The Power of Difference

An online supplement to NACD Directorship magazine on building a culture of inclusion.
Board Rebellion

In 1987, Pete Townsend, the singer/songwriter and guitarist for The Who, recalled the inspiration for writing the 1965 song “My Generation.” He told Rolling Stone that the song was “very much about finding a place in society. I was very, very lost. The band was young then. It was believed that its career would be incredibly brief.” The single ended up being a big hit, galvanizing The Who’s reputation and becoming an anthem for the counterculture movement. And its themes have transcended the era in which it was written, finding new and different audiences through covers by Patti Smith in 1975, Green Day in 1992, and Oasis in 2002, among others. The song’s iterations suggest that finding one’s place within a larger community is a timeless theme and that there will always be disruptors among us to challenge the status quo and effect change, be they in the context of society in general or business.

The collection of articles that follow explores the ways in which the business community sees the status quo changing, embracing difference in order to thrive in the years ahead. In the case of staffing company TrueBlue, a period of major expansion caused the board and the C-suite to seriously consider whether they were composed to reflect the new constituents they aimed to serve. Other companies, however, are being forced to embrace change, as KPMG’s Susan M. Angele and Annalisa Barrett examine in their article on trends in gender diversity quotas around the world and the ways in which those practices are gaining traction in the United States. But, as Deloitte’s Janet Foutty observes, boards can have a transformative effect on a company if they are asking the kinds of questions that will push boundaries. And similar to youth culture, the standard-setting and boundary-pushing boards will likely be remembered for the ways in which they challenge the status quo. —Jesse Rhodes
The need for a more diverse management team brings diversity and inclusion initiatives to a global staffing and recruitment agency.

By NACD Editors

TrueBlue received the inaugural NACD NXT Recognition Award, in conjunction with Deloitte, for a small-cap company. An esteemed judging panel selected TrueBlue for its intentional efforts to diversify its management, board of directors, and workforce. What resulted was a total transformation of the company that is “healthier today because the board had the foresight and commitment to diversify.” What follows is the story of how TrueBlue reinvented its culture to foster diversity and inclusion at all levels.

The nature of TrueBlue’s business means that diversity should have always been at the forefront. Founded in 1989, the temporary staffing and workforce management company annually places some 750,000 individuals in jobs with 150,000 clients around the world. That entails working with people from various and varied backgrounds, be it in terms of geography, gender, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. Yet in the early 2000s, as TrueBlue was expanding into new markets and countries outside the United States for the first time, the senior executive team took a hard look at itself and realized it didn’t reflect the communities the company was striving to serve.

“In today’s world, it is not enough to employ a workforce with varying backgrounds and views,” said Steven C. Cooper, who was TrueBlue’s CEO from 2006 to 2018 and currently serves as board chair. “We also need to welcome the differing
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experiences and perspectives we all bring when we work together. Embracing diversity and fostering an environment of inclusion bring out the best in everyone and deliver optimal results to our stakeholders.”

TrueBlue board member Jeffrey B. Sakaguchi agrees. “I think TrueBlue has done and continues to do a great job in a social context of giving opportunities to people to find jobs, have work, get paid, and build skills, and helping those employees develop leadership abilities and grow within the company. Demonstrating diversity at the board and executive levels is something that would help the rest of the corporation understand that we welcome and celebrate different backgrounds, different ways of thinking, and different ways of getting business done.”

While acknowledging the need to foster informed decision making by having more diverse executives and directors at the helm is a good start, bringing diversity into the upper tiers of the organization required intention—and the influence and participation of the company’s board.

Reflection Leads to Action

TrueBlue enjoyed several years of acquisitions and geographic expansions in the mid–2000s, but despite a fulsome period of organizational change, Cooper and his senior leadership team started to become aware of the lack of diversity at the top. “Our diversity initiative started as an internal initiative in 2010,” Cooper told NACD’s Lisa Plaskow. “We were starting to have conversations about how our leadership might not reflect the communities that we’re serving. That observation drove great conversations as we updated the board on how we were doing internally. It gave the board an opportunity to reflect on where we were as a team—and not just an executive team.”

