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ANNEX: SUMMARY OF EU POLICIES.

_Ulf Blomqvist, Lars-Erik Eriksson, Olle Findahl, Håkan Selg, Roger Wallis_

Policies encompass future goals and the means with which to attain them. Even if they are long-term, few stay intact throughout an implementation process, simply because the world is dynamic. This is particularly true in the area under focus (experiences from the Music Industry) in this project. Many of the policy instruments, for example the EU Copyright Directive, are based on international agreements spelt out up to ten years ago, when very little was known about how ICT innovations would develop.

Another important characteristic of policies is that they frequently build on achieving a sensible balance between opposing trends, interests or forces. Throughout the 1990s, the convergence debate was at the forefront of EU policy debates. This included frequent reminders of the need to balance the ownership interests of intellectual property rights holders, with the need to stimulate innovation, evolve new business models that utilised the potential of Information Society technologies. This is not a new phenomenon, but one which regularly needs to be highlighted, and not infrequently gets hidden under a cloud of more spectacular debates – not infrequently driven by incumbent industry interests which fear threats to traditional business models. This was described succinctly by former Commissioner Monti in 2004 in a speech to mobile operators about the need for access to content in new high speed mobile networks:

“The importance of access to attractive content for the success of all media is generally recognised by most operators ... since the Commission’s general objective is to keep media markets open and to stimulate growth as much as possible, the Commission needs to ensure that access to key inputs in the markets for delivery of content is not unjustifiably restricted... We certainly do not have the illusion of having removed once and for all the obstacles that, as far as content is concerned, might hamper the development and opening to competition of new media markets. .... In many cases, innovation builds up as a challenge to existing technologies and/ or processes. As such, it pits new players against established firms. Such configurations obviously create incentives for the incumbents to try to block or curtail the new dynamics in the market place, to try to maintain their position at the expense of the innovations” (Monti M. “Access to content and the development of competition in the New Media market – the Commission’s approach”. Speech 04/353 given to the Workshop on access to quality audio-visual contents, Brussels 8 July 2004.)

1.1 Balance of interests – the example of IPR regimes in the digital environment

Throughout the development of IPR regimes, there has been a constant need to consider the notion of balance, between the interests of content owners on the one hand and between users on the other. If the IPR regime is used primarily to control how and where copyrighted materials are used or consumed (or blocked from consumption), then the role of IPR as a means to stimulate creative, via offering a financial incentive, can suffer.
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This risk has been noted by a number of academics and industrial think tanks. In a 2004 report from the US Committee for Economic Development (an independent research and policy organisation of business leaders and educators) (CED report), the dangers of moving away from an ideal balance between content owners and users are analysed in detail.

“The fundamental idea between intellectual property protection is that creators are entitled to limited incentives in order to stimulate the production - and distribution - of new works. We grant limited privileges to creators because we want them to create and to share their works for the benefit of society as a whole, not in order to give them control over how their works are used. The central problem with broad use of DRM is not that software code will be regulating users, but that content owners will be unilaterally regulating private uses of content and controlling the source of subsequent innovation”.

The CED report goes on to note creativity does not occur in a vacuum, and indeed relies heavily on users improving existing ideas. Many legislative moves to increase content owners ability to control usage under discussion in the USA (and support heavily by the US content industries) could “raise the costs of creation by the follow-on inventor. As a result these proposals are likely to lead to an underproduction of innovation from those who would otherwise base their work on earlier created works. ... To the extent that such control channels innovation to areas that do not threaten incumbents or undercut existing business models, the likelihood of genuine breakthroughs will be sharply reduced.” (Promoting Innovation and Economic Growth the special problem of digital intellectual property. Report from the Digital Connections Council of the Committee for Economic Development. Washington DC, USA 2004)

Such statements underscore the dangers of seeing DRM implementation as a panacea for all the problems of the content industry in the emerging Information Society. Some European creators might react strongly against the views expressed by this report. In US copyright the moral rights of the creator are less strong than in traditional European equivalents. But this is not the point; the US report refers to general principles of innovation which rely heavily on borrowing and improving other peoples’ ideas.

