SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–40517; File No. SR–Phlx–98–28]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Order Granting Accelerated Approval of Proposed Rule Change by the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc. Relating to Its Arbitration Program

October 1, 1998.

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 July 15, 1998, the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc. (''Phlx'' or ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change. The proposed rule change, as amended, is described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the Phlx. The Phlx submitted Amendment No. 1 to its proposal on August 12, 1998,[3] Amendment No. 2 on September 1, 1998,[4] Amendment No. 3 on September 24, 1998,[5] Amendment No. 4 on September 29, 1998,[6] and Amendment No. 5 on October 1, 1998.[7] The Commission is publishing this notice and order to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons and to grant accelerated approval of the proposed rule change.

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

The Phlx proposes to amend Phlx Rule 950, Arbitration, as part of the cessation of the Exchange's arbitration program. Specifically, the Phlx proposes to amend Phlx Rule 950 to state that every member, member organization, member corporation,[8] participant[9] and participant organization as defined by Exchange rules (and hereinafter referred to as ''members'') shall be subject to the Code for every claim, dispute, or controversy arising out of or in connection with the securities business of any such member of the Exchange, including disputes outlined in Section 1, Section 6, and Section 8 of Phlx Rule 950.[10] For purposes of Rule 950, each member will be subject to and required to abide by the Code as if such member were a ''member'' of the NASD.

In addition to the foregoing, the Phlx also proposes to amend Rule 950 to combine the customer and member arbitration programs such that arbitrators for member cases will be drawn from the same pool as arbitrators for customer cases. This amendment is necessary to resolve cases already pending with the Phlx.[11]

The complete text of the proposed rule change is as follows [new text is italicized; deleted text is bracketed]:

ARBITRATION

Rule 950

* * * * *

Composition and Appointment of Panels

Sec. 3. Public customer controversies shall be heard as provided in Section 9 or Section 15, as applicable. [Member controversies shall be heard by a panel of Committee persons composed of on-floor and off-floor persons, who shall be appointed to serve on such panels by the Director of Arbitration in alphabetical rotation. The Committee shall consist of a pool of 25 persons, 15 members or persons associated with on-floor member and/or participant organizations and 10 members or persons associated with off-floor member and/or participant organizations. The Director of Arbitration shall appoint persons in an alphabetical rotation until a panel is composed. The Director of Arbitration shall fill a vacancy by appointing another person who is next in alphabetical rotation. A member controversy panel shall consist of not fewer than five (5) Committee persons where the amount in controversy does not exceed $100,000. Where the amount in a member controversy exceeds $100,000, a panel shall consist of not fewer than seven (7) Committee persons. In order for a pre-hearing conference or a hearing on the merits to be conducted, not more than two Committee persons may be absent from a proceeding from either a five (5) or a seven (7) member appointed panel. The panel chairman shall be designated by a majority of the panel.] *In member controversies, the Director of Arbitration shall appoint an arbitration panel which consists of no fewer than three (3) arbitrators, all of whom shall be from the securities industry.*

* * * * *

Composition of Panel

Sec. 16. The individuals who shall serve on a particular [public customer arbitration] panel shall be determined by the Director of Arbitration. The Director of Arbitration may name the chairman of the panel.

Notice of Selection of Arbitrators

Sec. 17. The Director of Arbitration shall inform the parties of the arbitrators' names and employment histories for the past ten (10) years, as well as information disclosed pursuant

---

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] In Amendment No. 1, the Exchange proposes to (1) eliminate its arbitration program after all open cases are closed by submitting a rule filing to the Commission deleting Rule 950, except for those provisions regarding the transfer of its arbitration program to the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (''NASD''); (2) discipline members who fail to abide by the NASD arbitration procedures; (3) disclose the names of arbitrators; and (4) combine the customer and member arbitration programs with respect to the selection of arbitrators. *See* Letter from Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, to Michael Walinskas, Deputy Associate Director, Division of Market Regulation (''Division''), Commission, dated August 11, 1998 (''Amendment No. 1'').

[4] In Amendment No. 2, the Exchange (1) clarifies that disputes arising under Section 8 of Phlx rule 950 also are subject to the Code of Arbitration Procedure of the NASD (''Code''); (2) clarifies that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act, because the proposal provides an alternative forum for members as well as investors to arbitrate disputes; (3) makes a technical change to its rule language in Section 16 of Rule 950; and (4) seeks accelerated approval of the proposed rule change. *See* Letter from Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, to Michael Walinskas, Deputy Associate Director, Division, Commission, dated August 27, 1998 (''Amendment No. 2''). In a telephone conversation on September 1, 1998, the Exchange confirmed that Section 15 of rule 950 should not have been amended notwithstanding the revision to the Rule made in Amendment No. 2, because it only applies to public customers. Telephone conversation between Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, and Terri Evans, Attorney, Division, Commission, on September 1, 1998.

[5] In Amendment No. 3, the Exchange clarified that the Exchange and NASD have reached an agreement regarding the transfer of arbitration cases, but have not entered into a contract regarding the transfer of cases. *See* Letter from Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, to Katherine England, Assistant Director, Division, Commission, dated September 21, 1998 (''Amendment No. 3'').

[6] In Amendment No. 4, the Exchange revised the date on which arbitration cases would be transferred to the NASD from September 1, 1998 to October 1, 1998, and clarified that participants also are subject to NASD arbitration procedures. *See* Letter from Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, to Katherine England, Assistant Director, Division, Commission, dated September 28, 1998 (''Amendment No. 4'').

[7] In Amendment No. 5, the Exchange made a technical change to Exchange Rule 44 reflecting the October 1, 1998, transfer date. *See* Letter from Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, to Katherine England, Assistant Director, Division, Commission, dated September 30, 1998 (''Amendment No. 5'').

[8] This term was inadvertently omitted in Amendment No. 3, *supra* note 5. However, the Exchange confirmed that member corporations are subject to the Code. Telephone conversation between Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, and Terri Evans, Attorney, Division, Commission, on September 30, 1998.

[9] This term inadvertently omitted in Amendment No. 3, *supra* note 5. However, the Exchange clarified that participants are subject to the Code. *See* Amendment No. 4, *supra* note 6.

[10] *See* Amendment No. 2 *supra* note 4 (clarifying that disputes arising under Section 8 are subject to the Code).

[11] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 3.

to Section 19, at least fifteen (15) business days prior to the date fixed for the first hearing session. A party may make further inquiry of the Director of Arbitration concerning an arbitrator's background. In the event that prior to the first hearing session, any arbitrator should become disqualified, resign, die, refuse or otherwise be unable to perform as an arbitrator, the Director of Arbitration shall appoint a replacement arbitrator to fill the vacancy on the panel [with respect to a public customer arbitration (with respect to a member controversy, the replacement arbitrator will be the next committee member in the alphabetical rotation)]. The Director of Arbitration shall inform the parties as soon as possible of the name and employment history of the replacement arbitrator for the past ten years, as well as information disclosed pursuant to Section 19. A party may make further inquiry of the Director of Arbitration concerning the replacement arbitrator's background and within the time remaining prior to the first hearing session or the five (5) day period provided under Section 18, whichever is shorter, may exercise its right to challenge the replacement arbitrator as provided in Section 18.

* * * * *

Disqualification or Other Disability of Arbitrators

Sec. 20. In the event that any arbitrator, after the commencement of the first hearing session but prior to the rendition of the award, should become disqualified, resign, die, refuse or otherwise be unable to perform as an arbitrator, the remaining arbitrator(s) shall continue with the hearing and determination of the controversy, unless such continuation is objected to by any party within five (5) business days of notification of the vacancy on the panel. Upon objection, the Director of Arbitration shall appoint a replacement arbitrator to fill the vacancy [in public customer controversies. With respect to member controversies, the next committee member in the alphabetical rotation shall be appointed to fill the vacancy]. The Director of Arbitration shall inform the parties as soon as possible of the name and employment history of the replacement arbitrator for the past ten years, as well as information disclosed pursuant to Section 19. A party may make further inquiry of the Director of Arbitration concerning the replacement arbitrator's background and within the time remaining prior to the next scheduled hearing session or the five (5) day period provided under Section 18, whichever is shorter, may exercise its right to challenge the replacement arbitrator as provided in Section 18.

* * * * *

Awards

Sec. 37. (a) All awards shall be in writing and signed by a majority of the arbitrators or in such manner as is required by applicable law [with respect to public controversies. With respect to member controversies, the Chairman of the panel will certify the decision of the panel in writing]. Such awards may be entered as a judgment in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(b)–(e) No change.

(f) All awards [involving public customers] and their contents[, excluding the names of the arbitrators,] shall be made publicly available. A party to an arbitration [involving a public customer] may request that the Director of Arbitration provide copies of all awards rendered by the arbitrator(s) chosen to decide its case. A party wishing to obtain such information must notify the Director of Arbitration within three (3) business days of receipt of notification of the identity of the person(s) named to the panel.

* * * * *

Arbitration Claims Filed on or After October 1, 1998

Sec. 43. The Exchange will not accept any new arbitration claims filed on or after October 1, 1998.

NASD Jurisdiction Over Arbitrations Against PHLX Members

Sec. 44. As of October 1, 1998, every member, member organization, member corporation, participant or participant organization (as defined by Exchange rules and hereinafter referred to as ''members'') shall be subject to the Code of Arbitration Procedure of the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (''NASD'') for every claim, dispute, or controversy, arising out of or in connection with the securities business of any member of the Exchange, including disputes outlined in Section 1, Section 6 and Section 8 of this Rule. For the purposes of this Rule, each member shall be subject to, and shall abide by, the NASD Code of Arbitration Procedure as if such member were a ''member'' of the NASD.

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 its received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange 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

The Exchange has determined that it is no longer willing to operate an arbitration program because of the costs associated with such a program. The Exchange has determined that effective October 1, 1998, no new arbitration claims will be accepted, thereby ceasing the arbitration program. The Exchange will continue to provide arbitration facilities for the parties involved in those cases that were filed prior to such date, but will discontinue its arbitration program when all such cases have been closed.[12]

The NASD agrees that it will accept arbitration claims from and against Phlx members after the date of October 1, 1998;[13] therefore, the Phlx is amending its Rule 950 to provide that every member, member organization, member corporation,[14] participant[15] and participant organization shall be subject to the Code for every claim, dispute, or controversy arising out of or in connection with the securities business of any member of the Exchange, including disputes outlined in Section 1, Section 6 and Section 8 of Phlx Rule 950.[16] For purposes of Rule 950, each member shall be subject to and shall abide by the Code as if such member were a ''member'' of the NASD. In

[12] Parties to cases that were filed prior to the implementation of this proposal, may, by mutual consent, determine to withdraw their claims and resubmit their claims to another forum, such as the NASD. In appropriate cases (e.g., where no arbitrator has been assigned), the Phlx will encourage them to do so by refunding applicable fees. Following the closure of open cases, the Phlx will submit a filing to the Commission eliminating all provisions contained under Phlx Rule 950, except for those provisions regarding the transfer of the program to the NASD. *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 3.

[13] *See* Amendment No. 3, *supra* note 5.

[14] This term was inadvertently omitted in Amendment No.3, *supra* note 5. However, the Exchange confirmed that member corporations are subject to the Code. Telephone conversation between Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, and Terri Evans, Attorney, Division, Commission, on September 20, 1998.

[15] This term was inadvertently omitted in Amendment No. 3, *supra* note 5. However, the Exchange clarified that participants are subject to the Code. *See* Amendment No. 4, *surpa* note 6.

[16] *See* Amendment No. 2, *supra* note 4.

return, the Exchange will cover the costs incurred by the NASD in transferring data,[17] including data to be made available to the public, into the NASD's arbitration and disclosure programs.[18] The parties to any such arbitration matter, however, would be responsible to the NASD for payment of the NASD's arbitration fees. The Exchange also is proposing to amend Section 37(f) of Rule 950 to make the names of arbitrators in customer arbitration awards publicly available, in order to facilitate the NASD's administration of the arbitration claims.[19]

Because Rule 950, Section 44, requires NASD arbitration and subjects Phlx members to the Code, failure to pay a NASD arbitration award and failure to submit to NASD arbitration would be consider a violation of Phlx Rule 950. Such violations would be subject to disciplinary action under Phlx rules.[20]

In addition to terminating its arbitration program, the Exchange proposes to amend Rule 950 to combine the customer and member arbitration programs such that arbitrators for member cases will be drawn from the same pool as arbitrators for customer cases.[21] This is necessary in order to arbitrate already pending member cases. The arbitrator pool for member cases was disbanded by a proposed rule change to Phlx By-Law provisions which changed the Arbitration Committee from an arbitration pool to an advisory committee.[22]

2. Statutory Basis

The Phlx believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act[23] in general, and Section 6(b)(5) of the Act[24] in particular, because the proposal provides an alternative forum for investors and members[25] to arbitrate disputes in light of the cessation of the Exchange's arbitration program.

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

The Phlx does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any inappropriate burden on competition.

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

No written comments were solicited or received at the time of the filing.

III. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change 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, D.C. 20549. 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 in Washington, DC. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Phlx. All submissions should refer to file number SR–Phlx–98–28 and should be submitted by October 29, 1998.

IV. Commission's Findings and Order Granting Accelerated Approval of the Proposed Rule Change

The Commission believes that the proposal is consistent with the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act.[26] Specifically, the Commission believes the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act,[27] which requires an exchange to have rules designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest.[28] In particular, the Commission believes that the proposed rule change eliminating the Phlx's arbitration program and referring cases to the NASD for arbitration will help protect investors and the public interest by ensuring there is a fair arbitration forum available for all Phlx arbitration claims.

The Commission believes that it is consistent with the Act to allow the Phlx to send its arbitration cases to the NASD for arbitration, in part because the Phlx is no longer willing to operate the program due to the costs associated with running the program. The Commission also believes that procedurally the proposed rule change should adequately ensure that all arbitration cases that would be subject to Phlx's arbitration process will be provided for under the NASD arbitration program, by viture Phlx members being deemed ''members'' of the NASD for purposes of arbitrating any claims involving the securities business of any members of Phlx.[29] The proposed rule change accomplishes this by subject Phlx members, as of October 1, 1998, to the NASD's Code for ''every claim, dispute, or controversy, arising out of or in connection with the securities business of any member of the Exchange, including disputes outlined in Section 1, Section 6 and Section 8'' of Phlx Rule 950. In addition, the proposed rule change requires that Phlx members abide by the NASD's Code as

[17] In Amendment No. 3, *supra* note 5, the Exchange amended this language by deleting the reference to a contract with the NASD and by limiting costs payable by Phlx to those costs incurred in transferring data regarding Phlx arbitrators. The latter change was unintentional. The Phlx intends to cover costs incurred in transferring all data from Phlx to NASD, not just costs associated with transferring data regarding Phlx arbitrators. Therefore, notwithstanding Amendment No. 3, this sentence has been revised to reflect Phlx's agreement with the NASD. Telephone conversation between Nandita Yagnik, Counsel, Phlx, and Terri Evans, Attorney, Division, Commission, on September 30, 1998.

[18] *See* Amendment No. 3, *supra* note 5.

[19] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 3.

[20] The failure to abide by the NASD arbitration procedures by a Phlx member would trigger the disciplinary process (investigation and action pursuant to Phlx Rules 960). For example, failure to pay an arbitration award rendered pursuant to the Code would constitute a violation of Phlx Rule 950, because proposed Rule 950, Section 44, subjects Phlx members to the Code. *Id.* The Exchange intends to notify its members of the filing and approval of the proposal.

[21] *Id.*

[22] *See* Letter from Edith Hallahan, Vice President & Associate General Counsel, Phlx, to Michael Walinskas, Deputy Associate Director, Division, Commission, dated August 7, 1998 (regarding (i) withdrawal of SR–Phlx–98–06, which provided for, in part, the combination of customer and member arbitration programs, and (ii) inclusion of such provisions in SR–Phlx–98–28); Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 3; and Securities Exchange Act Release No. 38960 (August 22, 1997), 62 FR 45904 (August 29, 1997) (order granting approval to proposed rule change relating to amendments to certificate of incorporation and by-laws of the Exchange).

[23] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[24] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[25] *See* Amendment No. 2, *supra* note 4.

[26] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[27] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[28] In approving this rule, the Commission notes that it has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

[29] The Commission notes that the Phlx will cover the costs incurred by the NASD in transferring data, including data to be made available to the public, into the NASD's arbitration and disclosure programs. The parties to any such arbitration matter, however, would be responsible to the NASD for payment of the NASD's arbitration fees.

if they were members of the NASD for purposes of arbitration.

In addition, the Commission believes that the proposed rule change adequately provides for the enforcement of Phlx Rule 950, Section 44, because Phlx will continue to be responsible for the enforcement and disciplining of members regarding arbitration. A Phlx member's failure to pay an arbitration award rendered pursuant to the NASD's Code would constitute a violation of Phlx Rule 950, Section 44, since it is that rule, as amended, that subjects Phlx members to the NASD's Code. Similarly, a Phlx member's refusal to submit to arbitration pursuant to the NASD's Code would constitute a violation of Phlx Rule 950, Section 44.

Finally, the Phlx provides adequate measures for the transition from the Phlx arbitration forum to the NASD arbitration form. Even though the Phlx will no longer accept any new claims filed with the arbitration program as of October 1, 1998, it will continue to operate its program in order to administer its current, open cases and any new claims received prior to October 1, 1998. The Exchange will then discontinue its arbitration program when all such cases have been closed.[30]

The Commission also believes that the proposed rule change combining the customer and member arbitration programs helps protect the public interest by focusing the Exchange's arbitration efforts on its existing arbitration docket, including arbitrations involving member controversies. The Commission believes that the proposed rule change provides a fair procedure for members to arbitrate any dispute claim or controversy arising out of or in connection with the securities business and further notes that the proposed rule change is necessary in order to arbitrate pending member cases.

The Exchange has requested that the Commission approve the proposal prior to the thirtieth day after the date of publication of notice of the proposal in the **Federal Register.** The Commission finds good cause for approving the proposed rule change prior to the thirtieth day after the date of publication of notice thereof in the **Federal Register,** because the Commission believes that the proposed rule change will allow for fair arbitration of all member arbitration claims and will facilitate the processing of the Exchange's remaining arbitration cases by permitting both public customers and members to arbitrate their disputes.

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,[31] that the proposed rule change (SR–Phlx–98–28), as amended, is approved on an accelerated basis.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[32]

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–27000 Filed 10–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[30] The Commission notes that the Exchange has stated that at that time it will submit a filing to the Commission to delete provisions of Rule 950, except for those provisions regarding the transfer of its arbitration program to the NASD. The Commission notes that Phlx should also not delete the part of the Phlx Rule 950, Section 39, which generally provides that it may be deemed conduct inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade for a member, member organization or person associated with a member to fail to arbitration on demand, fail to appear or to produce any document in his possession or control as directed, or fail to honor an award of arbitrators properly rendered when required by Rule 950.

[31] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[32] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice No. 2901]

Overseas Security Advisory Council (OSAC) Meeting Notice; Closed Meeting

The Department of State announces a meeting of the U.S. State Department—Overseas Security Advisory Council on October 27, 28, and 29, at the State Department in Washington, D.C. Pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1) and (4), it has been determined the meeting will be closed to the public. Matters relative to classified national security information as well as privileged commercial information will be discussed. The agenda calls for the discussion of classified and corporate proprietary/security information as well as private sector physical and procedural security policies and protective programs at sensitive U.S. Government and private sector locations overseas.

For more information contact Marsha Thurman, Overseas Security Advisory Council, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20522–1033, phone: 202–663–0869.

Dated: September 21, 1998.

Peter E. Bergin,

Director of the Diplomatic Security Service.

[FR Doc. 98–27005 Filed 10–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–24–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Termination of Operating Authority of Certain Foreign Air Carriers

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Order to Show Cause, Docket OST–98–4531, Order 98–10–3.

SUMMARY: The Department is inviting comments on its tentative decision to terminate the foreign air carrier permit and exemption authority held by 47 foreign air carriers. These foreign air carriers have failed to file family assistance plans with the Department and the National Transportation Safety Board, as required by the Foreign Air Carrier Family Support Act of 1997 (Act), 49 U.S.C. 41313. The Act, signed into law by the President on December 16, 1997, requires foreign air carriers to file plans for addressing the needs of families of passengers involved in an aviation disaster. The deadline for filing the plans was June 15, 1998. Since that time, the Department has taken repeated measures to notify foreign carriers of their responsibility to file their plans, and to offer assistance to the affected carriers. Of the 252 foreign air carriers required to file plans, 205 have done so. The Department believes that the continued failure of the remainder to file, particularly in the face of repeated advisories from the Department that they must do so, constitutes grounds for termination of those carriers' authority to serve the United States. Of the 47 non-filing carriers, the Department has received information that at least 32 are no longer in business, and that others no longer conduct any U.S. operations, have no near-term plans to do so, and do not oppose the termination of their authority. The 47 foreign air carriers whose authority the Department proposes to terminate are: Aero Transcolombiana de Carga Ltda.; Aerolineas Latinas, C.A.; Aeronautica de Cancun, S.A.; Aeronaves del Peru, S.A.; Air Manitoba Limited; Air Niagara Express, Inc.; Anglo Airlines Limited; Blue Scandinavia AB; Caicos Caribbean Airways Limited; Canair Cargo Ltd.; ChallengAir; Cherokee Air, Ltd.; Cleare Air Limited; Compania de Aviacion ''Faucett'', S.A.; Garuda Indonesia; General Air Cargo, G.A.C., C.A.; Interestatal de Aviacion, S.A.; Jet Air International Charters, C.A.; Jetall Holdings Corp.; Jetflight Limited; Kar-Air oy; Lineas Aereas La-Tur, S.A.; Nigeria Airways, Ltd.; Nordic European Airlines International AB; North Cariboo Flying Service Ltd.; North Coast