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An Emerging Value Base

- **Every child deserves a family**—
  - The 16 year old as well as the infant
  - Long-term foster care is not permanency
  - Congregate care should be used only when necessary, not merely when it is convenient to the agency

- **Families need support and services from their neighborhood and community**

  *Kids do better when their families do better, and families do better in strong neighborhoods and communities*

- **Child welfare agencies need neighborhood and community partners to protect children and to support families**
Some Assumptions About Accountability in the Child Welfare System

• A community-based approach is more responsive and responsible.

• The child welfare agency *shares* authority and responsibility with the community

• Must address outcomes, not merely procedural compliance

• New “bottom lines”
  ✓ Child safety, permanence, & well-being
  ✓ Family outcomes
  ✓ Community outcomes
Whose Outcomes?

- Child Welfare Outcomes Report to Congress
- Child and Family Service Review Process
- Consent Decrees
- State Strategic Planning Processes
- Reform Initiatives
  - Family to Family, the Annie E. Casey Foundation
  - Casey [Family Program] Outcomes & Decision-Making Project
  - Families for Kids, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation
  - Community Partnerships for Protecting Children
- National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being
“Real” Outcomes vs. Experiences of Families and Children

• Child welfare is more attuned to results today, compared to a few years ago

• Child welfare information systems contain data that make it possible to describe the experiences of children, but they do not contain clinical assessments of the well-being of children

• Responsibility for the outcomes of children extends to society as a whole, not just the child welfare system, which is intended to provide temporary homes
Federal Outcome Framework

Safety

- Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.
- Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

Permanency

- Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.
- The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for families.

Family and Child Well-Being

- Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs.
- Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.
- Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.
### Federal Indicators & National Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence of Maltreatment</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>For six months following the first report date during the period from January-June, the percentage about whom another substantiated or indicated report is received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of Abuse and/or Neglect in Foster Care</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>The percentage of children reported as maltreated by a perpetrator who was a foster parent or a residential facility staff person for the nine-month period of January 1 through September 30 divided by the population of children served in foster care for the same time period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care Re-Entries</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>Of all children who entered foster care during a given year, the percentage who were re-entering foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability of Foster Care Placements</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>At a point in time, among children who have been in foster care less than 12 mos from the time of the latest removal or left care in the previous 12 months without having been in care 12 mos, the percentage with &lt; 3 placement settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Achieve Reunification</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>Among children reunified in a given year, the percentage reunified in &lt; 12 months from the time of the latest removal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Achieve Adoption</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>Among children who exit in a given year to a finalized adoption, the percentage who exit care in &lt; 24 months from latest removal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excerpt from a CFSR

• Item 7. Permanency goal for child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Area Needing Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Basis: Statewide Assessment

The median length of stay for each of the last five entry cohorts (i.e. SFY 94-95 through SFY 98-99) is (in days) 425, 401, 391 and 369 respectively. DSS attributes this improvement to . . .

The number of children in foster care has declined from a peak of 6,982 in 1997 to 5,765 in 2000. In part because of the requirements of ASFA, the percentage of terminations resulting from adoption increased from 14.8% of all closures to 21.3% of all closures.

Basis: Onsite Review

While the length of time to achieve reunification and achieve adoption did not meet the national standards, the trend is demonstrably going in that direction, as measured by declining average length of stay in foster care and the declining number of children in foster care.
Georgia’s 1999 statewide data for stability of foster care exceeded the national standard (Georgia: 92.4%, National: 86.7%), and were therefore in compliance. However, during the on-site review portion of the CSFR [sic], in 8 out of 27 cases reviewed (29.6%), the stability of foster care placement was found to be an area needing improvement. Thus, the on-site review found that 70.4% of cases reviewed were stable, creating a discrepancy with the 92.4% reported from statewide data. To resolve this discrepancy, Georgia has accepted the indicator as not substantially achieved and has stipulated this as an area needing improvement.


http://dfcs.dhr.georgia.gov/vgn/images/portal/cit_1210/8985750PIP%20version%204%20September%202002.pdf
# Scoreboard for 2001 CFSRs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>States in Substantial Conformity</th>
<th>States Not in Substantial Conformity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanency 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanency 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Being 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Being 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Being 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Placement Stability From Three Perspectives

No. of Placement Settings for 1st-Time Entry Cohort Group: AFCARS

No. of Placement Settings in Current Placement for Children in Point-in-Time Profile: AFCARS

