

If the Administrator finds that the applicable airworthiness regulations (i.e., part 25, as amended) do not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards for the Gulfstream V because of a novel or unusual design feature, special conditions are prescribed under the provisions of § 21.16 to establish a level of safety equivalent to that established in the regulations.

Special conditions, as appropriate, are issued in accordance with § 11.49 of the FAR after public notice, as required by §§ 11.28 and 11.29, and become part of the type certification basis in accordance with § 21.101(b)(2).

Special conditions are initially applicable to the model for which they are issued. Should the type certificate for that model be amended later to include any other model that incorporates the same novel or unusual design feature, or should any other model already included on the same type certificate be modified to incorporate the same novel or unusual design feature, the special conditions would also apply to the other model under the provisions of § 21.101(a)(1).

Novel or Unusual Design Features

The Model Gulfstream V incorporates new avionic/electronic installations, including a digital Electronic Flight Instrument System (EFIS), Air Data System, Attitude and Heading Reference System (AHRS), Navigation and Communication System, Autopilot System, and a Full Authority Digital Engine Control (FADEC) system that controls critical engine parameters. These systems may be vulnerable to high-intensity radiated fields (HIRF) external to the airplane.

Discussion

There is no specific regulation that addresses protection requirements for electrical and electronic systems from HIRF. Increased power levels from ground-based radio transmitters and the growing use of sensitive electrical and electronic systems to command and control airplanes have made it necessary to provide adequate protection.

To ensure that a level of safety is achieved equivalent to that intended by the regulations incorporated by reference, special conditions are issued for the Gulfstream V which require that new technology electrical and electronic systems, such as the EFIS, FADEC, AHRS, etc., be designed and installed to preclude component damage and interruption of function due to both the direct and indirect effects of HIRF.

High-Intensity Radiated Fields

With the trend toward increased power levels from ground-based transmitters, plus the advent of space and satellite communications, coupled with electronic command and control of the airplane, the immunity of critical digital avionics systems to HIRF must be established.

It is not possible to precisely define the HIRF to which the airplane will be exposed in service. There is also uncertainty concerning the effectiveness of airframe shielding for HIRF.

Furthermore, coupling of electromagnetic energy to cockpit-installed equipment through the cockpit window apertures is undefined. Based on surveys and analysis of existing HIRF emitters, an adequate level of protection exists when compliance with the HIRF protection special condition is shown with either paragraph 1 or 2 below:

1. A minimum threat of 100 volts per meter peak electric field strength from 10 KHz to 18 GHz.

a. The threat must be applied to the system elements and their associated wiring harnesses without the benefit of airframe shielding.

b. Demonstration of this level of protection is established through system tests and analysis.

2. A threat external to the airframe of the following field strengths for the frequency ranges indicated.

Frequency	Peak (V/M)	Average (V/M)
10 KHz–100 KHz	50	50
100 KHz–500 KHz	60	60
500 KHz–2000 KHz ..	70	70
2 MHz–30 MHz	200	200
30 MHz–100 MHz	30	30
100 MHz–200 MHz ...	150	33
200 MHz–400 MHz ...	70	70
400 MHz–700 MHz ...	4,020	935
700 MHz–1000 MHz .	1,700	170
1 GHz–2 GHz	5,000	990
2 GHz–4 GHz	6,680	840
4 GHz–6 GHz	6,850	310
6 GHz–8 GHz	3,600	670
8 GHz–12 GHz	3,500	1,270
12 GHz–18 GHz	3,500	360
18 GHz–40 GHz	2,100	750

As discussed above, these special conditions would be applicable initially to the Model Gulfstream V. Should Gulfstream apply at a later date for a change to the type certificate to include another model incorporating the same novel or unusual design feature, these special conditions would apply to that model as well, under the provisions of § 21.101(a)(1).

Discussion of Comments

Notice of Proposed Special Conditions No. SC 95–3–NM for the

Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation, Model Gulfstream V, was published in the **Federal Register** on June 1, 1995 (60 FR 28550). One comment was received. The commenter states that the presently proposed certification basis for the Gulfstream V is part 25 of the FAR as amended by Amendments 25–1 through 25–81 instead of through 25–75 as stated in the notice. The FAA agrees with the commenter and has incorporated the change in this document.

Conclusion

This action affects certain design features only on the Gulfstream V airplane. It is not a rule of general applicability and affects only the manufacturer who applied to the FAA for approval of these features on the airplane.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 25

Aircraft, Aviation safety, Federal Aviation Administration, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

The authority citation for these special conditions is as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. app. 1344, 1348(c), 1352, 1354(a), 1355, 1421 through 1431, 1502, 1651(b)(2), 42 U.S.C. 1857f–10, 4321 et seq.; E.O. 11514, and 49 U.S.C. 106(g).

The Special Conditions

Accordingly, the following special conditions are issued as part of the type certification basis for the Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Model Gulfstream V airplanes.

1. *Protection From Unwanted Effects of High-Intensity Radiated Fields (HIRF).* Each electrical and electronic system that performs critical functions must be designed and installed to ensure that the operation and operational capability of these systems to perform critical functions are not adversely affected when the airplane is exposed to high-intensity radiated fields.

2. For the purpose of these special conditions, the following definition applies: *Critical Functions.* Functions whose failure would contribute to or cause a failure condition that would prevent the continued safe flight and landing of the airplane.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on August 18, 1995.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, ANM–100.

[FR Doc. 95–21333 Filed 8–28–95; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

15 CFR Part 292

[Docket No. 950330085-5164-02]

RIN 0694-AB36

Manufacturing Extension Partnership; Infrastructure Development Projects

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this rule is to provide for the introduction of effective training, tools, practices, techniques and analyses, and information systems into the national manufacturing extension system and to codify the process by which NIST will solicit and select applications for cooperative agreements and financial assistance on projects for providing improved training, tools, practices, techniques and analyses, and information systems to the national manufacturing extension system. The intended effect is to increase the effectiveness of the extension system by providing improved infrastructure capability to promote the competitiveness of smaller U.S. manufacturers.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 29, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathryn Leedy, Manufacturing Extension Partnership Infrastructure Development Projects Manager, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899, telephone: 301-975-5020.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposed rule was published on May 15, 1995 (60FR25872) with a 30 day comment period. One respondent submitted three suggestions. The first comment proposed changing the proposed rule so that it could be used as a Broad Agency Announcement in addition to serving as a basis for solicitations in order to further accelerate the process of infrastructure development by providing a mechanism for inviting creative proposals. This idea was not accepted because structured solicitations are considered to be a better way to develop projects that meet program needs. Further, it is anticipated that frequent solicitations will be issued so that new directions can be taken and new needs met.

The second comment suggested that the selection criteria be removed from the rule or that they be designated the default criteria to be used unless other criteria are given in the solicitation. In

response to this suggestion, Section 292.1(b) was modified to add the words "as well as any further definition of the selection criteria" to the information required in the announcements of solicitations.

The third comment proposed the use of a database of addresses for the distribution of draft rules and other materials. This comment was not accepted since it is an administrative suggestion and outside the scope of the rule.

The purpose of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Manufacturing Extension Partnership is to promote the competitiveness of smaller U.S. manufacturers. This is done primarily through technical assistance provided by a network of nonprofit manufacturing extension centers. The purpose of this rule is to provide for the development of infrastructure capability to effectively support the national manufacturing extension system and to codify the process by which NIST will solicit and select applications for financial assistance, typically for cooperative agreements, on projects which have the benefit of enhancing the ability of the extension system to promote the competitiveness of smaller U.S. manufacturers. Proposals from qualified organizations will periodically be solicited for projects which accomplish any one of the following objectives:

Development and Deployment of Training: To support the delivery of effective technical assistance to smaller manufacturers by trained service delivery personnel at the manufacturing extension centers. Specific categories of training and mechanisms of deployment may be specified in solicitations.

Development of Technical Assistance Tools, Practices, Techniques, and Analyses: To support the initial development, implementation, and analysis of tools, techniques, or practices which will aid manufacturing extension organizations in providing effective services to smaller manufacturers. Specific categories of tools, techniques, practices, or types of analysis may be specified in solicitations.

Information Infrastructure: To support and act as a catalyst for the development and implementation of information infrastructure services and pilots which will aid manufacturing extension organizations and smaller manufacturers in accessing the technical information they need or will accelerate the rate of adoption of electronic commerce. Specific industry sectors or subcategories of information

infrastructure projects may be specified in solicitations.

In general, eligible applicants for these projects include all for-profit and nonprofit organizations including private companies, universities, community colleges, state governments, state technology programs, and independent nonprofit organizations. However, specific limitations on eligibility may be specified in solicitations.

Announcements of solicitations will be made in the Commerce Business Daily.

In accordance with the provisions of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272 (b)(1) and (c)(3) and 2781), as amended, NIST will provide assistance to the national manufacturing extension system. Under the NIST Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP), NIST will periodically make merit-based awards to develop and deploy infrastructure improvements into extension centers and to other organizations for the development and deployment of training, tools and techniques, and information infrastructure. MEP assumes a broad definition of manufacturing, and recognizes a wide range of technology and concepts, including durable goods production; chemical, biotechnology, and other materials processing; electronic component and system fabrication; and engineering services associated with manufacturing, as lying within the definition of manufacturing.

Classification

This rule relating to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts is exempt from all requirements of section 553 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553(a)(2)) including notice and opportunity for comment and delayed effective date. Therefore, a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis is not required and was not prepared for this rule for purposes of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 603 and 604). The program is not a major Federal action requiring an environmental assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act. This rule does not contain policies with Federalism implications sufficient to warrant preparation of a Federalism assessment under Executive Order 12612. This rule contains collection of information requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act which have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB Control Numbers 0693-0005, 0348-0043 and 0348-0044). Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 40 hours per

response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the address shown above; and to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

It has been determined that this rule is not significant for purposes of EO 12866.

List of Subjects in 15 CFR Part 292

Grant programs—science and technology, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Science and technology, Technical assistance.

Dated: August 22, 1995.

Samuel Kramer,
Associate Director.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 15 CFR Part 292 is added to read as follows:

PART 292—MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP; INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Sec.

- 292.1 Program description.
- 292.2 Training development and deployment projects.
- 292.3 Technical tools, techniques, practices, and analyses projects.
- 292.4 Information infrastructure projects.
- 292.5 Proposal selection process.
- 292.6 Additional requirements.

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 272 (b)(1) and (c)(3) and 2781.

§ 292.1 Program description.

(a) *Purpose.* In accordance with the provisions of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272 (b)(1) and (c)(3) and 2781), as amended, NIST will provide financial assistance to develop the infrastructure of the national manufacturing extension system. Under the NIST Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP), NIST will periodically make merit-based awards to develop and deploy training capability and technical tools, techniques, practices, and analyses. In addition, NIST will develop and implement information infrastructure services and pilots. MEP assumes a broad definition of manufacturing, and recognizes a wide range of technology and concepts, including durable goods production; chemical, biotechnology, and other materials processing; electronic component and system fabrication; and engineering services associated with

manufacturing, as lying within the definition of manufacturing.

(b) *Announcements of solicitations.* Announcements of solicitations will be made in the Commerce Business Daily. Specific information on the level of funding available and the deadline for proposals will be contained in that announcement. In addition, any specific industry sectors or types of tools and techniques to be focused on will be specified in the announcement, as well as any further definition of the selection criteria.

(c) *Proposal workshops.* Prior to an announcement of solicitation, NIST may announce opportunities for potential applicants to learn about these projects through workshops. The time and place of the workshop(s) will be contained in a Commerce Business Daily announcement.

(d) *Indirect costs.* The total dollar amount of the indirect costs proposed in an application under this program must not exceed the indirect cost rate negotiated and approved by a cognizant Federal agency prior to the proposed effective date of the award or 100 percent of the total proposed direct costs dollar amount in the application, whichever is less.

(e) *Proposal format.* The proposal must contain both technical and cost information. The proposal page count shall include every page, including pages that contain words, table of contents, executive summary, management information and qualifications, resumes, figures, tables, and pictures. All proposals shall be printed such that pages are single-sided, with no more than fifty-five (55) lines per page. Use 21.6×27.9 cm (8½"×11") paper or A4 metric paper. Use an easy-to-read font of not more than about 5 characters per cm (fixed pitch font of 12 or fewer characters per inch or proportional font of point size 10 or larger). Smaller type may be used in figures and tables, but must be clearly legible. Margins on all sides (top, bottom, left and right) must be at least 2.5 cm. (1"). Length limitations for proposals will be specified in solicitations. The applicant may submit a separately bound document of appendices, containing letters of support for the proposal. The proposal should be self-contained and not rely on the appendices for meeting criteria. Excess pages in the proposal will not be considered in the evaluation. Applicants must submit one signed original plus six copies of the proposal and Standard Form 424, 424A, and 424B (Rev 4/92), Standard Form LLL, and Form CD-511. Applicants for whom the submission of six copies presents

financial hardship may submit one original and two copies of the application.

