exchange and protection of confidential information? If so, how? If not, why not?

10. What form of agreement(s) would best achieve the goal of enhanced enforcement cooperation? Should such agreements be negotiated on a bilateral or another basis?

Exchange of Confidential Information—Criminal Enforcement Matters

The United States is party to 19 bilateral mutual assistance treaties in criminal matters (MLATs), under which it can request assistance in obtaining information, including confidential information, from its MLAT partners for use in U.S. criminal antitrust enforcement investigations and litigation. This paper (or papers) could consider the following.

11. What has been the United States' experience in seeking assistance for criminal antitrust matters under its MLATs? For those jurisdictions that are party to bilateral antitrust agreements with the United States but not to MLATs, is there any meaningful difference in the assistance that can be provided? With the goal of enhanced cooperation in mind, how might the United States encourage antitrust authorities in other jurisdictions to change restrictions in their laws so that existing (or future) MLATs with such countries may extend to antitrust matters?

12. The United States also encounters obstacles when seeking extradition from abroad of defendants to U.S. antitrust actions. In what way can the United States encourage foreign countries to lower their barriers to providing the United States with extradition assistance in antitrust matters? Provide examples and an analysis of successes or frustrations in U.S. efforts to seek extradition assistance from abroad in connection with a U.S. criminal antitrust matter.

Transnational Cartels

The topics below are intended to be addressed in separate essays.

13. This paper should consider the incidence of transnational cartels. What does the empirical evidence suggest is the impact that transnational cartels have on the United States' economy and on U.S. business interests? This paper should also compare the nature and effect of transnational cartels and of cartel enforcement in the U.S. today with earlier periods. This paper might also explore whether the structure of international markets has changed so that international cartels are more likely to be detected now than in earlier periods. Finally, this paper should assess what recent evidence suggests about the relative economic significance, in terms of cartel structure and welfare losses, of transnational versus domestic cartel arrangements.

14. Is there any evidence that weak antitrust or competition policy enforcement is producing environments that are home to international cartels? Are there global markets or market structures that are likely to foster cartel arrangements? Or more generally, are there market or structural factors that can be identified as associated with domestic or international cartel formation and operations, and are there any differences between the two?

15. *Hard Core Cartels.* This paper will comment on whether it is necessary or useful to have a common international understanding about what constitutes a ''hard core cartel'', both domestically and internationally, and on how the term should be defined. This paper would consider the potential for cooperation under existing bilateral or international instruments (e.g., bilateral accords and OECD Recommendations, among others), and assess next steps under these agreements. Further, this paper would make suggestions for enhanced enforcement cooperation between the United States and foreign jurisdictions in enforcement efforts against hard core cartels. These suggestions would include recommendations for positive incentives the United States might offer to foreign jurisdictions as encouragement for them to alert the United States to hard core cartel activities that are affecting the United States.

Please send written replies to: ICPAC, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division—Rm. 10011, 601 D Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20530, Facsimile: (202) 514–4508, Electronic Mail: icpac.atr@usdoj.gov.

Merit E. Janow,

Executive Director, International Competition Policy Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 98–28547 Filed 10–26–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal Bureau of Investigation

DNA Advisory Board Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, notice is hereby given that the DNA Advisory Board (DAB) will meet on November 18, 1998, from 10:00 am until 4:00 pm at The Double Tree Hotel, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, 22202. All attendees will be admitted only after displaying personal identification which bears a photograph of the attendee.

The DAB's scope of authority is: To develop, and if appropriate, periodically revise, recommended standards for quality assurance to the Director of the FBI, including standards for testing the proficiency of forensic laboratories, and forensic analysts, in conducting analysis of DNA; To recommend standards to the Director of the FBI which specify criteria for quality assurance and proficiency tests to be applied to the various types of DNA analysis used by forensic laboratories, including statistical and population genetics issues affecting the evaluation of the frequency of occurrence of DNA profiles calculated from pertinent population database(s); To recommend standards for acceptance of DNA profiles in the FBI's Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) which take account of relevant privacy, law enforcement and technical issues; and, To make recommendations for a system for grading proficiency testing performance to determine whether a laboratory is performing acceptably.

The topics to be discussed at this meeting include: a review of minutes from the July 16, 1998, meeting; introduction of the newly appointed Board Chairman, voting on the DRAFT Quality Assurance Standards for Convicted Offender DNA Databasing Laboratories; update on the waiver process for technical manager or leader; discussion of certification; and a discussion of topics for the next DNA Advisory Board meeting.

The meeting is open to the public on a first-come, first seated basis. Anyone wishing to address the DAB must notify the Designated Federal Employee (DFE) in writing at least twenty-four hours before the DAB meets. The notification must include the requestor's name, organizational affiliation, a short statement describing the topic to be addressed, and the amount of time requested. Oral statements to the DAB will be limited to five minutes and limited to subject matter directly related to the DAB's agenda, unless otherwise permitted by the Chairman.

Any member of the public may file a written statement for the record concerning the DAB and its work before or after the meeting. Written statements for the record will be furnished to each DAB member for their consideration and will be included in the official minutes of a DAB meeting. Written statements must be type-written on 8½″ x 11″ xerographic weight paper, one side only, and bound only by a paper clip (not stapled). All pages must be

numbered. Statements should include the Name, Organizational Affiliation, Address, and Telephone number of the author(s). Written statements for the record will be included in minutes of the meeting immediately following the receipt of the written statement, unless the statement is received within three weeks of the meeting. Under this circumstance, the written statement will be included with the minutes of the following meeting. Written statements for the record should be submitted to the DFE.

Inquiries may be addressed to the DFE, Dr. Dwight E. Adams, Chief, Scientific Analysis Section, Laboratory Division—Room 3266, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 935 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20535–0001, (202) 324–4416, FAX (202) 324–1462.

Dated: October 21, 1998.

Dwight E. Adams,

Chief, Scientific Analysis Section Federal Bureau of Investigation.

[FR Doc. 98–28758 Filed 10–26–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Job Training Partnership Act: Native American Employment and Training Council

AGENCY: Employment and Training Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463), as amended, and section 401(k)(1) of the Job Training Partnership Act, as amended [29 U.S.C. 1671(k)(1)], notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Native American Employment and Training Council.

TIME AND DATE: The meeting will begin at 9:00 a.m. EST on Thursday, November 12, 1998, and continue until 5:00 p.m. EST that day. The meeting will reconvene at 9:00 a.m. EST on Friday, November 13, 1998, and adjourn at 4:00 p.m. EST on that day. The period from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST on November 12 will be reserved for participation and presentation by members of the public.

PLACE: Rooms S–4215 A, B, & C of the Frances Perkins Building, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20210.

STATUS: The meeting will be open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: The agenda will focus on the following topics: (1) status of the Program Year 1998 Partnership Plan; (2) progress of the evaluation of the section 401 program; (3) progress of the performance measures/standards workgroup; (4) status of technical assistance and training provision for Program Year 1998 and 1999; (5) status of FY 1999 Indian and Native American Welfare-to-Work program implementation; and (6) status of pending implementation of the Workforce Investment Act, including a report on the progress of the Regulations Work Group.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Anna W. Goddard, Director, Office of National Programs, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–4641, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20210. Telephone: (202) 219–5500 ext 122 (VOICE) or (202) 326–2577 (TDD) (these are not toll-free numbers).

Signed at Washington, DC, this 21st day of October, 1998.

Anna W. Goddard,

Director, Office of National Programs.

[FR Doc. 98–28750 Filed 10–26–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Institute of Museum and Library Services, Office of Library Services: Submission for OMB Review, Comment Request; State Grants Annual Report

AGENCY: Institute of Museum and Library Services, NFAH.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Institute of Museum Services has submitted the following public information request to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (P.L. 104–13, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) Currently, the Institute of Museum and Library Services is soliciting comment concerning a new collection entitled, State Grants Annual Report. A copy of this proposed form, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Institute of Museum and Library Services, Director of State Program, Director, Jane Heiser (202) 606–5395. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TTY/TDD) may call (202) 606–8636.

Comments should be sent to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn.: OMB Desk Officer for Education, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503 (202) 395–7316), by March 27, 1998.

The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Background: Public Law 104–208 enacted on September 30, 1996 contains the Library Services and Technology Act, a reauthorization and refocusing of federal library programs. This legislation provides that [The State plan shall] provide assurances satisfactory to the Director that such agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Director may reasonably require to carry out this subchapter and to determine the extent to which fund provided under this subchapter have been effective in carrying out the purposes of this subchapter. The Act describes the following purposes.

- establish or enhance electronic linkages among or between libraries electronically link libraries with educational, social or information services; assist libraries in accessing information through electronic networks;
- encourage libraries in different areas, and encourage different types of libraries, to establish consortia and share resources; or
- pay costs for libraries to acquire or share computer systems and telecommunications technologies; and
- target library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children (from birth through age 17) from families and incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section