

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : The Files

DATE: 23 April 1957

FROM :

DOC	5	REV DATE	6 MAY 1957	BY	018313
ORIG COMP	033	OPI	56	TYPE	021
ORIG CLASS	5	PAGES	2	REV CLASS	2
JUST	22	NEXT REV	2010	AUTH:	HR 70-2

50X1

SUBJECT: Contract RD-128, Task Order 1, QRF with [redacted]

50X1

1. On 18 April 1957 the writer, accompanied by [redacted] SPD/EAB, visited the QRF contractor to investigate the status of the minifon recorder redesign under Work Order No. 4. Delivery of the engineering models of this unit was at that time almost three weeks late.

50X1

2. The company project engineer showed one of the engineering models which was almost completely assembled. The following deficiencies were noted:

- a. The amplifier battery holder was poorly constructed and battery replacement would require shifting of a holder by loosening two screws and then manipulation with a screwdriver or similar tool to pry the battery from the spring holder.
- b. The front panel of the amplifier which forms part of the outside of the case did not match the contour of the case corners.
- c. With the top cover of the equipment open, the motor and delicate speed governing mechanism were exposed.
- d. Removal of the motor battery was difficult.
- e. The amplifier ON/OFF switch was unsatisfactory.
- f. The cover latch was poorly constructed.
- g. The equipment cover was poorly mounted to the case.
- h. The multi-conductor amplifier jack was exposed.
- i. The component parts were not finished uniformly.
- j. The potted amplifier which slides into the unit from the front of the case was not keyed and could be put into the case upside down which might damage the pins of the plug connector.

SECRET**CONFIDENTIAL**

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

- k. The motor switch was difficult to operate and the handle was crudely made.
- l. The equipment covers did not mate properly with the case.

3. The contractor was advised of the unsatisfactory condition of the equipment and was asked to prepare a list of corrections which could be made within two weeks. The writer called the Government Contracts Administrator at [redacted] and informed him of the unsatisfactory state of Work Order No. 4. The writer and [redacted] met with the company engineers again on 22 April 1957. The deficiencies listed above were discussed in detail with the company agreeing to make the recommended changes and promising delivery of three engineering models on 10 May 1957.

50X1
50X1

4. The enthusiasm which [redacted] displayed originally for the QRF seems to have lessened considerably over the past six weeks. The decreasing work load and the difficult cost accounting appear to be the direct causes. The company project engineer, originally full time QRF engineer has been assigned other projects, consequently the service needed on a QRF contract has not been forthcoming. We have waited three to four weeks for a cost estimate on the antenna measurements scheduled under Work Order No. 9. With the company's work order processing method it is no longer possible to initiate work by telephone. As evidenced by the interference generator, Work Order No. 5, and the type of work described in Paragraph 2 above, the quality of design is lacking. It is the writer's opinion that major changes in the contract and a more carefully planned work schedule will be necessary for satisfactory operation of the QRF during the next fiscal year.

50X1



50X1

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL