CENTER ROUTING SLIP

FROM

RESEARCH & ENGINEERING DIVISION

DATE 26 AUG 1970

| TO | | INITIALS | DATE | REMARKS |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DIRECTOR | | | | FYI |
| DEP/DIRECTOR | | | | |
| EXEC/DIRECTOR | | | | |
| SPECIAL ASST | 1 | M | 8/27 | |
| ASST TO DIR | | | | |
| HISTORIAN | | | | |
| JJH | 2 | JJH | 8/31 | Held |
| CH/PPBS | | | | |
| DEP CH/PPBS | | | | Copies of the draft |
| EXO/PPBS | | | | of this memo were |
| | | | | sent to [redacted] 25X1 |
| CH/SS | | | | |
| DEP CH/SS | | | | & [redacted] 25X1 |
| SC & P | | | | |
| RECORDS MGT | | | | per PNS direction |
| PERSONNEL | | | | |
| LOGISTICS | | | | |
| TRAINING | | | | |
| SECURITY | | | | |
| FINANCE | | | | |
| CH/IEG | | | | |
| DEP CH/IEG | | | | |
| EXO/IEG | | | | |
| CH/PSG | | | | |
| DEP CH PSG | | | | |
| EXO PSG | | | | |
| CH/TSG | | | | |
| DEP CH/TSG | | | | |
| EXO/TSG | | | | |
| DIR/IAS/DDI | | | | |
| CH/DIAXX-4 | | | | |
| CH/DIAAP-9 | | | | |
| CH/SPAD | | | | |

IP FORM 30 (7-70) OBSOLETE PREVIOUS EDITIONS

SECRET

NPIC/TSG/RED/SDB-030-70
21 August 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table with Representatives [redacted] 25X1 25X1

1. On 18 August 1970, a meeting was held in [redacted] 25X1 to discuss the evaluation of the prototype [redacted] 1540 Model II Light Table. In attendance were Messrs. [redacted] 25X1 25X1 25X1

2. [redacted] opened the meeting by stating that the [redacted] had requested the meeting. He asked if [redacted] had specific questions they wished to have answered. [redacted] stated that he had questions on the short comings of their equipment: 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1

a. In what ways were the systems and subsystems of the [redacted] table deficient? How were they relative to the [redacted] table? 25X1 25X1

b. In the evaluation of the tables, was past performance of the companies rated? Did managerial, technical, or any other factors influence the evaluation?

c. He had questions on the equality of the evaluation. He stated he heard rumors about the evaluation.

d. Is the [redacted] table built to the same specifications as the [redacted] table? 25X1 25X1

e. Was [redacted] allowed to make more corrections to their table during the evaluation period? 25X1

f. Was the [redacted] table over engineered, and if so, was this brought out at the critique? 25X1

3. [redacted] pointed out that his organization carried out a quantitative evaluation and not a subjective one. Mr. [redacted] suggested that it might answer most of the questions if [redacted] briefed on his evaluation of the "fixes" made to 25X1 25X1 25X1

SECRET

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic downgrading and declassification

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table with Representatives [redacted] [redacted] 25X1 25X1 25X1

the [redacted] table. [redacted] gave the same briefing he gave the Executive Director, NPIC, on 4 August 1970. He stated that the deficiencies had been corrected with the exception of: 25X1

a. Excessive temperature at the film plane after 4.5 hours operation with 2.0 density film.

b. Rate control of the carriage movement was still too high.

c. Dirt still got under the glass.

4. [redacted] said they would like to know what must be done to improve the equipment and make it competitive. [redacted] stated we would be glad to discuss the shortcomings and corrections to the [redacted] table but would not give a comparison of systems and subsystems of the [redacted] [redacted] tables. He explained that a time problem existed during the evaluation period, and the Center made an engineering judgment of which table came closest to meeting specifications and the PI needs. He stated that both tables did not totally meet specs, and that the shortcomings were reviewed with T&E and IEG, and the decision had to be made on a time basis. He stated that if the [redacted] had initially contained all these "fixes" it could have influenced our decision. 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1

5. [redacted] asked when the decision was made to go with [redacted] said it would be difficult to answer since there are many decision points in our procurement cycle. This varies from the operational request to the executive sign off. He thought it might have occurred in June. [redacted] stated that they had demonstrated some "fixes" in April and some in mid-June. He asked if the decision had been made prior to mid-June. [redacted] stated that due to our procurement cycle, the decision had to be made prior to the end of June and technical and cost considerations both entered the picture. He said he would not hazard a guess if the present [redacted] table and a different price would have won the competition. [redacted] said they ran operational tests on both tables in March and April. The PIs felt they could immediately go to work on the [redacted] table, but they desired further features. The PIs felt they could not do this with the [redacted] table. 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table with Representatives of the [redacted] 25X1 25X1 25X1

6. [redacted], asked if [redacted] was allowed in more frequently for repairs. [redacted] said he could not state how many times each company was in for repairs. He stated that the ground rules were that a contractor would be allowed in for repairs only if the malfunction would cause the termination of the T&E tests. [redacted] stated that 8 series of PIs were used in the operational tests. There was very little down time for either table. Cost information was withheld and only the operation of the table was used in the evaluation. [redacted] asked what items prevented the [redacted] table being used immediately. [redacted] stated that the film drives, the heat problem, and the film tracking prevented its immediate use. 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1

7. [redacted], stated that the over temperature of the drive systems was caused by a failure of a component that was allowed to remain uncorrected during the evaluation period. He thought this might have seriously affected the evaluation. [redacted] stated this was not the case. A list was made of all the faults, and a description made of the seriousness of the fault. In all cases, faults had detailed rationales as to their seriousness. Heat in PI space alone did not reject the table. [redacted] stated that the 70mm tracking was a very serious problem during the operational evaluation. [redacted] stated this did not occur initially at the [redacted] plant. The first [redacted] knew of this was when the table was returned to [redacted] after the critique. [redacted] stated that we have to assume that the table is in proper working order and ready for evaluation when it is delivered to us. 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1

8. [redacted] asked if [redacted] was asked in more often during the T&E. [redacted] stated that they were not asked in more as far as he is aware. [redacted] stated that [redacted] had one recurring problem and [redacted] two problem areas. [redacted] did not know the dates and number of visits. He said [redacted] worked on the carriage drives several times when it stopped the tests, but that [redacted] was not allowed to make other "fixes" during these visits. 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1

9. [redacted] asked if any other evaluating groups (from the Intelligence Community) had been involved in the decision on the tables. [redacted] stated that we brokered the evaluation for the Community through our T&E and operational people. 25X1 25X1

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table with Representatives [redacted] [redacted] 25X1

10. [redacted] said he is still at a loss to get a hold on the situation. He asked what it is about the [redacted] table that is not satisfactory or is less satisfactory than the [redacted] table. He said [redacted] needed to learn "what you are not happy with," and what makes the [redacted] table "less good". [redacted] stated that this had been pretty well covered by [redacted] telling what was wrong and by [redacted] explaining the time frame. 25X1

11. [redacted] asked what does the Center prefer in a table beyond the specs. [redacted] explained that no one table could please every PI, but that the PI could not possibly live with the [redacted] table as it was during the operational evaluation. 25X1

12. [redacted] stated that if they could have looked at the table prior to 4 May, certain "fixes" might have been made. [redacted] stated that they were provided a critique once the T&E had been completed, but that there had been some procrastination on Richards' part in responding to "fixes" to the problems highlighted at the critique. 25X1

13. [redacted] stated that the tracking problem was not made clear at the critique. [redacted] stated this was not true, and that it was the number one item addressed on the [redacted] List of Fixes, dated 22 April. [redacted] also stated that it was discussed at the critique. [redacted] stated that the tracking and hunting problem had not been corrected in late June. 25X1

14. [redacted] stated that it sounds like the Center has thoroughly evaluated the tables. [redacted] asked: "Can you compare the major areas of both tables so [redacted] knows where to improve their table?" [redacted] stated that we have given you an evaluation of the shortcomings of your table, and that a comparison of the tables is not needed. 25X1

15. [redacted] asked what weight was given to past performance. [redacted] stated that the green oil and the leaks could not have come at a worse time, but that we had accepted [redacted] explanation of the method of overcoming this problem. [redacted] asked if the [redacted] table had been over engineered and had too many frills. [redacted] 25X1

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table with Representatives [redacted] [redacted] 25X1 25X1 25X1

said he saw a picture of the [redacted] table and thinks that [redacted] had a more polished job. [redacted] stated that the added items may have given the [redacted] table added points in the evaluation. [redacted] stated that the overall outward appearance of the [redacted] table was better. 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1

16. [redacted] stated they are trying to answer for themselves the great difference in cost for the tables. Did frills contribute to these costs. [redacted] stated that there were many intangible differences between the tables. [redacted] said intangibles only entered the PI evaluation not the T&E. Both tables basically met specs but that the evaluation had to be time oriented. 25X1 25X1 25X1

17. [redacted] asked why the purchase was all one buy if tables were required by a certain date. [redacted] stated that this had been aired and discussed. If [redacted] could not have met the production schedule, there might have been a split order. He further stated that the T&E report will be distributed throughout the Community, and it will state that the fixes have been made to the [redacted] table. 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1

18. [redacted] stated that one point has not been covered. [redacted] built a prototype at a great loss, and a competitor was provided the information free. The competitor is rumored to have received 2 to 3 times as much money for the development. [redacted] stated this was not true - that the amount spent on each contractor for total development was within [redacted] He further stated that we were not buying competition. He also stated that [redacted] would have to answer any questions on contracting. 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1

19. [redacted] emphasized that the results of this procurement by no means meant that we were terminating relationships with the [redacted] We still had respect for and confidence in their capabilities and they would be given an opportunity to bid on future tasks. In fact, [redacted] had recently been solicited for a proposal on the High Intensity Tracking Light Source. 25X1 25X1 25X1

20. [redacted], said the only question he raises is evaluating the [redacted] table without correcting the temperature problem. [redacted] stated that the evaluating people realized the table does not ordinarily operate this hot. 25X1 25X1 25X1

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype [redacted] 1540 Light Table with Representatives [redacted] [redacted] 25X1 25X1 25X1

21. [redacted] thanked the group for their time and information. [redacted] reiterated that the T&E report on the tables and the corrections will go out to the entire Community. 25X1 25X1

25X1

[redacted]
Chief, Systems Development Branch, RED

Distribution:
Original - Exec. Dir/NPIC
1 - C/TSG
1 - C/PPBS
1 - C/IEG
1 - C/ESD/TSG
1 - Route RED
1 - Contract File
1 - SDB Chrono