ORCID is an independent not-for-profit organisation that aims to address the problem of unique identification of researchers by giving individuals a globally unique identification number that lasts over time. Some of the world’s largest publishers, funders, and institutions have adopted ORCID and community uptake has dramatically increased over the past year. On 29 July, the Australian National Data Service (ANDS) and the Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL) co-sponsored a national summit on ORCID to reflect on the progress of ORCID internationally, share national perspectives on ORCID, discuss institutional views of ORCID adoption and facilitate practical measures that can meet institutional needs. University Librarians, Office of Research Directors, representatives of research funding bodies and other interested parties attended the Roundtable. There were 55 registrations received.

**ORCID: Persistent Identifiers for Researchers and Contributors**

The keynote speaker at the Roundtable was Dr Laurel Haak, ORCID Executive Director. Laure highlighted the challenge of uniquely identifying researchers and referred to the many researcher profile and identifier services available. Identifiers disambiguate and enforce uniqueness, which enables linking and data integration, forming a basis for data governance. ORCID is a Hub: an ORCID identifier can connect researchers with their works, organisations and other person identifiers; ORCID APIs enable data exchange between research information systems.
ORCID has issued over 800,000 identifiers since its launch in October 2012. It has over 140 members from every sector of the research community. There has been over 110,000 unique visits to the ORCID website from Australia and four Australian institutions have joined ORCID: Charles Darwin University, University of NSW, University of Queensland and University of Sydney. There are three membership types available: standard, local consortium and national consortium.

ORCID is working collaboratively with the research community on development and adoption of research information exchange standards. Researchers can link to existing works through self-claim search wizards and embedding new works via integration with publishers in manuscript systems. ORCID can now interoperate with ISNI. Those integrating with ORCID include: publishers; researcher funders; professional associations; universities and research organisations; repositories, CRIS and metrics sites. A number of publishers and funders have been integrating ORCID IDs into their review workflows and ORCID is working with CASRAI on this. The Wellcome Trust has integrated ORCID IDs into its eGrants application system.

In the UK, Jisc and ARMA are running an ORCID pilot program for UK higher education institutions. Alfred P. Sloan Foundation award supports ORCID implementation by US universities and professional associations. The prototypes were showcased at ORCID Outreach meeting in May 2014.

For Universities, integrating with ORCID is more challenging in the social aspect than the technical aspect. Socially, it’s critical that researchers are engaged with the process. Laurel outlined case studies of ORCID integration from Sweden (Chalmers University), the USA (University of Colorado, Texas A&M) and the UK (Oxford).

Support for ORCID IDs is also included in a number of research management products used widely at universities including Cornell’s VIVO, Elsevier’s Pure, Symplectic Elements and Thomson Reuters Converis. ORCID is also used in repository software including ePrints and DSpace and integrates with DataCite.

The discussion highlighted:

- The benefits of ORCID membership: members can read and write information into an ORCID record, validate information and become a trusted party. Membership fees also contribute to sustaining ORCID, a not-for-profit organization.
- ORCID can deal with duplicate records for the same researchers: you can associate an ORCID ID with multiple email addresses, ask users if they already have an ORCID ID etc. Note there is a genuine use case where a researcher should have more than one ORCID ID.
- The relationship between ORCID IDs and Thomson and Scopus IDs: Thomson and Scopus IDs can be linked to ORCID, however Thomson and Scopus have different coverage of publications so it is important to link to both of these
The Scopus to ORCID wizard allows researchers to claim those identifiers.

- Requests for new functionality and other ideas can be submitted to ORCID via the ‘ideas’ section of their website.

Agency perspectives

After morning tea, the agenda moved to ‘agency perspectives’. In this session, we heard from Brian Yates (Australian Research Council), Clive Morris (National Health & Medical Research Council), Heather Gordon (Council of Australian University Librarians) and Douglas Robertson (Research Office, ANU). Funding bodies may encourage use of ORCID, which could be used to disambiguate researchers during the ERA exercise. Publicly available ORCIDs could be used when looking for assessors. Linking ORCID IDs to research grants also has potential benefits.

CAUL statistics show that the number of works in repositories is growing, mandated deposit for all research publications is increasing, but repository staffing has remained constant. Name ambiguity impedes citations tracking, makes it more difficult to share records, report and discover. A global researcher identifier could assist with automated integrations with different systems to simplify workflows and lower costs, help capture every stage of research work, and enable sharing of records and information globally. CAUL is providing improved visibility for universities’ research outputs through repositories and discovery services.
The Research Office has changed a lot over the past few years. In the old world view, the university hounds researchers, government agencies only route for data is from universities themselves and there is no need for unique identifiers because “we know our researchers”. The library is disconnected from the research office. In the new world view, the researcher simply publishes, the research office and library harvest, government and funding agencies generate their own reports and the research office and library are highly connected. Key to the new world is unique, global identifiers for researchers, but how do we get from here to there?

In the discussion, the need for well-designed and usable systems to be in place to leverage a unique global identifier for researchers was highlighted. It was acknowledged that there are currently many different identifier schemes used by researchers.

**Institutional perspectives**

After lunch, Linda O’Brien (Griffith University) chaired the session on ‘institutional perspectives’. In this session, we heard from Heather Todd (University of Queensland), Nathaniel Lewis (University of Sydney), Brian Flaherty (University of Auckland) and Simon Porter (University of Melbourne).

The Associate Director, UQ Library, has been appointed as an ORCID ambassador which allows her to keep in touch with ORCID activities. UQ promote ORCID whenever possible e.g. training classes, discussions with researchers and research student and the library just signed up for an institutional subscription. Business drivers for supporting ORCID at UQ include: to accurately and easily link researchers to as many publications as possible; best practice for researchers; the importance of author identification and importance of collecting research publications; support from the Office of the DVC (Research). The UQ library will lead project to roll out ORCID across the university.

The University of Sydney joined ORCID as Institutional Member in June 2014 and are now at the planning stage of ORCID implementation across the University. Institutional business drivers include: data quality, accuracy and consistency; persistent identifiers, minimise manual intervention; managing duplicates across systems; mapping affiliations, publication, grants, data, Open Access compliance; maximise research performance in reporting, compliance and rankings. Creating ORCID IDs for all Sydney researchers will need an engagement strategy with all sectors of the University.

In New Zealand, most universities are using Symplectic Elements and this product can be used to integrate with ORCID. The University of Auckland is looking to the example of ORCID at HKU. The VC Strategic Development fund at Auckland will assist with institutional membership of ORCID and an institution-driven ORCID integration. Business drivers for supporting ORCID at Auckland include: enhancing the University’s research profile through improved visibility and discoverability of research outputs and their research impacts; improved bibliometrics; not having to ask researchers for the same information over and over. Simon Porter demonstrated
how Symplectic Elements can be used to integrate with ORCID at the University of Melbourne.

The discussion highlighted:

- The need for clear communication with all stakeholders when implementing unique identifiers.
- The challenge of how to deal with duplicate records.
- The need to share implementation experiences with the sector, especially as these are early days.

Future directions
Following an afternoon tea break, an open session to discuss future directions was held. A panel of all speakers from the day was invited to comment on how we can get from “here” to “there”.

The discussion highlighted:

- A need to engage all stakeholders as progress requires all parties to come to the table. Researchers, discipline experts, researchers from non-traditional fields and IT could be included in the conversation along with other research organisations. It was also suggested that a good solution should perhaps be invisible to researchers, and therefore not require their involvement.
- More work needs to be done to get ORCIDs into repository software, research systems.
• Targeting higher degree research students for ORCID adoption might be an easier way to start an institutional approach.
• A globally unique, persistent identifier for grants would be very useful. There is no “DOI” equivalent for grants.
• Opportunities to exchange information about what people are doing with ORCID are very important. Case studies work well.
• Cultural change needs to happen at the individual level, as well as at the institutional level.
• Internal institutional constraints and priorities may inhibit progress but an institution needs to develop and move to a position where it can take up an opportunity when conditions are favourable.
• When rolling out a big change like ORCID at an institution, good things need to happen the first time.
• Some researchers already have an ORCID. Take this into account when adopting at the institutional level.
• Confirmation that ORCID is ready to scale.
• Development of an equivalent of Enterprise Architecture on a national scale.
• Agreement for the group at the Roundtable to meet “not infrequently”.

Summary - on the journey to get “there”:
• Develop national architecture, 12-24 months timeframe, involving researchers, IT, students, and institutional shared approach.
• Continue the dialogue, forum for ideas, and involve more stakeholders: ANDS, CAUL, ARMS, CAUDIT, NLA, funding bodies.

Whiteboard notes from the ‘future directions’ session.
Evaluations
We received 28 evaluation forms. In general, evaluations suggested:

- Overwhelmingly positive feedback
- People attended the event for a variety of reasons from wanting to know more about ORCID to hearing about ORCID implementations at other institutions in preparation for their own implementation.
- Many said "yes" to implementing changes as a result of the event such as joining ORCID, assigning ORCIDs to HDR students, preparation for ingesting ORCID into internal systems (e.g. repository, research master), general awareness-raising about ORCID at home institution.
- Generally people were happy with the venue, the organisation of the event, the interactivity, mix of attendees and the pace. There were a few suggestions of how the event could be improved, specifically: including software vendors and inclusion of more stakeholders.
- There were some suggestions for follow up events and resources. Some would like the event repeated in 12 months; there were suggestions for more frequent virtual catch-up's, webinars, group emails on progress of ORCID implementers, hackfests etc.
- General agreement that the dialogue around ORCID needs to be continued.

Adrian Burton, ANDS, provides closing remarks
Follow-up actions
Drawing from the ‘future directions’ panel and the evaluation forms, the following follow-up actions are suggested for consideration:

- Repeat the ORCID Roundtable in 2015, inviting more stakeholders, to assess and facilitate progress.
- Create a resources website and/or discussion platform.
- Facilitate regular communication and develop the community of practice among implementing institutions:
  - hold frequent virtual catch-ups;
  - make use of conferences (e.g. ARMS, THETA);
  - schedule webinars to share the progress of the early adopters;
  - establish ORCID Google group for Aus/NZ implementers (early and potential).
- Possible topics for further discussion: progress of early implementers; ORCID and research systems e.g. Research Master and management systems, Symplectic and other systems; ORCID Ambassadors
- Follow up on the development of national infrastructure. Hold roundtable to gain agreement on national information architecture and role of identifiers.
- Support for technical as well as strategic/policy level discussions and resources:
  - Explore possibilities of a common position/statement/principle on researcher identification between CAUL, ARMS, ARC, NHMRC
  - Consider small hack group and sponsorship of hackfests to make progress on adoption.
- Develop case studies.
- Develop roadmaps of ORCID implementation to provide examples.
- Explore shared licensing options