

3. No procedure had been established for allocation of property on a priority basis, as prescribed in the GOT directive of general policy and procedures for acquisition and transfer of U.S. excess property.

4. No back-order system had been established for filling the requests for property which were not available at the time requests were received.

5. No summary information had been prepared of unfilled requests from each agency. The only way to ascertain the backlog and age of unfilled request was to check each individual request.

6. As of February 27, 1966, the Excess Property Branch had 409 unfilled requisition for 6,651 items of equipment 36,000 meters of water pipe, 39,000 meters of electric and telephone cable and other miscellaneous items. 182 requisitions for 1271 items were 30 to 120 days old, 49 requisitions for 731 items were six months old, 157 requisitions for 1,073 items were 12 months old and 21 requisitions for 3,576 items were 18 months old. We were unable to ascertain which requisitions had been screened against excess property catalogs.

Recommendation H-1 (Action Office—GOT Ministry of Finance): It is recommended that all GOT and Municipal employees, having access to the organization of the program and of their responsibilities in connection with the program.

Recommendation H-2 (Action Office—GOT Ministry of Finance, OIEC Excess Property Branch): It is recommended that the OIEC design and install an administrative management improvement program specifically including:

a. A program and priority allocation system for excess property broken down into ministry and independent agency program appropriate to the needs of each ministry and independent agency.

b. A back-order system for filling requests for property which is not available at the time the requests are received.

c. Summary control information on unfilled requests from each agency.

d. Procedures for clearing the backlog of unfilled requisitions.

VII. GENERAL COMMENTS

The following comments are based on 82 individual end-use reports of visits to 74 recipients. Two reports each were made on 8 recipients of both direct acquisition and Section 608 property.

Utilization

With the exception of isolated instances, the recipients are obtaining maximum work value from the excess property received to date. It is our opinion that the non-utilization problems disclosed by the audit are relatively normal to a program the size and nature of the Excess Property Program in Turkey.

Illustrative of obtaining maximum work value from excess property is the utilization of the following road building equipment transferred to the Turkish Republic of Turkey: