Information System

GDPR – General Data Protection Regulation

Summary of Key Actions

Agenda Item	Action	Who
2	contact Linda O'Brien (ORCID board member) and ask if she can attend our next advisory committee meeting.	JM
4	work with the Society, Māori librarians' group and Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga to identify what key questions around ORCID need to be answered and add these to the FAQs on the consortium's webpages.	KR / JM / JG
4	organise presentation to an ITP managers' meeting.	JG / JM
4	increase the time limit on Hub generated invitations to four weeks.	JG
4	enhance current FAQs to better explain the benefits of ORCID to the researcher.	JM/JG
4	ask consortium member's legal consultant if the analysis of ORCID's legal statements can be shared with this committee.	JM
4	request an ORCID success story message from Scion to share with all consortium members.	JM
4	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
6	Send English translation of German analysis of ORCID's privacy policy to all consortium members via newsletter	JM
7	add sentence to the 'vision' section of the committee's document, edit the layout, and circulate for final approval.	JM, JG, CW, MB
10	circulate updated Terms of Reference to the committee once a new contract between the Society and MBIE is in place.	JM
12	send around a Doodle poll to determine a time for the next meeting	JM

Agenda item 1 – Welcome and introductions

Round-table introductions and welcome to EV as a new committee member.

Agenda item 2 – Presentation on ORCID board's activities (Linda O'Brien, by videolink)

Unfortunately, Linda did not join us.

ACTION - JM will contact her and ask if she can attend the next meeting.

Agenda item 3 – Minutes and actions from previous meeting

AS has not had a reply from the Māori librarians' group.

KR has talked to Māori liaison librarian –no strong views on ORCID.

JG has been invited to speak to the next IRANZ board meeting on ORCID.

Society discussion with REANNZ currently deferred as many members are not using Tuakiri to assert affiliations.

Royal Society to speak to the next ITP meeting.

Agenda item 4 – Round table feedback in each sector, including Māori

Māori community

There are concerns within the Māori community around data ownership and use. ORCID has no field for an ethnicity indicator and the only place this can be captured is in the keyword or biography section. The real benefits of ORCID are not yet apparent to people. Some clear FAQs are needed to answer the questions relating to data ownership/stewardship in ORCID.

ACTION – KR to work with the Society and Māori librarians' group and Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga to identify what key questions need to be answered and JM/JG to add to FAQs on the consortium's webpages.

Universities

The universities are at different stages in their ORCID plans. Universities of Otago and Canterbury are more advanced than the others. The major focus at universities this year is PBRF which is pushing ORCID back until after July. Canterbury and VUW will be testing out the Hub using their HR system to send information automatically via the Hub's API. VUW are including ORCID into their PhD inductions.

ITPs

Participation in ORCID at the ITPs has been low, so far. 'Non-traditional' outputs are currently captured in a variety of databases. Information cannot be easily transferred from one place to another. JG commented that if information can be exported to a spreadsheet, this could be captured by the NZ ORCID Hub as the Hub will take information from a csv file to write to ORCID records. ORCID accepts over 30 types of output plus 'other' if a particular output is not listed. The ITPs also have a current focus on PBRF. Ara Institute and Otago Polytechnic are suggesting that ORCID IDs go on staff profiles as this would be an easy way for staff to make their research outputs visible. There was a request for the Society to come to another ITP meeting to present information on ORCID.

ACTION – JG/JM to organize a presentation to an ITP meeting.

HRC

HRC has specific Māori funds. HRC plans to introduce ORCID as part of its application process with some smaller grants during 2019, with it being mandatory for the 2021 Annual Funding Round. However, there will be some funding rounds for which the HRC will not make ORCID mandatory such as the Ngā Kanohi Kitea (Community Grant).

CONZUL

There is varied understanding amongst researchers about the value of ORCID. The current two week expiry time on the Hub generated invitations to researchers is too short to allow librarians to do personalized one-on-one follow ups and an extension to four or six weeks for this invitation was requested. Some discussion took place on what would be a more acceptable time-frame and the Society agreed that four weeks was a reasonable time period.

