

27 January 2020
info@girlforum.org

FAO: Maria Balshaw, Anne Barlow, Alex Farquharson, Helen Legg, Frances Morris, Lionel Barber & Board of Trustees,

Dear Tate Directors and Trustees,

We are writing to you to address a dissonance between Tate, its outlined missions and the reality of its engagement. The following document outlines Tate's publicly stated values and how Tate's actions have contradicted these, resulting – whether intentionally or not – in the cultivation of an alienating culture.

Our goal in contacting Tate is to demand the formation of a more robust and representative ethics committee to address these failings.

This document has been created using publicly available information and is supplemented by confidential first-hand personal accounts as well as an open letter signed by 111 art workers. In light of the scheduled upcoming review of Tate's Ethics Policy, its purpose is to propose a constructive way forward that we ask you to take seriously. Within these pages you will find:

- I. Preamble: Tate's Ethos
- II. Problematic and Contradictory Actions
- III. Proposed Remedial Actions
- IV. Concluding Statement
- V. Appendix A: Open Letter Regarding Ties with Anthony d'Offay (111 signatures at the time of sending)
- VI. Appendix B: Citations
- VII. Appendix C: Personal Accounts from Art Workers

We formally request a response within 20 working days from the date of this letter outlining what action Tate and its board plan to take in regard to this ongoing situation. We are anticipating that this response will be serious and will not rely on truisms. In these changing times, we urge you to consider that your own legacies are at stake.

Kind regards,

GIRLFORUM*, on behalf of the research group that has authored this letter

Preamble: Tate's ethos

Tate's initiative *Talking About Our Collection* asks members of the public to identify text that "overlooks or misrepresents an important perspective, or uses language which you suggest we should improve or change". Words are connected to actions; in Tate's own words, the institution is committed to:

- Welcoming diverse and broad audiences
- Engaging new and more diverse audiences
- Creating a supportive and inclusive environment where everyone can feel comfortable to be themselves and be their best. Dignity and respect at work requires attention and commitment from everyone who works at Tate, both in role-modelling the right ways to behave and preventing inappropriate behaviour.
(<https://www.tate.org.uk/about-us/working-at-tate/diversity-inclusion>)
- Placing artists and their art at its centre
(<https://www.tate.org.uk/about-us/projects/tate-modern-project/vision>)
- Engaging audiences with the artworks, particularly young people and marginalised groups
(<https://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/tate-papers/16/artist-rooms-young-people-and-learning-2009-10>)
- Being transparent and accountable, and always to act in the public interest
(March 2018 Ethics Policy)

As per its director, most recently writing in the Art Newspaper in March 2019
(<https://www.theartnewspaper.com/comment/art-sensitive-times>):

- "...the public art museum has a difficult, but essential role to hold open an open space for dissenting experiences of art and culture."
- "...we urgently need to cultivate better listening skills and more empathetic codes of engagement."
- "The role, therefore, of the art museum is to create a space premised on an ethics of care, for people, different views, values and realities..."

In a joint statement commenting on the allegations of sexual harassment made against art dealer Anthony d'Offay in 2018, Tate and National Galleries Scotland (NGS) stated:

- "The work of Tate and NGS is underpinned by values of fairness, equality and respect and the right to work free of sexual harassment. We expect these values to be demonstrated in the behaviour of everyone who is involved in our organisations."

In addition, since April 2016 Tate's ethics committee members have been expected to operate by the Museums Association's Ethics Policy guidelines:

- Recognise responsibility for practising and promoting ethical behaviour
- See ethics as a positive force, responsive to developing professional and public views, and underpinning change and improvement
- Regard an awareness and discussion of ethics as the norm, connecting all museums and playing a role in planning and decision making
(<https://www.museumsassociation.org/ethics/ethics-committee>)
- The Museums Association changed its focus in 2015 to suggest that publics come before collections; the chair of its ethics committee, Rowan Brown, described this in December 2017 as "A shift from a focus... purely on collections to a much more engaged, socially resonant practice, in partnership with our communities"

Problematic and contradictory actions

Tate has gone against its stated ethical commitments and values on various occasions. We acknowledge that efforts were made in some cases to address the examples listed below; however they are presented here with the understanding that no known attempts have been made to prevent such occurrences, only to address them after the fact under the pressure of public demand. The following examples are important to cite as part of a troubling pattern that Tate risks continuing:

