

**Minutes of Meeting #1 of the New Zealand ORCID Consortium Advisory Committee, 27<sup>th</sup> March 2017; 10am-1pm at Royal Society of New Zealand, 11 Turnbull Street, Thorndon, Wellington.**

**Present:**

Committee: Megan Biles (standing in for Rebecca Luther of HRC, by telephone link); Marie Bradley (from AgResearch, a member of Science New Zealand's strategy managers group); Adam Jaffe (from Motu, representing IRANZ); Margaret Leonard (from Ara Institute of Canterbury, representing ITPs); Kate McGrath (from VUW's Research Committee, representing Universities New Zealand- Te Pōkai Tara); Anne Scott (from University of Canterbury, representing CONZUL); Andrew Watkins (from NIWA, a member of Science New Zealand's IT group); Clinton Watson (from MBIE).

Secretariat: Jason Gush (Royal Society of New Zealand – ORCID programme manager and ORCID hub product owner); Jill Mellanby (Royal Society of New Zealand ORCID coordinator); Roger Ridley (Royal Society of New Zealand, Director of Expert Advice & Practice) for first and last half hour

Guest(s): Laurel Haak (ORCID chief executive, by video-conference) for first half hour

**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  
ARMS – Australasian Research Management Society

**Agenda item 1 – Welcome and introductions**

The meeting opened at 10am with welcome and personal introductions explaining the sector represented by those present.

**Agenda item 2 – Presentation by Laurel Haak on ORCID: past, present and future**

Laurel presented information and statistics on numbers of ORCID records, member organisations and consortia, and institutional integrations worldwide, as well as statistics on the Asia Pacific area. 2016 milestones were stated, which included API 2.0, allowing item level queries to ORCID. Goals for 2017 were shown on ORCID's public Trello board; these include the improvement of consortia on-boarding, rolling out ORCID training resources and expanding the 'collect & connect' programme. ORCID is exploring ways of integrating ORCID identifiers with systems capturing the use of research facilities (such as complex lab equipment), as this could enable connections between facilities use and research output.

Laurel encouraged nominations to the ORCID board from the Asia Pacific region.

This presentation was followed by a short Q&A session.

How can organisations encourage researchers to sign up for an ORCID ID? What identifiers can be used for work items that have no DOI?

Answers– Researchers need to know the immediate benefit of ORCID to them. Laurel suggested that the organisation give them something in return e.g. assertion of their employment and population of their ORCID ID from the organisation's research repository. Universities should also work with PhD students to encourage them to sign up to ORCID and use their ID.

ORCID is working on connecting to repositories where work types with identifiers other than DOIs are held.

There was some discussion around the table on what an organisation can see about their employees in their ORCID records; if a researcher has made information private, the organisation cannot read it.

Organisational repositories and their ability to accept non-traditional work outputs were also discussed.

At this point Megan Biles opted to leave the meeting by telephone as the audio quality was making it difficult for her to hear the discussion.

### **Agenda item 3 – Break**

### **Agenda item 4 – Nomination of permanent chair**

Some discussion took place on the role of the chair. AW nominated AJ as permanent chair and CW seconded. AJ was duly elected as chair of the committee, going forward.

### **Agenda item 5 – Finalise the Terms of Reference for the committee**

It was suggested that the University of Auckland, as technology partner, should be named in paragraph three. There were no objections to this addition.

It was pointed out that Royal Society of NZ is attending the meeting in the role of secretariat but that they may also be an interested party, as a funding administrator. JG stated that if the Society is asked for its opinion from a funder perspective, this can be offered.

It was pointed out that there is no representative from the district health boards on the committee; also no representative from the wānanga. This led to a wider discussion on how ORCID identifiers would work with Māori research. It was agreed that the Committee explore particular issues for Māori research as they relate to ORCID, such as attribution to an individual versus to a collective pool of contributors.

The group agreed that the Terms of Reference need to be amended such that a representative with knowledge of Mātauranga Māori research could be added to the committee. Current members will be asked to nominate suitable people and, from the nominees, one person will be asked to join the committee.

**Actions** – JM to add University of Auckland as technology partner to paragraph 3; AJ to suggest wording to the section on 'Membership' that allows a Mātauranga Māori research representative to be added to the committee. The committee will identify a suitable individual, who will be approached to join the committee.

### **Agenda item 6 – Discuss and agree on the purpose of the committee**

Much of the purpose of the committee was discussed in item 5. It was pointed out that the Terms of Reference state that encouraging new consortia members is a role, even though we are now at 45

members and more have expressed an interest in joining the consortium. It was suggested that 'champion the use of ORCID' be moved up a bullet point in the TOR. The committee ought to consider, apart from the existing number of New Zealand ORCID IDs, what metrics should be used to measure the success of the committee.

**Actions** – JM to adjust bullet points on p1 of TOR to promote 'champion use of ORCID' to point 2 and demote 'encourage new members to join' to point 3

### **Agenda item 7 – Feedback from each sector**

Much discussion took place around the differing needs of the sectors represented by the committee. It was noted that there is a need for more frequent communication from the Royal Society of NZ, particularly on the progress of the ORCID hub. Although the technical contacts have been invited to join the technical advisory group and to join the web meetings every second Thursday, few of them have taken this invitation up. It appears that technical information is not generally being disseminated to each consortium member organisation. Organisations have a need to know more about the hub's progress so that it can inform their internal decisions.

