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Abstract

“New Normal” is a term which is used to define and name the new form and shape that has come into existence due to the fact that the ways of doing business has radically changed as a result of globalization’s forming its own organizations in the development process of technology by keeping away from the crises. The economy elite in the world is now discussing about a new order which is directed to the human needs and is more convenient and about a more creative capitalism, and about mechanisms that has become more social and that provides balances with organizations within the countries or with supranational organizations. In the new global system in which more risk will be taken and more precaution will be needed, the “new normal” contains and involves a supervisory measure which is rather regulative. Now the rules of “new normal”ization are being discussed instead of the old standards and systems. In the present era through which we are passing, enterprises have various responsibilities and duties in order to provide the necessary compliance for the state of affairs and in finding solutions for the conflicts. And these are mainly made up of finding answers to the questions with respect to competition, market, technology, and human beings; and at the same time it is necessary that the enterprise should find new ways for its capacity of change and for expanding in the market and for improving.

The Strategic cooperation and agreements of organizations and corporate bodies (companies) and sharing knowledge and experience in the new normal are an answer to the indefiniteness brought about by the new normal and to the new form of relationships. When this new approach and constructive management style are implemented, they seem to be one of the most important tools on the way to success in today’s world. Those corporations which will be able to establish strategic alliance and be skillful in the management of strategic alliance will have a distinctive feature in comparison to those corporations which will not be able to that. This study aims at finding what the “new normal” brings about and at analyzing the strategic alliance and agreements by scrutinizing them, and it aims, at the same time, at emphasizing the factors that play important roles in the success of those strategies.
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1. “New Normal”

Today’s Enterprises live in a world which is more active, more competitive, and more speedy than it was in the past. Trading, flow of capital and technology are in such a way that they are at levels much higher than they were in
Changes are realized in very short periods of time. And we witness such developments as international competition, globalization in terms of elimination of geographical borders, developments in communication and information technologies—satellite technology, internet, social networks, intelligent mobile phones, multiple sharing sites, and blogs, etc.—human rights, human values, concept of individualism, the thought that all the changes are up to and dependant on the human being, and approaches which involve increasing the level of education and level of living standards. (Tutar, 2000:85).

For a long time, only such concepts as bigness, strength, and industrial experience were evaluated to be important. Such qualities of the past as stagnant structures, foreseeing in advance, bigness, economies of scale, and strict organizational structures have now been replaced by such concepts as change, speed, strengthening the personnel, and elasticity. In today’s world, enterprises are living in such environments which are more mobile, more competitive, and faster than the environments of the past. The days when people depended on corporate bigness remained in the past. In a world which defines itself once every two weeks, how much value would you assess for having an experience of 20 years in order to manufacture the products of the future? (Kiernan, 1998: 13). The technological improvement and the revolution of information, destructive technologies and innovations, the rising and emerging economies other than the U.S.A. and the European countries, excessive competition, environmental consciousness, and the increasing power of the consumer have now become the main elements of the globalization revolution, and they all made everything tied to each other and dependant on each other. (Kotler and Caslione, 2011:34). During the days when everything goes well in the economy, this mutual dependence is actually good for everyone. However, when everything in the economy do not function well, the problems spread very rapidly, and they cause harm to everyone. And this situation increases the indefiniteness, costs, and vulnerabilities. Today, every five or seven years very serious and strong crises are experienced in the world (Akın, 2010:118), and today’s economic world shows very big and clearly seen differences from the economic world in the past.

In Peter Drucker’s book called The Age of Discontinuity, in Andy Groves’s book Only the Paranoid Survive, in the former President of the Federal Reserve Bank in the U.S.A. Alan Greenspan’s book called The Age of Turbulence, in Clayten Christensen’s book called Business Innovation and Disruptive Technology, it is indicated that change always exists and happens, and it may come from any part of the world, and may effect any corporation or company to a great extent. As a matter of fact, nobody in the business world would imagine that in the united states Bear Stearns could be purchased, Fannie May and Freddie Mac would be controlled by the government, AIG would one day go bust and then be saved later on, Lehman Brothers would go bust and be sold, Wachovia would be sold to Citibank first, and to Wells Fargo later on, Countrywide would be purchased by Bank of America. And all these happened within a couple of months towards the end of 2008 (Kotler and Caslione, 2011:65).