So a focus on DRM policies, based carefully on the notion of balance of interests will be a major feature of future work within the MusicLessons project. A relevant policy question is thus: has the argument primarily from incumbent content industries that only strict control over use of copyrighted materials can protect creativity, led to a shift away from the search for a sensible balance between rights holders’ interests and the goals of unleashing the potential of new technology to stimulate new innovations and ways of doing business?


1 DRM: Digital Rights Management.
The report concludes that falling sales of legitimate CDs in the record industry cannot be totally linked to file sharing (P2P\(^2\)) activities over the Internet – the basis of claims by the content industry for stricter IPR\(^3\) regimes. This analysis closely mirrors the analysis presented by the MusicLessons project in Deliverable 1 (Technology versus usage and effects, April 2005). The OECD concludes that digital music is a driver for the global technology markets, and that “regulatory frameworks which balance the interests of suppliers and users, in areas such as the protection of intellectual property rights, and digital rights management, without disadvantaging innovative e-business models, are called for”.

Here the OECD is once again reiterating in the strongest fashion the principles of balance which featured so strongly in the EU debate on convergence during the mid to late 1990s.

---

\(^2\) P2P: Peer-to-Peer

\(^3\) IPR: Intellectual Property Rights
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2. The various policy areas.

The overall EU goals for the Information Society stem from the Lisbon declaration, revised in 2005 and spelt out more specifically in the eEurope 2005 Action Plan. This overall goal covers policies for regulating, stimulating and exploiting the benefits of the Information Society, via a number of eEurope priority areas: Broadband, eBusiness, eGovernment, eHealth, eInclusion, eLearning and Security. The Commission’s mission statement notes:

“The principle guiding eEurope is to stimulate demand and lower obstacles in parallel, getting around the ‘chicken and egg’ problems which often block the development of new products and services.” A summary of EU policies, as formulated by the Commission, is included in an annex to this deliverable.

2.1 Goals, means and prerequisites.

The Lisbon vision is linked to Europe’s competitiveness in a global arena. Information Society technologies can increase the efficiency of European businesses. A prerequisite is eInclusion, that any major digital divide between haves and have-nots can be avoided. Europe’s cultural diversity is regarded as a major asset which needs to be protected, encouraged and exploited (in the best sense of the term). Other prerequisites include protecting human values, offering security, respecting integrity, and creating communication systems that can be trusted.

Information and Communication technologies are central to these goals, prerequisites and means. Robust communication services which satisfy demands on integrity and privacy must be maintained. In the media arena, DRM systems are seen as a key facilitator. But even DRM systems can be extremely intrusive - leading to a conflict with the notion of individual privacy and integrity.

2.2 Broadband for all

Widespread and affordable high speed Internet access has been identified as a cornerstone prerequisite for the development of the Information Society. Roll-out will require a combination of public and private sector initiatives. The propensity to invest, however will be linked to actual and potential traffic generation. Up to now, traffic in audio, audio-visual and other files has driven such traffic generation. Content industry driven actions to hinder file-sharing (closing Napster, filling Kazaa with polluted files etc) has caused users to migrate to newer P2P networks characterized by a) more anonymity, and b) gatekeepers who eliminate spoof files or exclude those who introduce them. In some cases this has also led to an increase in traffic, since users must establish themselves as holders of minimum quantities of data to join the network.

Following the OECD report’s advice to find ways of legalizing P2P networks would remove the inherent conflict between technologies that encourage investment leading to the ‘broadband for all’ goal, and the concerns of copyright holders.
Part of this policy issue concerns whether or not P2P file sharing networks can be curtailed or eliminated via instruments such as the implementation of the EU Copyright Directive. Recent statistics indicate that file sharing is not decreasing, but that there has been a shift to newer forms of networks, as older ones such as Kazaa (Fast track protocol) have become less useable.

Source: www.slyck.com, 2005
Since this shift in part is the result of content industry actions (filling networks with polluted files to clog up the system and tire file sharers out), then such actions, known as spoofing or decoying, should be considered in connection with the EU anti-spam initiative (spotlight on spam in the context of the electronic communications regulatory framework). This is based on the fear that spam could cause the e-mail system to grind to a halt. Spoofing encompasses similar tendencies. Spoofing may also have a significant effect on consumer trust particularly if one should consider new payment forms based on number of bits downloaded.