- Tate took sponsorship from oil major BP, providing it with cheap cultural capital while the company continued to extract fossil fuels and cause environmental degradation predominantly affecting people of colour. Tate renewed its sponsorship relationship with BP even after the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill, Tate director Sir Nicholas Serota saying at the time ‘you don’t abandon your friends because they have what we consider to be a temporary difficulty.’ (<https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/art/news/tate-galleries-forced-to-disclose-the-extent-of-controversial-bp-sponsorship-deal-9942927.html>)
- According to a 2015 Arts Professional article, the May 2010 ethics committee minutes state: “Taking a moral stance on the ethics of the oil and gas sector, and the Canadian Oil Sands initiative in particular, is outside of Tate’s charitable objectives.”
- (<https://www.artsprofessional.co.uk/node/199148>)
- When Tate accepted the £50 million donation from the Blavatnik Family Foundation in 2011, it became complicit in what a recent open letter to US think tank the CFR (Council for Foreign Relations) refers to as a ‘longstanding effort to launder his [Sir Leonid Blavatnik’s] image by linking himself to [...] respected institutions [...]. That is his strategy.’ There has been widespread and ongoing concern about the nature of Sir Leonid Blavatnik’s political donations and the access and influence they confer. In 2010, academics, anti-corruption voices, and journalists publicly campaigned against the new Blavatnik School of Government at Oxford. In spite of this, Tate accepted his donation the following year. Blavatnik’s governmental interventions have included donations to Trump’s inauguration committee, while the Tate staged ‘Soul of a Nation: Art in the Age of Black Power’ adjacent to the newly named ‘Blavatnik Building’, calling into question the integrity of Tate’s programming. His connections to Russian intervention in US politics remain under scrutiny.
- In 2019 Tate made no public objection to the Turner Contemporary arranging for Stagecoach South East to be lead sponsor of the 2019 Turner Prize despite the well-known homophobic track record of the company’s chair Brian Souter, which included donating £1 million to a campaign to retain the anti-gay section 28 of the Local Government Act 1988.
- Tate resumed its relationship with art dealer Anthony d’Offay in 2019, despite unresolved allegations of sexual harassment, racism, and an ongoing police investigation.
- In relation to this, Tate and the relevant parties have been evasive in responding to FOI requests. Most recently, when asked to supply the 2008 agreement between d’Offay and the Tate for the Artist Rooms sale, it was made clear that Tate believe ‘commercial sensitivities’ outweigh public interest throughout this case. Contrary to the Museum Association’s directive to prioritise communities over collections, this demonstrates Tate’s preference for maintaining relationships with private donors over its relationships with the public.

- In 2019 Tate Liverpool included without comment an image of someone in blackface within a slideshow accompanying the Keith Haring exhibition. The photograph was removed only at the press viewing of the exhibition when an art critic from The White Pube noticed it and publicised this failing.
- Tate has been criticised for not doing more to make its exhibitions accessible, for example in 2019 failing to provide a ramp for Olafur Eliasson's *Your Spiral View* and failing to assist a blind person to walk along *Your Spiral View*.

These problems are publicly known and documented in press articles, see Appendix B, i - vi for examples.

When viewed in light of the enormous efforts of your staff to provide socially and politically relevant engagements through initiatives like Art Now, Tate Exchange, the Duveen Commission, the performance and moving image programmes, or any of the number of historically significant artists and curatorial frameworks in recent years, the impact is significant. There is not one of these programmes whose intentions are not negatively affected by these issues.

While some of these issues have been dealt with in the eyes of Tate's administration, the consistency of these failures reveals a troubling pattern unlikely to stop unless broader measures are taken. It is no longer acceptable to make encouraging statements in the press that are later negated by what can only be viewed as cowardly retreats to the norm. Internally, these events are felt by creative workers and staff in a way that prohibits innovation and progress. Please refer to Appendix C for personal accounts from artists who have worked at Tate, current and ex-members of staff.

