# PUBLIC WEB EDITION

### of the

# **Opinion Presented 16 October 2009**

## to the

## **Commission of the European Union**

This public web edition is available in the following web page: <u>http://www.jukkarannila.fi/lausunnot.html#nro\_17</u>

Readers of the Opinion are strongly to evaluate critically both Microsoft's proposal of the Commitment and opinions/proposal presented in the Opinion.

Information related the Case No.COMP/C-3/39.530 can be read and downloaded from the following web page:

<u>http://ec.europa.eu/competition/antitrust/cases/index/by\_nr\_79.html#i39\_530</u> This web page contains Proposed Commitments and annexes to the Proposed Commitments.

Reader(s) of this Opinion are strongly recommended to give their **<u>own opinions</u>** to the following email address:

COMP-GREFFE-ANTITRUST@ec.europa.eu These opinions provided by the readers must be in the Commission before 7 November 2009.

With Best Regards,

Jukka Rannila

citizen of Finland signed and delivered electronically

<u>www.jukkarannila.fi</u>

16 October 2009 Public / World wide web

1				
2 3	COMP_GREEEE_ANTITRUST@ec.europa.eu			
4	COMP-GREFFE-ANTITRUST@ec.europa.eu European Commission			
5	Directorate-General for Competition			
6	Antitrust Registry			
7	B-1049 Bruxelles/Brussel			
8				
9				
10	Market notice on 9 October 2009			
11				
12	OPINION CONCERNING CASE COMP/C-3/39530 – MICROSOFT (TYING)			
13				
14	This opinion collect some viewpoints based on the Market Test Notice related to antitrust case Case			
15	COMP/C-3/39530 – Microsoft (Tying).			
16 17	These opinions do not represent any organisation, and it is an opinion of an concerned citizen in a			
18	Member State.			
19	Wenter Suie.			
20				
21	Generally speaking the Proposed Commitment contains many issues, which must be:			
22	– modified,			
23	– extended,			
24	– rewritten,			
25	– specified more, or			
26	– deleted.			
27				
28	In current form the Proposed Commitment can not be a final form of the final Commitment.			
29	Moreover, there is some technical details, which are poorly specified.			
30				
31				
32	Annex 1 holds information of copyright, licence and disclaimer.			
33				
34				
35	Best Regards,			
36 37				
38				
39	Jukka Rannila			
40	citizen of Finland			
41				
42	signed and delivered electronically			

www.jukkarannila.fi 16 October 2009 Public / World wide web 43 44 **Request for new round of hearings** 45 46 It is probable that this invitation for comments will result a large amount of opinions. Since this case is utmost important, I propose a second round of comments, i.e. Market Test, after 47 48 the second version of the Commitment is ready. 49 50 **Proposal 1**: A new Market Test is needed for the second version of proposed Commitment, 51 after the Commission has consolidated all provided positions/opinions related to the (first) 52 Proposed Commitment in the EU / Antitrust case COMP/39.530. 53 54 General 55 I will go through the text of the proposed commitment paragraph by paragraph and by 56 57 sentence by sentence. 58 59 **Paragraph 1** 60 61 **Proposal 2**: A web page <u>www.microsoft.com</u> is too general since Microsoft has hundreds of pages in their web site. Therefore it must something like this: 62 63 www.microsoft.com/ballot screen 64 65 **Proposal 3**: There should be also separate annexes for describing ballot screen procedure with Windows XP and Windows VISTA operation systems. 66 67 **Proposa 4**: The Commission can request on its own will these separate annexes for 68 69 describing ballot screen procedure with Windows XP and Windows VISTA operation 70 systems. 71 72 **Proposal 5**: There must be point added to the third sentence in the paragraph (1): 73 74 Microsoft will ensure that if Internet Explorer is turned off, then 75 [...] 76 (iv) Windows operating system will work coherently even though Internet 77 Explorer is turned off, and Microsoft will promptly correct reported defects 78 that are related to turning off Internet Explorer. 79 80 Paragraph 2 81 82 Opinion 1: There must be change in written form for OEM terms, where is specifically specified, that an OEM has free choice to pre-install any web browser. Surely there is 83

**OPINION** 

EU / Antitrust case COMP/39.530

2(12)

8687 Proposal 6: Therefore every OEM must be given a written notice of change in the terms, i.e.

Force Majeure -situation, and change in terms is possible.