2.3 Competitiveness goals, monopolies, vertically integrated conglomerates

A robust infrastructure is seen as a major prerequisite (broadband for all, eInclusion). The integration of the small business sector (SMEs) into the digital society, coupled with the diversity of European cultures is seen as a major potential source of future innovation. At the same time entry barriers must be low for these new or smaller players. The web and P2P technologies have indeed lowered the barriers for such players to reach new audiences and possibilities to find inspiration and talent. In this policy area experiences form the music industry are of considerable interest. One can note a growing divide between the major international music companies and the smaller. Often locally based entrepreneurs. The latter have often adopted the unknown risks of the Internet as a potential for marketing new products; the Majors see any lack of control as a threat to their major investments in global superstars (which of course it also offers).

Another area where policy lessons can be drawn from the music sector is that pertaining vertical integration, or collective dominance. By linking rights ownership, rights exploitation (production rights), distribution rights and even distribution channels together, major synergies arise which favour the integrated global conglomerate, but create severe problems for smaller players seeking an even playing field. Such issues were addressed when Time Warner AOL wished to join up with EMI (2000), a move that was rejected by the Commission. Similar arguments were not deemed as serious when Sony and Bertelsmann desired to amalgamate their respective recording companies (2004). Policy implications of direct integration and even indirect integration (via business deals offering exclusive advantages) on competition are a vital area for policy debate.

The music industry has considerable experience of monopoly collecting societies which act as intermediaries between rights holders and users. These have been viewed with considerable suspicion by the Commission (as monopolies). It can be argued that they perform a vital service for amalgamating data, collecting and fairly distributing revenues in a way no SME let alone an individual creator could do. Again this is a question of policy balance, requiring such agencies to be efficient, transparent and non-discriminatory in their treatment of rights exploiters and member creators. Such policies should also take account of the negative effects of vertical integration in the content industries. Music collection societies represent rights holders, i.e. even the major publishers. The major music publishers
with around 80% of the market are also controlled by the same companies that control the 4 major record companies. With divisions of the same conglomerates on "both sides of the negotiating table", the market performance of a monopoly society can become perverse.

As we move into a digital world of business and transactions with copyrighted materials, the need for efficient intermediaries hardly decreases. In other words, this policy area is closely related to the overall eEurope 2005 goals.

2.4 The IPR regime.

We have already referred to the principle of balance between the interests of users and creators that is so essential both for the public’s respect for copyright and the stimulation of further creativity.

A copyright regime, which allows leading rights holders to spread a public message that all forms of file sharing are illegal, could hinder emerging business models which use the Internet as a cheap entrance to finding an audience for new products. The whole emerging debate on open source software and the creative commons movement need to be evaluated in this context.

IPR policy discussions should also be related to those concerning integrity/privacy. Those involved in commercial piracy should, of course not be able to hide behind an “integrity” shield. On the other hand if those involved in non-commercial, small scale virtual equivalents of home taping with physical cassettes, are subjected to an overdose of intrusiveness from the content industry’s detectives, then the result can devastating for the public’s respect for copyright. The Swedish Data Inspection Board has already concluded that methods used by the Swedish Anti-Pirate Bureau to identify users with particular IP umbers in a particular session, as well as the storage of this data, contravenes Sweden’s privacy laws. Once again, a policy balance is required.

The EU has generally shunned notions of content regulation except in the case of defining materials that can be harmful to minors. Few European countries favour the notion of quotas for national media products in radio/TV, even if there are notable exceptions.
3. Media and Cultural policies

Media, culture and education were previously within the same EC directorate. With the audio-visual sector moving into the Information Society directorate both policy challenges and opportunities should arise. The Internet provides a huge potential for the spread and development of cultural diversity, for different traditions to blend creating new variants. At the same time heritage needs to be protected, primarily in the case of the visual arts via being documented, and stored. At the same time, European cultural diversity can act as a catalyst for the production of new forms of commercially available culture. This process cannot merely rely on powerful encouraging statements or even limited financial support. The process requires its own dynamics, and a prerequisite for this is a functioning communications infrastructure that allows for access to channels between the creator and a potential audience.

Media policy in other words needs to be related to notions of both cultural diversity and business opportunities for the Europe audio- and audiovisual industries. Business policies, and IPR policies need to note that cultural diversity in some sectors has moved in the Internet environment. Both the OECD and the US CED reports noted above observe that a streamlining of content in mainstream media channels (radio/TV) has led to the curious music lover seeking something different via the Internet. They both argue that policies should facilitate making file sharing legal (via some form of revenue generation and distribution model) rather than attempting to declare something millions do as illegal. This would involve a type of “broadcast model” (where a lump sum is paid for access to all repertoire) combined with a non-intrusive DRM monitoring system for collection and distribution of returns to rights holders. The later is something the major content owners have firmly rejected (for fear of losing control over marketing). They are also supported by the telecom lobby who regard the lack of conduit responsibility granted them in the WIPO 1996 Copyright Treaty and EU Infosoc directive as granting them a lack of responsibility for involvement in any such a blanket license solution. Since history indicates that such a solution will be a fact of life sooner or later, then its relevance in the context of the copyright and DRM policy discussion should not be underestimated.

3.1 Media Policy - Technological standards, media content and conflicting interests (content owners/distributors and consumers)

In the middle of the 1990's EU had a theoretical opportunity to regulate much needed Digital TV (DTV) standards to facilitate the creation of a pan-European digital television market with a multitude of consumer choices in services. That was also the official goal (The Advanced Television Standards Directive, 1995) but no clear guidance on standards was given at the time. The duality of regulation and liberalisation of the markets was evident and EU chose as was stated in the Bangeman report (1994) a more "technological-neutral" approach avoiding market distortions.
The result was a lack of common standards that created a technological bottleneck. Different systems, which must be installed in the set-top box, makes it impossible for digital television viewers to access all the digital channels available on the market with one receiver. This was in the interest of the pay-TV satellite broadcasters who feared losing control over their existing customers when the analogue TV services were phased out and the market changed to digital. With open standard solutions the market was open to new competitors. The EU belief in minimalist regulation and that the market itself will come up with the best solutions has given the broadcasters the possibility to transmit their digital signals across Europe but the audience access to those signals are limited to those with the right set-top box. The result appears to be a fragmented DTV market even within countries.

A new opportunity became available with the Multimedia Home Platform standard (2000). That is an open API-standard for digital television based on open Java language that can be used as a standard in set-top boxes. That standard is now used among German and Nordic TV operators and free-to-air terrestrial broadcasters. But this standard is not an attractive proposition for digital satellite broadcasters and the EU has only offered symbolic support.

DTV is not the first policy problem area of EU-led standardisation. Europe was far ahead in the end of the 1980's with a High Density Television (HDTV) standard. But the satellite broadcasters refused to adopt the standard and EU could not maintain its policy. Today HDTV is developed as a standard and in use in US and Japan.

3.2 Media policy continued: Television as content or industry

Even more problematic than promoting a technological standard in the EU has been the question of how to cope with television. That has partly to do with the internal division of the Commission and the relationships between different directorates that effect policy formulation and decision-making. Television cuts across several policy dimensions: technological, economical, social and cultural.

In the 1990's the main EU perspective was digital convergence between the telecom and the audiovisual sector and the best way to promote this development was to avoid market distortions. Minimising regulatory interventions was the way to open new markets in the view of the Bangeman report (1994). At this point in time television meant the Media and Communication industry and belonged to the jurisdiction of the industry and telecom commissioner Bangeman. From this industry perspective public service television, that had existed in Europe for 50 years, appeared as a distortion of the market and an obstacle that had to be resolved. Not only the fact that public service television is financed by license fees and in some countries with support from the state, but there are also regulations in some countries demanding that 50% of the programs should be domestic products. This is clearly a market distortion. The first EU television directive. "Television without frontiers" was issued in 1989 (revised later in 1997). The EU has stated that this directive may well “be further amended, to take account, inter alia, of the impact of digital broadcasting and the wider range of channels it offers”

But there are a number of obstacles. Television in most European countries is the responsibility of Ministries of Culture. Can only public service television offer the citizens of
Europe a political and cultural television content that can act as a European alternative to a cheap inflow of mainly US programming? With a new EC Directorate General combining both Media and the Information Society, new policy challenges and opportunities arise. A renewed focus of public service’s “to be or not to be”, as well as its relation to cultural diversity and creativity, should probably be a high policy priority, as the following case studies suggest.