There is a perception amongst some academics that ORCID is yet another profiling system similar to Academia.edu or ResearchGate but without the same features. Better communication about what exactly ORCID is and why it can help people needs to be in place. The committee felt that communications should be improved on three fronts:

- clear information on ownership and governance of ORCID Information
- differentiation with other platforms
- benefits to researchers.

One member organisation had a legal expert go through the ORCID agreement and the Society will ask if this analysis could be shared with this committee. CW noted that Germany had commissioned an extensive report on ORCID's privacy policy and settings, and that this report was being translated into English.

A survey of CONZUL responses to questions about ORCID was shared with the committee.

ACTION- JG to increase the time limit on Hub-generated invitations to four weeks. JM/JG to enhance current FAQs to better explain the benefits of ORCID to the researcher.

ACTION – The Society to ask member's legal representative if their analysis of ORCID's terms and conditions can be shared with this committee.

CRIs

CRIs are at different stages of ORCID implementation with PFR being much further ahead than the others in their use of the Hub; they have dedicated resourcing in place. Scion is encouraging new staff to get ORCID IDs as part of their induction process. There was a request for Scion to share their success story about ORCID being part of their induction process.

ACTION- JM to request a success story message from Scion to share with all consortium members.

IRANZ

MRINZ aims to affiliate all of their staff through the Hub and use this as a case study to encourage other IRANZ members to follow suit. MRINZ next stage is to hook up their HR system using the Hub's API. Motu have already gone through the process of affiliating their staff. A short survey of the state of understanding of ORCID at IRANZ was shared with the committee. Briefly, the majority of respondents were familiar with ORCID, many from their experiences with publishing. The main barrier to ORCID uptake was the belief that ORCID was not relevant to people's roles within the organisation. More than half of respondents were not familiar with the NZ ORCID Hub but would be comfortable with their organisation writing affiliation data to their records and accessing other information from them, such as grants, research outputs and other affiliations.

MBIE

The basic MBIE integration with ORCID, accepting ORCID IDs, is now in place and communication will be sent out in April to the super users of the grants management system. The first funding round for which applicants can connect their ORCID iD to their application will be the smart-ideas fund.

Further integration steps, such as the ability to push information from ORCID IDs into the grants management system, will be developed later this year. MBIE is continuing its work on the National Research Information System and continue to see the ORCID iD as a critical part of that system.

Royal Society Te Apārangi

All Marsden fund recipients from the 2017 funding round (both PIs and AIs) were invited to allow the Hub to write the information to their ORCID records. 60% of fund recipients gave permission to the Society for the writing of that information. There was a request for information on who at University Canterbury did not accept so that librarians could follow up with those researchers to find out why. The Society has had two DHB meetings – with Hutt Valley DHB and with Capital and Coast DHB. HVDHB meeting was more productive and the Society has been asked to present to the Chief Medical Officers' quarterly meeting. ORCID could be used by them to populate their research reports. The issue for DHBs is the joint appointments between universities and clinical staff as to which organisation will be credited for the research output. Some discussion ensued about the place of the DHBs within the whole NZ research sector. The Committee noted that work on implementation of the New Zealand health research strategy should increase the acceptance and awareness of research activities within the DHB sector.

ACTION – JG to let AS know which University of Canterbury Marsden fund recipients haven't followed up on the Hub invitation to have information written to their ORCID IDs.

Agenda item 5 – Update on NZ ORCID Hub

The consortium now has 49 members and, with many small to medium members, we need to ensure that the Hub functions for all of them. Hub use has been higher in the first quarter of this year due to Marsden recipient invitations being taken up, and higher use by the Universities of Canterbury and Otago. We are currently on version 3 of the Hub, allowing writing of information by both automated (Tuakiri driven) means and by manual file upload. Information can be written to affiliation and funding sections of ORCID records and the process can be automated by use of the new Hub API. Version 4 of the Hub will allow works to be written. At least six versions of the Hub are anticipated as part of ongoing development.

Agenda item 6 – Feedback on ORCID consortium meeting, Lisbon, Jan 2018

Approximately 25 consortia were represented as well as those thinking of forming consortia. All other consortia represented at the meeting devoted considerable effort to sustainability, with the common model being to support consortium operations through additional fees levied to members on top of the consortium fee. While other consortia were generally surprised by, and seemingly envious of, the NZ government's support of our consortium, a number of delegates did express concern that future governments may not wish to continue this support.

