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The Shrimp Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Perdido Beach Resort, Orange Beach, Alabama, Monday morning, January 25, 2016, and was called to order at 11:15 a.m. by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

ADOPITION OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES
ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS

CHAIRMAN LEANN BOSARGE: Let’s call the Shrimp Management Committee to order. Myself, Dave Donaldson is Vice Chair, we have Commander Brand, Dr. Crabtree or Steve, Dr. Lucas, Myron is here, and Lance and Robin are here. All right.

Our agenda is Tab D, Number 1. We have a pretty short agenda today, and so hopefully we can stay on track and stay on schedule. We don’t want to miss the dog. I am pretty excited about it. On the agenda, are there any edits or revisions or additions that anybody would like to make to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is adopted. The minutes are under Tab D, Number 2. Were there any revisions that needed to be made to the minutes from our last meeting? Kevin.

MR. KEVIN ANSON: Thank you. Just one. Page 16, line 15, change “think” to “thing”.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: So noted. Any other revisions? Seeing none, the minutes are adopted with that revision. Our Action Guide and Next Steps are listed under Tab D, Number 3. The first thing that we’re going to take a look at this morning is Final Action on Shrimp Amendment 17A. we have a couple of items there. Is Emily going to lead us through these public hearing comments? It says “Muehlstein”.

MS. CHARLENE PONCE: I will do the written public comment and Assane will do the public hearing. I can go first, if that’s all right.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That sounds great.

FINAL ACTION ON SHRIMP AMENDMENT 17A
SUMMARY OF WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. PONCE: For the written comments, we received comments of support for ending the moratorium, saying that there should be more permits available for shrimp vessels. The industry cannot grow without the availability of permits, and they would like to see the moratorium expire.
We had comments requesting that the moratorium be extended. Comments regarding that were the cost of gear alone creates limited entry, and so there should be no further regulations imposed on the shrimp fishery. There were comments to extend, specifically for ten years, because there are enough boats in the Gulf. The current and anticipated market situation deem it appropriate, and that they feel they’ve earned the right to have the moratorium stay in place. There is enough competition as it is.

Then there were specific comments to extend the moratorium for only five years and support for extending the moratorium, but also requiring the implementation of VMS. Finally, regarding royal reds, if they are overfished, then an endorsement for royal reds is warranted.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay and then who was going to give us the other summary? Assane? Are you ready, sir?

SUMMARY OF THE PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

DR. ASSANE DIAGNE: Yes, Ms. Bosarge, and thank you. Overall, we held one webinar and eight public hearings. The total attendance at these nine meetings was thirty-three. Thirty-three people attended, in total.

In terms of comments, there was some support expressed for a permanent limited access program. Questions were asked as to why should we keep on going on five or ten years. Some attendees did voice their support for just having a limited access program once and for all and be done, if you would, but the most popular comment, or the one that we’ve heard the most, was that the preferred alternative selected by the council, which would be to have the moratorium in place for another ten years.

There was a lot of support expressed for that, having, again, another ten-year period, which would give the council the opportunity, of course, to revisit this when the time comes.

There was some opposition to the moratorium idea in itself, but those discussions centered really, mostly, around 17B, which, as you know, is the amendment that is coming afterwards. For some people, the main idea was that the council needed a lot of information to evaluate, if need be, this idea of having a permit pool and also to getting at the target or the, quote, unquote, optimal number of permits when the time comes.
Concerning the royal red endorsement, attendees, some of the attendees, recognized the fact that we have a large number of people who get that endorsement, but very few shrimpers actively use it, and so the usefulness of the endorsement was questioned by some, but some felt that it was necessary to maintain it and to keep the endorsement.

In a nutshell, that’s a very quick summary of the comments that we received and the full description of the comments and some of the discussions we had are listed in your briefing book. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Assane. Myron, go ahead.

