Royal Caribbean Cruises Ltd. and Radiance of the Seas Inc.
1050 Caribbean Way
Miami, FL 33132–2096
Vessel: RADIANCE OF THE SEAS

Royal Caribbean Cruises Ltd. and Sunshine Cruises Limited
1050 Caribbean Way
Miami, FL 33132–2096
Vessel: VIKING SERENADE

Royal Olympic Cruises Ltd., RO Cruises Inc. and Olympic World Cruises Inc.
805 3rd Avenue, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10022
Vessel: OLYMPIC VOYAGER

Silversea Cruises, Ltd. and Silversea New Build One Ltd.
110 East Broward Blvd.
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
Vessel: SILVER SHADOW

World Explorer Cruises, Inc., Azure Investments, Inc., Institute for Shipboard Education, Inc., and Seawise Foundation, Inc.
555 Montgomery Street, #1412
San Francisco, CA 94111–2544
Vessel: UNIVERSE EXPLORER

Dated: March 23, 2001.

Bryant L. VanBrakle,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–7686 Filed 3–28–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Ocean Transportation Intermediary License; Revocations

The Federal Maritime Commission hereby gives notice that the following Ocean Transportation Intermediary licenses have been revoked pursuant to section 19 of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 U.S.C. app. 1718) and the regulations of the Commission pertaining to the licensing of Ocean Transportation Intermediaries, effective on the corresponding dates shown below:

License Number: 3777.
Name: J.G. International Freight Forwarding, Inc.
Address: 9949 N.W. 89th Avenue, Bay 17 and 18, Medley, FL 33178.
Date Revoked: May 6, 1999.
Reason: Failed to maintain a valid bond.

License Number: 11591NF.
Name: United Van Lines, Inc.
Address: One United Drive, Fenton, MO 63026.
Date Revoked: January 23, 2001.
Reason: Surrendered license voluntarily.

Sandra L. Kusumoto,

Director, Bureau of Consumer Complaints and Licensing.

[FR Doc. 01–7687 Filed 3–28–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Ocean Transportation Intermediary License; Reissuances

Notice is hereby given that the following Ocean Transportation Intermediary licenses have been reissued by the Federal Maritime Commission pursuant to section 19 of the Shipping Act of 1984, as amended by the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 1998 (46 U.S.C. app. 1718) and the regulations of the Commission pertaining to the licensing of Ocean Transportation Intermediaries, 46 CFR 515.

License No.	Name/Address	Date Reissued
4444N	Lloyd International, Inc., 931 Main Street, Norwell, MA 02061	January 10, 2001.
16562F	U.S. Brokers (BOS) Inc., 331–333 Northern Avenue, Boston, MA 02210	January 18, 2001.
15917N	Golden Jet-L.A., Inc., dba Golden Jet Freight Forwarders, 12333 S. Van Ness Avenue, Suite 201, Hawthorne, CA 90250.	January 14, 2001.
2023F	Pike Shipping Co., Inc., 2 Canal Street, 22nd Floor, New Orleans, LA 70130	January 30, 2001.

Sandra L. Kusumoto,

Director, Bureau of Consumer Complaints and Licensing.

[FR Doc. 01–7688 Filed 3–28–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–P

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Public Workshop: Emerging Issues for Competition Policy in the World of E-Commerce

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice announcing workshop.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission (''FTC'' or ''Commission'') will hold a public workshop on May 7 and 8, 2001, to examine selected competition policy issues that arise in connection with business-to-business (''B2B'') and business-to-consumer (''B2C'') electronic commerce. Interested parties are invited to attend or to submit written presentations.

DATES: The workshop will be held on May 7 and 8, 2001. It will be open to the public, without fee, and advance registration is not required. Seats in the workshop room will be available on a first-come, first-served basis; some overflow seating will be available. Written presentations may be submitted through May 21, 2001.

ADDRESSES: The workshop will be held in Room 432 of the Federal Trade Commission Headquarters Building, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. Any interested person may submit a written presentation that will be considered part of the public record of the workshop. Written presentations should be submitted in both hard copy and electronic form. Six hard copies of each submission should be addressed to Donald S. Clark, Office of the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580. Submissions should be captioned ''Comments regarding E-Commerce Antitrust Issues.'' Electronic submissions may be sent by electronic mail to ecommerce@ftc.gov. Alternatively, electronic submission may be filed on a 3½ inch computer disk with a label on the disk stating the name of the submitter and the name and version of the word processing program used to create the document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To obtain information about the workshop, please contact Gail Levine, Assistant Director for Policy Planning, Federal Trade Commission, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580, telephone (202) 326–3193, e-mail glevine@ftc.gov. A detailed agenda and additional information relating to the workshop will be posted on the Commission's web site, www.ftc.gov/opp/ecommerce, in advance of the workshop.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Overview

In June 2000, the FTC held a public workshop on B2Bs entitled ''Competition Policy in the World of B2B Electronic Marketplaces.''In October 2000, FTC staff issued a report, available at www.ftc.gov/bc/b2b/index.htm, that summarized the workshop and laid the foundation for understanding how to answer traditional antitrust questions in the context of new B2B technology.

