Question Report - Better Together: Open new possibilities with Open Infrastructure (APAC time zones)		
#	**Question**	**Answer**
1	I don't see orcid on the list of posi adopted organisations, why?	ORCID's inaugural Board of Directors established a set of founding principles very early in our history, and have been guided by these, along with our values, vision, and mission, ever since. We are proud that we can demonstrate over a decade of compliance with our principles, which have never been changed. As you probably know, the POSI website was launched earlier this year by Crossref, although the Principles of Open Scholarly Infrastructure enshrined therein date back to a 2015 blog post. We are not fully aware of what drove Crossref to formalize them this year, but we do understand that the POSI principles themselves were, to some extent, inspired by ORCID's founding principles. ORCID's board has not yet evaluated POSI for their specific relevance to ORCID, but we think our own principles are broadly aligned with them. We believe our commitment to continually evaluating alignment with our own principles plays a significant part in our early and ongoing success, as well as the trust we have earned from. In case it's helpful, there's a blog post on the Crossref website about why we decided to adopt POSI and Geoffrey talks about the great model that was provided by the ORCID founding priciples :) https://www.crossref.org/blog/crossrefs-board-votes-to-adopt-the-principles-of-open-scholarly-infrastructure/
2	'@Vanessa, thank you for an informative presentation. One thing I would love to see in Crossref is the ability to amend existing DOI records, without having to redeposit (eg. if a URL should change, or if we want to add supplementary information to a previously deposited DOI). Where should we lodge these kinds of feature requests?	Hi Alex, so we are working on creating a new interface in future which will make it easier to see everything about your Crossref account in one place including in the long term a new content registration tool which will make it easier to make amendments to exitsting records. When it comes to adding some supplementary information like references and funding information you can currently send us a 'resource deposit' without having to do a full metadata deposit, find our how to do this here: https://www.crossref.org/documentation/metadata-stewardship/maintaining-your-metadata/resource-only-deposit/ You can also do a bulk URL update if you have a long list of URLs that need updating by uploading a csv list to the admin tool: https://www.crossref.org/documentation/metadata-stewardship/maintaining-your-metadata/updating-your-metadata/#00172 You can also let us know about what features you would like to see in a new helper tool on our community forum here: https://community.crossref.org/t/feedback-on-new-helper-tool/1721
3	So datacite is for patents? for eg	DataCite started out mainly to facilitate DOI registration for research data, we have been incorporating more types of resources for which DataCite DOIs can be applied to, including but not limited to data management plans, instruments, and even physical samples through our partnership with IGSN. More: https://datacite.org/
4	Are there any ways that you are seeing researchers advocate for the use of PIDs when using systems that don't natively support them?	Researchers are always keen for ways to save time and cut down in duplication. Having to re-enter information in numerous places can be very time consuming, especially if the value of doing so is not clear. So where we often see researchers advocate for the use of PIDs is in order to speed up their work flow and make life easier.
5	Is the experience of each of the organsiations (DataCite, ORCiD and CrossRef) that their is higher awareness of their organisations amongst librarians and support staff, and less amongst researchers? If so, does that need to change?	That's so far been the experience of Crossref in terms of awareness and knowledge about the value and use of metadata. As we have talked about today, infrastructure, when it works well, is often invisible. There's definitely more work to do in engaging researchers, raising awareness of the importance of metadata in terms of getting their work discovered and recognising the different outputs and actors of the research nexus, as well as work by publishers to make it as easy and streamlined as possible for researchers to provide this information.

6	Could all of you share success story/experience approach community to use services each of your organization	Talking from the DataCite perspective, we provide different types of memberships to meet organization or institute's needs, and the consortium model is particularly welcomed by the community, as it brings together members that share common traits, streamlines and localizes the support process, and is more cost-effective. More on DataCite membership models: https://datacite.org/become.html Each of the organizations present today run some version of the consortium model. A specific recent succes story at Crossref is that of linkages between registered grants at Crossref and other outputs. Funders started to register grants with Crossref in 2019. This stands to create a host of benefits to funders and the wider community. One of the biggest benefits is being able to track outputs related to specific grants in a more automated way. Of the 38,326 grants we had registered (as of March 2022), we found 20,834 links between research outputs and registered grants, involving 17,082 research outputs and 3,858 grants (10% of all registered grants.), so this is a great start and really demonstrates the value of the research nexus and making these connections visible in the metadata: https://www.crossref.org/blog/follow-the-money-or-how-to-link-grants-to-research-outputs/
7	what is the position of the publishers towards open infrastructures?	publishers are in the position to both benefit and contribute to the open scholarly infrastructure, all our organizations work closely with publishers (of various types of research outputs) and we are excited to keep the collaboration going strong
8	how can institutions help by pushing publishers their metadata towards open infrastructures? collective deals?	Deinitely requiring metadata deposit as part of deals (subscriptions/publishing payments etc) is a powerful way of improving things
9	How is ROR different from GRID?	GRID was operated by a for-profit company -- they handed off their public registry to ROR last fall. GRID is deprecated and ROR is its successor. The ROR organisation took the GRID database as a seed for the ROR database. ROR identifiers include GRID ids in a mapped external ID field along with ISNI and Wikidata and others https://www.digital-science.com/press-release/grid-passes-torch-to-ror/ Bit more background on the ROR blog: https://ror.org/blog/2021-07-12-ror-grid-the-way-forward/
10	I was not sure what "equity" actually means in open identifiers	Glad you asked, when we talk about equity we are mainly talking about open membership model, with a fee or fee-assistance program that is appropriate for organizations of different types, sizes, disciplines, and geographies. More on this see: Cousijn, H., Hendricks, G., & Meadows, A. (2021). Why openness makes research infrastructure resilient. Learned Publishing, 34(1), 71,Äì75. https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1361 I also want to share ORCID's latest launched program relating with equity: https://info.orcid.org/global-participation-program/