

A: Datasheet

Algorithm: rankone_010

Developer: Rank One Computing

Submission Date: 2020_11_05

Template size: 261 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 194 msec

Template time (median): 198 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 218 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 42 (out of 279) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0022 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime_005

Mugshot webcam ranking 17 (out of 241) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0098 vs. lowest 0.0062 from sensetime_005

Mugshot profile ranking 46 (out of 210) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.3738 vs. lowest 0.0587 from xforwardai_002

Immigration visa-border ranking 40 (out of 168) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0048 vs. lowest 0.0013 from visionlabs_010

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 55 (out of 165) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1263 vs. lowest 0.0568 from cloudwalk_hr_000

Identification:

Frontal mugshot ranking 26 (out of 279) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0136, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_004


Mugshot webcam ranking 35 (out of 236) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0582, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0122 from sensetime_003

Mugshot profile ranking 24 (out of 209) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.8015, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.1331 from cloudwalk_hr_000


Immigration visa-border ranking 54 (out of 167) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0517, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0047 from idemia_008

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 34 (out of 162) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2601, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0996 from cloudwalk_hr_000


B: Mugshot natural images, identification mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (sensetime_004)




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




D: 1:N error tradeoff by dataset and enrollment type. N = 1600000 individuals




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




G: FPIR dependence on T by probe type for N = 1600000 subjects



H: Reduced length candidate lists for human review

Dataset is border–border with time–lapse [10,15] YRS with N = 1600000. Probes are 10–15 years later than enrollment image



I: FNIR and FPIR dependence on threshold

Dataset is border-border with time-lapse [10,15] YRS with N = 1600000. Probes are 10-15 years later than enrollment image

False {Negative | Positive} Identification Rate

FNIR(T)

0.40

0.20

0.10

0.04

0.02

0.01

FPIR(T)

1e+00

4e-01

2e-01

1e-01

4e-02

2e-02

1e-02

4e-03

2e-03

1e-03

4e-04

2e-04

1e-04


0.4

0.6


0.8

1.0


Threshold value




J: DET for Mugshot natural images and various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.




K: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (sensetime_005)




L: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



M: 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



O: FNIR(T, N = 1.6 million) by sex, age and time-lapse. The top row gives investigational rank-1 miss rates. The bottom panels give high threshold for more lights-out identification with low FPIR.



P: FPIR(N = 1.6 million) by sex and age. It is typical for false positive identification rates to be higher in women except in their teens.


Algorithm: rankone_010, Dataset: Border-Crossing Ageing
Threshold: 0.831047 set to achive FPIR(30-45, Male) = 0.001

Color encodes log(FPIR)



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

Dataset: 2018 Mugshot N = 3068801



R: Decline of genuine scores with ageing, with some eventually dropping below typical thresholds shown by the horizontal lines

