



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 29 January 2013

5834/13

**PE 45
RELEX 87
COMER 14**

NOTE

from: General Secretariat of the Council
to: Delegations

Subject: Summary record of the meeting of the European Parliament **Committee on International Trade (INTA)**, Brussels, 23 January 2013

The meeting was chaired by M. Moreira, S&D, PT. The agenda was adopted (item 1). The minutes of the meeting of 17-18 December 2012 were approved (item 2).

3. Chair's announcements

4. Amendment to Annex I to Council Regulation (EC) No 1528/2007 as regards the exclusion of a number of countries from the list of regions or states which have concluded negotiations

In the absence of the rapporteur, Mr. MARTIN (S&D), Mr. CUTAS (S&D) recalled that the European Parliament had voted its report with three amendments on delegated acts and with 1 January 2016 as date of entry into force for the exclusion of countries, at first reading. None of these amendments had been accepted by the Council which only made some technical amendments and kept 1 January 2014 as entry into force date as foreseen in the proposal of the Commission. The rapporteur therefore requested a mandate to negotiate on the basis of his report, a second reading agreement with the Council. Whereas Ms. KELLER (Greens) and Mr. SCHOLZ (GUE) agreed to support the initial report, Mr. FJELLNER (EPP) suggested that since the document had only been adopted with a narrow majority, a vote should be taken on the Council's position.

In the subsequent vote it was however agreed to enter into negotiations with the Council and the Commission with the aim of reaching a second reading agreement (see item 11).

5. Presentation by Richard Bruton, Minister for Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation of Republic of Ireland, representing the President-in-Office of the Council, on the priorities of the Irish Presidency in the area of International Trade Policy

The Minister gave the speech in Annex 1.

Replying to questions from Members, the Minister subsequently said amongst other things that :

- the final report of the EU- US High Level group was awaited before a final assessment of the possibilities for a comprehensive free trade agreement could be made, negotiations on agriculture, data protection and intellectual property rights would not be easy but the principles of existing EU legislation would be respected moreover since trade policy could not overrule other policies, the agreement should provide for a balanced approach taking into account interests of all stakeholders and bilateral agreements could go hand in hand with multilateral action,
- the Presidency fully recognised that investment protection was an exclusive EU competence since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty and together with the European Parliament, the Presidency would guarantee compliance with these provisions,
- the Presidency and the Council were fully aware that third countries were not always respecting international trade rules and that wherever necessary, the appropriate procedures should be used,
- as regards Uzbekistan, and other countries, the EU had always insisted on respect for human rights including the fight against child labour, he hoped that the Uzbekistan government would become more cooperative with international organisations,
- note had been taken of European Parliament's concerns that the FTA with Singapore should not be exploited by other Asian countries to benefit from the rules of origin,
- the roadmap for negotiations with Japan was clear as regards the abolition of non tariff barriers and the timetable did not permit for negotiations to drag on indefinitely,

- the Presidency was aware of the powers of the European Parliament as regards micro-financial assistance and negotiations hopefully could overcome divergence of views on implementing and delegated acts,
- perception may be that the scope of an agreement with India had narrowed but progress in negotiations was only possible in areas where there was agreement, the European Parliament would have the possibility to assess the merits of a possible agreement when they would be asked to give consent, concerns about "mode 4" were noted,
- currently there was no proposal to start negotiations with Taiwan but in due time, the opportunity should be seized,
- negotiations with Mercosur were advancing much slower than anticipated mainly by internal regional difficulties, nevertheless efforts should continue.

6. Trade between the Community and third countries in drug precursors

The rapporteur, Mr. PROUST (EPP), highlighted the most important features of the proposal which mainly aimed to close the loophole in the current legislation as regards the powers conferred to customs and police authorities to stop and seize drug precursors (ephedrine and pseudoephedrine) for illegal use.

He welcomed the proposal as an important step in the fight against narcotic drugs but expressed doubts as regards certain comitology provisions which he considered to be unclear and inappropriate. Delegated powers should be limited in time. On the other hand he criticised the lack of flexibility which for certain categories prohibited a quick reaction and adaptation of the annex.

Ms. KELLER, questioned the overall volume of trade in drug precursors and asked about the costs for pharmaceutical companies. Ms. ANDRES BAREA welcomed the proposal which would make the fight against narcotics more efficient.

