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Abstract: A system and method for a system for server-side database-driven services that can be accessed by a variety of client-side applications, as disclosed in this disclosure. There are many applications for desktop computers and mobile devices for accessing a variety of content, such as, for example, e-mail, documents and contacts. However, these applications all work individually and not collaboratively.
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