



Connecting Research
and Researchers

2017 ORCID Consortia Survey Report

November 2017

Josh Brown  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8689-4935>

Matt Buys  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7234-3684>

Laure Haak  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5109-3700>

Alice Meadows  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2161-3781>

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Methods and Sample	4
Key Findings	4
Next Steps	8
APPENDIX 1. Existing consortia as of May 2017	10
APPENDIX 2. Survey participants	11
APPENDIX 3. Consortia resources	12
APPENDIX 4: 2017 consortia survey questions	13

ORCID Consortia Survey 2017

ORCID consortia are fundamental to our mission. To be successful at building national and regional communities of practice that support a global open research infrastructure, we need the commitment of our consortia members and their lead organizations.

ORCID consortia grew out of our Adoption and Integration project, carried out in 2013-14 and funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.¹ Started less than a year after the ORCID Registry was launched, the project provided external funding for universities to integrate ORCID identifiers, support the collaborative elicitation and documentation of use cases and open source code, and establish a collaborative venue for disseminating best practices.

After evaluating the impact of the Adoption and Integration project, we launched a formal consortium program in November 2014.² Our goal was to foster communities of practice that can apply ORCID services and resources in regional and national contexts, using global implementation standards. We created incentives for collaboration by providing deep discounts for ORCID members who agree to form consortia – groups of five or more not-for-profit organizations that embed administration, governance, and community engagement components.

Three years later, and with 457 (63%) of our members joining through consortia, we wanted to learn more about their experiences and expectations. In 2017, we fielded a survey of our existing consortia (n=16), to gather information about how well they understand – and have committed to helping us meet – our goal, and find out how we could better support their work.

ORCID consortia differ significantly in terms of size, location, and governance. Not surprisingly, they have different approaches, different goals, and different levels of awareness of our goals. While some are deeply committed to embedding ORCID in their community, others do not realize that this is a key goal. Some have developed a shared service to support ORCID integration across the consortium, others do not have a shared implementation goal.

From this survey, it is clear that we need to provide greater clarity on our goals and expectations, and do more to provide communications resources and develop communities. In turn, the consortia can do more to engage members and researchers and encourage adoption and integration following our Collect and Connect guidelines. The good news is that, per the survey respondents, we have already established excellent relationships with the key contact points at ORCID consortium lead organizations – a great base on which to build.

¹ Brown, Josh; Wilmers, Catalina; Haak, Laurel (2015): Final Report: Sloan ORCID Adoption and Integration Program 2013-2014. Figshare. <https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1290632.v1>; Jisc-ARMA ORCID Pilot program, <https://orcidpilot.jiscinvolve.org/wp/>; Brown, Josh (2015): ORCID at Scale. <https://orcid.org/blog/2015/05/01/orcid-scale>.

² ORCID Membership webpage, <https://orcid.org/about/membership>; Consortium License Agreement, <https://orcid.org/content/consortium-member-license-agreement>.

Methods and Sample

In May 2017, we sent an online survey to one or more contacts at all 16 (at that time) ORCID consortia lead organizations. Sixteen people, representing 12 consortia, responded to the survey (more than one person responded from some consortia). The survey responses included respondent name and contact information.

The survey questions focused on policy, community, integrations, future plans, and ORCID support, as well as general information about each consortium. Most respondents were either consortium leads or consortium support staff, but three respondents identified themselves as other stakeholders (consultant, funder, and implementation committee member), all of whom were deeply involved in creating or managing a consortium.

Respondents represented a range of consortia. The smallest had no members at launch and the largest had 61. Expected membership growth in the next year ranged from zero to over 40. The oldest consortium represented launched in 2014; the most recent, in May 2017.

Key Findings

(1) The reasons for forming a consortium varied widely, and were related to how the consortium viewed their role in providing support staff.

“to build the infrastructure to enable the massive registration of several thousands of Italian professors, researchers and doctoral/post-doc students; to integrate ORCID with the current research system adopted by 67 Italian universities in order to make the best use of ORCID API for push and pull activities, reduce researcher burden and take advantage of the services offered as well as support the activities of the national assessment reviewers by reducing the workload and at the same time improving data quality.”

