Name of dataset or data source:	Endangered Ecological Communities in Coastal Hazard Areas within Shoalhaven LGA 2023
Custodian of the dataset or data source:	Shoalhaven City Council
Description:	This vector dataset provides updated mapping of the distribution and condition of Endangered Ecological Communities in Shoalhaven City Council's coastal hazard areas. The report and mapping also includes updated mapping of Endangered Ecological Communities within tidal inundation risk areas within the Lower Shoalhaven River, St Georges Basin, Sussex Inlet, Berrara Creek and Lake Conjola. Ecoplanning were engaged by Shoalhaven City Council to conduct an assessment of Endangered Ecological Communities at 15 sites within the Shoalhaven Local Government Area. The sites are made up of a combination of nine Coastal Erosion sites and six Tidal Inundation sites. Regional vegetation mapping (Department of Planning and Environment 2013) identified that six Endangered Ecological Communities had been previously mapped within the study area including: • Bangalay Sand Forest in the Sydney Basin and South East Corner Bioregions • Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest on coastal floodplains of the NSW North Coast, Sydney Basin and South East Corner Bioregions. • Coastal Saltmarsh in the NSW North Coast Sydney Basin and South East Corner Bioregions. • Swamp Sclerophyll Forest on Coastal Floodplains of the NSW North Coast, Sydney Basin and South East Corner Bioregions. • Freshwater Wetlands on Coastal Floodplains of the NSW North Coast, Sydney Basin and South East Corner Bioregions. • Littoral Rainforest in the NSW North Coast, Sydney Basin and South East Corner Bioregions. With the exception of Littoral Rainforest, the remainder of these coastal Endangered Ecological Communities were recorded within the study area. A total of 105.53 ha of the study area was identified as supporting Endangered Ecological Communities, including 87.02 ha in the Tidal Inundation study area and 18.51 ha in the Coastal Erosion study area. Bangalay Sand Forest and Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest were the most widespread communities, accounting for 91.39 ha of the 105.53 ha of endangered ecological community (EEC) vegetation recorded respectively. Generally, the mapping produced from field survey conforms reasonably closely to existing vegetation mapping. A total of 23 Biodiversity Assessment Method (2020) plots were completed to assess the Endangered Ecological Communities present in a standardised and robust way. These plots determined that the vegetation within the Coastal Erosion and Tidal Inundation study areas was in moderate to good condition with Vegetation Integrity scores ranging from VI 32.8 to VI 70.1. Whilst systematic threatened species surveys were beyond the scope of this assessment, one threatened flora species was incidentally recorded during field survey. Approximately 40 Melaleuca biconvexa plants were observed in vegetation to the north of St Georges Basin Sports Ground, south of The Wool Road. It is anticipated that the population size would be higher, and potentially significantly higher, if parallel field traverses were conducted. Based on the higher cover and diversity of High Threat Exotic (HTE) species present within Bangalay Sand Forest, compared to Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest, it is recommended that the former be prioritised for weed

management activities. Likewise, it was noted that the Coastal Erosion sites (containing Bangalay Sand Forest) had a higher cover of HTEs than the Tidal Inundation sites, therefore the former should also be prioritised for weed management actions.

Data quality rating:	★Institutional Environment - 4 ☆Accuracy - 3 ☆Coherence - 3 ☆Interpretability - 2 ☆Accessibility - 3

INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Very Good ★

✔ 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

✔ Data collection is authorised by law, regulation or agreement

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

✗ The following governance roles and responsibilities for this asset are clearly assigned:

- Information Asset Owner
- Information Asset Custodian
- Information Steward

ACCURACY

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.

✔ 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

✗ 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.

COHERENCE

Good ☆

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

✔ Elements within the data can be meaningfully compared.

✔ 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).

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

✗ 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 **Fair** ☆

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

✔ 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 help users evaluate the accuracy of the data and any level of error

✗ 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 **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 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

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:	Shoalhaven City Council
Data Broker email:	council@shoalhaven.nsw.gov.au
Data Broker phone:	N/A

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 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?