31	Paris 66–77	Housing, flywheel and clutch, REO, truck	234	3,323

The listing should not be interpreted to suggest that AID should have claimed all or even most of its items. Indeed, it is deemed obvious that many were unsuitable. Rather, the intent is to show that some items do survive screening and, in connection therewith, to indicate the types of items that have survived.

b. *Receipt of Excess.*—AID Advance Acquisition (608) shipping documents carry the notation:

"In accordance with the Administrator's directive . . . the USAID excess property office should inspect all items covered by the subject purchase order immediately upon arrival in the host country and report their condition to MR/GPR/W."

Over 30 perecnt of the FY66 shipments of domestic excess to Vietnam came through the port of Saigon during the two months of April and May. The weight and cube of those shipments slightly exceeded 1,600 metric tons. It would appear that three excess property officers in Saigon would find it impossible to carry out this responsibility. Fortunately, in the Vietnam Mission, responsibiilty for arrival inspection of excess property has been assigned to the Maintenance organization, and Maintenance has, at least in part, contracted it out.

On balance, it appears that excess property staff personnel share the general MR/GPR attitude that once an item of excess has been delivered to the host country, AID's concern with it ceases. In excess property, as otherwise in Vietnam, no density figures are available. The Section's records show what excess property has been received over the [illegible] acquisitions, the acquisition process is, as it were, difficult enough without making maintainability a further limiting factor. Mission noncompliance may perhaps be attributable to the separation of supply and maintenance functions, or perhaps to the widespread attitude that mission responsibility ceases upon delivery of the item to the host government, or to a combination of both. In any event, and notwithstanding formal policy declarations, maintenance in general and spare parts in particular remain a major, unsolved problem in the AID excess property program.

The minutes of the Excess Property Seminar conducted May 23–25, 1966, in Panama (held for Latin American personnel) state that

". . . spare parts support on excess property is far more complicated than on new procurement and . . . the likely need for spare parts in the case of old equipment is greater than in the case of new, yet, at the same time, spares are more difficult to come by."

The Bureau of Latin America has a proposed Spare Parts and Maintenance Policy (which, as of 27 September 1966, lacked only MR/GPR clearance to become official). This Policy declares:

"*No* excess property . . . which requires spare parts for normal maintenance will be authorized for use in any grant or loan program in Latin America unless . . . the Borrower/Grantee . . . will immediately make arrangements to assure the availability of spare parts normally required."

d. *Equipment vs. Commodity Excess.*—The 608 program as operated by MR/GPR involves a flat accessorial charge of 15 percent against all items of excess property, irrespective of the item. Since roughly 75 percent of all dollars in the