The disconnects laid out here are not intended to place blame on any individual, but rather to illustrate a wider infrastructural problem. For a specific example, we view the move to renew ties with Anthony d'Offay and the pressures laid on the institution by Tate's board of trustees as demonstrating an imbalance in values and intent:

1. This sent a clear message that Tate prioritised the financial interest of the museum and the legacy of one of its major donors over its commitment to progress, equality, and valuing marginalised members of society.
2. The continued presence of Anthony d'Offay's name as one of four major donors in the Turbine Hall, obscuring the facts that Tate and National Gallery Scotland purchased the Artist Rooms collection for £26.5 million (the original cost to d'Offay of the collection) and that the DCMS paid the £14.6 million in income and corporation tax that would have been incurred by d'Offay from the sale. The Artist Rooms collection was not a donation but instead was sold to Tate at a discount. Although the discount was large, it is not uncommon for artists and galleries to offer substantial discounts to an institution of such national and international importance.
3. This type of "investment", as clearly outlined in Tate's 2018 financial report (<https://www.tate.org.uk/file/tate-annual-accounts-2018-19>) in which the Artists Rooms are mentioned

16 times, directly contradicts, and undermines the Tate's initial statement of support for ethical practice.¹

Furthermore, it should be noted that the Artist Rooms collection itself is not representative of Tate's own stated goals and exhibits a visible racial bias: there is only one artist (of 42) who is a person of colour in the Artist Rooms collection. The proclaimed focus of AR on learning programmes for young people is useful only if it does not replicate a white, predominantly male, 'contemporary' canon. There are approximately 70,000 works in Tate's collection and around 1,600 of those are AR works. Why does such a small part of the collection stand to represent so much power? These figures suggest that the way the AR collection is disseminated amounts to 'parachuting' a narrow canon into communities nationwide in order to reassert its unearned dominance. As such, this approach reveals that the programme is undeniably colonial in its thinking.

The makeup and prominence of the AR collection certainly does not represent the director's stated view that to become less white and western is "a key part of our future as we explore the meanings of historic collections formed through imperial might in a contemporary, post-colonial world, and the way art and artists shape debates about identity, power and the politics of culture."

(<https://www.theartnewspaper.com/comment/art-sensitive-times>)

For anyone who has been listening and felt that they were being seen, heard, and valued at the time of the initial statement on fairness, equality and the right to work free of sexual harassment the actions that have followed render the original statement misleading at best and void at worst. Dismissing the validity of the several women who came forward to talk about their experiences with Anthony d'Offay reinforces the insincerity of Tate's stated desires to support and welcome marginalised groups. In addition, the fact that most of the women felt compelled to maintain their anonymity is testament to the resulting culture of alienation and inequity.

This conflict, along with the aforementioned concerns relating to corporate investments, reveals a major and consistent flaw in Tate's ethical approach. We fear that in spite of "good intentions", this pattern leads to future acts of marginalisation and an erosion of the public's trust and interest.

Proposed Remedial Actions

After reviewing publicly available information about Tate's internal ethics committee, its organisation and constitution, we view that the lack of adequate expertise and representation on the committee provides insight into where changes could be made in 2020 when Tate reviews its ethics policy. There are several areas in which Tate's programme is on track to achieve its stated goals and desired culture. These activities will be undermined if adjustments are not made to the organisation's ethical framework. We suggest these adjustments can be supported by:

- An ethics committee or panel – with little to no overlap with the Board of Trustees – capable of making accountable and independent decisions

¹ Repeated here: "The work of Tate and NGS is underpinned by values of fairness, equality and respect and the right to work free of sexual harassment. We expect these values to be demonstrated in the behaviour of everyone who is involved in our organisations."

- For this to become an expanded and diverse committee or panel and that no single member is alone in representing a minority group. This includes ability, age, class, gender, and race
- Ethics committee members who have expertise in the particular areas that the programme is wishing to engage with
- Ethics committee members who are actively engaged in discourse and communities around the particular areas the programme is wishing to engage with
- Ethics committee members who are active in all aspects of artistic activity: artists, curators, writers, as well as patrons or administrators
- An official member who is professionally involved with Ethics Law and who can effectively arbitrate boundaries in a way that is realistic to Tate's stated missions
- Transparency between the committee or panel and the institution's framework: ideological, structural, and financial

