Table of Foreign Passports Recognized for Extended Validity

ALGERIA
ANTIGUA & BARBUDA
ARGENTINA
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BAHAMAS, THE
BANGLADESH
BARBADOS
BELGIUM
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHILE
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
COTE D'IVOIRE
CUBA
CYPRUS
CZECH REPUBLIC
DENMARK
DOMINICA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
EL SALVADOR
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
FRANCE
GERMANY
GREECE
GRENADA
GUINEA
HONG KONG (Certificates of identity & passports)
HUNGARY
ICELAND
INDIA
IRELAND
ISRAEL
ITALY
JAMAICA
JAPAN
JORDAN
KOREA
KUWAIT
LAOS
LEBANON
LIECHTENSTEIN
LUXEMBOURG
MADAGASCAR
MALAYSIA
MALTA
MAURITIUS
MEXICO
MONACO
NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA (Diplomatic & official only)
NIGERIA
NORWAY
OMAN
PAKISTAN
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
PHILIPPINES
POLAND
PORTUGAL
QATAR
SENEGAL
SINGAPORE
SLOVAK REPUBLIC
SLOVENIA (ADDED)
SOUTH AFRICA
SPAIN
SRI LANKA
ST. KITTS & NEVIS
ST. LUCIA
ST. VINCENT & THE GRENADINES
SUDAN
SURINAME
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
SYRIA
TAIWAN (ADDED)
THAILAND
TOGO
TRINIDAD & TOBAGO
TUNISIA
TURKEY
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES
UNITED KINGDOM
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

Public Notice 2902 of October 9, 1998 issued at 63 FR 54512 is hereby superseded.

Dated: October 24, 1998.

Mary A. Ryan,

Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs.

[FR Doc. 98–29861 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 2923]

Fine Arts Committee; Notice of Meeting

The Fine Arts Committee of the Department of State will meet on Friday, November 13, 1998 at 2:00 p.m. in the John Quincy Adams State Drawing Room. The meeting will last until approximately 3:00 p.m. and is open to the public.

The agenda for the committee meeting will include a summary of the work of the Fine Arts Office since its last meeting on April 4, 1998 and the announcement of gifts and loans of furnishings as well as financial contributions from January 1, 1998 through September 30, 1998. Public access to the Department of State is strictly controlled. Members of the public wishing to take part in the meeting should telephone the Fine Arts Office by Monday, November 9, 1998, telephone (202) 647–1990 to make arrangements to enter the building. The public may take part in the discussion as long as time permits and at the discretion of the chairman.

Dated: October 28, 1998.

Gail F. Serfaty,

Vice Chairman, Fine Arts Committee.

[FR Doc. 98–29860 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–38–M

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice #2928]

Advisory Committee on International Economic Policy; Public Meeting Notice

Members of the Advisory Committee on International Economic Policy (ACIEP) will meet from 9:00–11:30 am on Monday, November 23, 1998, in Room 1105, U.S. Department of State, 2201 C Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20520 to discuss on-going work in the OECD on multilateral rules on investment. The Department regrets shorter notice necessitated by last minute conflicts in schedule of senior officials.

Admittance of public members will be limited to the seating available. As access to the Department of State is controlled, persons wishing to attend the meeting should notify the ACIEP Executive Secretary by Thursday, November 21, 1998.

Each person must provide his or her name, company or organization affiliation, date of birth, and social security number and a valid photo ID (U.S. driver's license with picture, U.S. passport, or U.S. government identification) for entrance into the building at the C Street diplomatic entrance, to the ACIEP Secretariat at (202) 647–5968 or fax (202) 647–5713 (Attn: Sharon Rogers). A list will be made and the Reception personnel will direct attendees to Room 1105.

For further notification or information, contact Sharon Rogers, ACIEP Secretariat, U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Room 6828, Main State, Washington, DC 20520. She may be reached at telephone (202) 647–5968 or fax number (202) 647–5713.

Dated: November 4, 1998.

Alan P. Larson,

Assistant Secretary for Economic and Business Affairs.

[FR Doc. 98–30101 Filed 11–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–07–M

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Sanitary and Phytosanitary Issues

AGENCY: Trade Policy Staff Committee, USTR.

ACTION: Request for written comments on ''Information for Evaluation of the Consistency of Foreign Trade Measures with the Provisions of the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures.''

SUMMARY: The Trade Policy Staff Committee (TPSC) is publishing a set of questions developed to elicit information on foreign trade measures that may be inconsistent with the provisions of the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement). This set of questions, ''Information for Evaluation of the Consistency of Foreign Trade Measures with the Provisions of the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures,'' was developed by a subcommittee of the TPSC which focuses on issues related to the WTO SPS Agreement. These questions are attached as an annex to this **Federal Register** notice. They will be used by the TPSC in collecting and organizing information for analysis and for prioritizing potential U.S. Government action on trade barriers raised by sanitary or phytosanitary measures that appear to be inconsistent with the SPS Agreement.

