

Name of dataset or data source:	Coolah Tops National Park Vegetation 2019. VIS_ID 5105
Custodian of the dataset or data source:	ED Science (E&H)
Description:	<p>Eco Logical Australia was commissioned by the National Park and Wildlife Service (NPWS) to undertake vegetation survey and mapping of Coolah Tops National Park in 2019. The reserve includes the former Bundella and Warung State Forests and was gazetted as National Park in 1996. The reserve forms part of the Liverpool Range which makes up the largest lava field province in NSW, dated between 32 and 40 million years covering an area of over 6,000km² with up to 400m thickness of basalt.</p> <p>The project sought to review existing data and mapping and align vegetation communities with the current state-wide Plant Community Type classification through the collection of strategic data on floristic and structural diversity. Existing vegetation surveys and mapping were reviewed and supplemented with over 340 rapid data points. Plant Community Type mapping was undertaken at a scale of between 1:2,500 and 1:10,000 using a range of datasets. Development of linework and attribution of Plant Community Types was undertaken in three dimensions using high resolution stereo ADS40 imagery. The final mapped product is considered accurate at a 1:5,000 scale. A total of 464 species from 82 plant families were recorded, of which 13% were exotic (four being priority weeds). A total of 24 unique Plant Community Types (totalling 16,264 hectares) were mapped. In addition, more than 160 separate subtypes were mapped due to significant variability with each Plant Community Type based on the dominant species in each patch. The vast majority of vegetation mapped falls within the Grassy Woodlands Formation, followed by Dry and Wet Sclerophyll Forests respectively. A range of management considerations are discussed including: management of old growth forests dominated by <i>Eucalyptus pauciflora</i> (Snow Gum), <i>E. nobilis</i> (Mountain Ribbon Gum) and <i>E. laevopinea</i> (Silvertop Stringybark); inappropriate fire regimes; biosecurity including feral animal and weed management; and track maintenance. Based on the results of this project, the following recommendations have been developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct detailed research into the likely fire ecology of each PCT including recent and likely historic fire regimes as well as sensitive species to better inform fire management requirements. • Review and update relevant fire management plans taking into consideration the minimum fire intervals, mosaic burning practises, the adequacy of existing trail networks, management of fire in long unburnt forests and consideration of impacts to conservation significant species. • Establish a biodiversity monitoring program to determine changes and help manage the effects of climate change over time. As an isolated basalt plateau, many of the species and communities that occur in the reserve are restricted and are unlikely to be able to adapt in a changing climate. • Control priority and environmental weeds. Early detection and eradication of any Scotch Broom or Gorse is recommended. • Control feral animals including goats, pigs and deer. • Should additional funding become available, additional targeted vegetation survey across a range of PCTs, particularly in the south east where access is limited, would help to further define and understand the floristic and structural diversity of the reserve. • Spring surveys for rare and threatened species including orchids are recommended in wetland areas, high altitude forests and in steep gullies and rock outcrops. • Investigate the significance of rare and regionally significant PCTs with the intent of

nominating communities for listing under the BC Act and/or EPBC Act. Specifically, a review of PCT 497 Teatree shrubland / sedge land / forbland swamp wetland should be undertaken for consideration of amendment to the listing of the BC Act Endangered Ecological Community Upland Wetlands of the Drainage Divide of the New England Tableland Bioregion. It is understood that EES is currently undertaking a review of the state-wide PCT classification including a complete reanalysis with the intent of refining each PCT and developing positive diagnostic species. This review may help to redefine some of the PCTs mapped as part of this project, and some new PCTs may be created and old PCTs retired. A review of the mapping undertaken as part of this project is recommended once the review has been completed.

Data quality rating:

- ★ Institutional Environment - 5
- ★ Accuracy - 5
- ★ Coherence - 5
- ☆ Interpretability - 3
- ★ Accessibility - 5

INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Excellent



- ✓ Does the information have the potential to enhance services or service delivery?
- ✓ The data aligns with the Data Quality Framework, including:
 - Legislation
 - Policies
 - Information Asset Governance
 - Standards
 - Data Management Plans
- ✓ The following governance roles and responsibilities for this asset are clearly assigned:
 - Information Asset Owner
 - Information Asset Custodian
 - Information Steward
- ✓ Data collection is authorised by law, regulation or agreement
- ✓ The Custodial agency has no commercial interest or conflict of interest in the data

ACCURACY

Excellent



- ✓ 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.)
- ✓ Data is revised and the revision is published if errors are identified
- ✓ 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.

COHERENCE**Excellent**

- ✓ Standard definitions, common concepts, classifications and data recording practices have 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**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

- ✗ A data dictionary is available to explain the meaning of data elements, their origin, format and relationships
- ✗ Information is available to explain ambiguous or technical terms used in the data

- i Find out more about the data dictionary from the Custodian (contact details below).
- i Find out more about the primary data sources and methods of data collection from the Custodian (contact details below).
- i Find out more about concepts used in this dataset and how to understand or interpret the data from the Custodian (contact details below).
- i Find out more about ambiguous or technical terms used in the data from the Custodian (contact details below).

ACCESSIBILITY**Excellent**

- ✓ 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 described using open standards (e.g. RDF, SPARQL) and persistent identifiers (URIs or DOIs)
- ✓ 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 DISCLAIMER

You must check and comply with the licensing conditions for the information you wish to use. This may require you to contact the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE), or other custodial agency, or the third party copyright owner for permission to use the material. You may also use any material in accordance with rights you may have under the [Copyright Act 1968](#) (Cth), for example under the fair dealing provisions or statutory licences. Use of material in a way not permitted by this copyright notice may be an infringement of copyright. Infringing copyright may expose you to legal action by, and liability to, the copyright owner. Wherever a third party holds copyright in material, the copyright remains with that party. Their permission may be required to

use the material and you should contact that party directly. As far as practicable, material for which the copyright is owned by a third party will be clearly labelled. Excluded material can only be used under the specific terms of use attached to that material. If you want to use this material in a manner that is not covered by those specific terms of use, you must request permission from the copyright owner of the material.

DPE endeavours to make sure that information provided is correct at the time of its publication. However, as necessary you should obtain independent advice before making any decision based on the information. The information is made available on the understanding that custodial agencies and the State of NSW accept no responsibility for any damage, cost, loss or expense incurred by you as a result of:

- any error, omission or misrepresentation in the information provided
- without limiting the above, any delay, failure or error in recording, displaying or updating information, including but not limited to, data relating to credit holdings.

Custodial agencies and the State of New South Wales disclaim all responsibility and all liability (including without limitation, liability in negligence) for all expenses, losses, damages and costs you might incur as a result of the information being inaccurate or incomplete in any way, and for any reason.

For more information about this dataset or data source, contact:	NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water
Data Broker email:	data.broker@environment.nsw.gov.au
Data Broker phone:	131555

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 dataquality 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 the data?
- 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?