

« [JANUARY 15th EVENT – Prof. Levi, Dr. Bianchini and Prof. Villa reports](#)

[Hydrogen/Nickel cold fusion probable mechanism](#)

»

JANUARY 15th FOCARDI AND ROSSI PRESS CONFERENCE

Energy Catalyzer first test videos – January 14th 2011 – Bologna-Italy

Energy Catalyzer Bologna University Test 1/3



Energy Catalyzer Bologna University Test 2/3



Energy Catalyzer Bologna University Test 3/3



Today, Saturday January 15th, at 10:00 AM Sergio Focardi and Andrea Rossi will be on-line for the press conference with Journal's readers.

The press conference will start at 10 a.m. Italian Time.

To put questions, you will have to send your inquiry as a comment of this post, you will receive the answer in real time online.

Warm Regards,

The Board Of Advisers of the Journal Of Nuclear Physics

January 12th, 2011 | Category: [Publication](#)

1,023 comments to JANUARY 15th FOCARDI AND ROSSI PRESS CONFERENCE

[« Older Comments](#) [1](#) [...](#) [19](#) [20](#) [21](#)

Andrea Rossi

June 18th, 2011 at 3:25 PM

Dear Frank Di Bianca:

People that really understands our work and knows it and our Customers have no doubt that my reactors work pretty well.

About all the others, honestly, I do not care too much, they are either competitors, sometimes disguised as Research Laboratories anxious to validate, fake journalists sent by the same, or just honest sceptic who are not important for our market. Our universal credibility will come from our working plants that we will sell to our Customers. I leave to others, more supplied of free time, the burden to chatter of LENR, I have to make them, and I have not time to confront chatters. For example, we had recently a "fake" journalist here who wrote stupidities about the water in the steam: very good, my 300 reactors actually under stress tests are making steam without water, I mean perfectly dry steam, and they will go in operation not in my factory, but in the factory of our Customer: once my Customer has dry steam produced by a 1 MW plant do you think that the stupidities of a snake are worth something? In these days, together with the University of Bologna and with my Customers, we have made tests measuring not only dry steam, but also with really , really, REALLY high performances: they know, I know, we know. That's enough.

Warm Regards,
A.R.

Frank A. DiBianca

June 18th, 2011 at 1:43 PM

Dear Ing Rossi,

In my opinion, your power generator is the most interesting device I have ever heard of. I wish you every success in the future.

However, there seems to be a continuing debate over whether or not the eCAT actually works, so I have been thinking about the possibility of a simple and indisputable test that overcomes all your concerns such as runaway reactions, etc.

As I understand it, there are two basic issues:

- 1) There are input power and output power, and people continue to argue if output is truly greater than input for a sufficiently long time to preclude the possibility of hidden stored energy (batteries, etc.). This issue would be irrelevant if the input power were zero and the output power were any significant, positive amount.
- 2) Since the device apparently produces much more energy than it consumes, it is not difficult to provide the necessary ignition heating from the device itself rather than from an external power source. However, this can be dangerous since there is then no easy control of the input power, and the device may (and has been observed to) go into a runaway condition.

So, here is my suggestion. You operate two eCATs together (maybe this can be done with just one device, but two seem to allow more separation of input and output). Each device is connected to an electrical generator (steam turbine, thermoelectric cell, etc.). Some of the electricity from each electrical generator is fed back to the heating resistor of the OTHER device. Hence, you now have full control over the input power, exactly as you do in the normal eCAT, however, there is NO outside power source. So, you can now channel the remaining electricity from the two generators to power an electric motor, boil water, whatever you wish. Could such electrical regeneration actually be used in your commercial power station?

In summary, a well-controlled machine with no input power could produce observable output power for many months. Hence, the energy must be coming from the Nickel-Hydrogen (presumably nuclear) reaction. To answer the few remaining skeptics who might assert that energy is secretly being pumped in electromagnetically (microwaves, etc.), that should be easy to rule out by letting them monitor emag radiation, or apply electromagnetic shielding, or simply show that such emag power would be unrealistic, etc. As I said, maybe you could do this with one eCAT instead of two.

Have I overlooked something in making this suggestion?

