Turning Propositions into Profit through Collaboration, not Competition

University Design Industry Partnership Scheme Conference Summary

Emma Murphy
Uwe Derksen
Maxine Horn
Gus Desbarats
Professor Phil Gray

March 2010
# Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Background to this report</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Summary</td>
<td>The Innovation Landscape, Key Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Points</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate Feedback, Simple Definitions</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>About BDI</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>About UCA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>About the Authors</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cited publications</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

BACKGROUND TO THIS REPORT

In March 2009 British Design Innovation (BDI), the trade organisation for leading industrial designers, service designers and innovation professionals, published Delivering the Innovation Dream: The BDI Report, a review of the relationship between the government’s innovation strategy, the strategic design industry and universities in the UK.

The BDI Report highlighted growing tensions between private sector design and innovation companies and the university sector – which first arose, BDI believes, when the government initiated a policy of funding design and innovation through universities directly to industry, creating competition between universities and private sector design companies and standing in the way of the development of collaborative partnerships.

The key concerns expressed in The BDI Report were:

- An aggressively competitive disruptive market working against the growth of the private sector design industry as a consequence of funded university direct selling (or under-selling) services to industry.
- The distortion of the private sector market this brings, and its implications;
- The lack of engagement with the strategic design profession by some universities on an equitable and appropriate commercial basis
- The lack of best practice procurement processes
- The implications surrounding Intellectual Property and the placement of students.

However, the Evolution of the Infrastructure of the Knowledge Exchange System (2009), a PACEC report for HECFE, highlighted the plethora of universities’ business and community engagement, including:

- Facilitating the research translation process
- Skills and human capital development
- Stimulating interactions
- Exploiting HE’s physical assets
- Civil and community.

In November 2009 the government published Higher Ambitions – the future of universities in a knowledge economy, a framework report written by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS). Higher Ambitions called for universities to develop closer relationships with
industry, to develop programmes responding to economic challenges and for research to achieve greater impact.

In a bid to address these issues, BDI proposed the creation of a formal process they dubbed the University Design Industry Partnership Scheme (UDIPS). Responses from the universities and private sector strategic design companies to this proposal were so positive that a major consultation was called for.

BDI and the University for the Creative Arts (UCA) joined forces to host Propositions into Profit through Collaboration, not Competition, the inaugural UDIPS conference, at the Design Council’s London offices on 26 February 2010 – the first time a national face-to-face debate between universities and private sector strategic design companies had taken place in the UK.

The event was attended by 30 directors of leading strategic design companies and 37 universities from Northern Ireland, Wales and all nine regions of England. Such demonstrably wide-ranging representation is indicative of the significant level of interest shown for discussing mutually-beneficial collaborative relationships.

The Propositions into Profit conference had several core aims:

- To provide a platform for friendly debate between HE and Industry
- To highlight and overcome any preconceptions and misunderstandings
- To identify common ground for collaboration
- To explore best practice for engagement.

This report summarises the key issues raised at the conference, and proposes actions for bringing both parties closer to productive and successful communication and collaboration.
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THE INNOVATION LANDSCAPE

Following an introduction by BDI’s CEO Maxine Horn, presentations and illustrative case studies about strategic design were made to conference delegates by BDI Directors Gus Desbarats (The Alloy) and Professor Phil Gray (Quadro Design Associates). Uwe Derksen, UCA assistant director of research and enterprise, put forward the case for university engagement.

The innovation landscape is changing and its boundaries are becoming ever more blurred. It is no longer possible to describe universities as being ‘about research’ and industry being ‘about innovation’. Research, innovation, R&D and knowledge transfer are no longer exclusive to any single sector, if they ever were.

Private sector strategic design and innovation companies possess great knowledge and combine wide experience with successful track records. They represent incredible efficiency – and therefore value – when partnering HEIs (and other the public sector organisations), thus creating the perfect commercial bridge between universities and industry, and between technology and the consumer.

Universities and industry can collaborate in the innovation process despite their differing backgrounds and ethos. In addressing the issues surrounding deliverables, funding and stakeholders, each faces different contexts, pressures and constraints, but there is common ground from which to work in a mutually beneficial and collaborative manner.