The Chair, Mr. MOREIRA, asked why on comitology provisions, the Commission had already given in to the Council beforehand. It was not up to the European Parliament to defend the Commission's autonomy.

The representative of the Commission explained that it had proposed the standard comitology applicable to trade issues, that detailed data on trade in these specific products were only being collected since 1 January this year when a specific tariff line had been created, that there was only

a very limited impact for companies since the requested data would need to be provided in the usual custom declaration and further replied to some specific comments of the rapporteur.

Mr. PROUST concluded that there is no ideal solution for this issue which had to provide for an efficient control mechanism for illegal use without hampering legal trade.

The draft report would be debated in the next Committee meeting.

7. Coordinators' meeting

In camera

8. Monitoring Group Activities

The Chair reported on recent activities of the monitoring group on South Caucasus, which confirmed the very good progress made on both FTAs currently negotiated. The rapporteur Zahradil reported on the activities of the monitoring group on Vietnam. There were no comments by MEPs.

9. State of play of ongoing trilogue negotiations

The Chair made an overview of the state of play on trilogues under way: trade omnibus I, customs enforcement of intellectual property rights, Partnership Instrument Regulation (lead: AFET).

10. Access of third-country goods and services to the Union's internal market in public procurement and procedures supporting negotiations on access of Union goods and services to the public procurement markets of third countries

The rapporteur M. Caspary (PPE) on the occasion of the second exchange of views on this item indicated that there were two groups of MS delegations, with one defending the option of rejecting the proposal and therefore the possibility of opening up the EU public procurement markets to third countries, and the second one defending the majority position in favour of examining the modalities of the proposed instrument. He further stated that the major issues were the Article dealing with abnormally low tenders, which is technically particularly complex, Articles 8 and 10 on the options for excluding certain markets from these provisions, and Article 6 which provides for the exclusion of certain bidders in a manner which the rapporteur considered arbitrary. He asked for a EP impact assessment on these issues. He suggested to proceed to an exchange of views with the IMCO committee.

M. Susta, S&D, IT considered that the market should be based on reciprocity rules and principles, given the competition arising from a number of emerging countries which continue to benefit from the status of developing country. He agreed that Article 6 should be further discussed. On the proposed threshold of 5 Million euros, he requested more information data on justifying this threshold. On abnormally low bids, he suggested to use an automatic threshold for excluding them. On inquiries, he suggested to add a time limit to close them.

M. Kazak, ALDE, BU stated that an efficient regulatory framework was key to reach the EU's objective of achieving more reciprocity on public procurements' markets. He expressed doubts on the chances to reach this objective with the proposed draft legislation. He suggested instead legislation which would both exert pressure and provide incentives for third countries to open up their markets. He considered that arbitrary measures to exclude specific bidders would not improve the situation and that the issue of who would take the proposed decisions ought to be clarified in the draft provisions. He advocated a simplification of the proposed rules.

Mr. Jadot, Verts, ALE, FR stated that this file was not easy to deal with since the issue was highly controversial within the Council and MEPs missed specific information to be able to give an informed opinion on the proposed legislation. He asked for an impact study to get more information on some aspects, notably the penetration rate of EU firms in some third countries and of third country companies in the EU. He considered that an in-depth debate should therefore take place on all issues at stake. He regretted that the only criterium used was the objective of reciprocity and that no consideration was given to local or industrial policy issues, or to social protection aspects.

M. Stordy, ECR, UK stressed the issue of jobs creation as an essential objective to be taken into consideration and stressed the need to secure economic opportunities outside the EU.

M. Scholz, GUE/NGL, DE stressed the need to pay attention to jobs preservation and social rights and to make sure that dumping practices on pay and social rights cannot take place. He further recommended to check the compliance of the proposed rules with WTO legislation.

Ms. Berra, EPP, FR stressed that the real issue at stake was the fact that 50% of the world market is not accessible to EU firms and that EU public procurements markets are more accessible than third countries markets, with 80% of the EU market being accessible against 12% of the US market and 4% of the Indian market.

She regretted that the option of a "Buy European Act" was not considered appropriate and asked whether the impact of the proposed legislation had been evaluated. She expressed concerns as to how the EU could check compliance to the rules of origin and suggested a time limit to inquiries under Articles 6 and 9.

