

Version No: 01 Issue Date: 16/8/2017 Portfolio: Data Processing	Horizons Regional Council	Section No: 12.13 Page: 1 of 2
	Hydrology Operations Manual	

Review: Rainfall

Overview:

As part of the data life cycle, all validated data is quality assured and peer reviewed before being archived [24.7 Quality Assurance and Verification](#). The archiving process is detailed in [24.8 Archiving Data Batch Files](#); peer review needs to be completed first.

If the batch of processing passes review then it is ready to be archived. Minor typos and glitches should be fixed as part of the review, the data has not failed review if it requires clarification, however if significant re-processing is required – or the record is not sufficiently clarified/documented/unclear then the issues should be listed on the URF ([24.18 Update Request Form \(URF\)](#)) and returned promptly to the processor.

Checklist:

Date/Time periods/datasource/site match:

- Logsheet Loader – Batch file (if uncertain about how batch files are loaded see: [24.19 Environmental Data Validation: Batches](#))
- Register and URF
- Hilltop file
- Chits/logsheets

Does the rainfall make sense? [Sanity Check]

- Is there a corresponding flow rise at the site? Or an increased flow with no rainfall recorded?
- Check intensities, how do they compare to HIRDS-10min, 1 hour, 24hr intensities? Is it a summer thunderstorm? Or is it a wiring fault?
- Check above with a corresponding rainfall site if there is one available
- Check Provisional and Provisional NEMS archives – is the data consistent? No kinks introduced – or the timing of inspections with rounding to 6 minutes been miss-applied.

Any updates to Non-Conformances which are now complete if the period of record has passed review?

QC/Comments

- Reflect representation of parameter measured and alterations made to the data.
- Only the long-term comments should be approved to copy up to the archive (versus processing comments).
- Are archive comment applicable to the end user? Do they inform the end user?

Upon review, the reviewer is required to complete the Reviewed by and date on the physical URF as well as the digital form in Catchment Data Tools.

Does the batch of processing pass review?

No – back to the person who processed the data, detailed when and who reviewed and what issues need addressing on the URF. Major corrections (re-processing, lack of information/understanding) are returned to the Processor and the cycle is repeated until the URF is accepted. NB: if this is more than twice and is not in a period of training, then it should be escalated.

Yes – Who and when the file was reviewed is completed on the URF and CDT. ny minor corrections are made and noted on the URF (Comments section), Pass circled, Minor corrections and N for fail and completes the authorised by with their initials and the date.

The Original URF must be maintained throughout the entire URF cycle to maintain the chain of custody of the period of processing.

Version No: 01 Issue Date: 16/8/2017 Portfolio: Data Processing	Horizons Regional Council	Section No: 12.13 Page: 2 of 2
	Hydrology Operations Manual	

Review: Rainfall

The authorised section initiates that the data is suitable to be committed to the final archive. This may not be completed when the data/datasource are not yet authorised or directed to which archive it may be committed to.

When the data is archived, the person archiving the data upon committal of all pertinent information to the archive will initial and date the completed by section and complete the digital form in Catchment Data Tools and the URF of the document.

When reviewed, passed and authorised, the same person or another person can commit the data to the archive, see [24.8 Archiving Data Batch Files](#) and [24.18 Update Request Form \(URF\)](#).

NB: Do not copy up using mapped drives – the audit trail requires copying of the full file path.