Name of dataset or data source:	Vegetation surveys and mapping of the Crinolyn and Windella Ramsar sites of the Gwydir wetlands 2023
Custodian of the dataset or data source:	ED Biodiversity & Conservation (E&H)
Description:	This dataset is the Plant Community Type (PCT) mapping for the Crinolyn and Windella Ramsar sites of the Gwydir wetlands based on from the tree demographic and full floristic plot vegetation surveys undertaken by Eco Logical Australia from 12 April to 16 April 2023 under the NSW Department of Planning and Environment Gwydir Reconnecting Watercourse Country Program. Within Crinolyn, three PCTs were recorded, two of which (PCT 40 and 53) occur in two distinct forms and form the dominant vegetation communities within the site. A total of four PCTs were recorded within Windella, one of which (PCT 53) occurs in two distinct forms. Coolabah woodland (PCT 40a and 40b) occupied a considerable extent (33.02 ha combined) of Crinolyn and the presence of dead Coolabah throughout areas of PCT 53a, indicate a greater previous extent of Coolabah woodland within and surrounding the site. The extent of Coolabah woodland (PCT 40b) across Windella is less extensive, consisting mostly of patches featuring one mature tree and surrounding saplings and seedlings. PCT 182, characterised by dense stands of Typha domingensis (Narrow-leaved Cumbungi), dominates the central and southern portions of Windella. Following recent inundation, Narrow-leaved Cumbungi is widespread across the majority of the site, featuring as a measurable component of the remaining three other PCTs. A total of two tree demographic / full floristic plots and four full floristic monitoring plots were established in both the Crinolyn and Windella Ramsar sites. A total of 70 flora species (comprising 50 native and 20 exotic species) were recorded within Crinolyn full floristic plots, whilst a total of 48 flora species (comprising 33 native and 15 exotic species) were recorded within Windella full floristic plots. Condition class schemas developed for flood-dependent PCTs were applied to Crinolyn and Windella full floristic plot data. Condition class results were consistent for PCTs across both Crinolyn and Windella, with PCT 40 plots (PCT 40a and 40b) assessed as either Intermediate/Poor or Intermediate, whilst PCT 53a plots ranged from Intermediate to Good or Excellent/Benchmark and PCT 182 plots were assessed as Intermediate. A total of 45 trees were assessed within the two tree demographic plots (CRIN_3 – PCT 40b and CRIN_6 – PCT 40 a) established and surveyed within Crinolyn Coolabah woodland patches. Despite the two plots occurring in the two different forms of Coolabah woodland (PCT 40a and PCT 40b), major differences in tree condition between the two sites were not apparent. A total of 65 trees were assessed within the two tree demographic plots (WIND_2 and WIND_3 – both PCT 40 b) established and surveyed within Windella Coolabah woodland patches. Both plots recorded consistent results, reflective of the similar structure of the Coolabah woodland patches present within Windella. Landscape features or structures present within and surrounding the Crinolyn and Windella Ramsar sites which may influence inundation and hydrological regimes were noted during the field survey, most evidently drainage channels that have been constructed within both sites. Both drainage channels influence the flow of water across both sites and in doing so, also influence the distribution and composition of vegetation within the sites. Away from site boundaries, and apart from Phyla canescens (Lippia) which was widespread across both sites, weed cover was generally low and no listed weed species for the region were recorded during field surveys (Local Land Services 2017). Crinolyn and

Windella Ramsar sites contain vegetation reflective of functioning wetland systems which vary in form and condition across their extent, and in addition to their individual ecological value, are an important part of the wider Gwydir Wetlands. At a broader scale, the separation of the sites from one another and surrounding wetlands is apparent, as is the influence of external factors such as the scale and intensity of surrounding land use. The vegetation and conditions within both sites at the time of field surveys were typical of a recent 'wet' period and may contrast considerably with 'dry' period conditions. Given this, there may be value in assessing condition changes across both sites through remote sensing and a follow up 'dry period' field survey. It is also recommended that a revision of the boundaries of both Crinolyn and Windella Ramsar sites be undertaken in order to maximise the extent of remnant vegetation and overall ecological value of both sites.

Data quality rating:

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

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.

ℹ Find out more about the quality assurance processes from the NSW Government Standard for Data Quality Reporting. https://www.finance.nsw.gov.au/ict/resources/data-quality-standard

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 — Excellent ★

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

✔ 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

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

You must check and comply with the licensing conditions for the information you wish to use. This may require you to contact the Department, 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.

The Department 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.

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?