The May 2001 workshop will build upon and extend that foundation. It will be divided into two sessions. The May 7 session will invite antitrust practitioners, economists, and business representatives to examine B2B mergers, interoperability, and operating rules against the background of specific hypotheticals. The goal is to elicit more detail about varying approaches to competition issues that may be raised by B2Bs and to analyze certain issues not addressed at the June 2000 workshop. Among other things, the hypotheticals will invite discussion of competitive effects of mergers and acquisitions among B2Bs and exchange-to-exchange interoperability. The hypotheticals will be available at www.ftc.gov/opp/ecommerce before the workshop.

The May 8 session redirects the focus to selected competition issues that are beginning to emerge in B2C contexts. Rather than debating familiar, long-standing issues, the session will focus on new fact patterns and selected competition policy issues that may arise in distribution and marketing over the Internet, in conjunction with or in comparison to offline commerce. It will explore such issues as price and promotional coordination between online and offline distribution channels, sole online distributorships, exclusive dealing over the Internet, and the role of information-collection technologies in online distribution. The goals will be to gain a better understanding of online distribution and marketing competition and to begin to develop a framework for assessing antitrust issues arising in those contexts.

A transcript of the discussions at the workshop will be publicly available after the workshop at www.ftc.gov/opp/ecommerce.

Specific Questions To Be Addressed

May 7 Session: B2B Mergers, Interoperability, and Operating Rules

The hypotheticals will raise competition issues involving B2Bs, including the following:

Mergers

What is the relevant market for purposes of analyzing the effects of a merger of B2Bs on competition in offering marketplace services? The market for online marketplaces? The market for marketplaces, whether online or offline? Another market? What facts are needed to address these questions?

Who are participants in the relevant market? Is entry likely? What facts are needed to address these questions?

What are likely adverse competitive effects of a merger of B2Bs in the market for marketplaces? In the market(s) for goods traded on B2Bs (or for the goods derived from them)? What facts are needed to address these questions?

What efficiencies are likely to be accomplished with a merger of B2Bs? Are the supply-side or demand-side scale economies to be gained through such a merger? Are these merger-specific efficiencies, or are there practical alternatives, in the business situation faced by the merging B2Bs, that could mitigate competitive concerns? What facts are needed to address these questions?

How, if at all, do the financial pressures faced by B2Bs today effect the analysis? What additional facts are needed to address this issue?

Interoperability

How does interoperability among B2Bs work, as a practical matter? Do interoperable B2Bs share fees or other resources?

What factors are relevant to ascertaining the likely effect of an interoperability agreement on the ability and incentive of B2Bs to compete? How does an interoperability agreement affect incentives to lower price, increase quality and service, and innovate?

What are the procompetitive benefits of interoperability agreements? What factors are relevant to this analysis?

Operating Practices

What B2B information-sharing practices may facilitate collusion? What safeguards could—or should—be erected to avoid such collusion. Which safeguards are most effective? Are there practical problems with implementation of certain safeguards? Do some types of safeguards interfere with the achievement of efficiencies? If so, why and in what circumstances? What are reasonable audit mechanisms for ensuring that safeguards are actually working?

How can efficient joint purchasing be distinguished from the improper exercise of monopsony power in a B2B? What factors are relevant to this analysis?

What B2B practices have the potential to harm competition by excluding competitors? What are the countervailing efficiencies of such parties?

May 8 Session: Online Distribution and Marketing

What are the benefits of online distribution and marketing (''online distribution'') to manufacturers and traditional offline retailers? What are the costs of setting up an online distribution system? What problems do moderately-sized manufacturers or retailers face in developing online distribution systems?

How have relationships been structured between manufacturers or offline retailers, on the one hand, and online distributors, on the other? What factors determine whether the online distributor is fully or partially owned by a manufacturer or offline retailer? What factors determine whether an online distributor is set up as competitor collaboration? What factors affect whether the online distributor is established as a principal or agent?

How have online distributors and the manufacturers they serve coordinated their marketing efforts? How have offline distributors and their associated, online counterparts coordinated their marketing activities? Under what circumstances have they coordinated pricing, advertising, or advertised pricing? Under what circumstances have they allocated business opportunities? What are the justifications for coordination? What are the relevant competition issues? How should dual distribution in these contexts be assessed?

Under what circumstances have manufacturers prohibited online distribution of their products or confined it to specific web-sites? What are the business justifications? How have the limitations been enforced? What are the relevant competition issues?

Under what circumstances have manufacturers contracted with Internet service providers or search engines for exclusive or preferential treatment of a manufacturer's products? Under what circumstances have manufacturers contracted with online retailers for exclusive or preferential treatment of a manufacturer's products? What are the efficiencies associated with such practices? What factors are relevant to determining whether such exclusive or preferential arrangements are likely to cause anticompetitive harm? How do efficiencies and other factors differ between online and offline distribution?

What steps have offline distributors taken in opposing online distribution? Have joint activities been involved? What is the role of state law? What are the relevant competition issues?

To what extent are shopbots or other information-collection technologies used to gather data from online distribution systems? What are the likely benefits of such technologies? Have on-line distributors limited access such technologies to their data? How? What are the business justifications for such limitations? What are the relevant competition issues?

The Commission welcomes suggestions for other questions that also should be addressed. Proposed questions, identified as such, may be sent by electronic mail to ecommerce@ftc.gov.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–7784 Filed 3–28–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[File No. 001 0067]

DTE Energy Company, et al.; Analysis to Aid Public Comment

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Proposed consent agreement.

SUMMARY: The consent agreement in this matter settles alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition. The attached Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes both the allegations in the complaint that accompanies the consent agreement and the terms of the consent order—embodied in the consent agreement—that would settle these allegations.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 23, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20580.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dennis Johnson, FTC/S–2105, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20580. (202) 326–2712.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46 and § 2.34 of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 2.34), notice is hereby given that the above-captioned agreement containing a consent order to cease and desist, having been filed with and accepted by the Commission, has been placed on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days. The following Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes the terms of the consent agreement, and the allegations in the complaint. An electronic copy of the full text of the consent agreement package can be obtained from the FTC Home Page (for March 22, 2001), on the World Wide Web, at ''*http://www.ftc.gov/os/2001/03/index.htm*.'' A paper copy can be obtained from the FTC Public Reference Room, Room H–130, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580, either in person or by calling (202) 326–3627.

Public comment is invited. Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20580. Two paper copies of each comment should be filed, and should be accompanied, if possible, by a 3½ inch diskette containing an electronic copy of the comment. Such comments or views will be considered by the Commission and will be available for inspection and copying at its principal office in accordance with § 4.9(b)(6)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 4.9(b)(6)(ii)).

Analysis of the Proposed Consent Order and Draft Complaint To Aid Public Comment

I. Introduction

The Federal Trade Commission (''Commission'') has accepted for public comment from DTE Energy Company (''DTE'') and MCN Energy Group Inc. (''MCN'') (collectively the ''proposed Respondents'') an Agreement Containing Consent Order (the ''proposed consent order''). The proposed Respondents have also reviewed a draft complaint contemplated by the Commission. The proposed consent order is designed to remedy the anticompetitive effects that are described in the Commission's draft complaint and that are likely to arise from the merger of DTE and MCN.

II. Description of the Parties and the Proposed Acquisition

DTE, headquartered in Detroit, Michigan, is a holding company with subsidiaries engaged in various energy-related businesses. DTE's principal operating subsidiary, The Detroit Edison Company (''Edison''), is a public utility engaged in the generation, transmission, distribution, and sale of electricity in southeastern Michigan, including the Detroit metropolitan area.

MCN, also headquartered in Detroit, Michigan, is a diversified energy holding company, with its primary operations involved in the production, gathering, processing, transmission, storage, and distribution of natural gas. MCN is the parent of Michigan Consolidated Gas Company (''MichCon''), a natural gas utility serving areas throughout the State of Michigan, including southeastern Michigan. MichCon distributes natural gas, and Edison distributes electricity, in a portion of southeastern Michigan consisting of the city of Detroit and all or parts of Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, Washtenaw, and Wayne Counties (the ''Overlap Area'').

Pursuant to an Agreement and Plan of Merger dated October 4, 1999, and amended November 12, 1999, MCN plans to merge with a subsidiary of DTE. Each share of MCN common stock will be converted into the right to receive either $28.50 in cash or 0.775 shares of DTE common stock, subject to proration. The transaction is valued at approximately $2.6 billion in cash and stock, plus the assumption of approximately $2 billion in debt.

The Commission has carefully examined all areas in which the proposed merger of DTE and MCN might be anticompetitive. The Commission found that the transaction raises competitive concerns in the Overlap Area, as described in the draft complaint, and the Commission proposes to take action to remedy these potential anticompetitives effects.

III. The Draft Complaint

The draft complaint alleges that the merger of DTE and MCN would lessen competition in the local distribution of electricity and the local distribution of natural gas in the Overlap Area. According to the complaint, MichCon is the only distributor of natural gas within the Overlap Area. Similarly, except for the cities of Detroit and Wyandotte, which operate their own municipal electric utilities, Edison is the only distributor of electricity within the Overlap Area. Following the merger, Edison would effectively control the distribution of both electricity and natural gas within the Overlap Area.

According to the complaint, entry into the distribution of electricity and the distribution of natural gas within the Overlap Area is effectively blocked by regulatory constraints, and would not be timely, likely or sufficient to prevent anticompetitive effects that may result from the merger.

The draft complaint describes three ways in which the proposed merger would lessen competition. Each of these three ways is described below.

A. Self-Generation of Electricity

According to the complaint, natural gas is the fuel of choice for new electricity generation in the Overlap Area. Other fuels are not likely to be used for new electricity generation because of various disadvantages