The following are starting points from which Tate could commence preparing the institution for such a body:

- Set concrete goals for the creation and care of a diverse culture at all levels of the institution within a realistic timeline
- Outline consequences for Tate if outlined goals are not met
- Provide better transparency to the public as to how decisions are made
- Remove Anthony d'Offay's name from Tate's walls. Remove control of Artist Rooms from those with financial or personal interests in d'Offay's legacy and subsume the works from Artist Rooms into the wider Tate collection
- Institute a policy that major corporate sponsorships and donors must be subject to review by an impartial panel (such as the ethics committee or panel described above)

Concluding statement

Tate's institutions provide a critical space in which artists can address emotional, ethical, political, and social threads within contemporary culture. These vital activities are compromised by an unwillingness to protect the institution (audiences and workers included) from conflicts of interest. The ethical framework of Tate's operations must be taken as seriously as the financial framework. Consistent oversights, no matter how small, yield direct influence on the programme's ability to succeed and an audience's ability to feel welcome.

Beyond the exhibitions, the institution's educational and public events provide a platform for important discourse within the UK. It must be clear that the events and experiences outlined in this document jeopardise this discourse and can make participants feel unvalued, unwelcome, and potentially unsafe in relation to their own well-being. Further, it puts artists and your own staff in the untenable position of being complicit, however unwillingly and often as a consequence of back channel positions, in structural and systemic oppression.

Confidence and trust must be restored. We are more than aware of the pressures facing art institutions in these times. We appreciate Tate's strong support of artists and their practices, and value its important role in the global arts community. However, we feel strongly that a lack of ethical accountability is a

threat to its relevance and effectiveness as a force in global arts and culture. At such an important moment in artistic and social history we see great potential to set precedents that reflect Tate's own stated set of values.

In an interview in April 2016 Frances Morris declared that Tate must navigate and approach difficult terrain with a 'strong moral compass' (<https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2016/apr/16/tate-modern-director-frances-morris-interview>), but the failures outlined in this letter make many feel that the Tate is falling far short of acting in a moral and ethical way. We formally request a response within 20 working days from the date of this letter outlining what action Tate and its board plan to take in regard to this ongoing situation.

Appendices

Appendix A

Updated open letter to Tate re its relationship with Anthony d'Offay, revised from the original open letter 25th April 2019

6 November 2019

Dear Tate,

Earlier this year, we circulated an open letter regarding the resumption of contact between Tate and Anthony d'Offay. This is a new and updated iteration to address the ongoing situation.

The points made in the original version still stand. Tate ignored the ongoing Metropolitan Police investigation into malicious communications from d'Offay, reinstating ties while the allegation was still under investigation. An FOI request submitted by GIRLFORUM* after the publication of the original letter revealed that ties were actually recommenced on 11 January 2019, almost 3 months before it reached the press. (https://f50085c2-8aa5-4632-b272-ebdd77fd22a5.filesusr.com/ugd/2d0dc3_3619cb1e25064db3abe74e67ae8a377c.pdf)

In April 2019, the Art Newspaper quoted a spokesman for Tate as saying “No formal investigation ensued and trustees have since resumed contact with Mr d'Offay, and informed relevant stakeholders accordingly.” This was incorrect – there was an ongoing police investigation at the time, the existence of which was originally made public by the Observer on 14 January 2018. In Tate's response to our FOI request, the ethics committee minutes in section 3 demonstrate that this article was presented to its members as part of the annual review of major donors on 23 February 2018 and 21 February 2019, demonstrating that Tate were well aware of the content of the article. (<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2018/jan/13/anthony-doffay-denies-historical-allegations-sexual-harassment>)

As stated in the original letter, we also understand that staff members have raised concerns about Mr d'Offay's conduct in the past. Since the original circulation of this letter, the wider art community's concern over his continued connection with Tate has been very clear to us.

We originally had two questions for the organisation:

Has it carried out an internal investigation into the allegations and into its own conduct?

Has its ethics committee considered the allegations?

Through the FOI request, it has become clear that Tate made no formal investigation beyond an insufficient consideration of the circumstances by the board of trustees and the ethics committee.

