

Additional information addressing the Y2K issue may be found at the General Services Administration's Office of Information Technology website at <http://www.itpolicy.gsa.gov>.

#### Review Process

The Bureau 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. All eligible proposals will be reviewed by the program office, as well as the U.S. Department of State's Office of the Senior Coordinator for the Newly Independent States and the public affairs offices of U.S. embassies overseas, where appropriate. Eligible proposals will be forwarded to panels of Bureau officers for advisory review. Proposals may also be reviewed by the Department of State, Office of the Legal Adviser or by other Bureau elements. Final funding decisions are at the discretion of the Department of State's Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs. Final technical authority for assistance awards (grants or cooperative agreements) 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 exhibit originality, substance, precision, and relevance to the Bureau's mission, and responsiveness to the objectives and guidelines stated in this solicitation. Proposals should demonstrate substantive experience in the social sciences and civic education.
2. **Program planning and ability to achieve program objectives:** Detailed agenda and relevant work plan should demonstrate substantive undertakings and logistical capacity. Agenda and plan should adhere to the program overview and guidelines described above. Objectives should be reasonable, feasible, and flexible. Proposals should clearly demonstrate how the institution will meet the program's objectives and plan.
3. **Multiplier effect/impact:** Proposed programs should strengthen long-term mutual understanding, including maximum sharing of information and establishment of long-term institutional and individual linkages.
4. **Support of Diversity:** Proposals should demonstrate substantive support of the Bureau's policy on diversity.

Achievable and relevant features should be cited in both program administration (selection of participants, program venue and program evaluation) and program content (orientation and wrap-up sessions, program meetings, resource materials and follow-up activities).

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

6. **Follow-on Activities:** Proposals should provide a plan for continued follow-on activity (without Bureau support) ensuring that Bureau supported programs are not isolated events.

7. **Project Evaluation:** Proposals should include a plan to evaluate the activity's success, both as the activities unfold and at the end of the program. A draft survey questionnaire or other technique plus description of a methodology to use to link outcomes to original project objectives are recommended. Successful applicants will be expected to submit intermediate reports after each project component is concluded or quarterly, whichever is less frequent.

8. **Cost-effectiveness/Cost-sharing:** 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. Proposals should maximize cost-sharing through other 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

through the Freedom for Russia and Emerging Eurasian Democracies and Open Markets Support Act of 1993 (Freedom Support Act).

#### Notice

The terms and conditions published in this RFP are binding and may not be modified by any Bureau representative. Explanatory information provided by the Bureau that contradicts published language will not be binding. Issuance of the RFP does not constitute an award commitment on the part of the 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.

#### Notification

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

Dated: December 1, 1999.

**Evelyn S. Lieberman,**

*Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 99-31967 Filed 12-8-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-45-U

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Proposed Advisory Circular; Damage Tolerance for High Energy Turbine Engine Rotors

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of proposed advisory circular and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the availability of draft Advisory Circular (AC), No. 33.14-1, Damage Tolerance for High Energy Turbine engine Rotors.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before January 10, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Send all comments on the proposed AC to the Federal Aviation Administration, Attn: Engine and Propeller Standards Staff, ANE-110, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803-5299.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tim Mouzakis, Engine and Propeller Standards Staff, ANE-110, at the above address, telephone (781) 238-7114, fax (781) 238-7199.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Comments Invited**

A copy of the draft AC may be obtained by contacting the person named under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. Interested persons are invited to comment on the proposed AC, and to submit such written data, views, or arguments as they desire. Comments must identify the subject of the AC, and submit comments to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered by the Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service, before issuance of the final AC.

**Background**

This advisory circular (AC) provides guidance and information on acceptable methods, but not the only methods of compliance with § 33.14 of the Federal Aviation Regulations, title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Section 33.14 contains requirements of life management requirements applicable to the design and life management of titanium alloy high energy rotating parts of aircraft engines. Although this AC does refer to regulatory requirements that are mandatory, this AC is not, in itself, mandatory. This AC neither changes any regulatory requirements nor authorizes changes in or deviations from the regulatory requirements.

This advisory circular would be published under the authority granted to the Administrator by 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701–44702, 44704 and would provide guidance for the requirements in 14 CFR part 33.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on December 2, 1999.

**Ronald L. Vavruska,**

*Acting Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 99–31981 Filed 12–8–99; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–M**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****National Highway Traffic Safety Administration****Annual List of Defect and Noncompliance Decisions Affecting Nonconforming Imported Vehicles**

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Annual list of defect and noncompliance decisions affecting nonconforming imported vehicles.

**SUMMARY:** This document contains a list of vehicles recalled by their manufacturers during Fiscal Year 1999 (October 1, 1998 through September 30, 1999) to correct a safety-related defect or a noncompliance with an applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standard (FMVSS). The listed vehicles are those that have been decided by NHTSA to be substantially similar to vehicles imported into the United States that were not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable FMVSS. The registered importers of those nonconforming vehicles are obligated to provide their owners with notification of, and a remedy for, the defects or noncompliances for which the listed vehicles were recalled.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** George Entwistle, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–5306).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards (FMVSS) shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle of the same model year that was originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115. Once NHTSA decides that a nonconforming vehicle is eligible for importation, it may be imported by a person who is registered with the agency pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30141(c). Before releasing the vehicle

for use on public streets, roads, or highways, the registered importer must certify to NHTSA, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30146(a), that the vehicle has been brought into conformity with all applicable FMVSS.

If a vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States is decided to contain a defect related to motor vehicle safety, or not to comply with an applicable FMVSS, 49 U.S.C. 30147(a)(1)(A) provides that the same defect or noncompliance is deemed to exist in any nonconforming vehicle that NHTSA has decided to be substantially similar and for which a registered importer has submitted a certificate of conformity to the agency. Under 49 U.S.C. 30147(a)(1)(B), the registered importer is deemed to be the nonconforming vehicle's manufacturer for the purpose of providing notification of, and a remedy for, the defect or noncompliance.

To apprise registered importers of the vehicles for which they must conduct a notification and remedy (i.e., "recall") campaign, 49 U.S.C. 30147(a)(2) requires NHTSA to publish in the **Federal Register** notice of any defect or noncompliance decision that is made with respect to substantially similar U.S. certified vehicles. Annex A contains a list of all such decisions that were made during Fiscal Year 1999, which ran from October 1, 1998 through September 30, 1999. The list identifies the Recall Number that was assigned to the recall by NHTSA after the agency received the manufacturer's notification of the defect or noncompliance under 49 CFR part 573. After September 30, 2000, NHTSA will publish a comparable list of all defect and noncompliance decisions affecting nonconforming imported vehicles that are made during the current fiscal year.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30147(a)(2); 49 CFR 593.8; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: December 6, 1999.

**Marilynne Jacobs,**

*Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.*