

increased, locations expanded, time-frame increased)?

Who should be responsible for providing the test personnel and equipment for the Test-Bed?

Should organizations with proprietary technology or information be permitted to participate in the Test-Bed? If so, how should release of data based on their technology be handled?

D. Activation/Termination of the Test-Bed

Should computer simulations be performed before the Test-Bed is activated?

Should a test plan be developed and agreed to by all parties before the Test-Bed is activated? If so, who should be responsible for developing the test plan? What process should be used to review the test plan?

Under what conditions should the Test-Bed be terminated (e.g., problems with equipment)?

E. Evaluation of the Test-Bed

What metrics should be used in evaluating the results of the Test-Bed?

Should status reports be prepared throughout the duration of the Test-Bed (e.g., 6 months)?

Who should be responsible for analyzing the data from the Test-Bed and preparing the final report?

III. Selection Criteria for Test-Bed

The following criteria are being proposed to evaluate and select the proposed technology or service to be

implemented in the Test-Bed. Comments are requested on the proposed Test-Bed selection criteria.

How well does the proposed technology or service achieve the goal of the Test-Bed?

How readily available is the equipment proposed for the Test-Bed?

How well does the proposed technology or service explore creative and original concepts in spectrum sharing?

For the proposed technology or service can the results of the Test-Bed be disseminated broadly to enhance scientific and technologic understanding? If so, how broadly can the results be applied?

How well does the proposed technology or service address the potential impact on the incumbent spectrum user(s)?

How much and in what ways does the proposed technology or service benefit the public?

Are there any technical factors that limit the proposed technology or service to a specific frequency range?

Will the necessary technical support be provided to assure performance of the equipment during the Test-Bed? If so, how sufficient is the proposed support?

Dated: June 2, 2006.

Milton E. Brown,

Acting Chief Counsel, National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-8874 Filed 6-7-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-60-S

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Transmittal No. 06-32]

36(b)(1) Arms Sales Notification

AGENCY: Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense is publishing the unclassified text of a section 36(b)(1) arms sales notification. This is published to fulfill the requirements of section 155 of Public Law 104-164 dated 21 July 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. J. Hurd, DSCA/DBO/ADM, (703) 604-6575.

The following is a copy of a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Transmittal 06-32 with attached transmittal and policy justification.

C.R. Choate,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

BILLING CODE 5001-06-M



DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, DC 20301-2800

30 MAY 2006

In reply refer to:

I-06/004612

The Honorable J. Dennis Hastert
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-6501

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 06-32 and under separate cover the classified annex thereto. This Transmittal concerns the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Pakistan for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$370 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a press statement to notify the public of the unclassified portion of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Richard J. Millies", is positioned above the typed name.

Richard J. Millies
Deputy Director

Enclosures:

1. Transmittal
2. Policy Justification

Same ltr to:

House

Committee on International Relations
Committee on Armed Services
Committee on Appropriations

Senate

Committee on Foreign Relations
Committee on Armed Services
Committee on Appropriations

Transmittal No. 06-32

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer
Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1)
of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

- (i) **Prospective Purchaser:** Pakistan
- (ii) **Total Estimated Value:**
- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Major Defense Equipment* | \$308 million |
| Other | <u>\$ 62 million</u> |
| TOTAL | \$370 million |
- (iii) **Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:** 50 UGM-84L (submarine-launched), 50 RGM-84L (surface-launched), and 30 AGM-84L (air-launched) Block II HARPOON missiles, 5 Encapsulated HARPOON Command Launch Systems, 115 containers; missile modifications; training devices; spare and repair parts; technical support; support equipment; personnel training and training equipment; technical data and publications; U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics support.
- (iv) **Military Department:** Navy (ADB)
- (v) **Prior Related Cases, if any:**
- | | |
|--------------|---------------------------|
| FMS case ACZ | - \$161 million - 30Jun05 |
| FMS case ACK | - \$ 24 million - 24Apr90 |
| FMS case ABO | - \$ 38 million - 30Sep85 |
| FMS case ABD | - \$ 45 million - 18Oct83 |
- (vi) **Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid:** none
- (vii) **Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold:** See Annex under separate cover.
- (viii) **Date Report Delivered to Congress:** 30 MAY 2006

* as defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Pakistan – HARPOON Block II Anti-ship Missiles

The Government of Pakistan has requested a possible sale of 50 UGM-84L (submarine-launched), 50 RGM-84L (surface-launched), and 30 AGM-84L (air-launched) Block II HARPOON missiles; 5 Encapsulated HARPOON Command Launch Systems; 115 containers; missile modifications; training devices; spare and repair parts; technical support; support equipment; personnel training and training equipment; technical data and publications; U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics support. The estimated cost is \$370 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country that continues to be a key ally in the global war on terrorism.

Pakistan intends to use the HARPOON systems on its P-3 aircraft, surface ships, and submarines. The Pakistan Navy currently has AGM-84 Block I air/surface/subsurface launch capability and recently accepted the Block II air- and surface-launched HARPOON. The AGM-84, HARPOON Block II upgraded targeting capability significantly reduces the risk of hitting non-combatant targets thus improving Pakistan's naval operational flexibility. Pakistan will have no difficulty absorbing these additional missiles into its armed forces.

The HARPOON Block II system will provide a significant upgrade to Pakistan's existing systems and allow for improved target acquisition. The system has an increased number of waypoints associated with missile flight and incorporates a Global Positioning System that allows for precision use.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not affect the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be The Boeing Company of St. Louis, Missouri. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require several U.S. Government and contractor representatives to travel to Pakistan on a temporary basis in conjunction with program technical and management oversight and support requirements.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.