We contend that the overlap in the membership of the board of trustees and the ethics committee renders it unfit for purpose. Tate is reviewing its ethics policy in March 2020. We would like to update the demands of the original letter to call for the instatement of an independent and accountable ethics committee at Tate, which is capable of reviewing the morality of Tate's decisions rather than the legality alone.

A text by Tate Neighbour Khulud Benmoussa on the wall of Tate Exchange reads:

“We are committed to building a common language of civic responsibility and selfless actions to care for one another.

We all have some responsibility for the poor treatment of people around us and the hierarchies of power that divide us...In times when thoughts and words are not enough, actions must become our common language”

We ask Tate to embody the values laid out in this text, to cut ties with Mr d'Offay and carry out a full and thorough review of its decision-making structures.

Yours sincerely,

- 1) GIRLFORUM*
- 2) Jane Lawson, artist
- 3) Hettie Judah, writer
- 4) Edward Ball, curator and writer
- 5) Amanprit Sandhu, curator
- 6) Sarah Boulton, artist
- 7) Maxima Smith, artist
- 8) Rebecca James, artist
- 9) Louisa Brown, art worker
- 10) (Dr) Kate Random Love, art historian
- 11) James Harrington, designer and artist
- 12) Annabel Dover, artist
- 13) Dala Nasser, artist
- 14) Dr James Boaden, art historian

- 15) Liv Wynter
- 16) Lou Macnamara
- 17) Raju Rage
- 18) Sophie Chapman
- 19) Paul Purgas, artist
- 20) Erin Hope Francis, Sociology Student
- 21) Zach Harper, Architectural Assistant
- 22) Madeleine Pledge, artist
- 23) Susannah Stark, artist and musician
- 24) Cecile B. Evans, artist
- 25) Yuri Pattison, artist
- 26) Ben Greehy, graphic designer
- 27) Zinzi Minott, artist
- 28) Alice Channer, artist
- 29) Michelle Williams Gamaker, artist
- 30) Fiona McGovern, Gallery Director
- 31) Lynn Murphy, mother of an artist
- 32) Felix Bahret, artist
- 33) Michael Brzezinski, photographer
- 34) Decolonise History of Art and Architecture, University of Cambridge
- 35) Harriet Mena Hill
- 36) Sophy King, artist
- 37) Marie-Anne McQuay
- 38) Eloise Bonneviot
- 39) Alia Rebecca Butt
- 40) Joel Wycherley, artist

- 41) Jade Forbes, artist
- 42) Lara Smithson, artist
- 43) Celia Hempton
- 44) Francis Taylor
- 45) Sam Risley, artist
- 46) Jenny Mellings, artist
- 47) Rachel Knowles, artist
- 48) Ian Nesbitt, artist
- 49) Roy Claire Potter artist and Senior Lecturer Liverpool John Moores University
- 50) Leah Miller-Biot, artist
- 51) Sam Vardy, artist and Senior Lecturer in Architecture, Sheffield Hallam University
- 52) Pete Smithson
- 53) Paula McCloskey, artist researcher
- 54) Season Butler, writer and artist
- 55) Sarah Pledge, art educator and mother of an artist
- 56) Daniella Valz Gen
- 57) Sarah Maple
- 58) Rabz Lansiquot, curator
- 59) Jack Tan, artist
- 60) Madeleine Hodge, Curator
- 61) Benedict Drew, artist
- 62) Vivien Blackett
- 63) Susannah Bolton, artist
- 64) Ruth Beale, artist
- 65) Nicky Deeley, artist

- 66) India Nielsen
- 67) Lucy McKenzie
- 68) Eva Sajovic, artist
- 69) Anna Bunting-Branch
- 70) Nicole Morris
- 71) Julia Vogl, artist
- 72) Katherine Jenkins
- 73) Ro Hardaker
- 74) Adam Smythe
- 75) Hava Carvajal
- 76) Maz Murray
- 77) Georgia Taylor Aguilar, Producer
- 78) Maurice Carlin
- 79) Jennifer Boyd
- 80) Zadie Xa
- 81) Sarah Pickering, artist
- 82) Adam Farah / free.yard (artist / born 'n' raised Londoner)
- 83) Cavan Pledge, Art Teacher
- 84) Ellen Mara De Wachter
- 85) James Bridle, artist and writer
- 86) Louise Ashcroft
- 87) Adham Faramawy
- 88) Xavier de Sousa
- 89) Lu Williams
- 90) Fauziya Johnson, editor
- 91) Dillwyn Smith, artist

