

A: Datasheet

Algorithm: idemia_2

Developer: Idemia

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 364 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 405 msec

Template time (median): 415 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 434 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 122 (out of 259) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0100 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime_005


Mugshot profile ranking 140 (out of 190) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.9564 vs. lowest 0.0591 from sensetime_005

Identification:


Frontal mugshot ranking 81 (out of 259) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0518, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_004

Mugshot profile ranking 42 (out of 189) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9705, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.1733 from sensetime_005


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




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




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




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



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



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

Dataset: 2018 Mugshot N = 3068801

