

# Tenth Anniversary of the Plastics Color Formulation Tool

*William Cheetham*

■ Since 1994, GE Plastics has employed a case-based reasoning (CBR) tool that determines color formulas that match requested colors. This tool, called *FormTool*, has saved GE millions of dollars in productivity and material (that is, colorant) costs. The technology developed in *FormTool* has been used to create an online color-selection tool for our customers called ColorXpress Select. A customer innovation center has been developed around the *FormTool* software.

With headquarters in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, and technical facilities, manufacturing sites, and sales locations on five continents, GE Plastics (GEP) produces many of the world's best known and most widely used polymers. In offices and factories, in hospitals, homes, and schools, on the road and in outer space, products made with GE materials make life simpler, safer, and more comfortable for people every day. The plastic GE creates can be made any color that is requested by a customer. Plastic is colored by adding pigments while the plastic is manufactured. In order to determine the correct formulas for our customers, a case-based reasoning (CBR) (Watson 1997) tool called *FormTool* was started in 1994.

Determining the colorants and loading levels that can be added to plastic so the plastic matches a given color is a difficult problem for multiple reasons. First, the number of combi-

nations of possible colorants is very large. From 4 to 7 colorants are selected from 30 to 50 potential colorants. Second, for each set of possible colorants, the amount of each colorant also needs to be determined. Third, there is currently no accurate method to predict the color produced when a set of colorants is added to plastic. Unlike paint, where light primarily reflects off of the surface, in plastics a significant percentage of light penetrates the surface, reacts with the internal structure of the plastic, and can exit the plastic a color that depends on that internal structure. Fourth, a given formula can appear different in different lighting conditions (natural sunlight versus fluorescent lighting). Fifth, different base plastics have different starting colors (for example, clear, white, gray), so the same set of colorants will likely produce a different color in different grades of plastic. GEP makes hundreds of different grades of plastic. Because of these difficulties, selecting the colorants and loading levels for a color formula was previously accomplished by using either human working experience or computationally expensive computer programs. There are commercially available computer programs that can calculate the colorant loading proportions for a color formula that matches a color standard. Because these programs perform an exhaustive search, they require a user to select a subset of the allowable colorants. Usually 5 to 7 are selected




Figure 1. The Color-Matching Process.

out of the 30 to 50 possible colorants. Since the final formula usually consists of 4 or 5 colorants, users have to decide what colorants to select for the search, a critical decision that often produces nonoptimal solutions. Furthermore, the solution does not take into consideration other important attributes of a color match, such as the cost of the colorants.

I mentioned earlier that there is no exact algorithm for predicting the color produced by a given set of colorants and loadings. However, the Kubelka-Munk theory (Meyer 1981) can be used to produce an approximation of the color produced by a set of colorants and loadings. This theory describes how the absorption and scattering of colorants in a material are related to the visible color of the material. Each colorant contributes to the absorption and scattering of the material, and its contribution is proportional to the amount of it present in the system multiplied by an absorption and scattering coefficient for that colorant. Our system uses the Kubelka-Munk theory.

### Description of the Color-Matching Process

GEP provides a color-matching service to customers. Customers submit a physical sample

of the color they want, and GEP either finds a close match from its color library or formulates a new color to meet the customer's needs. GEP currently has more than 50,000 previously matched colors on file and performs approximately 4,000 color matches per year. In the past, when GEP performed a custom color match and formula development, there was a significant cost to GEP, and the turnaround for the customer averaged two weeks. We looked for ways to reduce this cost and shorten the turnaround time.

Selecting the colorants and loading levels for a color formula was previously accomplished by using a combination of human working experience and computationally expensive computer programs. Figure 1 shows the color-matching process that was in place. The process started with a color matcher inspecting the color request for the type of plastic, the physical color standard supplied by the customer, and the special properties requested. The matcher then compared the customer's color standard with previous color chips that were stored in a filing cabinet. The filing cabinet held about 2,000 plastic chips that were about 2 by 3 by 1/8 inches, sorted by color. The matcher would select the most similar color from the filing cabinet. Each



Figure 2. FormTool on PC with Spectrophotometer.

chip was labeled, and another filing cabinet held a formula card for each chip. The matcher would then inspect the physical chip selected from the filing cabinet to determine whether it matched the color and special properties requested by the customer. If it did match, then the formula that was associated with the selected chip would be used for the customer, and the match was finished. If the best chip from the filing cabinet was not a satisfactory match, then the matchers used experience along with commercially available computer programs to adapt the colorant loadings. The new loadings would be used to create a small chip containing the adapted loadings. This chip would be compared with the standard. If it was acceptable, the adapted formula would be used for the customer, and the chip would be placed in the filing cabinet for future reference. If the color was unacceptable, then the formula would be adapted repeatedly until an acceptable formula was obtained.

## FormTool Description

The color-matching system consists of a spectrophotometer attached to a personal computer as shown in figure 2. The spectrophotometer is used to determine a numerical representation of a color, called a reflectance curve. The reflectance curve shows the percentage of light reflected by a color at each wavelength of the visible spectrum (that is, 400 to 700 nanometers). A spectrophotometer reads the reflectance of an object at 31 points equally spaced along the visible spectrum. Comparing two spectra is done by calculating the sum of differences or sum of squared differences between two curves over all 31 points in the visible spectrum. The personal computer contains the case-base and case-based reasoning software, called FormTool. Each case in the case-base contains a reflectance curve and a list of pigments and loadings used to create that color. FormTool is described below.

The existing color-matching process already followed the CBR methodology, so the auto-




Figure 3. The Automated Color-Matching Process.

mated CBR process is very similar to the original color-matching process and is shown in figure 3. The color matcher places the physical color standard in the spectrophotometer and reads the spectrum of the color standard into the color-matching system. Next, the color matcher enters key information such as the resin and grade of material in which to generate the match. FormTool then searches its case-base of previous matches for the “best” previous match and adjusts those previous matches to produce a match for the new standard. There are multiple criteria that the color match must satisfy: (1) the color of the plastic must match the standard under multiple lighting conditions; (2) there must be enough pigments to hide the color of the plastic; (3) the cost of colorant formula should be as low as possible; (4) only a limited amount of light can be transmitted through the plastic (optical density); and (5) the color should not change when the plastic is molded at different temperatures. This information is presented in figure 4.

The color matcher looks at the physical standard from this previous match and determines whether it is acceptable for the application and customer. If the match is not acceptable, FormTool then adapts this previous match so that it more closely matches the requested color and

application. The color matcher then makes a physical chip using the adapted formula. The molding machines used to make the sample are shown in figure 5.

If this new match is acceptable, then the adapted loadings are saved into the database and the match is finished. If the match is not acceptable, then the user can decide to do one of two things: (1) manually or automatically adjust the color loadings (manual), or (2) switch to a different previous match as the starting point for this color match (search database).

After one of these is done, the cycle continues until a match is found. When the “End” oval is reached, a formula has been obtained that gives the “best” color match and balance of all other important properties.

### Case Selection

This subsection describes a method to evaluate the quality of a specific color formula. A selection process that uses this method to evaluate a formula can be used to find the formula that reproduces a specified color and meets all desired attributes for the application of the specified color. A “nearest neighbor” retrieval is used. However, the nearest neighbor must be determined by evaluating the degree of match





Figure 5. Color Chip Test Molding Machines.

classify previous matches into various sets of linguistic terms, GEP found that there was enough precision in the evaluation of the similarity of the attributes to have four linguistic terms. Table 1 shows the linguistic terms and the numeric similarity score that corresponds to each term.

Fuzzy preference functions were created for each of the following attributes of the color match: (1) color similarity, (2) total colorant load, (3) cost of colorant formula, (4) optical density of color, and (5) color shift when molded under normal and abusive conditions. For more details on the case selection, see Cheetham and Graf (1997).

### Case Adaptation

Most formulas that are retrieved need some adaptation. The similarity calculation described previously is used to guide the adaptation. Adaptation is done by repeatedly varying the loadings of the colorants in the formula retrieved and evaluating the new similarity. Kubelka-Munk theory is used as part of the similarity calculation and provides a formula for predicting the color change from modifying the loadings of the colorants. Having a function that can accurately evaluate the effect of

an adaptation is the key to performing the correct adaptation.

### Hardware and Software Used

The hardware selection was limited to the hardware that was currently available in the color-matching laboratory. Consequently, FormTool's hardware consists of a spectrophotometer attached to a personal computer running Windows 95. The spectrophotometer is used to determine a numerical representation of a color, called a reflectance curve. The reflectance curve shows the percentage of light reflected by a material at each wavelength of the visible spectrum (that is, 400 to 700 nanometers). A typical color spectrophotometer reads the reflectance of an object at 31 points equally spaced along the visible spectrum. Two spectra are compared by calculating the sum of squared differences between two curves over all 31 points in the visible spectrum.

The software used to create FormTool required a little more evaluation. Existing CBR tools were researched. The one that appeared to have the most promise was ART IM. We created a quick prototype in ART IM, but found that (in 1994) ART IM did not allow the flexibility of case selection needed. Furthermore, GE Plastics systems support would not be able to maintain an ART IM application after it was created. We needed to use tools that could be supported after FormTool was created. A custom development using a Visual Basic front end connected with C++ code for adaptation routines was selected. The case-base was later stored in a Microsoft access database.

### Use of AI Technology

FormTool was one of the first AI systems to fully implement the CBR process as described in Aamodt (1994) (see figure 7). When a new color is matched, the case selection algorithms "retrieve" a set of close matches to that color and related attributes. The "reuse" of those cases is done by the adaptation algorithms based on color theory. The "revision" phase is performed by a human who makes a sample batch of the color formula suggested by FormTool. If that formula is proven correct, then the solution is confirmed. If the confirmed solution is significantly different from all cases in the current case base, uses different colorants, or is greater than a set color difference in Lab color space, then the solution is "retained" by the case-base. It was very convenient that the existing process exactly used the CBR methodology before this project was started.




Figure 6. Fuzzy Preference Function.

### Application Use and Payoff

FormTool has been in constant use since its introduction in 1995. During 2004 it was used for an average of 130 custom color matches per week. Multiple benefits have resulted from using FormTool, in color matcher productivity, pigment cost reduction, global color consistency, tool development, color-match speed, and so on.

#### Color Matcher Productivity

The average number of test chips that are created in the revise phase has decreased from 4.2 to 2.7 per color match. This is an average reduction of 4.5 hours per color match. Since more than 5,000 color matches are performed per year, using FormTool has saved 22,500 hours of work per year. The custom color match is a free service for our customers, so the cost of these 22,500 hours would directly reduce our profits. Saving the time directly adds to our bottom line.

#### Pigment Cost Reduction

Pigments are the most expensive component in plastic. If the amount of pigment that is needed can be reduced, then the difference in the cost of the pigment and the cost of the plastic would be saved. This could be a few cents

Fuzzy Rating	Maximum Score	Minimum Score
Excellent	1	0.95
Good	0.94	0.75
Average	0.74	0.25
Poor	0.24	0

Table 1. The Global Preference Function Scale.

per pound. FormTool’s adaptation algorithms were designed to determine the minimum pigment loading that would allow for correct manufacturing of the color desired.

Another way to reduce pigment cost is to use cheaper pigments. Different pigments have different properties and different costs. For example, some red pigments are twice as expensive as other red pigments. The most expensive pigments are usually the easiest to use in a color match. FormTool’s case-selection algorithms select the best previous match based on cost and other factors, in addition to the color of the case.

Part of the testing for FormTool that was conducted in 1994 was rematching 100 colors that had already been matched but still were being manufactured. FormTool found lower-cost matches for 64 of the 100 colors. The new formulas were substituted for the old, more costly, formulas. For each of these colors we




Figure 7. The CBR Process (adapted from Agnar Aamodt).

tracked the number of pounds that were manufactured with the new formula. The cost savings can be calculated by multiplying the difference in cost by the volume for each color, then taking the sum for all 64 colors. This was done near the end of 1994. The cost savings were \$200,000 in 1994, \$1.2 million in 1995, and \$1.5 million in 1996. FormTool was used for new matches from 1995 onward. The colorant cost savings for years after 1996 are conservatively estimated at an average of \$2.4 million per year.

These cost savings had a critical impact on the Parkersburg plant. Before FormTool, the plant was losing over a million dollars per year and was slated for closure. This shutdown would have put a hundred people out of work in an area where jobs were scarce. Since FormTool and other measures allowed the plant to start making a profit, it was not closed, and those people did not lose their jobs.

### Global Color Consistency

GE has plastics manufacturing sites throughout the world. The consistency of the colors we produce is important to our customers. FormTool has been used to share color formulas. Also, if some pigments are not available in one location, FormTool's case selection can automatically substitute the unavailable pigments with the closest available pigments. This has helped provide globally consistent colors.

A separate tool was created to allow the color matchers to manage the case-base and list of available colors. The manager tool allows color matchers to import a case-base from another location, numerically determine the visual properties of a pigment for use in adaptation,

specify which pigments are available for use, and specify the price of each pigment.

### Other Tool Development

The case adaptation algorithms were used to create a tool for controlling the color produced by a manufacturing line, called *LineTool*. When colors are manufactured they do not always come out as planned—because of many factors. LineTool can determine how to adjust a color that is not exactly on target. It produces a list of pigments that should be added to bring the manufacturing line back on target.

### Speed of Color Match

The speed of the color match was very important to many of our customers. For example, if a cell telephone maker needed to add a month of time to its development cycle in order to get the various pieces of plastic in the casing to match, it might miss its target date for product release. FormTool reduced the time needed for a color match. This allowed the color matchers to eliminate the backlog of color matches. Since less experience was needed to perform a color match, resources could easily be added when a spike in demand was received and shifted to other work when there was low demand. Because of the benefits mentioned, the average time from receiving a color match request to creating the formula was reduced by two thirds. By 2004, FormTool was used in the countries shown in gray in figure 8.

## Application Development and Deployment

The software engineering paradigm used was the spiral development process. Two developers created the first version of FormTool in less than one year for a total cost of \$300,000. The first version worked for only one family of plastic—Cyclocac, which was manufactured Parkersburg. The initial deployment was only to the West Virginia site. At the system's first demonstration, the manager paying for the project asked the developers to rematch a red color that had just been matched and had not started use in production. FormTool found a match that saved GE \$50,000 on that year's production of that color.

The two developers continued working on FormTool and related projects for the next two years. During these years features were added, a maintenance tool was created, new families of plastics were supported, and FormTool was introduced at other sites in the United States. It was more difficult to make the transition to using FormTool at a new site than we expected.



Figure 8. Countries with FormTool in Use.

Each site had a different color-matching process. We needed to standardize these processes before FormTool could be easily introduced elsewhere. This standardization involved determining what was the best process, modifying FormTool to meet this process if needed, and convincing people to adopt this process. We recruited a local expert at each site to be the person in charge of FormTool at that site. The expert's tasks included installing updates, distributing locally added cases, and training others at his or her site in how to use FormTool.

Globalization of the tool was performed in 1997. The user interface was modified to be in either English or French. The case-base was changed from a local version, which needed user intervention to be updated with downloads of new cases, to a centralized database. In 1998, maintenance of FormTool was moved from the two developers to the Information Technology group of GE Plastics.

The creation of FormTool paved the way for other AI tools. In 1996 LineTool was created to help operators of the plastics manufacturing line adjust the color of a batch that is being produced. If samples indicated the color was not correct, then a slightly modified version of

FormTool was used to determine what pigments to add in order to bring the batch back to the correct color.

In 1997 ColorXpress Select was created as an online color selection tool for GE's customers.<sup>1</sup> The case-base from FormTool was used as a color palette that our customers can browse, request samples from, and order online. When a customer used this tool it completely eliminated the need for a color match and reduced the time needed for the customer to get the match completed. Any item selected has already been matched, and a sample can be sent via FedEx to the customer in less than 48 hours. The web page for selecting a formula is shown in figure 9.

To select a formula, customers first select the resin type, opaque or transparent. Then they can select a custom color by specifying the color desired on the rainbow display or selecting a color standard by specifying the type and ID of the existing standard. If a point in the rainbow display is selected, the values of that point are placed in the numeric color value boxes. When the "Next Step" button is clicked, the case selection algorithm is executed, and another screen shows the nine closest matches to the desired color. If a satisfactory match cannot be




Figure 9. ColorXpress Select Web Page.

found, then a custom match request can be submitted, and FormTool is used offline to create the color formula. The formula created for the custom match will eventually be available on ColorXpress Select.

ColorXpress Select has been in use since 1999. It is one of the first customer-service tools that GE Plastics has made available over the web. Tools like this have simplified the process for customers to submit orders over the web. GE now leads the plastic industry in on-line sales. The online dollar sales of GE Plastics are greater than the book sales of Amazon.com.

In 1998, the cost savings from FormTool and ColorXpress Select allowed GE Plastics to invest in another method for customers to select colors. In early 2000, GE Plastics opened a new \$10 million ColorXpress center to help designers and marketers quickly create custom colors and special effects for plastics. The 4,000 square foot center in Selkirk, New York, brings together all of the resources needed to select and develop custom colors and produce color chips, pellet samples, and prototype parts in a single day.

