

Annotation:  
*Already sent to  
Brother Hem*

Comments on the Request to Purchase  
Tractors' Spare Parts from Yugoslavia  
(IMT540 and IMT558 Tractors for Ploughing Purpose)



- We already sent the list of purchase request to Yugoslavia in a form of letter dated 16 March 1978.
- We received the invoice of price quotes from the supplier on 9 August 1978. The total cost is USD 226, 904.53 CIF Kampong Som.
- Our technical ministry already examined the list of spare parts and proposed amendment to some items. It was done through a letter dated 24 August 1978, and we also requested our supplier to re-issue a new invoice.
- Having waited for the reply from our supplier for too long, we faxed them to seek for the information on 3 November 1978 (the supplier has not yet replied to this fax).
- On 11 November 1978 we received the letter and the invoice from the supplier (through the Democratic Kampuchea Embassy in Beijing). The letter was dated on 19 September 1978 and the invoice was dated on 11 September 1978, which will be expired with effect from 10 November 1978 (they gave us 60 days to review and decide on the purchase). In this new invoice, the supplier included a spare part that we did not request for (60 items of the spare part which cost 122.40 dollars) by indicating that this spare part is necessary for other spare part we requested to buy.
  - o The total cost is USD 194,172.00 CIF Kampong Som.
  - o Delivery is made within 180 days after the credit has been received.
- Processing Method
  - o Because the invoice is no longer valid, it is suggested that we fax the supplier requesting them to extend the validity period for the invoice until 10 December 1978.
  - o When the supplier agrees with this request, our Cambodia Bank will transfer the money for the purchase to Yugo Banka Belgrade through which the supplier receives their payment (the payment has to be made by 10 December 1978).
- My comments
  - o I would like to propose the issue of letter delivery that is related to commerce affairs [to be discussed].
  - o From my experience in this issue, I propose that the concerned section be the one who receives and delivers letter(s). When it receives the letter, the date of receipt should be written on the envelop. By doing so, we will be able to tell which section is responsible for any delay of letter delivery.

For example, for RUDNAP letter, we do not know whether it is RUDNAP's fault, it is the fault of Yugoslavian Embassy in Beijing or it is our embassy's fault in Beijing as there is no stamp or anything written about when the letter was received.

I would like you, Brother, to be informed of this report and give your comments as guidance. Especially, I would like to invite the ministry in charge of this spare part issue to come and discuss and make decision accordingly.

Respectfully Yours,

12 November 1978

Committee of Commerce