## A: Datasheet

Algorithm: idemia\_007

Developer: Idemia

Submission Date: 2020\_01\_17

Template size: 860 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 783 msec

Template time (median): 794 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 866 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 45 (out of 265) — FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0026 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime\_005

Mugshot webcam ranking 46 (out of 227) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0151 vs. lowest 0.0062 from sensetime\_005

Mugshot profile ranking 196 (out of 196) — FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 1.0000 vs. lowest 0.0591 from sensetime\_005

Immigration visa-border ranking 43 (out of 148) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0061 vs. lowest 0.0013 from visionlabs\_010

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 50 (out of 145) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1311 vs. lowest 0.0568 from hr\_000

Identification:


Frontal mugshot ranking 32 (out of 265) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0181, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime\_004

Mugshot webcam ranking 30 (out of 225) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0546, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0122 from sensetime\_003


Mugshot profile ranking 192 (out of 195) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 1.0000, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.1331 from hr\_000

Immigration visa-border ranking 43 (out of 146) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0515, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0049 from hr\_000

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 136 (out of 141) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 1.0000, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0996 from hr\_000




C: Evolution of accuracy for IDEMIA algorithms on three datasets 2018 – present




D: 1:N error tradeoff by dataset and enrollment type. N = 1600000 individuals **Immigration Immigration** Mugshot visa-border visa-kiosk natural 0.700 -0.500 -0.300 -0.200 -0.100 -0.070 -0.050 -0.030 -0.020 -0.010 -0.007 - 0.005 - 0.005 - 0.002 - 0.001 - 0.001 - 0.700 - 0.500 - 0.200 enrolment\_style consolidated-ONE-MATE random-ONE-MATE recent-ONE-MATE unconsolidated-ALL-MATES unconsolidated-ANY-MATE 0.100 -0.070 -0.050 -0.030 -0.020 -0.010 -0.007 -0.005 -0.003 -0.002 -0.001 -


False positive identification rate, FPIR(T)

E: Dependence of error rates on T by number enrolled identities, N, for Mugshot natural images




F: FPIR vs. Selectivity for mugshot images, N = 1600000 subjects enrolled with one recent mate 7e+01 -5e+01 -3e+01 -2e+01 -1e+01 -7e+00 -5e+00 -3e+00 -2e+00 -1e+00 -7e-01 -5e-01 -3e-01 -2e-01 -1e-01 -7e-02 -5e-02 -3e-02 -3e-02 -1e-02 -**Enrolled images:** recent N = 1600000 Mugshot natural Mugshot webcam 7e-03 -5e-03 -3e-03 -2e-03 -1e-03 -7e-04 -5e-04 -3e-04 -2e-04 -1e-04 -7e-05 -5e-05 -3e-05 -2e-05 -1e-05 -1e-02 1e-05 3e-05 1e-04 3e-04 1e-03 3e-03 3e-02 1e-01 3e-01 False Positive Idenification Rate, FPIR(T)






I: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (sensetime\_005) Immigration **Immigration** visa-border visa-kiosk 0.100 -0.070 -0.050 -0.030 -0.020 -0.010 -0.007 -0.005 -0.003 - 0.002 - 0.001 - 0.001 - 0.000 enrolment\_style consolidated ---- random --- recent Mugshot webcam Mugshot natural FNIR@Rank = 1 -- idemia\_007 sensetime\_005 0.030 -0.020 -0.010 -0.007 -0.005 -0.003 -0.002 -0.001 -1e+06 3e+06 1e+07 1e+06 3e+06 1e+07 Enrolled population size, N



Template duration; search duration vs. N. The blue and pink ribbon covers 95 percent of observed measurements. The template generation time is independent of N. The log and power–law models are fit to the first two (N,T) observations



M: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