The purpose of this notice is to solicit written public comments on the set of questions developed by the inter-agency TPSC committee. Comments are specifically invited to address the appropriateness and comprehensiveness of the questions as they are set forth in the annex to this **Federal Register** notice. If there are areas of concern or issues which commentors feel have not been fully addressed they should provide their rationale for inclusion or exclusion of such concerns.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted by December 9, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Payne, Director for SPS Affairs, USTR, telephone (202) 395–6127; or e-mail: jpayne@ustr.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: It was recommended in a United States General Accounting Office (GAO) report, entitled ''Agricultural Exports: U.S. Needs a More Integrated Approach to Address Sanitary/Phytosanitary Issues'' (NSIAD–98–32 December 11, 1997) that the U.S. Government should:

> * * * establish a more systematic process by which USDA entities evaluate complaints they receive about SPS measures, determine which ones they should address, prioritize their efforts, develop unified approaches, and determine when to recommend consideration of dispute settlement procedures to USTR. This process should be developed and implemented in consultation with the U.S. Trade Representative, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, the Administrator of EPA, and the Secretary of State, or their designees.

The USTR in its response to the GAO report stated that the SPS subcommittee of the TPSC would develop a methodology for evaluating SPS issues brought to its attention and that methodology would be used to determine policy options for addressing specific SPS issues which appear to violate the WTO SPS Agreement. USDA in its response to the GAO report stated that a **Federal Register** notice would be published that invited public comment on factors to be taken into account in evaluating and prioritizing trade-related SPS measures.

The SPS subcommittee of the TPSC (comprised of representatives from USTR, the United States Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the State Department, and representatives of other interested Departments and Agencies) developed a set of questions to guide the collection of information to evaluate the consistency of foreign trade measures with the provisions of the SPS Agreement. This set of questions will be amended based on comments provided from this notice and, over time, through experience as new issues are identified that would lead to improving the collection of information for analysis of SPS measures which appear to violate the WTO SPS Agreement.

In order to assist the TPSC in its analysis of specific SPS measures, government Agencies intend to use the set of questions as a tool to systematically collect and organize their information on issues. It is understood that the information responsive to these questions may be provided from a number of sources, including Agencies of the U.S. Government and information voluntarily provided by industry or consumer groups. Failure of the TPSC to obtain answers to some of the questions does not mean that the issue will not be addressed, but the more complete the information, the sooner the evaluation can be completed, and potentially, the sooner the issue could be resolved. This set of questions is intended to ensure that the TPSC is aware of all available information that is pertinent to an issue. It does not imply any particular judgment regarding the relative importance of any specific item of information provided.

Submission of Written Comments

Those persons wishing to submit written comments should provide twenty (20) copies (in English) to Gloria Blue, Executive Secretary, Trade Policy Staff Committee, Office of the United States Trade Representative, Room 501, 600 17th Street Northwest, Washington, DC 20508. Comments should state clearly the position taken and should describe the specific information supporting that position.

If the submission contains business confidential information, twenty copies of a confidential version must also be submitted. A justification as to why the information contained in the submission should be treated confidentially must be included in the submission. In addition, any submissions containing business confidential information must be clearly marked ''Confidential'' at the top and bottom of the cover page (or letter) and of each succeeding page of the submission. The version that does not contain confidential information should also be clearly marked, at the top and bottom of each page, ''public version'' or ''non-confidential.''

Written comments submitted in connection with this request, except for information granted ''business confidential'' status pursuant to 15 CFR 20003.6, will be available for public inspection in the USTR Reading Room, Room 101, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street Northwest, Washington, DC. An appointment to review the file may be made by calling Brenda Webb (202) 395–6186. The Reading Room is open to the public from 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon, and from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Frederick L. Montgomery,

Chairman, Trade Policy Staff Committee.

Annex: The Consistency of Foreign Trade Measures With the Provisions of the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

In order to assist the TPSC in its analysis of the SPS measure in question, please provide as much information as possible in response to the following questions. It is understood that the information requested may be provided from several other sources, including the U.S. Government. Failure to answer questions does not mean that the issue will not be addressed by the TPSC, but the more complete the information, the sooner the evaluation can be completed. If any of the information provided is business confidential, please ensure that specific business confidential information on all copies is so marked.

Please note that this set of questions is intended to ensure that the TPSC is aware of all available information that is pertinent to this issue. It does not imply any judgment regarding the relative importance of any specific questions or specific elements of the information provided.

I. Description of The SPS Barrier

A. What country has imposed a trade restriction or SPS barrier?

B. What product or commodity is affected?

C. What claim (e.g., health, safety, etc.) is the government making as the reason for its measure?

D. Has this issue been brought to the attention of the U.S. Government before? If so, what was the date of the previous communication and to what Agency?

