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Collection Evaluation

Are recommended elements there?

What is there?

Quick Evaluations
Recommendation Reports

**Purpose:** To identify and compare the usage of UMM Profile concepts across CMR Metadata Collections.

**Scope:** This report considers over 15,000 metadata records from 18 NASA Providers and 8 Other providers.

**Demo Focus:** UMM-Collection metadata Profile

https://confluence.hdfgroup.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=48803313
Quick Evaluations

**Purpose**: To identify and compare the usage of commonly used documentation objects across CMR metadata Collections.

**Scope**: This report considers over 15,000 metadata records from 18 NASA Providers and 8 Other providers.

**Demo Focus**: How do CMR metadata providers document people and organizations?

[Link](https://confluence.hdfgroup.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=48802017)
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