"Changes" clause, and finally accepted final form of the Commitment can be compared to

Copyright, licence and disclaimer: check Annex 1.

84 85 Jukka S. Rannila

	Jukka S. Rannila	OPINION EU / Antitrust case	3 (12) COMP/39.530
	www.jukkarannila.fi	16 October 2009	Public / World wide web
88 89	free choice for pre-installation of web brows	ers.	
89 90	<b>Proposal 7</b> : Previously mentioned list of not	tified OFMs must be	delivered to the
91	Commission and updated regularly, i.e. mon		
92	Commission and updated regularry, i.e. mon	uny, to the wherosoft	web site.
93	Paragraph 3		
94			
95 96	<b>Proposal 8</b> : Sentence 1 in paragraph must be	e following:	
90 97	"Within Migrogoff's DC Droductivity	Applications which	are specified in this
97 98	"Within Microsoft's PC Productivity Commitment, and distributed in the		
98 99	links or short-cuts or provide any oth		
100	Microsoft web browser."		Swilload of instantation of a
101	Wherosoft web browser.		
101	Paragraph 4		
102			
104	<b>Proposal 9:</b> Similarly to free choice to pre-in	nstall any web brows	er, there must be a
105	covenant provided by Microsoft not sue whe		
106	supporting software that competes with Mich		
107			
108	<b>Proposal 10:</b> This written notice to the OEM	Is must be given at th	ne same time as notice of
109	free choice of pre-installation.		
110			
111	Paragraph 6		
112			
113	Opinion 2: This paragraph considers direct	<i>,</i>	
114	previously mentioned free pre-installation ar	nd free using, distribu	iting, promoting or
115	supporting of web browsers.		
116 117	<b>Proposal 11</b> : Therefore there must be one se	ntanaa mara:	
117	<u>110posal 11</u> . Therefore there must be one se		
119	"Microsoft shall not terminate	e a direct OEM licenc	re based on OFMs
120	(licensees) usage of competin		
121	other Microsoft's web browse	-	
122			
123	Paragraph 7		
124			
125	Opinion 3: The five months roll-out in this p	aragraph is totally va	igue.
126			
127	Proposal 12: After sentence "If Microsoft en	ncounters objective u	nexpected technical
128	difficulties which mean that it is unable to co	-	
129	Microsoft will before the end of this period s		juest for an extension to the
130	Commission." there must be following sen	tences:	
131	<b>40</b>	1 1 • • • •	4 4 <b>1</b> 4 <b>•</b> 41
132	"Commission can nominate to	ecnnology-oriented e	xperts to determine the