E. Who may have information available to answer more fully questions in this questionnaire? U.S. Government Agencies? Others?

II. Market Impact

A. Which export markets (i.e., countries, territories, regions) are affected by this measure?

B. Which foreign government agencies are responsible for developing, implementing, and enforcing the measure?

C. When was the measure adopted, publicized and implemented? Please provide as complete a chronology as possible.

D. Which U.S. export products are affected? Please provide as detailed a description as possible, including harmonized tariff schedule numbers (If known).

E. What other countries' imports of products into the country taking the measure are (might be) impacted by this measure?

F. What is the approximate value of the actual lost export earnings resulting from the application of this measure? (or) The estimate of lost export earnings which would result if the proposed measure were implemented?

(1) What is the approximate value of U.S. exports of the affected products to the affected markets in recent years?

(2) What is the approximate value of all U.S. exports of the affected products to the world in recent years?

(3) If there is no trade because of the measure (import bans, etc.), what is your estimate of potential market value if the current restriction were removed?

III. Health Objective of the Measure

A. Has the government applying the measure identified that it is doing so to protect human, animal or plant life or health? If so, provide the specific health concern the measure is intended to address. Please provide any available documentation.

B. If the measure is intended to mitigate against a disease or pest, which specifically?

(1) Do the pests or diseases of concern exist in the U.S.?

(2) If the pest or disease exist in the U.S., are there relevant surveillance or monitoring data to demonstrate that the pest or disease does not affect the product for which the measure is taken?

(3) Is the pest or disease known to occur in the country that has applied the measure? If so, is the pest or disease limited or widespread in that countries territory? Is the pest or disease under an official control program or quarantine in that country?

IV. Scientific Basis for the Measure

A. Are there any international standards, guidelines or recommendations which address the same or similar health concerns? Please identify and describe. Would use of those international standards, guidelines or recommendations be more or less trade restrictive than application of the measure in question?

B. Has the government that has applied (or is proposing) the measure conducted a risk assessment which provides a scientific basis for the measure? Are you aware of any other risk assessment upon which the measure may be based?

C. Is there strong scientific evidence that the measure is or is not based on scientific principles or maintained on the basis of sufficient scientific evidence? Does the scientific evidence indicate that application of this measure is necessary to achieve the intended level of health protection (as determined by the government applying the measure)? Please attach a technical summary of the relevant scientific evidence.

D. Have U.S. government or private sector scientists evaluated the scientific basis for the measure in question? If so, what is their view?

E. Does the measure take into account the sanitary and phytosanitary characteristics of the areas from which the affected products originate and the areas to which they are destined (e.g., does in recognize post harvest risk mitigation techniques and pest-free or disease-free production areas)?

F. How much technical analysis and research are required to generate conclusions regarding the other county's SPS measure (low, medium, high)? What are the research costs, current activity, and funding sources?

V. Consistency of the Measure

A. Has the measure been enforced consistently and in a non-discriminatory manner?

(1) Is the measure applied in a non-discriminatory way to all international suppliers, where identical or similar conditions prevail?

(2) Does the government applying the measure apply the measure in a non-discriminatory way to both imported and domestic products, where identical or similar conditions prevail? If not, has the government given a reason why it does not?

(3) Is the measure applied seasonally? If so, is there a scientific justification for seasonal implementation? How does seasonal implementation relate to seasonal U.S. export patterns?

VI. Transparency and Other Procedural Issues

A. To your knowledge, has the measure been formally notified through WTO notification procedures to the SPS Committee? Other WTO Committees?

B. Did the government applying the measure provide an opportunity for U.S. firms to comment on the measure before its adoption and implementation? Were any comments provided in response? If so, were they taken into account in the development of the final measure?

C. Did the government applying the measure provide sufficient time for U.S. exporters to adjust to the measure prior to its implementation?

VII. Previous or Ongoing Consultations

A. Have there been any consultations between the government applying the measure and affected (private sector) U.S. exporters? If so, when did those consultations take place, which foreign government agencies were involved, and what were the results? Please attach as detailed a chronology as possible.

B. Have there been any official bilateral consultations between the government applying the measure and the U.S. government regarding the application of the measure? When did those consultations take place, and which U.S. and foreign government agencies were involved?

C. Have any third parties sought or conducted consultations with the government applying the measure on this issue? If so, what were the results?

D. Are issues relevant to the application of this measure currently on the agenda of any relevant international standards setting bodies or other regional or international organizations?

VIII. Comparable Measures

A. What SPS measures, if any, does the United States apply in order to address the same or similar health concerns in association with the same or comparable products? In other words, What are the comparable U.S. measures, including related domestic and interstate regulations, to protect against the same or comparable risks?

