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Abstract
Despite growing interest in social entrepreneurship, education and training programs
that address the needs of socially-motivated individuals and organizations are scarce.
This paper reports on the results of a recent study by the Working Group for
Education and Training in Philanthropy and Social Investment. The study examined
the supply of and demand for education and training in various topic areas relevant to
social entrepreneurship, including corporate social responsibility, fundraising, grant
making and social enterprise. The study identified a significant gap in education and
training in these areas and revealed that universities are the preferred
education/training provider and are seen to have the credibility, rigor, and impartiality
required to implement a common standard of education and training in the field.
Benefits of Philanthropy for the Community

Society has long turned to philanthropy to help alleviate its many and varied problems and to meet its highest aspirations. Unconstrained by shareholder or voter pressure, philanthropists have the scope to invest their resources in a broader range of social causes (e.g., AIDS, poverty, sustainability), capturing a niche that the business/government sector is unable (or finds it inconvenient) to service adequately\(^1,2\). As such, philanthropists can help develop innovative, occasionally risky, and potentially-profitable ways of problem solving which may later be ‘scaled up’ and implemented by the for-profit or government sector\(^2,3\). Accordingly, philanthropy may offer an important outlet for relieving growing social needs, including long-standing or urgent societal problems\(^1\).

The Growth of Philanthropy: Current Trends

Since the 1990s, there has been a steady increase in the creation of wealth around the globe\(^2\). Catalyzed by the rapid creation but uneven distribution of wealth in recent years, there are more and more people who want to make a difference to the world\(^1\). In addition, corporate giving is increasingly recognized as a core business function and an integral component of business strategy. The February 25\(^{th}\) 2006 edition of The Economist carried a special supplement, ‘The Business of Giving’, which described a renewed interest in philanthropy worldwide. Total giving is on the rise in most countries, and ‘Diaspora philanthropy’, the sending of gifts back home by those who have prospered abroad, is also growing\(^2\). Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that a new generation of givers, with a new style of giving, is emerging: while people typically used to give in their 60s and 70s and to established charitable agencies, they now give much earlier, in their 30s and 40s and to more activist organizations\(^2\). Contrary to popular belief, smaller donors, including small businesses, also play a major role in philanthropy\(^4,5\). Thus, initiatives for increasing giving should not only target the rich and famous but also middle-class inheritors, and the corporate sector. The aim is to equip the next generation for giving, so as to capitalize on the inter-generational transfer of wealth and meet the serious challenges facing our world. Importantly, this approach to philanthropy goes beyond seeing virtue in giving, to insisting that giving be directed at achieving results. Some commentators describe this as a generational shift from ‘check book’ philanthropy to ‘engaged’ or ‘venture’ philanthropy.

There is currently a ‘philanthropic renaissance’ taking place in the U.S. Since the mid-1990s, there has been significant growth in large-scale philanthropy, with an increasing number of foundations boasting assets in excess of a billion dollars, and a rise in the number of people establishing foundations or contributing large gifts (>$100 million) to foundations and other types of non-profit organizations\(^4\). Giving in Australia is currently sitting at around 0.68% of Gross Domestic Product\(^6\). Although this is much lower than the equivalent figure for the United States (1.6%)\(^6\), many of the trends that have encouraged giving in the U.S are also present in Australia (e.g., economic prosperity, growing societal challenges, dissatisfaction with the government’s role in welfare, increased interest in civil society, many successful entrepreneurs, intergenerational transfer of wealth). The incidence of large private gifts is growing, and major philanthropists are increasingly choosing causes and organizations to support, rather than just responding to requests and applications. These trends, coupled with the Australian Government’s recent introduction of initiatives to encourage giving (e.g., incentives such as tax-advantaged Prescribed Private Funds), indicate significant potential for philanthropic giving in this country\(^5\).
Social Entrepreneurship: A ‘New Breed’ of Philanthropy

In the past, philanthropy has tended to carry an undertone of amateurism\(^1\). However, philanthropy is evolving to a new stage. Philanthropy is increasingly recognized as a field of academic inquiry in its own right, with several conferences and journals emerging on the topic\(^5\). Traditional philanthropy is giving way to social investment, a process in which philanthropists are encouraged to see themselves not just as donors, but as informed, active and committed partners who give a lot more than money. Social investors typically invest money, time, knowledge and wisdom to bring about identified social outcomes. Like financial investors, they tend to be guided by strategic planning, to set key performance indicators, and to prefer a ‘hands-on’ role in a negotiated partnership with the agencies they support. They often have an exit plan, in case an investment fails to meet expectations. Increasingly too, the for-profit sector is also involved in the effective expenditure of philanthropic funds - through the growing tendency for corporate social investment and the partnerships which follow, and through its direct involvement in areas (e.g., aged care provision), traditionally regarded as the domain of non-profit organizations.

In contrast to traditional philanthropy, the ‘new breed’ of philanthropy is increasingly business-like, knowledge-based, market-conscious and strategically-oriented\(^3\). Demonstrated and encouraged by some very large recent gifts (Branson, Buffett, Gates, Soros etc.), and by the increased acceptance of corporate social investment, philanthropy is finding new ways of expressing itself and is finding new legitimacy in the form of corporate social responsibility, the triple bottom line, venture philanthropy, and social enterprise (An example of this evolution, drawing on the merging of the non-profit and for-profit sectors and the emerging notion of ‘venture philanthropy’, is microfinance. Originally offered in developing countries, microfinance is being applied, for instance, in Australia’s Cape York region). Indeed, it is the recognition of this interconnectedness that is giving rise to the new term ‘social entrepreneurship’ and, in some quarters, ‘the fourth sector’.

Broadly, social entrepreneurship can be defined as entrepreneurial activity that has a social - as well a business - purpose. Like conventional, commercial entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship is characterized by the creation of something new; unlike commercial entrepreneurship however, social entrepreneurship is motivated by the creation of social value rather than individual or shareholder value\(^7\). Definitions in this emerging and contested field often differ on the point of whether ‘for-profit’ entities should be included within the social entrepreneurship construct, or whether social entrepreneurship must come from the non-profit sector. The border between non-profit and for-profit organizations is blurring, as both organization types take on the roles of the other. In addition, there are ‘for purpose’ organizations (e.g., OurCommunity.com) that generate profit, but apply it to social objectives. This paper assumes an inclusive definition of social entrepreneurship that recognizes appropriate activities within the ‘for-profit’ sector.

The potential for social entrepreneurship in Australia is very large indeed. Wealth is being created and transferred between generations at an unprecedented rate, and there are a growing number of people who have the desire, assets, skills, and time to make the world (or perhaps just part of it) better\(^3\). Their interests are diverse: the environment, global and local poverty and disadvantage, medical research and treatment, indigenous issues, the arts, and so on.\(^8\)

Perhaps the most concise summary of Australian philanthropy and social investment is contained in a series of fact sheets compiled by the industry body, Philanthropy Australia.\(^9\) A more detailed report, *Giving Australia*,\(^10\) was
commissioned by the Federal Government in 2005. According to this report, giving in Australia has almost doubled over the past decade, with corporate giving growing at a slightly greater rate than household and personal giving. Although giving in Australia is on the increase, as indicated above, it is still low in comparison to the U.S, possibly reflecting a gap in knowledge regarding how to give and give effectively. For instance, similar initiatives often exist in parallel, leading to duplication and inefficiency.

In order to ‘grow’ social entrepreneurs, a framework is needed to foster their development; more choices, information, opportunities, and services to stimulate or support people’s “philanthropic imagination” and increase the prospect of philanthropic effectiveness. A major challenge, therefore, is to build capacity in this area so as to maximize the public value generated by social entrepreneurs.

Building the Infrastructure for Social Entrepreneurship: The Importance of Philanthropic Education

The provision of education and training is an essential element of the ‘infrastructure for social entrepreneurship’. Aspiring social entrepreneurs require the knowledge and skills needed to enable sound decision making in this context. Relevant skills include applying business and ethical criteria to assess opportunities for social investment, identifying appropriate causes in which to invest, monitoring whether investment has been effective, and negotiating arrangements with their (usually ‘not-for-profit’) partners. Investment in the infrastructure for social entrepreneurship now will ensure that lack of investment does not become a burden later. For instance, failure to provide needed infrastructure could see billions of dollars lost in missed opportunities or wasted on ineffective giving.

Despite growing interest in social entrepreneurship, education and training programs that address the needs of socially-motivated individuals and organizations are scarce. This paper investigates current gaps in education and training in this area, evaluating ‘supply’ against ‘demand’. The paper will report on the results of a recent report compiled by the Working Group for Education and Training in Philanthropy and Social Investment (A list of the Working Group members is included as an Appendix). The Working Group, led by the Asia Pacific Centre for Philanthropy and Social Investment at Swinburne University of Technology, investigated the supply of and demand for education and training in various topic areas relevant to social entrepreneurship including corporate social responsibility, fundraising, grant making and social enterprise. These four themes are inter-related in the sense that they are all associated with those areas of the economy typically described as the community sector, non-government sector, non-profit or not-for-profit sector, third (and now fourth) sector, voluntary sector and civil society, both conceptually and in career and professional terms (see Figure 1).

Method

Overview

A Working Group on ‘Philanthropy and Social Investment Education and Training’ was established at the invitation of, and funded by, the Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, the Honourable Mal Brough, following an approach by Baillieu Myer AC to the Prime Minister. The Working Group was assembled to achieve the following broad goals: (a) identify the education and training at tertiary level that will encourage and enable informed and effective philanthropy and social investment, (b) identify means to promote, support and
undertake research into how giving in Australia can be increased and made more effective, (c) audit the range of options in Australian universities to address these matters, and (d) identify education and training gaps and recommend ways that these might be filled, including: (i) level of courses (undergraduate and postgraduate), (ii) duration of courses (short courses, executive education, graduate certificates etc.), and (iii) finding the best way of ensuring such education and training is delivered into the future.

In this section, we describe the methodologies employed by the Working Group to analyze the supply of and demand for education in the fields of corporate social responsibility, fundraising, grant making and social enterprise. More specifically, these methodologies were employed to examine (a) the extent and nature of the supply of education and training in these fields by higher education, industry, and non-government organizations (NGOs), and (b) the extent and nature of demand for education in these fields from the philanthropic sector, fundraisers, corporates, professional consultants, the finance industry, and NGOs.

**Philanthropy and Social Investment Education and Training: Analysis of Supply and Demand**

**Methodology - Supply**

The analysis of the supply of education and training in philanthropy and social investment consisted of three components: (a) a keyword search, (b) a survey of business schools, and (d) an internet search for independent training providers. The keyword search incorporated the following keywords: ‘corporate social responsibility’, ‘fundraising’, ‘grant making’, ‘philanthropy’, and ‘social enterprise’. These were entered into ‘Coursefinder’ on all Australian university websites. The emphasis was on gathering relevant information from within the university sector as no courses were found on TAFE internet websites. The survey of business schools consisted of a letter, sent via email to the Deans of all Australian business schools, requesting information about programs offered in these areas. The internet search examined conferences, courses, seminars and workshops currently offered by Australian commercial training providers, government organizations and NGOs in the areas of corporate social responsibility, fundraising, grant making and social enterprise. Independent training providers were identified using the search engine ‘Google’.

**Methodology - Demand**

The analysis of the demand for education and training in philanthropy and social investment consisted of four components: (a) a survey (described in more detail below); (b) response to current courses; (c) secondary analysis of related data sources (i.e., ‘Corporate Community Investment in Australia Study’, ‘Giving Australia Report’, and a ‘Needs Analysis for a Postgraduate Program in Social Enterprise’); and (d) an estimate of the demand from the business sector (described in more detail below).

In regard to methodology (a), a brief survey was distributed via the online survey program ‘Opinio’ to evaluate the demand for education and training in philanthropy and social investment, specifically: (i) the extent of education or training currently provided by organizations in each of the following areas: philanthropic granting making, fundraising, corporate social responsibility, social enterprise and non-profit management; (ii) level of interest in education/training in philanthropic granting making, fundraising, corporate social responsibility, and social enterprise;
Methodology (d), which estimated the demand for courses in the business sector, was based on two components (i) the number of companies in the business sector that have a foundation and over 500 employees (used as an indicator of the number of people likely to be interested in relevant programs) and (ii) the number of students currently enrolled in business-based university courses (used as an indicator of potential numbers for stand alone units or units within one broader programs). Although methodology (d) focused on the business sector, it should be noted that there is likely to be significant demand for courses of this type in the not-for-profit and philanthropic sectors.

Results

Findings regarding the supply of and the demand for education and training in philanthropy and social investment are provided below. Results are organized according to the methodologies outlined in the previous section.

Supply

(a) Keyword Search

The keyword search revealed three relevant units at undergraduate level (all elective units dealing with corporate governance), and 14 individual units in 9 universities at postgraduate level. All but two of these units were in the Accounting, Business, and Economics disciplines, and dealt with corporate governance. In only three instances were the units not electives. Designated graduate programs focusing on philanthropy and social investment were only offered by two Universities, Queensland University of Technology (QUT) and Swinburne University of Technology (SUT).

It should be noted that there are limitations associated with the methodology used here. For example, QUT’s on-line Study Finder does not give links to its courses and units referred to above, although its general search engine does so. Many institutions recorded a number of entries under ‘philanthropy’ but, with the exception of QUT and SUT, these invariably referred to the university’s efforts to attract donations.

In addition, the search was confined to the five keywords highlighted above and therefore did not detect other relevant courses such as University of Technology, Sydney’s (UTS) Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma, and Masters in Community Management. However, notably, this program is directed at managers of non-profit organizations rather than both the non-profit and for-profit sectors.
It is also possible that other universities are in the process of developing relevant courses which could not be identified in the search. For example, the Faculty of Commerce at the University of Wollongong is currently working on proposal for a combined Masters in Social Marketing and Social Entrepreneurship. It is likely to consist of an 8 subject Masters degree comprising the four core subjects in the Masters of Commerce (accounting, economics, management, marketing), two compulsory specialization subjects (social marketing, social entrepreneurship), and two elective subjects from a range of ‘yet to be determined’ electives, one of which would be a research or work placement subject.

(b) Survey of Business Schools

Disappointingly, only six Australian business schools responded to the request for information regarding programs offered in the areas of corporate social responsibility, fundraising, grant making, and social enterprise. Responses described units in business ethics, corporate governance, corporate social responsibility (variously defined), environmental practice, and leadership. Philanthropy, social investment, grant making, and fundraising were not mentioned. However, it should be noted that the failure of some business schools to respond does not necessarily indicate an absence of relevant programs in these schools (this could not be inferred unless the schools had indicated that this was the case). Thus, it is possible that some existing programs might not have been identified with this methodology, although these should have been flagged through the keyword search.

The Australian Graduate School of Management (AGSM) at the University of New South Wales, and the Centre for Executive Education at Bond University, offer executive education programs in corporate social responsibility. AGSM has a three-day workshop, ‘The Sustainable Enterprise’, while the Centre for Executive Education offers customized, corporate executive education programs, open (public) executive education programs, and short courses.

(c) Internet Search of Independent Training Providers

Of the 19 independent training providers identified, only six deliver training in more than one of the topic areas, suggesting that a comprehensive offer is also lacking in this sector. There are six training providers who currently deliver training in fundraising, six in corporate social responsibility or grant making, and four in social enterprise (three training providers offer training that is specific to volunteering).

Demand

(a) Survey

The results of the survey indicated that (a) few organizations provide education and training in the areas of corporate social responsibility, fundraising, non-profit management, philanthropic grant making, and social enterprise; (b) there is a high level of interest in education and training in corporate social responsibility, fundraising, grant making and social enterprise, with a similar level of interest for all four topic areas; (c) there is no clear preference for one type of education/training over another, although preferences for executive education are slightly stronger; (d) universities are the preferred provider and are seen to have greater capacity to implement a common standard of education in the field, due to their greater credibility, intellectual rigor, and impartiality. In regard to course content, respondents expressed a need for greater emphasis on fundraising, leadership and
management skills specific to the field, practical and experiential-based learning, and relevant units within business/marketing degrees. Concerns about current educational offerings included their lack of credibility, rigor, and sophistication. Issues signaled as important in developing new educational offerings included keeping the cost of courses down; providing accessible courses, both in terms of geographic location and delivery mode e.g., on-line; and ensuring that education/training providers are suitably experienced in the field.

Although respondents expressed a specific need for greater emphasis on fundraising courses, these findings might have been an artifact of the sample, as most respondents came from that field. Nevertheless, this does not diminish the importance of the remaining three topic areas: corporate social responsibility, grant making and social enterprise (as mentioned above, there was a high level of interest in education and training across all four topic areas). In addition, as represented in Figure 1, there is considerable overlap between the topic areas. Respondents expressed an acute awareness of the growing importance of the field and the need for educational offerings to support this growth.

(b) Response to Current Courses

It is worth noting that it is difficult to quantify the demand for education and training programs in an area that is largely new and untested. That said, the response to courses currently offered at the Asia-Pacific Centre for Philanthropy and Social Investment at SUT, the Centre of Philanthropy and Non-profit Studies at QUT, and UTS has been encouraging, providing a further indication of potential demand.

The SUT program has an average of around 65 participants per year (15 in the graduate programs and up to 50 attending occasional workshops). Given the pioneering nature of the program and the almost total absence of any marketing initiatives to date, most students enroll purely on a word-of-mouth basis. With appropriate marketing, all the indications suggest that there is a significant pool of potential students from which to draw.

QUT commenced a Graduate Certificate of Philanthropy and Nonprofit Studies in 2002. It has a cap of 30 students in any intake and has had an average of 24 students each year since its commencement. Furthermore, students from the University of Queensland and other QUT Faculties regularly take some units as electives. A small number of international students from the Netherlands, United Kingdom and Hong Kong have entered the full graduate certificate.

UTS’s Masters in Community Management Program is the longest (and in terms of student numbers) largest of the established programs in this area. The Masters in Community Management program is currently in its 16th year of operation and attracts approximately 45 students per year from all over Australia (the program is taught in a flexible delivery mode).

(c) Analysis of Related Data Sources

Several secondary data sources support the need for social entrepreneurship education. The Corporate Community Investment in Australia Report noted the following:

“[there is a] paucity of attention to corporate community investment in management education, including in business schools, other business-related education, and in the internal orientation and training program of companies in Australia...Management education is very client-driven and given its
significance in business strategy and the attitudes of young staff and executives, there appears to be some market failure here. This could be addressed in part by an initiative of business and government to create greater awareness of this gap, and to help resource teaching materials and possibly staff positions in leading schools’ (p. 113).

In 2005, the Prime Minister’s Community-Business Partnership (the Partnership) published *Giving Australia: Research on Philanthropy in Australia*, ‘the most comprehensive survey ever of the contributions made in money and time by Australian individuals and businesses’. It examined motives for giving at the individual and organizational level, but had little to say specifically on the demand for education and training in these areas. Nonetheless, several findings from this report suggest that the demand is likely to increase:

- Australia’s total giving is on the increase, suggesting that there is a huge market to tap for education and training in this area, including integration into existing business courses.
- Big businesses are more likely to give and to give more. Small businesses tend to have less positive attitudes about giving. This finding suggests that there is a niche market in educating small business entrepreneurs about giving.
- There is huge variability in giving by industry type, suggesting that many industries are simply unaware of how to give and/or give effectively.

A *Needs Analysis for a Postgraduate Program in Social Enterprise*, completed in March 2006, examined the feasibility of Swinburne University of Technology offering a Master of Social Enterprise Course. The report revealed that there is a gap in the market and recommended that a Masters level course be established. It also recommended that the course should offer distance learning in addition to face-to-face learning.

**(d) Estimate of Demand from Business Sector**

Thirty-seven per cent of the corporations that responded to the *Corporate Community Investment in Australia* survey had a foundation, and 809 of the corporations in the *Giving Australia Report* had over 500 employees. Assuming an average of 1.5 course attendants per corporation, and a staff turnover rate of one in three years, the number of potential participants in social entrepreneurship courses can be estimated at 30 participants for a strike rate of 20%, and 60 participants for a strike rate of 40% (this is a conservative estimate).

