



IMAGING & ARCHIVES

Tested System: ID#:314

Printer: Epson SureColor P600

Inks/Colorants: Epson OEM Ultrachrome HD

Media: Hahnemuhle Photo Rag Pearl 320gsm

Coating(s): no additional coating

Sample #: AaI_20150503_SN005

Testing Status: 200 Megalux hours total light exposure

Testing is complete - there are no more updates

Conservation Display Rating (CDR)

Lower limit: 99 Megalux hours (for weakest 10% of the color patches)Upper limit: 124 Megalux hours (for average of all the color patches)

Note: a CDR with narrow range (typically less than 2:1) indicates relatively even overall fading of the image. A wide range indicates faster fading in certain local colors/tones prior to general fading of most colors/tones in the entire image. Compare ratings for different systems directly and/or use the table on page 2 to estimate time (years) on display.

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of members of Aardenburg Imaging & Archives. Members may share this information with other members, friends, colleagues, and individual clients. It may also be distributed to groups for educational purposes (classes, lectures, educational seminars. etc). However, all contents including but not limited to Conservation Display Ratings may not be posted to web sites and may not be reproduced or distributed for corporate research, marketing, or other

copyright ©2018

http://www.aardenburg-imaging.com

^{*} Please read document AaI_2009_0118_TA-01.pdf, "An Overview of the AaI&A Conservation Display Ratings",



About this Report

This report contains light fastness information about a sample test print produced by a specific digital printing system. "System" refers to all hardware, software, and materials used to make the finished print. The hardware, software, material components, and printmaker's skills contribute to the final image quality and image permanence. The tested sample is made with current or recently discontinued stocks of commercially available products unless otherwise stated. Each sample has been prepared by Aardenburg Imaging & Archives or one of its members in accordance with customary print making practices unless otherwise noted. The sample may also contain additional finishing materials such as overcoats and laminates which are also noted when used. Finally, the sample has been tested under standardized conditions that are defined on the Sample Description page (see page 4). Aal&A makes every effort to ensure but cannot guarantee that the samples are properly identified and documented and that test results are accurate. For this reason, Aal&A also strives to test independently produced sample replicates in order to increase sampling confidence and to provide information on process variability. Please compare the results in this report to replicate test samples when the data become available.



The magnitude and visual appearance of fading depends not only on the chosen printing system but the chosen image as well. In other words, different images are comprised of different colors, and the fading relationships between those colors dictate how the image will look as it fades. The sample print in this test report was made by reproducing the digital image shown on the left. It contains 30 standard colors. 24 of the colors are colorimetrically matched to the Macbeth ColorChecker™ chart viewed under D50 illumination. The remaining six colors supplement the ColorChecker™ array with four additional skin tone colors, one patch for paper white, and another for maximum black. The additional colors

Information about the fading characteristics of the product is provided in three ways:

- 1) You can visually assess the fading. The target images reproduced in this report are digitally reconstructed from the spectrally measured color data rather than scanning or otherwise reproducing the physical print by conventional techniques. This method ensures a colorimetrically accurate representation of the print appearance as the print fades. A calibrated monitor is recommended to experience the best possible reproduction of the test sample appearance. The side-by-side "before and after" presentation of the target images simulates looking at a perfect copy of the unexposed original print along side the same print after light exposure. You can also use Adobe Reader's full screen mode to cycle through the pages and "animate" the fading.
- 2) I* Color and tonal accuracy scores are reported. This report includes I* metric scores that compare the color and tonal relationships of the light exposed samples to the color and tonal relationships existing in the original print prior to light exposure. Perfect I* scores of 100% can be approached when no significant fading occurs. Average scores above 90% generally indicate excellent retention of original quality, 80% good, 70% fair, etc., but your conclusions may vary depending on your image quality requirements. I* color rates the retained color accuracy (hue and chroma) while I* tone rates the retained tonal accuracy (lightness and contrast). The score is on a percentile scale where 100% is a perfect match between the comparison image (e.g., "after" light exposure) and the reference image (e.g., "before" any light exposure). 0% I* color means no color accuracy is left. 0% I* tone means essentially no tonality remains and all image information content is lost. Negative I* values have significance as well and contribute to the average I* score when they occur. Negative I* color values mean false color has occurred, for example, when a skin tone turns green or a neutral gray becomes distinctly colorful. Negative I* tone scores mean visual contrast between colors has become inverted (i.e., like the tonal relationships in a photographic film negative). Serious image quality problems must arise before false colors and/or tones appear. For more information on the I* metric, please refer to the AaI&A web site.
- 3) Color changes are also reported using the classic color difference model, ΔE . Note that ΔE values lose perceptual scaling significance when they become large (e.g., > 15). Also, the ΔE equation does not unambiguously measure changes in image contrast. This limitation is generally not a problem for paints and textiles, but can be a serious oversight when evaluating

