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Abstract

For many years, there has been an ongoing debate over intelligence analysis: is it an art or science?; tradecraft or training?; creative or critical thinking? As a result, academics and practitioners often differ in their views of how to teach intelligence analysis. On May 23, 2017, at this year’s International Associate for Intelligence Education (IAFIE) Conference in Charles Town, West Virginia, a roundtable composed of faculty members from five universities in the United States shared their views on how they approach the teaching of intelligence analysis within their specific academic departments and disciplines. These include graduate and undergraduate degree programs; intelligence-specific majors or minors; multidisciplinary programs; traditional liberal arts programs; and professional school programs. They also come from diverse backgrounds as academics, scholars, practitioners, or all of the above. This article summarizes the views shared by the roundtable participants regarding how they approach teaching intelligence analysis, to include pedagogy; methodology; learning outcomes; assessment methods; course content; use of analytical tools and structured analytical techniques; and simulations and exercises.
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Resumen

Por muchos años ha habido un debate acerca del análisis de inteligencia: ¿Es un arte o es ciencia?; ¿oficio o entrenamiento?; ¿pensamiento creativo o pensamiento crítico? Como resultado, los académicos y los profesionales a menudo difieren en su visión de cómo enseñar el análisis de inteligencia. El 23 de mayo de 2017, en la conferencia...
de International Associate for Intelligence Education (IAFIE) en Charles Town, Virginia Occidental, una mesa redonda compuesta de diferentes miembros de cinco universidades en los Estados Unidos compartieron sus puntos de vista acerca de los métodos con que se enseña el análisis de inteligencia dentro de sus departamentos y disciplinas específicos. Estos incluyen programas de pregrado y posgrado; especializaciones académicas en inteligencia; programas multidisciplinarios; programas tradicionales de *Liberal Arts*; y programas de escuela profesional. También provienen de diferentes disciplinas como académicos, investigadores, profesionales o todo lo ya mencionado. Este artículo resume los puntos de vista que comparten todos los participantes de la mesa redonda en relación con la enseñanza del análisis de inteligencia, para incluir la pedagogía; metodología; resultados del aprendizaje; métodos de evaluación; contenido del curso; uso de herramientas analíticas y técnicas analíticas estructurales; y simulacros y ejercicios.

*Palabras clave: inteligencia, análisis, pedagogía, metodología, enseñanza*

**摘要**

多年来，关于情报分析的辩论一直在进行：情报分析是一种艺术还是科学？是谍报技术还是训练？是创造性思维还是批判性思维？辩论结果则是，大学教师和从业人员时常在如何进行情报分析教学一事上持有不同观点。2017年5月23日，美国西弗吉尼亚查尔斯镇举办了国际情报教育协会（International Associate for Intelligence Education，简称IAFIE）会议，该圆桌会议由5所大学的教师参加，他们分享了各自如何在其特定的学术部门和学科下进行情报分析教学。分享的观点包括研究生和本科生学位课程、以情报为主修或辅修的课程、跨学科课程、传统自由艺术课程、以及专业学校课程。与会人员同时也是来自不同背景的大学教师、学者和从业人员。本文对圆桌会议参与者关于如何进行情报分析教学分享的观点进行了总结，从而将教学法、方法论、学习成果、评估方法、课程内容、分析工具的使用、结构化分析技术（*structured analytical techniques*）的使用、模拟法以及练习包括在内。

**关键词：**情报，分析，教学法，方法论，教学
Introduction

Tale as old as time
Tune as old as song
Bitter sweet and strange
Finding you can change
Learning you were wrong

(Ashman and Menken 1991)

This may be a song lyric from a Disney movie, but it could also be an appropriate description of how academics and practitioners often differ in their views of intelligence analysis: Art or science? Tradecraft or training? Creative or critical thinking? Beauty or beast?

On May 23, 2017, at this year’s International Association for Intelligence Education (IAFIE) Conference in Charles Town, WV, a roundtable composed of faculty members from five universities in the United States shared their views on how they approach the teaching of intelligence analysis within their specific academic departments and disciplines. These include graduate and undergraduate degree programs; intelligence-specific majors or minors; multidisciplinary programs; traditional liberal arts programs; and professional school programs. They also come from diverse backgrounds as academics, scholars, practitioners, or all of the above.

Roundtable Participants

Dr. Stephen Coulthart, Assistant Professor of National Security Studies at the University of Texas, El Paso (UTEP), teaches intelligence analysis courses in support of two degree programs: a Master of Science in Intelligence and National Security and a Minor in Intelligence and National Security. UTEP’s graduate program is certified by the International Association for Intelligence Education. UTEP also offers an open source certificate, the first in the country that offers curriculum not found in many civilian institutions, such as: social media intelligence; commercial imagery; and geospatial intelligence. At the undergraduate level UTEP offers an online Bachelor of Arts in Security Studies.

Dr. Stephen Marrin, Associate Professor of Intelligence Analysis at James Madison University (JMU) in Harrisonburg, VA, is the Program Director for the undergraduate Bachelor of Science in Intelligence Analysis (IA) degree program. It is administered as part of the multidisciplinary Department of Integrated Science
and Technology (ISAT). The JMU Intelligence Analysis program is undergraduate only, with about 250 students in the major. There are two primary concentrations: national security and competitive intelligence, with law enforcement possible if the students minor in criminal justice. JMU’s technical specialties include cyber intelligence (linked to computer science), and geospatial intelligence (linked to geographic sciences). It may be best to think of JMU’s program more as an “analysis” major, which sets its graduates up well for a wide variety of different kinds of jobs to include—but not limited to—intelligence analysis.

Sarah Miller Beebe, Adjunct Faculty, Johns Hopkins University (JHU), teaches intelligence analysis courses in the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, Advanced Academic Programs and Graduate Degree Programs at JHU’s Washington, D.C. campus. The course is offered as part of the five-course Intelligence Certificate. The Certificate may also be combined with four graduate degree programs: Master of Arts in Global Studies; Master of Arts in Government; Master of Science in Government Analytics; or Master of Arts in Public Management. The majority of students who pursue the Certificate do so in the context of their Master’s degree. JHU views this Intelligence Certificate as being something along the lines of a public policy program for current or future intelligence officers, to help them understand the full contours of the profession, how it works across its breadth, and relates to the U.S. Government writ large. The program provides students with an understanding of the ways in which the United States practices intelligence; the purposes to which it puts intelligence; the limits upon intelligence, be they practical, legal, ethical, or cultural; and the important debates in the field. The faculty members are scholars and practitioners with many years of experience in the field.

Dr. Brian Simpkins is the Associate Director of the Blue Grass State Intelligence Community Center of Academic Excellence (BGS IC CAE), at Eastern Kentucky University (EKU) in Richmond, KY. Brian Simpkins is also a part-time faculty member within the EKU Homeland Security Degree Program. The EKU Intelligence Studies Program is part of the Bachelor of Science in Homeland Security offered through the College of Justice and Safety. The Intelligence Studies Program started with a required intelligence process course for Homeland Security majors and then expanded to an interdisciplinary undergraduate Certificate in Intelligence Studies, requiring four courses to include intelligence history; intelligence process; counterintelligence; and intelligence analysis. It is paired with students completing four courses in a concentration, including intelligence collection and analysis; threat specialization; regional analysis (plus two language courses); security operations, and science and technology. EKU also offers a graduate Certificate in Intelligence and National Security with four courses in foundations of homeland security; terrorism and intelligence; intelligence analysis; and international relations. The undergraduate and graduate certificates are
standalone in which a student can obtain the certificate without having to enroll or complete a formal degree. Starting in fall 2017, EKU will also offer a Minor in Cybersecurity and Intelligence pairing three intelligence courses in intelligence process; counterintelligence; and intelligence analysis; with four forensic computing courses.

Dr. Richard J. Kilroy, Jr., Assistant Professor of Politics at Coastal Carolina University (CCU) in Conway, SC, teaches intelligence analysis courses in support of CCU’s Bachelor of Arts in Intelligence and National Security Studies (INTEL) degree program. The undergraduate intelligence degree program is administered within the Department of Politics at CCU, and as such, follows a traditional liberal arts curriculum. INTEL majors at CCU complete the University core curriculum, which includes foreign language; sciences; arts; politics; history; English; and math courses. Since students elect to be an INTEL major upon enrollment, they take courses during their core curriculum required for the major, to include anthropology; communications; geography; philosophy; and statistics. Foundational intelligence courses required for the major include Introduction to Intelligence Studies; Intelligence Communications; Intelligence Analysis; Intelligence Operations; Intelligence Research and Writing; and either Homeland Security or National Security. Students complete the program with a Capstone Course, which involves a major research paper. Students in other disciplines can also pursue a Minor in Intelligence and National Security Studies. Other minors available to INTEL majors include Geospatial Information Systems (GIS); Criminology; Global Studies; and Computer Science.

Discussion

The format of the roundtable discussion posed a series of questions on teaching Intelligence Analysis to each of the participants. The following is a summary of the responses from each of the faculty members.

1. What courses do you currently offer in Intelligence Analysis?

Stephen Coulthart stated that several courses are offered at UTEP, including Introduction to Intelligence Analysis; Intelligence Collection and Analysis; and Introduction to Intelligence and National Security course. Graduate-level courses are reading intensive, so students are expected to be familiar with most of the significant literature in the field of intelligence studies.

Brian Simpkins shared that EKU offers three upper level undergraduate courses which focus on intelligence analysis: HLS 321W Critical Problem Analysis (an undergraduate critical thinking course required for all Homeland Security majors); HLS 401 Intelligence Process; and HLS 403 Intelligence Analysis. At the
graduate level, EKU offers HLS 825 Intelligence Analysis.

Sarah Miller Beebe explained that students pursuing JHU’s Certificate in Intelligence are required to take one course in each of five areas: Introductory Courses; Theory; Operations; Law and Ethics; and Applications. The analysis course falls under the Operations requirement. It is also an elective in the various MA programs as well.

Since JMU’s program is all about analysis, Stephen Marrin shared that there are 14 required courses in the Intelligence Analysis degree program: four courses focus on methods, how to think, counterfactuals, etc.; four courses focus on technology applications, such as data science, data mining, and visualization; and a number of others provide broad contextualization of the analytic function, as well as a senior Capstone course. In the Capstone course students conduct a self-initiated research plan, choose a topic and develop a research question, more along the lines of a senior thesis or self-initiated analytic product rather than one that was requested.

At CCU, Richard Kilroy explained that Intelligence Analysis is taught initially within the INTEL 200 Introduction to Intelligence Studies course, which students take in their freshman or sophomore year. Students later take INTEL 310 Intelligence Analysis as part of the major’s foundational curriculum. Students can also take elective courses, such as POLI 399 Applied Intelligence Analysis and INTEL 337 Law Enforcement Intelligence, which teach intelligence analysis within the context of specific geopolitical regions, or disciplines.

2. Are your courses limited to Intelligence Studies majors only and what prerequisites are required for taking intelligence analysis courses?

Stephen Coulthart reiterated that at UTEP, only Intelligence Studies majors can take Intelligence Analysis courses. For Introduction to Intelligence Analysis and Intelligence Collection and Analysis, students need to take the Introduction to Intelligence and National Security course. This course provides a very broad overview of the field, to include the basic context of the intelligence community, the intelligence cycle, etc.

Brian Simpkins said that at EKU, any major may take the intelligence certificates or the new minor. The undergraduate certificate in particular was designed to be multidisciplinary to attract majors from across the campus. EKU is an Intelligence Community Center of Academic Excellence (IC CAE) and the IC CAE program office desires the multidisciplinary approach. EKU has been informed by the IC CAE program office that the IC desires graduates with degrees from a number of traditional academic disciplines, especially STEM degrees, who know something about intelligence and analysis. This is how the EKU Intelligence Studies Program was structured to provide students basic knowledge about intelli-
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gence and analysis paired with their traditional degree. There are no required under-
dergraduate prerequisites for courses in intelligence analysis. It is recommended, however, that the student has taken the basic undergraduate research methods course in their major before enrolling in HLS 403 Intelligence Analysis.

Sarah Miller Beebe explained that intelligence analysis is fundamentally about understanding and communicating to decision makers what is known, not known, and surmised, as it can best be determined. Therefore, students in JHU's graduate degree programs will read seminal texts on intelligence analysis, discuss the complex cognitive, psychological, organizational, ethical, and legal issues surrounding intelligence analysis now and in the past, and apply analytic methodologies to real world problems. As a prerequisite for taking Intelligence Analysis, graduate students are expected to have completed one of the following: AS 470.620 Introduction to Intelligence in the Five Eyes Community; AS 470.711.51 Intelligence: From Secrets to Policy; or AS.470.748.51 The Art and Practice of Intelligence (or gain permission of instructor).

Stephen Marrin stated that at JMU, most courses in the IA program are limited to Intelligence Analysis majors, but he will take additional students who request to be added in. Since he is a Political Scientist by academic discipline in the multidisciplinary ISAT Department, Marrin noted that political science students who take IA courses seem to enjoy them and do well. As for prerequisite courses, the only requirement for students pursuing the BA in Intelligence Analysis is Statistics. For courses which Marrin teaches, functionally there are no prerequisites, since most are pitched as mid-to upper-level political science courses. Other courses in the Intelligence Analysis major do have prerequisites.

At CCU, due to the large number of students enrolled in the Intelligence and National Security Studies degree program (currently 350), Richard Kilroy explained that the Major Core required courses, such as Intelligence Analysis, are limited to INTEL majors or minors. To take the prerequisite course for all Major Core INTEL courses (INTEL 200 Introduction to Intelligence Studies), students are required to have taken POLI 201 American Government. Students must pass INTEL 200 with a grade of C or better if they are already a declared INTEL major. If they are an INTEL pre-major (determined by High School GPA and SAT/ACT test scores at admission), they must achieve a grade of B or better to become an INTEL major.

3. What pedagogical style do you use in teaching Intelligence Analysis? What course content do you include? What learning outcomes do you have for your students?
Stephen Coulthart shared that at UTEP, with undergraduates in his Intelligence Collection and Analysis course, he curates a classroom environment that is as interactive as possible. This is done to help keep students engaged. For example, he uses an exercise on HUMINT collection from Lahneman and Arcos (2014). In terms of content, he focuses on learning about intelligence analysis for 75 percent of the course (e.g., theory and substantive knowledge of intelligence agencies) and 25 percent on analytical skills (e.g., Bottom Line Up Front briefing and writing). The course content comes from two books. For the content on intelligence collection, he uses Lowenthal and Clark (2015) and for intelligence analysis content he uses Fingar (2011). In terms of intelligence analysis content, Coulthart expects that students walk away from the course being able to discuss and define intelligence analysis and how it fits into U.S. national security as well as identify the key issues and debates in intelligence analysis. To test for this knowledge he uses mostly multiple choice along with some short answers (one in class and one out of class). Coulthart’s approach toward graduate intelligence analysis education is quite different from undergraduates. It is informed by Schon (1990), which stresses the importance of providing aspiring professionals with environments where they can fail, adopt, and succeed repeatedly. In developing his syllabus for the course, he drew inspiration from art studios where students are given difficult tasks and allowed to “fumble” through them. Coulthart sees his role in this course less as an instructor imparting knowledge and more as a coach/resource person helping students make sense of each task. In terms of learning outcomes he expects that students will possess a basic understanding of the context of intelligence analysis (e.g., historical and organizational) and basic intelligence analysis proficiencies (e.g., searching, validating, organizing, analyzing, and communicating).

Brian Simpkins explained that at EKU, each of the courses which cover intelligence analysis employ different pedagogies determined by the expected learning outcomes. For example, HLS 321W Critical Process, on-campus, utilizes a lecture and lab format—each week has a lecture on the assigned topic and students then are provided exercises or team simulations where they must use the material covered in the lecture as they work on a major research project. The online version of HLS 321W is a self-study course where the students do the same simulations and exercises as on-campus students and also develop a major research project. The course utilizes Elder and Paul’s (2016) framework from the *Thinker’s Guide to Analytic Thinking*. The last four to five weeks of HLS 401 Intelligence Process, which focuses on intelligence analysis, employs a team-based learning format on-campus, and online a self-study format. HLS 403 Intelligence Analysis employs a seminar format with extensive case study work done individually and in teams. The online course is more self-study, but still employs student team projects. HLS 825 Intelligence Analysis is only taught online and is done in a self-study format with significant case study work done by individual students and an individual student threat analysis project. Intelligence analysis courses utilize a number of techniques.
from Heuer and Pherson (2014), to include Analysis of Competing Hypotheses (ACH); What If Analysis; Red Teaming; and Indicators Analysis. The course also uses Clark (2016), based on formal modeling and case studies.

Sarah Miller Beebe shared her teaching pedagogy at JHU, which includes learning objectives, multiple learning methods, and assessment types. The graduate intelligence analysis course she teaches is designed to ensure that it fits within the curriculum, includes clearly defined terminal learning objectives and multiple, relevant assessment methods. There is a strong critical thinking and metacognitive underpinning to the course. She structures her teaching as a seminar to guide graduate students through the 14-week course. It is literature-based with learning objectives for every class meeting and opportunities throughout the semester to bridge theory and practice. She employs readings from a number of sources, to include George and Bruce (2014), Heuer and Pherson (2014), Beebe and Pherson (2014), Clark (2016), National Research Council (2011), DNI (2015), and CIA (2009). She also recommends that students read historical literature such as Kent (1949).

Stephen Marrin reiterated that since JMU’s program is all about analysis, the faculty members in the program employ a variety of pedagogical styles in teaching different courses. For his knowledge-based courses, he recognizes the challenge in teaching undergraduates that they do not often read the assigned materials. Therefore, he assigns papers that have the following as a requirement: answer a question by referencing key content from each of the assigned readings into a holistic, synthetic evaluation of the course content. This provides a platform for the students to develop their evaluative and argumentative skills (the core skills of the strategic intelligence analyst). Marrin also has students prepare strategic intelligence assessments in a capstone course. Students in this course can choose a client for whom they will present their paper as the consumer of the product, or they can produce it as a self-initiated product. Since this is a two semester course process, students must pick a topic, choose a research question, identify methods to employ, and then implement the research design by learning in a trial and error way (like riding a bike), where they continually revise their research design and ultimate product. Marrin stated that his goals as a political scientist teaching social context in an intelligence analysis program are to (1) give students knowledge about aspects of intelligence, intelligence analysis, and national security decision making; (2) be diagnostic and give the students a chance to decide if national security intelligence analysis (or intelligence, or analysis, or national security) is the right path for them; and (3) be preparatory, or as Rob Johnson (2005) referred to it, a kind of “sociological acculturation” ... a preparation for what it takes to do analysis well. Marrin said that JMU’s Intelligence Analysis program is very much like the new pre-med degree programs, which go beyond science education to now include a multidisciplinary approach which includes a social context (e.g., including courses
in philosophy, psychology, and sociology), with the goal being a solid knowledge foundation for those who choose to go to medical school after graduation. He says the JMU intelligence analysis program has many similarities with this pre-med approach to undergraduate education (Marrin 2009).

At CCU, Richard Kilroy explained that multiple faculty teach INTEL 310 Intelligence Analysis and each brings in their own pedagogy to enhance learning. In the Introductory course, INTEL 200, however, where students are first exposed to Intelligence Analysis, all faculty use Jensen, McElreath, and Graves (2012). In his INTEL 310 classes, Kilroy begins by discussing critical thinking using literature such as Heuer (1999); Moore (2007); and Facione (2015). The course then focuses on teaching Structured Analytical Techniques (SAT), using Heuer and Pherson’s (2014) text, along with Beebe and Pherson (2014). Students work in teams assigned to specific case studies, which then must “teach” the other students in the class about the case study, guide them through the use of the appropriate SAT, and then demonstrate an understanding of the SAT by explaining their outcome. As a culmination of the course, students also work in teams to analyze a contemporary security situation by developing four scenarios for the possibility of a Third Intifada in the Middle East, using adversarial collaboration and structured debate to argue their most likely outcome. In addition to the written papers, the assessment instruments for the course include a midterm which is more objective (multiple choice, true/false, short answer) assessing Bloom’s lower cognitive skills and a final exam (all essay questions) assessing Bloom’s higher cognitive skills (Bloom 1956).

Questions from the Audience

At the conclusion of the discussion, the roundtable participants took questions from the audience.

One question focused on teaching students the importance of getting a security clearance and how to do that. Stephen Coulthart mentioned that at UTEP, they cover this in their new student orientation, given the prevalence of social media today and how public students are with their personal lives. Brian Simpkins stated that at EKU, students are taught how to be smart about getting a clearance in their JSO 100 course. They learn about background checks, medical issues, financial disclosures (paying rent on time, etc.). Further, the BGS IC CAE and homeland security student groups often bring in guest speakers who discuss the security clearance process. Richard Kilroy said that at CCU, in their National Security Club, students are taught about filling out an SF 86 (starting now to gather information needed from parents, employers, etc.).

Another question was: is it alright for students to fail? Stephen Marrin argued that yes it is, since it is acceptable to try something and learn from experiences. In the capstone project he does not grade solely on the quality of the final
project, but also on the degree to which the students engage with the learning experience as well as a reflective essay at the end of the process. This reflective essay, modeled on a paper the graduate students at Brunel University’s MA in Intelligence and Security Studies write at the end of the Brunel Analytic Simulation Exercise (BASE), allows students to reflect on the process, have good conversations on failure and recovery, and understand how lessons learned help prevent future failures.

One question addressed whether students are exposed to courses in philosophy and logic at the different schools. Stephen Coulthart said that undergraduate UTEP students do take these courses as part of the Liberal Arts core curriculum. For graduate courses, students learn methods of argumentation. Stephen Marrin stated that at JMU students do learn critical thinking skills in their methods courses which were developed and taught by Noel Hendrickson based on his background in philosophy (Hendrickson 2008). Richard Kilroy shared that at CCU, Intelligence majors are required to take PHIL 110, Introduction to Logic, as part of their Intelligence Foundation curriculum.

A student from the University of Mississippi provided a brief overview of the Intelligence Studies program at Ole Miss, which does not offer an Intelligence major, but rather a minor in Intelligence to compliment other majors. Students take six courses in Intelligence Studies, to include Analytics I and II, where they must score a B or higher. In these courses they learn Structured Analytical Techniques, how to brief and write effectively, using estimative language in the intelligence community. Ole Miss also requires students to have had an internship during their undergraduate studies, which provides a career-oriented sense of purpose to the program of study.

A lecturer at Edith Cowan University in Perth, Australia asked about how faculty in the United States develop assessment tasks for intelligence analysis courses. Stephen Coulthart stated that in his graduate intelligence analysis course, they have four modules in their course which include the context of intelligence analysis (e.g., socio-organizational issues); setting analysis (e.g., requirement analysis); methods of analysis (e.g., forecasting and hypothesis testing); and analytical communication (e.g., writing and briefing). He also stated that his research informs his teaching and helps determine methods of assessment. For example, his doctoral thesis at the University of Pittsburgh focused on the effectiveness of Structured Analytical Techniques in intelligence analysis. New information has been discovered on the use of SATs, in regards to what works and what does not (Coulthart 2017). Sarah Miller Beebe uses multiple assessment instruments in her graduate courses at JHU which demonstrate logic and reasoning as they read the intelligence analysis literature. Students produce short reaction papers, complete analytic problem sets, provide oral briefings, and produce an annotated bibliography and longer paper on a topic relating to intelligence analysis. Throughout
the semester-long seminar they engage in give-and-take discussions focused on class-generated key questions that align with the learning objectives for each week. Beebe used the example of solving a math problem, where students not only study the literature, including theory and methods (like SATs), but also “show the work” of their analysis—a process that helps them bridge theory and practice and observe their own intellectual progress. Richard Kilroy shared that at CCU, there are assessments within courses tied to the learning objectives, but there are also program assessments required by the university. For Intelligence Studies, there is not a formal test, such as a major field exam like other majors (Political Science, for example). He suggested that maybe this is something that IAFIE could help develop.

Conclusion

Since the roundtable was limited to 70 minutes, there were more topics that were left for another discussion, as well as questions that did not get asked. In the end, the roundtable left the “tale as old as time” of whether intelligence analysis is an art or science open to further dialog (Landon-Murray and Coulthart 2016). The good news is that academics and practitioners are talking to each other, and in many schools, teaching together. This ultimately benefits students who desire to pursue careers as intelligence analysts by having faculty members who bring diverse experiences throughout the intelligence community as practitioners, along with academics and scholars who bring new research into analytical methodologies, new pedagogies, and new insights into teaching intelligence analysis.
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