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1. About the Work Package and this Deliverable

Work Package 4 involves the implementation of the two participative methodologies the convergence seminars (Partner 1) and the Democs (DEliberative Meetings Of Citizens) game
(Partners 2 and 5). The objectives are two-fold. One is to engage with lay publics to raise the awareness and debate on the ethical aspects of implant and enhancement technologies. Secondly, we wish to enable a comparison of the insights on these issues of lay-people, ethical specialists and religious communities both at national and EU levels, which will help promote an ongoing dialogue on these issues in wider society.

Within this package, Deliverable D7 is for the creation of the first pilot phase of Democs card games on neural implants and human enhancement due for Month 8, and this is now reported, describing the Democs concept, the creation of the game and listing the cards, voting grid and feedback forms in the Appendices.

The original intention was to create two separate games one on human implants and one on human enhancement, to be played in parallel, reflecting the two main subject foci of the project. At the second meeting the draft review on implants showed the substantial overlap of subject matter with enhancement. It was realised that two create and play two games simultaneously on such overlapping subjects would present logistical difficulties, not least in describing the differences of unfamiliar subjects to volunteer facilitators of games. A decision was made to create only one Democs game, covering human enhancement, but also with cards suitable to extend the scope further into medical implant issues if the need arose. This would simplify and focus the task of this work package, and enable more games to be played on one subject and potentially better statistical validity of the results.

A subsequent deliverable (D8) will report and analyse the experience of the first phase of playing the draft games (Month 12). The purpose is to draw conclusions in order to finalise the Democs games for the main work of this part of the work package, and namely playing the games over a wide spectrum of publics in as many member states as possible. This will include creating web-based versions for translation into different languages. The results of this will be reported in the last deliverable of this work package D9 in Month 30 towards the end of the Project.
2. The Democs Concept

DEMOCs (DEliberative Meetings Of Citizens) is a novel form of lay participation on complex technical issues, devised by Perry Walker of the New Economics Foundation (Partner 5 in ETHENTECH) in 2002. www.neweconomics.org. The original game was originally devised for stem cells, with sponsorship from the Wellcome Trust and with expert consultants (of which Partner 2 was one). Democs games have now been created on a wide range of issues from cloning to climate change. Although their primary aim is to enable and stimulate lay publics with no prior knowledge of a subject to engage with emerging issues especially in science and technology, they have been found valuable tools in many different contexts. For example Democs games have been useful in graduate teaching at MSc and PhD level, in summer schools on bioethics. They have been used in UK Government consultations, such as the ‘GM Nation?’ debate on GM crops in 2003, and on genetic testing kits for the Human Genetics Commission. They have also become widely used in Europe, translated into several languages and made available on the web in the EC FP6 DECIDE project.12 and now also in a successor EC FP7 project FUND.3

2.1 The Game

It is not a game played to win, but a semi-structured group discussion for 6-8 people, normally lasting 1½ - 2 hours, through the medium of prepared cards which are dealt out and discussed in three stages.

a). Story Cards - imaginary narrative contexts, based on real life situations or ones reasonably envisageable. The aim is to introduce the technology through people who are involved in it or by it, often presenting an ethical dilemma.

b). Information Cards - essential information to cover the basic science involved in synthetic biology, its potential applications and the regulatory context, aimed at being fair and objective.

c). Issue Cards - a range of questions, perceptions, issues and opinions to explore the ethical and social implications of the technology. Many cards present differing and even directly opposing views, aiming to cover a fair range of opinions and attitudes views known or likely to exist.

The group uses these cards as a medium from which to discuss and form their own views. These are expressed in the last phases of the game, when the group focuses its discussion into producing group statements or opinions, based on ‘Clusters’ of selected cards which the group have found important. These can be as consensus statements or divergent opinions within the group, or questions or dilemmas they have found. Next, everyone votes as an individual on a range of prepared policy options about the technology. In some Democs games, a second vote is made on the acceptability, or otherwise, of different applications of the technology, with the option for each player to state in his/her own words why they voted as they did. Finally, feedback forms collect basic information of date, place, name of the group, age and gender distribution, prior knowledge and ask for comments and suggestions about the game and their experience in playing it.
2.2 The Outputs

The game allows for an open selection by the group of the issues it considers most important, as well as numerical and qualitative information about policy options pre-selected in the game design. The outputs which can be analysed are as follows:

i). the cluster cards statements stating viewpoints, plus any additional cards or information the group may have written during the game

ii). the lists of cards supporting these cluster statements; if certain cards were chosen very often, over many games, these may be an indicator of issues of significance for the players.

iii). the summation of the voting on policy positions and/or applications,

iv). the reasons give by players for their votes on different applications of the technology, in cases where this option is offered.

v). feedback forms.

2.3 The Value of Democs

By its nature, Democs is user-focused. One of the problems with public engagement activities which sample representative populations is that they access relatively few people. Democs seeks to address this by enabling a much broader degree of lay participation, by starting with people in the contexts where they normally get together - friends in a pub, neighbours, a club or leisure activity group, a church or community group, a group of students, and so on. A member of a group sends away for the game, which is free, reads the instructions and calls the group together to play it. Democs has also been successfully used as a participative event for visitors at science festivals and to science centres. Games are often available on-line for downloading and printing out, and this will be especially important for Phase 2 ETHENTECH. For the Phase 1 pilot game, the emphasis was on finding people prepared to put on a game in the necessary timescale. People who have hosted Democs games in the past were contacted and asked if they would like to do the same thing for the new game, and new contacts were followed.

The game is very much what each particular group of people make of it. Participants are encouraged to contribute their own ideas and insights, to write their own cards, or produce alternative policy positions to vote on, if they want to; and people often do. The aim is that the expert input is in the cards, not in a specialist who is present to help the participants. The original Democs aim was that facilitation should be minimal, or not at all. In practice, experience suggests that unfamiliar and very technical subjects seem to work better with someone present who is at least somewhat familiar with the material.

The approach is a compromise between providing enough information for people to discuss meaningfully without prior knowledge, and a degree of inevitable framing by the content of the cards. This puts a considerable onus on the writers of a particular game, and the peer review process, to achieve the necessary rigour and balance with as little personal bias as possible. Analogous questions arise in the preparation of focus group stimulus material or providing citizens jury expert inputs, or the framing of questionnaires.
Democs falls between focus groups and opinion polling in the type of information generated and numbers of people who can engage. It can provide considered views and comment from a much wider range than are tapped by normal focus group sampling and in far more depth than from tick box opinion polling. Its advantages over conventional focus groups are that it can be played by any group of people who care to take part, anywhere. It does not require the presence of experts, and is not usually dependent on paid facilitators. Democs is generally cheap to play. The games are available free of charge. It may cost no more than providing coffee and biscuits, but sometimes payment for people to attend, postage, travel, and room hire may be needed. The game format gives an important multiplicative value in that, once devised, the game can continue to be played as an ongoing public engagement, not tied to a particular time-limited and often expensive consultation event.

The primary aim is to get people engaging and for this just to play the game with otherwise unengaged citizens is its own justification. Democs games can also produce empirical data. It does not normally seek formally representative samples of the population, but sufficient diversity can eventually be achieved if enough games can be played among enough varied sectors of the community, locations, age-groups, etc. It provides an alternative approach to the idea of sampling a population, but the results must be understood and interpreted with care. A GM crops Democs game was one of the recognised methods for tier 2 and 3 public meetings in the 2003 UK “GM Nation?” debate to discuss GM crops, and enough games were played for the data obtained to form part of the results of the consultation. The discussions of a game can also be recorded and transcribed for qualitative content analysis, for example in a recent public engagement exercise on nanotechnology and food in Austria.

Although it began in the UK, experience in the FP6 DECIID project shows that the Democs game concept can be translated and adapted successfully for use in different countries, languages and cultural contexts across Europe.

People already deeply engaged with the issue may find it superficial, because it is aimed squarely at people who are not expert and may know little about it. Nonetheless, it has found a considerable role in teaching ethics to science students, and a cut down ‘expert’ version on nanobiotechnology focusing only on issue cards has been used to help scientists in the field to explore ethical issues.

3. Creating the Game

3.1 Game Design

A first quite large set of cards was prepared by Partner 2, assessed by Partner 5, revised and further iterated between them. The revised cards were then sent to the ETHENTECH partners for comment and people voted on which cards they preferred. The number of cards was then reduced by selection to make up the pilot version of the game, with 6 Story Cards, 36 Information cards and 40 Issue cards, to be tested in Phase 1 of the project.

The creation of the cards for a Democs game is a complex and skilled task, requiring many iterations. It is a compromise of several key factors, and all this has to be compressed into something like 30 words per information and issue card, preferably less, and about 160 for Story
Cards. Each card has to make sense on its own, without depending too much on other cards, because each player will not necessarily know about them. In creating the game, the designer has a full and complex picture of the logic of the information. But he/she has to sit in the place of the player in a 2 hour game, who will handle only a selection of the cards, with only fragments of the whole picture. The value of the group game is that the collective information provided by the players together brings into play than any one individual has in hand, but this will still only be a subset of the full information set contained in the cards.

3.2 Information Cards

The process of designing the game first involved deciding what factual information someone with no prior knowledge would need in the Information Cards. This meant describing the concept of human enhancement, the different types of enhancement that may be possible – implants, chemical, genetics, etc., and giving an idea of the state of the art - what is technically possible already, and what is reasonably envisaged, what is far future, if ever, and what is likely to remain fantasy. One of the characteristics of human enhancement is that it is largely about what future technologies might achieve. As with previous games on nanotechnology and synthetic biology, it is difficult to establish with such ground-breaking and future-oriented science, what are realistic prospects likely to turn into viable technologies. There are few present applications, but a great deal of speculation and exaggeration, both positively and negatively. Inevitably, the question of realism entailed a measure of personal judgement, drawing upon former technical experience in academic and industrial research, risk regulation and technology assessment.

Information cards must achieve the right range of factual information so that people who know nothing of the issue can grasp the essential facts sufficiently to be able to discuss its wider implications. It has to avoid jargon and complex technical or abstract terms. This can be difficult when there is no synonym (like the word ‘technology’, for example). But it also has to use ways of relating unfamiliar concepts in creative ways that link to things people are familiar with. Useful bridges to get over the concept of human enhancement were found in familiar ideas like coffee, cosmetic surgery and sports enhancements, and in imagining where a medical application like a retinal implant chip might one day be adapted to make an enhancement like infrared vision.

Another important aspect was to make a series of important distinctions to clarify the nature of human enhancement – things we do at present that we might consider enhancements versus the sorts of body and brain interventions being envisaged: small increments and more radical changes; enhancements that are external (tools) to the body and those incorporated within it; transient and permanent enhancements; and the much debated issue of a distinction between medical interventions and those with no relation to a medical condition. Relevant additional information included landmark events such as the US NBIC report, significant features of the landscape such as transhumanists and more conservative critics, the military connection, and some indication of current research. The regulatory and legal context is also normally summarised here, but in this case it is largely non-existent. During the process of drawing up the factual information, suitable applications were identified to form the basis of the Story Cards, which would introduce the game.
3.3 Issue Cards

The second stage was to decide what are the main ethical and social issues to explore in the Issue Cards. To create these requires a thorough knowledge of the ethical and social issues, regulatory and political factors, the international context, what are the main viewpoints in issues of controversy, and how some of the issues as articulated by scientific or ethical experts would be perceived by lay publics. Issue cards require a sufficient mix of questions, arguments, counter-arguments, points to ponder which cover the main issues and points of debate, and must also keep a balance among the issues. Decisions have to be taken about minority views and how to portray disputed evidence, or ‘heterodox’ opinions.

Cards were written on issues identified from many sources. This drew on the previous experience of Partner 2 on human enhancement ethics of a number of years. In particular it used two pieces of work done in the FP6 NanoBio-Raise project, which was the predecessor project to ETHENETECH. These were an expert working group study on the feasibility and ethics of human enhancement, and a Democs game on nanobiotechnology created for that project, which included a few cards on human enhancement. Other sources were a discussion report on human enhancement drafted by Partner 2 in the Conference of European Churches’ working group on bioethics, and the insights from the ongoing review of ethical issues of human enhancement being conducted for WP3, and the parallel review of implants in WP2.

An especially important help in designing this game was the recent work done by Partners 2 and 5 in creating an Argument Map, called ‘Open Up!’ on human enhancement. This is a new public engagement tool which reduces the Democs concept to a series of arguments, laid out as an A3 paper-sized interactive map of arguments and questions. The A-Map had divided the issues into 4 groups:
- whether or not humans have natural limits,
- whether or not enhancement would be unfair,
- risk aspects,
- considering what is the purpose or aspirations of enhancement.

This framing provided a useful structure around which to group and categorise cards, eliminate duplication and overlaps, spot gaps, refine the argument on a particular card, and also to have a sense of the overall balance among the issues and viewpoints.

Care was taken to ensure that arguments of both proponents and those more critical of enhancement were given a fair hearing in their own terms, as far as possible within the world limits of a card. This was not a simple matter of creating equal and opposite pairings of cards. The debate it is not a simple for and against argument, but is complex and nuanced. The reply to a particular criticism, say, may be to put a slightly different point in support, rather than a simple refutation (and vice versa). It is also worth noting that, as in many Democs games on new technologies, the critical arguments usually require a lot more words to explore than the often relatively straightforward case in support of an innovation.

3.4 Story Cards

Story Cards can be powerful explanatory tools because they make the imaginative link to people and human situations, and concrete applications. But unlike an existing technology like GM crops, human enhancement biology has few tangible examples that are beyond experimental proof of concept. Many its applications are speculative and some very far-fetched. We were able to draw upon and develop three stories from the A-Map and one from the NanoBio-Raise
Democs game. Two new stories were created. In all but one case, the stories describe an application of enhancement by focusing on a fictitious person involved in some way, and also pose a dilemma they might face in an imaginary but plausible future situation. The exception is Story Card 2, which does not describe an application but gives a vision for enhancement through the eyes of a transhumanist. The five applications chosen were extending the medical technique of electrical stimulation of the brain, using chemicals to improve concentration in an educational context, sports enhancement and competition, infrared vision while driving, and dilemmas posed by military - medical ‘dual use’.

3.5 Policy Voting Grid

A Democs policy voting grid offers policies for each of which every player is asked to vote: “I support this option” / “I can live with this option” / “I oppose this option” / “I abstain.” In this case 6 policies were offered, plus a 7th space for a group to devise their own policy position if the ones offered do not satisfy what the players would like to see done. Experience shows that this additional policy creation option is indeed used by some groups.

To create the policy voting grid for human enhancement was difficult because there are several parallel issues which might affect a policy decision. Following the practice of other Democs games, an obvious first position was an ‘in principle’ objection to the technology, in this case on the grounds of not radically altering human beings. At the other pole, policy 6 offers a purely individualistic view of enhancement as a matter of personal choice, and not a matter for public policy at all. Between these two extremes, positions offered the view that enhancement should not be permitted on risk grounds (2), or on grounds of justice and inequity (3), or that it may be allowed with different provisos (4 and 5). Position 4 stresses the need for regulation and steps to ensure fairness (assuming this was possible). Position 5 attempted to distinguish between small increments to one’s existing capacities, and more radical changes.

3.6 Instructions and Feedback Forms

An Instruction Manual and a Feedback Form were created based on the ones produced for the Synthetic Biology Democs game, with minor adaptations. Feedback forms collect the date, place and name of the group, its age and gender distribution, how much prior knowledge the players had of the subject. The forms also offer players the opportunity to express comments, criticisms and suggestions about the game and their experience in playing it, which, as in the present case, can provide valuable input to improving the game.

3.7. Completing the Game

The game was completed by early June 2010 (Month 12), and pilot games were played between Month 12 and Month 16 (September 2010), reported in Deliverable 8.

The Story Cards are reproduced in pp.9-11. Information on pp.12-13 and Issue Cards on pp.14-16. The policy voting grid is on p.17 The feedback form on pp.18-19. The instruction manual is in a different page format, and is available separately.
4. What Next?

4.1 Testing the Game in the Pilot Phase and Revisions for Phase 2

A first round of games aims to play 10 games if possible. Particular attention, will be paid to formal and informal feedback from the games to analyse their strengths and weaknesses. On the basis of this evaluation we will decide what amendments will be necessary to the game before producing a final version for printing and distribution, for putting on the web and for translation into other European languages. Note will also be taken of the reviews in WP2 and WP3 and the parallel public engagement activity in WP4 of convergence seminars. The preliminary findings of the first phase games will also be summarised and noted, but these will be indicative only. Statistically significant results will not be gained until enough games have been played with a wide enough spread of groups, in phase 2. A combined interim report will be written on the first rounds of convergence seminars and the first phase of the Democs games. (Month 12. Deliverable D8).

In addition, a major factor in the second phase of Democs games will be to achieve a wider uptake and dissemination of the games across Europe. This will be done by transferring the two games into a web-based format, using the methodology and software successfully established in the FP6 DECIDE project on the Playdecide website (Month 13). As the DECIDE programme demonstrated, the web-based Democs game will enable dissemination across different EC countries, including translation of the materials into different languages, and for feedback of results. The Sub-contractor will use his contacts with numerous Science Centres across Europe, which will collaborate and facilitate in this process.

