

Narrative" sections of the proposal on a 3.5" diskette, formatted for DOS. These documents must be provided in ASCII text (DOS) format with a maximum line length of 65 characters. ECA will transmit these files electronically to Public Affairs Sections at U.S. Embassies in the NIS for review, with the goal of reducing the time it takes to obtain embassy comments for ECA's grants review process.

Diversity, Freedom and Democracy Guidelines: Pursuant to ECA's authorizing legislation, programs must maintain a non-political character and should be balanced and representative of the diversity of American political, social, and cultural life. "Diversity" should be interpreted in the broadest sense and encompass differences including, but not limited to, ethnicity, race, gender, religion, geographic location, socio-economic status, and physical challenges. Applicants are strongly encouraged to adhere to the advancement of this principle both in program administration and in program content. Please refer to the review criteria under the "Support for Diversity" section for specific suggestions on incorporating diversity into the total proposal. Public Law 104-319 provides that "in carrying out programs of educational and cultural exchange in countries whose people do not fully enjoy freedom and democracy," ECA "shall take appropriate steps to provide opportunities for participation in such programs to human rights and democracy leaders of such countries." Public Law 106-113 requires that the governments of the countries described above do not have inappropriate influence in the selection process. Proposals should reflect advancement of these goals, to the full extent deemed feasible.

Review Process: ECA will acknowledge receipt of all proposals and will review them for technical eligibility. Proposals will be deemed ineligible if they do not fully adhere to the guidelines stated herein and in the Solicitation Package. The Program Office, as well as the Public Affairs Sections overseas, where appropriate, will review all eligible proposals. Eligible proposals will be subject to compliance with Federal and ECA regulations and guidelines and forwarded to ECA grant panels for advisory review. Proposals may also be reviewed by the Office of the Legal Adviser or by other Department elements. Final funding decisions are at the discretion of the Department of State's Acting Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs. Final

technical authority for assistance awards (grants or cooperative agreements) resides with an ECA Grants Officer.

Review Criteria: Technically eligible applications will be competitively reviewed according to the criteria stated below. These criteria are not rank ordered and all carry equal weight in the proposal evaluation:

1. *Program Development:* The proposal should exhibit originality, substance, precision, and relevance to ECA's mission. Objectives should be reasonable, feasible, and flexible. A detailed and relevant work plan should demonstrate substantive understanding of program goals and logistical capacity.

2. *Institutional Capacity:* Proposed personnel and institutional resources should be adequate and appropriate to achieve the program's goals. The proposal should demonstrate an institutional record of successful exchange programs, including responsible fiscal management and full compliance with all reporting requirements for past ECA grants. ECA will consider the past performance of prior recipients and the demonstrated potential of new applicants.

3. *Multiplier Effect:* The program should strengthen long-term mutual understanding, including maximum sharing of information and establishment of long-term institutional and individual linkages.

4. *Support of Diversity:* The proposal should demonstrate the applicant organization's commitment to promoting the awareness and understanding of diversity through participant recruitment efforts, the selection of U.S. host institutions, and other measures.

5. *Follow-on and Alumni Activities:* The proposal should provide a plan for continued activity which ensures that ECA-supported programs are not isolated events, but have meaning and scope beyond the time the actual exchange took place.

6. *Project Evaluation:* The proposal should include plans to evaluate the program's success, both during and after the program.

7. *Cost-effectiveness:* The overhead and administrative components of the proposal, including salaries and honoraria, should be kept as low as possible. All other items should be necessary and appropriate.

8. *Cost-sharing:* The proposal should maximize cost sharing through private sector support as well as institutional direct funding contributions.

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

Exchange Act of 1961, Public Law 87-256, as amended, also known as the Fulbright-Hays Act. The purpose of the Act is "to enable the Government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries * * *; to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States and other nations * * * and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world." The funding authority for the program above is provided principally through FREEDOM Support Act legislation.

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

Notification

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

Dated: June 5, 2001.

Helena Kane Finn,

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

[FR Doc. 01-15052 Filed 6-13-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-05-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee Meeting on Transport Airplane and Engine Issues

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice announces a public meeting of the FAA's Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) to discuss transport airplane and engine (TAE) issues.

DATES: The meeting is scheduled for June 26-27, 2001, beginning at 8:30 a.m.

on June 26. Arrange for oral presentations by June 22.

ADDRESSES: Boeing Commercial Airplane Group, 535 Garden Avenue, N., Building 10-16, Room 11G4, Renton, WA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Effie M. Upshaw, Office of Rulemaking ARM-209, FAA, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, Telephone (202) 267-7626, FAX (202) 267-5075, or e-mail at effie.upshaw@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463; 5 U.S.C. app. III), notice is given of an ARAC meeting to be held June 27-28, in Renton, WA.

The agenda will include:

June 26

- Opening Remarks
- FAA Report
- Joint Aviation Authorities Report
- Transport Canada Report
- Harmonization Management Team Report
- Executive Committee Report
- Human Factors Harmonization Working Group (HWG) Report
- Seat Test HWG Report
- Design for Security HWG Report
- Ice Protection HWG Report
- Engine HWG Report
- Continued Airworthiness Assessment Methodology Working Group Report
- Flight Test HWG Report
- Electromagnetic Effects HWG Report
- Powerplant Installation HWG Report
- Mechanical Systems HWG Report
- Cargo Standard HWG Report

June 27

- General Structures HWG Report
- Airworthiness Assurance HWG Report
- Extended Range with Two-Engine Aircraft Tasking Update
- Loads & Dynamics HWG Report
- Flight Guidance System HWG Report
- System Design and Analysis HWG Report
- Avionics Systems HWG Report
- Electrical Systems HWG Report

The ARAC is expected to approve the following submittals for forwarding to the FAA:

- Recommendations addressing installation of a primary ice detection systems, or visual cues for recognizing ice accretion on specified airplane surfaces (Ice Protection HWG);
- Recommendation revising the Class B cargo compartments and establishing standards for a new Class F cargo compartment; and
- Technical reports drafted under the fast track process by the Human

Factors, Loads and Dynamics, Mechanical Systems, and Avionics Systems HWG's.

Additionally, there will be a discussion/review of FAA-prepared documents that evolved from technical reports prepared by the System Design and Analysis HWG under the fast track process.

Attendance is open to the public, but will be limited to the space available. Visitor badges are required to enter Boeing Building 10-16. Please confirm your attendance with Norm Turner, (425) 234-3312, or by e-mail—norman.g.turner@Boeing.com.—and provide the following information: full legal name, country of citizenship, and company that you represent, if applicable. Please arrive 15 minutes early to avoid any problems with parking or badges.

The public must make arrangements by June 22 to present oral statements at the meeting. Written statements may be presented to the committee at any time by providing 25 copies to the Assistant Executive Director for Transport Airplane and Engine issues or by providing copies at the meeting. Copies of the documents to be approved may be made available by contacting the person listed under the heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

If you are in need of assistance or require a reasonable accommodation for the meeting or meeting documents, please contact the person listed under the heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. Sign and oral interpretation, as well as a listening device, can be made available if requested 10 calendar days before the meeting.

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 6, 2001.

Brenda Courtney,

Acting Director, Office of Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 01-15163 Filed 6-12-01; 2:26 pm]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Policy Statement Number ANM-01-02]

FAA Policy on Type Certification Assessment of Thrust Management Systems

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of policy statement; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This notice announces an FAA policy applicable to the type certification of transport category airplanes. This notice advises the

public, in particular manufacturers of transport category airplanes and their suppliers, that the FAA intends to adopt a new policy concerning the type certification assessment of thrust management systems. This notice is necessary to advise the public of this FAA policy and give all interested persons an opportunity to present their views on it.

DATE: Send your comments by July 16, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Send all comments on this policy statement to the individual identified under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mike McRae, Federal Aviation Administration, Transport Airplane Directorate, Transport Standards Staff, Propulsion/Mechanical Systems Branch, ANM-112, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA 98055-4056; telephone (425) 227-2133; fax (425) 227-1320; e-mail: mike.mcrae@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

You may comment on this policy statement by sending any written data, views, or arguments as you may desire. You must identify the Policy Statement Number ANM-01-02 on your comments, and send your comments, in duplicate, to the address indicated above. The Transport Airplane Directorate (Transport Standards Staff) will consider all communications received on or before the closing date for comments.

Background

The FAA traditionally has certified automated thrust management features, such as autothrottles and "target rating" displays, on the basis that they are only conveniences to reduce crew workload and do not relieve the crew of any responsibility for assuring proper thrust management. Consequently, even when the crew is no longer directly involved in performing a given thrust management function, they must be "aware" when this function is not being performed safely. Further, when they do become "aware" of any thrust management malfunction, they must be capable of taking appropriate corrective action to safely address that malfunction.

For most thrust management systems (TMS) that the FAA has certified to date, this crew "awareness" has been accepted as coming from:

a. Inherent aircraft operational cues (for example, failure of the throttles to properly respond to an autothrottle command is usually assumed to be