I wish you and your colleagues the best success.

Frank DiBianca (bioengineer and particle physicist)

Andrea Rossi

June 18th, 2011 at 11:30 AM

Dear Herald OPatterson,

Here are the additional answers:

3- the maximum safe output level is 10 kW per module

4- Not so far, it is too dangerous. So far. We are making modiles operate without input in this precise moment, but under my direct control.

Thans to you for communicate with me.

Warm Regards,

A.R.

Andrea Rossi

June 18th, 2011 at 11:23 AM

Dear Herald Patterson,

Thank you for your kind attention. Here are the answers:

1- 50 cc total

2- Once the Cat reached the stability, the output doesn't change. It ends within 20 minutes after you stop it.

3- hydrogen pressure, but it is still dangerous

Warm Regards,

A.R.

Herald Patterson

June 18th, 2011 at 10:04 AM

Dear Mr. Rossi,

I'm not sure if my post went through, so I will post it again.

Thank you for sharing the information about the test of an E-Cat with zero input. It is very exciting and interesting!

Could you please share a few extra details about the experiment?

- The size of the E-Cat (50cc or one liter in volume).
- How high the output went before the test had to end.
- What variables you are changing to allow for safe operation with zero input.
- Anything else you would like to add.

If you don't feel like answering any questions, that is perfectly fine. I realize you are very busy and have lots of work to do. I do not want to get in the way of your efforts. I am just very excited about your technology, and cannot resist asking questions. If I am being rude by asking, I apologize.

Sincerely,

Herald

Herald Patterson

June 18th, 2011 at 9:33 AM

Dear Mr. Andrea Rossi,

It is exciting that progress is being made towards producing E-Cats, that are safe when operated with zero input. Would you mind answering a few questions about the experiment?

1)What size of E-Cat were you testing? Was the reactor vessel 50cc in size, or 1000cc (one liter)?

- 2) What variables are you testing/changing that could allow an E-Cat to function safely with no input?
- 3) How high did the output go, before you needed to stop it? What do you consider is the maximum "safe" output level?
- 4) Do you think the one megawatt power plant being opened by Defkalion might operate with zero input?

Thank you again for being willing to communicate with us!

Keep up the great work!

Sincerely,
Herald

Italo Romano

June 18th, 2011 at 9:10 AM

Egregio Ing. Rossi

Lei non ha certamente bisogno di complimenti, chissà quanti ne riceve continuamente!!

Io sono un suo profondo ammiratore e non vedo l'ora che arrivi la fine di quest'anno per assistere alla svolta epocale che

l'E-Cat produrrà nell'economia mondiale appena sarà in funzione l'impianto in Grecia.

A proposito di tale impianto, con le mie esperienze di automazione impianti ho voluto immaginare come potrebbe essere, ed ho

fatto uno schizzo P&I che si può vedere qui:

<http://www.favorscake.com/public/ecats.jpg>

Ovviamente è solamente una mia idea molto approssimata che non corrisponderà certamente alla realtà, ma abbozza i principali parametri che sono da misurare e tenere sotto controllo.

Sulla parte sinistra in alto c'è un serbatoio di idrogeno gas che pressurizza un collettore ad una pressione resa costante dal controllore PC-01.

A sinistra in basso c'è un serbatoio di acqua demineralizzata dal quale una pompa centrifuga preleva ed invia in alimentazione al primo reattore.

Sulla mandata della pompa è inserito un riciclo che tiene costante la pressione tramite il regolatore PC-02.

Su tale linea c'è un regolatore di portata FC-01 il cui set point è funzione del carico totale dell'impianto.

La misura di portata può essere fatta con disco calibrato o con tubo Venturi o con boccaglio.

La portata di idrogeno in alimentazione a ciascun reattore è regolata tramite una valvola di regolazione a microflusso

comandata dal relativo regolatore di temperatura TC-01 (o TC-02 ecc.).

La misura della temperatura dell'acqua (o vapore) all'uscita dal reattore può essere eseguita con termocoppia tipo J o tipo

K. E' da escludere secondo me una termoresistenza Pt100 per la sua fragilità in un impianto industriale.

Il regolatore di temperatura potrà essere del tipo PID, con l'aggiunta cioè dell'azione derivativa per poter anticipare o

compensare eventuali ritardi termici tra azione regolante e misura della temperatura.

