Comments and facts below in chronological order as testing progress

Date	Added non resistive	Added resistive	Total load	Watt meter from grid	kWh
Jan 13	6 + 9 = 15 W		15 W	16	
Jan 17	3 x 27 = 81 W		96 W	100	
Jan 20		428 W 2 x 10 min	524 W	545	
Jan 21		2 x 15 min		518 (lost 1 fan)	
Jan 22		2 x 20 min			
Jan 23		2 x 30 min			
Jan 24		2 x 40 min			
Jan 25		2 x 50 min			
Jan 26		2 x 60 min			
Jan 27		428W permanent	518 W		
Jan 28		1170 W 2 x 15 min	1640 W	1688	
Jan 29		2 x 30 min			
Jan 30		2 x 45			
Jan 31		2 x 60			
Feb 1		1170W permanent	1580 W		
Feb 2		-1170W	475 W	518 W	14.5
Feb 8			483 W		86
Feb 15			487 W		66 (80)
Feb 22			475		47.5 (81.5)
Mar 4			472		74.5 (127)
Mar 19			466		47.1 (173)
Mar 20			444	1318W	
April 2			455/1575		
Maj 31				518 W	

Table 1

Jan 8

Delivery of unit. The order date was Oct 13 2015. So delivery was within the formal delivery time of 90 days.

Jan 10

Connecting unit to grid. No load on unit at all. Monitor of Watts is inserted between wall socket and the cable strip that is BEFORE input to Power Unit. This phase is 220 V/10 A fusage.

Jan 13

First load connected . 2 LED lamps. 6W + 9W . This load and all load from here on is added to the OUTPUT side of the Power Unit.
Watt meter show 15-16 W

Jan 17

Status before new load is Watt meter 16 -18 W and no nano coating seen on the bare cables. Little interesting the Watt increased a bit since load connect. Still it's within fault margins for measurement. Also we could see the total energy taken from grid was 1.5 kWh (kilo watt hours). That's pretty much what you should get from 16 W load 4 days.
16 x 24 x 4 = 1536 Wh = 1.5 kWh

What we add now is 3 table fans each adding some 27 Watt load. This ended up total load, all non resistive very near 100 W.

Jan 20

Status after 3 days with the 100 W load. No nano coating seen. Total energy from grid now is 8.4 kWh. The last 3 days of 100 W load should add
100 x 24 x 3 = 7200 Wh = 7.2 kWh
If we add 1.5 kWh from previous metering give us 7.2 + 1.5 = 8.7 kWh total from start …. That's what energy we should have used in theory. So it's 300 Wh more than what we see on meter. Possibly a tiny indicator we are using less grid power than a normal house grid. Still it can also be within fault margins.

Anyway after running the 10 min load of 428 W I could see the total W usage was down to some 72 W. Instead of 100 W ….
But then I noticed one of the 3 27 W fans was not running. Turned out it was broken. Did not work at all even when I tried on the "normal" house grid. So my initial thinking that the power from grid was reduced after connecting heat fan was not so. It was just one of the fans broken.

When running the heat fan we could see 545 W as input from grid. Theoretical we should have seen 524 W (96 + 428 W, see table 1). Not major diff enough for me to guess any about it … just like we seem to see a tendency that meter from grid is slightly above what you expect from theory.

I will go on testing, not replacing the broken fan. My thinking is the 80 W load of the 3 fans has already been doing it's job. I don't see it as a game changer that one of the fans broke.

Jan 27

Watts from grid gone down from 524 to 520 during these 67 days. Tell us nothing really since it's within fault margins. The kWh was a little surprise. We had 24.8 kWh. The energy increase in theory

should have been
2x(10+15+20+30+40+50+60)x524/60 = 3.9 kWh
If we add that to what we had before we get
8.4 + 3.9 = 12.3 kWh
What we read is pretty near double of what's expected. Don't have any good idea on this so far.
We'll have to see what trend we get with the next load …

Jan 28

Summary: No real more info than before
Power reduction (1-475/518)x100 = 8 %

Total Watts gone down to 490 W during 20 hours of permanent heat fan. Is this a true decrease ? Can't really say.
Anyway we can check a little on the kWh now. I had 35 kWh on meter. Added this 20 hours now should be
20 x 520 = 10400 Wh = 10.4 kWh
Adding that to yesterdays value
24.8 + 10.4 = 35.2 kWh
This makes more sense than the 24.8 value we had from yesterday ….
Adding the next heater we have 50 W less on meter compared to total Watt load
Again, is this a true indicator we consume less from grid ….. maybe, maybe not ;)
Next step will be to increase load time for the 1170W heater during 4 days. So on Monday Feb 1 we will see what happens when we change the location of the 1170W load. That is going to be the most important step trying to verify this device.

Feb 1

Total Watts reading now is around 100W less than what should read without no reduction of power used from grid. On first check we had 498 W with 1170 heater off. After 5 hours of 1170w load we had 475 W for same connections.
Total watts was 1580 W. After move of 1170 heater to input side this was 1585 W.