4.2 Incorporating Religious Issues

Human enhancement raises profound religious or theological questions, such as the limits or otherwise of the human body and human technological intervention, eternity and the goal of humanity, the conceptual challenge of transhumanist views, views of justice and equity, privilige and the ‘have-nots’, and what is considered to be right or wrong with humans and human society. One of the foci of ETHETECH is to explore the religious views across Europe on issues. Among the 25 games which are planned for the second phase with each type of game, it is intended to play some games among local religious faith communities, building upon the contacts begun in WP6, and also using Partner 2’s many contacts in the Christian traditions. For this purpose, if the experience of playing the pilot games and the religious views obtained so far in WP6 suggest there would be an advantage in doing so, the option exists to create a specific religious Democs game on human enhancement. A decision is to be made at the end of the pilot phase. In the first phase of the ETHETECH Democs game, it was decided to make only small reference to religious issues and see what some religious groups made of the game, and then decide what adaptations would be necessary.
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<td>1.3.5 Human performance</td>
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<td>1.3.7 Human performance</td>
<td>1.3.8 Human performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tbody>
</table>

The document appears to contain a table with various issues, each labeled with a number. The content seems to discuss various aspects related to human performance, possibly in a technical or scientific context. The table headers include issues such as human performance, human performance, and human performance, among others, indicating a repetitive pattern in the list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B38</strong> A dreadful of disassociation?</td>
<td><strong>B39</strong> Would I be satisfied, knowing that we really needed more help?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B37</strong> Becoming less human?</td>
<td><strong>B38</strong> Would we be better humans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B36</strong> Would we be satisfied better?</td>
<td><strong>B35</strong> If I get an enhancement to prove my worth, I be satisfied, knowing I want another better, but I just need a shift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B34</strong> Well-being</td>
<td><strong>B33</strong> Some people say that we could use well-being as a predictor to assess enhancements. But how do we agree on the level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B32</strong> Into the higher</td>
<td><strong>B31</strong> The process of transcending our human limits is the greatest goal we can aspire to. Now were getting the tools to make these enhancements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B30</strong> Enhancing lives and</td>
<td><strong>B29</strong> Some people say these limits our eyes and other species, and other species, we done interrupted him. Should we be aware of these limits as well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B28</strong> What more we are able to be aware of these limits that we haven’t been able to</td>
<td><strong>B27</strong> So let us consider what we have yet to explore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B26</strong> Uneven risk balance</td>
<td><strong>B25</strong> Can we keep in balance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B24</strong> Found ourselves</td>
<td><strong>B23</strong> Some people measure our lives by how we have learned our achievements in our life of exploration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B22</strong> We go to the moon and back!</td>
<td><strong>B21</strong> Our potentialities are done under great regulation to avoid causing unnecessary harm, we will be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B20</strong> Should society deliberate?</td>
<td><strong>B19</strong> Are the implications of enhancement too serious to read just as matter of personal preference? Of this society no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario</td>
<td>Parental Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would I know that something I did was an enrichment to myself? And would my friends and family agree? It was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is our success as humans more about making the most of what we are than seeking always to be changing it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vote on Six Policy Options on Human Enhancement**

Each person should vote by putting a cross in one of the 4 boxes. For each of the 6 policy options, if none of the 5 options fit, there is a space to add a policy of their own making.
Feedback Form to know who’s played this game & if it helped you

Would the Dealer kindly fill this in, with the help of the group?

Why are we asking for Feedback?

To assist us in interpreting the findings you and other groups have sent us from playing this Democs game, it helps to have some idea of the spread of age and gender of the group, where and when it was played, and whether you found it helpful. Thank you.

We are also looking to see if we can improve the game, so any feedback - positive or negative - the group or the dealer can offer would be appreciated. We would take the results and the feedback from the participants to help us revise and improve the game.

Group / Organisation: ___________________________ Where did you play the game? __________________
How many people played? ___ Date: _______ Email address (optional):

1. Age and Gender : Please tick the relevant boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How useful did you find this Democs game? : Please tick the relevant boxes

My knowledge about human enhancement biology before playing the game

Player: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Very little
Not bad
Quite good
Very good

Do you feel you understand more about human enhancement and its issues after playing the game?

Not much
Just a little
Quite a lot
A lot
PTO ...
3. What was most satisfying or valuable about this Democs game?


4. What was less than satisfying or disappointing, or any suggested improvements?


5. Have we pitched the game at the right level? Is there too much or too little detail?


6. Have we missed important issues? If so, what are they?


7. Do all the policy positions make sense? If not, how could they be improved?


8. Are there some cards that need changing – not clear, not relevant, etc.? Which ones?


Thank you!

Please send the cluster cards, voting grid and this feedback form in the stamped addressed envelope to
In England & Wales: Perry Walker, New Economics Foundation, 3 Jonathan Street, London SE11 5NH
In Scotland: Donald Bruce, Edinethics Ltd., 11/6 Dundonald Street, Edinburgh EH3 6RZ.

For more information on Democs contact Perry Walker,
Tel: (020) 7820 6360 Email: perry.walker@neweconomics.org
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