MR. MYRON FISCHER: To add to some of what Assane said, I’ve had Louisiana shrimpers -- He touched on it a bit, but they did feel uncomfortable -- They supported the ten-year moratorium, but, at the same time, felt uncomfortable and wanting to know where 17B and what those permit totals would be. If the totals would be cut drastically, then, of course, they wouldn’t have supported the moratorium. They were just kind of hoping for a status quo on this.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Myron. All right. The next item on our agenda is to actually review the document, which can be found at Tab D, Number 5. I believe, Assane, are you going to lead us through that review? We have a preferred alternative for the first action item, but not for the second, and this is up for a possibility of final action today.

DR. DIAGNE: Yes, Ms. Bosarge, but I believe that Dr. Kilgour is on the phone and she is ready to lead you through that discussion. Thank you.

DR. MORGAN KILGOUR: Yes, I’m here.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Great. Sorry about that, Morgan. I didn’t realize you were with us. Glad to have you back. Go ahead.

REVIEW DOCUMENT

DR. KILGOUR: All right. It looks like they have the page right up, and so we just need to, I guess, quickly review the Action 1. The current preferred alternative is to extend the moratorium for an additional ten years. The other two alternatives is no action, where the current will expire on October 26, 2016, or Alternative 3, which is to create a federal
limited access permit for commercial shrimp vessels in the Gulf.

To be eligible, you would have to have a valid or renewable permit as of October 26, 2016, and it would need to be renewed every year. Again, this is a limited access permit that could be changed at any time by the council and so are there any questions on these three alternatives?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I don’t see any hands. Go ahead.

DR. KILGOUR: All right. The next would be on page 12, if you guys could scroll ahead to Action 2. This is where I would need the committee to make a recommendation on a preferred alternative.

Right now, we have Alternative 1, which is no action, which would continue to require a royal red shrimp endorsement. Endorsements are only eligible for people that already have a federal shrimp permit, or Alternative 2 would be to discontinue the royal red shrimp endorsement. That would mean that anybody with a federal shrimp permit could harvest royal red shrimp. Are there any questions on these?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had a question, and this might be for Steve Branstetter. In the document, when it discusses Alternative 2 and the cost savings and how many of these endorsements are out there versus how many are being actively fished, it says “Additionally, an economic database specific to royal red shrimp would not be maintained, although royal red shrimp landings data are still collected.”

Now, this is if we were to do away with the endorsement. Steve, can you tell me the economic database -- What exactly is encompassed in that database? What would we be losing?

DR. STEVE BRANSTETTER: To be real honest, I’m not real sure. The economic report that all shrimpers have to turn in at the end of year would continue, whether the endorsement is there or not, and so I’m not real sure what that -- I can try to find out.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Sorry to put you on the spot. Kelly, did you have a question?

DR. KELLY LUCAS: I did. In the document, and this is on page 12, it says that -- It doesn’t appear that the establishment of an endorsement has helped with collecting the desired data, and the desired data was catch effort, operating costs, maximum
sustainable yield estimates.

I was just wondering if -- You narrow down your universe and so what’s the discrepancy between you’ve narrowed it down, but it’s not helping with collecting the data? I mean is there any explanation of that?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Mara.

MS. MARA LEVY: I think it’s because the number of endorsements that folks have, because anyone with a shrimp permit can get one, is in the three-hundreds, and the number of vessels that actually land it are under twenty. You’re not really narrowing the universe of folks that actually catch royal red shrimp by issuing this permit, because 300 people have it, but seven are actually fishing.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: All right. One more question. You know we had a meeting with the Coral AP where we wanted to bring in some specific expertise from the royal red fishery, and we realized that we didn’t have any of those on our Shrimp AP to pull from, and this may be for Carrie.

I know somebody came to me and said, hey, do you have any names of people that do this, and so if we were to get rid of the endorsement and we have questions like that, where we’re wanting to hone in on this particular expertise for some specific question, how do we then find that universe of people to go to?

DR. KILGOUR: I can answer that. We could still check and see who has royal red shrimp landings. That information isn’t going to go away. The economic database that was intended to be created for the endorsement never really was created, and so we’re still getting most of our information based on the landings and not from this economic database that never was created.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. That answers my question and I appreciate it. Steve.

DR. BRANSTETTER: Back to your question, I have been informed that that database going away is an incorrect statement and they intend to remove that from the document.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. My only other concern is there is obviously a lot more endorsements out there, and this is my personal opinion, but there is a lot more endorsements out there than what are being fished.
Two concerns I have is I can see the advantage of doing away with the endorsement, as far as the cost savings. I can see that, and it’s just a time savings. If it’s not useful, from a data perspective, then why are we collecting it?

On the other hand, I do think it could be useful at this point, with things we have on the horizon, from an enforcement perspective. If we do create some of these HAPC areas, and if the royal red fleet is given an exception to use bottom-tending gear, you know with certain criteria, in those closed areas, the only way for enforcement to verify, from a paper perspective, that they legally can trawl there would be if they have that endorsement on their federal Gulf permit.

Otherwise, enforcement has to become an expert on, well, is that royal red gear? Is this boat set up only for royal red? It seems it would probably be a no-brainer. If you're in that deep water, you’re probably royal redding, but, still, there would be no paper documentation there for enforcement to definitively say that.

The other concern to me, and it hasn’t been an issue -- Could it become an issue in the future? I don’t know. There is not a lot of people fishing for this particular type of shrimp, but there is an ACL attached to it. If, heaven forbid, we bumped up against this ACL or exceeded it in the future, I do want to know that we have the amount of data that we need to change our management strategy and implement things that can work for the fishermen and for the shrimp as well. Those are my two concerns, but I would like to hear some feedback from the committee as to where you want to go with this. Mara.

MS. LEVY: I will just point out that essentially the endorsement is open access for anyone who has a shrimp permit. It’s not like this universe of people are the only universe that can get it. You talk about establishing the closed areas and if someone is like, hey, I want to fish in that closed area and I will just go get an endorsement -- I mean it seems to me that you would have to develop some other type of criteria to limit who has the endorsement if you really want to use it as some sort of enforcement tool in some future closed areas, because, right now, anyone who has a shrimp permit can get it for the extra ten-dollars, I think, that they pay.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Roy.

MR. ROY WILLIAMS: Yes, but in response to that, at least if you
know who the universe of people is that think they might go
go royal red shrimping at some point, if you do create some closed
areas to protect deepwater corals, at least you have a place
where you can direct enforcement and the Regional Office can
direct their correspondence to those people, to say, look,
you’ve got this royal red shrimp endorsement and we want you to
know that these areas are now closed and you have to avoid these
areas, because we’re protecting deepwater corals there.

Rather than having to send one of these to notice every shrimp
fisherman out there, you would simply be noticing the people who
have that royal red shrimp endorsement, and I think that’s the
point Leann was making, and I think it’s a good one. I say that
on behalf of -- As Chairman of the Coral Committee.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: David.

MR. DAVID WALKER: I agree with Roy. I mean it’s a small group
of fishermen, an endorsement, and I think we should continue it.
You know interaction with coral or whatever it may be -- It’s
better for enforcement and I think it’s something we should be
continuing.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Jason.

LCDR JASON BRAND: I would concur that it does help us from the
enforcement standpoint for the deepwater coral, and even the
Texas shrimp closure. We can get onboard and see what they
have, if they’re actually fishing for royal reds or not.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: The Texas shrimp closure, I had not thought
about that. I could see where it may play into that. All
right. But there is obviously still a cost and time savings,
from a management perspective from NMFS if we were to do away
with this.

We’ve had some good discussion on it. We can continue this
discussion, but this is the second action in this document and
we don’t have a preferred as of yet. Do we think that we can
choose a preferred on this today? What’s the committee’s
pleasure? Myron.

MR. FISCHER: Madam Chair, it’s so neutral whether to do it or
not, and it’s not a contentious point. I would recommend we
postpone it to council and just let all seventeen people vote on
it at once.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That’s not a bad idea. Hopefully everybody
has been -- Sometimes people tune out during the Shrimp Committee, but hopefully everybody has been listening to the discussion. Does everybody around the table feel comfortable? Are there any questions that you have at this point or are we comfortable with that? I know Dr. Crabtree just came in and he may -- I will put him on the spot right away. We’re talking about the royal red endorsement. You may have some feedback on what you would like to see happen with that.

DR. ROY CRABTREE: I don’t think the endorsement, as it’s configured right now, does very much for us. It’s not very useful.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I had an out-of-the-box thought too earlier today. We do have a lot of these endorsements out there that are not actively fished. If I was a fisherman, in the back of my mind -- A lot of them probably think, well, what if this part, there’s a moratorium at some point on this part. That could be a lot of the reason that they get this endorsement every year, to show that at one point they were a participant or something of that nature.

Now, another way that we may could get rid of some of these endorsements that people aren’t using is increase the price. I mean it only costs ten-dollars. Can we not do that? That’s not an option?

DR. CRABTREE: No, we can only charge administrative feeds and so we can’t increase the price like that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Myron.

MR. FISCHER: If your goal is to reduce the number of endorsements, could you have a landings criteria?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Well, we had discussed that, and I think we actually had that in the document at one point, and we decided to take that to that Considered but Rejected. If I remember correctly, we decided not to do the landings requirement.

DR. KILGOUR: That’s correct.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Steve.

DR. BRANSTETTER: Thank you. To your point, I know when we first put the endorsements in that we had a lot of phone calls at the office, and one of the main reasons that people -- They said I might as well go ahead and get it and it’s only ten-
bucks, and the way things go, you will lock this down in a moratorium and so I want to make sure I have the historical participation, although I have no participation and never will.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I figured that would probably be a lot of the mindset of that three-hundred-and-some-odd endorsements right there, and I can’t say that I blame them for that. We will have some more discussion on this, I guess, at full council, if no one on the committee wants to pick a preferred at this time.

DR. KILGOUR: Could I make a comment?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Yes, ma’am.

DR. KILGOUR: I just would like to remind the committee that this is the final action and if we don’t take final action by the April meeting, then the moratorium will expire. It’s just a friendly reminder that eventually a preferred need to be picked.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you, Morgan. Lance.

MR. LANCE ROBINSON: If we’re finished with this topic, before we go to the next one, I had a question that came up at one of the public meetings in Texas.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: To that point, Dr. Crabtree?

DR. CRABTREE: Just before we leave the endorsement, and I apologize for coming in late, but we do need to take final action on this amendment this week. I don’t see this endorsement as being a big deal at all.

If you have reservations about getting rid of it or you think there may be some use for it down the road, then just keep it for now, and I don’t think that really does any harm to anything, but I certainly wouldn’t want to see us slow down because of this action.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Thank you, and I have to say I probably do have a few reservations about discontinuing it at this point. Maybe at some point in the future, once we hash out some of these HAPCs and the deep-sea corals.

Maybe I would feel a little more comfortable with it at that point, but right now, I -- Hopefully the cost is not overbearing on the Center to continue this. I would like to see it continue. I would like to see our preferred alternative to continue it, so Alternative 1, no action, essentially.
MR. WALKER: I would like to make that motion, to make Alternative 1 the preferred alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion that’s being placed on the board, and it’s been seconded by Myron. In Action 2, to make Alternative 1 the preferred alternative. We have had some discussion and do we have any more discussion on this, any questions or further input? Okay. All those in favor of this motion, signify by saying aye; all those opposed same sign. The motion passes. All right, Morgan. We have a preferred alternative and do you want to finish your discussion?

DR. KILGOUR: No, I think that’s the end of the review document. The last thing we would need to do would be just to review the codified text.

REVIEW CODIFIED TEXT

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. The codified text is Tab D, Number 6 in our briefing book, and I did take a look at it. I don’t think that we have any codified text in there relative to the royal red endorsement. We had not picked a preferred or anything at that time. Obviously we just did it, and so I’m assuming that is something that would be incorporated?

MS. LEVY: You have picked no action.

DR. KILGOUR: Nothing has changed and so if the preferred alternative is no action, then nothing will have changed in the codified text.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Perfect. That makes that simple.

DR. KILGOUR: Yes, and so the only thing that has changed, if you scroll down a little bit farther on the page, is that the moratorium will be extended until October 26, 2026. If this all looks good, then if the committee wants to recommend that Amendment 17A be deemed necessary and appropriate, it may do so, or wait until full council, but that’s all I have.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. As a committee, are we comfortable with our preferred alternatives and want to recommend this to be sent to the Secretary for approval?

MR. WALKER: I would like to make that motion.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: I apologize to staff that we’re not the best planners. We don’t have our motions prewritten and emailed to you. David, is your motion to recommend to the council --

MR. KEVIN ANSON: It’s on the board.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. We have a motion on the board to approve Shrimp Amendment 17A and that it be forwarded to the Secretary of Commerce for review and implementation and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate, giving staff editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document. The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to the codified text as necessary and appropriate. David, is that your motion?

MR. WALKER: Yes, that’s my motion.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Okay. Is there a second to the motion? It’s seconded. Any discussion on the motion? Mara, you’re okay with it?

MS. LEVY: I was just going to say that technically you probably don’t need the last sentence, since all we’re changing is the date, but I don’t think leaving it in there is a problem.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. All in favor of this motion signify by saying aye; all opposed same sign. The motion carries. I believe that wraps up Amendment 17A. Lance had a comment.

MR. ROBINSON: I apologize and it won’t take long, but just a question came up at the Brownsville meeting from a couple of the participants. Maybe you or someone from NOAA staff can help me with the answer.

They expressed concern, I guess difficulties on their part, that if they hold multiple permits that they’re coming due over the stretch of the year and packaging them together might make it more administratively easier for them to kind of -- Is that something they can do themselves or do they just hold off and send them all in at once, to get them on the same time cycle?

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: Typically, permit renewals all coincide with the permit holder’s birthday, but many people have corporate permits and so that might be different. I think that’s something I
would have to inquire about, but, generally, we do try to do
that and it’s based on the permit holder’s birthday.

MR. ROBINSON: If you find something, could you let me know? I
would appreciate it. I would like to get back with the folks.
Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. Anything else before we leave
that topic? Morgan, is there anything that you would like to
add or anything that we missed? I take that as a no. She has
hung up the phone.

The next item on our agenda is Number V, Discussion on NOAA’s
TED Enforcement Boarding Form, with OLE Staff. Carrie and Doug,
do you know who is going to lead us through that agenda item?

DISCUSSION ON NOAA’S TED ENFORCEMENT BOARDING FORM

DR. CARRIE SIMMONS: I did email Tracy Dunn and, unfortunately,
I don’t think his designee is here to lead us through that
discussion on the progress they’ve made on that form. I don’t
know if he will be here later, or if they can get a field agent
that might be familiar with it, but I apologize. The gentleman
that was supposed to be here had medical issues.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: That’s not a problem. What we can do, we
have the form on the board, and we can discuss this maybe more
at full council. I would like to have a brief discussion now,
if we still have time and we’re on track.

On this boarding form, we were going to receive a little
presentation that would, I guess, take us through it. Then we
were looking at possible revisions. One thing that I know Dale
and myself have commented on in the past is we had some
questions as to what is going into some of the biological
reviews.

We have a process within the industry where a fisherman can
actually make a phone call and have his TEDs inspected before or
he or she leaves the dock, to make sure that he is within the
legal parameters and that he has a legal TED.

What we have some confusion on is how that is being treated once
it leaves -- This form is being filled out and so, in other
words, if he asks for a voluntary inspection to make sure he has
his TEDs right, this form is being filled out. Say his angle
was a little bit off, and so it’s being reported on this form
and it is being submitted and it, in some fashion, is counting
against the industry as a violation, per se.

Now, there may be some differences in how it’s weighted. Maybe it’s not as bad as an at-sea boarding violation, but what I was hoping to see added to this form would actually be a box that specifies voluntary inspection, and it just says yes or no. You would circle yes or you would circle no, whoever is filling out the form.

If this was a voluntary inspection, we will at least have the data. That’s not to say that anything will change in the future as to how we use that data, that it may still be counted against the industry, but at least we’ll have the data there in the future if we decide we do want to look at those differently, and maybe not penalize people for having their TEDs inspected before they leave the dock, to make sure that they have it right and hopefully do not harm any turtles when they go out to trawl.

That was one thing I had hoped to see added to the form, and we can discuss it more with NOAA OLE at full council when we go through our committee report.

The other thing I was hoping to have added to the form, from a data collection standpoint, was a little bit of information on the gear, the type of trawl gear that’s being used, whether it be otter trawl or whatever it may be. There’s some things on the horizon that I think the more data that we have, the better off we’ll be from a management perspective, and able to implement things and fine-tune things and tweak things. Is there anything else?

We don’t have a presenter, and so I’m just trying to lead you through the things that were at the forefront of my mind. Any other comments about this form? Dale, do you have any feedback on the voluntary part?

MR. DALE DIAZ: I think you’ve captured it pretty well. I believe Mississippi’s law enforcement unit calls them courtesy inspections. This is where people ask them to come down, and it’s something I brought up at this council before. I just really hate to see anything count against the shrimp industry whenever they’re going the extra mile to make sure they’re correct.

I would hate that to be counted against them in any way, and if there is a way to eliminate counting it against them, these courtesy-type inspections, I think we should try to do that. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you for correcting my grammar. Okay. Courtesy inspection then is what I would like to see added to the form and then a yes or a no, possibly, there. Dr. Crabtree.

DR. CRABTREE: I don’t think we have any problems with adding those. In fact, I have got a draft form that law enforcement has sent me that has those added to it. Now, we may not add the net type until we actually require TEDs, if we actually require TEDs, in skimmer trawls, but I don’t have any problem with collecting the types of data you’re talking about, and I agree with the need for that.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. That sounds great. Yes.

LCDR JASON BRAND: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to add, although this is a NOAA form, the Coast Guard in the Gulf of Mexico now uses the same form, for consistency, and so we’re working with the Gear Management Team to help make sure that the Coast Guard is at least more consistent with the Gear Management Team and these inspections, so that we don’t have discrepancies when they check each other’s TEDs, so that we’re a little bit more aligned with the consistency in that matter.

CHAIRMAN BOSARGE: Thank you. I appreciate that feedback, and you would think that, okay, your TED is right or it’s not, but it’s not a simple process. I mean there is a whole DVD on how to inspect a TED that NMFS and NOAA have gotten together and put out.

It’s a pretty complicated process. It requires a lot of training, not only on the part of the fishermen and the net builders and such to get it right, but experience and training on the enforcement side too, and so I completely understand where you’re coming from. It’s not cut-and-dried. Okay.

It seems that we don’t have a lot of pushback on those, and so hopefully maybe we’ll get a little feedback from OLE at full council and, if they don’t have a problem with it, maybe we can write a simple letter saying this is our wish list and at some point in the future if you could incorporate these changes, we would really appreciate it.

The last item on our agenda is Other Business. Is there anything that anybody would like to address under Other Business? No? All right. Thank you for great participation. That concludes our committee.
Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m., January 25, 2016.
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