In a survey which was held with the presidents of the Fortune 500 corporations (Augustine, 1995), it was found that 98 % of the participants in the survey indicated that economic crises are inevitable in the business life. While in 1980 7 products out of every 10 products were unsuccessful, this number has risen up to 8 in 2004 (Akın, 2010:43). In the year 2011 in a survey in which 160 CEO’s had participated and contributed to and which was about how the CEO’s were effected by the fact that bad economic news from the European Union countries and from the United States were coming and that the economic grade of the United States was lowered by the economic rating companies, 50.6 of the CEO’s indicated that this global wave adversely affected their businesses. The rate of those who indicated that they weren’t affected was only 27.7 percent (Büyük, 2011). It is the first time in the history of Commerce that groups of 10 people are fighting against multi-national giants, and that they have won these fights. In an interview made with Costas Markides, the author of the book called “Game Changing Strategies” Markides had said that 95 % of the
different business models in the world come out of the companies which had recently entered into the market, that the old companies do not want to change the rules of the game, and that these old companies are obliged to take measures against the business models which have become successful in the market (Bayıksel, 2008).

Competition has become something which is seen everywhere very frequently, is indefinite, difficult and democratic. (Kiernan, 1998:29). Chaos, risk, and turbulences that create indefiniteness (ambiguity) have now become normal things which are experienced by branches of industries and by companies. While the period of holding ordinary stock certificates was 3 years in the 1980’s, today this period is only nine months (Zook, 2007). The reason is that today’s new technologies reduce the costs, and as a result of this, capital, innovation, and management capability move and circulate around the globe more freely and more quickly. And the technological and market supports of each business go out of existence over time. For example, Kodak is the best photograph film brand in the whole world. And it was the 16th most valuable brand in the world in the year 1999 according to a survey which was carried out by Interbrand. However, Kodak became the 82nd most valuable brand in the world in the year 2007 due to the fact the other competitors of Kodak started manufacturing digital products, but Kodak was not able to launch a second brand name into the market (Ries & Ries, 2010:46). While he was describing this, the famous guru Tom Peters says “Now, nothing is like it was during the times when our fathers were living” (Ateş, 2005:4). Turbulence is now the new normalness. The characteristic feature of this new normalness is that the economic boom and economic crisis periods come into existence suddenly and follow each other- this also includes recessions and long-term crises which turn into economic stagnation (Kotler ve Caslione, 2011:12). The economy of the new normalness for the business world is something quite different from the cyclical waves (fluctuations) in the normal times which can be foreseen at the macro level. The best example for this is the company Microsoft. While the company Microsoft is the 400th biggest company in the world in terms of sales turnover, it is the 3rd biggest company in terms of market value. On the other hand Bill Gates said that Microsoft is only two years ahead of failure (Baldock, 2000:16). The difference the between normal cyclical waves (fluctuations) and the economies which have turbulences is shown in Figure 1 (Kotler and Caslione, 2011:32).

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>NORMAL ECONOMY</th>
<th>ECONOMY of NEW NORMALNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic cycle</td>
<td>Foreseeable</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls/rises</td>
<td>May Be Defined (On average 7 years)</td>
<td>Unforeseeable, irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis/recession</td>
<td>Describable (On average 10 months)</td>
<td>Unforeseeable, irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential effect of the events experiences</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total investments</td>
<td>In creasing, spreads over the economy in general.</td>
<td>Prudent, concentrates and focuses on certain fields and areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tolerance of the market for risk</td>
<td>Risk is taken</td>
<td>Risk is averted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer behavior</td>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer preferences</td>
<td>Consistent, develops/changes</td>
<td>Worried, seeking for safe port</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As is seen in the table, the scenarios implemented during the periods of economic boom and economic stagnation have remained in the past. As a matter of fact, Richard Foster concluded that even the most reputable and esteemed corporations in the world can keep their strength and power to compete at most for 15 years. He indicated this in his survey which involved 1,000 companies from 15 different sectors (Yavuz, 2009).

