

Arnold, Debra

From: Wood, Bryan
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2008 2:46 PM
To: Adams, Holly; Paoletti, Charles R; Gruber, Patricia; Christodoulou, Julie A.; Shlesinger, Michael; Lawrence, Joseph
Subject: Purdue Scientific Misconduct STIB

ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGE - DO NOT DISSEMINATE

Folks:

As painful as it has been, I have read through just about everything that Holly has gathered on the Taleyarkian issue. I wish I could say that I understood all of it, but I'm really not that smart. With that said, I have one basic question: was Dr. Xu's experiment/work carried out under the ONR/UCLA grant or at least funded by it? After reading everything, I can't tell. Here's my quick(?) summation of the facts as I understand them:

* The ONR grant to UCLA required two actions: (1) the complete rebuild of the sonofusion thingy at Purdue with Tal's full input and Tal then using that thingy to recreate his original test and results from his Oak Ridge days; and (2) Tal's full cooperation with UCLA so that UCLA could set up a carbon copy sonofusion thingy at UCLA and attempt to duplicate Tal's experiment/results.

* USCL would subgrant to Purdue to pay for the cost of Tal's participation in this experiment/attempt to confirm.

* UCLA also would subgrant to Illinios for Suslick's input/analysis on the overall grant requirement.

Tal spent the subgrant funds to set up the sonofusion thingy at Purdue, get Cho (from Oak Ridge) to help do so, ran the experiment and failed to duplicate the results.

* After consultaion with Tal and obtaining the design of the sonofusion thingy that Tal had at Oak Ridge, UCLA set up its duplicate sonofusion thingy, conducted the experiment and also failed to duplicate Tal's results form Oak Ridge.

* Now the fuzzy part: it appears to me from the Purdue SM report (not any of the grant, subgrant, cost element or final report documents) that Tal sponsored Xu in attempting to perform ANOTHER duplicate experiment on the Purdue sonosofusion thingy in an attempt to independently confirm his results. He reported that the results were confirmed by the Xu experiment.

* The original and follow-on grant proposals from UCLA, Purdue and Illinois, the grant and subgrant documents themsleves and all of the reports submitted as a result of the grant/subgrants never mention Xu or his experiment.

If this is true, what is our connection to the Xu enperiment? Did we pay for it out of this grant/subgrant money? If so, why, as it was not part of the original grant? Even if Tal used our subgrant funds to pay for this "second" experiment, is it really an "ONR issue"?

At this point, I'm leaning toward either of two conclusions for this whole issue:

(1) our role as the ONR STIB is only to review whether the university conducted a full review under its own bylaws and to give deference ot the findings of the univiersity iof they conducted a "proper" investigaiton. In that case, whether we agree with the final findings or not, we have no overwhelming reason to believe that the process was improper. However, we intend to take no action (debarment, suspension or refusla to award furhter grants/contracts to Tal or Purdue based on the findings; or

(2) the research/experiment/publishing at issue in the SM findings arises from Xu's work and was not a part of ONR's intended grant or intended findings from that grant/subgrant -

0369

even though funds may have been used to fund Xu's work. In that case, ONR has no jurisdiction to render a decision of any sort on the allegations/findings of misconduct in this case.

I guess this is what I need to discuss at tomorrow's meeting.

R/
Bryan H. Wood
Counsel
Office of Naval Research
875 N. Randolph Street
Arlington, VA 22203
(703) 696-4271