



**THE MARINE BIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF
THE UNITED KINGDOM**
Data Archive for Seabed Species and Habitats



Table 1. Quality assessment (QA) criteria.

Level	Spatial accuracy	Taxonomic accuracy	Methodological consistency	Temporal Accuracy	QA procedure	Overall QA
High	Accurate positioning system used, i.e. dGPS, GPS. Spatial reference system documented.	Surveyors with expert knowledge, surveyors accredited e.g. NMBAQC trained, or record verified by taxonomic expert, very few errors expected	A standard methodology used and documented in detail.	Accurate dates and times available for all records.	Rigorous internal (and possibly external) QA procedures documented	Very high quality data, internally quality assessed, high confidence of accuracy of position and species identification of all records.
High-Medium	Positions estimated from charts or OS maps by surveyor but with reference to easily identifiable features and detailed descriptions, e.g. End of pier, rocky outcrop on beach etc	Trained surveyors with good natural history background potential for a small number of potential errors in difficult to identify groups.	A standard methodology used and documented in detail, some minor details unclear.	Most records have accurate date (and time if appropriate), but some records may be recorded to month only.	Data Collection and QA procedures in place, including training of data collectors and use of standardized methodologies. Post processing QA of data on a more ad hoc basis not necessarily documented or standardized e.g.	High quality data, Most data with high confidence of accuracy of position and species identification.



**THE MARINE BIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF
THE UNITED KINGDOM**
Data Archive for Seabed Species and Habitats



Level	Spatial accuracy	Taxonomic accuracy	Methodological consistency	Temporal Accuracy	QA procedure	Overall QA
					data entry not QA'd	
Medium	Positions estimated from charts or OS maps by surveyor but no easily identifiable features to QA against.	Surveyors volunteers, MSc students or professionals with good natural history background potential errors in difficult to identify groups.	A standard methodology used but not supported by full documentation or references.	All records recorded to minimum of month and year but often not to day.	Some internal (or external) QA on a more ad hoc basis not necessarily documented or standardized	Good quality data, may lack internal QA, full documentation or may have some spatial/taxonomic ambiguity
Medium-Low	Positions estimated by third party from map provided surveyor.	Volunteer or other non-expert surveyors with some background in marine identification errors possible for non-common and difficult to identify species	Indications that a standard methodology was used but poorly documented.	Some dates recorded to month and year but many only recorded to month range e.g. summer 1984 or year only.	It is possible that some ad hoc internal (or external) QA has taken place during data collection, e.g. verification of species identification but no documentation available and it is unlikely that post sample processing	Some good quality data present but lacking internal QA, and/or full documentation Inaccuracies expected in a number of records.



**THE MARINE BIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF
THE UNITED KINGDOM**
Data Archive for Seabed Species and Habitats



Level	Spatial accuracy	Taxonomic accuracy	Methodological consistency	Temporal Accuracy	QA procedure	Overall QA
					QA has occurred.	
Low	Description only. Positions estimated from charts or OS maps by third party.	Volunteer other non-expert surveyors errors possible for all except very easy to identify species	No information on methodology or indications that no set methodology was used, this includes records from casual observations.	Only vague dates recorded. Large date ranges e.g. summer 1984, year only or year ranges e.g 1977-1979.	No QA procedures documented, ad hoc QA unlikely.	Data with spatial/taxonomic ambiguities and/or little documentation
Data deficient	Insufficient information available to make an assessment.	Insufficient information available to make an assessment.	Insufficient information available to make an assessment.	Insufficient information available to make an assessment.	Insufficient information available to make an assessment.	Insufficient information available to make an assessment.

Data were also graded on survey quality using the following three categories with respect to field surveyors:

- Professional
- Academic
- Naturalist
- Volunteer with expert ID
- Volunteer.



**THE MARINE BIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF
THE UNITED KINGDOM**
Data Archive for Seabed Species and Habitats



For each dataset, an assessment was made on the quality of the data developed from criteria set out in the ISO 19115 standard for geospatial metadata (ISO, 2006) and using guidelines set out in Rackham & Walker (2006) (Table x).

Rackham L. & Walker R. (2006). Metadata Guidelines for Geospatial Datasets in the UK. Part 3 Metadata Quality commissioned by the Department for Communities and Local Government.
<http://www.gigateway.org.uk/pdf/guidelines/MetadataGuidelines3.pdf>

1 Data Archive for Seabed Species and Habitats (DASSH)