The idea behind the ColorXpress center is that in a competitive marketplace the color, texture, and style of a product can be a differentiating feature. An example of this is the Apple iMac computer. The ColorXpress center provides a location where customers can go through the CBR process of selecting a color face to face with a GE color matcher. The color

matcher helps the customers refine the look and special effects of their products. This one-day service is now available only because of the FormTool system, which is the key tool used in the center. Before FormTool, most color matches took more than two days. Now, most matches take a day or less.

The case-base in the ColorXpress center is a color-chip room where three walls are filled with 20,000 baseball-card size colored plastic chips (see figure 10). Three sets of overhead lights—incandescent, fluorescent, and daylight—show how the chips' color varies under different lighting conditions.

Development included creating documentation, training manuals, and tutorials and submitting patents on various algorithms in FormTool. The U.S. Patent and Trademark office has granted GE four patents on various aspects of the color-matching process described here.<sup>2</sup>

The FormTool case-base originally resided in a Microsoft Access database format and requires minimal maintenance. The main responsibility of the site experts was to update and back up the database and send new local cases for distribution to other sites using FormTool. The database is now in Oracle, and this job is automated by having one global case-base.

New cases are automatically added to the database each time a color match is performed and saved. Filtering algorithms are run just before adding a new case to make sure that is in fact a nonredundant case. This has made it possible to keep the case-base database optimized as it grows with time.

Functionality has been built into the software to allow color specialists to add new pigments and dyes to the tool. This process involves producing a number of color batches used to characterize the optical properties of the pigment or dye that are then saved in the tool to be used in the case-adaptation algorithms. Additionally, the site expert has the responsibility to enter the rules for each pigment or dye. These rules include which product grade it can be used in and at what minimum and maximum concentrations. However, since new pigments or dyes are added infrequently, this does not consume much time of the color specialists. A Visual Basic maintenance tool was created to assist the site expert in these tasks.

## Conclusion

FormTool is considered a huge success at General Electric due to the project's financial return on investment. It is also considered a technology achievement due to its early use of the CBR



Figure 10. The ColorXpress Center Chip Room.

methodology, the number of patents obtained, and the opportunities for other systems it has created.

### Notes

1. [www.gecolorxpress.com/](http://www.gecolorxpress.com/).
2. U.S. Patent No. 5,668,633: Method and System for Formulating a Color Match; U.S. Patent No. 5,720,017: System and Method for Formulating a Color Match Using Color Keys; U.S. Patent No. 5,740,078: Method and System for Determining Optimum Colorant Loading Using Merit Functions; and U.S. Patent No. 5,841,421: Method and System for Selecting a Previous Color Match from a Set of Previous Matches.

### References

- Aamodt, A. 1994. Case-Based Reasoning: Foundational Issues, Methodological Variations, and System Approaches, *Artificial Intelligence Communications (AICom)* 7(1): 39–59.
- Billmeyer, F. 1981. *Principles of Color Technology*. Second Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cheetham, W., and Graf, J. 1997. Case-Based Reasoning in Color Matching. In *Case-Based Reasoning Research and Development: Second International Conference (ICCB-97)*, 1–12. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Volume 1266. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Mendel, J., 1995. Fuzzy Logic Systems for Engineering: A Tutorial. *Proceedings of the IEEE* 83(3): 345–377
- Watson, I. 1997. *Applying Case-Based Reasoning: Techniques for Enterprise Systems*. San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers.

**William Cheetham** is a senior researcher at the General Electric Global Research Center in upstate New York, where he has worked since 1985. His job is to invent or improve knowledge-based products and services. This often involves the application of artificial intelligence and related techniques. He has led the development of more than a dozen intelligent systems that are in use throughout the General Electric Company. Since 1998, he has been an adjunct professor at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, where he now teaches the class Applied Intelligent Reasoning Systems.



*Call for Participation*  
**2006 AAI Spring Symposium Series** 

**March 27–29, 2006 ■ Stanford University, Stanford, California**

*Sponsored by the American Association for Artificial Intelligence*

**Important Deadlines**

*October 7, 2005:* Submissions due to organizers

*November 4, 2005:* Notifications of acceptance sent by organizers

*January 27, 2006:* Accepted camera-ready copy due to AAI.

For full descriptions and submission instructions, please see  
<http://www.aaai.org/Symposia/Spring/2006/sss-06.html> or contact

AAAI, SSS-06, 445 Burgess Drive, Menlo Park, CA 94025, 650-328-3123, 650-321-4457 (fax), [sss06@aaai.org](mailto:sss06@aaai.org).