Designers were once an integral part of the university sector: BDI regional director and international strategic design consultant Professor Phil Gray was one of the first employees of Loughborough Consultants Limited, the university’s commercial company set up in 1972. A reciprocal relationship exists between those universities that educate the UK’s leading design graduates and the strategic design organisations that employ them – both are stakeholders in their future careers.

KEY ISSUES

A lively and informative post-presentation Q&A exchange between the panel and the floor took place, after which delegates were assigned to four breakout discussion groups. Chaired by members of the panel, participants brainstormed the opportunities and barriers surrounding better shared communication and collaboration, discussed issues surrounding the proposed University Design Industry Partnership Scheme, and sought to clarify best practice collaboration and identify core actions. In outline, the identified key issues were:
1. The academic research process and the design industry’s innovation process
The research process, the terminology used and the different meanings academia and industry associate with certain terms were a recurring theme at the conference. While it was agreed that design consultancies and universities both engage in the research process in pursuit of new knowledge, the two parties approach the process differently and the word ‘research’ conveys different meanings to both sides. Academics expressed frustration at designers who claim to undertake research, while strategic designers working in industry expressed equal frustration that their role in the process isn’t recognised by academics, or is undervalued by them. It was agreed that both parties contribute to the research process in particular ways and have complementary roles in the innovation process with different emphases.

While the objective of the day was not to arrive at a set-in-stone definition of research, it was suggested that project-based design research among industrial designers in industry was usually more short-term, user-centred and solution-driven. Such ‘anthropology before the technology’ research is geared towards market application with a customer focus, whereas universities’ academic research was usually more long-term, applying peer-reviewed and academically accepted methodologies (in other words rigour as defined in RAE guidelines) – and sometimes in pursuit of the discovery of new paradigms rather than simply new knowledge. Better communication and facilitation in understanding each process would help and enhance future collaboration.

Difficulties also surrounded the use of the term ‘knowledge transfer’. It was suggested that in the context of the conference a more accurate terminology for what was being proposed was ‘knowledge exchange’ (a phrase already beginning to gain currency in the HE sector), as it explicitly describes the core function of collaborative innovation partnerships.

2. The need for a spectrum of clear remuneration models
Another core issue highlighted was that of remuneration. The view was expressed that the process of engaging designers at this level is not widely known, and that there is a lack of knowledge about the different deal types. There is a need to break down the perception that one needs to be ready, design brief in hand, before engaging a designer, and that ‘fees for services’ is the only remuneration model. Different remuneration models discussed included:

- Buying a small amount of strategic design thinking at the outset (pre-brief)
- Traditional fees for services during the course of the project
- Project retainer
- Mentoring
- Shared Risk and Reward/Licensing/Royalties
- ‘Other’

It was noted that there needs to be a different remuneration model that ensures reciprocal benefit to universities. Whichever model of remuneration is selected, it is a two-way street.
3. The need for clarity in roles and objectives

It was acknowledged that many presumptions have been made by both parties regarding each others’ roles and objectives; designers in industry presume certain things about education and vice versa. However, the assumption is that both parties are on the same side and can benefit from collaboration. Given the fact that in the future we will see more private sector universities, collaboration was seen not just as an option but a necessity.

Universities and design firms are the best-suited partners in the innovation landscape; they both want to create new knowledge, new processes and new technology – and develop the applications for such findings – for the benefit of both parties. Both parties can bring complementary strengths to this process, from knowledge creation to commercialising, so there needs to be an understanding of parties’ motives, strengths, capabilities and offerings. The view was also expressed that collaborators in such partnerships should focus on what they can bring to the partnership, not on what they want to get out of it.

In addition, experience and expertise are important in identifying partnership roles and contributions (universities have expertise in academic research methodology while design firms have experience in solving design problems and identifying market applications, for example). Respecting complementary experience and expertise among all parties can lead to a better clarification of, and mutual respect for, different but complementary collaborative roles.