(f) *Content of proposal.* (1) The proposal must, at a minimum, include the following:

- (i) An executive summary summarizing the planned project consistent with the Evaluation Criteria stated in this part.
- (ii) A description of the planned project sufficient to permit evaluation of the proposal in accordance with the proposal Evaluation Criteria stated in this part.
- (iii) A budget for the project which identifies all sources of funds and which breaks out planned expenditures by both activity and object class (e.g., personnel, travel, etc.).
- (iv) A description of the qualifications of key personnel who will be assigned to work on the proposed project.
- (v) A statement of work that discusses the specific tasks to be carried out, including a schedule of measurable events and milestones.
- (vi) A completed Standard Form 424, 424A, and 424B (Rev 4-92) prescribed by the applicable OMB circular, Standard Form LLL, and Form CD-511, Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; Drug-Free Workplace Requirements and Lobbying, SF-424, 424A, 424B (Rev 4-92), SF-LLL, and Form CD-511 will not be considered part of the page count of the proposal.

(2) The application requirements and the standard form requirements have been approved by OMB (OMB Control Number 0693-0005, 0348-0043 and 0348-0044).

(g) *Applicable federal and departmental guidance.* The Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audits are dependent upon type of Recipient organization as follows:

(1) *Nonprofit organizations.* (i) OMB Circular A-110—Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Nonprofit Organizations.

(ii) OMB Circular A-122—Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations.

(iii) 15 CFR Part 29b—Audit Requirements for Institutions of Higher Education and Other Nonprofit Organizations (implements OMB Circular A-133—Audits for Institutions of Higher Education and Other Nonprofit Organizations).

(2) *State/local governments.* (i) 15 CFR Part 24—Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments.

(ii) OMB Circular A-87—Cost Principles for State and Local Governments.

(iii) 15 CFR Part 29a—Audit Requirements for State and Local Governments (implements OMB Circular A-128—Audit of State and Local Governments).

(3) *Educational institutions.* (i) OMB Circular A-110—Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Nonprofit Organizations.

(ii) OMB Circular A-21—Cost Principles for Educational Institutions.

(iii) 15 CFR Part 29b—Audit Requirements for Institutions of Higher Education and Other Nonprofit Organizations (implements OMB Circular A-133—Audits of Institutions of Higher Education and Other Nonprofit Organizations).

(4) *For-profit organizations.* (i) OMB Circular A-110—Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Nonprofit Organizations.

(ii) 48 CFR Part 31—Federal Acquisition Regulation, Contract Cost Principles and Procedures.

(iii) 15 CFR Part 29b—Audit Requirements for Institutions of Higher Education and Other Nonprofit Organizations (implements OMB Circular A-133).

(h) *Availability of forms and circulars.* (1) Copies of forms referenced in this part may be obtained from the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Room C121, Building 301, Gaithersburg, MD 20899.

(2) Copies of OMB Circulars may be obtained from the Office of Administration, Publications Office, 725 17th St., NW, Room 2200, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

§ 292.2 Training development and deployment projects.

(a) *Eligibility criteria.* In general, eligible applicants for these projects include all for-profit and nonprofit organizations including universities, community colleges, state governments, state technology programs and independent nonprofit organizations. However, specific limitations on eligibility may be specified in solicitations. Organizations may submit multiple proposals under this category in each solicitation for unique projects.

(b) *Project objective.* The purpose of these projects is to support the development and deployment of training programs which will aid

manufacturing extension organizations in providing services to smaller manufacturers. While primarily directed toward the field agents/engineers of the extension organizations, the training may also be of direct use by the smaller manufacturers themselves. Specific industry sectors to be addressed and sub-categories of training may be specified in solicitations. Examples of training topic areas include, but are not limited to, manufacturing assessment functions, business systems management, quality assurance assistance, and financial management activities. Examples of training program deployment include, but are not limited to, organization and conduct of training courses, development and conduct of train-the-trainer courses, preparations and delivery of distance learning activities, and preparation of self-learning and technical-guideline materials. Projects must be completed within the scope of the effort proposed and should not require on-going federal support.

(c) *Award period.* Projects initiated under this category may be carried out over a period of up to three years. If an application is selected for funding, DOC has no obligation to provide any additional future funding in connection with that award. Renewal of an award to increase funding or extend the period of performance is at the total discretion of DOC.