In “New Normal”, it is not possible for the companies to have and own all of the competitive assets such as skills, customers, products in order to be able to cope with their competitors. Therefore, in “new normal” companies have had to create a system in which they developed security systems against risks and reaction systems to ambiguities (Kotler and Caslione, 2011:9). One of these systems is to establish strategic alliances. Andersen Consultancy made a survey in which they researched how important it is for companies to have alliances with companies in the same branch of industry; in this survey 17% of the senior managers indicated that alliances are important, 36% of these senior managers indicated that alliances will have a vital importance within 10 years (Baldock, 2010:114). The chairman of Sony Akio Morita pointed out that no corporation is an island that they need each other and that in a globalizing world they are in a way obliged to find ways to cooperate with other companies in order to be able to compete (Yoshino and Rangan, 2000:4). As a result, “strategic alliance” has become a style of business life for each company irrespective of their sizes (Kiernan,1998:125), and manages and directors have now noticed that cooperating with other companies is not only economical, but also it is a necessity (Yoshino and Rangan, 2000:62). Companies which are able to establish strategic alliance and have become skillful in managing strategic alliances shall have a distinctive advantage in comparison to those companies which are not able to establish and manage such alliances successfully (Kiernan,1998:126).

2. Strategic Alliance, Why Cooperate?

Strategic alliance is defined in the business literature as the collaboration of two or more companies with respect to the joint utilization of physical and human resources. That is to say, strategic alliance is the cooperation and collaboration of two or more independent companies each of which has its own culture, own agenda, and strategy. Senior managers and directors (top executives) find strategic alliance formation to be a way out in order to increase sales and profitability and most importantly in order to increase the prices of their shares (stock certificates) as they come face to face with difficulties in an environment of global competition in order to be able to keep and increase. As Doz and Hamel (1998:4-5) pointed out top level executives of companies want to establish strategic alliances for the purposes of obtaining supplementary products and services that they are not able to develop by themselves and in order to have their companies gain values by bringing together the sources and values of their companies and by learning new skills for their companies from their competitors. For example, Virgin Atlantic has been able to deal with and overcome the disadvantages of being a small company by making a strategic alliance with Delta Airlines (Kiernan,1998:108).

Whatever the goals of the alliances are, the quality of becoming a Good partner has now become a key asset of the corporations (Kanter, 1994). That is to say, while, between the years 1996 and 2001, 5,700 American Companies had declared that they established alliances in the year 2000 the number of the alliances that had been realized by the American companies according to the data of Thomson Financial was 10,349 (Dyer et al., 2004). As the companies wish to grow bigger and bigger, their wish to form strategic partnerships will continue to be at the top of their priorities list, the reason being that organic growth is extremely slow. There are many evidences which show that mergers and acquisitions do good very rarely. For example, in a research that is mentioned in Journal of Finance, it
has been found out that corporations had incurred loss of 10% of their wealth as a result of the merger during the first five years after the completion of the merger process (Dyer et al., 2004). Therefore, in a global economy, establishing efficient co-operations and collaborations, and having superior abilities of keeping them up in comparison to the competitors provides an important competition advantage for those companies that are able to do these (Kanter, 1994). However, when companies start collaborating with each other by forming strategic alliances especially due to the fashions arising out of urgent and tactical reasons, their alliance doesn’t become successful (Yoshino and Rangan, 2000:87). According to Bleeke and Ernst (Bleeke ve Ernst, 1995) the lifetime of partnerships 7 years on the average, and almost 80% of alliances turns out to be in a situation where one of the partners are sold. Dyer, Kale and Singh (Dyer et al., 2004) indicate that 40% to 55% of the strategic alliance partnerships collapse without reaching a maturity. Actually for such circumstances it may be misleading to use the term alliance. Perlmutter and Heenan (1989) have seen alliance formation as the fashion of the future, and they emphasize that companies having strategic alliance should increase their companies’ values by utilizing the competitive advantage of having alliance partnerships and by working in harmony. Bleeke and Ernst point out to the fact that more than 75% of the alliances end up one of the partners’ purchasing and acquiring the other partner (Bleeke and Ernst, 1991). Therefore, Reich and Mankin (1986) compare alliance partnership to the horse of the Troy, and they indicate that alliance partnership means handing your company over to the hands of others, and that alliance partnership is something that should be avoided. However, in “new normal” the strategic alliances do not only influence the relationships within the home country, but they also influence the relationships on an international basis; and in general strategic alliances are made not only between the competitors in the same industry, but also they are made by and between corporations in different industries. This situation increases the costs of a corporation for developing and manufacturing a new product and penetrating into new markets by itself. In a similar way, all of the factors such as very high costs of growing, increasing risk factors in an environment of tough competition, and a business life where the concept of synergy comes into prominence makes it necessary to establish a strategic alliance. For this reason, establishing strategic alliances is the most efficient and useful way of penetrating into new markets, obtaining new skills, technologies, or products, and of sharing fixed costs and resources (Bleeke and Ernst, 1991).