No. of Placement Settings in Initial Spell Through Feb. 2001 for Entry Cohorts

- One
- Two
- Three
- Four
- Five
- Six or more
Long and Short Spells in the “Sample”

Jan. 1, 2002

Jan. 1, 2001

Jan. 1, 2003
Race of 7,397 Children In Care on May 31, 2002, Compared to Race of 10,250 Children Who Entered Care 1999 - August 2002

Caseload
- White
- Black/African-American
- Unable to determine
- Other

Cohort
- White
- Black/African-American
- Unable to determine
- Other
Current Ages of 7,397 Children In Care on May 31, 2002, Compared to Age at Entry of 10,250 Children Who Entered Care 1999 - August 2002
Caseload vs. Longitudinal Perspectives on Length of Stay

![Bar chart showing length of stay for different periods and years]
The Cycle of Experiences in the Child Welfare System

- Substantiated Report of A/N
- Use of Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care
- Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care
- Counterbalanced Indicators of System Performance
- Lengths Of Stay as Brief as Possible
- Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship
- Ensure Continuity Of Care
- Maintain Positive Attachments To Family, Friends, and Neighbors
The Cycle of Experiences in the Child Welfare System

Substantiated Report of A/N

Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship

Use of Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care

Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care

Counterbalanced Indicators of System Performance

Maintain Positive Attachments To Family, Friends, and Neighbors

Ensure Continuity Of Care

Lengths of Stay As Brief As Appropriate
Rates of Out-of-Home Placement in F2F County and Other Large Counties

% of 1st Substantiations

Initial Admissions to Child Welfare Custody

- 2000
- 2001
- Projected 2002
The Cycle of Experiences in the Child Welfare System

Substantiated Report of A/N

Use of Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care

Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care

Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship

Lengths of Stay As Brief As Appropriate

Counterbalanced Indicators of System Performance

Ensure Continuity Of Care

Maintain Positive Attachments To Family, Friends, and Neighbors
Initial Placements for Children Entering Care 1997 - 2002

Regions:
- Region 1
- Region 2
- Region 3
- Region 4
- Other

Types of Placement:
- Foster Care
Initial Placements in F2F County: 1997 - 2002

- Foster Care
- Private Child Care
- Relative
- Other

Year:
- 1997
- 1998
- 1999
- 2000
- 2001
- 2002

Placements Distribution:
- 1997: 10%
- 1998: 20%
- 1999: 30%
- 2000: 40%
- 2001: 50%
- 2002: 60%
The Cycle of Experiences in the Child Welfare System

1. **Substantiated Report of A/N**
2. **Use of Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care**
3. **Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care**
4. **Counterbalanced Indicators of System Performance**
5. **Maintain Positive Attachments To Family, Friends, and Neighbors**
6. **Ensure Continuity Of Care**
7. **Lengths of Stay As Brief As Appropriate**
8. **Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship**

Ensure Continuity Of Care

Maintain Positive Attachments To Family, Friends, and Neighbors

Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care

Use of Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care

Counterbalanced Indicators of System Performance

Lengths of Stay As Brief As Appropriate

Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship
Are Children Being Placed Near Their Homes? Caseload vs. Longitudinal Perspectives

Percentage of Children Placed in Same Zip Code

- Zip 3
- Zip 7
- Zip 4
- Zip 10
- Zip 2
- Zip 1
- Zip 9
- Zip 5
- Zip 8
- Zip 6

- Initial Entered 1997-1999
- In Care 1999
Placements in Home County

White

Black/African-American

Home County
Other County
The Cycle of Experiences in the Child Welfare System

- Substantiated Report of A/N
- Use of Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care
- Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care
- Maintaining Positive Attachments To Family, Friends, and Neighbors
- Ensure Continuity Of Care
- Lengths of Stay As Brief As Appropriate
- Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship
- Counterbalanced Indicators of System Performance
Number of Placements in 1st Spell Among Children Initially Entering Custody 1999 - August 2002

- 2002: 5 or more
- 2001: 5 or more
- 2000: 5 or more
- 1999: 5 or more
Number of Placements by Type of Initial Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Initial Placement</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Home</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH - Residential Relative</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH - Treatment</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Red: 5 or more
- Yellow: 4
- Green: 3
- Gray: 2
- Blue: 1
- Purple: Home Only

