

they accounted for 88 percent of all such items. Relatively few materials handling equipments were dated; of those that were, the preponderance fell into the eleven-to-fifteen-year interval. The same interval constituted the mode for compressors, generators, and pumps.

(2) Standards of Rehabilitation: It is the announced policy of MR/GPR on rehabilitation of excess equipments to restore such equipments to 70 percent of their original serviceability before shipment to missions for use in the field. While this policy is voiced many times throughout the MR/GPR organization, it is likewise clear that actual rehabilitation is undertaken on an "... inspect and repair only as necessary" basis.¹⁰ And, what is necessary depends primarily upon the condition of the particular EPRO since no written MR/GPR standards for frequent complaints registered against excess equipment, as recorded in the various AID reports, concerns bald tires. Research has disclosed that most excess equipments ready for shipment this summer had poor tires—either poor tread or poor casings, or both.

In June 1966, the Director of MR/GPR sent a memorandum to each EPRO Officer-in-Charge, attaching a copy of a Saigon report which indicated a "... very serious problem of deterioration of rubber componentry in mechanical items." The Director's memorandum concluded:

"As a matter of policy, I fully endorse USAID's recommendation that all such parts subject to deterioration be replaced during the rehab process, even though the part may meet our normal Section 608 criteria. Please take the action required and implement this direction at once."

What effect the Director's memorandum has had to this point is uncertain. Certainly, when he was informed of one EPRO's interpretation of his words "rubber componentry" as not requiring new tires, the Director stated that he would correct the EPRO's misinterpretation.

On balance, it is clear that AID cannot afford to rehabilitate equipments to the level of serviceability undertaken by the Department of Defense. But AID is not limited to a mere choice of either retaining present minimum standards or going to military rebuilding criteria. Other possible levels lie in between.

(3) EPRO Operating Differences: (a) *Differing rehabilitation levels.*—Research conducted in Vietnam confirmed the view that foreign excess equipments are often rehabilitated to higher standards than domestic. One reason for this difference is the existence of written standards in the Tokyo EPRO's largest rehabilitation contract. Another reason, perhaps, is the matter of labor rates, which range from about 24 cents an hour in Korea to something over a dollar

¹⁰ Indeed, the minutes of the process actually employed this year employed "inspect and repair only as necessary" as a criterion for the conduct of rehabilitation operations.

¹¹ The Tokyo EPRO has developed a series of written standards for rehabilitation of the equipments undertaken by one of its contractors—Japan Aircraft. By lay standards, these criteria appear to be thorough, viable, and reasonably explicit.