(d) *Matching requirements.* Matching fund requirements for these proposals will be specified in solicitations including the breakdown of cash and in-kind requirements. For those projects not requiring matching funds, the presence of match will be considered in the evaluation under the Financial Plan criteria.

(e) *Training development and deployment projects evaluation criteria.* Proposals will be evaluated and rated on the basis of the following criteria listed in descending order of importance:

(1) *Demonstration that the proposed project will meet the training needs of technical assistance providers and manufacturers in the target population.* The target population must be clearly defined and the proposal must demonstrate that it understands the population's training needs within the proposed project area. The proposal should show that the efforts being proposed meet the needs identified. Factors that may be considered include: A clear definition of the target population, size and demographic distribution; demonstrated understanding of the target population's training needs; and appropriateness of the size of the target population and the

anticipated impact for the proposed expenditure.

(2) *Development/deployment methodology and use of appropriate technology and information sources.* The proposal must describe the technical plan for the development or deployment of the training, including the project activities to be used in the training development/deployment and the sources of technology and/or information which will be used to create or deploy the training activity. Sources may include those internal to the proposer or from other organizations. Factors that may be considered include: Adequacy of the proposed technical plan; strength of core competency in the proposed area of activity; and demonstrated access to relevant technical or information sources external to the organization.

(3) *Delivery and implementation mechanisms.* The proposal must set forth clearly defined, effective mechanisms for delivery and/or implementation of proposed services to the target population. The proposal also must demonstrate that training activities will be integrated into and will be of service to the NIST Manufacturing Extension Centers. Factors that may be considered include: Ease of access to the training activity especially for MEP extension centers; methodology for disseminating or promoting involvement in the training especially within the MEP system; and demonstrated interest in the training activity especially by MEP extension centers.

(4) *Coordination with other relevant organizations.* Wherever possible the project should be coordinated with and leverage other organizations which are developing or have expertise with similar training. If no such organizations exist, the proposal should show that this is the case. Applicants will need to describe how they will coordinate to allow for increased economies of scale and to avoid duplication. Factors that may be considered include: Demonstrated understanding of existing organizations and resources relevant to the proposed project; adequate linkages and partnerships with existing organizations and clear definition of those organizations' roles in the proposed activities; and that the proposed activity does not duplicate existing services or resources.

(5) *Program evaluation.* The applicant should specify plans for evaluation of the effectiveness of the proposed training activity and for ensuring continuous improvement of the training. Factors that may be considered include: Thoroughness of evaluation plans,

including internal evaluation for management control, external evaluation for assessing outcomes of the activity, and "customer satisfaction" measures of performance.

(6) *Management and organizational experience and plans.* Applicants should specify plans for proper organization, staffing, and management of the implementation process. Factors that may be considered include: Appropriateness and authority of the governing or managing organization to conduct the proposed activities; qualifications of the project team and its leadership to conduct the proposed activity; soundness of any staffing plans, including recruitment, selection, training, and continuing professional development; and appropriateness of the organizational approach for carrying out the proposed activity.

(7) *Financial plan.* Applicants should show the relevance and cost effectiveness of the financial plan for meeting the objectives of the project; the firmness and level of the applicant's total financial support for the project; and a plan to maintain the program after the cooperative agreement has expired. Factors that may be considered include: Reasonableness of the budget, both in income and expenses; strength of commitment and amount of the proposer's cost share, if any; effectiveness of management plans for control of budget; appropriateness of matching contributions; and plan for maintaining the program after the cooperative agreement has expired.

§ 292.3 Technical tools, techniques, practices, and analyses projects.

(a) *Eligibility criteria.* In general, eligible applicants for these projects include all for profit and nonprofit organizations including universities, community colleges, state governments, state technology programs and independent nonprofit organizations. However, specific limitations on eligibility may be specified in solicitations. Organizations may submit multiple proposals under this category in each solicitation for unique projects.

(b) *Project objective.* The purpose of these projects is to support the initial development, implementation, and analysis of tools, techniques, and practices which will aid manufacturing extension organizations in providing services to smaller manufacturers and which may also be of direct use by the smaller manufacturers themselves. Specific industry sectors to be addressed and sub-categories of tools, techniques, practices, and analyses may be specified in solicitations. Examples of tools, techniques, and practices

include, but are not limited to, manufacturing assessment tools, benchmarking tools, business systems management tools, quality assurance assistance tools, financial management tools, software tools, practices for partnering, techniques for urban or rural firms, and comparative analysis of assessment methods. Projects must be completed within the scope of the effort proposed and should not require on-going federal support.