Soon, however, there were two catalytic events that would expand the focus from just top-tier employee diversity to the board itself. Cooper recalls a major acquisition in 2014 that expanded TrueBlue’s global footprint and changed the company’s dynamics from being a staffing company to a recruiting company. Despite the continued growth, however, the company’s board composition hewed to historic norms. In January 2010, the board was comprised of seven men and one woman, all Caucasian. The board’s geographic diversity was also lacking, with all but one board member living in the Pacific Northwest.

The second catalyst was when Cooper began to lay plans for his successor in the CEO role. “When we started planning my exit was the time that the board really stepped up and said, ‘Well, there’s going to need to be a reset around the boardroom table,’” Cooper said. “And we anticipated that it was going to take three or four years for me to get ready to leave and my successor to step into my shoes. When you’re going to really start moving positions, then that gives you the opportunity to open up the pool better and look at candidates for board decisions differently.”

Diversity at the board level became a strategic objective for TrueBlue: To compete in the dynamic and global world the board felt it must lead the way in better reflecting all constituencies, with a wide variety of skills and backgrounds, and new thinking, insights, and perspectives about consumers, markets, and business practices. Cooper, as CEO and a member of the board at the time, embarked on a journey with the board to make diversity a key focus for board recruiting. The board not only

A SEVEN-STEP PLAN TO DIVERSIFY YOUR BOARD

The TrueBlue board recognized that diversity for its own sake would fall short of expectations, and that what mattered was a breadth of perspective provided by a board that remains diverse across multiple dimensions. Colleen Birdnow Brown, a director of TrueBlue since 2014, boiled down the board’s dedicated actions to achieve boardroom diversity to seven steps, starting with commitment. “We believe a diverse board exemplifies the strongest commitment a company can make for inclusion,” Brown said. “As we aligned the board to compete in this highly volatile and global environment, TrueBlue added directors with extensive global skills and strategic sophistication.”

1. Having a well-defined and disciplined director recruitment process coupled with commitment by the board.

2. Engagement of a top-tier search firm, with searches led by a highly experienced, diverse recruiter.

3. Consistently expecting and seeing diverse candidates.

4. A willingness to add a diversely qualified candidate, even if it means expanding the size of the board’s membership for a time.

5. A commitment by the full board to undertake a time-consuming, thorough, and rigorous process designed to ensure success in recruiting directors.

6. Adherence to a self-identified, interactive skills matrix that highlights opportunities to strengthen the board.

7. An active process that is always advancing succession planning for directors.

Source: Excerpted from TrueBlue Director Colleen Birdnow Brown’s letter of nomination to NACD
engaged a premier search firm that specialized in diversity, but also worked directly with a diverse recruiter at the firm to identify a robust selection of highly qualified diverse candidates for both the board and CEO roles.

**Uneasy Conversations**

“It forced the board to sit back and ask: What imperatives really need to be met by this company in the next five years? That’s the kind of CEO that we want to bring in, and that’s the kind of board that we should be,” Cooper recalled. In identifying those imperatives, Cooper and the board were subsequently able to identify the skill sets they needed to deliver on those goals, and insist that the recruiter compose a pool of candidates that was diverse in age, gender, ethnic background, geographic background, and industry background.

“I’m not saying that every day or every conversation was easy,” Cooper said, “but the board was just willing to have those difficult conversations and take on this issue at a methodical pace. And I’ve seen situations where boards were unwilling to have a refreshment conversation. If you don’t have that conversation, then you’re in no position to improve diversity, because everyone is just going to look around the room and wait for someone else to raise their hand. Talking about relieving board members from their positions is one of the hardest conversations to have.”

And where some boards use formal mechanisms such as term or age limits to spur these conversations, TrueBlue employs an open process where the board ensures that transition is a component of a boardroom discussion on an annual basis, both in terms of the trajectory of an individual director and where the board wants and needs to be as a whole in the years ahead.

As a direct result of the steps taken to achieve the stated objective, six of the seven directors who have joined the board over the past nine years—Jeff Sakaguchi, Bonnie Soodik, Colleen Birdnow Brown, Bill Goings, Kim Harris Jones, and Kristi Savacool—are either female, racially diverse, or both. TrueBlue’s full board reflects significant additional diversity across multiple dimensions. Said Brown: “Of paramount importance to my decision to join the TrueBlue board was its clear and continuing commitment to a more diverse and inclusive environment at all levels of the company, starting with the board.”