Alla fine del treno di reattori in serie e parallelo il vapore surriscaldato entra finalmente in turbina.

Il vapore espanso in uscita viene rinviato indietro al serbatoio di alimentazione dopo essere stato condensato tramite uno

scambiatore per recuperare il calore residuo.

Le invio cordialissimi saluti, e seguo costantemente on-line l'evolversi degli eventi...

Italo Romano

Andrea Rossi

June 18th, 2011 at 8:37 AM

Dear Dr Stefano Marcelli, MD:

1- I am not a Professor

2- I ask the protection of God.

Warm Regards,

A.R.

Andrea Rossi

June 18th, 2011 at 8:32 AM

Dear C.Monti:

Thanks for your smart insight.

About the question: in these days we are making tests with zero energy input, to try to make them safe.

Probably we are close. The day before yesterday a new Cat worked for one hour producing 15 kWh/h without energy input, then I had to stop it because it was continuing to raise energy output. Anyway: yes, we have a power back up if grid goes black out.

Warm Regards,

A.R.

c. monti

June 18th, 2011 at 5:54 AM

Dear Mr Rossi,

I'm very impressed about your incredible personal "energycat" .. let me joke with words! Mr Rossi sometimes we should also try laughing just to relax weight of life controversies. This doesn't mean being less professional but taking the right distances from certain life events! Of course I'm referring to the last "Krivit report" controversy about which I would comment with the following:

"Dante, Inferno Canto III

...

Fama di loro il mondo esser non lassa;
misericordia e giustizia li sdegna:
non ragioniam di lor, ma guarda e passa.

..."

I believe it is really a nonsense debating about "water MASS vs steam VOLUME" and so I'm suggesting who still has doubts on this to read carefully the "Essen-Kullander report" in which it is clearly described the principle used in calculation. Water mass checking is used since it is the easiest and more common sense methodology to be used. Other methodologies are simply "not workable" because more complex and maybe not easily feasible and effective in the results.

Mr Rossi , coming back to your E-CAT I would like to make a comment about your answer to Mr. Dave Stone in which you said:

"2- Yes, the operation without energy input is possible, we make it many times during stress tests, but is dangerous."

The question is:

Assuming that E-CAT without input energy can be dangerous, how can be managed a failure event with a lack of input electric energy? Is there any safety mechanism which automatically (without the need of electric energy) shuts down the exothermic reaction preventing dangerous situations?

Wishing all the best with you I thank you for your kindness.

Warm regards

c.m.

Stefano Marcelli MD

June 18th, 2011 at 4:40 AM

Dear Prof. Andrea Rossi,

thank you very much for you ideas.

In my opinion, E-Cat is a device that concentrates what Life does everywhere and everytime inside their evo-devo creatures. At this moment, E-Cat belongs to non-conventional physics, so it is suffering from the same troubles of non-conventional medicines. Don't be worry, think Galileo and Sommelweis. Have you ever thought to ask the collaboration and protection of Elisabeth II, who's the Queen of Meridian Zero of all google mapped people?

I am sincerely,

Stefano Marcelli

Andrea Rossi

June 18th, 2011 at 4:02 AM

“Rossi Responds to Scrutiny of his Claims”:

The content of water in steam is always measured in mass, not in volume, because psychrometers work is based on the heat necessary to the evaporation ow residual water, and the heat is given in Joule/g, wherein g means grams. Krivit is not convinced only because has not the elementary knowledge of the physics involved. He had all the necessary explications from us, just did not (or wanted not) to understand. By the way: in a statement he released further, he said that while Prof. Levi told him there was a report about this issue, I said in the interview that there was not a report about this issue. This is a translation problem: with the term “report” I mean an extensive paper, while Prof. Levi referred to the simple communication that we received from the specialist who made the measurement, in which there were just the results. This is a misunderstanding, not a contradiction.

Warm Regards,

A.R.

Rossi Responds to Scrutiny of his Claims » E-Cat World

June 18th, 2011 at 1:31 AM

[...] Asked on his website about Krivit's report, Rossi has had strong words. He believes that they have indeed thoroughly reported on the water-in-steam issue and that Krivit has been unfair in his reporting and questioning. In the larger picture, Rossi reiterates that he is not interested in getting into any validation in the public arena: “Now I have to make my 1 MW plant, then we will make other 1 MW plants for our Customers. That's all we will do. Our Customers tests are the sole tests that count, for us. Therefore, I have absolutely not time for competitors anxious to test my Cat to make their “validation”. Tweet [...]

Andrea Rossi

June 18th, 2011 at 1:04 AM

Dear Dan:

I appreciate, thanks,

Warm Regards,

A.R.

Andrea Rossi

June 18th, 2011 at 1:02 AM

Dear Roger Barker:

I am not angry, I just was disappointed that, after we published repeatedly that we made the measure of steam indicating the percentage of water residue in the steam IN MASS, Mr Steve Krivit wrote that we measured it in volume, which not only is a stupidity, but is the contrary of what we explained to him. Also he, who lacks of elementary bases in Physics, has not to offend (and blackmail) a Prof. of Physics of the University of Bologna. Like the rat who teaches to the cat how to mew.

Thank you for your kind attention,
Warm Regards,
A.R.

Roger Barker
June 17th, 2011 at 8:18 PM

Dear Andrea Rossi,

I can understand why you are angry but please try to understand our position as well. Yes, you are right, in October when you do reveal your 1MW reactor all skeptics can go f..k themselves. However till that day comes people will question the E-CAT. Why? Because it just sounds too good to be true.

So please forgive me for asking the question regarding Krivit. I saw it in his blog and simply decided to ask you about it.

If you truly have the answer to all the worlds energy problems then I wish you all the success in the world.

Regards
Roger Barker Phd

Dan
June 17th, 2011 at 8:12 PM

If you have confidence in your invention. Then you should remember that you will go down in history and your every word will be recorded for posterity. Being skeptical is pretty understandable but I'm sure everyone is praying your findings are correct even those who challenge you.

Andrea Rossi
June 17th, 2011 at 5:10 PM

Dear Dave Stone:

- 1- I do not care of minutiae.
- 2- Yes, the operation without energy input is possible, we make it many times during stress tests, but is dangerous. We guarantee anyway to our Customers an output of energy 6 times the input.
- 3- In October we will start up a 1 MW plant and our Customer will be the sole validator we will care of.

Warm Regards,
A.R.

Andrea Rossi
June 17th, 2011 at 3:10 PM

Dear Maryyugo:

We have already made enough public tests, either heating the water (please go to read all our reports and papers on the Journal Of Nuclear Physics, or making steam. In this last case we always made the measurement of unvaporized water residue giving the result in mass. Our tests have been made with Professors of Physics working with the Universities of Bologna, Uppsala, Stockolm, with CERN, with INFN, and I think that only an imbecile can think that such Persons are not able to weight water in steam. We are receiving suggestions how to measure the water in steam, and this is like teach to a cat how to mew. By the way: the steam from the reactors which we are testing now, and that will compound the 1 MW plant, is dry. The steam during the interview of the clown of yesterday was totally dry. Of course, should be this not true, our Customers will be very angry: in that case, that will be an opinion which will be very important for us, while the opinion of our competitors and of their friends, for obvious reasons, have not much importance for us, if any. Now I have to make my 1 MW plant, then we will make other 1 MW plants for our Customers. That's all we will do. Our Customers tests are the sole tests that count, for us. Therefore, I have absolutely not time for competitors anxious to test my Cat to make their "validation".

About the work that we will make with the University of Bologna and Uppsala, this will not be a public demo,

but a work of Research and Development, made closed doors.

Warm Regards,
A.R.

maryyugo

June 17th, 2011 at 1:08 PM

Dear Mr. Rossi,

I can understand your upset. But you could put the whole issue of testing to rest by allowing just one E-cat to be given to University of Upsala or any other major research center. They could test it as a "black box" using whatever method they thought best but protecting its secrets. An important part of the test would be that they have full control of both the input power and the output power measurement methods and that they provide the electrical power and water coolant. The test should be done in their lab (not yours). They should use only liquid water eliminating issues about what portion of the steam was dry vapor and what portion was liquid. If you could allow this independent testing, it would make it impossible for anyone to claim that the tests already done are in error.