4. The need to revise existing business models

There was a general acceptance that universities and industry are perfectly suited partners in the innovation process, but that dynamic innovation business models and knowledge platforms reflecting the aspirations and strategic objectives of each partner (HEIs, their students, the design industry and SMEs) are required for such partnerships to work. One collaborative and mutually beneficial model is Open Innovation, where organisations accept the collaboration of external parties in product and service development in order to open up new opportunities and new markets, and Shared Risk and Reward to bridge funding gaps.

A review of current knowledge exchange and partnership models and how they could be adapted to university design industry partnership would be beneficial. AURIL, BDI, IKT, JISC, RCUK and others have reviewed such models and would be a good starting point.

5. Intellectual Property and Commercialisation

This is a dominant issue in collaboration. The BDI Report highlighted examples where IP was poorly managed. Although it would be inaccurate to imply that all collaborations have poor IP management, it was widely acknowledged at the conference that there is a need to devise robust IP agreements which take into account the needs of all partnership stakeholders fairly.

Issues of IP management where client organisations provide universities with live projects for students were highlighted. Although there is no doubt that the students can benefit from the experience of working with commercial SMEs and corporate organisations, the commercial
benefits of these projects should be extended to all parties (this links to the issue of appropriate remuneration models, see point 2 above).

Although client organisations provide useful experiential learning opportunities for students, the involvement of a strategic design industry partner could enhance the learning experience for students and universities, as they add value to the design content by utilising their high-level design experience. However, a clear line in the sand needs to be drawn; it was felt, between what is direct commercial work, the commercialisation of students' work by industry with no remuneration or IP benefit, and students' knowledge-building and skills development through industry mentoring and so forth. Design delegates felt that corporate organisations should desist from the practice of placing purely commercial private sector projects into universities under the guise of live project work.

In addition to client organisations having a duty to manage IP among all parties, the view was expressed that universities should be more proactive in ensuring IP expectations are managed. It is a shared responsibility among all parties to ensure that the benefits from commercialisation are managed fairly and expectations articulated at the outset; there must be a reciprocal benefit for all parties. Where the design and client organisation partners may benefit from commercial application, for example, the university partner can benefit where there is a distinct new knowledge contribution, and the student benefits from the experience. Most importantly, the IP of all parties is protected and fairly recognised. Closer collaboration between universities and design companies exploring IP strategies and approaches would be mutually beneficial.

6. Design Education: the increasing number of graduates

High-level skills for higher value, a Design Council Creative & Cultural Skills report in 2007, states that ‘there is an oversupply of designers in the UK market, with almost half as many students of design as there are designers in industry’ (Higher Education Statistics Agency 2006, cited in Design Council and Creative and Cultural Skills, 2007:24). However, it might equally be argued that many design students subsequently excel in other areas of employment, as students of other disciplines do.

Design delegates took the view that the design industry should be engaged on HE design courses to encourage a wider appreciation of what ‘design practice’ can mean. It was suggested that this entails broadening the role of what a design degree can do, and encourage design graduates to consider roles other than that of practising designer (working as a design buyer or in marketing, for example). If more design graduates commence work in such roles it could help achieve a greater understanding of design among non-practitioners.

This requires an increased dedication to the cause of design thinking, defined by Tim Brown of IDEO as “a discipline that uses the designer’s sensibility and methods to match people’s needs with what is technologically feasible and what a viable business strategy can convert into customer value and market opportunity”. (Brown, 2008: 86).
It was acknowledged that in-house design teams are an under-represented but extremely important part of design employment opportunities, representing over 50% of designers’ employment. BDI needs to work harder to engage this sector (possibly with the support of one of the public sector agencies, for whom such initiatives are one of their remits).

7. What do University Design Industry Partners bring to each other?

The mutual added value each party can bring to a University Design Industry Partnership Scheme emerged from discussion.

The logic of positioning the design industry as an innovation partner for universities, with strategic design companies as value chain enablers positioned right at the interface of the commercial, design and business worlds, became self-evident. Additional ideas for engagement between BDI members and universities ranged from designers wishing to make contributions as visiting lecturers, mentors and event speakers, or interested in undertaking strategic and non-executive roles with spin-outs, to design companies keen to establish visual business cases to support funding rounds, or to engage in taking research into market applications.