Ms Mc Clarkin, ECR, UK was deeply concerned by this proposal and its effects on growth at a time of crisis. She considered that the objective ought to be one of ensuring that the EU is competitive and stated that the proposed instrument was not the right one to secure this objective.

The Commission representatives (DG Trade and DG Markt) referred to the WTO reporting on public procurements and to various estimates illustrating the fact that the EU was offering more than double the market access to third countries than the one offered in turn. They explained that the objective of the proposal was to restore a level playing field on the market, replied to questions raised on retaliation risks related to the proposed provisions, explained the reasoning behind the proposal, clarified that the default rule would be market access, including for those countries which didn't negotiate an agreement, and that the proposal aimed at the same time at obtaining a better leverage in negotiations with third countries whilst ensuring that local authorities and cities do not take any frivolous decisions on public procurements' issues. In reply to concerns expressed by MEPs notably on social issues, they stated that Article 7 on abnormally low bids was indirectly dealing with labour and environmental protection issues.

The rapporteur stated that the committee would come back to the issue during the hearing devoted to those issues.

11. The EU's External Aviation Policy - Addressing Future Challenges

The rapporteur for the opinion M. Sturdy (ECR, UK) (responsible committee: TRAN) in presenting his draft opinion stated that the aviation sector was driving economic growth through trade and tourism and was securing directly or indirectly some 7.8 Million jobs. He welcomed the Commission Communication which sets out the problems faced by the aviation market.

During that first exchange of views, M. Lange, S&D, DE stressed that the aviation sector was responsible for 5% of GDP and 5 Million jobs, noted that the EU market share was declining and suggested to analyze the reasons for this.

He pointed to unfair competition, a fragmentation of aviation agreements and the need to strengthen the competitiveness of the sector through the conclusion of international agreements and the implementation of the single European sky. He also referred to the need to tackle related social and environmental issues.

M. Jadot, Verts/ALE, FR referred to the need for the EU to take the world lead on climate issues and to the issue of compliance of the aviation sector with CO2 quotas market issues. He suggested that the aviation sector should take appropriate responsibility on climate and environmental protection issues.

The Commission representative noted that the EU aviation sector was an important one, stressed that it was facing hard times, stated that the Commission was launching a review of the external aviation policy; that the strength of this sector should not be taken for granted; that the single market dimension of the EU aviation market should be reinforced and national fragmentation reduced. She indicated that the reflexion under way should examine ways to protect the sector against unfair competition and to deal with difficult trade partners and competitors.

The rapporteur M. Sturdy agreed that the derogations granted on CO2 emissions should indeed have a time-limit of one year whilst recommending caution in dealing with this important sector which should not be weakened.

12. Amendment to Annex I to Council Regulation (EC) No 1528/2007 as regards the exclusion of a number of countries from the list of regions or states which have concluded negotiations

The decision to enter into negotiations with the Council and the Commission with the aim of reaching a second reading agreement (Rapporteur: M. Martin (S&D, UK)) was adopted by 24 votes in favour, 2 against.

13. Advancing Development Through Trade

The draft opinion (Rapporteur for the opinion: Saïfi, S&D, FR, responsible committee: DEVE) was adopted by 19 votes in favour, 1 against.

14. Sustainability in the global cotton value chain

The motion for a resolution (Rapporteur: Ms. Muscardini, ECR, IT) was adopted by unanimity.

15. Establishing a framework for managing financial responsibility linked to investor state dispute settlement tribunals established by international agreements to which the EU is party

The rapporteur M. Zalewski (EPP, PL) noted that the issue was controversial since it could affect the EU budget, that the key problem was to foresee possible cases and financial burden attributions. He considered that several provisions which he enumerated (Articles 2, 8.2, 9.2, 13.3, 18.1, 21) were still vague and needed to be clarified. He suggested to define the term "treatment".

The Chair noted that the fact that the rapporteur was commenting on specific provisions implied his agreement on the general approach of the proposal.

M. Lange, S&D, DE considered it urgent to establish a framework with clear rules on the respective financial responsibility of both the EU and its MS, despite the reservations this process was raising. He mentioned the need to secure maximum transparency of the procedures, the obligation to report to the European Parliament, the need to have clear definitions and the threshold for the transition from a formal to an informal dispute settlement procedure.

