

them to Saigon. Saigon has 30 days to screen each of these documents and then they tell us they want 50 or 100 of them or all or some of them. We immediately tell Saigon this is only a temporary measure because the possibility exists we will not get all these items, but we will get most of them. Then as the items come in we earmark them for Saigon and consider it a commitment and begin work on it immediately. Our schedule is based on the firm commitments we have made.

Mr. ROMNEY. In the course of the rehabilitation of an item it might be discovered that far more work is required than originally appeared to be the case. What consultation is necessary upon that discovery and what decisions are made in a typical situation?

Mr. WOLL. Well, No. 1, when a piece of property comes in here it is inspected to ascertain if it has been cannibalized since we received an order for it and whether it has been damaged. Then an inspection is made by the contractor's staff as well as our marshaling site superintendent. Each item of repair that is required for this item is listed on a work order with the time that it is supposed to take. After this work order has been negotiated by our marshaling site superintendent and the contractor's personnel they start to work on the property. If during this process it is found that something else comes to light that requires more rehabilitation than we thought, our marshaling site superintendent has the authority to determine whether we should go forward with this, and the criterion for going forward with rehabilitation is if a firm commitment has been made in the past.

Mr. ROMNEY. This is not an economic criterion. If the work requires an additional amount of money that would make the item perhaps twice as expensive for you to process than was estimated before, you would still carry it through if you had the commitment?

Mr. WOLL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROMNEY. Does this happen in every case?

Mr. WOLL. No, sir. It better not happen in every case. If it does our inspection and the contractor's inspection of the item prior to the start of the work is not right, and it just better not happen in every case.

Mr. ROMNEY. Do you have an idea of how many times it is necessary to make a subsequent addition to the work order?

Mr. WOLL. Al, could you give us an estimate?

Mr. GIBSON. Roughly 20 to 25 percent. At the same time some of our work orders run under the estimate.

Mr. ROMNEY. And in each case before a work order is amended is there a physical inspection made by the AID representative to determine whether it is feasible to proceed?

Mr. WOLL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROMNEY. In cases where you do not have a prior commitment?

Mr. WOLL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROMNEY. In each case?

Mr. WOLL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROMNEY. In terms of actual number of items, does this not impose a considerable workload on the AID representative? In effect, then, you have three inspections of every item: (1) The brief inspection upon arrival to see if the item has been cannibalized or damaged in shipment; (2) the inspection to determine what work is to be done; and (3) in 20 or 25 percent of the cases an inspection or examination to determine what should be done with respect to possible amended work orders?