At the same time, cooperation and collaboration in the business life is also seen in the form of making use of the economies of scale. In addition, for the purposes of increasing the volume in common to a maximum level, some strategic alliances are established not only in the form of usual joint-ventures or alliances which involve two corporations but also in the form of groups of companies that have come together for reaching a common goal (Gomes-Casseres, 1994). The facts that the companies outside the U.S.A. and all around the world have caught up with the American companies together with the effects of the global economies and they have become the competitors of the American companies, and that together with the development of technology the product design needs and increasing complexity of product transportation and dispatch have all caused the need for strategic alliance to arise (Gomes-Casseres, 1994). Therefore, top level executives should take into consideration the facts that the strategic alliances are the “normal” of the “new normal” and in order to be able to compete with the competitors on a global scale they should establish strategic alliances with other companies or especially with their competitors, that they should not forget that these alliances include both strategic risks and strategic benefits, that they should consider that in the nature of alliances there exist both collaboration and competition. The issue here is that a corporation entering into a strategic alliance should be able to come out of that alliance as a company which has become stronger in terms of competition (Hamel et al., 1989).
3. How Can The Strategic Alliances Be Successful?

In order that we can show how strategic alliances can be successful and that the subject can be better understood, it is necessary to examine the subject matter under three headlines. These headlines are discussed here below as choosing and evaluating the partners, the subjects that should be taken into consideration during the agreement stage and after the agreement has been made.

3.1 Evaluating And Choosing The Partners

One of the most important elements required for the success of strategic alliances is that the partners should have strategic compliance and acculturation (Wolff, 2002:309). In order that any joint-venture can operate without any problems and be successful it is of vital importance that the partners should share the same goal for the future with respect to experience, value, and principles (Nanda and Williamson,1995). When corporations are establishing alliances, during the process of making a choice, they can make a good start with respect to the relationships if they know the sector they are involved in very well and can make an assessment and use of the changing conditions of the sector (Kanter, 1994). Because collaboration is actually a different form of competition, top level executives may be able to establish partnerships which may go along with their strategic plans by evaluating their strengths and weaknesses with respect to the product, technology, market penetration and access, and functions and by considering how these strengths and weaknesses may change over time with respect to the short-term and long-term success in the market and by evaluating the conflict potentiality (Bleeke and Ernst, 1995). In addition to that, it is necessary that priority should be given to long-term relationship rather than short-term revenues.

One of the subjects that one must be careful about in the evaluation stage is the strengths and weaknesses of a corporation as compared to the competitors or to the partners with whom an alliance is established. An alliance agreement which is made between two strong partners is more reliable than an alliance made between two weak partners (Bleeke and Ernst, 1991). However, many powerful and strong corporations try to have alliance partnerships with weaker smaller or weaker companies in order to be able to exert control over the alliance. Researches made in this respect show that the alliance agreements made by and between strong corporations and weak corporations can rarely be kept going, and that such alliances do not provide the skills and other possibilities, and they increase the performance very little (Bleeke and Ernst, 1991). In such a case, weaker alliance partners should structure the alliance agreement in such a way as to keep the control of one or more important business subjects and elements such as the customer relations in their hands (Bleeke and Ernst, 1995). The rate of success of the alliance partnerships which are established by and between two financially strong partners or two partners one of which is financially strong and the other partner has financially average level performance (mediocre) is 67% (here performance is the average of the stock or asset yield or return during the last five years before the alliance partnership was established) (Bleeke and Ernst, 1991). The alliance of two or more companies with larger scale partners that is established with the hope that they may compete with larger scale companies and have a better position in the market usually ends up to be a failure (Bleeke and Ernst, 1995). Bleeke and Ernst point out that the rate of success of the partnerships between two weak partners is 39% (Bleeke and Ernst, 1991). The rate of success of the partnerships in which the financial ownership is equally shared between the partners is higher (60%) than the partnerships where one of the partners have majority of the shares (31%) (Bleeke and Ernst, 1991). Therefore, whether the chosen partner is financially strong or weak and the
position of having shares (equally or unequally) must be taken into consideration, and must be carefully evaluated in accordance with the results indicated here above.