3.3 From the goals of Television across Frontiers, though market development, to the future of European audio visual production/distribution

The whole notion of Public Service broadcasting is a tricky one which needs to be constantly reviewed and carefully weighed in the context of the total media landscape. Where license financing is in place, the public service aspect is often stressed by broadcasters as a reason for continuing this form of finance – public service however is rarely defined. There is a general underlying assumption that it is a guarantee for range and freedom of choice.

Studies in Sweden show fairly conclusively that the range of choice offered is heavily affected by competition from commercial alternatives. After commercial radio was introduced into Sweden in the early 1990s, the range of choice of music performed on one Swedish national public service channel decreased by almost 50% over ten years. The broadcasters explained this in terms of adapting to a new competitive environment. Their dilemma of course, was to balance attractive programming which would draw in an audience with more obscure programming (the combination of the two thus motivating the licence).

In this context the route from the first Television Across Frontiers directive has been bumpy to say the least. The goal of 50% European programming in all stations has hardly been met.

In the early 1990s an interesting policy debate ranged between the European Commission and the Council of Europe, with the latter focusing on questions of national identity (a focus which has returned to the Commission with the more recent focus on Cultural Diversity). At this time the EU debate was somewhat clouded by vested interests, not least those of Luxembourg with a long tradition of supporting commercial transborder radio transmissions, and at that time ownership of Astra satellites with a large footprint over Europe. Almost ten years later in 1999, another piece of policy input emerged in the “Culture for the European Citizen of the Year 2000”. Here the policy advice was:

The EC will gain credibility in its cultural actions if it takes its distance from ... thinking influenced by ‘economic determinism’ which pervades more and more of the social notions of culture and underestimates its dynamics with evident political and economic implications”

Between the lines one can read of a mixture of confusion and understanding regarding the link between cultural and economic factors. The third vital issue, that of technological developments seemed to be absent from the debate.
What have the results of this mixture of forces been in a small country such as Sweden? Sweden has two national, license-financed TV channels. From an initial aim to provide, for example, competing independent news programmes on these separate channels, the news output has been amalgamated (mainly to save on costs). In the early 1990s TV4 was granted a monopoly national franchise as the only commercial terrestrial channel, with a sizeable franchise fee to the Ministry of Culture.

With the planned phase-out of analogue transmitters and a replacement by digital terrestrial equivalents, many things have happened. To get round the monopoly franchise enjoyed by TV4, other actors have brought their programmes into the Swedish market by satellite signals uploaded from the UK (to avoid Swedish restrictions on advertising breaks, amongst other things). Swedes are now in the process of purchasing set top boxes to be able to continue watching Swedish TV when the analogue transmitters are turned off. The external channels (TV3 and TV5) have been allowed to be included in the new digital terrestrial net. To see them a consumer needs to pay a monthly fee. With set programme aggregators offering set top boxes for SEK 1, as long as a subscription is taken out for a range of channels, then the result has been that TV3 and TV5 are gradually gaining the same audience that the franchise holder TV4 has access to, meaning that the franchise, and the conditions attached to it cannot be supported in the long term.

A short snapshot of programme availability over Public service TV, TV4 (commercial with franchise) and the new operators TV3, TV5 gives food for thought regarding the success of the Television across Frontiers directive and its goal of stimulating more European programming.

