

# Researcher ID questionnaire for JISC - closes 0600 on 7 June

## Preamble

Responses to this questionnaire will inform JISC's [work on unique identifiers for researchers](#) [link to JISC's project website: opens in a new window], and, in particular, a **recommendation for the adoption of ORCID**, the Open Researcher and Contributor ID.

Previous work with stakeholders identified several problems to which commonly used unique researcher IDs could provide solutions. Specifically:

1. **Researchers** not only need to identify themselves uniquely but they also need to attach themselves uniquely to a number of things: datasets, equipment, outputs, articles, media stories, citations, experimental notebooks etc. The number and diversity of the different systems and the different identifiers they currently use is high, very time consuming and very frustrating. A researcher wants to unambiguously assert: *it was me who did that at that place and that time and no-one else and the results were xyz.*
2. For **institutions**, increased demands for multiple submissions of accurate data for assessment and statistical purposes require sure identification of individuals and their national and international research activities.
3. For **research managers**, accurate exchange of information is the crucial use case. Publications and projects routinely have international collaborations now – and institutions too increasingly have international roles and participants.
4. There is a **research council need** to integrate with various Current Research Information Systems in universities. A unique researcher ID will make exchanging/mapping information easier, and reduce the need to ask researchers many times for the same information. There is an identified need to track researchers across institutions and organisations, academic, commercial and third sector (charities, the voluntary sector, not for profits/NGOs) and along career paths.
5. For **repositories**, internationally-used unique IDs will make it much easier to disambiguate author names.
6. **HESA** would be very interested in having a robust and reliable staff identifier that covers all academic staff – this would be very helpful for studying career progression.

Acknowledging these issues, a “task and finish group” <sup>[1]</sup> was established by JISC in 2011 to draft recommendations for the UK on the adoption of an identifier that will address these and other problems and that will meet the needs of the research community now and in the future.

The group made a number of recommendations, one of which is that the “best likely solution” for the UK would be the widespread adoption of ORCID – the Open Researcher and Contributor ID – an open, independent **researcher and contributor registry**. ORCID is being developed by the ORCID Initiative, which is working to ensure that ORCID is adopted and embraced internationally as the scholarly research community’s de facto standard for IDs for researchers and for people who contribute to research <sup>[2]</sup>.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to consult within the UK research community about the feasibility and general acceptability of the task and finish group’s recommendations, of which those relating to ORCID and its implementation are central. The data gathered through this survey, along with that from interviews, will inform a report for JISC that will help prepare the ground for the UK-wide use of a common researcher ID which can be used to uniquely identify anyone involved in research. The report, by Nicky Ferguson, Helen Lawton Smith, Dick Moore and Seb Schmoller, is due to be completed by the end of July 2012.

# Researcher ID questionnaire for JISC - closes 0600 on 7 June

## Footnotes

[1] The group consisted of representatives from key organisations and bodies from the UK HE sector, alongside experts and researchers. The organisations represented on the task and finish group included the Association of Research Managers and Administrators (ARMA), HEFCE, the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), the Medical Research Council (MRC), the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC), the Universities and Colleges Information Systems Association (UCISA), and the Wellcome Trust. Researcher viewpoints were provided by Dr Simon Coles (Head of the National Crystallography Service, based at the University of Southampton) and Dr Cameron Neylon (Senior Scientist, Science and Technology Facilities Council).

[2] The idea behind ORCID is that once identifiers are in widespread use in the research community, they, and the relationships between them, will be linked to a researcher's output, so as to:

- enhance the scientific discovery process;
- improve the efficiency of research funding;
- improve collaboration between researchers.

The ORCID Initiative will create:

1. a central registry of unique identifiers for individual researchers;
2. an open and transparent linking mechanism between ORCID and other current author ID schemes.

To find out more about ORCID go to [orcid.org](http://orcid.org) [Link to ORCID website: opens in a new window].

## Important notes

1. There are 24 questions.
2. We have tested this questionnaire and have found that it can realistically be completed in between 10 and 15 minutes; longer if extensive narrative responses (which we welcome) are made.
3. We will discount responses which do not appear to be from an identifiable individual.
4. In no circumstances will your contact details be passed to any third party or used for any purpose other than for the administration of this survey.
5. If we decide to include the views of an identifiable individual respondent in our report to JISC we will **only** do this having obtained your express permission. (We offer you a range of permission options at the end of the questionnaire.)
6. If you would like to view and possibly print a PDF of the whole survey before completing it, you can do so by [clicking on this link](#) [PDF file: opens in a new window].

