Name of dataset or data source:	Identification of corridors of river recovery for NSW Hunter catchments
Custodian of the dataset or data source:	N/A

Description:	By connecting corridors of river recovery, resilience can be built into river systems to mitigate against future floods and droughts driven by anthropogenic disturbance or climate extremes. This database can be used to systematically analyse where corridors of geomorphic river recovery could be created via conservation or rehabilitation. Analysis is undertaken in ArcGIS using the recovery potential layer of the Open Access NSW River Styles database that is available from DPIE (www.dpie.nsw.gov.au). The River Styles database was accessed in January 2021. The database and associated workflow identifies reach and loci connections based on different combinations of recovery potential classes. Reach connections are defined as an upstream to downstream section of river that is connected end-to-end, and loci connections are defined as isolated sections of river from which recovery can be seeded and extended into adjacent reaches. This map for all freshwater stream length of the NSW Hunter catchments, shows the spatial distribution of thirteen connections based on combinations and sequences of conservation, strategic and high recovery potential targets. Other connections of interest to river practitioners can be identified and >80 different user-defined scenarios run using a workflow available at protocols.io.
	Attribution to: Macquarie University, D Agnew and K Fryirs (2022) Corridors of river recovery database and workflow. Data accessed from The Sharing and Enabling Environmental Data Portal.
	This work is funded by an Australian Research Council Linkage project based at Macquarie University with industry partners Landcare Australia and Hunter-Central Rivers Local Land Services.
	This work is published in two Open Access papers:
	• Agnew D, Fryirs K (2022) Identifying corridors of river recovery in coastal NSW Australia, for use in river management decision support and prioritisation systems. PLoS ONE 17(6): e0270285. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0270285 • Agnew D, Graves BP, Fryirs K (2022) A GIS workflow for the identification of corridors of geomorphic river recovery across landscapes. PLoS ONE 17(12): e0278831. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0278831
	The workflow is available at: https://www.protocols.io/view/a-gis-workflow-for-the-identification-of-corridors-n2bvj8625gk5/v1

Data quality rating:	☆Institutional environment - 3 ★Accuracy - 4 ★Coherence - 5 ★Interpretability - 4 ★Accessibility - 4

INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT	**Good**	☆

✔ Does the information have the potential to enhance services or service delivery?

✔ Data governance roles and responsibilities are clearly assigned for the dataset or data source

✔ The Custodial agency has no commercial interest or conflict of interest in the data

✗ The data are collected and managed according to a Data Quality Framework

✗ Data collection is authorised by law, regulation or agreement

ACCURACY	Very Good	★

✔ Data has been subject to a data assurance process (For example: Checking for errors at each stage of data collection and processing, or verifying data entry and making corrections if necessary.)

✔ There are no known gaps in the data or if there are gaps (for example: non-responses, missing records, data not collected), they have been identified in caveats attached to the dataset.

✔ No changes have been made or other factors identified (for example: weighting, rounding, de-identification of data, changes or flaws in data collection or verification methods) that could affect the validity of the data; or any changes/factors have been identified in caveats attached to the asset.

✔ The data collection met the objectives of the primary user. The data correctly represents what it was designed to measure, monitor or report.

✗ Data is revised and the revision is published if errors are identified

COHERENCE	Excellent	★

✔ Standard definitions, common concepts, classifications and data recording practices been used.

✔ Elements within the data can be meaningfully compared.

✔ This data is generally consistent with similar or related data sources from the same discipline

✔ The data can be analysed over time (for example, there have not been any significant changes in the way items are defined, classified or counted over time).

✔ The data does not form part of a collection or, if it is the latest in a series of data releases, there have not been any changes in methodology or external impacts since the last data release.

INTERPRETABILITY	Very Good	★

✔ Information is available about the primary data sources and methods of data collection (e.g. instruments, forms, instructions).

✔ Information is available to help users evaluate the accuracy of the data and any level of error

✔ Information is available to explain concepts, help users correctly interpret the data and understand how it can be used

✔ Information is available to explain ambiguous or technical terms used in the data

✗ A data dictionary is available to explain the meaning of data elements, their origin, format and relationships

ACCESSIBILITY	Very Good	★

✔ Data is available online with an open licence

✔ Data is available in machine-processable, structured form (e.g. CSV format instead of an image scan of a table)

✔ Data is available in a non-proprietary format (e.g. CSV, XML)

✔ Data is linked to other data, to provide context (e.g. employee ID is linked to employee name or species name is linked to genus)

✗ Data is described using open standards (e.g. RDF, SPARQL) and persistent identifiers (URIs or DOIs)

DATA DISCLAIMER

NSW Government is committed to producing data that is accurate, complete and useful. Notwithstanding its commitment to data quality, NSW Government gives no warranty as to the fitness of this data for a particular purpose. While every effort is made to ensure data quality, the data is provided "as is". The burden for fitness of the data relies completely with the User. NSW Government shall not be held liable for improper or incorrect use of the data.

For more information about this dataset or data source, contact:	Macquarie University

Understanding the Data Quality Statement

The data quality statement aims to help you understand how a particular dataset could be used and whether it can be compared with other, similar datasets. It provides a description of the characteristics of the data to help you decide whether the data will be fit for your specific purpose.
The Data Quality statement is prepared by the data custodian (provider of the dataset), using a questionnaire that has been developed in accordance with the NSW Government Standard for Data Quality Reporting.
About the quality rating:
The reporting questionnaire asks five questions for each of these data quality dimensions:

- Institutional Environment
- Accuracy
- Coherence
- Interpretability
- Accessibility

For each question: "yes" = 1 point; "no" = 0 points
The number of points determines the Quality Level for each dimension (high, medium, low).
Only dimensions with four or five points receive a star.

Points	Quality Level	Star / No Star
0	Poor	No Star
1	Poor	No Star
2	Fair	No Star
3	Good	No Star
4	Very Good	Star
5	Excellent	Star

Evaluating data quality

Quality relates to the data's "fitness for purpose". Users can make different assessments about the data quality of the same data, depending on their "purpose" or the way they plan to use the data.

The following questions may help you evaluate data quality for your requirements. This list is not exhaustive.Generate your own questions to assess data quality according to your specific needs and environment.

- What was the primary purpose or aim for collecting the data?
- How well does the coverage (and exclusions) match your needs?
- How useful are these data at small levels of geography?
- Does the population presented by the data match your needs?
- To what extent does the method of data collection seem appropriate for the information being gathered?
- Have standard classifications (eg industry or occupation classifications) been used in the collection of the data?If not, why? Does this affect the ability to compare or bring together data from different sources?
- Have rates and percentages been calculated consistently throughout the data?
- Is there a time difference between your reference period, and the reference period of the data?
- What is the gap of time between the reference period (when the data were collected) and the release date of thedata?
- Will there be subsequent surveys or data collection exercises for this topic?
- Are there likely to be updates or revisions to the data after official release?