**CRIS/IR Type of content**

This graph answers two of the most pressing questions raised in the past few years: are CRISs replacing IRs? Are the two systems overlapping in their functionalities? Both questions seem to get a negative answer.

The two systems are clearly complementary: while IRs are the preferred ones for managing publications, dissertations and datasets, CRISs are regularly chosen for managing all the remaining data. It is worth noticing that datasets are managed in a still very small percentage of institutions and that the only entity that sees a certain overlapping is “dissertations and thesis”.

**Protocols, standards and vocabularies**

The graph shows that the three most frequently adopted technologies and standards are (in order of popularity): OAI-PMH, CERIF and ORCID. This result could be explained by the emphasis placed on Open Access policies, interoperability and data exchange among different systems, and the unique identification of researchers.

These three areas are all somehow related not only to technological decisions, but to political ones as well, both at individual institution and at governmental level.

The two systems are clearly complementary: while IRs are the preferred ones for managing publications, dissertations and datasets, CRISs are regularly chosen for managing all the remaining data. It is worth noticing that datasets are managed in a still very small percentage of institutions and that the only entity that sees a certain overlapping is “dissertations and thesis”.

The image shows the current trends in CRIS and IR adoption at institutions. IRs are much more mature systems and they have been used for a longer period of time, while CRISs are kind of new in the research information management area but their adoption has significantly speeded up in the last five years.