Seems like total watt usage is very slowly going down. Also any time you disconnect/connect a load it tend to increase watt usage for some time, like 1580 -> 1585 seen above.

On the kWh we had 35 since last time. We should have added now
4x500x24 = 48 kWh +
2x(15+30+45+60)x1620/60 = 7600 Wh

Total should read
35 + 48 + 7 = 90 kWh Reading on meter was 88 kWh
So this seems like about the same order

Summary: 100W less this time, 50W less last time

Is this a trend ….. still hard to say.

Feb 2

After running 20 hours with 1170W heater permanent connected we have

470W only heat fan
1585W total load on

470 is a little bit down since yesterday

After reconnect of heat fan to input side we had again 475W load, same as yesterday

Only drama today was kWh reading. Gone from 88 to 14.5 kWh
???????? No clue on that one. Could be failing meter, never had that before though.

Summary: No real more info than before
Power reduction (1-475/518)x100 = 8 %

Now we'll stay with this connection for long time. And register watt usage maybe once per week.
See if we can get more steady trend of power reduction.
Also we will contact Keshe Foundation support team and ask if this is what to be expected from the "conditioning" operation.

Feb 8

Summary: Watt meter reduction going less. That was a surprise 7%
Energy meter reduction much better 18%

Now we have been running with 518W load for 7 days

Watt meter is 483W
Watt reduction is 7%
So a little less than 7 days ago …..

kWh is 86 kWh and 7 days ago we had 14.5 kWh
So the energy reduction is
(1 - (86-14.5) / (.518*24*7)) = 18%

KF support recommend NOT to put in a watt meter like I do. I can understand that if you put it in a random place in the house wire net. With our test setup I don't understand it's a problem.
Not sayin it is not a problem, just sayin that I don't understand he he.
We have zero devices/loads between the watt meter and the central meter. The total house net has no other load/consumption at all beside what we use for test load.
So we will keep the watt meter rest of Feb. Then try without it. See if that give any different result.
Without the watt meter the only way we can see device performance is by the electric bill.

One little strangie. I replaced the broken cooling fan with a new one 7 days ago. Now I found that the replaced fan was broken again … Not sure if it is a plasma effect or just crappy cheap cooling fan ;)

Feb 15

Summary:	Watt meter reduction again small decrease in saving	6%
	Energy meter	8%

This was the second time the kWh data seems to have been reset from 0 somehow. Is it the plasma energy that mess up measure ? Hard to say if meter data is to be trusted at all ….
Time will tell. On Marsh 1 we can compare the electric bill data to theoretical energy data. That will be independent of watt meter data. We'll see what result we have there.

The load on input side, 428W heating fan, was moved to output side. The idea being that the output side load will produce more nano coating than load on input side. Also moved the 2 cooling fans to input side.

Current connections:

Output side	428W Heating fan, 15W led lamps
Input side	54W cooling fans

Feb 22

Summary:	Watt meter reduction going up some	8%
	Energy meter	6%

Watt usage 475 w
Energy usage 81.5 kWh

I think I solved the mystery with the kWh readings. The meter can only goto 99.9 kWh, then it restarts from 0. Pretty lame ….
So from now on I can calculate the kWh value. I put the calculated value with parentheses in table
Today example is
(100-66) + 47.5 = 81.5 kWh

The energy reduction is calculated based on the permanent load of
0.518 * 24 * 7 = 87 kWh
1 – (81.5/87) = 0.06

Seems like the energy save kinda stays like 7% average these last 2 weeks

Did a little happy testing …. Most fun testing a certified tester like to do ;)

I used my second watt meter and connected it straight to the heat fan on the output side. That gave me 400 Watts. Compare to the 428 W we had as consumption for this fan.
Give you also 7% gain.
Then I used the same meter and connected heat fan to the off test fuse line. That give me also 400 W.
So for anyone wanting to disprove the tech the conclusion of course is
NO energy gain at all !

For someone wanting to see the tech works the conclusion is
The heat fan got conditioned for less power consumption, ALSO when conneted to the off test fuse line.

I'm just testing …. You choose yourself what to believe. I won't believe either way until testing finished ;)

Mar 4

Summary:	Watt meter reduction	9%
	Energy meter	7%
	Electric Bill	21%

Watt usage 472 w
Energy usage 74.5 kWh

The energy reduction is calculated based on the permanent load of
0.518 * 24 * 11 = 137 kWh
1 – (127/137) = 0.07

Reduction based on watt meter

1 – (472/518) = 0.09

Electric bill

The theoretical watt usage during Feb is 29 days of 518 w load + one day with additional 1170 W 518 and 1170 W is what we measured at beginning of testing as the watt consumptions of loads when connected to the off test phase

29 * 0.518 * 24 + 24 * 1.17 = 388 kWh

Electric bill was 305 kWh

Reduction is 305 / 388 = 0.21 21%

Speculations

Why this big difference between electric bill and my watt meter calculations ? Guess most people will only care about the bill result ;)
One idea I got on this is maybe the plasma flow is affecting my watt meter some way so the readings are not what is taken from grid.
Another idea is my electric company is charging me 20% less than I consume ….. not really so plausible, I would rather expect them to overcharge me ☺

Anyway my watt meter results seems to stay around 8% these last 4 weeks . So maybe what to expect from this first version device is reduction of around 20% (if you go for the electric bill result).