On the other hand, Methodology 2 indicated that the demand for philanthropy and social investment units in business/commerce/management courses (undergraduate or postgraduate) could potentially be significant. The total number of students enrolled in business based-courses in 2004 was 267,000 (includes graduate certificate/diploma, bachelor degree, postgraduate degree, advanced diploma and ‘other’ students). Assuming that a social entrepreneurship unit could be added to any one of these students’ courses, and assuming the following conservative uptakes of such a unit, the number of students participating would be: 2,670 students for an uptake of 1%, 13,350 students for an uptake of 5%, and 26,700 students for an uptake of 10%.

**Discussion**

This study identified a significant gap in tertiary education and training in the field of social entrepreneurship. Although components of social entrepreneurship
are taught in courses at some Australian universities, full (designated) academic programs are unavailable. TAFE courses are non-existent, and only four universities currently provide designated courses in relevant areas such as corporate social responsibility, fundraising, grant making and social enterprise. Although there are a number of independent training providers that deliver workshops in one or more relevant topic area, a comprehensive offer is lacking. The paucity of learning opportunities is at odds with recent evidence which has suggested that the demand for education and training in this area is on the increase.

Our survey indicated that universities are the preferred education/training provider given their perceived credibility, rigor, impartiality, and capacity to implement a common standard of education and training across the field. Universities have the capacity to establish social entrepreneurship as an academic field in its own right and to increase the skills set in this area by delivering courses that adopt a holistic approach, addressing similarities and differences between the non-profit, for-profit, and government sectors, and bridging the traditional gap between them. Relevant skills include applying business and ethical criteria to assess opportunities for social investment, identifying appropriate causes in which to invest, and monitoring whether investment has been effective. The development of courses in this field is not just another educational exercise. Rather, the emphasis is on giving and spending well, and its consequent social impact. Improving knowledge and skills in this field should maximize the social return.

Our recommendations are consistent with the growing recognition of philanthropy as an important agenda for higher education, and the subsequent expansion of philanthropic education in other countries around the world. In Europe and in particular the U.S, rapid growth in the size of the non-profit sector has been met with a consistent increase in the number of education programs on philanthropy. European and U.S universities are driving the professional recognition of this evolving field, as reflected in their academic programs, consulting, mentoring, networking, research, and workshops. As such, universities have become an essential part of the infrastructure for social entrepreneurship in these countries.

While Europe and the U.S have been quick to respond to philanthropic growth, Australia is lagging behind. In the UK alone, there are at least 20 universities that offer relevant professional development courses. The past decade has seen the number of colleges and universities in the U.S that offer courses in the field grow to a staggering figure of more than 250. Courses are a combination of stand alone courses and units tacked onto existing courses. It should be noted that although there are over 250 colleges and universities in the U.S, and an unknown number in the E.U, that offer courses in topic areas related to social entrepreneurship, few of these provide concentrated educational offerings that cover a range of topics. Within the range of topics covered by the umbrella term 'philanthropy', especially as used in the U.S, fundraising and non-profit management are the most frequently covered, and social enterprise and grant making the least frequently covered.

It is pleasing to conclude on the following note: In response to the Working Group's investigation, the Australian Government has recently announced $12.5 million in funding for a joint initiative between the University of New South Wales, University of Melbourne, and Swinburne University of Technology initiative to increase philanthropic education. "The Centre for Social Impact will carry out teaching and research aimed at fostering greater co-operation between business, community groups, and the government on philanthropic activity. It will also conduct
courses to boost the skills of people working in not-for-profit organisations and improve reporting standards and transparency of these organisations to make them more attractive partners for the corporate sector.\textsuperscript{18}
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate social responsibility (CSR)</th>
<th>Fundraising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A way in which companies can voluntarily integrate into their activities social and environmental concerns which are over and above their legal responsibilities</td>
<td>Attracting people, money and in-kind resources to fulfil the mission of a community organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant making (philanthropy)</th>
<th>Social enterprise, including non-profit management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving by foundations, trusts, individuals, companies and governments that is intended to bring social benefits</td>
<td>Organisations that give significant priority to the achievement of a social purpose with reliance on business and entrepreneurial activity. These may be not-for-profit or for-profit entities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Four Broad Themes for Social Entrepreneurship Education*
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