Ms. Keller, Greens/EFA, DE conveyed the concerns and doubts of her political group, notably on the risk of the EU law being challenged with the objective of funds extortion. She supported a role to be given to the ECJ to judge if a case should go to arbitration.

The Commission representative explained the reasoning behind the proposal (necessary building block of the proposal given the EU competence on investment agreements, competence in terms of external representation and implications, principle of unicity of EU external representation). On the question as to whether a dispute settlement system was needed on investment agreements, she stated that EU investors needed to know the level of protection they could benefit from and that a protection was valid only if it could be enforced.

The Chair indicated that the draft report would be discussed at the next meeting of the committee.

16. Exchange of views with Valentine Sendanyoye Rugwabiza, Deputy Director- General of the World Trade Organization, on Gender and Trade

This item was postponed.

17. Current Challenges and Opportunities for Renewable Energy in the European Internal Energy Market

The rapporteur for the opinion Mr. JADOT (Verts/ALE, FR), presented his draft opinion for ITRE. He indicated that the EU's leadership on climate issues as well as other policy factors had made of the EU a leader in the field of renewable energies, whilst remarking that this leadership was seriously challenged and would be difficult to keep. He referred to the strong public financial support to renewable energies in China and the US and to the need for the EU to develop trade defence instruments. Among other things, he further mentioned the need to enhance the use of renewable energy at local level through public procurements.

M. Kasparý on behalf of the shadow rapporteur Ms. Correa, EPP, ES mentioned the need for enticements at local level and advocated a post-Kyoto international agreement, as well as measures to discourage de-localisations.

M. Fjellner, EPP, SV considered that too little was done on sustainability criteria, notably with regard to oil and gas. He advocated an environment technology agreement.

M. Langen, S&D, DE suggested to agree on objectives for 2030 so as to give a clear direction to the industrial sector and incentives to look for improved competitiveness through research and innovation on renewable energies so as to preserve the EU's leadership. He pointed to the rise of China as a significant competitor in this sector.

M. Scholz, GUE/NGL, DE regretted that the EU had lost its advance and neglected research activities, whilst expressing confidence that it could regain the lost ground with appropriate policy measures.

The Commission representative referred in this context to its inquiries examining possible distortions of competition as a means to protect the sector and the rapporteur noted that distortions could lead to de-localisations. He agreed on new objectives for 2030.

Deadline for comments: 28 January 2013 at noon.

18. EU-China Agreement (Articles XXIV and XXVIII of GATT 1994) relating to the modification of concessions in the schedules of Bulgaria and Romania in the course of their accession to the EU

The rapporteur Mr. SCHOLZ, GUE/NGL, DE, informed the Committee that this technical proposal aimed at aligning the EU - China agreement with WTO obligations following the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the EU. The EP was requested to give its consent on the agreed compensatory adjustments which were made on a number of tariff lines including garlic, mushrooms and chocolate and confectionary. He expressed the hope that China would also comply with its obligations internally.

The Commission representative clarified that there were no new concessions, but only compensations for the accession of Bulgaria and Romania in accordance with WTO rules.

19. Any other business

20. Next meeting(s)

- 20 February 2013, 9.00 – 12.30 and 15.00 – 18.30 (Brussels)
- 21 February 2013, 9.00 – 12.30 (Brussels)

**Opening Remarks by Minister Richard Bruton, TD
European Parliament's International Trade Committee
23 January 2013.
CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY**

Chairman Moreira,

I am honoured to have this opportunity to address the Parliament's International Trade Committee. The Parliament is one of the most important democratic institutions in underpinning democracy and accountability to the Union's citizens and I am grateful, Professor Moreira, for your invitation to address your Committee.

It is 40 years since Ireland joined the EU and this is Ireland's seventh Presidency. In our long and indeed very beneficial involvement with Europe, there has been a transformation in how the institutions engage with stakeholders and citizens. I very much welcome this evolution. Your Committee's extensive work and examination on international trade issues fulfils Parliament's role as co-legislator on trade. We have a joint responsibility to shape the trade policy agenda so that it delivers for citizens, employees, businesses and more broadly for society across the Union. We also have responsibility in terms of our trade partners and producers and workers in third countries, especially in those which are less economically well developed. I very much look forward to co-operating with you in relation to legislation and on trade agreements. We can only gain from seeking to understand each other's perspectives.

This is also the Year of the Citizen - a reference point that reminds me that trade policy impacts on the rights and expectations of European citizens. It underlines the importance of the work of your Committee in looking at how trade can contribute to increasing the opportunities for citizens in a globalised world.

The Irish Presidency is taking up its responsibilities at a very difficult time for global trade, economic activity and employment. We are going through an economic crisis that is the most difficult and pervasive of all economic cycles in many decades. Consequently, it will not surprise you that the theme of our Presidency is simple and straightforward - Stability, Jobs and Growth. This reflects the reality facing our economies, businesses and citizens. That is, the urgent need to make progress on revitalising countries and communities.

Trade and investment plays a huge part in this agenda and in accelerating the capacity for growth in Europe. Increased trade, and the jobs and opportunities that it brings can be a catalyst to give hope and confidence to our citizens, that their prospects and those of their children will distinctly improve.

Our message is that Europe is always open to business and open for business. Our openness also means that others will continue to see the EU as an honest and reliable partner. One that is fair, consistent and predictable in developing its trade policies yet firm and committed when it comes to defending the rights and expectations of its economic operators, and holding our partners to honouring their commitments across the bilateral and multilateral trade agenda.

I want to now move into highlighting our priorities by commenting on the impact of trade agreements on growth and jobs. Today there are over 26 million people unemployed in the EU. The benefit to the EU economy from all potential Free Trade Agreements is about 2 million jobs. Creating these trade related jobs would be a significant contribution to tackling one of the biggest social challenges facing us today.

Our entrepreneurs have the creativity, technologies and the ambition to win more business in more diverse corners of the globe. To capture this potential means moving forward with new market access opportunities through free trade agreements. This is at the top of our agenda.

Chairman, you have completed some important analysis on the benefits from a potential free trade agreement with the U.S. Your personal involvement underlines the importance of this topic for all concerned. Subject to the recommendations of the EU US High Level Working Group our priority is to put our energies into strengthening the transatlantic market place. Although transatlantic markets are deeply integrated through large flows of trade and investment, it is fair to say that we could do more.

We need to capitalise on what we have already achieved and fully exploit the further potential of the transatlantic economic and business relationship. The potential gain in both jobs and economic activity is too attractive not to make it a success. It would also send a strong signal that, even in times of serious economic difficulty, both economies are prepared to push ahead with extending and opening markets rather than protecting them. This would be a strong message for our other global trading partners.

We are approaching the completion of yet another historic FTA – that with Canada. Canada is another important transatlantic trade and investment partner. Although tariffs are low between both economies, expected gains will be significant when behind the border restrictions are taken away. I hope that the last outstanding issues can be quickly resolved and agreement reached without too much delay.

Of course there are also other economies with which we would like to deepen and strengthen already strong trade and economic relations. I hope that we can move forward with the start of negotiations with Japan very soon. This would be a significant event involving two economies of global significance. I would also like to see progress on our negotiations with India where an FTA would provide both sides with important benefits. We have to bear in mind the wider impact of an agreement in the context of our relations not only with India but also in the wider region.

It was evident at the last Summit that there is considerable richness and potential in our relationship with China. We would like to prepare the ground for the next summit so that the conditions would be ripe to launch negotiations for a landmark investment agreement with market access.

Our Neighbourhood policy can help create the conditions to expand prosperity in areas that are closest to us not only in terms of geography but with which we have personal and economic connections. Trade negotiations with Moldova, Georgia and Armenia are making good progress and I hope will be substantially completed during our Presidency.

Our Southern Neighbours face many difficulties in tackling necessary reforms arising from the Arab Spring. Trade can make a significant contribution to accelerating the pace of their economic development and underpinning political stability. We need, however, to take into account essential capacity building so that when talks commence on liberalising trade flows, our partners are well prepared. We hope that the launch of trade talks with Morocco will be symbolic of a new, dynamic and supportive relationship with our Southern Neighbours and quickly lead to others accepting the open invitation to use trade to grow and progress.

ASEAN is a fast growing region of significant economic relevance for the EU. Their economies are growing at a faster pace than ours while the size and spending power of the EU is an attractive proposition from their perspective. We hope that the network of FTAs already underway in the region can be expanded by the addition of others, for example Thailand. This would be important as that economy is an important component in global supply and value chains.

