Preliminary Findings from the euroCRIS/OCLC Research Survey of Research Information Practices

Rebecca Bryant, PhD, Senior Program Officer, OCLC Research  
bryantr@oclc.org @RebeccaBryant18

Pablo de Castro, Open Access Advocacy Librarian, University of Strathclyde  
pablo.de-castro@strath.ac.uk @pcastromartin

Anna Clements, Assistant Library Director, University of St Andrews  
akc@st-andrews.ac.uk @AnnaKClments

Michele Mennielli, International Membership and Partnership Manager, DuraSpace  
mmennielli@duraspace.org @micmenn
Today’s talk

• Introducing OCLC Research, euroCRIS and their collaboration

• Discuss joint Survey of Research Information Management Practice: goals, scope, aims

• Share and discuss preliminary survey results and findings
OCLC: A global network of libraries

- Americas: 10,938 members in 28 countries
- EMEA: 4,009 members in 72 countries
- Asia Pacific: 1,601 members in 23 countries

As of 31 December 2017
• Devoted to challenges facing libraries and archives since 1978
• Community resource for shared Research and Development (R&D)
• Engagement with OCLC members and the community around shared concerns
• Learn more
  ▪ oc.lc/research
  ▪ Hangingtogether.org blog
Research Information Management
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Convenience and Compliance:
Case Studies on Persistent Identifiers in European Research Information Management
Rebecca Bryant, Annette Dortmund, and Christine Malpas
What is Research Information Management (RIM)?

The aggregation, curation, & utilization of metadata about research activities

Overlapping terms:

- CRIS (Current Research Information System)
- RIS (Research Information System)
- RNS (Research Networking System) RPS (Research Profiling System)
- FAR (Faculty Activity Reporting)
An international not-for-profit association founded in 2002 to bring together experts on research information in general and research information systems (CRIS) in particular.
RIM Survey: building on previous work

CRIS/IR Survey
Report

http://www.eunis.org/blog/2016/03/01/crisir-survey-report/
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Survey of Research Information Management Practices

• Joint project between

Rebecca Bryant, PI, OCLC Research
Pablo de Castro, Strathclyde University and euroCRIS
Anna Clements, University of St. Andrews and euroCRIS
Annette Dortmund, OCLC EMEA
Jan Fransen, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
Muhammed Javed, Cornell University
Constance Malpas, OCLC Research
Michele Mennielli, DuraSpace and euroCRIS
Maliaca Oxnam, University of Arizona
Rachael Samberg, University of California-Berkeley
Julie Speer, Virginia Tech

Plus a number of valuable collaborators at OCLC

• Report expected in November 2018

oc.lc/rim
Methodology & promotion

- Online survey data collection: Oct 2017 – Jan 2018
  - English and Spanish versions

- Survey promotion through:
  - OCLC and euroCRIS communications channels and events worldwide
  - Communications by CRIS vendors and user communities
  - Listservs, social media, and announcements to research & library organizations
Known limitations

• Inherent difficulties of evaluating RIM practices internationally—with differences in practices, terminology, maturity, and local or national scope
  —This may have inadvertently limited the response of national/regional CRIS or funder systems
  —Absence of libraries in national/regional CRISs—in part because of our outreach and interest in library engagement
• Large, but fairly heterogeneous sample
  —Resulting sub-samples may be too small for significance
• Specific advocacy bias inevitably skews results (e.g., in favour of specific vendors and countries)
• Survey fatigue
RIM Survey responses: geographic overview

381 survey respondents from 44 countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th># Resp.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th># Resp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>39 (10%)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>39 (10%)</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>39 (10%)</td>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>28 (7%)</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>24 (6%)</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>14 (4%)</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>10 (3%)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>7 (2%)</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 respondent from each of the following countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Hungary, Lebanon, Mexico, Namibia, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates and Uruguay
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Geographic distribution of responses: some findings

• Widest insight ever on the degree of RIM practice implementation

• RIM is practised worldwide, with European representation by far the strongest

• Slightly biased results arising from specific advocacy patterns

• Remarkable differences with previous EUNIS/euroCRIS survey results
  • Particularly the absence of Norwegian responses
Well over half (58%) have a live RIM System

Respondents by RIM Status (n=381)

- Not considering: 49 (13%)
- Exploring: 46 (12%)
- Procuring: 13 (4%)
- Implementing: 51 (13%)
- Unknown: 222 (58%)

Live RIM Systems (n=193)*
Base: Institutions with a live RIM

- Pure (Elsevier): 30%
- Developed in-house: 28%
- Elements (Symplectic): 12%
- DSpace-CRIS (Open source): 10%
- Converis (Clarivate Analytics): 10%
- VIVO (Open source): 4%
- Profiles (Open source): 1%
- Other: 36%

*Note: 29 respondents did not provide their RIM system
RIM System Distribution: findings

- Note that we invited research institutions at any stage of RIM adoption to participate
  - Reveals a quickly shifting landscape, with many institutions currently exploring RIM
  - > 200 institutions with an active RIM provides a significant sample
  - More synthesis may reveal regional differences

- Diversity of RIM systems in use
  - Elsevier Pure and locally-developed systems have highest adoption
  - The “Other” category is also significant, featuring entries like IRIS (Italy), ResearchMaster (Aus/NZ), OMEGA-PSIR (Poland), InfoEd
DRIVERS—WHY RIM?
Reporting and compliance drive RIM adoption

Importance of Reasons for Pursing RIM Activities (n=222)
Base: Institutions with a live RIM

- Managing annual academic activity reporting:
  - Extremely important: 58%
  - Important: 28%
  - Somewhat important: 9%
  - Not important: 5%
  - N/A or Not sure: 1%

- Supporting institutional compliance:
  - Extremely important: 53%
  - Important: 26%
  - Somewhat important: 12%
  - Not important: 4%
  - N/A or Not sure: 1%

- Supporting institutional research reputation and strategic decision making:
  - Extremely important: 40%
  - Important: 42%
  - Somewhat important: 16%
  - Not important: 2%
  - N/A or Not sure: 4%

- Improving services for researchers:
  - Extremely important: 36%
  - Important: 43%
  - Somewhat important: 16%
  - Not important: 4%
  - N/A or Not sure: 4%

- Supporting expertise discovery:
  - Extremely important: 23%
  - Important: 46%
  - Somewhat important: 20%
  - Not important: 7%
  - N/A or Not sure: 4%

- Recording IR facilities and their use:
  - Extremely important: 11%
  - Important: 32%
  - Somewhat important: 25%
  - Not important: 17%
  - N/A or Not sure: 14%
But this varies by geographic region

Base: Institutions with a live RIM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Europe (n=95)</th>
<th>Australia (n=21)</th>
<th>U.S. &amp; Canada (n=22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing annual academic activity reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting institutional compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting institutional research reputation and strategic decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving services for researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting expertise discovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording institutional research facilities and their use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extremely important  ● Important  ■ Somewhat important  □ Not important  ▲ N/A or Not sure

Convenience and Compliance

- Collaborative project between
- Case studies on adoption of persistent identifiers in RIM infrastructures
  - Finland
  - Germany
  - The Netherlands

oc.lc/rim
RIM uses
Most important RIM functions

Importantly Functions of RIM (n=203)
Base: Institutions with a live RIM

- Registry of institutional research outputs: 77% Extremely important, 16% Important, 1% Somewhat important, 4% Not important, 1% N/A or Not sure
- External (e.g., National) research assessment: 56% Extremely important, 19% Important, 11% Somewhat important, 7% Not important, 7% N/A or Not sure
- Internal reporting: 52% Extremely important, 37% Important, 8% Somewhat important, 2% Not important, 3% N/A or Not sure
- Publicly available researcher profiles: 44% Extremely important, 34% Important, 11% Somewhat important, 3% Not important, 8% N/A or Not sure
- Compliance and open access to publications: 45% Extremely important, 29% Important, 14% Somewhat important, 7% Not important, 5% N/A or Not sure
- Annual academic activity reporting workflows: 35% Extremely important, 31% Important, 15% Somewhat important, 7% Not important, 11% N/A or Not sure
- Reporting scholarly impact: 32% Extremely important, 42% Important, 15% Somewhat important, 20% Not important, 3% N/A or Not sure
- Awards/grants management workflows: 29% Extremely important, 26% Important, 15% Somewhat important, 14% Not important, 16% N/A or Not sure
- Reuse (in CVs, biosketches, other web pages): 27% Extremely important, 39% Important, 19% Somewhat important, 5% Not important, 10% N/A or Not sure
- Compliance and open access to research datasets: 28% Extremely important, 26% Important, 21% Somewhat important, 13% Not important, 13% N/A or Not sure
- Identifying collaborators or expertise: 22% Extremely important, 36% Important, 26% Somewhat important, 5% Not important, 10% N/A or Not sure
- Reporting societal impact: 20% Extremely important, 33% Important, 29% Somewhat important, 6% Not important, 12% N/A or Not sure
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These again vary by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Europe (n=95)</th>
<th>Australia (n=21)</th>
<th>U.S. &amp; Canada (n=22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registry of institutional research outputs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External (e.g., National) research assessment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal reporting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly available researcher profiles</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance and open access to publications</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual academic activity reporting workflows</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting scholarly impact</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards/grants management workflows</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuse (in CVs, biosketches, other web pages)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance and open access to research datasets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying collaborators or expertise</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting societal impact</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- Extremely important
- Important
- Somewhat important
- Not important
- N/A or Not sure

Findings: RIM uses

• The majority of respondents report that their RIM is valuable as a registry of the institution’s research outputs.
• We can also see that institutions are using their RIM for multiple uses:
  ▪ External & internal assessment are among the most important (and unsurprising).
  ▪ Managing OA compliance is also important.
  ▪ Supporting the discovery of potential research collaborators is less important.
• We can also see how some of these differences vary by region.
RIM Uses

Research Information

- Research Repositories
- Annual Academic Progress Reviews
- Reuse: Faculty Web Pages, Bloktes/CVs
- Awards/Grants Management
- Profiles: Public or Campus Only
- External Research Assessment
- Internal Reports
HOW
RIM interoperates with multiple internal and external systems

**Internal Systems that Interoperate with your RIM (n=184)**
Base: Institutions with a live RIM
Note: Respondents could select more than one answer

- Human resources system: 78%
- Institutional authentication system: 76%
- Institutional repository: 43%
- Student information system: 42%
- University finance and accounting system: 36%
- Grants management system: 32%
- Analytics system: 26%
- Project management system: 24%
- Library management system: 22%
- Electronic Thesis/Dissertation (ETD) repository: 20%
- Research data repository: 16%
- Tech/knowledge transfer: 5%
- Active data management system: 3%
- Other: 16%
- None of the above: 3%

**External Systems that Interoperate with your RIM (n=178)**
Base: Institutions with a live RIM
Note: Respondents could select more than one answer

- Publication metadata sources: 76%
- Researcher/author ID registry/database: 65%
- Research metrics sources: 47%
- National or regional reporting system: 29%
- Aggregated research portals: 24%
- Government/private grants award system: 10%
- Organization ID registry/database: 7%
- Aggregated research data portals: 4%
- Other: 16%
- None of the above: 11%

---
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A very important functionality

Registry of institutional research outputs

- Extremely Important: 71%
- Important = Somewhat Important: 14%
- Not Important: 10%
- Not Sure: 4%
- Other: 1%

Function Perform Registry of institutional research outputs

- Haven't started yet: 41%
- Somewhat Successfully: 13%
- Successfully: 12%
- Unsuccessfully: 0%
- Very Successfully: 32%
- N/A: 2%
RIM and repositories

RIM AS A DEFAULT..