Some universities proposed bringing BDI into new funding bids or into existing initiatives where some of their objectives could be met through relationships with BDI members, and review existing HEIF initiatives for opportunities to deliver on objectives. Some felt that an equal opportunity exists to provide university expertise in research, technology, materials etc to the resource and service range of design firms and their client base. A government-funded graduate ‘internship’ programme recently awarded to some universities could provide financially-supported and mentored students to design firms.

As facilitators, BDI can contribute significant resources to knowledge capture and dissemination. BDI’s best practice innovation tools, and its role as a strategic design industry-led business engagement and knowledge exchange platform, adds real value to the universities’ knowledge transfer and knowledge exchange strategies. It was recognised and accepted that because BDI is a non-funded independent not-for-profit organisation, universities should expect to support the resources required to deliver on the actions. It was also noted that BDI membership is open to (and already includes) design firms, in-house design teams, universities and intermediaries.

In light of the debates outlined above, the authors believe three key overall issues emerged which should form the main thrust of the ongoing debate. In simple terms, these key issues can be expressed as opportunities for:

- Relationship-building opportunities at different levels (networking, working with students, access to university resources, industry lectures etc)
- Exploring the research and design processes in their respective settings, academia and industry and how value can be added
- Building communication and collaboration platforms, including joint knowledge exchange opportunities.
Action Points

1. **The need for clearer terminology, roles and capabilities**
   It was agreed that clearer terminology will help clarify roles and responsibilities and increase awareness of surrounding pressures from industry and education perspectives, which will help to minimise preconceptions and misunderstandings. Particular attention should be paid to the definition of ‘research’ activity, so that complementary research roles and approaches can be respected. This will require an initial articulation by each party of their definitions, subsequently working towards an agreed definition of terminology.

2. **Formulation of Rules of Engagement**
   Again, if terms and conditions, expectations and responsibilities are clearly defined, all parties know what is required of them in order to work in partnership fairly and equally. This will also improve the fair acknowledgement and management of all parties’ IP.

3. **The formulation of remuneration models**
   Various levels of remuneration are available to collaboration partners. However, it was acknowledged that these are not widely known and may need revision. New remuneration models should be formed in order to reflect the complex relationships regarding expectations, pressures; constraints and funding. Once these are agreed, they should be made available through the BDI website – see BDI Shared Risk and Reward Guide: [http://www.britishdesigninnovation.org/index.php?page=newlook/researchdetails&report_id=12](http://www.britishdesigninnovation.org/index.php?page=newlook/researchdetails&report_id=12)

4. **The formulation of new business models**
   It was acknowledged that current collaborative working practice business models may be out of date and could be updated to reflect current and future best practice (Business Schools in universities could assist in this). A review of current knowledge exchange and partnership models and how they could be adapted would be beneficial.

5. **The formation of a steering group (special interest group)**
   It was suggested that in order to provide an informed and equal perspective on these actions, a core steering/interest group could be formed to action the issues addressed in this report. BDI will facilitate this.

6. **The role of BDI**
   It was acknowledged that BDI has a key role in facilitating these actions and providing knowledge capture and dissemination, and making any resultant information and tools available on their website or via a dedicated microsite. Because BDI is an unfunded independent organisation, universities recognised that they should support the resources required to deliver on the actions.
Actions required of BDI include:

**6.1 BDI website development.** The actions highlighted in this report could be enabled by utilising the BDI website (attracting over 1.5 million unique users per annum) to publicise the tools developed from them, such as remuneration models, IP best practice, rules of engagement, and terminology.

**6.2 Clarification of BDI’s offer.** Delegates opined that universities and design organisations sometimes don’t understand the role BDI can play, and that this – and the fact that membership is also open to universities – should be made more explicit on the BDI website or linked microsites. JISC representatives proposed that BDI pilot an online open innovation platform through which universities and design industries can collaborate and access each others’ resources. Updated information about BDI, their Innovation Bank IP trading portal and a ‘How to engage with BDI and its members’ link (where BDI’s existing Open Innovation Challenge page can be viewed) were recently uploaded onto the [www.britishdesigninnovation.org](http://www.britishdesigninnovation.org) web portal.

