

inspections conducted under the authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906.

**POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR STORING
RETRIEVING, ACCESSING, RETAINING AND
DISPOSING OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:**

STORAGE:

Information is stored on magnetic disks and tape.

RETRIEVABILITY:

Records may be retrieved by the name or alien registration number.

SAFEGUARDS:

Most INS offices are located in buildings under security guard, and access to premises is by official identification. Offices are locked during non-duty hours. Access to this system is obtained through remote terminals which require the use of restricted passwords and a user ID.

RETENTION AND DISPOSAL:

Records are archived and stored in the database for 10 years after adjudication of a benefits-seeking application and then deleted. The information contained on tapes is downloaded into the tracking system. The tapes are erased every three months and used to transmit and/or receive data from unrelated cases.

SYSTEM MANAGER(S) AND ADDRESS:

Associate Commissioner, Field Operations, Immigration Services Division, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 801 I Street NW, Washington, DC 20536.

NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE:

Inquiries should be addressed to the system manager.

RECORD ACCESS PROCEDURE:

Requests for access to a record from this system shall be in writing. If a request for access is made by mail the envelope and letter shall be clearly marked "Privacy Act Request." The requester shall include a description of the general subject matter and, if known, the related file number. To identify a record relating to an individual, the requester should provide his or her full name, date and place of birth, verification of identity (in accordance with 8 CFR 103.2(b)), and any other identifying information which may be of assistance in locating the record. The requester shall also provide a return address for transmitting the records to be released.

CONTESTING RECORDS PROCEDURE:

Direct all requests to contest or amend information to the FOIA/PA Officer at any INS office. State clearly and

concisely the information being contested, the reason for contesting it, and the proposed amendment thereof. Clearly mark the envelope "Privacy Act Amendment Request." The record must be identified in the same manner as described for making a request for access.

RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:

Information contained in this system of records is obtained from the individuals covered by the system and from the FBI.

**SYSTEMS EXEMPTED FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS
OF THE ACT:**

None.

[FR Doc. 00-19203 Filed 7-28-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-CJ-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Immigration and Naturalization Service

[INS No. 2051-00]

Extension of Memorandum of Understanding for Fines Mitigation Under Section 273 of the Immigration and Nationality Act

AGENCY: Immigration and Naturalization Service, Justice.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Air and sea transportation companies (carriers) may enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (Service). This MOU provides for mitigation of fines imposed under section 273 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act) related to transporting passengers without passports or visas. By signing the MOU, the carrier agrees to perform certain measures aimed at intercepting improperly documented aliens at foreign ports-of-embarkation. These MOUs are currently set to expire on September 30, 2000. This notice serves to extend the expiration date until September 30, 2001.

DATES: This notice is effective July 31, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Una Brien, National Fines Office, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1525 Wilson Blvd., Suite 425, Arlington, VA 22209, telephone (202) 305-7018.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Under What Authority Can the Service Reduce Fines?

Pursuant to section 273(e) of the Act, a violation for section 273(a)(1) of the Act may be reduced, refunded, or waived in cases in which a carrier

demonstrates that it screened all passengers on the vessel or aircraft in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Attorney General, or circumstances exist that the Attorney General determines would justify such reduction, refund, or waiver.

The Service published a final rule in the **Federal Register** at 63 FR 23643 (April 30, 1998) establishing procedures that carriers must undertake for the proper screening of passengers at the ports-of-embarkation to become eligible for a reduction, refund, or waiver of a fine imposed under section 273 of the Act.

The final rule provided that carriers that voluntarily signed an MOU with the Service would receive an automatic reduction, refund, or waiver of fines imposed under section 273 of the Act. By signing the MOU, the carrier agrees in writing to meet passenger screening standards stated in 8 CFR 273.3, to train employees in documentary requirements, and to pay fines and user fees promptly. The Service agrees to provide document training and information guides to carriers and to mitigate fines as appropriate.

How Does the Service Measure the Carrier's Screening Performance?

The numerical standard, or Acceptable Performance Level (APL), is calculated by adding the total number of section 273(a)(1) violations involving nonimmigrants for all carriers, divided by the total number of nonimmigrants transported by all carriers, multiplied by 1,000. Each carrier is then rated against the APL using individual Performance Levels (PL). A carrier's individual PL is calculated by applying the same formula used to calculate the APL.

Carriers that meet or exceed the APL may be eligible for automatic fines reductions if the carrier entered into an MOU with the Service.

If a carrier's PL is not at or better than the APL, the carrier may still receive an automatic fine reduction of 25 percent if it is signatory to and in compliance with the MOU.

In order to provide carriers with additional incentives to screen documents, a second reduction factor (APL2) was developed. The APL2 uses the same formula but only uses the number of violations and total passenger counts for carriers whose PL fails between 0 and the APL. These carriers will automatically receive an additional 25 percent reduction.

Why Is the Service Extending the Expiration Date for MOUs?

The Service is not contemplating any amendments to the current MOU before

September 30, 2000. In this light, an extension of all existing MOUs will benefit both the Service and the carriers by avoiding the administrative costs that would result had the Service required that a new MOU be executed for each carrier. Carriers will remain eligible for automatic fine reductions during the extended period of the MOUs validity as long as the signatory carrier is in compliance with screening standards, training requirements, and payment requirements enumerated in the MOUs.

Will the Measurements for Screening Performance Be Changed?

The measurement for screening performance set forth in the **Federal Register** at 63 FR 23643 (April 30, 1998) will continue to remain in effect. The Service will inform carriers of any plans to change the methods used to calculate a carrier's screening performance by publishing a notice in the **Federal Register**.

Can a Carrier Sign Up for the MOU After September 30, 2000?

A carrier can apply to be signatory to the MOU at any time. A carrier must meet all requirements before their MOU will be approved. Generally, a carrier must have a PL either at or better than the Service's APL and must be current in its payment of all administrative fines, liquidated damages, and user fees. If a carrier does not have a PL or does not have a PL that meets the Service's APL, the carrier must submit evidence to demonstrate that they have screening procedures in place to prevent transporting improperly documented aliens to the United States. Once an MOU is approved, violations that occurred on or after the date of MOU signing will receive the automatic reductions.

How Does a Carrier or the Service Terminate an Existing MOU?

Either party may terminate an MOU upon 30 days written notice.

Dated: July 7, 2000.

Doris Meissner,

Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[FR Doc. 00-19179 Filed 7-28-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-10-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

National Institute of Corrections

Solicitation for a Cooperative Agreement—Core Competency Model Project

AGENCY: National Institute of Corrections.

ACTION: Solicitation for a Cooperative Agreement.

SUMMARY: The project will identify the competencies needed by correctional leaders and managers at each of four organizational levels. It will define the competency, identify the relevant knowledge needed for its development, describe the behaviors that reflect the competency, identify the skills required to use and develop the competency, and suggest training strategies appropriate to the competency and the management level being addressed.

Project Objectives

Given the premise of the Core Competency Model, the work developed under the cooperative agreement will:

- Identify the competencies needed by correctional leaders and managers.
- Develop a profile of four identified management levels which can be used by correctional trainers in developing and targeting their programs; Supervisors, Managers, Senior Managers and Executives.
- Determine, list, and justify which competencies are most critical to each of the four management levels.
- Identify a knowledge base and/or the relevant theories required by the program participant to use and develop the core competency.
- Identify behaviors that reflect the core competencies at each level.
- Identify the skills required to use and develop the core competencies at each level.
- Provide a tool with which correctional training staff can revise and/or develop programs with the appropriate combination of theoretical and skill-based content.
- Provide a tool to help correctional training staff ensure any content being offered is appropriate to the management level for which it is offered.
- Provide a tool with which correctional training staff can advise practitioners regarding the programs to which they should apply to enhance their leadership and management abilities.
- Provide a tool with which correctional training staff can review the content of leadership and management programs to avoid duplication.

Scope of Work

Introduction

As the correctional field begins its work in the new millennium its leaders will be faced with significant challenges. They must continue to study and apply as appropriate the latest research in offender management and treatment; lead an ever increasingly diverse workforce; design, improve and oversee an efficient operational program; and ensure the incorporation of new technologies in a manner beneficial to their agencies. They must also provide those they lead with guidance and direction for the future. Much of this work will be accomplished through the efforts of those under their supervision. The need for capable leaders is clear.

The Core Competency Model will rest on a basic premise. Leaders and managers need the same or similar core competencies to perform their tasks. However, the actions and behaviors driven by those competencies will vary with the individuals position in the organization and the context of the situations they face. Training content should be grounded in the basic competencies, but vary with the participant's assignments and responsibilities.

Leaders and managers at all levels must have an ability to communicate effectively. But, the skills and behaviors needed will vary depending on who is receiving the communications(s) and the context of the interaction. A first line supervisor counseling a line staff officer on the appropriate use of sick time will employ different methods and behaviors than a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) responding to questions from the media. Likewise, line supervisors may employ problem solving techniques different from the strategic planning approaches employed by the agency's executives.

Background

Correctional leadership programs, including those offered by the Institute, are usually designed for correctional leaders in general, to achieve the broad goal of developing and/or improving correctional leaders. The content is often designed without any systematic consideration given to the specific skills and abilities needed by individuals at various levels of management. This can result in some unanswered questions and issues.

- Are participants applying for and being placed into programs that match their developmental level?
- Does the material challenge the participants?