(c) *Award period.* Projects initiated under this category may be carried out over a period of up to three years. If an application is selected for funding, DOC has no obligation to provide any additional future funding in connection with that award. Renewal of an award to increase funding or extend the period of performance is at the total discretion of DOC.

(d) *Matching requirements.* Matching fund requirements for these proposals will be specified in solicitations including the breakdown of cash and in-kind requirements. For those projects not requiring matching funds, the presence of match will be considered in the evaluation under the Financial Plan criteria.

(e) *Tools, techniques, practices, and analyses projects evaluation criteria.* Proposals from applicants will be evaluated and rated on the basis of the following criteria listed in descending order of importance:

(1) *Demonstration that the proposed project will meet the technical assistance needs of technical assistance providers and manufacturers in the target population.* Target population must be clearly defined. The proposal must demonstrate that it understands the population's tool or technique needs within the proposed project area. The proposal should show that the efforts being proposed meet the needs identified. Factors that may be considered include: A clear definition of the target population, size and demographic distribution; demonstrated understanding of the target population's tools or technique needs; and appropriateness of the size of the target population and the anticipated impact for the proposed expenditure.

(2) *Development methodology and use of appropriate technology and information sources.* The proposal must describe the technical plan for the development of the tool or resource, including the project activities to be used in the tool/resource development and the sources of technology and/or information which will be used to create the tool or resource. Sources may include those internal to the proposer or from other organizations. Factors that

may be considered include: Adequacy of the proposed technical plan; strength of core competency in the proposed area of activity; and demonstrated access to relevant technical or information sources external to the organization.

(3) *Degree of integration with the manufacturing extension partnership.* The proposal must demonstrate that the tool or resource will be integrated into and will be of service to the NIST Manufacturing Extension Centers. Factors that may be considered include: Ability to access the tool or resource especially for MEP extension centers; methodology for disseminating or promoting use of the tool or technique especially within the MEP system; and demonstrated interest in using the tool or technique especially by MEP extension centers.

(4) *Coordination with other relevant organizations.* Wherever possible the project should be coordinated with and leverage other organizations which are developing or have expertise on similar tools, techniques, practices, or analyses. If no such organizations exist, the proposal should show that this is the case. Applicants will need to describe how they will coordinate to allow for increased economies of scale and to avoid duplication. Factors that may be considered include: Demonstrated understanding of existing organizations and resources relevant to the proposed project; adequate linkages and partnerships with existing organizations and clear definition of those organizations' roles in the proposed activities; and that the proposed activity does not duplicate existing services or resources.

(5) *Program evaluation.* The applicant should specify plans for evaluation of the effectiveness of the proposed tool or technique and for ensuring continuous improvement of the tool. Factors that may be considered include: Thoroughness of evaluation plans, including internal evaluation for management control, external evaluation for assessing outcomes of the activity, and "customer satisfaction" measures of performance.

(6) *Management experience and plans.* Applicants should specify plans for proper organization, staffing, and management of the implementation process. Factors that may be considered include: Appropriateness and authority of the governing or managing organization to conduct the proposed activities; qualifications of the project team and its leadership to conduct the proposed activity; soundness of any staffing plans, including recruitment, selection, training, and continuing professional development; and

appropriateness of the organizational approach for carrying out the proposed activity.

(7) *Financial plan.* Applicants should show the relevance and cost effectiveness of the financial plan for meeting the objectives of the project; the firmness and level of the applicant's total financial support for the project; and a plan to maintain the program after the cooperative agreement has expired. Factors that may be considered include: Reasonableness of the budget, both in income and expenses; strength of commitment and amount of the proposer's cost share, if any; effectiveness of management plans for control of budget; appropriateness of matching contributions; and plan for maintaining the program after the cooperative agreement has expired.

§ 292.4 Information infrastructure projects.

(a) *Eligibility criteria.* In general, eligible applicants for these projects include all for profit and nonprofit organizations including universities, community colleges, state governments, state technology programs and independent nonprofit organizations. However, specific limitations on eligibility may be specified in solicitations. Organizations may submit multiple proposals under this category in each solicitation for unique projects.

(b) *Project objective.* The purpose of these projects is to support and act as a catalyst for the development and implementation of information infrastructure services and pilots. These projects will aid manufacturing extension organizations and smaller manufacturers in accessing the technical information they need or will accelerate the rate of adoption of electronic commerce. Specific industry sectors to be addressed or subcategories of information infrastructure projects include, but are not limited to, pilot demonstration of electronic data interchange in a supplier chain, implementation of an electronic information service for field engineers at MEP extension centers, and industry specific electronic information services for MEP centers and smaller manufacturers.

(c) *Award period.* Projects initiated under this category may be carried out over a period of up to three years. If an application is selected for funding, DOC has no obligation to provide any additional future funding in connection with that award. Renewal of an award to increase funding or extend the period of performance is at the total discretion of DOC.

(d) *Matching requirements.* Matching fund requirements for these proposals

will be specified in solicitations including the breakdown of cash and in-kind requirements. For those projects not requiring matching funds, the presence of match will be considered in the evaluation under the Financial Plan criteria.

(e) *Information infrastructure projects evaluation criteria.* Proposals from applicants will be evaluated and rated on the basis of the following criteria listed in descending order of importance:

(1) *Demonstration that the proposed project will meet the need of the target customer base.* The target customer base must be clearly defined and, in general, will be technical assistance providers and/or smaller manufacturers. The proposal should demonstrate a clear understanding of the customer base's needs within the proposed project area. The proposal should also show that the efforts being proposed meet the needs identified. Factors that may be considered include: A clear definition of the customer base, size and demographic distribution; demonstrated understanding of the customer base's needs within the project area; and appropriateness of the size of the customer base and the anticipated impact for the proposed expenditure.

(2) *Development plans and delivery/implementation mechanisms.* The proposal must set forth clearly defined, effective plans for the development, delivery and/or implementation of proposed services to the customer base. The proposal must delineate the sources of information which will be used to implement the project. Sources may include those internal to the center (including staff expertise) or from other organizations. Factors that may be considered include: Adequacy of plans; potential effectiveness and efficiency of proposed delivery and implementation systems; demonstrated capacity to form effective linkages; partnerships necessary for success of the proposed activity; strength of core competency in the proposed area of activity; and demonstrated access to relevant technical or information sources external to the organization.

(3) *Coordination with other relevant organizations.* Wherever possible the project should be coordinated with and leverage other organizations which are developing or have expertise within the project area. In addition, the project should demonstrate that it does not duplicate efforts which already are being performed by the private sector without government support. Applicants will need to describe how they will coordinate to allow for increased economies of scale and to

avoid duplication. If the proposer will not be partnering with any other organizations, then the proposal should clearly explain why the project will be more successful if implemented as proposed. A proposal which makes a credible case for why there are no, or very limited, partnerships will not be penalized in evaluation. Factors that may be considered include: Demonstrated understanding of existing organizations and resources relevant to the proposed project; Adequate linkages and partnerships with relevant existing organizations; clear definition of the roles of partnering organizations in the proposed activities; and that the proposed activity does not duplicate existing services or resources.

(4) *Management and organizational experience and plans.* Applicants should specify plans for proper organization, staffing, and management of the project. Factors that may be considered include: Appropriateness and authority of the governing or managing organization to conduct the proposed activities; qualifications of the project team and its leadership to conduct the proposed activity; soundness of any staffing plans, including recruitment, selection, training, and continuing professional development; and appropriateness of the organizational approach for carrying out the proposed activity.

(5) *Financial plan.* Applicants should show the relevance and cost effectiveness of the financial plan for meeting the objectives of the project; the firmness and level of the applicant's total financial support for the project; and the ability of the project to continue after the cooperative agreement has expired without federal support. While projects that appear to require on-going public support will be considered, in general, they will be evaluated lower than those which show a strong ability to become self-sufficient. Factors that may be considered include: Reasonableness of the budget, both in income and expenses; strength of commitment and amount of the proposer's cost share, if any; effectiveness of management plans for control of budget; appropriateness of matching contributions; and plan for maintaining the program after the cooperative agreement has expired.

(6) *Evaluation.* The applicant should specify plans for evaluation of the effectiveness of the proposed project and for ensuring continuous improvement. Factors that may be considered include: Thoroughness of evaluation plans, including internal evaluation for management control, external evaluation for assessing

outcomes of the activity, and "customer satisfaction" measures of performance.

§ 292.5 Proposal selection process.

The proposal evaluation and selection process will consist of three principal phases: Proposal qualifications; proposal review and selection of finalists; and award determination as follows:

(a) *Proposal qualification.* All proposals will be reviewed by NIST to assure compliance with the proposal content and other basic provisions of this part. Proposals which satisfy these requirements will be designated qualified proposals; all others will be disqualified at this phase of the evaluation and selection process.