	Jukka S. Rannila	OPINION EU / Antitrust case COMP/39.530	4 (12)
	<u>www.jukkarannila.fi</u>	16 October 2009 Public / World wide	e web
133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144		reasoned request and technical obstacles related to five (5) months time, grace period. These technology-oriented experts must be given a access technical development environment of Microsoft in order to determine to validity of reasoned request. If there is user manuals, development man introductory software, test suites or defect information, Microsoft will provide public, complete and concise list and free access of this informat to the nominated technology-oriented experts. Commission can order monthly payments for Microsoft after this grace period, if there is non-compliance after this five months grace period. Commission can determine amount of these monthly fines based on sev of the possible non-compliance after grace period."	to the nuals, ation
145 146 147 148	five (5) month	used on the previous non-compliance of Microsoft, it can be reasoned that is delay can be extended indefinitely, if there is not some monetary meas in-compliance in this respect.	
149 150	Paragraph 8		
150 151 152	Proposal 13:	One sentence must be added:	
153 154 155		"The Ballot Screen update will include an initial page that provides basis information concerning the purpose of the Ballot Screen. <u>This initial pa</u> <u>must be on the default language of the operating system.</u> "	
156 157 158 159 160		An average user might not understand how to test active internet connect t seems easy. Therefore one sentence must deleted and a new sentence m	
161 162		This page will include a notice that prominently reminds the user to ensitive internet connection before proceeding to the browser selection	
163 164 165 166 167 168 169		page. This initial page contains a button that will test internet connections by sending a PING <sup>1</sup> messages to vendor-managed download servers of the predetermined browsers, and if there are internet connection problems, t will be a notification of these problems and there is a possibility to cance installation process of web browsers.	there
170 171	<b>Proposal 15</b> : the accepted C	Term "ClickOnce" is not defined, and it must be defined in the final form Commitment.	1 of
172 173 174	Paragraph 9		
174 175 176	<u>Opinion 5</u> : Th	ere is not any mention about <b>manual update</b> in this paragraph.	
	1 http://en.wikipedia.org	a/wiki/PING	

1 <u>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PING</u>

	Jukka S. Rannila	OPINION EU / Antitro	5 (12) 5 st case COMP/39.530
	<u>www.jukkarannila.fi</u>	16 October	2009 Public / World wide web
177 178	<b>Proposal 16</b> : With ma Ballot Screen.	nnual update there must be a possib	ility to install web browser through
178	Ballot Scleell.		
180	Dronosal 17. It should	d ha passible to add the wanted web	b browser(s) to all computers by the
180	-	nel, not just removing Ballot Screen	1 5
182		ner, not just removing Danot Screen	1.
182	Paragraph 11		
184			
185	Oninion 6: "semi-ann	ually" is too vague in the sentence	1
186	<u>opinion o</u> . Senii ann	daily is too vague in the sentence	
187	Proposal 18. "semi-a	nnually" in the sentence 1 must be	replaced by "monthly"
188			epiacea of monomy .
189	Opinion 7 <sup>•</sup> "source co	mmonly agreed" is too vague in the	e sentence 1
190	<u></u>		
191	<b>Proposal 19</b> : There m	ust be a specific source mentioned	for calculating browser popularity
192			culating browser popularity must
193		icrosoft and Microsoft's subsidia	
194	•		
195	Paragraph 13		
196			
197	Opinion 8: "semi-ann	ually" is too vague in the sentence ?	3.
198			
199	Proposal 20: "semi-ar	nnually" in the sentence 3 must be	replaced by "monthly".
200			
201		l sentence of the paragraph 13 the te	1
202	-	a specific time period the final for	m of the Commitment, e.g. a
203	month.		
204			
205	-		ere is missing points. The procedure
206	for dispute resolution	e	
207		a dispute is recognised	~
208		the disputed issue is informed to th	
209		Microsoft and vendor try to resolve	-
210		Microsoft and vendor resolve the is	
211	-	written resolution of the dispute is	informed to the Commission
212	_	IF Microsoft and vendor cannot res	solve the dispute, then Microsoft
213		must submit the matter to the Com	mission for determination
214			
215	Paragraph 15		
216			
217	-		defined in the chapter 5. This issue
218	will be discussed later	on.	
219			4 1 22 4 1 1 I
220	-	nal sentence of the paragraph 13 "n	hay not charge must be changed
221	" <u>must not charge</u> ".		