TV schedules on a randomly chosen date (Tuesday June 21st 2005) were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SVT1</th>
<th>TV4</th>
<th>TV3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>Commercial/ Franchise</td>
<td>Commercial ex UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00 News</td>
<td>15.20 Melrose Place</td>
<td>15.40 Beverly Hills (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.05 Animals (Sw)</td>
<td>16.05 Candid Camera (US)</td>
<td>16.35 Small Town (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.35 Family Andersson (US)</td>
<td>16.35 Babyboom (Sw)</td>
<td>17.30 news (own production)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00 History pgm (Sw)</td>
<td>17.05 Angels of the law (US)</td>
<td>17.35 Dharma &amp; Greg (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00 UK comedy series</td>
<td>18.00 Tote and News (Sw)</td>
<td>18.00 Sex and the City (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830 Children’s pgm (Sw)</td>
<td>18.20 Jeopardy (Sw version)</td>
<td>18.30 Simpsons (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30 News</td>
<td>18.50 Weather/news (Sw)</td>
<td>19.00 Manly Beach (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00 Investigative Journalism (Sw)</td>
<td>19.30 The Vets (Sw)</td>
<td>20.00 Model hunt (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.00 Football Argentina Germany</td>
<td>20.00 Arnes Rike (Sw doc)</td>
<td>21.00 Boys in my life (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.45 Swedish jazz concert</td>
<td>21.00 Chicago Hope (US)</td>
<td>23.35 Miss Popularity (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.15 News (Sw)</td>
<td>21.55 News, weather (Sw)</td>
<td>0.35 Sex &amp; the City (repeat US)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: The schedule of Sweden's second public service TV channel (TV2) on this same date, comprised a majority of Swedish produced programmes. Foreign imports included a food programme (UK), a Norwegian short film and an episode from the French TV production, Napoleon. Another commercial satellite competitor (TV5) offered one 30 minutes Swedish produced programme on interior design. All other programming on TV5 was basically of US origin.

The goal of 50% European programming seems to be far away. It is a significant policy issue, since without access to an audience, then the European audio-visual content industry will find it hard to grow. The absence of a common standard for digital TV has probably been applauded by the content industry - different standards mean it becomes harder to crack the complete system of codes for all set-top boxes. It is interesting to consider the results if the same principle had been applied to GSM mobile telephony, i.e. if a consumer was forced to change to a new sim-card once over the border from Sweden to neighboring Denmark. The free flow of TV programmes over borders has clearly opened a market for wares from the dominant producer (the USA) allowing distributors to get up and running with very low production costs. "Public Service" principles, although often vaguely defines, will continue to play a vital role for range of choice, cultural diversity and the European audio-visual industry.

The experiences of the music industry in the Internet raise some interesting possibilities. European films, although being supported by the EU do not travel well. On the other hand communities in the Internet exist for many obscure forms of content (Japanese cartoons is one example). A more flexible approach to allowing consumers to find European content via P2P networks could produce a vital marketing injection of the sort where the Television across Frontiers instrument never succeeded.

3.4 Final thought.

As this report is being completed, the US Supreme Court has given its verdict in the Grokster case. One may not sell a technology by encouraging consumers to break the law. This sounds reasonable. But it could have a negative psychological impact on innovation, since the act of marketing a new technology can easily be confused with the technology itself.

Consider the following. A start-up company develops (and maybe patents) a major improvement to the traditional crowbar. A sales campaign, which applauds its ability to make burglaries easier would hardly be acceptable. On the other hand, if the Grokster ruling results in incumbent manufacturers of the traditional crowbar claiming that the publicity around the new crowbar will encourage more to break the law, then the new entrant might think twice about marketing a product which could provide the legitimate building industry with efficiency advantages. The example may sound far fetched. But it could apply to the developers of P2P solutions, which have potential uses over a range of business sectors.

If one accepts the OECD report's argument that legalizing P2P (via some sort of subscription mechanism) is good for Information Society goals in general and for the music
industry (long-term) in particular, then anything which frightens innovators could be negative for progress. The US ruling might also have the effect of blaming the technology for business problems that have arisen, which historically is unwise. No technologies have only negative uses, even if many technologies can be used for evil or malicious purposes.

The analyses in this deliverable remind one, once again, of the constant need in the policy area to consider not only technological issues, but the interaction between technological, economic and social/cultural factors. Cultural issues of range of choice, diversity etc. cannot be analyzed without taking account of trade and economic issues. Different policies interact with each other - sometimes incompatibilities arise. Policies must live a dynamic life. This paper has endeavored to pinpoint some areas where policy-makers should be particularly vigilant.
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