(b) *Proposal review and selection of finalists.* NIST will appoint an evaluation panel to review and evaluate all qualified proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria and values set forth in this part. Evaluation panels will consist of NIST employees and in some cases other federal employees or non-federal experts who sign non-disclosure agreements. A site visit may be required to make full evaluation of a proposal. From the qualified proposals, a group of finalists will be numerically ranked and recommended for award based on this review.

(c) *Award determination.* The Director of the NIST, or her/his designee, shall select awardees based on total evaluation scores, geographic distribution, and the availability of funds. All three factors will be considered in making an award. Upon the final award decision, a notification will be made to each of the proposing organizations.

§ 292.6 Additional requirements.

Federal policies and procedures. Recipients and subrecipients are subject to all Federal laws and Federal and Department of Commerce policies, regulations, and procedures applicable to Federal financial assistance awards.

[FR Doc. 95-21253 Filed 8-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 172

[Docket Nos. 89F-0400, 89F-0508, and 92F-0163]

Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Sucrose Fatty Acid Esters

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the food additive regulations to provide for the safe use of sucrose fatty acid esters as emulsifiers, stabilizers, and texturizers in chewing gum, confections, and frostings; texturizers in surimi-based fabricated seafood products; and emulsifiers in coffee and tea beverages with added dairy ingredients and/or dairy product analogues. This action is in response to petitions filed by the Nebraska Department of Economic Development and Mitsubishi Kasei Corp.

DATES: Effective August 29, 1995; written objections and requests for a hearing by September 28, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit written objections to the Dockets Management Branch (HFA-305), Food and Drug Administration, rm. 1-23, 12420 Parklawn Dr., Rockville, MD 20857.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Blondell Anderson, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS-207), Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202-418-3106, or

Dennis M. Keefe, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS-206), Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202-418-3102.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In notices published in the *Federal Registers* of October 24, 1989 (54 FR 43338), January 10, 1990 (55 FR 908), and May 13, 1992 (57 FR 20495), FDA announced that food additive petitions (FAP 9A4166, FAP 0A4183, and FAP 2A4321, respectively) had been filed by the Nebraska Department of Economic Development, 301 Centennial Mall South, Lincoln, NE 68509 (FAP 9A4166), and Mitsubishi Kasei Corp., 5-2, Marunouchi 2-Chome, Chiyoda-ku, Japan (FAP 0A4183 and FAP 2A4321),

proposing that § 172.859 *Sucrose fatty acid esters* (21 CFR 172.859) be amended to provide for the safe use of sucrose fatty acid esters as emulsifiers, stabilizers, and texturizers in chewing gum, confections and frostings; as texturizers in surimi-based fabricated seafood products; and as emulsifiers in coffee and tea beverages.

FDA has evaluated data in these petitions and concludes from all the available data that there is a reasonable certainty that the proposed uses are safe. In reaching this conclusion, the agency has among other things, calculated the estimated daily intake from the proposed uses and all previously approved uses of sucrose fatty acid esters (Ref. 1). The agency has also calculated from toxicological information the acceptable daily intake level of sucrose fatty acid esters (Ref. 2). The agency finds that the estimated daily intake from the proposed uses and all approved uses is less than the estimated acceptable daily intake level. Thus, the agency concludes that the food additive regulations should be amended as set forth below.

In accordance with § 171.1(h) (21 CFR 171.1(h)), the petitions and the documents that FDA considered and relied upon in reaching its decision to approve the petitions are available for inspection at the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition by appointment with one of the information contact persons listed above. As provided in 21 CFR 171.1(h), the agency will delete from the documents any materials that are not available for public disclosure before making the documents available for inspection.

The agency has carefully considered the potential environmental effects of this action. FDA has concluded that the action will not have a significant impact on the human environment, and that an environmental impact statement is not required. The agency's finding of no significant impact and the evidence supporting that finding, contained in an environmental assessment, may be seen in the Dockets Management Branch (address above) between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Any person who will be adversely affected by this regulation may at any time on or before September 28, 1995, file with the Dockets Management Branch (address above) written objections thereto. Each objection shall be separately numbered, and each numbered objection shall specify with particularity the provisions of the regulation to which objection is made and the grounds for the objection. Each numbered objection on which a hearing is requested shall specifically so state.