	Jukka S. Rannila	OPINION EU / Antitrust case	6 (12) COMP/39.530
	www.jukkarannila.fi	16 October 2009	Public / World wide web
<ul> <li>222</li> <li>223</li> <li>224</li> <li>225</li> <li>226</li> <li>227</li> </ul>	<b>Proposal 23</b> : There must be a new sentence "Microsoft will provide a way give must be listed in the page committee be informed in the same page."	feedback about API d	efects. These API defects
228 229 230	Opinion 11: This is not hard task, since a si	ngle web page can co	mply previous sentence.
230 231 232	Paragraph 17		
232 233 234	Opinion 12: This paragraph implies passive	e behaviour by Micros	soft, and it is not acceptable.
235 236 237 238 239 240	Proposal 24: There must be new sentences "When there is changes and updates Microsoft will invite browser vendo and updates in the Windows Update browser vendors mentioned in the p Update online service, Microsoft wi	s in the Windows Upd ors mentioned in the p online service. If the aragraph 13 in the up	ate online service, aragraph 13 to test changes re is defects found by dates in the Windows
241 242	Paragraph 18		
243 244 245 246	<u>Opinion 13</u> : There is not mentioning about browser market is still dominated by one w		
247	<b><u>Proposal 25</u></b> : There must be new sentences	in the end of the para	graph 19:
248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258	The term of this Commitment can b Commitment. Commission can on it have on its own will have Market R can reasonably proof, that web brow Microsoft web browser in the fifth y own will ask a new Market Test dur the Market Test, Commission and M this Commitment, and the negotiation fifth year of this Commitment.	ts own will monitor w eview of the web brow yser market is still abuy ear of this Commitma ing the fifth year of the ficrosoft can agree on	veb browser market, and can wser market. If Commission usively dominated by one ent, Commission can on its his Commitment. Based on the new Commitment after
259 260	Amendment 1 / Paragraph 20		
261 262 263	Proposal 26: I propose following paragraph	h 20 to be added.	
264	(())) The second	1	1
265 266	(20) The twelve (12) web bro provide yearly reports in Jan		

	Jukka S. Rannila		OPINION EU / Antitrust case	7 (12) COMP/39.530
	<u>www.jukkarannila.fi</u>		16 October 2009	Public / World wide web
267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280		situation in the web browser can be provided by individua web browser vendors. Comm reviewing effectiveness of th Commission can on its own v can have a public consultatio Software Products, Competit Products, Competition Author Organisations, Information an Associations and to the gener The Commission can use the effectiveness of this Commit "	l web browser vendor hission can evaluate the is Commitment. will have Market Rev n for Customers of the ors of the Microsoft's rities in the Member nd Communication Te ral public. se Market Reviews, v	rs or by collective effort of nese reports, when iews, i.e. the Commission e Microsoft's Relevant Relevant Software States, Standard Setting echnology Experts
280 281	Amendment 2 / Para	agranh 21		
282		-81 april 21		
283	<b>Proposal 27</b> :	I propose following paragraph	1 21 to be added.	
284	(( <b>0</b> 1))	гч °11 1 ° с с с	1 1 / 11 .	
285 286 287 288 289 290 291	Comm World is Gov definit brows	There will be new internet star hitment. According to annex 4( Trade Organization there can ernment Procurement in some ion) concerning web standards er version will comply with the ements."	b) to Marrakesh Agree be standards and tech country based on tec s in a procurement, bi	eement Establishing the nical specification. If there hnical specifications (WTO dding Microsoft's web
292 293	Opinion 14: H	Iere is following background f	or the proposed parag	pranh 21
294	<u>opinion 11</u> . 1		or the proposed putug	Shuph 21
295		ment on Government Procurer		o Marrakesh Agreement
296	Establ	ishing the World Trade Organi	zation (WTO).	
297 298	Article	e VI: Technical Specifications		
298	Attick	vi. icennical specifications		
300	1. Tecl	nnical specifications laying do	wn the characteristics	s of the products or services
301	to be p	procured, such as quality, perfo	ormance, safety and d	imensions, symbols,
302		ology, packaging, marking and	<b>U</b> 1	
303	-	roduction and requirements re		-
304	-	ibed by procuring entities, sha		
305	view to	o, or with the effect of, creatin	g unnecessary obstac	les to international trade.
306 307	2 Taal	nical manifications proscribe	d hy proguring optitic	a shall where appropriate:
307 308	2. Ieci	nnical specifications prescribe	a by procuring entitle	s snan, where appropriate:
308 309	(a) he	in terms of performance rather	r than design or desor	intive characteristics: and
310		based on international standar	e	1
210	(0) 00		as, miere such enlot,	content trabe, on numbrial

