ESA – 511 SIZE AND LOCATION OF PROTECTED TERRESTRIAL AND MARINE PARKS

Summary of Quality Assessment Results

Overall ESA Assessment	Institutional Environment	Relevance	Timeliness	Accuracy	Coherence	Interpretability	Accessibility
● Amber	● Green	● Green	● Amber	● Amber	● Red	● Green	● Green

List of Contributing Datasets and Custodians

- Collaborative Australia Protected Area Database (Dept of the Environment)

ESA Elements

Pillar	Dimension	Description	Critical Frequency	Critical Spatial	Critical Disaggregation
Environment	Land	Includes statistical information on the size and location of protected land and marine areas managed for biodiversity conservation.	Annually	National, Regional (Natural Resource Management)	Protected Areas

Overall ESA Assessment

The quality of ESA – 511 Size and Location of Protected Terrestrial and Marine Parks was assessed as an amber traffic light for the purpose of ESA. The overall quality of this statistic was reasonable, but lacked in some areas for the quality indicators selected and there was a need identified for some investment to improve the quality. The data custodian can be contacted for further information about the quality of the dataset which contributed to the statistic.

For more detailed quality information about each dimension, see over page

ESA – 511 SIZE AND LOCATION OF PROTECTED TERRESTRIAL AND MARINE PARKS

Institutional Environment

The statistic scored a green traffic light for institutional environment. There were sufficient quality and risk management processes in place and archiving processes. Staff were trained in data collation. Training on the statistical purpose of the administrative records could be improved.

Relevance

The statistic scored a green traffic light for relevance. All key information identified in the description of the statistic was available. The critical spatial levels and critical disaggregations identified for the statistic were also available.

Timeliness

The statistic scored an amber traffic light for timeliness. The duration between collection and release of data was timely and users were able to access the release of new data when expected. The critical frequency for the statistic was not met.

Accuracy

The statistic scored an amber traffic light for accuracy. The target population was represented sufficiently for the statistic. Most known under or overcounts were being managed and there were sufficient measures in place to adjust for missing values in most cases. The accuracy varied for information collected within the dataset.

Coherence

The statistic scored a red traffic light for coherence. Some information for the statistic was not able to be compared over time; while population and characteristic definitions remained mostly consistent, collection procedures changed over time. There was variation between data compiled from multiple sources. External sources were available for data confrontation.

Interpretability

The statistic scored a green traffic light for interpretability. Data quality statements, information to help users to understand the data and descriptions of conceptual limitations of the data were available. Users were able to access additional support if needed.

Accessibility

The statistic scored a green traffic light for accessibility. The key information, including visualisations such as graphs or maps, was publicly available and users could access data in a machine readable format, Excel and other formats such as html. The key information and other data was accessible for free.

Areas for Improvement

- The critical frequency for the statistic was not met.
- The accuracy varied for information collected within the dataset.
- There was variation between data compiled from multiple sources which affected coherence.