- 92) Ayçesu Duran, artist
- 93) Anna Arabindan-Kesson
- 94) Jesse Darling, artist
- 95) Harry Josephine Giles
- 96) Mark Leckey
- 97) Rachel Dobbs, artist & educator
- 98) Victoria Sin
- 99) Phoebe Collings-James
- 100) Jennifer Lewandowski
- 101) Helena Reckitt
- 102) Mariana Reyes Carranza; PhD student at Queen Mary University of London
- 103) Phoebe Collings-James
- 104) Rehana Zaman
- 105) Frances Scott
- 106) Emma Edmondson, artist/ educator
- 107) Evan Ifekoya, artist -healer teacher researcher
- 108) Alexandrina Hemsley
- 109) Karen Di Franco
- 110) Janine Francois, agitator
- 111) Ian Giles

Appendix B

i.BP

The Guardian: BP to end Tate sponsorship after 26 years

<https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2016/mar/11/bp-to-end-tate-sponsorship-climate-protests>

The Guardian: Tate's BP sponsorship was £150,000 to £330,000 a year, figures show

<https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/jan/26/tate-reveal-bp-sponsorship-150000-330000-platform-information-tribunal>

ii. Leonid Blavatnik

Bellingcat: Money Talks: Len Blavatnik And The Council On Foreign Relations

<https://www.bellingcat.com/news/2019/10/10/money-talks-len-blavatnik-and-the-council-on-foreign-relations/>

iii. Stagecoach

BBC News: Poll 'backs' Section 28

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/769639.stm>

BBC News: Souter defends Section 28 stance

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/744503.stm>

Pink News: Turner Prize sponsor Stagecoach dropped after anti-LGBT row

<https://www.pinknews.co.uk/2019/05/03/turner-prize-stagecoach-sponsor-dropped-lgbt/>

The Guardian: Stagecoach's sponsorship of Turner prize ends over LGBT rights row

<https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2019/may/02/turner-prize-drops-stagecoach-as-sponsor-over-anti-gay-views>

iv. Anthony d'Offay

The Guardian: Tate suspends contact with donor over sexual harassment claims

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jan/14/tate-suspends-contact-donor-sexual-harassment-claims-anthony-doffay>

The Art Newspaper: Artists protest Tate decision to resume ties with Anthony d'Offay

<https://www.theartnewspaper.com/news/artists-protest-tate-decision-to-resume-ties-with-anthony-d-offay>

v: Keith Haring exhibition

The White Pube: Keith Haring @ Tate Liverpool

<https://www.thewhitepube.co.uk/keith-haring-tate-liverpool>

vi: Accessibility problems

Hyperallergic: Wheelchair User Criticizes Tate Modern for Inaccessibility Issues at Olafur Eliasson Exhibition

<https://hyperallergic.com/513173/wheelchair-user-criticizes-tate-modern-for-at-olafur-eliasson/>

Frieze: 'The Curator's Choice'? Wheelchair User Calls Out Olafur Eliasson's Tate Modern Show For Lack of Accessibility

<https://frieze.com/article/curators-choice-wheelchair-user-calls-out-olafur-eliassons-tate-modern-show-lack>

Appendix C

Confidential Personal Accounts

These are **confidential** personal accounts provided by art workers about their working relations with Tate. They have been anonymised and redacted for the person's protection, but have otherwise been left unedited.

A significant number of contacts relayed their experience but did not feel safe contributing due to fear that they would be identified.

A significant number of contacts did not feel they had worked extensively enough with Tate to contribute but wanted to acknowledge their support and the urgency of the aims expressed.

A significant number of contacts who are POC relayed their sense that they had been invited as a token or to resolve a lack of representation within areas of the public programming (specifically). They did not have a "bad" experience but rather a suspicion about the terms of their involvement.

We were also in conversation with several people who were negatively impacted by the decision to reconnect ties with d'Offay. With respect to the nature of trauma, we did not proceed with recording personal accounts in certain cases but want to acknowledge the expression of distress.

Personal Accounts Redacted

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL