



## Serials & E-Resources News

---

### **Report on the NISO-NASIG Webinar: How Librarians Use, Implement and Can Support Researcher Identifiers**

Reported by Sofia Slutskaia

The NASIG-NISO (National Information Standards Organization) webinar “How Librarians Use, Implement, and Can Support Researcher Identifiers” ([http://www.niso.org/news/events/2016/webinars/aug10\\_webinar/](http://www.niso.org/news/events/2016/webinars/aug10_webinar/)) included three presentations covering both librarians’ and publishers’ involvement with research identifiers. The first presentation, “Attribution from a Research Library Perspective,” was from Micah Altman, Director of Research at MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) Libraries.

Altman’s talk covered the lifecycle view of research identifiers, emerging practices in the area, and the future of research identifiers. To create a broader background, Altman reminded the audience that the use of research identifiers should not be limited to published articles and that they can be applied to different types of works and entities (data, software, figures, images, etc.) It is also important to remember that the identifiers can be created and assigned at different stages of the research lifecycle. According to Altman, different types of identifiers exist for people, organizations, and works, and these identifiers have various relations with one another. He cited OCLC research that traced the use of research identifiers through a variety of library ecosystems and showed the complexity of the system.

Altman stated that the library community is well-placed to help foster the use of research identifiers both

because of its ties with publication systems and because of its understanding of metadata. As an example of library involvement, Altman discussed MIT’s implementation of ORCID IDs (<http://orcid.org/>). The MIT implementation was a collaborative effort among institutional research, the information technology department, and the library. The library’s function was to provide outreach and patron support. MIT developed a multi-step ORCID registration process that included a pre-registration check to identify scholars who were already registered, multiple rounds of e-mails to potential participants, and a post-registration check.

One of the positive outcomes of the MIT implementation was the ability of internal MIT systems to harvest information from external systems that had an associated ORCID ID. Altman’s examples of completed integrations included the local creation service and MIT profile system used for faculty evaluation and promotion. MIT is currently working on ORCID ID and DSpace integration that would allow associating ORCID IDs with open access publications and integration of ORCID IDs with the human resources system.

MIT and other universities’ experiences contributed to ORCID, developing a standardized process for the institutional implementation of ORCID IDs and offering resources for planning, integration, and communicating on its website (<https://members.orcid.org/research-organizations>).

In the conclusion of his presentation, Altman listed emerging trends such as an effort to describe contributor roles, assign research identifiers to data, and create software repositories and software and data

citation services. More information on Altman's research and MIT's participation with research identifiers can be found at <http://informatics.mit.edu/>.

Emma Ganley's presentation, "Data, Metadata, and Data Citation Practices at PLOS," (Public Library of Science) continued the discussion about the emerging trend of data citation and the assigning of research identifiers to data. Ganley, who is a chief editor of PLOS Biology, contributed the publishers' perspective to the research identifier discussion. Ganley's first topic was the PLOS participation in ORCID that included signing the open letter and committing to follow best practices when collecting, processing, and displaying ORCID IDs. As a result of this action, PLOS is encouraging its authors to associate ORCID IDs with their profiles and to use them consistently for all content. PLOS also implemented auto-updates with CrossRef and other systems to make sure that the system cross-pollination based on ORCID IDs was seamless to users.

Next, Ganley discussed the PLOS implementation of the CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) project. CRediT (<http://casrai.org/credit>) is a simple taxonomy of research contributions developed by CASRAI (Consortia Advancing Standards in Research Administration Information) and NISO. The taxonomy includes fourteen different contribution terms like conceptualization, methodology, software, validation, formal analysis, project administration, funding acquisitions, and others. The implementation of CRediT as part of the submission process for all PLOS journals improved the display of various contributor roles in the published articles, allowed the connection of this information to contributors' ORCID IDs, and allowed the information to be ported back to faculty profiles and other systems.

Ganley spent the majority of her time discussing PLOS' open data policy and projects involving data citation and crediting data creation. She started this part of her presentation by citing existing research that showed both the need for researchers to obtain other people's data and the difficulty in obtaining it.<sup>ii</sup> The research also showed that data availability declined significantly

over time with almost all research data being lost ten to fifteen years after publication.<sup>iii</sup>

The above conclusions contributed to PLOS adopting a new policy that required authors to make all data underlining findings described in the manuscripts fully available. All authors must provide a "Data Availability Statement" describing compliance with PLOS' policy. To encourage compliance, PLOS developed some guidelines and recommendations (<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/data-availability#loc-recommended-repositories>) including a list of recommended repositories that adhere to a set of standards such as accessibility, sustainability, archiving, licensing and persistent identifiers. Ganley shared some anecdotal evidence that compliance with the new policy actually increased data availability and that the persistent identifiers are being used for data sets.

Ganley mentioned PLOS' involvement with a number of other data-citation related projects including the Data Citation Implementation Pilot developed by FORCE11 (The Future of Research Communications and e-Scholarship - <https://www.force11.org/>) and Project THOR (Technical and Human infrastructure for Open Research - <https://project-thor.eu/>). Both projects aim to establish seamless integration and coordination among articles, data, and research across the research lifecycle.

The final presentation of the event, "How Libraries Can Support Identification and Discovery of Scholarly Output," was delivered by a group of librarians from the North Carolina State University led by William Cross, the director of the Copyright and Digital Scholarship Center at the NCSU library. He was joined by two NCSU library fellows, Eka Grguric and Madison Sullivan. The focus of their talk was the libraries' role in helping researchers identify useful tools for creating and controlling their scholarly identity. Presenters described a series of workshops that took place as part of the NCSU Libraries' Summer of Open Science program.

Cross talked about using ORCID as a perfect starting point for introducing research identifiers. According to

him, the workshop participants easily understood the advantages of ORCID IDs such as ease of set up and auto-update features that allowed automatic populating of a variety of other related services (CrossRef, DataCite, etc.) Researchers also knew that ORCID IDs were required by many funding agencies. Cross felt that creating ORCID IDs and ORCID profiles provided a good introduction to explaining altmetrics and scholarly impact.

Sullivan covered creating scholarly identity using social media. Her part of the workshop included a discussion about various social media channels and the importance of finding a channel that was the most relevant and useful for a particular discipline or subject. Sullivan cited a number of studies on researchers' use of Twitter, listing an ease of getting feedback, finding similar research, and discovering peers.<sup>iv</sup> The workshop offered hands-on experience with Twitter but also discussed advantages and pitfalls of other tools such as ResearchGate, Reddit, and Academia.edu, and it touched on analytics and privacy concerns. Sullivan

---

<sup>i</sup> Smith-Yoshima K., Altman, M., Cristan, A.L., Dawson, L., Dunham, J., Hickey, T., Hook, D., Horstmann, W., MacEwan, A., Schreur, P. and Smart, L (2014). *Registering researchers in authority files*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research.

<sup>ii</sup> Challenges and Opportunities (2011). *Science* 331: 692–693.

<sup>iii</sup> Vines, T.H., Albert, A.Y., Andrew, R.L., Débarre, F., Bock, D.G., Franklin, M.T., Gilbert, K.J., Moore, J.S.,

suggested that if participants wanted more control over their scholarly identity, they should consider disseminating their work on a personal website. Grguric's part of the workshop emphasized both website creation and search engine optimization (SEO) as tools for controlling one's digital footprint. WordPress was selected as a website creation tool due to NCSU institutional support.

Grguric concluded the presentation by offering some general comments about the program's success. The program was very well attended by graduate students (70%) and faculty (16%), representing twenty-one different departments across eleven colleges. It also resulted in many follow-up consultations. Overall, the presenters felt that there is a need for this type of interdisciplinary support, and the library is well positioned to offer it. More information about the NCSU program can be found at <http://go.ncsu.edu/niso-sos>.

Renaut, S. and Rennison, D.J., 2014. The availability of research data declines rapidly with article age. *Current Biology*, 24(1), pp.94-97.

<sup>iv</sup> Mandavilli, A. (2011). Trial by Twitter. *Nature*, 469(7330), 20.

<sup>v</sup> Van Noorden, R. (2014). Online collaboration: Scientists and the social network. *Nature*, 512(7513), 126-129.