When direct competitors whose geographical positions and products clash with each other try to form partnerships, conflict is inevitable (Bleeke and Ernst, 1995). On the other hand, if one partner can put distinctive qualities on the table— for example, different geographical and product and functional aspects—then the competitive conflict potential becomes minimum. As a matter of fact, 62% of the alliances which were formed by partners who have different and strong geographical positions were successful (Bleeke and Ernst, 1991). When one of the parties adds new qualities to the qualities of the other one instead of filling the vacancies in the key projects or in the market, the strong aspects of the alliance become more and stronger than the components which make it up. For example, PepsiCo and Lipton have unified their strong aspects which were different from each other for the production and marketing of canned cold tea. On the one hand, Lipton had put forth its expertise and specialization in the field of cold tea production. On the other hand, PepsiCo had put forth its possibility of access to the soft drink distribution channels (Bleeke and Ernst, 1995). In situations where the partners allow each other to have profitable operations, working potential may be exceeded. For example, Philips and Du Pont have developed and manufactured CD’s. However, neither of them had occupied the market of the other one. (Hamel et al., 1989).

3.2 Agreement Stage

Following the selection and assessment of the partner comes the agreement stage. There are usually three elements regarding good agreements between corporations (Kanter, 1994). The first one of them is that there is a specific partnership activity, or an initiative attempt or a project. This project supports to switch relations practically from thought to implementation, and helps partners learn to collaborate with each other, and constitutes a basis for measuring the performance. Existence of a real business to be carried out enables them to start relations. The second one is that there must be a commitment to expand relationships more and more by means of such secondary commitments as stock swaps and individual swaps. Such a commitment reflects an intention of the respective companies for sharing a common fate. The third one is that it must contain such signals that every partner will keep their independence.

In the agreements, which partner controls the customers to which the enterprise will provide services, which partner has the majority in the levels of management, who can invest on the alliance on the basis of profitability, cash and strategic importance of the business and taking the party who is eager to invest into consideration, are important in the sense of estimating how relative bargaining powers of the companies and the alliance will progress in the future (Bleeke and Ernst, 1995). The strengths that the partners have may change even if the bargaining powers at the very beginning of the alliance are equal. For instance, in the early stages of the sector development, the most powerful party is the one which provides product and technology in general. Unless this product and technologies are the properties of the party which provides them and additionally they are unique, then the party which controls the distribution channels and customers will take over the power. Moreover, the powers of the partners that assign most of their top executives into the key positions of an alliance will likely increase although they started the alliance as minority shareholders, and after the agreement is made, capability to invest in the alliance mostly becomes more important in the course of time. The founder who invests more will have generally more decision making power and share percentage. Therefore enterprises should ensure that vacancy in the capacities must be only limited to several key
areas. In addition to that, ineffectual partners must be attentive to the planning of the alliance around a series of skill-
building activities.

Negotiating all aspects of the alliance by contemplating all of the details and writing down all the possible rules that
may come to one’s mind and turning them into legal documents are not a warranty for a healthy development in a
written agreement that has been entered into after reviewing and evaluating all of the issues that are specified above.
But there are ways to make it successful (Bleeke and Ernst, 1991): by providing the alliance with a powerful chairman
at the top of the organization who is assisted by a complete functioning business system (R&D, production, marketing,
sales and distribution) and has full decision making power on matters in relation with the chairman's activities, and a
powerful board of directors, and a sense of identity.

