Minutes of Meeting #2 of the New Zealand ORCID Consortium Advisory Committee, 20th October 2017; 10am-3.30pm at Royal Society of New Zealand, 11 Turnbull Street, Thorndon, Wellington.

Present:
Committee: Rebecca Luther (from HRC); Marie Bradley (from AgResearch, a member of Science New Zealand's strategy managers group); Adam Jaffe (chair) (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); 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); Alex Semprini (from Medical Research Institute of NZ - will replace Adam Jaffe at next meeting as representative from IRANZ).

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 hour.

Guest(s): jeff kennedy, Roshan Pawar, Radomirs Cirskis, (University of Auckland, via video-conference) from 12.00-1.00pm

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
NRIS – National Research Information System

Agenda item 1 – Welcome and introductions

The meeting opened at 10am with a welcome from the chair and personal introductions explaining the background of those present, and the sector they represent.

Agenda item 2 – Minutes of previous meeting

These were approved by CW and seconded by MB. Passed as a true representation of meeting #1.

Agenda item 3 – New chair for committee, from meeting #3 onwards.

As AJ is leaving New Zealand at the end of the year a new chair is needed from the next meeting onwards. A call for volunteers was made and MB responded. This was supported by KR and accepted by all present. MB will chair next meeting.

Agenda item 4 – Round-table feedback on ORCID in each sector:

IRANZ – Organisations in IRANZ are generally small and wide ranging in their fields of expertise and do not necessarily have dedicated research departments. They are encouraging people to sign up to ORCID although no official poll reporting on numbers of IRANZ members with ORCIDs was carried out. They currently have little understanding of the Hub. A suggestion was made that Royal Society Te Apārangi, as consortium lead, goes to a board meeting to talk about the Hub and its functions.

ACTION – AJ to suggest to Rob Whitney, as board chair, that he invite someone from the Society to come to an IRANZ Board meeting to talk about the NZ ORCID Hub.

Universities New Zealand – Uptake of ORCID is generally good amongst academic staff, students and also post-docs. There has been some general criticism about the clunkiness of the Hub interface and some engagement on recommendations for improvement for the Hub is needed. It is felt that a mandate around ORCID when applying for government funding would encourage greater uptake. At VUW, all internal grant applicants now need to provide an ORCID number – this is as a result of a new application form which requires an ORCID number for the form to be submitted electronically. No applicants have complained about the need to have an ORCID to apply for internal funding, to date. For future ORCID-related communications, it was suggested that they are best received when academics are not so busy, with the worst times being the beginning of the academic year, and exam times, and leaving Mid March- September as the best release times for effective communications.
University of Canterbury note that they will be using the non-Tuakiri route for going through the Hub, to have richer affiliations written. They are piloting with one smaller group at the University, before rolling it out to the wider community.
An area of general concern is the issue of writing end dates when a researcher has revoked the organisation's permission to write to their ORCID record. If a person leaves an organisation and revokes permission for writing to their ORCID record the ORCID record will give the impression that a person still works there, despite the fact they may have left some time ago. JG noted that ORCID recognized this concern and were receptive to the idea to have an indicator showing whether the organization still has permission to write to the record.

CRIs – the CRIs are a bit behind the universities in their uptake of ORCID. Their uptake varies, with some CRIs being more advanced than others. If grant awarding agencies ask for ORCIDs, it would be a real incentive for people to sign up.   Some extensive discussion took place on institutional repositories and their interaction with ORCID; also institutional research information systems and their integration with ORCID. It was reiterated that larger institutions may want to build their own ORCID integrations with their current research information systems; the Hub allows smaller organisations who are not in a position to build their own integrations to connect with ORCID. The Hub is currently able to write a basic affiliation to the education/employment section of an ORCID record by taking information from Tuakiri but some users are unhappy with this and would prefer more information to be written than Tuakiri can provide. JG commented that the Hub is now accepting csv/tsv files of information to write richer affiliations but getting the required information into this file involves a certain amount of manual work at each organisation. Although it would be better for the Hub if more information was in the Tuakiri

payload to enable richer affiliations to be written, this is outside the original purpose of Tuakiri. JG is in discussion with REANNZ over whether Tuakiri would be able to provide more information, but noted that writing end-dates would still be an issue.

So far, Plant and Food Research are the biggest users of the Hub and have promised to provide some information to share with the consortium on what their strategy has been.

Landcare are currently testing and should be in a position to give feedback on the Hub soon.

ACTION – JM to follow up with Michele Napier at Plant and Food to ask her to write a piece for the Google Group about PFR's ORCID Hub communications strategy.

JG to continue discussions with REANNZ about what further information could be provided to the Hub through Tuakiri.

RSNZ and MBIE to arrange to talk to CONZUL and ITP meetings to talk about the Hub and possible solutions to their particular issues.

Agenda item 7 – Government perspective on ORCID

This item was covered next as there was some time available before item 5 at noon.
MBIE are currently in discussion with their legal team with regards to the requirement of asking for ORCIDs for grant applications.

From Jan/Feb 2018 MBIE will be accepting ORCID iDs in grant applications. There is strong support for ORCID at MBIE.

In response to comments that the place of ORCID in NZ was still unclear to many, it was agreed that an A3 diagram, or similar, showing how ORCID fits into all other research infrastructure systems would be very useful – with a request that it be similar to the NRIS conceptual diagram.

Some discussion took place on other funders and their plans for ORCID. HRC are working on their ORCID Integration and have an in-house developer. Royal Society is planning on writing all historic Marsden grant information to ORCID records by Christmas of this year.

