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Notes
Issue: How to integrate name authority and identifiers
citation analysis as a factor in rankings

Scholarly output impacts the reputation of authors.
Scholars may be published under many forms of names
Name authority files allow scholars to track across multiple languages/scripts
String matching is efficient

another challenge is the same name representing different people. only through researcher
identifiers can we tease apart who is whom
275 million people in China share the same name.
One researcher may have many profiles or identifiers
First action of group was to develop stakeholders and needs
There was initially a list of over 100 different systems, narrowed down to 20 which were profiled.
This is a representative sample of types of systems.
The total number of researchers (according to World Bank) is around 9-million
Researcher Identifiers are not the same as Name Authorities
Traditional (libraries) vs. researchers (publishers, researchers, funders, and libraries) 
Of course, there is overlap between the systems.

Same researcher info can be found in multiple databases and used in different ways 
Many actors contribute to multiple public views of information, multiple and possibly concurrent 
graphs which make for duplicate work flows and possible errors. This can mean that incorrect 
local instances can be corrected but the original mistake remains.

Emerging trends: 
widespread recognition that persistent identifiers for researchers are needed 
Registration services rather an authority files as a solution for RI 
Interoperability between systems is increasing 

Early adopters: Oxford, SPRinger, PLOS Wiley, CrossRef, Thomson Reuters 
Funders: WelcomeTrust, NIH, U.S. Dept of Energy, FCT, SciENcv 

Adoption trend Universities: 
Harvard (pilot) ORCIDs 
La Trobe University ISNI 
Stanford local identifiers 
Oxford ORCIDS 

Key Recommendations 
Researcher: get persistent identifier (earlier in the career the better) and use it on all external 
communications 
Librarians/Univ Admin: assign persistent identifiers to authors if they don’t already have them 
retain traditional identifiers 
Ensure ISNI or other ID is accurate 
advocate benefits and reasons for using and disseminating identifiers.

Manage risks 
Environment is evolving 
  funder mandates and policies are incomplete 
  no dominant business model 
  incomplete adoption, no single comprehensive data source 
  Integration between classes and new name authority is lacking 

Researchers: 
  • will not drive change alone 
  • are sensitive to who controls their profile and how info can be corrected 
  • more update among younger researchers 

Choosing identifiers
Broad Researcher Identifiers: ORCID & ISNI
   National mandates
   capabilities
   usage patterns

Retain traditional identifiers: VIAF, NACO
   Well supported in library systems
   Primarily describe authors of books and similar works

Be aware of community identifiers for local integrations (w.g. Arcx)

ISNI & ORCID
Complementary systems with two different approaches

ISNI: consolidates data from multiple databases
ORCID: Researchers self register

Share the same goals
  1) assign and share identifiers so both have one identifier
  2) Share publicly available metadata
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