According to current CEO Patrick Beharelle, focusing on diversity at the top has in turn achieved the desired cascading effect throughout the organization. “If we look at our promotions over the last year, about 60 percent went to women and about 50 percent went to non-white personnel,” he said. “We look at hires over the last year, and just under 70 percent were female and about half were non-white.”

In the main, Beharelle noted that the company does not have quantitative diversity goals it is trying to meet and that people are hired because they are an optimal fit for a given role. That in mind, the onus is on working with a search firm that can produce a highly diverse slate of candidates so that diversity is introduced organically throughout the organization. “What we’re trying to do is just be good corporate stewards and do the right thing without trying to force something to meet arbitrary targets,” Beharelle said.
Multilevel Reinforcements

Although TrueBlue may have eschewed some of the traditional, formal mechanisms that other companies use to drive diversity goals, it has implemented several programs and processes so that its diverse and inclusive culture can continue to grow and thrive.

In 2012, the company’s formal diversity and inclusion (D&I) program was established, and the creation of the D&I’s governing body, the TrueBlue D&I Council, followed shortly thereafter. The D&I Council enjoys the full support of the board and executive leadership, and is comprised of business and support function leaders, with membership numbers ranging between 15 and 24 people. Board members and executives regularly participate in D&I Council meetings and events, and D&I Council leadership routinely reports to the board on important initiatives and overall progress on achieving the program’s mission: “To foster a diverse and inclusive culture where every employee has an opportunity to contribute and grow while meeting the changing needs of the marketplace.”

The council gathers once a year for a strategic planning session, and then telephonically regroups on a bimonthly basis. “Our D&I Council has created, essentially, resource or support groups for specific groups within our population,” observed Jim Defebaugh, executive vice president, chief legal officer, and corporate secretary. “So it’s touching a large segment of our employee base and there’s regular training and communication that goes on throughout the year.”

Tracking Progress

TrueBlue’s five employee resource groups (ERGs) are voluntary and employee-led. Each group joins together in the workplace based on shared characteristics or life experiences, creating an opportunity for support that’s intended to enhance career and personal development. ERGs seek to maximize employee engagement and contribute to business objectives by allowing employees to be their true selves from the very start of their work at TrueBlue, through networking, shared communication, and cultural awareness. Company directors periodically lead discussions with the ERGs to better understand employee experiences and to underscore the importance of diversity and inclusion to the board. The current slate of ERGs represents a variety of interests and perspectives: the African American Resource Connection, the Veteran Employee Talent Society, Women in Leadership, Hispanic Opportunity and Latin Awareness, and a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer or Questioning ERG.

The board also receives a one-page scorecard each quarter that documents employee satisfaction and tracks diversity at all levels. While having this reporting mechanism alone is valuable in and of itself, TrueBlue has ensured that it gets featured in the executive summary included in each board book.

“Another metric we track rigorously is retention at different levels in the organization,” said Lead Independent Director Jeff Sakaguchi. “We know that there are certain key positions where increased turnover can be a sign of either ineffective management or some other issue. And it gives a really good perspective into what needs to get done, how are we doing in terms of promoting the right kind of leaders, developing those skills. It goes beyond just D&I, but D&I is a key component of
making sure that the employees and the temporary workers are all comfortable with the culture and the environment in the organization. By having a board that embraces diversity across multiple dimensions—of which gender, ethnicity, work experience, functional skills, even religion and political alignment, are a subset—the board can provide the level of governance and strategic guidance that will help the company continue to grow and thrive in today’s diverse, global economy.”
The State of Board Gender Diversity Globally and the Evolving US Landscape

By Susan M. Angele and Annalisa Barrett

As boards seek to improve their effectiveness and consider how best to carry out their oversight role amid rapid change and shifting expectations, diversity—of skills, background, and experience—must be top of mind. Institutional investors and other stakeholders, including employees and customers, continue to focus on board composition by considering whether the board includes the right mix of skills and experience to support the company’s strategy, as well as how the board considers diversity in assessing director candidates.

While gender is only one of the many facets of diversity, the underrepresentation of women on corporate boards remains a key area of focus for investors, proxy advisors, and regulators. Here, we look at the current state of gender diversity on corporate boards, efforts to accelerate the pace of progress, institutional investor and proxy advisor views, and recommendations for boards to consider.

