Name of dataset or data source:	Murray-Darling Basin floodplain vegetation mapping, Darling - VIS_ID 4454
Custodian of the dataset or data source:	ED Science (E&H)
Description:	The Murray-Darling Basin Plan (available at http://www.comlaw.gov.au/Details/F2012L02240) was developed under the Commonwealth Water Act 2007 and aims to deliver a coordinated approach to water use by States and Territories in the Murray-Darling Basin (MDB), underpinned by a commitment to restoring the long-term health of rivers and wetlands in the Basin. To achieve this, the Basin Plan sets a long term average Sustainable Diversion Limit (SDL) for surface water and groundwater use across the major valleys in the MDB, and incorporates an Environmental Watering Plan (EWP) that ensures surplus water beyond SDLs is made available for the natural floodplain and wetland systems. The EWP is central to the Basin Plan as it aims to achieve the best possible environmental outcomes in its use of environmental water, in terms of size, timing and nature of river flows. The EWP is supported by the Environmental Water Recovery Strategy, a voluntary water buyback instrument (SEWPAC 2012). The long term average SDL for surface water flow is currently set by the Basin Plan at 10,873 gigalitres per year (GL/y). This includes 3,468 GL/y for the northern Basin, which establishes a water 'saving' of 390 GL/y from water allocations previously set under the Living Murray initiative (MDBA 2011). These savings are available as 'environmental water' which is regulated by the Commonwealth Environmental Water Office (CEWO) via the EWP. Water allocations in the northern Basin are currently under review via the Northern Basin Review, which is due for finalisation in mid-2016. This review is expected to improve environmental science in relation to floodplain systems in the Condamine-Balonne and Barwon-Darling River systems, and may recommend changes to the Basin Plan accordingly. A key part of the Review is to improve knowledge about environmental assets within river systems of the northern Basin (e.g. floodplain and wetland vegetation, fish, water birds), and how they respond and interact to fluctuations in surface water flow. Improved knowledge about the native vegetation of inland floodplain systems is fundamental to the Northern Basin Review. To improve information about the distribution and extent of floodplain and wetland vegetation types in the northern Basin, Eco Logical Australia (ELA) was commissioned by the Murray Darling Basin Authority (MDBA) to map the distribution of plant community types (PCTs) within a large section of the Darling floodplain west of Louth, and within the Condamine-Balonne system south of the NSW-Queensland border. An improved knowledge about the distribution and extent of floodplain PCTs will inform how environmental water allocations might be refined, and is thus an important component of the Northern Basin Review. For more information please refer to the technical report Eco Logical Australia 2015. Vegetation of the Barwon-Darling and Condamine-Balonne floodplain systems of New South Wales: Mapping and survey of plant community types. Prepared for Murray-Darling Basin Authority. Attributes: PCT_ID = NSW Plant Community Type Code PCT_LABEL = Plant Community Type Label BROAD_VEG = Broad Vegetation Type HYDROL_ECOL = Hydro-Ecological

	Functional Group VEG_FORMAT = Vegetation Formation VEG_CLASS = Vegetation Class Floodplain = Floodplain vegetation (yes or no) MAP_LABEL = Short vegetation label suitable for display on map products RE = Regional Ecosystem Code RE_LABEL = Regional Ecosystem Label ACCURACY = Attribute accuracy (values 1 to 5) 5 - Verified in the field by either full floristic, rapid or API (observational) site 4 - Not verified in the field but likely to be correct due to extrapolation from similar verified pattern or verified in field but uncertain of boundary 3 - Probably correct although could be one of a few related communities 2 - Possibly correct but might be one of several other communities 1 - Unlikely to be correct VIS_ID 4454
Data quality rating:	★Institutional Environment - 5 ☆Accuracy - 3 ☆Coherence - 2 ☆Interpretability - 3 ☆Accessibility - 2

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	**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	Fair ☆

✔ 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.

✗ 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).

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	Fair ☆

✔ 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 available online with an open licence

✗ 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:	Murray-Darling Basin Authority
Data Broker email:	N/A
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?