At the meeting, ORCID awarded five consortia, including the New Zealand consortium, for their efforts in going beyond the activities required of a lead agency. Our award was for the Hub. The German consortium received an award for their analysis of how ORCID fits with the new European GDPR; this analysis has now been translated into English and may be of use to us.

Agenda item 7 – ORCID in New Zealand – summary diagram discussion

It was suggested that the vision statement incorporate a statement as to how ORCID will benefit New Zealand Society. Suggestion for vision sentence addition:

...Use of the ORCID identifier and information in ORCID records helps determine whether our research system is meeting New Zealand's needs and contributing to global challenges and opportunities.

ACTION – JM, JG, CW, MB to add this statement to the 'vision' section of the document, edit the layout, and circulate for final approval.

Agenda item 8 – Comments from the committee on the Society's most recent six-monthly report to MBIE

Correction requested and noted– ASE incorrectly named as being from NZ Medical Research Council – not MRINZ.

A discussion took place on the KPIs on the MBIE/Royal Society contract and a request was made and agreed to, to share the current contract with the committee members. There was extensive discussion on what success might look like in two years' time and what current 'unknowns' (i.e. questions that we cannot answer now) may be answered by use of ORCID in our research system. It was expected that ORCID uptake would lead to greater visibility/discoverability of NZ's non-traditional work outputs. It was also expected that the discipline/subject of any given researcher and/or their research grant might be determined from ORCID data. Some of the questions that may be addressed through ORCID use are:

Gain a better understanding of the NZ research system:

- What proportion of NZ research students create/are associated with research works?
- How many research students are to be found at any particular consortium member organisation?
- Who are the NZ researchers having any given skill set?

Gain a better understanding of the value and performance of NZ's public research funding:

- What research works were created /are associated with any given NZ public funding?
- What is the productivity difference between grant holders and non-grant holders in NZ?
- What is the effect on researcher productivity of having received multiple grants?
- Are NZ publications attributed to grants of higher quality than those without public support?
- What are the career trajectories of NZ's career development recipients and non-recipients?
- What funding total did any given NZ researcher receive in any given time period?
- Who are the researchers associated with any given National Science Challenge (NSC) /Centre of Research Excellence (CoRE) collaboration?

It was suggested that some impact related KPIs be included in the next contract so that success of the project could be measured. Success of the project in two years' time should be monitored against new KPIs in the next MBIE/Society contract.

Agenda item 9 – ORCID – Collect and Connect programme and other developments

ORCID is pushing for member organisations to ensure that they are eligible for their badging system. The badges indicate that an organisation meets best practice in terms of both technology and communications; the point being that all researchers have a near identical experience with ORCID as they progress through their career at different organisations. All organisations must have a dedicated page (internet or intranet or similar) explaining why they are collecting ORCID IDs from researchers and what they are doing with these IDs. The Society will work with our members, one by one, to apply for these badges.

Agenda item 10 – Looking ahead, beyond 30 June 2018

A case for continued funding for ORCID has gone through to MBIE and the Society awaits the outcome of this request. There has been international interest in the Hub and packaging it into a portable enterprise for use by the international community, making it multilingual, may be done by us. The advantage of this being that the Hub is more sustainable if it has a larger, international user base, in terms of maintenance, updates etc. Some discussion ensued around the investment given to the Hub for the international community versus New Zealand. A strong preference from the committee was that government investment in this project should prioritise benefit to New Zealand rather than the international community, particularly around spending on the Hub's development.

All current advisory committee members indicated that they are happy to continue after the 30th June 2018, with the exception of KM who is moving overseas and has already lined up another member of Universities New Zealand Research Committee to take her place.

ACTION – JM to send around updated Terms of Reference once Society/MBIE contract is finalized.

Agenda item 11 – Summary of key actions – (presented as table above)

Agenda item 12 – Date and time of next meeting

A Doodle poll will be sent around by the Society to determine a suitable time in September/October 2018.

The meeting closed with thanks being offered to KM for her activity on the committee and all wished her well in her future position.