The multilateral trade agenda continues to be of significant importance for the Irish Presidency. The WTO is the essential rule maker for international trade, making it easier for value chains to expand and economies to benefit from comparative advantage and specialisation. It also plays a vital role in helping less advantaged countries gain from trade and profit from growing connections with international markets. Making progress on key development issues, such as trade facilitation, should be one of the landmark outcomes from this year's WTO Ministerial, especially those that will most benefit Least Developed Countries. The poorest economies need the Doha agenda to have new life and for it to deliver, at the very least, on some of the issues that will accelerate growth across the least developed world.

There are other major opportunities for the EU and WTO members in Geneva based activity. We are all aware of the significant potential of trade in services to boost global trade as a whole. In order to reach a point where our common interests are best served it is important that the EU would work proactively to stimulate negotiations on services. The Irish Presidency will work constructively to optimise the EU's participation in discussions on a plurilateral on services in Geneva. We will work quickly to achieve an agreement for a negotiating mandate during early 2013 should formal negotiations commence in Geneva.

Legislative Files

I would now like to turn to some legislative files that are mutually important. Investment protection is an important constituent of trade policy. And I see that one important instrument to facilitate investment protection is on your agenda today.

Financial Responsibility in Investor-State Dispute Settlement

The Irish Presidency will work with you in seeking to achieve political agreement on a legislative framework governing the **allocation of financial responsibility in investor-state dispute settlement**. This is a key building block in the development of the EU's policy on foreign direct investment, which the Treaty of Lisbon brought within the scope of the Union's Common Commercial Policy. A legislative framework will close a gap. It will give us the necessary certainty to complete agreements that protect investors. Important in this regard will be the completion of agreements with a strong investment component with Canada and Singapore, advancing negotiations with Japan, India and other strategic partners, and of course as I mentioned previously, advancing the EU-China relationship.

Omnibus I&II

The Lisbon Treaty was designed to address the growing complexity of EU legislation and the effectiveness of the enlarged Union. In the trade area the **two Omnibus proposals** that aim at bringing trade legislation in line with the Treaty. I want to accelerate progress on these and enter into meaningful and constructive dialogue on these files so that we can achieve agreement under the Irish Presidency.

Public Procurement

I mentioned earlier that one of the hallmarks of Europe is its openness to trade and new ideas. This is not necessarily reflected to the same extent among those with which we both trade and compete. The Commission last year made a proposal to the Parliament and the Council for a **new instrument on Public Procurement**. The International Public Procurement initiative aims to improve access of EU companies to the public procurement markets of third countries. Some public procurement markets can be very large and offer lucrative opportunities for exporters. The Council is currently examining this proposal and I note that you will have a second exchange of views on this file later today.

Enforcement Regulation

The relevant Council working group has also begun its work on the Commission's proposal for a Regulation connected with the **enforcement of international trade rules**. This is aimed at facilitating a quick response by the EU to trade impediments newly introduced by third countries that affect our interests.

Market Access Regulation

Trade and development are inseparable in considering how best to support the long term aspirations of developing countries and especially those that are most in need of support. Some of the most important means of helping build prosperity in developing nations is via the range of Economic Partnership Agreements that are under negotiation or waiting for implementation. We look forward to discussing a way forward on the Market Access Regulation now that the Second Stage reading has commenced. [Indeed I understand that you have just discussed this issue this morning and we look forward to engaging with you to achieve a second reading agreement.]

Generalised System of Preferences [GSP]

While on the topic of development I want to mention important changes that are taking place in Myanmar/Burma. Political circumstances have contributed to this country being seriously disadvantaged and held back from realising its quite significant potential. I hope that the Parliament can give early consideration to the **proposal to reinstate Myanmar/Burma into the GSP** to reflect the considerable strides it has taken to correct the serious failings that prompted the EU to sanction it by withdrawing trade preferences.

Chairman, in conclusion, we look forward to working with you so that we can make early progress on the important legislative files. We have a shared interest and responsibility to ensure the EU's trade policy contributes to economic growth and supports jobs. We have much to do and I look forward to working with you over the next six months as we lay the ground work for our economic operators to move into new areas of opportunity.