## **\*1. Shall we email you a copy of the project report if and when it is made publicly available?**

- Yes please
- No thanks

## Section 1: About you

### **\*2. Your full name**

### **\*3. Your email address (please take particular care to complete this accurately)**

**4. The name of your organisation if you have one**

**\*5. In which country are you mainly based?**

**\*6. What is your gender?**

- Female
- Male
- Prefer not to say

**7. Which category below includes your age?**

- 25 or younger
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56-65
- over 65

**8. If you work for an organisation, which of the following best describes its size?  
(Please use the final option if you do not work for an organisation.)**

- Organisation with more than 1000 staff
- Organisation with 100 to 999 staff
- Organisation with 10 to 99 staff
- Organisation with 1 to 9 staff
- I do not work for an organisation

**9. If you work for an organisation, is it**

- Private sector?
- Public/state sector?
- University/other Higher Education?
- Not-for-profit or NGO?

Other (please specify)

**10. If you work for an organisation, which of the following categories best describe your organisation? [Please choose one or, at the very most, three.]**

- Organisation that undertakes or hosts research
- Research funder
- Scholarly society
- Statistical agency
- Publisher
- Other (please specify)

**\*11. Are you responding:**

- as an individual?
- on behalf of your organisation?

**\*12. Which of the following best describes your role? [Please select one or, at the very most, three.]**

- Researcher
- Manager of researchers or leader of teams of researchers
- Manager of research-related services
- Judge of applications for research funding
- Commissioner of research
- Manager of data about researchers and research
- Responsible for running the software systems that would need to take account of the adoption of ORCID or equivalent
- Responsible for making the software systems that would need to take account of the adoption of ORCID or equivalent
- Employed in scholarly publishing
- Other (please specify)

**\*13. If you have a disciplinary focus, in which one of the following broad categories is it mainly concentrated?**

- Arts, Humanities, Languages and Music
- Biotechnology and Biological Sciences
- Engineering and Physical Sciences
- Economic and Social Sciences
- Medical
- Mathematics, Computer Science and Informatics
- Media and Leisure
- Management and Finance
- Education
- Environmental and Earth Science
- N/A
- Other (please specify)

### Section 2: The Goal

The goal is to solve the researcher/contributor name ambiguity problem by implementing a central registry of unique identifiers for individual researchers which has an open and transparent linking mechanism with other current author ID schemes. The task and finish group's recommendation is that ORCID should be the method of choice to achieve the goal. In considering the questions below **please take as read that:**

1. identifiers will not encode semantic information such as organisation or discipline, or personal information such as name, gender, employer, age or ethnicity;
2. individual owners of researcher IDs (that is, the researchers themselves) will be able to check and control what optional information (if any) is centrally associated with their ID;
3. wherever possible, data holders should allow individual owners of researcher IDs (that is, the researchers themselves) to check and control what information is associated with their ID, and what information they are authorised to share (for example a researcher may wish to share current employer with anyone, and current job title only with a research funder ... or a researcher may wish to share job title with anyone, but current employer only with authorised UK institutions);
4. if there is widespread adoption of ORCID or equivalent, this will not obviate the need for national systems (and organisational systems such as HR systems) that hold data about people and which may or may not make use of ORCID IDs.

## Researcher ID questionnaire for JISC - closes 0600 on 7 June

**\*14. The following “actors” in the UK research community will benefit considerably from the widespread adoption of ORCID or an equivalent solution. [Please select Don't Know (D/K) if you have no view on the benefits for a particular "actor".]**

	Strongly agree				Strongly disagree	D/K
1. Researchers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Organisations that undertake or host research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Publishers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Research funders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Scholarly societies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Statistical agencies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please use the optional text box below if you want to supplement your response.

**\*15. The widespread uptake of ORCID or an equivalent solution is intended to bring a number of benefits. From your own perspective please indicate the importance of the following: [Please select Don't Know (D/K) if you have no view on an intended benefit.]**

	Very important				Not at all important	D/K
1. Improvements to the way in which research is administered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Simplified sign-on procedures to research-related systems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Reduced form-filling during the process of applying for grants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Better and more complete tracking of individual researchers' careers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Improvements in the way research collaborations are recorded	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Improvements in the way in which publications, grants, research projects, and researchers are mapped and linked	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Better interoperation of local and national systems that encode and store data about researchers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Easier creation of authoritative lists of publications, citations and CVs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Smoother exchange of data about researchers between institutions during the preparation of collaborative bids, or when staff move between employers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please use the optional text box below if you want to supplement your response.