There was much discussion around using Ringgold identifiers to query the ORCID registry as some organisations have several of these. The difficulty of searching the Ringgold database was pointed out, as it only gives a 30-day free trial. Everyone was informed that ORCID has a working group to look at organisational identifiers worldwide, as there are currently several in use.

Some discussion also took place around the Research Information Systems used by the different sectors; not all sectors use these as a way to capture research outputs. Different forms of research outputs that are not traditional published papers are not systematically captured but should be able to be placed in an institutional repository with an identifier.

It was agreed that, in most sectors, the main problem is that of encouraging researchers to sign up for ORCID and the question of whether ORCID is likely to be made mandatory by government was asked. The reply was that the focus for government was getting systems ORCID-ready and communicating the benefits of ORCID. The government was currently in no position to require the use of ORCID identifiers to apply for government funding.

### **Agenda item 8 – Government perspectives on ORCID**

CW explained that the establishment of the ORCID consortium has been part of a larger piece of work looking at data quality, structure and reuse. MBIE welcomed the partnership with the sector in forming the consortium and was looking forward to this collaborative engagement continuing. MBIE is committed to funding the consortium and to its success. ORCID is not going to be made mandatory for the foreseeable future. There was some discussion around the table on the advantages and disadvantages of mandating ORCID.

### **Agenda Item 9 – comments on the Society's most recent report to MBIE**

JG wished to raise an erratum: use of a Symplectic Elements integration is not sufficient to be eligible for the 'Collect' badge. Although footnoted, there is a need to emphasise that no New Zealand organisation has yet received a 'collect & connect badge' from ORCID.

It was suggested that other indicators on the use of ORCID records should feature in future reports, for example, how many IDs have works listed and how many have employers. It was pointed out that public data held in ORCID can be analysed but that, if researchers keep the information in their records private, it cannot be accessed. It was agreed that the committee could request papers on these subjects, but these would not alter the format of the 6-month report to MBIE.

Some discussion took place on the technical advisory group, which is currently very small.

### **Agenda item 10 – Update on the ORCID hub**

The project management approach being taken by the hub developers at University of Auckland was explained. Currently, about 15 people have been attending the fortnightly open sessions but more input from the consortium would be valuable to enable the developers to prioritise the hub's development. The first iteration of the hub will be ready for Tuakiri members to use by the end of June 2017.

There was some discussion around the use of the hub by consortium members. The results of a short survey sent to consortium members prior to this meeting showed that at least one large institution stated, at this point, that they did not intend to use the ORCID hub.

A general request around the table was made for better communications from the Society relating to the hub rather than relying on technical contacts to disseminate information. This was taken on board by RSNZ. There is a Google group set up; this will be communicated more widely to consortium members. There was some discussion around how the hub will deal with researchers who have multiple affiliations.

**Actions** – JG/JM to provide more frequent communication on hub development to the whole consortium in non-technical language. The next ORCID newsletter will bring attention to the tools that are in place for interacting with the hub's development.

### **Agenda item 11 – ORCID developments**

A recent survey has been sent to, possibly, a random sample of people on ORCID and books. Committee members were unaware of this.

**Actions** – JG/JM to forward this survey to consortium members and the committee.

### **Agenda item 12 – ARMS conference, September 2017**

JG explained that the Society is running a one-day workshop at this international conference on the 26<sup>th</sup> of September. He is meeting with the Australian Access Federation (the Australian ORCID consortium lead) to discuss a possible programme for the day. Laurel Haak will be attending this conference. We welcome suggestions on content for this workshop. A suggestion of having a researcher present a piece on how they have found ORCID useful was suggested.

**Actions** – Committee members to suggest ideas for workshop content to JG by 3 May

### **Agenda item 13 – Future meeting agendas**

Some standing items should be on the agenda (7,8,9,10,11).

It was suggested that a forum for the committee was made available where they could suggest agenda items well in advance of the next meeting. A process is required so that the agenda can be made up well ahead of meetings to ensure Committee members can share perspectives on agenda items from their sector.

If the committee members are to be ambassadors for ORCID within their communities, they need to know where relevant information is held.

**Actions** – JM to ask committee members for the most suitable forum to serve all needs and to comply with different organisational policies (Google group, Dropbox, other); JM to let the committee know the location of the Google group for technical information on the hub.

### **Agenda item 14 – Date and time of next meeting**

This is to be confirmed by Doodle or other similar means. The Committee thought the next meeting should be before the ARMS conference, but after the next report has been delivered to MBIE (scheduled for mid-August). September is very busy for KM. It was suggested that more time be allocated to the meeting; perhaps a half day, as today's meeting was somewhat rushed.

**Actions** – AJ or JM to send a Doodle poll to identify a suitable time for the next meeting.

**Meeting closed at 13.10**