(1) Are those U.S. measures more or less trade restrictive than the foreign measure in question?

(2) Are there any known scientific or other legitimate reasons for any difference between the foreign measure in question and the comparable U.S. measures?

B. What SPS measures, if any, do other governments apply in order to address the same or similar health concerns? Are these measures more or less restrictive than the measure in question?

C. Is there any other reasonably available measure or risk mitigation strategy which, taking into account technical and economic feasibility, would achieve the intended level of health protection (as determined by the government applying the measure) in a less trade-restrictive manner? Please provide any available scientific evidence which would demonstrate the efficacy of such alternatives.

IX. Other Information

A. Is there any other relevant information not asked for in previous questions, or information you believe to be pertinent that has not been provided in response to the previous questions?

B. Information in the following categories is particularly useful:

(1) Chronology of actions leading to the adoption and implementation of the measure.

(2) Chronology of any consultations between U.S. traders or U.S government representatives and the government applying the measure in question.

(3) Any available documentation of the specific requirements imposed under the measure and of the health justification identified by the government applying the measure.

(4) A technical summary of any available scientific evidence which calls into question the scientific basis for the measure.

[FR Doc. 98–29990 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Satellite Operational Implementation Team (SOIT) Hosted Forum on the Capabilities of the Global Positioning System (GPS)/Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS) and Local Area Augmentation System (LAAS)

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The FAA SOIT will be hosting a public forum to discuss the FAA's GPS approvals and WAAS/LAAS operational implementation plans. This meeting will be held in conjunction with a regularly scheduled meeting of the FAA SOIT and in response to aviation industry requests to the FAA Administrator. Formal presentations by the FAA will be followed by a question and answer session. Those planning to attend are invited to submit proposed discussion topics. Requests to make presentations to the assembled forum should be made to the point of contact listed.

DATES: November 16–17, 1998, 9 a.m.–5 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Holiday Inn Fair Oaks Hotel, 11787 Lee Jackson Memorial Highway, Fairfax, VA 22033, adjacent to the Fair Oaks Mall.

POINT OF CONTACT: Registration, submission of suggested discussion topics and requests to make presentations may be made to Mr. Steven Albers, phone (202) 267–7301, fax (202) 267–5086, or e-mail at steven.albers@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Open to the aviation industry with attendance limited to space available. Participants are requested to register their intent to attend this meeting by October 30, 1998. Names, affiliations, telephone and facsimile numbers should be sent to the point of contact listed.

Dated: September 22, 1998.

Hank Cabler,

SOIT Co-Chairman.

[FR Doc. 98–29950 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

Notice of Application for Approval of Discontinuance or Modification of a Railroad Signal System or Relief From the Requirements of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations Part 236

Pursuant to Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 235 and 49 U.S.C. App. 26, the following railroads have petitioned the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) seeking approval for the discontinuance or modification of the signal system or relief from the requirements of 49 CFR Part 236 as detailed below.

Docket No. FRA–1998–4694

Block Signal Application (BS–AP)–No. 3484

Applicant: CSX Transportation, Incorporated, Mr. R.M. Kadlick, Chief Engineer Train Control, 500 Water Street (S/C J–350), Jacksonville, Florida 32202

CSX Transportation Incorporated seeks approval of the proposed modification of the traffic control system, on the two main tracks, at South Yard, milepost S–1.7, Richmond, Virginia, on the Bellwood Subdivision, Florence Service Lane, consisting of the conversion of the power-operated crossover to hand operation equipped with an electric locked turnout, and the discontinuance and removal of absolute controlled signals L10, R10, L14, and R14.

The reason given for the proposed changes is that present day traffic does not warrant the retention of the remote controlled location.

Docket No. FRA–1998–4695

BS–AP–No. 3485

Applicant: Port of Pend Oreille, dba Pend Oreille Valley Railroad, Mr. Clifford G. Robbins, Port Operations Manager, 1981 Black Road, Usk, Washington 99180

Port of Pend Oreille, dba Pend Oreille Valley Railroad seeks approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of all slide detectors and indicators, on the former Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company's Newport Branch, between Dover, Idaho, milepost 1406 and Newport, Washington, milepost 1431, at five separate locations. The proposed changes include the installation of permanent ''restricted speed'' signs at proper locations.

The reasons given for the proposed changes are: the lack and prohibitive installation costs of A.C. power, replacement and disposal costs of primary batteries every 18 months, high vandalism rates, and to facilitate the cleaning of debris from the ditches.

Docket No. FRA–1998–4696

BS–AP–No. 3486

Applicant: Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company, Mr. William G. Peterson, Director Signal Engineering, 4515 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66106

Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway seeks approval of the proposed retirement of Tower 16 Interlocking, milepost 645.6, and the approximately 400-foot reduction of the traffic control system limits, on the single main track,