The slow pace of progress in boardroom diversity in the United States is well documented. Currently, fewer than one in five directors serving on the boards of US public companies are female. The percentage of women on Russell 3000 boards was 19.3 percent at the end of the first quarter of 2019, according to Equilar's Q1 2019 Gender Diversity Index. That compares with 17.6 percent as of midyear 2018, 15.7 percent in 2017, and 12.9 percent in 2014, based on Equilar’s Board Composition and Recruiting Trends report. Among the large companies in the S&P 500 Index, which tend to have more diverse boards, the percentage of women directors has also increased gradually, to 24 percent in 2018, up from 22 percent in 2017, and 18 percent in 2013, according to Spencer Stuart’s 2018 US Board Index report. July 2019 marked the first time all S&P 500 companies have at least one female director on their boards.

Gender Diversity Mandates

Outside of the United States, a number of countries have adopted quotas as part of their efforts to increase board gender diversity. Norway, which was the first country to institute a gender quota, in 2003, currently has the highest percentage of women serving on the boards of large public companies (46 percent), according to Spencer Stuart. Based on data published by Spencer Stuart (see Figure 2), only companies in Norway, France, and Germany have exceeded the applicable mandates. (See Figures 1 and 2).

Current US Developments

In 2018, California became the first state with a board gender diversity mandate. The law requires all public companies headquartered in California and traded on a major stock exchange (i.e., NYSE or Nasdaq) to have at least one woman on the board.
by Dec. 31, 2019, and for most companies, the minimum requirement will increase, depending on board size, to either two or three women by Dec. 31, 2021. Companies that do not report compliance may be subject to fines. In the first half of this year, more than 200 women were added to boards of California companies. (This article does not examine the presence or absence of a causal link between the law and any individual board appointment.) As of June, more than 80 percent of public companies headquartered in California were in compliance with the 2019 requirement, based on an analysis of BoardEx data.

Other state legislatures are considering similar bills. In New Jersey, Assembly No. 4726, introduced in November 2018, would impose the same requirements as the California law. More than one-quarter (29%) of New Jersey–headquartered companies had all–male boards, according to a Board Leadership Center analysis of BoardEx data as of June 2019. In Massachusetts, where 15 percent of companies had all–male boards, Senate No. 1879, introduced in January, would require at least one woman on the board by Dec. 31, 2021, and, depending on board size, a minimum of two or three women by Dec. 31, 2023. As of this writing, other states, including Michigan, have introduced similar bills.

Disclosure initiatives have been introduced elsewhere. A law passed in Illinois in August 2019 requires publicly traded companies headquartered there to report the demographics of their board and executives, including the self–identified gender

* Designates a requirement that companies either comply with an established diversity goal or disclose the reasons for their noncompliance. Those countries not so designated employ legal mandates. Country mandates for state-owned companies are not included in this list.

Source: KPMG Board Leadership Center research, MSCI Women on Boards Progress Report, December 2018
and race of each board member, as well as their policies and practices for promoting
diversity. The University of Illinois will publish an annual report card on Illinois com-
panies’ diversity. The New York legislature enacted a law that requires the Depart-
ment of State and the state Taxation and Finance Department to study the number
of women directors who serve on each board of directors of companies licensed to do
business in New York state. The information will be collected as part of the corpora-
tion’s filing statement required by the Business Corporation Law. In addition, bills
introduced in the US Congress would require disclosure by public companies.

Investor and Proxy Advisor Approaches
Investors have been increasingly focused on gender diversity on boards, and many
have adopted or updated voting policies that consider diversity. In 2017, State Street
Global Advisors (SSGA) adopted a policy initiative stating an expectation of at least
one female director on every board. This year, SSGA updated its board diversity policy
to state that, starting in 2020, it will vote against the entire nominating committee
“if a company does not have at least one woman on its board and has not engaged in
successful dialogue on State Street Global Advisors’ board gender diversity program
for three consecutive years.” BlackRock encourages companies to have at least two
female directors on their board, and its 2019 proxy voting guidelines state, “[T]o the
extent that we believe that a company has not adequately accounted for diversity
in its board composition within a reasonable time frame, we may vote against the
nominating/governance committee for an apparent lack of commitment to board
effectiveness.” T. Rowe Price’s 2019 proxy voting guidelines say it will generally
oppose the reelections of governance committee members if it can find “no evidence
of board diversity.”

