

## W1.1 2003 - 058

### Color Rendition Teleconference, November 12, 2003

- 1) Ann McCarthy announced that she will be serving as liaison between ICC and the W1.1 Color Rendition standards activity
  
- 2) Color Quantization
  - We started with a discussion of Oscar's data looking step detection in the printed serpentine targets. Eddy said that he had done this as well, finding good correlation, with steps greater than .5 DE being visible. He also stated that he saw some crispening effect; where steps close to the background color were easier to see than other colors (could it also be that steps at this density are easier to see? Or a combination of these factors?), and that he thought sweeps would be more sensitive to showing steps than the large patches (issue of step size versus visibility). To address these issues, we discussed remaking the targets using sweeps for the detection and the serpentine for the measurement where the light half of the sweep would be surrounded with a darker color and the dark half of the sweep would be surrounded with a lighter color.
  - With regard to steps in images, it was agreed that graphics represent the stress case and, as such, will be the focus when we look at quantization in images
  - ACTIONS:
    - Eddy to send his detected step data
    - Everyone to look for their serpentine targets and examine them under D50 lighting conditions for detected steps. Send out results.
  
- 3) Color Fidelity
  - We discussed the observer instructions for examining color fidelity. Ann sent out a suggestion for possible rewording. This suggestion, along with the results of our discussion have been included in the attached instructions. In response to the discussion regarding the numbers, I changed the anchors to 20 and 75. I have been advised in the past not to use numbers like 10 and 90 because this creates the possibility of a large number of prints being rated a 50, possibly resulting in ties, something regarding which Karin expressed concern. If people do not like the particular numbers I have chosen, please let me know. I am not beholden to them. Please note delineation of experimental conditions is still required as is a proposal of what we plan to measure.
  - Eddy – With regard to the test structure, I chose a rating procedure over a forced choice paired comparison because it was my belief that we are going to have a wide range of color fidelity represented by relatively few prints. With a paired comparison, there is the distinct chance that we would not have the “confusion” needed to create the scale; one print would always be identified as being better or worse than the next closest

print. I have not yet spoken with Brian Keelan, but I did recall from past discussions with him that while rating prints is not his favorite method, it is the best choice when saturation is possible.

- ACTIONS:
  - Susan to talk with Brian Keelan
  - Everyone to read attached observer instructions and submit comments
  - Susan to submit proposal for what we plan to measure. Suggestions welcome

4) Next meeting

- Dec. 3, 2003, 12:00 Eastern Daylight Time
- Jan. 14, 2004
- Propose a meeting at the EI conference in San Jose in January