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Financial COIs:
I work as a freelance academic consultant who is paid for this line of work on a per-client basis, and have done so for the American Heart Association as a subcontractor for Stratos.
I have no current or prior financial (or otherwise) connection with ORCID.
Why ORCID is suitable for funders tracking awardees

- ORCID is suitable generally, as:
  - it’s a Permanent ID for researchers
  - that already acts/is used as a form of “academic CV”
  - where users update and *verify* their own information and is increasing in uptake.

- Funders who are members have access to member-only data: in the same way that they can push data to those who authorize them, they can also retrieve data *made available to them*.

Therefore, the findings I’ve made so far are:

a) based on the bare minimum of what’s available, and

b) can be improved upon by guidance you give to awardees/applicants.
Initial findings working with a small public ORCID dataset

Kinds of Information *recorded*:

- **Person**
  - Names (except other credit names)
  - Email
  - Bio
  - Websites/Social Media
  - Country
  - Keywords
  - External IDs

- **Note: Demographics Not Included**
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Kinds of Information *recorded*:

- Activities
  - Education
  - Employment
  - Funding
  - Works
  - Distinctions, Invited Positions, Qualifications, Service, Membership
  - *(Journal Article) Peer Review; Research Resources*
What I did

I relied primarily on the annual “data dump” of public records from ORCID, and went through records by hand.

- Individual files of each record which are in XML format
- Did this in order to understand structure and content of records
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Kinds of Information generally *available* and somewhat *standardized*, for tracking interest:

- Current location and job title
  - Dates
- “Works” e.g. publications
  - Dates
  - Venue
  - Title
- Funding since award
  - Source
  - Amount
  - Title
  - Description
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Caveats

- No emails (publicly)
- Variations on data availability, based on what person set as private/public
- Variations on current location e.g. move to LinkedIn
- While data is more likely to be verified by author and *correctly attributed*, some may be missing purely by *omission*, or have inaccuracies
  - Dependent on how often author maintains account
  - However, may be likely to change with increasing focus on externally verified info
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Opportunities

- Member orgs have access to member API
- Communication to your applicants and awardees could drastically increase the information available to you as a member organization
- For various reasons, ORCID data is only likely to continue to get *better*, but also applicants likely to be motivated to keep it updated to reduce effort
- Last update date very recent i.e. same day (likely through API connections) - which is public, even if no other information is, suggesting more data likely to be available from member API.
- Opportunities to push “service” etc into unused categories.
General technical considerations for getting member data

General recommendation: Need for a developer to set up connection to API and retrieve what you want/need and return to you based on your preferred output.
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