Best regards,

M. Y.

Andrea Rossi

June 17th, 2011 at 4:54 AM

Dear Roger Barker:

Please read the answer I gave to Craig:

AGAIN : WE MADE THE MEASUREMENT OF THE WATER IN WEIGHT !!!!!

AND WE EXPLAINED THIS TO KRIVIT VERY WELL!!!!

AND HE GOT CONFIRMATION OF THIS FROM AN INDIPENDENT PROFESSOR HE CONTACTED !!!!!

NOBODY MAKES THIS KIND OF MEASUREMENT IN VOLUME, BECAUSE IT IS A NONSENSE !!!!!

KRIVIT SAID " I HAVE UNDERSTOOD" WHEN I TOLD THIS DURING THE INTERVIEW.

I HAVE MANY WITNESSES OF WHAT ABOVE ENCLOSED THE PROF. HE CONTACTED TO GET INDIPENDENT COUNSEL !!!!!

BUT HE REPORTED THAT WE DID NOT UNDERSTAND THE PROBLEM: WE. PHYSICS PROFESSORS OF CERN, UNIVERSITY OF BOLOGNA, UNIVERSITY OF UPPSALA, UNIVARSITY OF STOCKOLM, WHO MADE THE TESTS!!!! AND HE COMES HERE TO TESCH TO US PHYSICS!!!!!!

HE CAME TO US SMILING, VERY FRIENDLY, ACCEPTED TO BE INVITED TO GET LUNCH, ACCEPTED TAXI REMBOURSEMENT, MADE FAIR QUESTIONS, GOT PRECISE ANSWERS, AND NOW HE WRITES TOTALLY FALSE THINGS:

THIS IS A SNAKE, NOT A JOURNALIST, AND I WOULD LIKE VERY MUCH TO KNOW WHO SENT HIM (I HAVE A PRETTY IDEA, THOUGH, SINCE HE UNADVERTEDLY GAVE US A CLUE).

Warm Regards,

A.R.

Andrea Rossi

June 17th, 2011 at 4:38 AM

Dear Craig:

Mr Krivit has understood nothing of what he saw, from what I have read in his ridiculous report... This guy has seen for half an hour an E-Cat in the factory where we make many tests, made some questions to Prof. Levi, Prof. Focardi and me. Evidently has understood nothing, perhaps for the short time we gave him, also because we have to work: maybe he is angry because we had to send him away from the closed boxes and because we had to say him good bye shortly because we have to make our work. Prof. Levi has explained very well to him how the measures have been made and the importance of the issue. He has explained very well that the percentage of uncondensed water in the steam has been measured in weight (in volume is impossible, for various reasons), and he also got confirmation of this from a specialist from whom he has taken independent counsel. Nevertheless, he has understood nothing, or wanted not to understand, for reasons he better knows.

Our tests have been performed by Physics Professors, who know how to make measures , and I am measuring the performance every day on 300 reactors.
In any case we will start our 1 MW plant in october and we will see how it works. Of course I assure his considerations are invalid, but I want to say more: our products on the market will confirm this. Probably this journalist has been sent by someone that wants to dwarf our work. He also tried to blackmail prof. Levi, and Levi already has given to his attorney due information .
Warm Regards,
A.R.

Craig
June 16th, 2011 at 10:12 PM

Dear Mr Rossi,

Can you respond to the recent assertions by Steven B Krivit that the method in which the steam may have been measured previously is potentially giving incorrect measurements of the power capability of the e-cat.

Krivit says in his blog post.

“I discussed the crucial difference in steam enthalpy calculations by mass versus by volume with Levi on Wednesday afternoon. Based on his initial response, I could not be sure if he had previously understood the potential impact.”

I am hoping you can assure us that his concerns are invalid.

Best regards,

Craig

[« Older Comments](#) [1](#) [...](#) [19](#) [20](#) [21](#)