

administration of Exchange Visitor (J visa) Programs and adherence by grantees and sponsors to all regulations governing the J visa. Therefore, proposals should demonstrate the applicant's capacity to meet all requirements governing the administration of Exchange Visitor Programs as set forth in 22 CFR 6Z, including the oversight of Responsible Officers and Alternate Responsible Officers, provision of pre-arrival information and orientation to participants, monitoring of participants, proper maintenance and security of forms, record-keeping, reporting and other requirements. ECA will be responsible for issuing DS-2019 forms to participants in this program.

A copy of the complete regulations governing the administration of Exchange Visitor (J) programs is available at <http://exchanges.state.gov> or from: United States Department of State, Office of Exchange Coordination and Designation, ECA/EC/ECD—SA-44, Room 734, 301 4th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20547, Telephone: (202) 401-9810, FAX: (202) 401-9809.

Review Process: The Bureau will acknowledge receipt of all proposals and will review them for technical eligibility. Proposals will be deemed ineligible if they do not fully adhere to the guidelines stated herein and in the Solicitation Package. All eligible proposals will be reviewed by the program office. Eligible proposals will then be forwarded to panels of senior Bureau officers for advisory review. Proposals may also be reviewed by the Department of State's Office of the Legal Advisor, by other Bureau elements, or by outside experts and/or academics. Final funding decisions are at the discretion of the Department of State's Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs. Final technical authority for assistance awards (cooperative agreements) resides with the Bureau's Grants Officer.

Review Criteria: Technically eligible applications will be competitively reviewed according to the criteria stated below. More weight will be given to items one and two, and all remaining criteria will be evaluated equally.

1. **Overall Quality:** Proposals should exhibit originality and substance, consonant with the highest standards of American teaching and scholarship. Program design should reflect the main currents as well as the debates within the subject discipline of each institute. Program elements should be coherently and thoughtfully integrated. Lectures, panels, field visits and readings, taken as a whole, should offer a balanced presentation of issues, reflecting both

the continuity of the American experience as well as the diversity and dynamism inherent in it.

2. **Program Planning and Administration:** Proposals should demonstrate careful planning. The organization and structure of the institute should be clearly delineated and be fully responsive to all program objectives. A program syllabus (noting specific sessions and topical readings supporting each academic unit) should be included, as should a calendar of activities. The travel component should not simply be a tour, but should be an integral and substantive part of the program, reinforcing and complementing the academic segment. Proposals should provide evidence of continuous administrative and managerial capacity as well as the means by which program activities and logistical matters will be implemented.

3. **Institutional Capacity:** Proposed personnel, including faculty and administrative staff as well as outside presenters, should be fully qualified to achieve the project's goals. Library and meeting facilities, housing, meals, transportation and other logistical arrangements should fully meet the needs of the participants.

4. **Support for Diversity:** Substantive support of the bureau's policy on diversity should be demonstrated.

This can be accomplished through documentation, such as a written statement, summarizing past and/or ongoing activities and efforts that further the principle of diversity within the organization and its activities. Program activities that address this issue should be highlighted.

5. **Experience:** Proposals should demonstrate an institutional record of successful exchange program activity, indicating the experience that the organization and its professional staff have had in working with foreign educators.

6. **Evaluation and Follow-up:** A plan for evaluating activities during the Institute and at its conclusion should be included. Proposals should discuss provisions made for follow-up with returned grantees as a means of establishing longer-term individual and institutional linkages.

7. **Cost Effectiveness:** Proposals should maximize cost-sharing through direct institutional contributions, in-kind support, and other private sector support. Overhead and administrative components, including salaries and honoraria, should be kept as low as possible.

Authority: Overall grant making authority for this program is contained in the Mutual

Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Pub. L. 87-256, as amended, also known as the Fulbright-Hays Act. The purpose of the Act is "to enable the Government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries * * *; to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States and other nations * * * and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world."

Notice: The terms and conditions published in this RFGP are binding and may not be modified by any Bureau representative. Explanatory information provided by the Bureau that contradicts published language will not be binding. Issuance of this RFGP does not constitute an award commitment on the part of the Government. The Bureau reserves the right to reduce, revise, or increase proposal budgets in accordance with the needs of the program and the availability of funds. Awards made will be subject to periodic reporting and evaluation requirements.

Notification: Final awards cannot be made until funds have been appropriated by Congress, and allocated and committed through internal Bureau procedures.

Dated: August 13, 2003.

Patricia S. Harrison,

Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 03-21434 Filed 8-20-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-05-P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 4410]

Shipping Coordinating Committee; Notice of Meeting

The Shipping Coordinating Committee (SHC) will conduct an open meeting at 1 PM on Tuesday, September 9, 2003, in Room 4400 of the Department of Transportation Headquarters, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. The primary purpose of the meeting is to prepare for the Eighth Session of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) Sub-Committee on Dangerous Goods, Solid Cargoes and Containers to be held at the IMO Headquarters in London, England from September 22 to September 26, 2003.

The primary matters to be considered include:

- Amendments to the International Maritime Dangerous Goods (IMDG) Code and Supplements including harmonization of the IMDG Code with

the United Nations Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, and review of Annex III of the Marine Pollution Convention (MARPOL 73/78), as amended.

- Review of the Code of Safe Practice for Solid Bulk Cargoes (BC Code), including evaluation of properties of solid bulk cargoes.

- Cargo securing manual.
- Casualty and incident reports and analysis.

- Development of a manual on loading and unloading of solid bulk cargoes for terminal representatives.

- Guidance on serious structural deficiencies in containers.

- Measures to enhance maritime security.

- Ship/terminal interface improvement for bulk carriers.

- Alternative hold loading ban for bulk carriers.

Members of the public may attend the meeting up to the seating capacity of the room. Interested persons may seek information by writing: Mr. E. P. Pfersich, U.S. Coast Guard (G-MSO-3), Room 1210, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593-0001 or by calling (202) 267-1217.

Dated: August 15, 2003.

Margaret F. Hayes,

Chairman, Shipping Coordinating Committee, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 03-21433 Filed 8-20-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-70-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Docket No. FAA-2003-15745]

High Density Traffic Airports

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Disposition of comments on the lottery procedures.

SUMMARY: This notice addresses comments received on the lottery procedures to be used by the FAA in the allocation of limited air carrier and commuter slots at Washington Reagan National Airport on August 12, 2003. Additionally, this notice lists all carriers eligible to participate and provides the carriers' classification for slot selection in the lottery.

DATES: August 11, 2003.

Date/Location of Lottery: The lottery will be held in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Auditorium, 3rd floor, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591 on August 12, 2003, beginning a 1 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lorelei Peter, Operations and Air Traffic Law Branch, Regulations Division, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone number (202) 267-3134.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 9, 2003, the FAA published in the **Federal Register** a notice of lottery and allocation procedures for a limited number of air carrier and commuter slots at Reagan National Airport (DCA) (68 FR 41037). A clarification regarding the applicable definition of a limited incumbent carrier was published in the **Federal Register** on July 18, 2003 (68 FR 42796). On July 24, 2003, the FAA opened a docket for the lottery (FAA-2003-15745) and invited interested parties to comment on issues related to the lottery procedures by July 28, 2003. On July 31, 2003, the FAA issued a notice rescheduling the lottery from July 31, 2003, to August 12, 2003, in order to address these issues and others raised in the comments, prior to the scheduled lottery (68 FR 47378; August 8, 2003).

This notice responds to the comments received, explains the lottery procedures, and classifies the carriers eligible to participate in the lottery under our applicable regulations as new entrants, limited incumbents, and incumbents, as defined in 14 CFR 93.213. We also note which carriers are considered single operators for the purposes of slot allocation.

Discussion of Comments

The FAA received comments from the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA), Air Canada, ATA Airlines (ATA), Spirit Airlines, US Airways, the Air Carrier Association of America (ACAA) and Congressman Regula, as well as several reply comments. The comments identified five major issues, which are discussed below.

1. Definition of New Entrant

Under the applicable regulations, a "new entrant" carrier is an air carrier or commuter operator that does not hold a slot at a particular airport and has neither sold or given up a slot at that airport since December 16, 1985 (14 CFR 93.213(a)(1)) (emphasis added). A limited incumbent carrier is defined in 14 CFR 93.213(a)(5) and is a commuter operator or air carrier operator that holds or operates fewer than 12 air carrier or commuter slots, in any combination, at a particular airport

(emphasis added). In determining who qualifies as a limited incumbent carrier, the definition requires that we exclude international slots, Essential Air Service Program slots, or slots allocated at DCA between the local hours of 2200 and 0659. A carrier that holds or operates 12 or more slots at an airport is an incumbent carrier.

There are two carriers requesting to participate in the lottery that do not hold slots at DCA, but have a presence at the airport, and in fact, conduct operations at DCA. Chautauqua and Atlantic Coast Airlines operate slots, which are actually held by larger, incumbent carriers, through codeshare arrangements or by lease and conduct these operations on behalf of the incumbents.

The definitions cited do create something of an anomaly in that a carrier that holds no slots but operates more than 12 cannot be a "limited incumbent" under the lottery rule but could be a "new entrant." Similarly, a carrier could be both a limited incumbent and a new entrant if it operates fewer than 12 slots but holds none. ATA and Air Canada urge the FAA to apply the term "new entrant" as plainly defined and argue that any carrier that does not hold slots in its own right at DCA should be included in the new entrant category regardless of its operations at the airport. ACAA argues that Air Canada and Mesa should not be allowed to participate either as a "new entrant" or "limited incumbent" given that both operate more than 12 slots at the airport. ACAA argues if the regulations preclude a carrier from being a limited incumbent, the carrier logically cannot be a new entrant.

In making the argument that the FAA should veer from the plain language of the regulation, ACAA selects a phrase from section 93.225(e), the provision which sets out the lottery procedures and provides that "any U.S. carrier or foreign carrier where provided for by bilateral agreement, *that is not operating scheduled service at the airport * * * but wishes to initiate scheduled passenger service at the airport*, shall be included in the lottery if it notifies the FAA." (Emphasis added.) ACAA contends that because this provision distinguishes carriers operating at the airport from those who do not, a "new entrant" must mean a carrier that is not already operating at the airport.

A significant difference between a new entrant carrier and a limited incumbent carrier is that slots allocated under the Essential Air Service Program, for international operation or in the low-demand hours at DCA (2200-0659) are counted in determining whether a