<sup>2 &</sup>lt;u>http://www.wto.org/english/docs\_e/legal\_e/gpr-94\_01\_e.htm</u>

<u>www.jukkarannila.fi</u>

16 October 2009 Public / World wide web

311	technical regulations (footnote 3), recognized national standards (footnote 4), or
312	building codes.
313	
314	(footnote original) 3 For the purpose of this Agreement, a technical regulation
315	is a document which lays down characteristics of a product or a service or
316	their related processes and production methods, including the applicable
317	administrative provisions, with which compliance is mandatory. It may also
318	include or deal exclusively with terminology, symbols, packaging, marking or
319	labelling requirements as they apply to a product, service, process or
320	production method.
321	
322	(footnote original) 4 For the purpose of this Agreement, a standard is a
323	document approved by a recognized body, that provides, for common and
324	repeated use, rules, guidelines or characteristics for products or services or
325	related processes and production methods, with which compliance is not
326	mandatory. It may also include or deal exclusively with terminology,
327	symbols, packaging, marking or labelling requirements as they apply to a
328	product, service, process or production method.
329	
330	3. There shall be no requirement or reference to a particular trademark or trade name,
331	patent, design or type, specific origin, producer or supplier, unless there is no
332	sufficiently precise or intelligible way of describing the procurement requirements
333	and provided that words such as "or equivalent" are included in the tender
334	documentation.
335	
336	4. Entities shall not seek or accept, in a manner which would have the effect of
337	precluding competition, advice which may be used in the preparation of
338	specifications for a specific procurement from a firm that may have a commercial
339	interest in the procurement.
340	
341	Amendment 3 / Paragraph 22-24
342	
343	<b>Proposal 28</b> : I propose following paragraphs to be added.
344	
345	"(22) There will be new internet standards (both "de jure" and "de facto") presented
346	during time period of this Commitment."
347	
348	"(23) Microsoft will comply with a new web standard ("de jure"), if three (3) largest
349	or over six (6) web browser providers mentioned in the paragraph 13 are committed
350	to a specific web standard ("de jure"). Standard setting organisation (SDO) is
351	specified in Article VI: Technical Specifications of the Agreement on Government
352	Procurement <sup>3</sup> as annex 4(b) to Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade
353	Organization."
354	

<sup>3 &</sup>lt;u>http://www.wto.org/english/docs\_e/legal\_e/gpr-94\_01\_e.htm</u>