Proxy advisors have also introduced policies related to diversity. Notably, for
meetings held on or after Feb. 1, 2020, for Russell 3000 or S&P 1500 companies, Instit-
tutional Shareholder Services will generally recommend a vote against or withhold
from the nominating committee chair (or other directors on a case-by-case basis) at
companies with all-male boards. Effective for meetings held after Jan. 1, 2019, Glass,
Lewis & Co. will generally recommend voting against the nominating committee
chair of a board with no female members and, depending on other factors, may rec-
nommend voting against other nominating committee members.

Some institutional investors have formed coalitions to engage collectively with
their portfolio companies on board diversity. The Thirty Percent Coalition’s Institu-
tional Investor group includes institutional investors, asset managers, and owners
with more than $5 trillion in assets under management. The institutional investor
members work together to contact boards lacking gender diversity via letters asking
for engagement meetings with coalition members. In several circumstances, boards
that did not respond to such requests have faced shareholder proposals on board
diversity topics filed by coalition members.

The California Board Diversity Initiative, which includes several public pension
funds and a public university pension fund and endowment, engages companies
headquartered in California with no women on their boards. The Midwest Investor
Diversity Initiative—which includes public pension funds, foundations, and other
institutional investors in the Midwestern region of the United States—requests that companies headquartered in six states adopt board recruitment policies that focus on board diversity. The group calls on boards to adopt a policy requiring the inclusion of females and minorities in the candidate pool for every director search the board undertakes.

**Implications for Boards**

Whether solely because of these initiatives or for other reasons as well, boards are carefully assessing their own composition with an eye toward diversity. It is important that they do so thoughtfully, and consider how diversity ties to strategy in the context of each and every director search. And given the focus on gender diversity, boards seeking to align board composition with strategy should be mindful that their gender diversity practices are inclusive of African-American, Latina, Asian-American, and LGBT women.

In addition, boards should consider the following questions from *Diversity in the Boardroom: Pushing Forward, Reaching Back* by the WomenCorporateDirectors Foundation in partnership with KPMG Board Leadership Center:

- What are the needs of the company and the expectations of key stakeholders in both the country in which the company operates and the broader environment in which it does business?
- What are the challenges to building diverse boards and the tools boards are using to accelerate progress?
- How does a diverse board become more inclusive and maximize the value of different perspectives in the boardroom?
- How can boards set the tone and incent, encourage, and challenge management to move the needle on diversity and inclusion throughout the organization and become a strategic enabler to a strong culture and sustainable long-term growth?

Susan M. Angele and Annalisa Barrett are senior advisors with KPMG’s Board Leadership Center.

In providing active legislative examples, KPMG is not undertaking any analysis or view that could be considered public policy advocacy, suggestive of the relevant importance of one state’s potential actions versus another’s, or the relative merits among proposed legislation.
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Diversity Trends Among New Directors

Women are on the ascendant at Russell 3000 companies, according to data from MyLogIQ Multidimensional Public Company Intelligence. There were 925 director appointments between 2018 and 2019—nearly double the number of female director appointments made between 2015 and 2016 (see Figure 1). And regardless of the level of boardroom experience, Equilar data show that, if the current pace of change continues, Russell 3000 companies will achieve gender parity by 2034.

Generational diversity, however, has largely remained status quo. The concepts of age and experience are frequently linked, with more experienced (and, by implication, older) directors being viewed as solid bets at the expense of younger business leaders who may bring technological savvy and a knowledge of the newer generations of consumers. According to MyLogIQ, the average age of new public company directors at Russell 3000 companies is 57 years old. Baby boomers (defined here as those born between 1944 and 1964) occupy the largest share of board seats (see Figure 2). Proportionally, there has been a slight decline in other generation brackets, so despite the idea that younger leaders bring new perspectives to boards, those recruitment practices are essentially trending flat.