Some discussion took place on the government's data domain plan and the idea of an electronic CV. It was noted that much of the information in any eCV could come from ORCID, but ORCID could not replace it as additional information is needed, e.g., gender and ethnicity, which ORCID will not store or provide.

There was some discussion of how ORCID could usefully work in the areas of the National Science Challenges and the Centres Of Research Excellence.

Agenda item 5 – Update on ORCID Hub by Auckland development team

jeff kennedy, Enterprise Architect at the University of Auckland joined us via zoom and introduced the two developers responsible for the NZ ORCID Hub. A brief background to the Hub was given, reiterating

that the Hub was born out a genuine need to provide smaller organisations with the ability to write to and read from the ORCID records of their staff/students. A demonstration of the Tuakiri workflow and of a non-Tuakiri workflow was given, showing the resulting appearance of the affiliations that are written to an ORCID record. It was noted that a basic Tuakiri-style affiliation can be written by organisations to begin with, and the affiliation entry in their ORCID record can be updated with richer information at a later date.

ORCID themselves were reported as being very happy with the Hub as a product, and also the way in which our consortium is running.

Agenda item 6 – Reflection and feedback on consortium meeting at ARMS 2017 conference

It was felt that those who attended enjoyed it and received benefit, but the attendance of 20-30 through the day was noted. Ideally, more participants could have made this meeting better, but the additional cost levied by the conference organisers for this session may have been prohibitive for people.

Agenda item 8 – Session on Vision Mātauranga

This session resulted in a wide-ranging discussion. Some research that is funded is outsourced to people working within community groups who do not necessarily perceive themselves as researchers in the traditional sense. Asking them to set up ORCID records may be seen as bureaucratic, and non-compliancy may be likely. Vision Mātauranga is about unlocking potential, not creating barriers. It was pointed out within the committee that ORCID stands for 'contributor' not just 'researcher' and that the people who are involved with some research projects in the Mātauranga Māori context are valid contributors even if they are not traditional researchers, affiliated to an organisation. If it was pointed out to people that it is important to recognize all the contributors on a piece of research in a positive frame, this might encourage people to engage with ORCID. Smaller organisations may see that ORCID could be a way for them to showcase what they do and improve their profile and visibility. The best way to frame any request for an ORCID number is that everyone's contribution to research should be recognized, not just those who are traditional researchers working at recognized research organisations. Some discussion also took place on this same subject about the contribution to research of technicians and other support staff. There was no perception that Māori researchers would have any specific objection to ORCID, although other cultures and ethnicities may well do.

ACTION – AS to ask contacts within Te Rōpū Whakahau (?) for feedback on ORCID.

Agenda item 9 – Discussion on the Australian consortium's 'vision 2020' document

The idea of a 'vision' was generally disliked by those present. It was felt that a wireframe diagram showing how ORCID fits into the whole NZ research infrastructure would be more useful than a vison document. However, the explanations on the left hand side of the document were useful.

ACTION – JG, MB and CW to meet and work on putting together a wireframe diagram building on the concept of the A3 figure discussed in Agenda item 7.

Agenda item 10 – Comments on the Society's most recent six-monthly report to MBIE

A query was raised as to whether the Society, as ORCID lead, has a target for the number of people that are signed up to ORCID. Also, whether the Consortium covers all the relevant groups in the country. A breakdown of who is in the consortium versus who could be in the consortium was described. The consortium lacks members from the wānanga, has a selection of district health board members and a selection of ITPs and IRANZ members. Ideally, CW would like the Malaghan Institute of Medical Research to be a member. More teaching hospitals, where much research is carried out, could also become members. However, it was recommended that the Society should concentrate on service for current members rather than trying to expand the consortium at this time. although the Māori librarians' group could be approached with regard to engaging the wānanga with the consortium.

It was suggested that the Committee have targets around Hub use by current members. For example, the organisations represented by members of this committee should all have integrations to ORCID by the next meeting, with the exception of the HRC, who are not so far along the ORCID road as others, and have signaled that they intend to build their own integration.

A question was asked as to whether the Society's report could have a list of the various members who are in the Hub and how many of their researchers have had affiliations written. This information can be requested and given to the committee but is outside of the Society's current reporting contract with MBIE.

ACTION – AS will contact the Māori librarians' group to discuss the idea of wānanga in the Consortium.

Agenda item 11 – ORCID developments

ORCID have changed their log-in system. Now, when giving permission to an organisation to read from/write to an individual's ORCID record, the record holder firstly logs in to their ORCID record and is them prompted to give permission; previously, the permission appeared on the same page as the log-in.

ORCID have just sent out a blog post on their proposed expansion of affiliations. Our consortium should send a response to ORCID on their proposal.

ACTION – JG to send the information on ORCID's proposed expansion of affiliation types to the advisory committee and to coordinate a response to ORCID on behalf of theNZ Consortium.

Agenda item 12 – Summarise key actions for the Society and committee members

JG – provide a list to the committee of which members are in the Hub and what stage each is at with regards to ORCID's Collect and Connect badges.

KM – will provide feedback to the Society on issues with the Hub's user interface

JG, MB and CW – to meet and work on putting together an A3 page explaining how ORCID fits in NZ's research system.

AS - will talk to Māori librarian's group re the possibility of some wānanga joining the consortium

JM - will contact Plant & Food about sharing their successful strategy for getting their research staff to engage with the Hub

RL - will talk to the HRC Māori health manager about community groups and their potential feel for ORCID

Royal Society – to arrange to present to various groups about ORCID and the Hub, including CONZUL, Universities NZ IT Group

Agenda item 13 – Date and time of next meeting

A Doodle poll will be sent around by the Society to determine a suitable time, most likely in April 2018.