

**Michael Melich Presentation about Rossi Jan. 14, 2011 Demonstration in Bologna, Italy**  
**Presentation date: Feb. 6, 2011**  
**Presentation location: ICCF-16, Chennai, India**  
**Transcription by Steven B. Krivit**  
**Transcription version: 20160317**

Thank you Francesco.

Francesco had the opportunity to be in the laboratory on the 14th of January. There was – I was invited to come and 0:19 there as well. 0:29 and the reason for not going was that the 0:37 Francesco 0:42 not enable me 0:43 having some experimental experience measuring water heaters I was concerned, about having seen that experimental design, that the trip would be less than useful. Some subsequent time I will explain why it is that I know a fair amount about what Dr. Rossi has done [Note: Melich had seen Rossi demos in New Hampshire in 2009 or 2010.] but the reasons that I am involved in this at all derives from my responsibilities as a federal employee who is frequently approached 1:27 and Rossi and his partners approached us 01:35 said we will not talk 01:37 doing until such time that a report can be produced. We are still not any further 01:44.

There will be a presentation 1:49 during this ICCF-16. David Knies will be doing the presentation and our colleague at the Naval Research Laboratory, Ken Grabowski was the principal designer for the instrumentation 02:14 who essentially 02:15 that Francesco was suggesting. The device that interests me and P.J., last night during the course of a conversation with P.J. King, he said, " Now, if you know something is there and it works, that's information in and of itself." We are in that fuzzy period with Rossi where there are hints that it works, there are inconsistencies in what is reported, there are difficulties in the operability of the device as Francesco has described. And so, to say that it works or not, in a definitive fashion, I don't feel comfortable making such a statement.

The other way in dealing with uncertainty is, what you'd like to do is associate with these kinds of experimental operations. Some probability is going to be sufficient to encourage you to continue or not continue. Yesterday, or Friday or Saturday, I was told, at the tutorial, Mike McKubre explained and described various evolutions of the trials and methods for evaluating new techniques from an inventor. And I think it's fair to say that my first time around is seldom successful, and in fact, the second time around, the third time around, the fourth time around 04:10.

And I've listen to Ed Storms for years describe his experience with his mistress, he refers to "cold fusion" as his mistress and he has various terms that he uses to describe 04:30 and they are not ones of great consistency. So I guess I would caution 04:40 and try and

qualify a bit what it is that Francesco is saying today by saying 04:47. There are 04:53 question I posed to Dave Nagel last night is, "How much attention at a conference should we place in a one-off demonstration of the 14th of January alone? Does that encourage you to go on? Or do you say, well, it didn't work so 05:19 give up."

I think of all the scientific organizations and research groups that I've ever been associated with this is probably the most dogged group I've ever met. The fact that I see the same faces for 22 years convinces me that if we gave up after the first try, we would've given up, we wouldn't be here. So, I've seen enough of Rossi's work, and as I've said, I'm somewhat constrained by my responsibility as a federal employee, but I've seen enough to keep trying. And I can't tell P.J. exactly what this probability 06:06.

But I've looked at a fair number of cold fusion experiments over the years and the question as to whether or not they work and whether or not they will turn into a technology has been something I've had to grapple over and over again 06:29. I consider anything that has, in my estimation, a probability of one in 1,000 of producing a technology worth pursuing 06:42 I think Rossi's experiment can be 06:54 rising to the level of hot fusion. Dave Nagel, on Saturday, pointed out that the goal of ITER is to have a power gain of 10 after the expenditure of five to ten billion dollars after many years.

Francesco was complaining that the power gain [in Rossi's experiment] dropped to 30. I think it's probably worth paying a little — giving a little time, pushing along Rossi to accept 07:40 to let us make these measurements. I think it is in his long-term best interests and I certainly will try and encourage him to do that. But he's a very independent human being and the role that I was 07:57 is to try to facilitate the making of such measurements. So P.J., I can't tell you, but I'd say were probably closer to one in 10 rather than one in 1,000 and that's enough to keep me going.

There's been a fair amount of discussion, I gather, about this topic 08:23. There's been a lot of writing back and forth with Rossi. And the problem Rossi has, as I've understood it, is the problem that every independent inventor has. The history of independent inventors 08:49. Tesla is probably the most famous independent inventor who never realized anything from his inventions. And those lessons are known to us, and so 09:10 and sometimes paranoid people are, in fact, justified 09:18 and I would suggest that, in this case, this community has an interest in cutting [Rossi] a little slack and helping him. And I think the sort of comments Francesco has made are useful. I think there is a commentary that will come in the paper Ken Grabowski wrote and David Knies will present that is useful. The safety issues, the engineering issue, and all the rest of it, that's way down the road. I'm hoping that the nominal 10 kilowatt demonstration that we saw will be taking care of and looked at 10:06 and so I think that that is all I ought to say. I would tell you

though it strikes me, to complain about power gain, 120 dropping to 80, project like ITER  
10:26 20 years