One other Swedish guy I know has reported 20% reduction from a bought device of him so ….

Will see what other test scope to try out in the future.

Mar 20

Summary:	Watt meter reduction	14%
	Energy meter	7%

The energy reduction is calculated based on the permanent load of
0.518 * 24 * 15 = 186 kWh
1 – (173/186) = 0.07

Reduction based on watt meter
1 – (466/518) = 0.10

Not big change

Happy testing

A) Once again we added the heater, 1170W. This is added at the input side of the unit (upstream, if you prefer) After running 18 hours we had notable reduction

Reduction based on watt meter

1 – (448/518) = 0.14 (For load without heater)

1 – (1570/1688) = 0.07 (For load with heater)

Seems the "old" load types improved performance from the 1170W loading
No real temperature change for the unit when adding 1170W
* If you noticed, on the vid … I forgot to take the lid off when doing first measure of temp ☺ Anyway I did proper temp measure before leaving and no real change can be seen

B) Test to feed Magrav from off grid inverter. Only change here in test setup was we moved the cable from wall outlet to output of a small solar cell system. The inverter output is 220V AC from the 12V solar cell batteries. If you do this be SURE that you have an inverter that produces "true sinus" wave output. Most of the cheap inverters output is an ugly hacked up sinus wave form. Most certainly not good for Magrav feed.

Result was:

i) The unit seems to work and no harm done to it

ii) No energy gain could be seen during the 2 hour test of it

Question is, can you get this setup to work also with energy saving. That would be nice. Keshe support say this is not supported usage of this unit (that's why I had to try ☺)
Maybe it won't work …. Might do some more long time / more load test later on.

C) Try out of cheap AC field meter. Some people say they see growing field , out from unit, from added load or nano coating progress. Pretty arbitrary measure …. Just for the fun of it. And it was cheap ;)

Moving on

Rest of March we will do permanent load of total 1318W. This is with the added 1170W heater. Reason you see 1318W total load is 800 + 518 W. The 800W is due to that the heater turns off/on with a 60 sec on and 30 sec off. So average load will be around 800W instead of the nominal 1170W.

This will also be a tough test for the unit to copy with load going off/on , like most appliances in a normal house hold do. 1170W load off/on every 90 sec is far more frequent than you will see for a normal house hold ….

Next report will probably be beginning of April, when next electrical bill is available. Then we can see if the extra added load has any effect on the energy savings.

April 2

Summary:	Watt meter reduction	12%
	Electric bill	37%

The energy reduction is calculated based on the permanent load for Marsh
19 days with 518W load and 12 days with 1320W load

0.518 * 24 * 19 + 12*1.32*24 = 616 kWh
Electic bill was 391 kWh
Electric bill saving is
1-391/616 = 0.37

Reduction based on watt meter
1 – (466/518) = 0.12

Conclusions

The boost from 21 to 37 % savings Is probably due to the 1320W load now on input really get the benefit from the 518W load on the output. Probably running a full month with this load will get towards 50% savings.
Another learning is you have to put some planning into how you balance your load on input and output side.

Also it's pretty clear now the watt meter readings is no good for evaluate savings ….. just like Keshe guys said from beginning ☺

Next step

For now, we'll just connect the Magrav to the second phase and get the nano coating going on those wires. Watt meter is taken out of scope. It will just be electric bill to monitor savings.

May 31

Summary: New watt meter reduction 42%

Done some happy testing. Connected to a small solar cell system (2 x 100 W). It works per see for connected load. Have no way of measure if there is any power saving. Since I don't know how much kWh I get from the solar cells. Connected like 4 weeks so basic nano coating should be finished. Leave it for now until I can figure out how to evaluate.

Todays scoop ☺

I bought a fancy multimeter. With Bluetooth connection so you can monitor Volt/Ampere via a mobile app.
https://moosh.im/mooshimeter/

I was testing it today connecting to Magrav input power. The old meter, which we already know is not giving good results, was showing 2.85 A when I had a permanent load of 518 W.

2.85 * 230 = 656 W

That was way worse than any measure before. At least before there was a small benefit ….

Using the new meter I get 1.3 A

1.3 * 230 = 299 W

That's 42 % reduction

1 – (299/518) = 0.58

Improved from 37 -> 42 % . Probably due to 2 weeks connected, after solar cell tests, since April 2.

If this new meter turns out to give you correct value it's a great improvement. **You can get result of reduction just instantly**. To prove the new meter is correct we will load permanent this 518W load for all days in June. And see what result we have on the electric bill.
The load now is 428W resistive load on the input side and 90W reactive load on the output side. This should give good balance to benefit the average 4-6 times wattage on the input side from what you load output side.