Table to Convert Megalux-hours of Light Exposure to estimated "Years on Display" Light Fastness Ratings.												
Indoor Light Levels for Print Display		Multiply	Megalux-hours in test									
Light Exposure	Description	Mlux-hrs by	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
≤ 10 Lux 24 hours per day	Interior rooms, storage areas, or hallways without win- dows, illuminated sparingly by artificial lighting	11.42	114	228	342	457	571	685	799	913	1027	1142
50 Lux 12 hours per day	"Museum Standard" display condition	4.57	46	91	137	183	228	274	325	365	411	457
120 Lux 12 hours per day "Kodak Display Years" (1)	Average home illumination level for photos is ~ 60 lux. 90% of all displayed photos do not exceed 120 lux (1).	1.90	19	38	57	76	95	114	133	152	171	190
228 Lux 12 hours per day	Relatively bright home or office. Note the simple 1:1 relationship between "years on display" and Mlux-hr values at this condition.	1.00	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
450 Lux 12 hours per day "WIR Display Years" (2) Also equals 500 lux for 11.8 hours per day	A bright home or commercial office building illumination level is 200-500 lux. Also, good illumination for color critical viewing and color matching tasks begins at about 500 lux.	0.51	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	41	46	51
2000 Lux 12 hours per day	Commercial Gallery. Also, critical color evaluation standards call for 2000 lux and a D50 illumination source.	0.114	1.1	2.3	3.4	4.6	5.7	6.8	8.0	9.1	10.3	11.4
5000 Lux 12 hours per day	E.g., Sunlight through a window striking print at an angle.	0.046	0.5	0.9	1.4	1.8	2.3	2.7	3.2	3.7	4.1	4.6
10,000 Lux 12 hours per day	South-facing window in U.S.A., e.g., storefront display with photos directly facing window.	0.023	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.4	1.6	1.8	2.1	2.3

Light levels commonly encountered in the real world fluctuate widely throughout indoor print display environments and produce large variations in how long it takes for artwork to acquire light-induced damage. Use this table as a guide to estimate how many "years on display" (denoted in red text) it takes to accumulate an equivalent light exposure dosage. Review the test results to decide which Megalux-hour dose has caused fading to your level of concern (e.g., just noticeable, easily noticeable, objectionable, etc.). Then choose the "Light Exposure" description that best represents how your print is likely to be displayed. You may want to obtain a lux meter and make some measurements in your own display environment!

Note that as the years of display time increase, light-induced fading can be eclipsed by other serious aging mechanisms such as fading and/or staining caused by heat, humidity, and air pollutants. Mould damage can also occur at high humidity. Even when colorants remain water fast, direct contact with liquids may result in physical deformation and staining of the substrate. Also, temperature and especially strong seasonal humidity fluctuations can cause physical cracks and/or flaking, etc., over time. Handling damage such as scratching, abrasion, tears and creases, and catastrophic damage by smoke, fire, flood, etc., also destroy print quality over time. Thus, as illumination levels are reduced other forms of print degradation take on greater probability of occurrence.

- (1) Eastman Kodak cited this exposure condition with a 90% confidence limit as a rationale for estimating print fading times of traditional color photo materials in typical home display environments. However, for light fading claims regarding its line of pigment-based inkjet printers, Kodak adopted the higher level of 450lux/12 hours per day which is also used by Wilhelm Imaging Research, Inc. (See below).
- (2) Wilhelm Imaging Research (WIR) standardized its light fastness ratings on 450 lux for 12 hours per day in order to estimate the years on display necessary to reach "easily noticeable" fading. This average daily light exposure dosage, at an assumed 75°F/60%RH temperature and humidity level, has become a de facto industry standard for most industry-sponsored predictive "years of life" light fading estimates in the absence of a published International Standards Organization (ISO) test standard. The table above readily shows how much error occurs in such "print lifetime" predictions as actual real world light levels for prints on display routinely deviate above and below the assumed 450 lux intensity value.

