

Deleted: Draft of Tuesday, May 04, 2004

May 13, 2004 Conference Call on Cold Fusion

Participants

DOE: Dehmer, Kovar, Henry, Horwitz
Principals: Nagel, Hagelstein, McKubre and Hekman

Call Purpose

Outline for DOE Review of Cold Fusion/LENR

DOE Goal

Generate a report on the status of the research field. At the beginning of the report there will be an executive summary which says that conclusive evidence does or does not exist for anomalous nuclear effects occur in condensed matter at this time and whether there is a scientific case for continued interest and work in the field, and if so what are promising areas identified for such efforts.

Report

The report will be generated by DOE with individual input from the DOE sponsored review panel. Report to consist of a Fed summary of a review panel comments with concurrence of all review panel members.

Deleted: a

Review Panel

Members of a review panel will be chosen by DOE and recommendations from principals.

Review Panel Charge

- To examine and evaluate the experimental and theoretical evidence for the occurrences of nuclear reactions in condensed matter at low energies (less than a few electron volts).
- To determine whether the evidence is sufficiently conclusive to demonstrate that such nuclear reactions occur.
- To determine whether there is a scientific case for continued efforts in these studies and, if so, to identify the most promising areas to be pursued.

Reviewers will formulate their opinions based on written material and oral presentations made to the panel. Organization of material presented to reviewers will be based on a review document (15 pages) supplied by principals. The document will be used to identify the core topics for public presentations and published scientific papers to be sent out for mail review. DOE will work with the principals to identify speakers who will make presentations on those topics identified as relevant. DOE will use panel member comments in setting the agenda. DOE will allow for public comment or other presentations to ensure that everyone has had a chance to be heard (within reason).

Comment [h1]: Jim, by panel members to you mean the reviewers, or the principals here. I am a little confused

Review Presentation Format

1. Plenary session by presenters.
2. Q&A session with presenters.
3. Committee discussion and writing assignments based on an outline generated at the meeting.

Reviewers will be asked to provide written response to DOE 2-4 weeks after the meeting.

Comment [h2]: You might add an item to the format for the public comment -- also, how will the public be informed that there is an opportunity for public comment?

We can be present at plenary session.

Deleted: Draft of Tuesday, May 04, 2004

Review Document

Principals will provide a summary of the status of the field which articulates what are considered to be the most recent significant experimental observations and publications, and identifies those areas where additional work would appear to be warranted based upon what has been learned for progress in this area.

Conference Call Follow-up Action Items

Proposed Reviewers	(DOE and Principals, Due June 1, 2004)
Proposed Review Date (1-2 days)	(DoE, Principals, Panel)
Review Document	(Principals, 4 weeks prior to review date)

August Panel