### OPINION 9 (12) EU / Antitrust case COMP/39.530

www.jukkarannila.fi

16 October 2009 Public / World wide web

355 356 357 358	"(24) In "de facto" standards there can be Market Review by the Commission. If there is a "de facto" standard hindering the competition, the Commission can start antitrust proceedings with provider of that "de facto" competition hindering web standard. If competition hindering "de facto" web standard is provided by Microsoft,
359 360 361 362	Commission and Microsoft shall start immediately negotiations to alleviate the hindered competition during this Commitment. In market review the Commission can review if complying with "de facto" standard is reasonable and feasible to the web browser providers mentioned in the paragraph 13."
363	((25) Conformite of the step dends is immented for all houses are in the modest
364 365	"(25) Conformity of the standards is important for all browsers in the market.
	Microsoft will assure that Internet Explorer conforms with "de jure" and "de facto"
366	standards. If other browser vendors, consumers or other companies can prove that
367	Internet Explorer does not conform to these standards, Commission and Microsoft will accepting approximation and they will determine timetable
368	will negotiate about solving conformity problems, and they will determine timetable for achieving conformity. Commission can nominate technology-oriented experts to
369 370	determine conformance of Internet Explorer. If Microsoft does not comply with
370	accepted timetable, Commission can order monthly fines for Microsoft."
372	accepted timetable, commission can order montiny miles for wherosoft.
373	Opinion 15: Based on Microsoft's previous non-conformity to public standards, there must
374	be safety measures to ensure that Microsoft really conforms to standards.
375	be survey mousures to ensure that theresort rearry comornis to surraires.
376	<u>SIDENOTE.</u>
377	In WTO case EC - Bananas III (DS27) it was concluded that General
378	Agreement on Trade in Services Articles II and XVI prohibits de facto
379	discrimination as well as de jure discrimination, the Appellate Body noted
380	that in past practice, GATT Article I applied to de facto discrimination. Also
381	in case Canada – Autos (DS 139 and 142) it was concluded that article I:1
382	covers de facto discrimination as well as de jure discrimination.
383	
384	Amendment 4 / Paragraph 26
385	
386	Opinion 16: Microsoft is having a passive attitude of informing all interested parties in this
387	proposed commitment.
388	
389	<b>Proposal 29</b> : I propose following paragraph to be added.
390	((2) Misses & deall measure weblic such masses what day the Dellet Common It shall
391	"(26) Microsoft shall provide public web pages related to the Ballot Screen. It shall
392	be possible to all interested persons and all legal entities to sign into the information
393 394	mailing lists informing about the Ballot Screen and to RSS feeds informing about Ballot Screen Microsoft will promptly inform all relevant changes in the the Ballot
394 395	Ballot Screen. Microsoft will promptly inform all relevant changes in the the Ballot
393 396	Screen procedures to these information lists and to Microsoft's web page.
390 397	Amendment 5 / Paragraph 27
398	Amenument 5 / 1 aragraph 27
399	Opinion 17: Microsoft is not proposing that how Volume Licensing Customers are going to
577	<u>opinion 17</u> . Indicional is not proposing that now volume Electioning Customers are going to

Jukka	S.	Rannila

<u>www.jukkarannila.fi</u>

400 401	be served during this proposed Commitment.
401	<b>Proposal 30</b> : I propose following.
402	<u>I Toposat 50</u> . I propose following.
404	Microsoft and Commission can negotiate how Volume Licensing Customers are
405	served during the final Commitment.
406	Volume Licensing Customers need option, where they can enforce usage of certain
407	versions of web browsers in their organisations based on the policy in their
408	organisations.
409	Microsoft shall provide constructive proposal how to serve Volume Licensing
410	Customers for the next version of the proposed Commitment.
411	
412	Opinion 18: When there is a second Market Test, Microsoft's constructive proposals for
413	serving Volume Licensing Customers can be better evaluated.
414	
415	Definition "Timely Manner"
416	•
417	<b>Proposal 31</b> : This should contain definition of "alpha" version and clearer explanation
418	between "alpha" and "beta" versions.
419	-
420	<b>Proposal 32</b> : There is not mentioning, that how long period "beta testing" is. Is there some
421	standard "beta testing period" for Microsoft's products in the "beta testing phase"? This
422	should be defined better!
423	
424	Definition "Windows Client PC Operating System
425	
426	<b><u>Proposal 33</u></b> : This should information about Windows VISTA and about Windows XP and
427	their successors.
428	
429	MISSING Definition "API"
430	Dren and 24. The term "ADI" must be defined
431 432	<b>Proposal 34</b> : The term "API" must be defined.
432	MISSING Definition "ClickOne"
434	WISSING Demitton Chekone
435	<b>Proposal 35</b> : The term "ClickOnce" must be defined.
436	<u><b>I Toposar 55</b></u> . The term CheckOnee must be defined.
437	ANNEX A of the proposed Commitment
438	And LAX A of the proposed Communent
439	Opinion 19: The term "Turn Windows features on or off" is totally vague.
440	
441	<b>Proposal 36</b> : "Turn Internet Explorer on or off" should be a separate option right in the
442	Control Panel, not hidden deeply to "Turn Windows features on or off" menu.
443	
444	Opinion 20: An average user might not understand how to test active internet connection,

