Cost-per-Print Comparative Benchmarking User-Representative Test Target

HP LaserJet 1320, Dell 1710, Lexmark E340, and Samsung ML-2250 Laser Printers

> Final Report Presentation January 2006

SPENCEILAB DIGITAL COLOR LABORATORY Catherine Fiasconaro, Director

Spencer & Associates Publishing, Ltd. David R Spencer, President

Melville, New York

1.631.367.6655



www.spencerlab.com ©2006



Executive Summary — Research Objectives

Determine Cost-per-Print of a Higher Coverage, User Document

- The ISO 19752 standard measure of Monochrome Toner Cartridge Yield uses a simple text document
- When users print a higher coverage mix of text and graphics, do all printers have the same yield?
- Since Cost-per-Print varies directly with Cartridge Yield, this is a real cost users will experience

Conduct Two Cartridge Yield Tests

- Perform fully compliant ISO/IEC 19752 Cartridge Yield testing to verify manufacturers' Stated Yield
 - ° Use of ISO/IEC 19752 Standard Test Page
- Adapt ISO/IEC 19752 methodology to test Cartridge Yield utilizing a higher coverage, user-representative test file
 - ° Use high-coverage, monochrome presentation slide as test target
 - An office-type document of mixed text and graphics from the SpencerLab Printer Test Suite*
 - ° Test under identical controls of ISO/IEC 19752 Standard, only changing the test file

www.spencerlab.com

୦୦୦୦ନ

*The SpencerLab Printer Test Suite, now in βeta, is an extension of Spencer& Associates' Color Hardcopy Quality Factors test suite, a de facto industry standard since 1990.





ISA LSA





Test Results — Overview

All manufacturers met their stated yields per ISO 19752

° Standardized file important in comparison of manufacturer's stated toner yield

Two out of nine Dell "Use & Return" cartridges (22.2%) failed during testing

° Two replacement cartridges were used to complete testing

Higher Coverage Toner Cartridge Yield and Cost-per-Print

- HP's Declared Page Yield* was greater than other tested printers' yields
 - ° HP had 103% greater yield than the Dell 1710
 - ° HP had 79% greater yield than the Lexmark E340
 - ° HP had 35% greater yield than the Samsung ML-2250
- HP had the lowest Cost-per-Print

- ° Dell 1710's Cost-per-Print was 40% higher than HP
- [°] Lexmark E340's Cost-per-Print was 64% higher than HP
- ° Samsung ML-2250's Cost-per-Print was 16% higher than HP
- [°] Dell and Lexmark Customers not opting for "Use and Return" cartridges will incur still higher costs
 - Dell "Regular" cartridge Cost-per-Print was 102% higher than HP
 - Lexmark "Regular" cartridge Cost-per-Print was 92% higher than HP

*Declared Page Yield derived from tested Average Yield calculated with 90% confidence bound, in accordance with ISO/IEC:19752



Higher Coverage User-Representative Test File



www.spencerlab.com ©2006

Test Results — Page Yield Analysis



Higher Coverage User-Representative Test File



HP's Declared Page Yield* was greater than all tested competitors'

- ° 103% higher yield than Dell 1710
- ° 79% higher yield than Lexmark E340
- ° 35% higher yield than Samsung ML-2250

*Declared Page Yield derived from tested Average Yield calculated with 90% confidence bound, in accordance with ISO/IEC:19752



www.spencerlab.com



Cost-per-Print

Toner Cartridge Cost divided by Declared Page Yield*, plus Drum pro-rata Cost

| Printer | HP LaserJet 1320 | Dell 1710 | | Lexmark E340 | | Samsung ML-2250 |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Toner Cartridge Part Number | Q5949X | K3756 "Use & Return" | H3730 "Regular" | 34015HA "Use & Return" | 34035HA "Regular" | ML-2250D5 |
| Toner Cost per Cartridge | \$130.99 | \$89.99 | \$129.99 | \$119.00 | \$139.00 | \$112.50 |
| Pages per Cartridge | 831 | 410 | 410 | 463 | 463 | 616 |
| Toner Cost per Print | 15.76 ¢ | 21.95 ¢ | 31.70 ¢ | 25.70 ¢ | 30.02 ¢ | 18.26 ¢ |
| Drum Cartridge Cost | | \$49.99 | | \$62.50 | | |
| Pages per Drum | N/A 30,0 | | 000 | 30,0 | 30,000 | |
| Drum Cost per Print | | 0.17 ¢ | | 0.21 ¢ | | |
| Total | 15.76 ¢ | 22.12 ¢ | 31.87 ¢ | 25.91 ¢ | 30.23 ¢ | 18.26 ¢ |



Test File

Results based on tests conducted by *SpencerLAB* Digital Color Laboratory.

Pricing per respective manufacturers' web sites as of 01/15/2006.

Toner Cartridge & Drum Costs

Obtained from respective manufacturers' web sites

- [°] Dell and Lexmark offer optional "Use and Return" toner cartridges at a lower cost with the understanding that they will be used once and returned to the manufacturer
- ° Dell 1710 and Lexmark E340 contain user-replaceable imaging drum/photoconductor, therefore include these costs in total cost-per-print

*Declared Page Yield derived from tested Average Yield calculated with 90% confidence bound, in accordance with ISO/IEC:19752



www.spencerlab.com ©2006



Test Results — Cost-per-Print Analysis (cont'd)



HP had the lowest Cost-per-Print



Dell's "Use and Return" Cost-per-Print was 40% more expensive than HP

° Dell's "Regular" cartridge Cost-per-Print was 102% more expensive

Lexmark's "Use and Return" Cost-per-Print was 64% more expensive than HP ° Lexmark's "Regular" cartridge Cost-per-Print was 92% more expensive

Samsung's Cost-per-Print was 16% more expensive than HP

www.spencerlab.com ©2006



R012006

Methodology

Toner cartridge yield testing with adapted ISO/IEC 19752:2004 methodology

° Higher-coverage, user-representative, monochrome presentation slide used as test target

- Test file, SpencerLab HC MC Presentation, from the SpencerLab Digital Color Laboratory Printer Test Suite
- ° ISO/IEC 19752:2004 compliance on all methodology, other than test target

Nine (9) OEM high-capacity cartridges, where available, were tested for each printer

- Three cartridges on each of three printers, procured from at least three sources on the open market
- "Use and Return" cartridges were tested for Dell and Lexmark
- Samsung does not produce a high-capacity cartridge for use with the ML-2250

° Machines were run in semi-continuous mode (per ISO 19752)

- Automatic paper sensing was disabled to prevent possible error
- Stops were for paper replenishment, jam clearance, and overnight
- ° Testing was performed under ISO 19752 environmental controls
 - + 23° ± 2°C temperature; 50% ±10% relative humidity

Cartridge Yield was the number of pages printed until End-of-Life, determined by Fade

° End-of-Life and Fade determined per ISO 19752 definition

- None of the tested machines employed a TONER-OUT stop
- [°] The cartridge was first shaken at the first of either "Toner Low" signal on the printer control panel or visible fade; upon the next fade the cartridge was shaken again; the subsequent fade determined End-of-Life
 - The Samsung ML-2250 did not have a "Toner-Low" signal; the cartridge was shaken at the first and second fades; the third fade determined End-of-Life

Declared Page Yield calculated per ISO/IEC 19752

° Declared Page Yield derived from tested Average Yield calculated with 90% confidence bound

www.spencerlab.com



Methodology (cont'd)

Cost-per-Print

Calculate toner component cost-per-print

° Toner Cartridge Cost divided by the corresponding Declared Page Yield

PLUS

Calculate other user-replaceable component pro-rata costs

- [°] Dell 1710 and Lexmark E340 contain user-replaceable imaging drum/photoconductor, therefore include drum/photoconductor cost in total cost-perprint
- ° Drum Cost divided by Manufacturer's Stated Yield
- ° HP LaserJet 1320 and Samsung ML-2250 use all-in-one (integrated toner and drum) cartridges

Toner and Drum Cartridge Prices

- ° Pricing was obtained from manufacturers' web sites
 - Dell and Lexmark "Use and Return" cartridges are offered at a lower price with the understanding of onetime use and return to the manufacturer. "Regular" cartridges are offered at regular prices without these terms

Sum these component costs to obtain total Cost-per-Print for the test document

Copyright 2006 Spencer & Associates Publishing, Ltd. Research conducted by the SpencerLab Digital Color Laboratory, under the sponsorship of Hewlett-Packard Company. Results and analyses in this report are based upon testing procedures developed and implemented by SpencerLab in our continuing commitment to accuracy and integrity, and are based upon our best knowledge at the time of publication. Although this research was sponsored, as an independent test laboratory with a broad base of industry clients, SpencerLab believes that this report maintains its reputation for the integrity of its test procedures and analyses.

