Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu\_4)




Fig 3: Identification mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec\_3)




Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type




Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.





Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities

Rank, R

Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type

False Positive Idenification Rate, FPIR(T)



## 3. Report for algorithm allgovision\_000 2020-03-20 13:12:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N




Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: allgovision\_000
Developer: AllGoVision
Submission Date: 2019\_07\_30
Template size: 2048 bytes
Template time (2.5 percentile): 381 msec
Template time (median): 405 msec
Template time (97.5 percentile): 631 msec
Investigation rank 108 — FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0114 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen
Identification rank 99 — FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0878
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime\_003