**6.3 Provision of more explicit case studies and feedback.** BDI has a wealth of knowledge in terms of examples of successful collaboration. These should be made more explicit on the website, and in particular highlight best practice principles.

**6.4 Provision of BDI’s existing IKT-accredited Best Practice tools for engagement.** It was not known that BDI knowledge exchange tools and processes are accredited by the Institute of Knowledge Transfer; these should be made available to universities.

**6.5 A two-way communication platform.** It was acknowledged that ‘partnership’ is by definition a two-way street. A communication platform enabling time-efficient exchange of information and collaborative opportunity needs to be factored in.

**6.6 Resources, Business Plan and sustainability.** A steering group needs to focus on how to resource the collaborative activities between BDI and the participating universities to develop a UDIPS business plan and ensure its long-term sustainability.

**SUMMARY**

This report summarises the context for a national strategic University Design Industry Partnership Scheme, not the alternative ad hoc scenario of individual universities collaborating with individual design companies. The shared vision of BDI and UCA is that by hosting the Propositions into Profit conference and facilitating the above actions they will enable improved collaboration between universities and the design industry, and also bring about a more general appreciation that, as a national strategic objective, engagement by universities of private sector design and innovation partners under the BDI umbrella comprises the ideal commercial bridge between many university commercialisation initiatives and industry.
CONFERENCE DELEGATE FEEDBACK

“
A great initiative. It is vital for UK design’s role in the world that the design consultancy industry and design HEIs as a whole are fully engaged and integrated with each other and moving forward” – Stephen Green, Brunel University

“Collaboration was a key theme of the day. Through events like this, design consultancies and HEIs will find ways to work together to build a solid, sustainable foundation of innovation in the UK” – Emily Miller, Strategic Marketing Professional

“The lesson from other parts of the world is that collaboration is essential if we are to maintain and enhance the quality of UK design” – Prof. Michael Tovey, Coventry University

“Very well organised, very well structured, an important initiative for UK Plc”
– Louis della-Porter, Firsthand Design

“A very good starting point but one that revealed significant gaps in knowledge and understanding between two sectors who need to work together but also develop a common language” – Anne Boddington, University of Brighton

SIMPLE DEFINITIONS

Strategic Design is regarded as an effective way to bridge research, innovation, management and design, and shapes behaviours by bridging public sector policy and private sector strategy. Strategic design comprises the application of design principles to increase an organisation’s innovative and competitive qualities, enabling design decisions to be based on facts rather than aesthetics or intuition through the analysis of user-centred trends and data.

Industrial Design improves the aesthetics, production and marketability of a product by resolving problems of form, usability, ergonomics, technology, engineering, marketing, brand development and sales, thereby optimising the function, value and appearance of products and systems for the mutual benefit of both user and manufacturer.

Service Design is the activity of planning and organising people, infrastructures, communication and the material components of a service, in order to improve its quality, the interaction between service provider and customers and the customer’s experience.

The Design Industry The UK’s multi-faceted commercial design industry generates more than £15 billion in turnover and an average of £1 billion in annual export income. Strategic design companies in the UK typically contain experts in business creation, development and management, branding, digital and graphic design, engineering, industrial design, innovation, product design, anthropology, science, service design and technology. Strategic design companies in the UK are recognised as leading exponents of design and innovation.
ABOUT BRITISH DESIGN INNOVATION – The Voice of Industrial & Service Design

British Design Innovation (BDI) is the trade organisation for leading industrial designers, service designers and innovation professionals that promotes members’ creative expertise, knowledge and experience. BDI is the representative voice to industry of the majority of the most qualified top-end product, service, brand, digital and innovative 3D packaging designers in the UK, each with over a decade of experience in sectors such as aeronautics, biotechnology, consumer electronics, food and drink, medical, nanotechnology, telecommunications and transport.

Founded in 1993, BDI is an independent not-for-profit organisation financed by its members and managed by 30 regional board directors, and receives no government funding. BDI member companies generate a collective turnover of over £200 million per annum. Working from HM Government assessments that £1 invested in strategic design generates an ROI for business of £225, BDI members are responsible for generating £5 billion per annum in industry revenue.

BDI’s designers are engaged as key advisors by the world’s largest brand owners to progress product, service and brand development contracts. They apply new ideas and ways of thinking in support of start-ups, early-stage companies, global corporations, science parks and university technology spin-outs, and advise established portfolio companies on behalf of fund managers and investment teams. They play a crucial role in IP commercialisation, innovation and brand strategy, new market identification and applications, design development, implementation and stakeholder management, and translate science, engineering and technology into tangible products and services businesses can manufacture and consumers wish to buy. With portals in every region of the UK, BDI is concerned with the engagement of these world-class designers as the glue binding innovation and knowledge exchange partnerships together.

BDI’s Innovation Filter™ (a secure portal for evaluating ideas, trading IP and identifying business partners) and Open Innovation Challenge™ – a knowledge and concept trading vehicle utilised by corporate brand owners and professional Originators – are accredited as best practice knowledge transfer processes by the Institute of Knowledge Transfer www.ikt.org.uk. BDI’s Innovation Bank™ is an open innovation platform for professionals within the innovation community: designers, academics, entrepreneurs, start-ups, SMEs and global brands.

BDI’s website britishdesigninnovation.org is the national resource for those seeking to connect with the UK commercial design and innovation industry. It receives 1.5 million hits from 150,000 unique visitors per month (over1.5 million per annum) who download over 10,000 documents per month. It also contains the UK’s first and foremost content-rich members’ Design Directory and a newswire delivering design and innovation releases, articles, reports and opinion pieces to over 30,000 e-mail subscribers and nearly 40,000 RSS feed every month, and reaches an additional audience of 70,000 worldwide online visitors every month.
ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY FOR THE CREATIVE ARTS (UCA)

With approximately 6,500 students enrolled on more than 80 different courses at campuses in Canterbury, Epsom, Farnham, Maidstone and Rochester, the University for the Creative Arts (UCA) is one of the largest specialist universities of art, design, architecture, media and communication in Europe. Formed through the union of The Surrey Institute of Art & Design, University College and the Kent Institute of Art & Design, UCA has an outstanding heritage spanning 150 years.

With a thriving and vibrant community of students, staff and researchers, UCA plays a significant role in the creative, economic and cultural life of the UK and is home to several public art galleries, the Crafts Study Centre and to research centres that include the Centre for Sustainable Design, the Animation Research Centre and the Public Art and Architecture (PARC) research centre. As a specialist organisation, the university’s purpose-built facilities, its expanding programme of research and development, and its growing range of business and professional links are all focused on the promotion of the creative arts.

The university’s key strength lies in the breadth of specialist academic disciplines it offers. Providing students with a ladder of opportunity, the university enables talented individuals to progress from further education through to undergraduate and postgraduate study and on to employment or creative practice. Many staff are creative practitioners as well as academics, and are actively involved in the cultural industries. In this way they bring the workplace into the learning environment, enabling UCA to drive forward research and to prepare its students for the real world of work.

The university is established on a strong foundation of high-quality academic provision. The Kent Institute, for example, received an outstanding rating for its further education (FE) provision in its Ofsted inspection report (March 2005), which placed the Kent Institute as the highest-rated institution or university offering further education in art and design in England.

The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) gave its highest judgement of confidence to The Surrey Institute on completion of an institutional audit in May 2003. The judgement of ‘broad confidence’ indicated that the quality of the Institute's courses and the standard of its awards were extremely well managed, and confirmed an ability to secure and maintain this level of quality in the future. In the 2001 RAE (Research Assessment Exercise), the Kent Institute entered 22 research-active staff achieving an overall grade of 3a. The Surrey Institute was also awarded 3a for Art and Design in the same exercise, having raised its quality rating by three grades – the most significant improvement of all submissions in Art and Design.

The university counts many of the UK’s most successful designers, artists and communicators among its alumni, including Tracey Emin, Tony Hart, Owen Gaster, Karen Millen, Zandra Rhodes, Nargess Gharani, Vanja Strok, Martin Lambie Nairn, Humphrey Ocean, Tacita Dean, Daniel Greaves, Michael Dudok de Wit, Suzie Templeton and Roger Oates.

www.ucreative.ac.uk
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