adhere to the guidelines stated herein and in the Solicitation Package. The program office and the Public Diplomacy section at the U.S. Embassy will review all eligible proposals. Other Embassy elements may be asked to review proposals as well. Eligible proposals will be subject to compliance with Federal and Bureau regulations and guidelines and forwarded to Bureau grant panels for advisory review. Proposals may also be reviewed by the Office of the Legal Advisor or by other Department elements. Final funding decisions are at the discretion of the Department of State's Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, pending availability of FY04 funds. Final technical authority for grants resides with the Bureau's 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. Quality of the Program Idea: Proposals should be substantive, well thought out, focused on issues of demonstrable relevance to all proposed participants, and responsive, in general, to the exchanges suggestions and guidelines described above.

2. Implementation Plan and Ability to Achieve Objectives: A detailed project implementation plan should establish a clear and logical connection between the interest, the expertise, and the logistical capacity of the applicant and the objectives to be achieved. The proposal should discuss, in concrete terms, how the institution plans to achieve the objectives. Institutional resources—including personnel—assigned to the project should be adequate and appropriate. The substance of workshops and site visits should be included as an attachment, and the responsibilities of the U.S. participants and in-country partners should be clearly described.

3. Institution's Record/Ability: Proposals should include an institutional record of successful exchange programs, with reference to responsible fiscal management and full compliance with reporting requirements. The Bureau will consider the demonstrated potential of new applicants and will evaluate the performance record of prior recipients of Bureau grants as reported by the Bureau grant staff.

4. Follow-On Activities: Proposals should provide a plan for sustained follow-on activity, building on the linkages developed under the grant and the activities initially funded by the grant. Follow-on activities should continue after grant funds have been expended, ensuring that Bureau-supported projects are not isolated events.

5. Project Evaluation and Monitoring: Proposals must include a plan and methodology to evaluate the program's successes and challenges. In general, evaluation should be ongoing and evolving throughout the duration of the project. The evaluation plan will incorporate an assessment of the program from a variety of perspectives. Specifically, project assessment efforts will focus on: (a) Determining if objectives are being met or have been met, (b) identifying any unmet needs, and (c) assessing if the project has effectively discovered resources, advocates, and financial support for sustainability of future projects. Informal evaluation through discussions and other sources of feedback will be carried out throughout the duration of the project. Formal evaluation will be conducted at the end of each phase, using instruments designed specifically to measure the impact of the activities and should obtain participants' feedback and comments on the program content and administration. A draft questionnaire for evaluation purposes may be attached to support the proposal. A detailed evaluation should be conducted at the conclusion of the project and the report will be submitted to the Department of State Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. When possible, the evaluation should be done by an independent evaluator.

6. Impact: Proposed projects should, through the establishment of substantive, sustainable individual and institutional linkages and the encouragement of maximum exchange of information, enhance communities and societies.

7. Cost Effectiveness and Cost Sharing: Administrative costs should be kept to a minimum. Proposals should maximize cost sharing through support and in-kind contributions from the U.S. and partner organization(s).

8. Support of Diversity: Proposals should demonstrate substantive support of ECA's policy on diversity. Program content (orientation, evaluation, program sessions, resource materials, follow-on activities) and program administration (selection, orientation, evaluation) should address diversity in a comprehensive and relevant manner. Applicants should refer to ECA's Diversity, Freedom, and Democracy Guidelines on page four of the Proposal Submission Instructions.

Notice

The terms and conditions published in this RFGP are binding and may not be modified by any Bureau representative. Explanatory information provided by the Bureau or program officers that contradicts published language will not be binding. Issuance of the RFGP does not constitute an award commitment on the part of the U.S. Government. The Bureau reserves the right to reduce, revise, or increase proposal budgets in accordance with the needs of the program and the availability of funds. Awards made will be subject to periodic reporting and evaluation requirements. Organizations will be expected to cooperate with the Bureau in evaluating their programs under the principles of the GovernmentPerformance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993, which requires federal agencies to measure and report on the results of their programs and activities.

Notification

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

Dated: June 5, 2003.

C. Miller Crouch,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 03–15528 Filed 6–18–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Advisory Circular 23–15A, Small Airplane Certification Compliance Program

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of availability of proposed advisory circular (AC) and request for comments.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the availability of and requests comments on a proposed AC. Proposed AC 23–15A provides information and guidance concerning an acceptable means, but not the only means, of compliance with various sections of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) part 23 that have become burdensome for small, simple, low performance airplanes. However, applicability of these means of compliance remains the responsibility of the certification manager for each specific project. Utilization of these means of

compliance does not affect the applicability of any other certification requirements that fall outside the scope of this AC. Material in the AC is neither mandatory nor regulatory in nature and does not constitute a regulation.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 18, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Send all comments on the proposed AC to: Federal Aviation Administration, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, Regulations and Policy (ACE–111), 901 Locust Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Mark James, Standards Office, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, Kansas City, Missouri 64106, telephone (816) 329–4137, fax (816) 329–4090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Any person may obtain a copy of this proposed AC by contacting the person named above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.** A copy of the AC will also be available on the Internet at *http://www.airweb.faa.gov/AC* within a few days.

Comments Invited

We invite interested parties to submit comments on the proposed AC. Commenters must identify AC 23–15A and submit comments to the address specified above. The FAA will consider all communications received on or before the closing date for comments before issuing the final AC. The proposed AC and comments received may be inspected at the Standards Office (ACE–110), 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri, between the hours of 8:30 and 4 p.m. weekdays, except Federal holidays by making an appointment in advance with the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

Background

AC 23–15A, Small Airplane Certification Compliance Program replacedAC 23–15, Small Airplane Certification Compliance Program, dated January 2, 1997.

Some industry and aviation organizations expressed concern that the typical means of compliance for some regulations might be more demanding than justified. As a consequence, industry, aviation groups, and the FAA formed a team to study this issue. Historical files, Designated Engineering Representatives (DER's), ACO's, and industry were used to determine target regulations and provide known means of compliance. This AC is a compilation of the study results, listing the regulations and attendant means of compliance that offer an improvement in certification efficiency. The listed means of compliance have been found acceptable and historically successful, but they are not the only methods that can be used to show compliance. In some cases, highly sophisticated airplanes may require more accurate or substantial solutions. Accordingly, the FAA is proposing and requesting comments on AC 23–15A.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri on May 28, 2003.

James E. Jackson,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Office.

[FR Doc. 03–15139 Filed 6–18–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Weight and Balance Control Program Committee; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of request for participation; correction.

SUMMARY: This document makes corrections to the notice of request of participation published in the **Federal Register** on May 28, 2003 (68 FR 31740), which announces the formation of the Weight and Balance Control Program Aviation Rulemaking Committee to conduct a review of AC 120–27C and other related guidance, and provide advice and recommendations.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Darcy Reed, 202–267–9948, or e-mail: *Darch.D.Reed@faa.gov.*

Correction

In the notice FR Doc. 03–13243, published on May 28, 2003 (68 FR 31740), make the following correction:

On page 31741, in the first column, first full paragraph, line one, correct ''scheduled for June 24 and 25, 2003 in Washington, DC'' to read ''has been rescheduled; details on the meeting are available at *http://www.faa.gov/avr/afs/avgarc/*.''

Dated: Issued in Washington, DC on June 13, 2003.

David E. Cann,

Manager, Aircraft Maintenance Division, Flight Standards Service.

[FR Doc. 03–15527 Filed 6–18–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Anne Arundel County, MD and Prince George's County, MD

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for a proposed highway project in Anne Arundel County and Prince George's County, Maryland.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Nelson J. Castellanos, Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, The Rotunda-Suite 220, 711 West 40th Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21211. Telephone (410) 962–4440.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Maryland State Highway Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on a proposal to improve transportation operations and mobility to MD 3 from north of US 50 to south of MD 32, in southwestern Anne Arundel County and northeastern Prince George's County. The proposed improvements will address existing and projected operational and safety issues for local traffic along MD 3 from north of US 50 to south of MD 32.

Congested traffic flow, inadequate intersections and crossings, increased residential and commercial development, and insufficient bicycle/pedestrian safety have accelerated the need for improvements to MD 3 within the study area. Several sections of roadway within the project limits are currently failing or experiencing failing conditions during the afternoon peak hours.

The alternates under consideration include (1) a no-build alternate; (2) a boulevard concept with interchange options; and (3) a modified boulevard concept with interchange options.

Coordination will continue with Federal, State, and local agencies, and with private organizations and citizens who have expressed interest. A Focus Group, comprised of local residents, community leaders, and business owners, meets periodically with the project engineers to assist in the development of the proposed alternates of improvements along MD 3, the interchanges and nearby intersections,