- Discounted ORCID membership was the number one reason for forming a consortium (ranked 2.67 of a possible 3), closely followed by achieving economies of scale through a coordinated approach to using ORCID among consortium members, and increased awareness of ORCID by researchers and others (both 2.33/3). Current or impending policies requiring ORCID were the least likely reason for forming a consortium (1.86/3; one respondent noted that “Policy factors may play a more important part in the future”)
- Support staff varied by consortium. Those that did have dedicated staff reported a variety of cost recovery models. Invoicing members as an upcharge over the ORCID membership was the most popular payment option (six respondents); one consortium doesn’t charge a fee; and two have alternate arrangements

- 40% of respondents reported their support staff spending more time on outreach, one third spent more time on technical support, and 13% split evenly between outreach and technical support.
- In terms of proactive versus reactive support, most respondents (35.7%) reported a 50/50 split, 21.4% were more likely to be proactive with technical support, 14.3% with outreach
- Most respondents who answered the question (9/15) expected an increase in the number of members of their consortium in the next three to five years; three (20%) expect the numbers to stay about the same; and 6.7% (one respondent) anticipated a decline in numbers

“The primary goal for the Australian ORCID Consortium is to assist and support organisations with integrating ORCID with their systems. It is also to provide knowledge and resources to assist with this work and also grow the number of researchers that have an ORCID.”

(2) Most consortia expressed specific goals, but often did not have a formal policy document or governing body to be able to measure progress toward goals.

- Respondents reported that the primary goals for their consortium were to increase researcher registration and to support ORCID integrations - five consortia cited one or both of these in their free text answers. The development of shared resources and/or reducing the burden on researchers were also cited. One respondent replied that “There are no stated consortial group goals”
- Only five consortia have a formal policy document, and eight have a governing body/advisory board

“Promote and establish Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID) throughout Germany as a unique identifier for researchers at universities and non-university research institutions. The consortium will help German organizations by providing ORCID claiming services through BASE (73 million publications), linkage with other identifiers, ORCID claiming for content from the German National Library beyond articles, knowledge base including report about the legal consequences and coherences of privacy rights for researcher and organizations, and provide support for potential and existing members”

(3) Outreach is a core function of consortia, and several respondents reported improvements in community engagement after consortium launch, through a variety of outreach programs.

- Nine consortia had a dedicated web page for members
- Respondents reported a range of levels of engagement with ORCID in their community before their consortium launched, from non-existent (3/15 respondents who answered

the question) to excellent (2/15), with 6/15 viewing engagement as moderate. Post-launch, 2/15 respondents still report the level of engagement as excellent with the remainder all viewing it as moderate

- Consortia are undertaking many sorts of outreach activities to encourage engagement with and adoption of ORCID, the most popular of which were creating a website (reported by 11/15 respondents) and in-person events (9/15). Libguides and social campaigns (both reported by 1/15) were the least popular options.
- For consortia that reported consulting with stakeholder groups, librarians were ranked the most highly (2.86 out of a possible 3). Funding bodies and research sponsors were also seen as important stakeholders (2.56/3). Other consortia (1.75/3) and researchers themselves (1.73/3) were seen as least important

(4) Embedding identifiers in research workflows and information systems is a central goal of ORCID consortia members. Research information management (RIM) systems and institutional repositories were the most popular integration types, with some consortia taking a centralized approach and others a more distributed approach. Respondents view the main barriers to increasing adoption of ORCID in their community as a more or less equal mix of social (getting researcher buy-in and adoption) and technological, including access to IT resources, supporting vendor systems, and funding.

“Systems issues around integration are the most significant challenges identified, together with technical skills to support ORCID integration.”

Unsurprisingly, they also see improving these social and technological issues as the main opportunities for increasing adoption of ORCID.

- Nine consortia reported some level of consortium coordination around ORCID integration - four have created centralized shared services or infrastructures to support ORCID integration. Four consortia stated that there is currently no effort to coordinate member integration activities
- Only three of the 15 respondents who answered the question stated that their consortium support liaison is using ORCID’s Collect and Connect framework to evaluate integrations. The remainder either are not, didn’t know about the framework, or don’t have a support role
- There was a wide variation in the number of member organizations that have integrated with ORCID - from zero to 60 per consortium. Most of the respondents (7/13) reported fewer than five integrations across their consortium
- The most common types of integrations were with research information management (RIM) systems and institutional repositories (both reported by seven respondents). Four respondents reported that their members have integrated ORCID in HR/personnel systems, and two each reported integrations with grants management or identity management systems

(5) ORCID provides a number of resources and services to our community. Consortia appreciated the quality of our staff interactions, and sought easier access to outreach resources and more help facilitating communication between members and consortia about effective practices.

“We thoroughly enjoy working with ORCID. We are keen to develop this relationship and continue to work together to best support our members and others in the global community to collaborate.”

- The most popular resources provided by ORCID were our monthly member newsletter (50% of respondents regularly use this) and website (used by 42.9%). The least used resources are our Word and email templates (84.6% and 78.6% of respondents report never using these) and our GitHub repository (76.9% never use)
- Most respondents (9/15) report interacting with ORCID team at least once a month, with two stating that they interact with us less than quarterly. All stated that they are happy with their current level of interaction. Unsurprisingly, most of their interactions are with the regional director and/or regional community team contact
- Respondents rated most highly the quality of ORCID’s marketing and communications materials (ranked high or medium quality by 10/15 respondents) and help desk and support services for consortium support staff (9/15), and webinars (8/15).
- When asked to list two things that ORCID does well for their consortium, our responsiveness and support were by far the most common responses. “Rock solid reliable support” and “Always happy to assist and solve issues” were typical responses
- There was less consistency about what ORCID could do better for consortia, but the main themes were facilitating better communication between consortia, providing more information about other integrations (including updates on discussions with vendors), and providing more - and more easily discoverable - outreach and marketing materials

Next Steps

There are clear indications for improvements, both for consortia and ORCID. Consortia are struggling with outreach, engaging researchers, and communicating effective practices, so we need to more clearly articulate the why and how of consortia. We also need to work with consortia to ensure that they understand responsibilities - theirs and ORCID's. In addition, many consortia have limited or no support staff, and no guiding policy or goals. Some were formed only to benefit from reduced fees and are not currently meeting the requirement to provide member services.

“The staff at ORCID are helpful and dynamic and a pleasure to work with. There are issues with supporting institutions without integrations and sometimes issues where ORCID policy stops us moving forward as quickly as we would all like, occasionally problems with materials on the website not keeping up to date with latest developments; but overall I think ORCID is responsive and agile.”

We are committed to working with our consortia partners to develop successful ORCID communities of practice and are taking action in four areas to start to address these needs:

- (1) Documentation.** We have already started to make improvements to our documentation and materials, including the recent launch of our [new education and outreach materials for users](#), including:
- a new [Why ORCID video](#)
 - several more [how-to videos](#)
 - fully updated [KnowledgeBase](#) articles covering the why and how of all aspects of ORCID use
 - a [communications plan and toolkit](#) for librarians and others responsible for ORCID outreach

These were developed in consultation with the community, including staff from some consortia lead organizations. Feedback to date has been positive.

(2) Policy. We will be updating the membership pages on our website to clarify our expectations of and commitment to consortia. These changes will be reflected in the new version of our consortium membership agreement. Going forward, we will be using an onboarding checklist to ensure clear guidance on the requirements for participating in the consortium program.

(3) Community. To address feedback about fostering cross-consortia community, we will be holding our first [consortia workshop](#) in Lisbon, Portugal in January. We plan to hold an annual face-to-face event, hosted by different lead organizations around the world, to provide an opportunity for consortia leaders to meet and learn from each other. We will recognize examples of successful consortia initiatives and best practices. We will continue conversations started at these workshops on our online community forum, launched in 2016.

(4) Administration. To help consortia leads more quickly and easily share and manage information about their members, we are currently beta-testing new functionality that provides real-time access to our member management platform. This will enable consortium lead staff to add and delete member organizations and update contact information themselves.

We'll continue to develop resources and engage with our consortia partners around the world, and to formally evaluate the program by carrying out an annual consortia survey, and sharing the results with the consortia leads and the wider community.

APPENDIX 1. Existing consortia as of May 2017

Regional (USA):

- Lyris
- Big 10 Academic Alliance
- Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA)
- NorthEast Research Libraries (NERL)

National

- Australia
- Belgium
- Canada
- Denmark
- Finland
- Germany
- Italy
- Netherlands
- New Zealand
- Sweden
- Taiwan
- UK

APPENDIX 2. Survey participants

- Lyrasis
- Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA)
- Australia
- Belgium
- Canada
- Denmark
- Germany
- Italy
- New Zealand
- Sweden
- Taiwan
- UK

APPENDIX 3. Consortia resources

Jisc UK ORCID Consortium

- [Jisc-ARMA ORCID Pilot Project](#)
- [Cost-Benefit Analysis](#)
- [Community forum](#)
- [Membership policy](#)

New Zealand ORCID Consortium

- [Consortium Policy](#)
- [Community Resources](#)
- [Advisory Committee](#)
- [New Zealand ORCID Hub](#)

AAF Australian Consortium

- [Joint Statement of Principles - Research Institutions](#)
- [Joint Statement - Research Funders](#)
- [Governance](#)
- [Community Greenhouse](#)
- [Cost recovery model](#)

CRKN Canada ORCID Consortium

- [Joint Statement of Principles](#)
- [Community Resources](#)

Italian ORCID Consortium

- [Official Italian ORCID site](#)
- [Italian ORCID Hub \(code repository\)](#)

German ORCID Consortium

- [Consortium launch announcement](#)
- [Community resources](#)

Related ORCID Blog posts

- L. Haak (2014) [Denmark adopts ORCID](#)
- J. Brown (2015) [ORCID at Scale](#)
- Meadows (2015) [National consortium for ORCID set to improve UK research visibility and collaboration](#)
- N. Simons (2015) [Australian ORCID Consortium Model Released for Comment](#)
- N. Simons (2015) [ORCID Joint Statements released in Australia](#)
- A. Meadows (2016) [Australian consortium officially launched](#)

APPENDIX 4: 2017 consortia survey questions

Q1. Your name

Q2. Your affiliation (what organization do you work for)?

Q3. Your ORCID consortium

Answer Choices

Australia (AAF)

Belgium (Elektron)

Canada (CRKN)

Denmark (DEFF)

Finland (CSC)

Germany (TIB)

Italy (CINECA)

Netherlands (SURF)

New Zealand (RSNZ)

Sweden (SUNET)

Taiwan

UK (Jisc)

US (GWLA, NERL, Lyrasis, CIC-Big10, WRLC)

Other (please specify)

Q4. Your role in the ORCID consortium

Answer Choices

Lead

Support

Stakeholder

Other (please specify)

Q5. When was your ORCID consortium publicly launched/announced (MM-YYYY)?

Q6. Please provide URL(s) for the launch press release or other announcement.

Q7. What is the URL for the dedicated consortium website/web page?

Answer Choices

URL:

We don't have a webpage yet

Q8. How many organizations belong to your ORCID consortium?

Answer Choices

At launch:

Now:

Anticipated in the next 12 months:

Q9. How many full-time equivalent staff are employed or contracted by your consortium to provide ORCID technical and outreach support to members?

Answer Choices

0

1

2

More than 2

Other (please specify)

Q10. How many additional full-time equivalent staff are you planning to add in the next 12 months?

Answer Choices

0

1

2

More than 2

Q11. Roughly how much support personnel time is/will be spent on outreach vs technical activities?

Answer Choices

50/50

More time on technical than outreach

More time on outreach than technical

Not applicable

Q12. Roughly how much of their time is/will be spent on proactive vs. reactive activities?

Answer Choices

50/50

More time on technical than outreach

More time on outreach than technical

Not applicable

Q13. Who employs your ORCID support staff?

Answer Choices

Consortium lead organization

Other member organization

Not applicable

Comments (optional):

Q14. How do you fund your support personnel?

Answer Choices

Consortium lead invoices members as an upcharge over the ORCID membership

Consortium lead provides dedicated support for no additional fee

Member provides dedicated support

We do not provide dedicated support (yet)

We need some ideas!

Our members have all integrated ORCID and don't need any more support

Other (please specify)

Q15. How important were the following factors in contributing to the decision to form an ORCID consortium?

Achieving economies of scale through a coordinated approach to using ORCID among consortium members

Discounted ORCID membership

Increased awareness of ORCID by researchers and others

Current or impending policies requiring ORCID

Other (please specify)

Q16. Did you develop a consortium policy document? If published, please provide a link to that document

Answer Choices

Yes - please provide URL:

No

Q17. Does your consortium have a governing body/advisory board?

Answer Choices

Yes - please provide description and/or URL

No

Q18. How is your consortium funded?

Answer Choices

Consortium lead pays ORCID and invoices members

Consortium lead funds the membership

Other (please specify)

Q19. Are there policies in place in your region regarding or requiring ORCID iDs? (e.g., a requirement for research assessment, or for grant submissions)

Answer Choices

Yes: please provide a brief description or link to relevant document(s)

No

Not sure

Q20. What are the primary goals of your ORCID consortium? Such as, researcher registration, developing common integration workflows, increasing participation of specific stakeholders, reducing researcher burden, etc.

Q21. Rate your engagement with the following stakeholder groups when forming your consortium.

Researchers
Research administrators
Grant administrators
Technology administrators
Librarians
Government/policy makers
Funding bodies and research sponsors
Other consortia
Other (please specify)

Q22. If you answered yes to government and/or funder involvement, what impact did government and/or funder involvement have on the formation of your consortium?

Answer Choices
Participated in discussions
Published an ORCID policy
Funded (part of) the consortium
Are members of the consortium
Other (please specify)

Q23. If you answered yes to researcher/faculty involvement, did you gather feedback from or otherwise engage with researchers by any of the following methods?

Answer Choices
Survey/market research
In-person meetings
Indirectly, such as via librarians or research administrators
Booths at events
Engaging with leaders in the research community
Other (please specify)

Q24. What sorts of outreach activities have you undertaken to encourage engagement with and adoption of ORCID within your consortium? (Select all that apply)

Answer Choices
Website
Social campaign(s) such as Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn
Email campaign
Press release/media campaign
Webinar(s)
In-person event(s)
LibGuide

FAQ

Best practice documentation

No activities to date

Other (please specify)

Q25. How would you rate the level of engagement with ORCID in your community before your consortium launched?

Answer Choices

Non-existent

Moderate

Excellent

Not sure

Q26. How would you rate the level of engagement now?

Answer Choices

Non-existent

Moderate

Excellent

Not sure

Q27. How coordinated is your consortium's approach for integrating ORCID?

Answer Choices

We have a centralized approach that all members use

The objective of the consortia is to have members use a similar approach, though developed separately

Members seek best practices from each other, but do not strive to take the same approach

The consortia shares common information, though each member follows their own path

There is no effort to coordinate member activities related to ORCID

Comments

Q28. Has the consortium support liaison been using the "Collect and Connect" framework to evaluate integrations?

Answer Choices

Yes

No

Not sure

We don't have a support liaison

Q29. How many of your consortium members have integrated ORCID into at least one system?

Q30. In which types of systems have your consortium members integrated ORCID iDs?

Answer Choices

HR/personnel systems
Research information management systems
Repositories
Identity management systems
Grants management
IP/technology management systems
No integrations at present
Other (please specify)

Q31. In which types of systems have your consortium members expressed interest in integrating ORCID iDs?

Answer Choices

HR/personnel systems
Research information management systems
Repositories
Identity management systems
Grants management
IP/technology management systems
No integrations at present
Other (please specify)

Q32. Has your consortium created any shared services or infrastructures to support ORCID integration?

Answer Choices

Yes: please provide a brief description or link to the relevant document(s)

No

Not sure

Q33. Do any of your national or community shared systems use ORCID iDs?

Answer Choices

Yes: please provide brief description and link to relevant document(s)

No

Not sure

Q34. Are local and/or national integrations using ORCID iDs to synchronize data between systems?

Answer Choices

Yes: please provide a brief description or link to the relevant document(s)

No

Not sure

Q35. How do you expect the number of consortium members to change in the next 3-5 years?

Answer Choices

Increase

Stay the same
Decrease
Not sure

Q36. What are the main barriers to increasing adoption of ORCID in your community?

Answered
Skipped

Q37. What are the main opportunities for increasing adoption of ORCID in your community?

Q38. How often do you use the following ORCID resources? (Select all that apply)

Email templates for researchers
Monthly member newsletters
Social media campaigns/examples
Poster templates
PowerPoint templates
Word templates
Videos
Integration checklist
orcid.org
members.orcid.org
API users group
GitHub repository
Other (please specify)
Additional resources you would like us to provide??

Q39. How frequently do you interact with the ORCID team?

Answer Choices
At least weekly
More than once a month
Around once a month
Around once a quarter
Less than once a quarter

Q40. Would you like more interactions with the ORCID team?

Answer Choices
Yes
No
I'm happy with our current level of interaction

Q41. Whom do you typically interact with at ORCID?

Answer Choices
Regional membership director

Community support team member
Other (please specify)

Q42. Please rate the quality of support ORCID is providing to your consortium

Training of consortium support staff
Help desk and support services for consortium support staff
Online self-help support material
Availability of outreach resources
Resources to assist with integrations
Webinars
Marketing and communication materials
Comments?

Q43. List two things that ORCID does well for your consortium

Q44. List two things that ORCID could do better for your consortium
Answer Choices

Q45. What gap, service, or opportunity could ORCID address to better meet the needs of consortia?

Q46. If you have any other comments about the formation and running of your consortium, including your interactions with ORCID staff and other members of the ORCID community, please add them here: