

etc, and overall indirect rates in cost and by percentage. It is the desire of the Department of State to have the maximum utilization of the limited funds used for program operation in lieu of administrative and indirect cost. A "Special Note" to offerors. While the grant may not be awarded on the basis of lowest overall cost, the program cost to administrative cost and the direct cost to indirect cost ratios will be an important issue in the final selection. Applicants requesting funds to supplement a program having other sources of support should submit a current budget for it showing how specific lines in the budget would be affected by the allocation of requested grant funds. Other funding sources and amounts, when known, should be identified.

(3) The applicant's cost sharing proposal, if applicable containing appropriate details and cross-references to the requested budget.

(4) The organization's most recent audit report (the most recent U.S. Government audit report if available) and the name, address, and point of contact of the audit agency. Notice to Applicants: The threshold for grants that trigger an audit requirement under OMB Circular A-133 has been raised from \$25,000.00 to \$300,000.00.

(5) An indication of the offer's priorities if funding is being requested for more than one program or activity.

All payments will be made to the recipient through the Department of State.

#### *Evaluation Factors and Proposal Selection*

A Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) will perform the technical review from the U.S. Embassy's Bicommunal Team in Nicosia.

A/LM/AQM will make the final selection after reviewing evaluation results and recommendations from the TEP. The applicant should describe its overall organizational and management structure. Domestic and international. It should describe how the capabilities of this structure will complement actual operation and success of the program. It should describe all previous experience with similar programs and layout tentative operational plans that demonstrate complete understanding of the requirements of the Statement of Work. The proposal should reflect the institution's expertise in international affairs, especially those that pertain to the current political, economic, and social environment on the island of Cyprus. Since the BSP focuses on bringing together the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities on

Cyprus, a perception of total impartiality in the application will also be a tantamount issue. The proposal should also demonstrate the applicant's overall management approach is rational and within reason. The technical elements of the proposal will be significantly more important than the cost proposal in the final selection process. The applicant should specifically address each of the evaluation criteria elements identified below. The proposal should address succinctly, but completely, the elements described below and follow the format requirements. Proposals should include the following items:

TAB A—Table of Contents and Executive Summary

TAB B—Narrative

The narrative should demonstrate proven ability to handle logistics as well as include the U.S. institution's mission and date of establishment.

TAB C—Budget Submission

The budget included with the proposal should be broken down into the administrative direct cost of the program and the indirect cost. Direct costs are those costs that are totally attributed to the cost of the program. Indirect costs are those costs that are attributed to the overall operation of the organization.

TAB D—Past Performance References

At a minimum, the applicant will provide the following information for three references:

- Name of the referenced organization
- Project name
- Project description
- Performance period of the contract/grant
- Amount of the contract/grant
- Technical contact person and telephone number for referenced organization
- Administrative contact person and telephone number for referenced organization

A/LM/AQM may contact representatives from the organizations cited in the examples to obtain information on the applicant's past performance. A/LM/AQM also may obtain past performance information from sources other than those identified by the applicant.

#### *Resumes*

Resumes of any key program staff, except the proposed FOR should be included in the submission. Proposed personnel and institutional resources should be adequate and appropriate to achieve the program's goals. Resume should not exceed two pages.

The proposals will be considered on the following criteria in priority order:

#### A. Organizational Capabilities

1. Organizational experience and/or knowledge of the political, economic, and social environment on Cyprus.
2. Demonstrates sensitivity to political and cultural concerns of a divided Cyprus.
3. Demonstrates an understanding of the program.
4. Qualifications and experience of corporate staff.
5. The organizational structure and management capabilities of the offeror.
6. The international structure and experience of the offeror.

#### B. Program Capabilities

1. Ability to have Nicosia Field Office open by 21 August 2000.
2. Demonstrates understanding of program and experience and knowledge to provide the development of the Bicommunal programs.

#### C. Program/Administrative and Direct/Indirect Cost Comparisons and Overall Cost

#### *Proposal Deadline*

Seven copies of the proposal should be submitted by 30 June 2000, 4 pm local time to:

An Application sent by mail must be addressed to: Dr. Holly Peirce, Bicommunal Coordinator, American Embassy Nicosia, FPO, AE 09836.

An application that is hand delivered must be to: American Embassy, North Gate, Metochiou and Ploutarchou Streets, Engomi, Nicosia, Cyprus, Attention: Holly Peirce (x2064) or Rita Shipillis (x2605).

**Scott McDonald,**

*Post Management Officer, Bureau of European Affairs, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 00-13538 Filed 5-30-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710-23-P**

## **DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

**[Public Notice 3324]**

### **Notice of Open Session of the Cultural Property Advisory Committee**

Pursuant to the authority vested in me, under Department of State Delegation of Authority No. 236-2, the Cultural Property Advisory Committee will meet in open session from approximately 10 am to 12 noon, on Wednesday, June 28, 2000. The session will be held in the Trustees Room, 2nd Floor, The New York Public Library, Fifth Avenue and 42nd Street, New York, NY.

This open session is solely for information exchange between the Cultural Property Advisory Committee and persons interested in the work of the Committee pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2601, *et seq.*, the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act. Information about the Committee, the Act, and the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property may be found at <http://exchanges.state.gov/education/culprop>.

The Committee will make presentations about its work and about implementation of the Act followed by a question and answer period. In order to allow the maximum participation possible, individuals will be limited to five minutes each for comments/questions.

Due to the Library's security procedures and limited seating, prior notification of attendance is required. Attendees must use the entrance on 42nd Street, between Fifth and Sixth Avenues. Interested persons should contact the Cultural Property Office at (202) 619-6612 by 5 pm (ESDT), June 23.

Dated: May 25, 2000.

**William B. Bader,**

*Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 00-13543 Filed 5-30-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-11-U

## OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

[Dockets No. 301-62a and 301-100a]

### Proceedings Concerning the European Communities' Regime for the Importation, Sale and Distribution of Bananas and the European Communities' Measures Concerning Meat and Meat Products

**AGENCY:** Office of the United States Trade Representative.

**ACTION:** Request for comments

**SUMMARY:** The interagency Section 301 Committee is soliciting written comments on possible modifications to actions taken by the United States as a result of the European Communities' (EC) failure to implement the recommendations and rulings of the World Trade Organization (WTO) Dispute Settlement Body in proceedings regarding (i) the EC's regime for the importation, sale, and distribution of bananas (the EC-Bananas case) and (ii) the EC's ban on the import of U.S. meat and meat products produced from

animals treated with certain hormones (the EC-Beef Hormones case). Comments are requested with respect to the products listed in the annexes to this notice. The Section 301 Committee will consider the comments received in response to this notice, as well as comments previously received with respect to particular products. Accordingly, persons who have previously submitted comments with respect to particular products are requested not to resubmit such comments, although persons may wish to submit updates to previously submitted comments. The relevant statutory provision provides that the actions taken by the United States in the Beef and Bananas cases should be modified, unless (1) the USTR and the affected U.S. industries agree that such changes are unnecessary, or (2) resolution of the case is imminent.

**DATES:** To be assured of consideration, written comments should be submitted by 5 p.m. on June 14, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be addressed to: Chairman, Section 301 Committee, Attn: Implementation of WTO Recommendations, Room 100, 600 17th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20508.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sybia Harrison, Staff Assistant to the Section 301 Committee, (202) 395-3419, for questions concerning procedures for filing submissions in response to this notice; Ralph Ives, Deputy Assistant U.S. Trade Representative, (202) 395-6127, for questions concerning the EC-Bananas case or the EC-Beef Hormones case; or William Busis, Associate General Counsel (202) 395-3150, for questions concerning procedures under Section 301 or the WTO Agreement.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### A. The EC-Bananas Case

The EC's regime governing the importation, sale, and distribution of bananas is discriminatory and has harmed the economic interests of the United States by denying to U.S. companies a major portion of their banana distribution business. WTO dispute settlement panels have confirmed that the EC's banana regime is inconsistent with the EC's obligations under the WTO Agreement. Furthermore, WTO arbitrators have determined that the EC's banana regime has nullified or impaired U.S. benefits under the WTO Agreement in the amount of \$191.4 million per year. The procedural and substantive background of the U.S. investigation under Sections 301 to 309 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended ("Section 301") and the

associated WTO proceedings concerning the EC's banana regime is set forth in prior notices (64 FR 19,209, 63 FR 71,665, 63 FR 63,099, 63 FR 56,687, and 63 FR 8248).

As a result of the EC's failure to comply with recommendations and rulings of the WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) to bring its discriminatory banana regime into compliance with WTO obligations, on April 19, 1999 the DSB authorized the United States to suspend the application to the EC, and member States thereof, of WTO tariff concessions and related obligations covering trade in an amount of \$191.4 million per year. Pursuant to that authorization, the USTR announced a list of EC products, reprinted in Annex I to this notice, that would be subject to a 100 percent rate of duty (64 FR 19209).

Since that time, the United States and the EC have continued to consult in an effort to resolve this dispute. However, the EC has still failed to bring its banana regime into compliance with the EC's obligations under the WTO Agreement.

##### B. The EC-Beef Hormones Case

The EC bans the import of beef and beef products produced from animals to which certain hormones have been administered, despite the facts that such products have been consumed safely for decades and that no scientific basis exists for imposing such a ban. The effect of the EC ban is to prohibit the import of substantially all U.S.-produced beef and beef products. WTO panels have confirmed that the EC has no scientific basis for banning imports of U.S. beef, and that the EC ban is inconsistent with the EC's WTO obligations. Furthermore, WTO arbitrators have determined that the EC's import ban on U.S. beef and beef products has nullified or impaired U.S. benefits under the WTO Agreement in the amount of \$116.8 million each year. The procedural and substantive background of the U.S. investigation under Section 301 and the associated WTO proceedings concerning the EC's beef import ban is set forth in prior notices (64 FR 40,638 and 64 FR 14,486).

As a result of the EC's failure to comply with DSB recommendations and rulings concerning its beef import ban, on July 26, 1999 the DSB authorized the United States to suspend the application to the EC, and member States thereof, of WTO tariff concessions and related obligations covering trade in an amount of \$116.8 million per year. Pursuant to that authorization, the USTR announced a list of EC products, reprinted in Annex III to this notice, that would be subject