

F. How could the appointment and role of the U.S. Ambassador be improved?

G. Is the United States' negotiating strength improved or hindered by the use of an appointed political representative working with career spectrum managers and ITU experts from other countries?

H. Assuming the continued appointment of a WRC ambassador, at what point does the Ambassador's appointment need to be effective?

I. During conference preparatory meetings, administrations meet to agree on the final report of studies, which is used as the technical basis at a WRC. Is it important to bring the Ambassador on board in some capacity prior to the conference preparatory meeting? If so, how can this be accomplished?

6. Budgeting WRC Activities

A. Funding for the WRC Ambassador has been an ongoing concern. To ensure the Ambassador and the delegation staff are able to complete their missions, is it necessary to provide the Ambassador with an operational budget? Is so, how can representational funds best be used to conduct outreach efforts?

B. What facilities are critical to the functioning of the delegation and the Ambassador at the conference site?

C. Recognizing that agencies and companies send representatives to the delegation to participate in debates, negotiations, and outreach efforts, how should support be provided to cover the Editorial Committee of each WRC?

7. Outreach and Consultations With Other Countries

A. Are consultations with other administrations needed? If so, at what point in the process should they begin?

B. Is it important to work with other countries outside of the ITU study groups and the conference preparatory meeting? If so, why and how can this be improved?

C. Should the Country Contact/Outreach program that is developed and utilized at a conference be maintained between conferences? If so, how can this be accomplished? Who should lead this effort? What role can the private sector play?

D. Should WRC outreach activities be integrated with other international activities of the State Department, NTIA and FCC? If so, how?

E. How effective were the Delegation Consultations prior to WRC-03? Were they started in a timely manner?

8. Training

A. Are trained and qualified Federal Government Spokespersons and issue

coordinators available throughout the WRC preparatory process and especially at the Conference?

B. Are training programs needed for spokespersons and delegates? If so, what should they consist of?

C. Is preparatory training needed for general participation in ITU-R Study Groups in support of WRC activities? If so, what should it consist of?

D. What steps should be taken to maintain a cadre of experienced personnel in the Federal government in order for them to assume leadership and spokesperson roles at future WRCs?

9. WRC Domestic Implementation Process

A. In the past, the United States has been faced with challenges regarding the implementation of WRC decisions. What can be done to improve this process?

B. The GAO report noted that Federal agencies are concerned that WRC allocation decisions of primary interest to the Federal government go without action, how can the process be improved to ensure equal treatment of both government and private sector interests?

C. Should FCC/NTIA develop a plan and schedule to complete rulemaking for each WRC agenda item? If so, within what timeframe of WRC completion should the plan be executed?

General Areas

A. In broad terms, what goals should the United States have for WRCs? How should these goals be established?

B. How effective has the United States been in the WRC process?

C. What have been the benefits and costs of regional preparation for WRCs?

D. How often should WRCs occur and what, if any, limitations should the U.S. support regarding WRC agendas.

E. Over the years, there has been concern among WRC participants (government and non-government) regarding staffing issues. Do NTIA and the Federal agencies have sufficient staff with appropriate expertise to support spectrum management activities in the WRC preparation process?

Dated: October 20, 2003.

Kathy Smith,

Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 03-26789 Filed 10-22-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-60-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:

Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, DoD.

TIME AND DATE: 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., November 4, 2003.

PLACE: Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Board of Regents Conference Room (D3001), 4301 Jones Bridge Road, Bethesda, MD 20814-4799.

STATUS: Open—under “Government in the Sunshine Act” (5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3)).

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

8 a.m. Meeting—Board of Regents

- (1) Approval of Minutes—August 4, 2003
- (2) Faculty Matters
- (3) Departmental Reports
- (4) Financial Report
- (5) Report—President, USUHS
- (6) Report—Dean, School of Medicine
- (7) Report—Dean, Graduate School of Nursing
- (8) Comments—Chairman, Board of Regents
- (9) New Business

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Charles Mannix, Executive Secretary, Board of Regents, (301) 295-3981.

Dated: October 10, 2003.

Patricia L. Toppings,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 03-26849 Filed 10-21-03; 10:34 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of Education.

SUMMARY: The Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before November 24, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Lauren Wittenberg, Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington,

DC 20503 or should be electronically mailed to the internet address Lauren_Wittenberg@omb.eop.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment.

Dated: October 17, 2003.

Angela C. Arrington,

Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Type of Review: Revision.

Title: Application for Grants under Disability and Rehabilitation Research.

Frequency: One time.

Affected Public: Not-for-profit institutions; Individuals or household; Businesses or other for-profit; State, local, or tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden: Responses: 1,000. Burden Hours: 20,000.

Abstract: The National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) provides grants for research and related activities in rehabilitation of individuals with disabilities. The grant application package contains program profiles, standard forms, program regulations, sample rating forms, and transmitting instructions. Applications are primarily institutions of higher education, but may also include hospitals, State rehabilitation education agencies and voluntary and profit organizations.

This information collection is being submitted under the Streamlined Clearance Process for Discretionary Grant Information Collections (1890-0001). Therefore, the 30-day public comment period notice will be the only public comment notice published for this information collection.

Requests for copies of the submission for OMB review; comment request may be accessed from <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>, by selecting the "Browse Pending Collections" link and by clicking on link number 2358. When you access the information collection, click on "Download Attachments" to view. Written requests for information should be addressed to Vivian Reese, Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Room 4050, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202-4651 or to the e-mail address vivian.reese@ed.gov. Requests may also be electronically mailed to the internet address OCIO_RIMG@ed.gov or faxed to 202-708-9346. Please specify the complete title of the information collection when making your request.

Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be directed to Sheila Carey at her e-mail address Sheila.Carey@ed.gov. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

[FR Doc. 03-26705 Filed 10-22-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[CFDA No.: 84.264A-1]

Rehabilitation Continuing Education Programs (RCEP)—Regional Rehabilitation Continuing Education Projects (RRCEP); Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year (FY) 2004

Purpose of Program: To support training centers that serve either a Federal region or another geographical area and provide for a broad, integrated sequence of training activities that focus on meeting recurrent and common training needs of employed rehabilitation personnel throughout a multi-State geographical area.

Eligible Applicants: States and public or nonprofit agencies and organizations, including Indian tribes and institutions of higher education. Applications under this notice are invited for the provision of training for Department of Education Regions I and IV only.

Applications Available: October 31, 2003.

Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: January 8, 2004.

Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: March 8, 2004.

Estimated Available Funds: \$1,688,610.

Estimated Range of Awards: \$325,000-\$550,935.

Estimated Average Size of Awards: \$375,000.

Maximum Awards by Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) Region: We will reject any application that proposes a budget exceeding the following stated maximum award amount for a single budget period of 12 months.

Maximum Level of Awards by RSA Region:

Region I—\$405,965.

Region IV—\$550,935.

Estimated Number of Awards: 3. We expect to make one award in Region I and two awards in Region IV.

Note: The Department is not bound by any estimates in this notice.

Project Period: Up to 60 months.

Page Limit: The application narrative (Part III of the application) is where you, the applicant, address the selection criteria that reviewers use to evaluate your application. You must limit Part III to the equivalent of no more than 45 pages, using the following standards:

(1) A page is 8.5" by 11", on one side only, with 1" margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.

(2) Double space (no more than three lines per vertical inch) all text in the application narrative, including titles, headings, footnotes, quotations, references, and captions, as well as all text in charts, tables, figures, and graphs.

(3) Use a font that is either 12-point or larger or no smaller than 10 pitch (characters per inch).

The page limit does not apply to Part I, the cover sheet; Part II, the budget section, including the narrative budget justification; Part IV, the assurances and certifications; or the one-page abstract, the resumes, the bibliography, or the letters of support. However, you must include all of the application narrative in Part III.

We will reject your application if—

- You apply these standards and exceed the page limit; or
- You apply other standards and exceed the equivalent of the page limit.

Applicable Regulations: (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, and 86. (b) The regulations for this program in 34 CFR parts 385 and 389.