Sample Description

Sample # AaI_20150503_SN005 Batch #: N1

Printer:Epson SureColor P600Ink:Epson OEM Ultrachrome HDMedia:Hahnemuhle Photo Rag Pearl 320gsm

Coating(s): no additional coating

Test Print Prepared by:Aal&A memberPrinted:May 3, 2015Initial Print colors measuredMay 13, 2015Test Started:May 13, 2015

Test Image: AaI_StandardColorSet(v2)forSRGB.tif

RIP?Driver settings: 5760 dpi, HS off, 16 bit

Media Setting Ultra Premium Luster

Profile: AaI_P600_HnPhRagPearl_1.icc Rendering perceptual

Profile type: custom

Paper White Color (UV-included versus UV-excluded)

Optical Brighteners Present?	L	*	а	*	b*						
no											
	UV inc	UV exc	UV inc	UV exc	UV inc	UV exc					
Media Whitepoint Color	97.6	97.8	0.4	0.3	1.4	1.5					
	UV-inc/UV-exc ΔL*, Δa*, Δb* respectively										
	0	.1	0	.1	0.2						
	Calculated differences, especially for Δb^* , indicate the role and magnitude										
	of fluorescence on original paper color										
Maximum Printed Black	L*	a*	b*	Optical	Density	(Dmax)					
Maximum Frinted Black	5.7	-0.2	-2.1		2.20						

Light source: Phillips Colortone F40T12/C50 – 5000 K full spectrum fluorescent. Color

rendering Index (CRI) =92), soda lime glass filtered

Light Exposure Cycle: 8 hours on, 4 hours off, twice per 24 hours

CIELAB measurements: D50 2° observer, Xrite Gretag/Macbeth Spectrolino/Spectroscan

Average Illuminance during "on" cycle: 10640 Lux

Average Temperature: 24.3°C over full test duration, 25.1°C during light exposure.

Average Relative humidity: 57.6%RH over full test duration, 56.9%RH during light exposure.

Compare this sample to sample # Aal_20150503_SN006 (ID#315 in the Aal&A database) which is printed with the newer Epson Ultrachrome HD ink set on the same paper batch and run side-by-side in test.

Conclusions:

This sample is part of Batch N in the Aardenburg light fade test results database. Batch N contains six printer/ink/media combinations intended to look at differences in the newer Epson UltraChrome HD ink set versus the older Epson K3 ink set as well as the Canon Lucia EX ink set on two media, Epson WaterColor Paper Textured 320gsm and Hahnemuhle Photo Rag Pearl 320gsm. To find all six test reports easily in the Aardenburg test results database, filter the database for [batch] = "N".

The 200 Megalux hour test cycle is now complete, and the Conservation Display ratings are as follows:

Epson K3 ink:


Hahnemuhle Photo Rag Pearl...... 59-83 Megalux hours Epson WaterColor Paper Textured...... 55-82 Megalux hours

Epson HD ink:

Canon Lucia EX ink:

Epson's newer HD ink set clearly outperformed the older K3 set in the early stages of fading where little or no noticeable fade takes place (i.e., the basis for the Conservation Display ratings). However, once the fading reached a point where it becomes more noticeable, the HD ink set began to show a significantly faster fading rate. Compare the graphs on page 6 in each of the six test printer/ink/media combinations to evaluate the nonlinearity in the fading curves. The Canon Lucia EX ink set exhibited a more linear response over the full 200 Mluxhr cycle which enabled it to achieve superior overall fade resistance with respect to the two media types tested.

Epson SureColor P600, Epson OEM Ultrachrome HD, Hahnemuhle Photo Rag Pearl 320gsm, no additional coating



Epson SureColor P600, Epson OEM Ultrachrome HD, Hahnemuhle Photo Rag Pearl 320gsm, no additional coating