	Jukka S. Rannila	OPINION	11 (12)
		EU / Antitrust case	COMP/39.530
	www.jukkarannila.fi	16 October 2009	Public / World wide web
445 446 447	even though it seems easy. Therefore one sadded:	sentence must deleted	and a new sentence must be
447 448 449 450 451 452	<b>Proposal 37</b> : This initial page contains a b sending a PING messages to vendor-mana browsers, and if there are internet connecti problems and there is a possibility to cance	ged download servers on problems, there wi	of the predetermined ll be a notification of these
453 454 455	<u>Opinion 21</u> : There should be clear "HELP <sup>*</sup> following phases.	" link, that would oper	n clear explanation of the
456 457	ANNEX B of the proposed Commitment		
458 459 460 461 462 463	<b><u>Proposal 38</u></b> : In the bottom of the Ballot S which would give clear technical informat oriented persons.		
464	ANNEX 1 of this Opinion		
465 466 467 468	Annex 1 holds information of copyright, licence a	nd disclaimer.	
469 470 471	<u>SIGNATURE</u>		
472	Jukka Rannila		
473	citizen of Finland		
474			

475 signed and delivered electronically

#### OPINION 12 (12) EU / Antitrust case COMP/39.530

www.jukkarannila.fi

16 October 2009 Public / World wide web

### ANNEX 1

476

477 DISCLAIMER

478479 Legal disclaimer:

All opinions in this opinion paper are personal opinions and they do not represent opinions of any legal
entity I am member either by law or voluntarily. This opinion paper is only intended to trigger thinking and it
is not legal advice. This opinion paper does not apply to any past, current or future legal entity. This opinion
paper will not cover any of the future changes in this fast-developing area. Any actions made based on this
opinion is solely responsibility of respective actor making those actions.

486487 Political disclaimer:

488
489 These opinions do not represent opinions of any political party. These opinions are not advices to certain
490 policy and they are only intended to trigger thinking. Any law proposal based on these opinions are sole
491 responsibility of that legal entity making law proposals.

These opinions are not meant to be extreme-right, moderate-right, extreme-centre <sup>4</sup>, moderate-centre,
extreme-left or moderate-left. They are only opinions of an individual whose overall thinking might or might
not contain elements of different sources. These opinions do not reflect past, current or future political
situation in the Finnish, European or worldwide politics.

These opinions are not meant to rally for a candidacy in any public election in any level.

500 <u>Content of web pages:</u>

501

502 This text may or may not refer to web pages. The content of those web pages is not responsibility of author 503 of this document. They are referenced on the date of this document. If referenced web pages are not found 504 after the date when this document is dated that situation is not responsibility of the author. All changes done 505 in the web pages this document refers are sole responsibility of those organisations and individuals 506 maintaining those web pages. All illegal content found on the web pages referenced is not on the 507 responsibility of the author of this document and producing that kind content is not endorsed by the author of 508 this document.

509 510 COPYRIGHT

511
512 This opinion paper is distributed under Creative Commons licence, to be specific the licence is "Creative
513 Commons Attribution-NoDerivs-NonCommercial 1.0 Finland". The text of the licence can be obtained from
514 the following web page:

 515
 http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd-nc/1.0/fi/legalcode

 517
 518

 518
 The English explanation is in the following web page:

 519
 520

 521
 http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd-nc/1.0/fi/deed.en

<sup>4</sup> Based on the Finnish three-party system there is phenomenon called extreme-centre in Finland.