## Researcher ID questionnaire for JISC - closes 0600 on 7 June

**\* 16. The Higher Educational Statistical Agency (HESA) or an entity like it should be the kind of trusted body to administer and integrate the use of researcher IDs with currently used staff and postgraduate IDs in UK; and to advise institutions on data sharing issues. [Please select Don't Know (D/K) if you have no view on this issue.]**

Strongly agree

Strongly disagree

D/K

Please use the optional text box below if you want to supplement your response.

**\* 17. Any solution must be capable of covering all participants in UK research, whatever their contribution or standing, including those not in traditional research roles. [Please select Don't Know (D/K) if you have no view on this issue.]**

Strongly agree

Strongly disagree

D/K

Please use the optional text box below if you want to supplement your response.

**\* 18. Alongside ORCID (or equivalent), if it becomes operational, there will need to be a suitable UK wide contingency plan to ensure the continuity of ORCID's functions if for any reason ORCID ceases or fails. [Please select Don't Know (D/K) if you have no view on this issue.]**

Strongly agree

Strongly disagree

D/K

Please use the optional text box below if you want to supplement your response.

**19. Any further comments? Please use the optional text box below briefly to summarise any particular issues of which you would like JISC to be aware that relate to the goal of establishing an open, independent researcher and contributor registry.**

### Section 3: Getting There

This section concerns the process of establishing an open independent researcher and contributor registry.

**\*20. Prior to the ORCID (or any equivalent solution) being adopted by my organisation a business case to justify it will be needed. [Please select Don't Know (D/K) if you have no view on this issue.]**

Strongly agree		Strongly disagree	D/K
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please use the optional text box below if you want to supplement your response.

**\*21. Assuming that a business case is being developed please indicate the importance of each of the following issues within the case. [Please select Don't Know (D/K) if you have no view on a particular issue.]**

	Very important				Not at all important	D/K
1. A clear summary of the practical benefits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Interoperability between different identity standards and between different systems that encode and store research IDs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. One-off implementation costs of getting ORCID or its equivalent established within an organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. On-going local costs of maintaining ORCID or its equivalent within an organisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. A clear statement from ORCID on interoperability and boundary issues with potentially overlapping standards such as <a href="#">ISNI - opens in a new window</a> and <a href="#">VIAF - opens in a new window</a> .	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Privacy and control issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. An assessment of the risks and benefits that might arise from implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please use the optional text box below if you want to supplement your response.



## Researcher ID questionnaire for JISC - closes 0600 on 7 June

**\*22. Assuming that a business case is being developed please indicate *from your own perspective* the extent to which you think the business case should be written with the following organisations/categories in mind. [Please select Don't Know (D/K) if you have no view on a particular issue.]**

	Very important				Not at all important	D/K
1. Public sector organisations, including universities who employ researchers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Charitable sector organisations who employ researchers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Private sector organisations who employ researchers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Publishers of research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Research funders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Individual researchers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Professional and scholarly associations who have researchers as members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Government departments and agencies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Creators and suppliers of software systems such as HR systems that encode and store IDs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Politicians and planners	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Social science researchers who are interested in, for example, the mobility of researchers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please use the optional text box below if you want to supplement your response, for example if there are organisations/categories that we have omitted.

**23. Any further comments? Please use the optional text box below briefly to summarise any particular issues of which you would like JISC to be aware that relate to the goal of establishing an open, independent researcher and contributor registry.**

## Section 4: Permissions

**\*24. Finally, a reminder that only Nicky Ferguson, Helen Lawton Smith, Dick Moore and Seb Schmoller will see your answers linked to your identity. Any summary of the results provided to JISC will not identify individuals. However, we might wish to quote a few of your comments in the report we write. Please select at least one of the following options.**

**In the report:**

- you may quote my comments and attribute them to me;
- you may quote my comments but anonymously, not attributing them to me;
- if you wish to attribute any comment to me I require you to obtain my agreement prior to so doing;
- you may not quote any of my comments, but you may use them as background information.

**Many thanks for taking the time and trouble to contribute to this work.**

In case of difficulty, please [email Seb Schmoller](#).

*Nicky Ferguson, Helen Lawton Smith, Dick Moore and Seb Schmoller*  
24 May 2012