

Volume Web Service. As before, a specific individual subscriber may only receive the fee waiver one time.

Exhibit A to the proposed rule change reflects the NYSE Broker Volume fee schedule as modified by the proposed rule change.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule is consistent with the provisions of Section 6(b)(4) of the Act,⁷ in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among members and other persons using its facilities.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change will not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received from Members, Participants or Others

The Exchange has not solicited, and does not intend to solicit, comments regarding the proposed rule change. The Exchange has not received any unsolicited written comments from members or other interested parties.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

The proposed rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act⁸ and subparagraph (f)(2) of Rule 19b-4 thereunder,⁹ because it involves a due, fee, or other charge. At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission may summarily abrogate such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposal is consistent with the Act. Persons making written submissions should file six copies thereof with the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20549-0609. Copies of the submission,

all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the NYSE. All submissions should refer to file number SR-NYSE-2003-35 and should be submitted by December 17, 2003.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.¹⁰

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-29575 Filed 11-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-48806; File No. SR-PCX-2003-61]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change by the Pacific Exchange, Inc. Relating to Arbitration

November 19, 2003.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,² notice is hereby given that on October 30, 2003, the Pacific Exchange, Inc. ("PCX" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission" or "SEC") the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II and III below, which Items have been prepared by PCX. PCX filed the proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act³ and Rule 19b-4(f)(6) thereunder,⁴ which renders the proposal effective upon filing with the Commission. On November 12, 2003, the Exchange filed Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change.⁵ The Commission is publishing this notice to

solicit comments on the proposed rule change, as amended, from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange and its wholly owned subsidiary PCX Equities, Inc. ("PCXE") are proposing to extend the pilot rule in PCX Rule 12.1, Commentary .02 and PCXE Rule 12.2(h), which requires industry parties in arbitration to waive application of contested California arbitrator disclosure standards, upon the request of customers (and, in industry cases, upon the request of associated persons with claims of statutory employment discrimination), for an additional six-month pilot period.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The PCX has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

On November 21, 2002, the Commission approved, for a six-month pilot period, the Exchange's proposal to amend PCX and PCXE arbitration rules to require industry parties in arbitration to waive application of contested California arbitrator disclosure standards, upon the request of customers or, in employment discrimination cases, upon the request of associated persons.⁶ The Commission approved an extension of the pilot period on May 15, 2003.⁷ The pilot period is currently set to expire on November 22, 2003.

On July 1, 2002, the Judicial Council of the State of California adopted new rules that mandated extensive disclosure requirements for arbitrators

¹⁰ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 217 CFR 240.19b-4.

³ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

⁴ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(6).

⁵ See letter from Tanya Cho, Staff Attorney, Regulatory Policy, Exchange, to Nancy Sanow, Assistant Director, Division of Market Regulation, Commission, dated November 12, 2003. Amendment No. 1 made non-substantive corrections to PCX's original Form 19b-4 filing.

⁷ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4).

⁸ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

⁹ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(2).

⁶ See Exchange Act Release No. 46881 (November 21, 2002), 67 FR 71224 (November 29, 2002) (Order approving SR-PCX-2002-71).

⁷ See Exchange Act Release No. 47872 (May 15, 2003), 68 FR 28869 (May 27, 2003) (Order approving SR-PCX-2003-22).

in California (the "California Standards"). The California Standards are intended to address perceived conflicts of interest in certain commercial arbitration proceedings. As a result of the imposition of the California Standards on arbitrations conducted under the auspices of self-regulatory organizations ("SROs"), the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. ("NASD") and the New York Stock Exchange ("NYSE") suspended the appointment of arbitrators for cases pending in California, and filed a joint complaint in federal court for declaratory relief in which they contend that the California Standards cannot lawfully be applied to NASD and NYSE because the California Standards are preempted by federal law and are inapplicable to SROs under state law.⁸ Subsequently, in the interest of continuing to provide investors with an arbitral forum in California pending the resolution of the applicability of the California Standards, the NASD and NYSE filed separate rule proposals with the Commission that would temporarily require their members to waive the California Standards if all non-member parties to arbitration have done so. The Commission approved the NASD's rule proposal on September 26, 2002⁹ and the NYSE's rule proposal on November 12, 2002.¹⁰ Both the NASD and the NYSE recently filed rule proposals to further extend the pilot period for an additional six months.¹¹

Since the NASD's and NYSE's lawsuit relating to the application of the California Standards has not been resolved, PCX is now requesting an extension of the pilot for an additional six months (or until the pending litigation has resolved the question of whether or not the California Standards

apply to SROs).¹² PCX requests that the pilot be extended for six months beginning on November 23, 2003. The extension of time permits the Exchange to continue the arbitration process using PCX rules regarding arbitration disclosures and not the California Standards. No substantive changes are being made to the pilot program, other than extending the operation of pilot program.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act,¹³ in that it is designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade by ensuring that members and member organizations and the public have a fair and impartial forum for the resolution of their disputes.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

Written comments on the proposed rule change were neither solicited nor received.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

PCX has designated the proposed rule change as one that: (i) Does not significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (ii) does not impose any significant burden on competition; and (iii) does not become operative for 30 days from the date on which it was filed, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate. Therefore, the foregoing rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act¹⁴ and Rule 19b-4(f)(6) thereunder.¹⁵ At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission may summarily abrogate the rule change if it appears to the Commission that the action is necessary or appropriate in the public

interest, for the protection of investors, or would otherwise further the purposes of the Act.

Pursuant to Rule 19b-4(f)(6)(iii) under the Act,¹⁶ the proposal may not become operative for 30 days after the date of its filing, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate if consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest, and the self-regulatory organization must file notice of its intent to file the proposed rule change at least five business days beforehand. The Exchange has requested that the Commission waive the five-day pre-filing requirement and the 30-day operative delay so that the proposed rule change will become immediately effective upon filing.

The Commission believes that waiving the five-day pre-filing provision and the 30-day operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest.¹⁷ Waiving the pre-filing requirement and accelerating the operative date will merely extend a pilot program that is designed to provide investors with a mechanism to resolve disputes with broker-dealers. During the period of this extension, the Commission and the Exchange will continue to monitor the status of the previously discussed litigation. For these reasons, the Commission designates the proposed rule change as effective and operative immediately.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposal is consistent with the Act. Persons making written submissions should file six copies thereof with the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549-0609. Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All

⁸ See *NASD Dispute Resolution, Inc. v. Judicial Council of California*, 232 F. Supp. 2d 1055 (N.D. Cal. 2002), *Notice of Appeal* filed December 12, 2002, available on the NASD Web site at: http://www.nasdaq.com/pdf-text/ca_appeal_notice.pdf.

⁹ See Exchange Act Release No. 46562 (September 26, 2002), 67 FR 62085 (October 3, 2002) (Order approving SR-NASD-2002-126). Thereafter, the pilot period was extended to September 30, 2003. See Exchange Act Release No. 48187 (July 16, 2003), 68 FR 43553 (July 23, 2003) (Order approving SR-NASD-2003-106).

¹⁰ See Exchange Act Release No. 46816 (November 12, 2002), 67 FR 69793 (November 19, 2002) (Order approving SR-NYSE-2002-56). Thereafter, the pilot period was extended to September 30, 2003. See Exchange Act Release No. 47836 (May 12, 2003), 68 FR 27608 (May 20, 2003) (Order approving SR-NYSE-2003-16).

¹¹ See Exchange Act Release No. 48553 (September 26, 2003), 68 FR 57494 (October 3, 2003) (Order approving SR-NASD-2003-144) and Exchange Act Release No. 48552 (September 26, 2003), 68 FR 57496 (October 3, 2003) (Order approving SR-NYSE-2003-28).

¹² See also *Mayo v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc. et al.*, 258 F. Supp. 2d 1097 (N.D. Cal. 2003) in which the District Court for the Northern District of California held that the California Standards, at least as applied to SROs, are preempted by federal law. As this decision was rendered on April 22, 2003, it is still subject to appeal.

¹³ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

¹⁴ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

¹⁵ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(6).

¹⁶ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(6)(iii).

¹⁷ For purposes of accelerating the operative date of this proposal, the Commission has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

submissions should refer to File No. SR-PCX-2003-61 and should be submitted by December 17 2003.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.¹⁸

Margaret H. McFarland,
Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-29576 Filed 11-25-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 4539]

Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs; List of November 17, 2003, of Participating Countries and Entities (Hereinafter Known as "Participants") Under the Clean Diamond Trade Act of 2003 (Pub. L. 108-19) and Section 2 of Executive Order 13312 of July 29, 2003

AGENCY: Department of State.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with sections 3 and 6 of the Clean Diamond Trade Act of 2003 (Pub. L. 108-19) and Section 2 of Executive Order 13312 of July 29, 2003, the Department of State is identifying all the Participants eligible for trade in rough diamonds under the Act, and their respective Importing and Exporting Authorities, and revising the previously published list of September 1, 2003 (68 FR 53419-53420).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jay L. Bruns, Special Negotiator for Conflict Diamonds, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Department of State, (202) 647-2857.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 4 of the Clean Diamond Trade Act (the "Act") requires the President to prohibit the importation into, or the exportation from, the United States of any rough diamond, from whatever source, that has not been controlled through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme (KPCS). Under section 3(2) of the Act, "controlled through the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme" means an importation from the territory of a Participant or exportation to the territory of a Participant of rough diamonds that is either (i) carried out in accordance with the KPCS, as set forth in regulations promulgated by the President, or (ii) controlled under a system determined by the President to meet substantially the standards, practices, and procedures of the KPCS. The referenced regulations are contained at 31 CFR part 592 ("Rough

Diamond Control Regulations") (68 FR 45777, August 4, 2003).

Section 6(b) of the Act requires the President to publish in the **Federal Register** a list of all Participants, and all Importing and Exporting Authorities of Participants, and to update the list as necessary. Section 2 of Executive Order 13312 of July 29, 2003 delegates this function to the Secretary of State. Section 3(7) of the Act defines "Participant" as a state, customs territory, or regional economic integration organization identified by the Secretary of State. Section 3(3) of the Act defines "Exporting Authority" as one or more entities designated by a Participant from whose territory a shipment of rough diamonds is being exported as having the authority to validate a Kimberley Process Certificate. Section 3(4) of the Act defines "Importing Authority" as one or more entities designated by a Participant into whose territory a shipment of rough diamonds is imported as having the authority to enforce the laws and regulations of the Participant regarding imports, including the verification of the Kimberley Process Certificate accompanying the shipment.

List of Participants

Pursuant to section 3 of the Clean Diamond Trade Act (the Act), Section 2 of Executive Order 13312 of July 29, 2003, and Delegation of Authority No. 245 (April 23, 2001), I hereby identify the following entities as of November 17, 2003, as Participants under section 6(b) of the Act. Included in this List are the Importing and Exporting Authorities for Participants, as required by section 6(b) of the Act. This list revises the previously published list of September 1, 2003 (68 FR 53419-53420).

Angola—Ministry of Geology and Mines.
Armenia—Ministry of Trade and Economic Development.
Australia—Exporting Authority—Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources; Importing Authority—Australian Customs Service.
Belarus—Department of Finance.
Botswana—Ministry of Minerals, Energy and Water Resources.
Brazil—Ministry of Mines and Energy.
Bulgaria—Ministry of Finance.
Canada—Natural Resources Canada.
Central African Republic—Ministry of Energy and Mining.
China—General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine.
Democratic Republic of the Congo—Ministry of Mines and Hydrocarbons.

Republic of the Congo—Ministry of Mines and Geology.
Croatia—Ministry of Economy.
European Community—DG/External Relations/A.2.
Ghana—Precious Minerals and Marketing Company Ltd.
Guinea—Ministry of Mines and Geology.
Guyana—Geology and Mines Commission.
Hungary—Ministry of Economy and Transport.
India—The Gem and Jewellery Export Promotion Council.
Israel—The Diamond Controller.
Ivory Coast—Ministry of Mines and Energy.
Japan—Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry.
Republic of Korea—Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Energy.
Laos—Ministry of Finance.
Lebanon—Ministry of Economy and Trade.
Lesotho—Commissioner of Mines and Geology.
Malaysia—Ministry of International Trade and Industry.
Mauritius—Ministry of Commerce.
Namibia—Ministry of Mines and Energy.
Poland—Ministry of Economy, Labour and Social Policy.
Romania—National Authority for Consumer Protection.
Russia—Gokhran, Ministry of Finance.
Sierra Leone—Government Gold and Diamond Office.
Slovenia—Ministry of Finance.
South Africa—South African Diamond Board.
Sri Lanka—National Gem and Jewellery Authority.
Switzerland—State Secretariat for Economic Affairs.
Taiwan—Bureau of Foreign Trade.
Tanzania—Commissioner for Minerals.
Thailand—Ministry of Commerce.
Togo—Ministry of Mines and Geology.
Ukraine—State Gemological Centre of Ukraine.
United Arab Emirates—Dubai Metals and Commodities Center.
United States of America—Importing Authority—United States Bureau of Customs and Border Protection; Exporting Authority—Bureau of the Census.
Venezuela—Ministry of Energy and Mines.
Vietnam—Ministry of Trade.
Zimbabwe—Ministry of Mines and Mining Development.

¹⁸ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).