| | |
|---|---|
| **Name of dataset or data source:** | Bird, Ground Dwelling Vertebrate and Invertebrate Data |
| **Custodian of the dataset or data source:** | ED Science (EES) |
| **Description:** | These data were collected as part of the NSW Grazing Study. Surveys were conducted at a subset (108 sites) of the 451 NSW Grazing Study sites to determine the abundance and diversity of fauna.<br><br>The following methods were employed;<br><br>**Small mammals and reptiles** were surveyed using dry pit-fall traps, funnel traps, Elliott traps and timed searches. Vertebrate trap lines consisted of two 20 L buckets (150 mm deep), two 150 mm diameter PVC pipes (500-600 mm deep), and four double-ended funnel traps placed under or along a 20 m drift-fence. Pit-fall traps were placed flush with the ground under the drift fence. Captured specimens were provided with sarking sheets, shade cloth sheets, PVC tubes, Styrofoam blocks, litter and some soil in each trap to prevent over-heating or drowning in the event of rain. Ant rid powder and sprays were used at sites where ants were abundant. Funnel traps were located at either side of the drift fence, between the end pairs of pit-fall traps. A sarking or 90% shade-cloth cover was placed over the top of the funnel traps to buffer temperatures inside the traps. Captured specimens were provided with a cardboard roll and/or a sheet of sarking for shelter. All fauna surveys were conducted with approval from the Animal Ethics Committee (approval number: 140602/02).<br><br>Four Elliot traps were also positioned near each trap line in appropriate habitat patches such as under shrubs, or near logs or rocks to enhance capture rates. Each trap was baited with a mixture of rolled oats and peanut butter. Traps were covered with shade cloth or sarking cover to buffer temperature extremes for captured specimens. All trap-lines were checked and cleared early each morning and late each afternoon over a 4 day period (8 times). The species name of each specimen captured was recorded and the specimen marked to obtain an assessment of the number of recaptures.<br><br>Two 30 minute habitat searches were undertaken at each 100 m x 200m site on different afternoons. Searches were targeted towards potential reptile habitat (e.g. open patches, leaf litter, logs, rocks, bark) by experienced personnel. Species were generally identified without the need for capture, although some species did need to be captured with a noose or by hand for identification.<br><br>**Bird surveys** were conducted during two springs to early summers over two consecutive years. Each year, all sites were sampled twice for 20 minutes, on different days at different times, by a single observer. Surveys commenced from dawn and concluded by 12 noon or if the ambient temperature reached 30 degrees C or if it became excessively windy (>39 km/hr). In addition, we collected data on the cover and density of trees, shrubs, groundcover, bare soil, litter and coarse woody debris along a 200 m belt transect that formed the central line of the 2 ha bird sampling plot. For each sampling site we derived a habitat complexity score. Six habitat attributes were rated on a scale of 0 to 3 and the scores for all six attributes totalled to give an overall score for a site. Thus sites with a larger score have greater habitat complexity.<br><br>**Ground dwelling invertebrates** were sampled using both |

| | |
|---|---|
| | wet and dry pitfall traps. Wet pitfall traps were 250 ml plastic screw-top containers half filled with ethylene glycol, installed at each corner of a 5 m x 5 m plot, plus one trap located centrally within the plot. Each pitfall trap was placed flush with the ground with a cover to prevent damage or loss of material due to rainfall. Traps were left open for five consecutive nights at each site. Incidental captures of large invertebrates (i.e. scorpions, spiders, centipedes, beetles, etc. > 1 cm, but not ants) were also collected from the vertebrate fauna pitfall traps each morning. |
| **Data quality rating:** | ★Institutional Environment - 5<br>★Accuracy - 5<br>★Coherence - 5<br>☆Interpretability - 2<br>★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 | Fair | ☆ |
|---|---|---|

✔ 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

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

✗ 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

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**

DPIE 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:** | Department of Planning, Industry and Environment |
| **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 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?