- **Institutional Repository**
  - Europe: 69% (n=95)
  - US & Canada: 14% (n=22)
  - Other Countries: 47% (n=19)

- **Research Data Repository**
  - Europe: 23% (n=95)
  - US & Canada: 9% (n=22)
  - Other Countries: 53% (n=19)

- **Electronic Thesis/Dissertation (ETD) Repository**
  - Europe: 48% (n=95)
  - US & Canada: 0% (n=22)
  - Other Countries: 42% (n=19)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Europe (n=93)</th>
<th>Australia (n=21)</th>
<th>U.S. &amp; Canada (n=22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human resources system</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional authentication system</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional repository</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student information system</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University finance and accounting system</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants management system</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytics system</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management system</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library management system</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Thesis/Dissertation (ETD) repository</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research data repository</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech/knowledge transfer</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active data management system</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External Systems that Interoperate with RIM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Europe (n=92)</th>
<th>Australia (n=21)</th>
<th>U.S. &amp; Canada (n=22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication metadata sources</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher/author ID registry/database</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research metrics sources</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National or regional reporting system</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated research portals</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/private grants award system</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization ID registry/database</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated research data portals</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Top Bibliographic Metadata Sources for RIM

Publication Metadata Sources that Populate your RIM (n=185)
Base: Institutions with a live RIM
Note: Respondents could select more than one answer

- Scopus: 72%
- Web of Science: 63%
- PubMed: 61%
- CrossRef: 44%
- ArXiv: 37%
- Europe PubMed Central: 26%
- Google Books: 12%
- CiNii: 11%
- SSRN: 10%
- RePEc: 9%
- WorldCat: 7%
- MLA International Bibliography: 7%
- dblp: 6%
- Scielo: 4%
- SAO/NASA Astrophysics Data System: 4%
- Other (Please specify): 11%
- None of the above: 14%

EBSCOhost (n=4)
Mendeley (n=4)
Espacenet (n=3)
### Protocols/Standards/Vocabularies that RIM Relies On

**Protocols/Standards/Vocabularies RIM Relies On (n=169)**

- **Base:** Institutions with a live RIM
- **Note:** Respondents could select more than one answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol/Vocabulary</th>
<th>Europe (n=89)</th>
<th>Australia (n=23)</th>
<th>U.S. &amp; Canada (n=19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OAI-PMH</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERIF/CERIF XML</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shibboleth</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of Science (FOS) Classification</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify):</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Researcher Identifiers in Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Europe (n=92)</th>
<th>Australia (n=21)</th>
<th>U.S. &amp; Canada (n=22)</th>
<th>Other Countries (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORCID</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scopus ID</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResearcherID</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PubMed ID</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arXiv ID</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National authority files</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISNI</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


by OCLC Research CC BY 4.0
Organization Identifiers in Use

Europe (n=88)  
- None of the above: 81%
- National authority files: 8%
- GRID: 1%
- Ringgold: 3%
- CrossRef Funder Registry: 2%
- ISNI: 0%
- Other: 6%

Australia (n=18)  
- None of the above: 72%
- National authority files: 0%
- GRID: 6%
- Ringgold: 17%
- CrossRef Funder Registry: 6%
- ISNI: 0%
- Other: 6%

U.S. & Canada (n=16)  
- None of the above: 75%
- National authority files: 0%
- GRID: 19%
- Ringgold: 0%
- CrossRef Funder Registry: 0%
- ISNI: 0%
- Other: 0%

Other Countries (n=36)  
- None of the above: 78%
- National authority files: 0%
- GRID: 6%
- Ringgold: 8%
- CrossRef Funder Registry: 6%
- ISNI: 0%
- Other: 6%

Some summary findings

• Congruent with our qualitative *Convenience and Compliance* findings

• Strong adoption of person identifiers
  
  o **ORCID** becoming a *de facto* standard in scholarly literature, but other identifiers also needed and used

  o **Organizational identifiers** largely unused
Some summary findings

• Fairly high degree of RIM system interoperability with other institutional systems – including IRs
• Significant workflows for funding information exchange both internally and externally
• Institutions leverage publications metadata harvesting
• Extensive integration of person identifiers like ORCID into RIM systems
• OrgID implementation remains very low (but worth a follow-up sometime in the near future)
• Nearly 50% now include externally-sourced bibliometrics
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Discussion

• Survey results and data to be published as an OCLC Research Report in 2018
• Follow us at hangingtogether.org
• More information at oc.lc/rim
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