Keeping the information in mind that the lifetime of the strategic alliances is 7 years on the average, righteous
terms and conditions of termination of the agreement, which mutually reserve strategic and financial interests of each
one of the partners, must also be defined. Because the development of the formulas which will equitably distribute the
assets of the alliance in the future is much more important than maintaining each partner's initial share (Bleeke and
Ernst, 1995). If there is a possibility of sale, alliance must be so organized that the company for sale must be easily
separated (Bleeke and Ernst, 1995). This situation is valid for the alliances established especially in order to sell
companies which has no key importance but high performance since they are not conforming to the vision of the
parent company (Nanda and Williamson, 1995).

3.3 After The Agreement

At this stage there is an agreement that has been entered into and the alliance is now established. Joint-ventures are,
at the same time, new enterprises, therefore they bring uncertainties and unexpected difficulties along with them.
Operational and cultural differences come into view. In this case, the structures of the partners which are not similar
to each other must be harmonized, and to this end, there must be an adequate amount of communication in order to keep
the alliance safe. The best way is that companies must spare some time to learn each other's differences between
themselves at the beginning of the business and prepare themselves against these problems.

In the collaboration that has been established with the competitors, in spite of everything, the following rules must
also be definitely implemented even though it seems to be in conflict with the topics mentioned above, in order to
benefit the most from it (Hamel et al., 1989). Companies should always bear in mind that their partners may disarm
themselves. In forming an alliance, they must have quite clear strategic targets, and be aware of how the targets of
their partners will effect their own successes. Successful companies know that harmony is not the most important
criterion of the success, because the best evidence of the existing collaboration based on common interests is the
conflicts which happen from time to time. They inform each one of their employees at every level on which skills and
technologies must be kept secret from the associated company and keep a close watch on what the partners asked for
and what they got finally. And ultimately, successful companies consider every alliance they formed as a door opening
to the comprehensive skills of their partners. They make use of the alliance they formed in acquiring new skills within
the areas other than those specified in the official agreement and distribution of the new knowledge systematically all
around their own organizations.

Collaboration does not always allow the partner to internalize its skills completely. Nevertheless, it may be very
valuable to acquire new and more accurate criteria with regard to the partner's performance. A new criterion may also
initiate a series of competitive improvements as well as it may trigger the company to review its existing performance
level entirely. Learning to utilize rough estimates and turning them into internal targets in order to determine at which points the competitor or the partner is better, faster, or cheaper, and readjustment in order to determine the improvement in the competitor's performance are the required skills to analyze the competitor (Hamel et al., 1989).

The company which is successful in learning - and configures the alliance in such a way that it can access the partner's skills and internalize them - will probably be less dependent on its partners as the alliance progresses (Hamel et al., 1989). The biggest advantage of the competitive collaboration is to facilitate the acquisition of a criterion by means of relationship. As a matter of fact, some analysts enunciate that one of the reasons which Toyota has entered into a joint-venture affair for NUMMI plant with General Motors is to evaluate the GM production quality. Such a situation provides such a relationship possibility that they can presume how each of them will act upon cancellation or termination of the alliance (Hamel et al., 1989).

4. Conclusion

Globalization is a new and unique phenomenon that continues with its evolution in terms of politics, economic aspects and culture. Perpetuity of such inversions in the course of this process has introduced and introduces uncertainties in such areas as economy, communication, politics and so forth. These fluctuations have radically changed the anticipated paradigms of "the former". This is "the new normal" from now on.

It is observed that recently ways of doing business have also changed as a result of the globalization movement in the world and rapid advancements in technology. Logic of the competition has changed for the companies which have to move and act fast, and have opportunities to penetrate into different markets, and have to conduct continuous improvement processes and R&D activities, and strategic alliances became important at least as much as competition.

In consequence of sharing information regarding different processes and common projects, the strengths of each party can be transferred mutually by way of fast information flow. This also contributes significantly to the companies in the way of generating dynamics suitable for rapidly changing business environment and in search of new. Conservative and inward-oriented management styles suggesting the opposite are not capable of responding today’s circumstances.
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