## CONFIDENTIAL

NPIC/PADS/D/6-1609 3 October 1966

	•						
		MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant for Photographic Analysis, NPIC					
Т	-	ATTENTION:					
Т	•	SUBJECT: Stereoviewer Evaluation					
		1. Effective 15 September 1966, PADS transferred one  Stereoviewer to PAG on a temporary loan basis for an operational evaluation.  2. This instrument which is an East German production model originally designed for cartographic work has some unique features and operating characteristics which we feel may have possible application in NPIC film exploitation. A listing of some of these characteristics (Attachment 1) is included for your information.  3. We request that PAG perform an operational evaluation of this equipment from both a technical and a human engineering viewpoint and forward a summary of their recommendations and comments to PADS by 17 October 1966. An evaluation form (Attachment 2) is included to simplify this process.  4. At the completion of this evaluation it is requested that PAG transfer the stereoviewer to IAD for further evaluation.					
		Colonel, USAF Assistant for Plans and Development, NPIC					
		Attachments: 1. Technical Data 2. List of Evaluation Questions					
		Distribution: Orig & 1 - Addressee 3 - P&DS/DB (99843-5)					
Т		NPIC/P&DS/DB: (3 Oct. 1966)					

GROUP 1
Excluded from automa:
downgrading and
downgrading and
declassification

STA

ATTACHMENT 1

3 October 1966

TECHNICAL DATA FOR STEREOVIEWER

STAT

Magnification: 2X to 6X and 5X to 15X

Resolution: 13 1/mm @ 2X, 40 1/mm @ 6X and 100 1/mm @ 13X

Magnification compensation between right and left picture:

with zoom - up to 1:3

with zoom and turret - up to 1:7.5

Field of Stereoscopic View: 200 mm/magnification

Diopter Adjustment: +5

IPD Adjustment: 55 - 75 mm

Illuminated Surface: Incident light - adjustable to ll0mm  $(4\frac{1}{2})$ 

diameter transmitted light - 600 X 300mm (24 x 12")

Optical Image Rotation: 360 degrees

Common displacement of objectives: (Free-hand motion) X axis max

240mm (9½")

Y axis max 300mm (12")

Parallel axis motion of objectives: X axis 90-310mm  $(3\frac{1}{2} - 12")$ 

Y axis +65mm  $(2\frac{1}{2}")$ 

Operating voltage: 220v 50cy (110v 60cy with transformer)

Power requirement: 250 watts

Dimensions: Width without film holder: 1000mm  $(39\frac{1}{2})$ 

Width with film holder: 1260mm  $(50^{\circ})$ Depth with film holder: 700mm  $(27\frac{1}{2})$ 

Height with film holder:  $1273 \text{mm} \left(50\frac{\text{I}}{2}\right)$ 

Weight with film holder: 276hg (620 lbs.)

ATTACHMENT 2

## TENTATIVE EQUIPMENT EVALUATION FORM

Α.	Please answer either by checking "Yes", "No", Not Applicable.	or YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE
	1) Is this piece of equipment satisfactory		2,0	NOT MITHORDING
as	is?		•	
	2) Does it fulfill a real requirement?			
•	a) Can you now accomplish a new			
	job?			
	b) An old job easier?			
	c) An old job faster?			
	d) An old job more accurately?			
	3) Would its training time outweigh its			
eve	entual advantages?	-		
	4) Is equipment comfortable to use?			***************************************
	a) Seating position comfortable?	1		<del></del>
	b) Viewing position comfortable?		<del></del>	
	5) Does it produce noticeable fatigue?			
	a) Eye fatigue?			
	b) Muscular fatigue?			
	6) Is the intensity of illumination			<del></del>
ade	equate?	1 1		
	a) Is the color of illumination			
	pleasing?	1 1		
	b) Is glare a problem?	1		
	7) Is resolution adequate?			<u> </u>
	a) Is the magnification range broad			
	,	1		
	enough? 8) Is the field of view large enough?		<del></del>	
	a) Is the image's shape distorted? :		-	
	b) Is its color aberrated?			
	9) Is the operating temperature low enough?			·
•	10) Is this machine of sufficient durability	! !		
ror	its potential working environment?			
•	11) Are the controls satisfactory?	!		
	a) Too hard to reach?	11		
	b) Too hard to identify?			
	c) Would you prefer a greater degree of			
	control automation (more buttons	1		•
	rather than handwheels, joysticks,			
	etc.)?			•
	d) A lesser degree?			
	12) Can the same job be performed better			
on a	an existing instrument?	1 1		
	If so, one which one?			************
	13) Is a operation too time-consuming?			
	If so, which one(s)?			
	14) Is this instrument too complex?	7	·	
	If so, in what way?			
	15) Is pointing easy enough?		··· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	a) Is the reticle satisfactory?		<del></del>	
	If not, how not?			
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

B. 1) Please discuss whether or not your objections to this development,

if any, are to its total concept or to its specific implementation.

2) What essential improvements would you recommend? What alterations, additions or deletions do you think are necessary?