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Abstract

The investment treaty arbitral tribunals had experienced a significant increase in the disputes initiated for non-commercial activities, such as environmental protection, public health, human rights and labour standards. It has witnessed the greater participation of civil society as non-disputing parties to gain access to these forums as amicus curiae. Initially, none of the international investment instruments had explicitly authorized the submission of amicus curiae briefs. It was only after 2001 when the NAFTA tribunal accepted amicus curiae briefs in the most celebrated case of Methanex, which was followed by the UPS and the Glamis disputes, it is emerging as a practice in the investment treaty arbitration. The ICSID tribunal also admitted amicus briefs on the basis of public interest for the first time in the Vivendi case on 19 May 2005, followed by the Aguas Provinciales in 2006 for the purpose of distribution of water. As an outcome of this Tribunal, the ICSID Arbitration Rules were amended to incorporate an explicit provision to approve amicus curiae briefs. The acceptance of amicus briefs clearly shows the interest of the common public in the process of investment arbitration.

Most of the scholars welcomed the arrival of non-disputing parties in the ICSID and the UNCITRAL arbitrations. But, the confidentiality of proceedings remains as a general rule. Amicus-curiae are refused to access documents and to attend hearings unless disputing parties consented to do so. This practice apparently raised a serious doubt on greater transparency and equal participation of non-disputing parties in arbitral proceedings. It is in this connection, the paper makes a concerted attempt to address the pertinent issues involved in participation of amicus curiae in arbitral proceedings. It further looks into the details on various issues on access to information, publication of awards and the admissibility of amicus curiae briefs.
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Introduction

The question of transparency and public participation is not restricted only to the areas of investment arbitration. For instance, the World Trade Organization (WTO) had deliberated upon these issues much before the investment arbitral tribunals. The WTO has well-established practice on the participation of non-disputing parties in their dispute settlement process [1]. The reason is clear because of the close bonding between economic interest and the public interest [2]. The decisions of the WTO dispute settlement bodies in the notable decisions of US-Shrimp Case, US- Lead Bars and EC-Asbestos case are evident of it [3-6]. It is pertinent to note that investment arbitration is governed by the public international law and laws of the host State [4,7]. The investment arbitration concerns not only the investor’s interest but also the public interest. For this reason, the arbitral tribunals have strongly advocated the participation of non-disputing parties as amicus curiae in arbitral proceedings [7,8].

Evolution and Diversification of Third Parties Participation in Investment Arbitration

Amicus requests have a long list which includes, standing as a party, leave to submit written submissions, access to case documents, to take part in court hearings, make oral submissions, respond to the questions, to review memorials, and declare observer status. Initially, the arbitral tribunals had rejected amicus submissions in its entirety. But, the subsequent decisions had gained a momentum because the tribunals started accepting amicus request only to leave to file briefs [9]. As a consequence of these developments, several amendments have been brought to the existing international investment instruments in order to incorporate new provisions on the acceptance of amicus curiae briefs. Further, it clarifies the customary standards of non-disputing parties in investment arbitral proceedings [9,10].

The non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have profoundly exerted a development of international law since 1900. These public interest groups have attracted a greater attention by the legal scholars in the field of international investment law since 1990, with specific focus on environment and human rights issues [11]. The NGOs are requested to participate as an amicus curiae in investment treaty arbitration (ITA) for two reasons, first being an interpretation of investment treaty to increase harmonization and consistency, and second is to analyze the subject matters falls within the dispute [12].

Initially, only NGOs have submitted their amicus briefs in investment arbitration. This practice had shifted later, for instance, home-state submissions, international communities such as European Communities (EC) and World Health Organization (WHO), even individuals become a part of the amicus curiae, more particularly when the question of the interpretation of treaty occurs [11]. The Glamis tribunal had accepted amicus submissions from individuals, and business associations i.e., Quechan Indian Nation, National Mining Association, and American Business Association [13].
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Home-State Submissions

The practice on home-State submissions is not a new concept in international investment law. It can be traced back to the Rules of Procedure of the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal, 1983, Article 15, Para 5 of the rules permits the submissions from the non-disputing States [2]. Subsequently, Article 1128 was incorporated to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and Article 37(2) to the ICSID Arbitration Rules through an amendment in 2006 [2]. For instance, the US had submitted the amicus briefs in Marvin Feldman v Mexico to support their investors and also to interpret Article 1117 (1) of the NAFTA2. Once again the US had requested the tribunal in the most celebrated case Metalclad Corporation v Mexico to express their opinion to define the term 'tantamount to expropriation' [3].

The European Commission had enabled its active amicus participation in investment arbitrations initiated against the new European Union (EU) members such as Hungary, the Slovak Republic, and Romania [1]. Interestingly, in Eureko B.V. v The Slovak Republic, the UNCITRAL Tribunal on its motion invited the home state’s opinion from the EU and the Dutch Kingdom to decide the jurisdiction [14]. It is interesting to note that this is the EC’s first amicus request to support their investors [15]. Eventually, the ICSID tribunals also granted similar kind of requests to the EC in the most epic disputes such as AES v Hungary, Electrabel v Hungary and Micula v Romania [16]. The AES arbitration constituted as a result of disputed new regulations introduced by the Republic of Hungary to comply with the EU Competition Law. The EU had convinced the Tribunal and submitted its amicus brief to enforce the Competition Law. It is in this connection the next part significantly discusses the necessary requirements to file amicus submissions under various international legal instruments.

Requirements under the NAFTA, ICSID, and UNCITRAL Rules

Several adjustments had been brought to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (ICSID), the ICSID Arbitration Rules and the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Arbitration Rules to address the potential imbalances. The participation of non-disputing parties was absent in Chapter Eleven of the NAFTA until the emergence of Methanex arbitration. Provisions were later incorporated in Article 1128 of Chapter Eleven, which explicitly grants the permission to amicus curiae submissions and to access court documents. The ICSID Convention also amended in 2006 to increase the access to public hearing and documents can be granted only with the consent of parties. The NAFTA also carved out certain guidelines to be followed by the tribunals holding that it had no power to add any third parties other than the disputants to the arbitration. Further, it ruled that they can allow third parties to the proceedings only as amicus curiae, and they can submit written briefs, which was within the powers of the tribunal. The final decision on acceptance such submissions to be determined with the consultation of the parties on merits of the proceedings.

The Methanex tribunal reached the final decision on acceptance of amicus briefs without considering Mexico’s objection. They contended that such kind of practice was not permitted under domestic law [19]. The tribunal further reasoned that the disputed issues had to be resolved under Chapter Eleven of the agreement which comes under the purview of international law and not the domestic law. The tribunal relied on the usual practice of WTO’s DSB adopted in Iran-US Claims Tribunal. The Methanex tribunal also adopted the FTC statement and accepted amicus submissions from the two non-disputing parties, the IISD and Earth Justice with the consent of disputing parties [20]. The tribunal further described that the amicus brief was ‘carefully reasoned’ [21]. But, the limitation on submission of briefs and participation of amicus curiae in oral hearings has to be decided by the tribunal only with the consent of parties.

Subsequently, the UPS Tribunal with the support from Methanex case granted the amicus curiae submissions and further observed that the petitioners are not entitled to make submissions on the issues related to the place of arbitration or jurisdictional matters [21]. The access to public hearing and documents can be granted only with the consent of both parties, and there was no such agreement in this case, and therefore, the Tribunal rejected the petitioner’s request in this regard.

The Methanex and UPS were followed by the Glamis, which raised aboriginal rights issues, mining claims and other matters concernon environmental protection. The Tribunal had ‘decided to accept each submission and consider it, as appropriate, in accordance with the principles stated in the FTC Statement and the particular criterion mentioned by the Respondent that each submission brings a perspective, particular knowledge or insight that is different from that of disputing

Proceedings. It stated that the NAFTA does not limit the tribunal to accept the written submissions from the third parties. The statement also carried out certain guidelines to be followed by the tribunals while granting this kind of applications. The process of amicus curiae submission starts with the petition for leave to file a brief and when the Tribunal accepts the filing, then it is followed by actual submission. The statement also framed a detailed instruction on amicus requests which is more or less similar to the content and format adopted by the WTO DSB in the Asbestos dispute [18].

The Methanex and UPS are the two early cases recognized the admission of amicus curiae submissions. Surprisingly, both the tribunals held that it had no power to add any third parties other than the disputants to the arbitration. Further, it ruled that they can allow third parties to the proceedings only as amicus curiae, and they can submit written briefs, which was within the powers of the tribunal. The final decision on acceptance such submissions to be determined with the consultation of the parties on merits of the proceedings.

Subsequently, the UPS Tribunal with the support from Methanex case granted the amicus curiae submissions and further observed that the petitioners are not entitled to make submissions on the issues related to the place of arbitration or jurisdictional matters [21]. The access to public hearing and documents can be granted only with the consent of both parties, and there was no such agreement in this case, and therefore, the Tribunal rejected the petitioner’s request in this regard.

The Methanex and UPS were followed by the Glamis, which raised aboriginal rights issues, mining claims and other matters concern on environmental protection. The Tribunal had ‘decided to accept each submission and consider it, as appropriate, in accordance with the principles stated in the FTC Statement and the particular criterion mentioned by the Respondent that each submission brings a perspective, particular knowledge or insight that is different from that of disputing.
parties’ [17,22]. It is pertinent to note that the submission of amicus briefs are now become a continual feature of the NAFTA arbitration [23].

**Requirements under the ICSID Arbitration Rules**

The practice of the ICSID Tribunals on amicus submissions has developed in a similar direction of the NAFTA Tribunals [23]. The ICSID Arbitration Rules are regularly used as a procedural rule in most of the Investor-State arbitral proceedings. It is interesting to note that admission of amicus curiae briefs have raised a serious concern before the ICSID tribunals on numerous occasions, even much before the adoption of the ICSID Arbitration Rules, 2006 [24]. These issues raised before the tribunal for the first time in the most notable case of *Aguas del Tunari v. Bolivia* [25]. Unfortunately, the tribunal had rejected all the requests made by the petitioners for the three reasons. Firstly, the claims were made ‘beyond the power or the authority of the tribunal to grant’ [21]. The tribunal held that it did not have any authority to grant such requests (Table 1) [15]. Secondly, there was no agreement between the petitioners and the disputing parties to accept amicus curiae submissions. Therefore the Tribunal held that petitioners’ request cannot be allowed [16]. Lastly, the Tribunal emphasized on the treaties that ‘there is no less our duty to follow the structure and requirements of the instruments that control this case’ [14] [17]. However, the ICSID tribunal had reached a different conclusion in the subsequent cases, *Aguas Argentinas* [18], and *Aguas Provinciales* [19]. The tribunal held that it had sufficient power under Article 44 to grant amicus curiae submissions [8,22]. Provided that the petitioners had to establish to ‘the Tribunal’s satisfaction that they have the expertise, experience, and independence to be of assistance’ in appropriate cases [20]. Further, the Tribunal in *Aguas Argentinas* adopted three criteria to determine the acceptance of amicus submissions [21]. The Tribunal concluded that the appropriate non-disputing parties might assist the arbitral tribunals to reach the correct decisions [8,25]. The detailed analysis of these cases are provided in the Table 1 below.

The ICSID Arbitration Rules, 2006

The ICSID Arbitration Rules were amended in 2006, and new Paragraph 2 of Rule 37 was added with an additional title ‘submissions of Non-Disputing Parties’ [10]. The revised rules stated that ‘after consulting both parties, the Tribunal may allow a person or entity that is not a party to the dispute’ to ‘file a written submission before the Tribunal regarding a matter within the scope of the dispute’ [10,26]. To determine the submissions from non-disputing parties to accept or reject, the Tribunal shall consider the following three requirements, which were adopted by *Aguas Argentinas* Tribunal [22]:

- a) The submissions would assist the tribunal in the determination of factual or legal issue, and it would also bring a new perspective or insight which should be different from the disputing parties;
- b) The subject matter of submissions should fall within the scope of the dispute, and
- c) The non-disputing parties should have a significant interest in the proceedings [8,27].

In addition to that, the Tribunal shall ensure the equal opportunity to the parties to convey their observations [1]. The interpretation for Rule 37(2) and scholarly writings sets out that arbitral tribunal has to consult the parties, but it authorizes the courts to accept amicus briefs even if the parties vetoed it [17,28]. Since the 2006 amendment, the Tribunal received amicus briefs from non-disputing parties on many occasions. Surprisingly, the tribunal had rendered only a few awards till to date, and the remaining cases are still pending [29].

**Requirements under the UNCITRAL arbitration rules**

The UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules 1976 have the most restrictive approach to the aspects of transparency, and also the transparency is an exception rather than a rule [29]. It is interesting to note that unlike the ICSID Rules and the NAFTA, the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules 1976 and amended 2010 Rules had no express provisions to permit amicus briefs in the UNCITRAL administered proceedings. However, Article 17(5) of the UNCITRAL Rules, 2010 is strictly limited only to the joinder of a person who is a party to the arbitration agreement. It states that third persons can join as a party to the arbitration only if they are party to the arbitration agreement [30,31]. The need for obtaining factual information through amicus curiae participation is somewhat discussed in the 2013 UNCITRAL’s new standard for transparency, and it is excelled than the ICSID and the NAFTA on many aspects discussed below [10].

The UNCITRAL rules on transparency, 2013

Unlike the 2010 Rules, Articles 4 and 5 of the 2013 Rules addressed the amicus submissions. Article 4 created a standard for the third party, who is not a disputing party and not a party to the Treaty. Article 5 made another standard for non-disputing parties, who are not a disputing party, but a party to the Treaty [31].

The petitioners, who wish to make amicus submissions, shall provide the following details to tribunal:

- a) The submissions must be in writing, and it should provide the details of the third person, relevance of its membership, its objectives and the nature of its activities;
- b) Any other information which the petitioner has direct or indirect connection with any disputing party; and
- c) The information regarding financial or other assistance rendered to the petitioner while preparing the submission [29].

---

Footnotes:

[1] Glimis Gold Ltd. v. The United States of America, UNCITRAL Award, 8 June 2009, para 286.
[4] *Ibid* at paras 15-18; Also refer the Table 1.
[8] *Aguas Provinciales Award, Supra note 1.
The amicus submissions can be allowed at the discretion of the tribunal after consulting the parties. But, the tribunal has less discretion when the requests are made by the non-disputing parties, who are parties to the treaty. The tribunal shall accept the amicus submissions from non-disputing parties only if it does not disrupt or unduly burden the arbitral proceedings, or unfairly prejudice any disputing party. The Tribunal also ensures the equal opportunity to the disputing parties to convey their observations in the submissions.

The investment treaty arbitration is a method of public law adjudication and it also ‘touches upon matter of public policy’. On the one side, amicus submissions act as a shield to reduce the risk of public goods and host state, and on the other hand, it imposes a burden on disputing parties. Accordingly, the benefits and concerns of amicus curiae submissions are considered in greater detail in the next section.

**Benefits of Accepting Amicus Briefs**

**Protection of Public Interest and improvement in quality of award**

It provides an option to the civil societies to raise their voice to protect the public interest such as environmental issues, labour welfare, human rights, cultural rights, and corruption issues. It also ensures the procedural openness in investment arbitration. Arbitrators and disputing parties might lack knowledge and expertise on some issues such as ecological studies, environmental impact assessment, and cost-benefits analysis on environmental policy. With the grassroots level experience, the NGOs can make a significant contribution and assist the tribunal to reach a quality decision. For instance, the Suez tribunal acknowledged that ‘non-parties may be able to afford the Tribunal perspectives, arguments, and expertise that will help it to arrive at a correct decision’.

**Increase in transparency**

Transparency combats legitimacy in investment arbitral proceedings. It also enhances the public credibility and acceptability of decision of the investment arbitral tribunal. Amicus participation might eliminate the corruption practices which are prominent in most of the investment arbitrations. For instance, in *World Duty Free v the Republic of Kenya* both the parties expressly acknowledged the payment of a bribe to the previous government. From the institutional perspective, the practice of amicus briefs could enhance the trust on the arbitral proceedings.

**Concerns on Amicus Submissions**

**Unilateral approach and reflecting on the impartiality**

Amicus briefs supported in favour of the host State’s approach in most of the cases and the tribunal might be compelled to accept their submissions and give importance to the host State’s arguments. This risk was identified in *Methanex*, as ‘any amicus submissions are more likely to run counter to the claimant’s position and eventually to support the respondent’s case’. Amicus briefs are often criticized for repeating respondent’s argument and intervening Civil Society groups are also biased. Allowing amicus curia to the arbitral proceedings would lead to ‘subvert the consensual nature of arbitration’ this might depart from the fundamental arbitral principle.

**Cost and delays to be borne by the disputing parties**

The participation of amicus curiae increases the cost and also creates an unnecessary delay for the parties because they have to analyse and respond to the amicus curiae submissions. If the tribunal accepted the amicus submissions, then the expenses of the submissions shall be borne by the parties. The arbitral proceedings held for several years and runs into enormous costs, further burdening the disputing parties would be inappropriate.

**Politicization of the dispute**

As the concern of the public is extremely high in this kind of disputes, the risk of politicization of the third party is more prevalent, particularly NGOs. In some instances, NGOs are being funded and manipulated by the host States or Private companies. It is difficult for the tribunal to balance the economic interests of the foreign investor and the public interest of host state in amicus submissions. The NGOs are often extending their support in favour of the host states in many cases. For instance, the US Chamber of Commerce in UPS and National Mining Association in *Glamis* supported the position of foreign investors. The US Chamber of Commerce had received $100,000 from the UPS before submitting their briefs. The active participation of other entities such as EC and WHO also seriously raised the politicization issue in investment arbitrations.

**Conclusion**

The recent practice of accepting amicus participation in investor-state arbitration has become a unique feature in international law. Amendments to the Chapter Eleven of the NAFTA, the ICSID Arbitration Rules, and the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules are only the first step and made marginal improvements to the jurisprudence of international investment law. Still, the current position is unsatisfactory. It is necessary to reassess the existing legal framework in order to find a right balance between public legitimacy and secrecy of international investment disputes. The success of transparency will be achieved only if the tribunals guaranteed the public access to attend hearings, to present their legal arguments and to access the documents.
Table 1: Amicus Curiae requests in Investment Arbitration filed under the different forums.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.no</th>
<th>Disputing Parties</th>
<th>Applicable Arbitration Rules</th>
<th>Third Parties</th>
<th>Amicus Request/s</th>
<th>Tribunal Held</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Methanex Corp v USA (15.01.2001)34</td>
<td>UNCITRAL 1976: • Art 15(1) • Art 25(4) Legal Instrument: • NAFTA</td>
<td>IISD and Earth Justice52</td>
<td>i) Oral and Written Submissions ii) To participate in the proceedings iii) To review memorials and to declare an observer status</td>
<td>Accepted only amicus curiae written submissions and refused to grant all other requests</td>
<td>i) This is the first NAFTA arbitration, where amicus brief was accepted ii) Tribunal relied on the WTO Iran-US claims tribunal and the Carbon Steel disputes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UPS v Canada (17.10.2001)</td>
<td>UNCITRAL 1976: • Art 15(1) • Art 25(4) Legal Instrument: • NAFTA</td>
<td>The Canadian Union of postal workers, Council of Canadians and US Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>i) To stand as parties ii) To intervene in the proceedings and disclose the court materials</td>
<td>Accepted only amicus curiae written submissions and denied all other requests</td>
<td>i) Tribunal relied on Methanex arbitration ii) US Model BIT was revised after UPS and Methanex decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agus Del Tunari v Republic of Bolivia (29.01.2003)</td>
<td>UNCITRAL 1976: • Art 15(1) • Art 25(4) Legal Instrument: Bolivia-Netherlands BIT</td>
<td>The Legal Resources Centre (LRC) and others v Republic of Argentina</td>
<td>i) On behalf of four NGOs35 Earth Justice filed the amicus briefs ii) Standing as parties to the dispute and make Submissions iii) To attend the hearings and make oral presentation iv) To have access to all the submissions</td>
<td>Rejected all the requests</td>
<td>First ICSID case, where amicus brief was filed. Unsurprisingly, the tribunal denied all the requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agus Argentinas et al v Argentine Republic (Suez/ Vivendi) (19.05.2005)</td>
<td>UNCITRAL 1976: • Rule 6(2) • Rule 3(2) Legal Instrument: Argentina- France BIT; Argentina- Spain BIT</td>
<td>Five NGOs34</td>
<td>i) To make amicus submissions ii) Access to court hearings iii) To present their legal arguments and access to case materials</td>
<td>Accepted only amicus submissions and rejected all other requests</td>
<td>The tribunal adopted the three criteria to qualify for submitting amicus curiae briefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Agus Provinciales et al v Argentine Republic (Suez/InterAgus) (17.03.2006)</td>
<td>UNCITRAL 1976: • Art 44 • Rule 3(2) Legal Instrument: Argentina- France BIT; Argentina- Spain BIT</td>
<td>One NGO along with three individuals40</td>
<td>i) To accept and grant amicus curiae status ii) To make a written submission and access to documents</td>
<td>Refused to grant permission to make amicus submissions and also denied all other requests</td>
<td>This lead to an amendment to the ICSID Arbitration Rules 32, 37 and 48 in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Biwater Gauff v United Republic of Tanzania (02.02.2007)</td>
<td>ICSID : • Rule 37(2) • Rule 41(3) Legal Instrument: Tanzania- UK BIT</td>
<td>Three Tanzanian based NGOs41 and two international NGOs42</td>
<td>i) To make written submissions ii) To grant access to key documents and attend oral hearings iii) To respond questions</td>
<td>Only granted the parties to submit amicus briefs and denied all other requests</td>
<td>First amicus petition filed after 2006 amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Piero Foresti, Laura de Carli and others v Republic of South Africa (05.10.2007)</td>
<td>ICSID Additional Facility Rules: Articles- 41(3), 27, 39 and 53</td>
<td>Four NGOs40 jointly filed a brief</td>
<td>i) To make written submissions ii) To grant access to key documents iii) To attend oral hearings</td>
<td>i) Grant permission to file written submissions ii) Also granted an access the key documents iii) Denied the request to take part in oral hearings</td>
<td>Tribunal adopted a novel procedure for participation of non-disputing parties in arbitral proceedings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34Date of decision on amicus curiae petitions.
35On behalf of other three NGOs Blue Water Network, Communities for a Better Environment, Center for International Environmental Law.
36One Joint submission by Friends of Earth Canada and US, and another joint submission by National Mining Association and Sierra Club/Earthworks
37The Coalition for the Defense of Water and Life (Coordinadora), the Cochabamba Federation of Irrigators’ Organizations, Friends of the Earth-Netherlands and SEMAPA Sur.
38It includes written submission, claims and defences of the disputing parties.
39Associacion Civil por la Igualdad y la Justicia (ACU), Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS), Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL), Consumidores Libres Cooperativa Ltda. de Provision de Servicios de Accion Comunitaria, and Union de Usuarios y Consumidores.
40Mexico based Fundacion para el Desarrollo Sustentable (AC Sustainable development Foundation) as well as Professor Ricardo Ignacio Beltramino, Dr. Ana Maria Herren, and Dr. Omar Dario Heffes.
41The Lawyers’ Environmental Action Team (LEAT), the Legal and Human Rights Centre (LHRC) and Tanzania Gender Networking Programme (TGNP).
42Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL) and International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD).
43Namely, the Centre for Applied Legal Studies (CALS), the Legal Resources Centre (LRC), the Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL), and INTERIGHTS (the International Centre for the Legal Protection of Human Rights).
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