Home Only placements are not applicable for Foster Home placements.
## Placement Patterns in First Spell for DCSN Children and Youth Entering Care 1999 - 2002 and Initially Placed in a Foster Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Pattern</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percent of Children</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
<th>Placement Pattern</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percent of Children</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFD</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>FFD</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD THV</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD IH</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD THV</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD FFD FFD</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD IH</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD FFD THV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD FFD FFD</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD IH THV</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD RUN</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD FFD FFD THV</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD FFD IH</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD FFD FFD FFD THV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD RT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD ETS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD FFD FFD FFD FFD THV</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD RT THV</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD THV IH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD IH IH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD IH FFD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD THV THV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD FFD FFD FFD FFD FFD THV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD THV THV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD THV FFD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD IH FFD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD FFD FFD FFD FFD FFD THV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD DET</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD RT IH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD RT FFD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD GH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD THV IH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD FFD THV FFD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD ETS THV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFD DEA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other patterns</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,732</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

DEA Diagnosis, Evaluation, Assessment
DET Detention
ETS Shelter
FFD Foster home
GH Group home
IH In-home
RT Residential treatment
RUN Runaway
THV Trial home visit

**Data Source:** DCSN (Data Collection and Statistical Network)

**Note:** The data represents children who left care and those who remain in care, with cumulative percentages indicating the progression of placements over time.
The Cycle of Experiences in the Child Welfare System

Substantiated Report of A/N

Use of Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care

Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care

Counterbalanced Indicators of System Performance

Lengths of Stay As Brief As Appropriate

Maintain Positive Attachments To Family, Friends, and Neighbors

Ensure Continuity Of Care

Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship

Counterbalanced Indicators of System Performance
Length of Stay Among DCSN Children Initially Placed in Foster Homes

Proportion remaining in care

Length of First Custody Spell

- **Balance of state**
- **Shelby**
- **Mid Cumberland**
- **East Tennessee**
- **Davidson**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Proportion remaining in care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Length of Stay Among DCSN Children by Initial Placement*

Proportion remaining in care

Length of First Custody Spell

- **Diagnosis, evaluation**: □
- **Shelter**: ▲
- **In-home**: △
- **Detention**: □
- **Residential treatment**: ◊
- **Foster home**: ●
Length of Stay Among DCSN Children

Proportion remaining in care

Length of First Custody Spell
The Cycle of Experiences in the Child Welfare System

- Substantiated Report of A/N
- Use of Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care
- Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care
- Counterbalanced Indicators of System Performance
- Lengths of Stay As Brief As Appropriate
- Ensure Continuity Of Care
- Maintain Positive Attachments To Family, Friends, and Neighbors
- Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship
Re-Entry to Care by Permanent Placement at End of First Spell

Proportion Re-Entering Care

Time to Reentry or Age 18
Drawing Attention to the Relationship Between Changes in Practice and Improvements in Outcomes

- Strategy groups assembled to plan and implement changes in practice (TDM, community partnerships, and resource family recruitment, training and support) identify how their efforts will lead to specific improvements in outcomes.

- Strategy groups monitor their progress toward full and effective implementation by establishing and monitoring benchmarks.

- The self-evaluation team supports strategy groups by providing outcome data at client group, geographic, and programmatic aggregations needed to monitor improvements in outcomes.
## Estimate of Number of TDM Staffings per Month

### Estimate of Children at Risk of Entering Placement

Source of data: entry cohort data files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total initial entries in 5.25 years</td>
<td>11,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reentries in 5.25 years</td>
<td>1,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total entries and reentries</td>
<td>13,647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Annual number of entries and reentries: 2,599
- Average number entries/reentries per month: 217

**Estimate of Children at "risk for placement" - TDM required**

(assumes 80% placement rate) 271

### Estimate of Children exiting placement

Source of data: entry cohort data files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total exits in 5.25 years</td>
<td>9,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Annual number of exits                                          | 1,731   |
- Average number exits per month                                  | 144     |

**Number of TDM's for children exiting** 144

### Estimate of placement changes

Source of data: entry cohort data files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total placement changes in 5.25 years</td>
<td>8,694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Annual number of changes                                        | 1,656   |
- Average number of changes per month                             | 138     |

**Number of TDM's for children at risk for moves** 138

### Total events per month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAR's</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total events per month** 553
St. Louis City, 2000 Data

Average Distance From Home to Placement

Distance is in miles for children for whom we have data.
Year 2000 data.

Legend
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