

Commissioners—as long as all conflict of interest requirements are followed and the process meets Corporation standards as described in the State administrative application guidelines. Commissioners can participate in the review and recommendation processes and as the decision-makers after staff have prepared their recommendations.

B. *Renewal Applications.*—States have the option to renew programs that have completed only one or two years of operation under funding from the Corporation. Those that have received three years of funding from the Corporation must apply as new programs. The process for evaluating the program's progress and plans for the upcoming year has not change from that followed in 1996 and described above in section IV.

C. *New Applications.*—Each state must develop a process that uses groups of experts to evaluate the comparable quality of all the applications received. The experts can either be outsiders to the Commission or members of the staff and board or a combination of these individuals. Each state must use the minimum criteria issued by the Corporation to evaluate the quality of the applications as described in Section III, but may add other criteria determined by the State.

Once comparable quality has been established, the results of that review are analyzed by the commission and recommendations submitted to the commission board for decisions. During this process, the commission may bring into the selection process additional factors that the state Commission Board and staff have approved and previously published in the state's application guidelines. Examples of such factors are:

- Geographic diversity
- Program model diversity
- Member diversity
- Preferences and priorities
- Diversity among priorities and issue areas

D. *Corporation Review of Competitive Applications.*—As mandated by the Act, the Corporation is responsible for making decisions concerning competitive programs. Therefore, it must conduct a complete quality review of the AmeriCorps State Competitive program applications submitted by the states. The Corporation will convene panels of outside experts to evaluate the quality of these applications. Staff will analyze the panel results, then make recommendations for funding, taking into consideration other preferences and priorities published in the application guidelines or mandated by statute. The Corporation will consider factors such as:

- Capacity of the state commission to monitor and oversee programs
- Geographic diversity across the country
- Program model diversity
- Member diversity
- Diversity among priorities and issue areas

The capacity of State Commissions will be evaluated according to the criteria published in the Guidelines for State Administrative Fund Applications.

VI. AmeriCorps National and AmeriCorps Tribes and Territories Review Process

The National Direct applications will come directly to the Corporation and the Corporation will conduct both a peer review (using outside experts to

determine comparable quality using criteria listed above) and a staff analysis and recommendation process identical to the process describe above for the States.

Dated: July 31, 1996.

Deborah Jospin,

Acting General Counsel, Corporation for National and Community Service.

[FR Doc. 96-19874 Filed 8-5-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6050-28-P-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Transmittal No. 96-59]

36(b) Notification

AGENCY: Defense Security Assistance Agency, Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense is publishing the unclassified text of a section 36(b) arms sales notification. This is published to fulfill the requirements of section 155 of Public Law 104-164 dated 21 July 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. A. Urban, DSAA/COMPT/FPD, (703) 604-6575.

The following is a copy of the letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Transmittal 96-59, with attached transmittal and policy justification pages.

Dated: July 31, 1996.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M



DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY

WASHINGTON, DC 20301-2800

23 JUL 1996

In reply refer to:
I-04234/96ct

Honorable Newt Gingrich
Speaker of the House of
Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515-6501

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 96-59, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Japan for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$200 million. Soon after this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to notify the news media.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Thomas G. Rhame".

Thomas G. Rhame
Lieutenant General, USA
Director

Attachments

Same ltr to: House Committee on International Relations
Senate Committee on Appropriations
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
House Committee on National Security
Senate Committee on Armed Services
House Committee on Appropriations

Transmittal No. 96-59

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer
Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1)
of the Arms Export Control Act

- (i) Prospective Purchaser: Japan
- (ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment*	\$ 0 million
Other	<u>\$200 million</u>
TOTAL	\$200 million
- (iii) Description of Articles or Services Offered:
Logistics support for the 767 AWACS aircraft to include test sets and ground support equipment, maintenance of system software and related services, spare and repair parts, publications and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor technical and logistics services, and other related elements of program support.
- (iv) Military Department: Air Force (QBI, QBP, QBJ, GHT, JAF, and JAG)
- (v) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None
- (vi) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold:
None
- (vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: 23 JUL 1996

as defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATIONJapan - Logistics Support for the 767 AWACS Aircraft

The Government of Japan has requested the purchase of logistics support for the 767 AWACS aircraft to include test sets and ground support equipment, maintenance of system software and related services, spare and repair parts, publications and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor technical and logistics services, and other related elements of program support. The estimated cost is \$200 million.

This sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country which has been and continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in Asia.

Japan previously purchased four AWACS aircraft and needs this logistics support to help maintain the operational readiness of its extended Airborne Early Warning (AEW) and command, control and communications (C3) systems. Japan will have no difficulty absorbing this logistics support into its armed forces.

The sale of the logistics support services and equipment will not affect the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor is the Boeing Aerospace Company, Seattle, Washington. There are no offset agreements proposed to be entered into in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this sale will require the assignment of six U.S. Government personnel and six contractor representatives to Japan for periods ranging from three years up to five years.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this sale.