—Mandy Wright

---

**FIGURE 1 NUMBER OF FEMALE FIRST-TIME PUBLIC COMPANY DIRECTORS, RUSSELL 3000**

- 2015–2016: 451
- 2016–2017: 533
- 2017–2018: 698
- 2018–2019: 925

**FIGURE 2 PERCENTAGE OF FIRST-TIME DIRECTORS BY GENERATION, RUSSELL 3000**

- Gen Z: 30%
- Gen Y: 40%
- Gen X: 50%
- Baby Boomer: 60%
- Gen Older: 70%
- Female: 80%

Source: MyLogIQ Multidimensional Public Company Intelligence
At a time when technology is the driving force behind change and growth in the business world, leaders must be able to anticipate and adapt to new technology. Yet a recent survey conducted by Deloitte revealed that only 26 percent of employees believe their organizations are “ready” or “very ready” to address the impact of disruptive technologies. At a minimum, readiness requires having a fundamental understanding of the technologies advancing business today, such as artificial intelligence (AI), robotics, blockchain, and cloud computing.

I’ve experienced firsthand the enterprise shift that occurs when technology becomes ubiquitous. When I was leading Deloitte Consulting LLP’s Technology practice six years ago, we carefully followed a “business-led, tech-enabled” strategy. Today, we operate in a world where it’s about technology-led business enablement. That is why, when I became CEO of our consulting business in 2016, one of my earliest strategic goals was to create a tech-savvy program for our entire organization, providing “non-tech” colleagues the understanding they need to have credible, thoughtful conversations that bridged their domain expertise with knowledge of the technologies impacting change and growth.

Now, as chair of the board of Deloitte, I believe boards can play an important, outsized role in helping their organizations gain a more holistic understanding of technology and strategy that extends beyond managing risk. Boards can help identify the optimal value and impact of technology investments; understand the ethical implications of digital design and use; prepare for the talent implications of AI and robotics adoption; and increase the tech-savviness of the board as a whole.

To guide board conversations and strategy development around the intersection of technology, governance, and transformation, I’ve outlined five key questions that boards can use.

1. **Are we thinking about opportunities or solely about risks?** A 2017 study by Deloitte reported that 48 percent of board conversations about technology are centered on cyber risk and privacy topics, while less than one-third (32%) are concerned with digital transformation driven by technology. While it’s critical for boards to understand technological risk, members also have an obligation to guide the company toward growth and innovation. To do that, boards must spend equal time discussing the many strategic opportunities technology affords.

2. **Are technologists represented?** Other Deloitte studies show that high-performing S&P 500 companies are more likely to have a tech-savvy board director than other companies (by 17%); yet less than 5 percent have appointed technologists
to newly opened board seats. Adding a technologist to the board—for example, a current or former C-level tech leader—can bring both new skill sets and fresh thinking to the boardroom as it pertains to tech-related opportunities, risk, spending, and organizational strategy enablement.

3. **Are we committed to continuous learning?** Given the rapid rate of disruption and change, the future of work requires everyone from the boardroom to the workforce at large to be committed to lifelong learning. While not everyone on the board needs to be a technologist, it’s important for all members to gain a foundational understanding of, and be conversant in, the technologies that drive change and opportunity. This level of understanding also ties into the board’s responsibility to monitor and advise whether the C-suite and senior management have the necessary technology skills needed to lasso value potential.

4. **Are we engaged with the office of the chief information officer?** Whether through a designated committee or as a full board, members should dive deeper on technology topics with subject matter experts outside the boardroom. It’s up to each board to facilitate regular technology conversations, and if done via a committee, to ensure takeaways from those conversations are reported to the full board.

5. **Are we effectively identifying and managing the ethical implications of technology?** A true understanding of technology requires considering the ethical implications of where and how technology is being applied. This includes mitigating unintentional biases and consequences, creating a diverse and inclusive technology organization, and overseeing growing technology ecosystems beyond your organization. As both understanding and the use of technology increase, innately human skills such as judgment and empathy should remain at the center.

These days, every board is a tech board, and therefore must focus on increasing their own tech-savviness—and helping their organizations do the same. In readying ourselves for the impact of technology, we can not only better manage its risks, but also leverage its many opportunities.

Janet Foutty is chair of the board of Deloitte. She is also a member of Deloitte’s Global Board of Directors and chair of Deloitte Foundation. Foutty previously served as chair and CEO for Deloitte Consulting LLP.
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