A: Datasheet

Algorithm: toshiba_1

Developer: Toshiba

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2060 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 873 msec

Template time (median): 875 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1659 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 76 (out of 259) −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0048 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime_005

Mugshot webcam ranking 78 (out of 221) −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0220 vs. lowest 0.0062 from sensetime_005

Identification:

Frontal mugshot ranking 94 (out of 259) −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0577, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_004

Mugshot webcam ranking 51 (out of 219) −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0919, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0122 from sensetime_003


B: Mugshot natural images, identification mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (sensetime_004)
False negative identification rate, FNIR(N)
0.050
0.030
0.020
0.010
0.007
0.005
0.003
0.002
1e+06
3e+06
1e+07
Enrolled population size, N
enrolment_style
consolidated
recent
Dataset:
2018 Mugshot
FNIR@FPIR = 0.001
sensetime_004
toshiba_1

C: Evolution of accuracy for TOSHIBA algorithms on three datasets 2018 − present




D: 1:N error tradeoff by dataset and enrollment type. N = 1600000 individuals
Immigration visa−border
Immigration visa−kiosk
Mugshot natural
sensetime_004
toshiba_1
False negative identification rate, FNIR(T)
0.700
0.500
0.300
0.200
0.100
0.070
0.050
0.030
0.020
0.010
0.007
0.005
0.003
0.002
0.001
1e−04
3e−04
1e−03
3e−03
1e−02
3e−02
1e−01
3e−01
1e+00
False positive identification rate, FPIR(T)
enrolment_style
consolidated−ONE−MATE
random−ONE−MATE
recent−ONE−MATE
unconsolidated−ALL−MATES
unconsolidated−ANY−MATE


E: Dependence of error rates on T by number enrolled identities, N, for Mugshot natural images
N
00640000
01600000
lifetime_consolidated
recent
FNIR
FPIR
Identification Error rate, FPIR(T) or FNIR(T)
7e−01
5e−01
3e−01
2e−01
1e−01
7e−02
5e−02
3e−02
2e−02
1e−02
7e−03
5e−03
3e−03
2e−03
1e−03
7e−04
5e−04
3e−04
2e−04
1e−04
7e−05
0.60
0.65
0.70
0.75
Threshold


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


G: FPIR dependence on T by probe type for N = 1600000 subjects
False Positive Idenification Rate, FPIR(T)
7e−01
5e−01
3e−01
2e−01
1e−01
7e−02
5e−02
3e−02
2e−02
1e−02
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
0.60
0.65
0.70
0.75
Threshold
Enrolled image:
random
N = 1600000
Mugshot
natural
Mugshot
webcam
enrolment_style
recent


H: DET for Mugshot natural images and various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.
0.700
0.500
0.300
0.200
0.100
0.070
0.050
0.030
0.020
0.010
0.007
0.005
0.003
0.002
False negative identification rate, FNIR(T)
1e−04
3e−04
1e−03
3e−03
1e−02
3e−02
1e−01
3e−01
1e+00
False positive identification rate, FPIR(T)
2018 Mugshot
Enrolled image:
recent
00640000
01600000


I: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (sensetime_005)
Immigration
visa−border
Immigration
visa−kiosk
Mugshot
natural
Mugshot
webcam
False negative identification rate, FNIR(N)
0.100
0.070
0.050
0.030
0.020
0.010
0.007
0.005
0.003
0.002
0.001
1e+06
3e+06
1e+07
Enrolled population size, N
enrolment_style
consolidated
random
recent
FNIR@Rank = 1
sensetime_005
toshiba_1


J: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type
sensetime_005
toshiba_1
False negative identification rate, FNIR(N)
0.100
0.070
0.050
0.030
0.020
0.010
0.007
0.005
0.003
0.002
0.001
1
3
10
30
Rank, R
enrolment_style
lifetime_consolidated
random
recent
FNIR(R)
N = 1600000
Immigration visa−border
Immigration visa−kiosk
Mugshot natural
Mugshot webcam


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
MODEL
Log Model
Power Law Model
7000
5000
3000
2000
1000
Search Duration (milliseconds)
7e+05
8e+05
1e+06
Enrolled population size, N, one image per person


Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores
TVAL
FPIR = 0.001
FPIR = 0.003
FPIR = 0.010
FPIR = 0.030
Similarity Score
0.9
0.8
0.7
0.6
Desired outcome:
AA high, AB low
AA−fraternal
AA−identical
AB−fraternal
AB−identical
Gallery: Twin A; Probe: Twin A or B; Type of Twin


M: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing
Dataset: 2018 Mugshot N = 3068801
(00,02]
(02,04]
(04,06]
(06,08]
(08,10]
(10,12]
(12,14]
(14,18]
FPIR
Rank
sensetime_005
toshiba_1
False negative identification rate (FNIR)
0.700
0.500
0.300
0.200
0.100
0.070
0.050
0.030
0.020
0.010
0.007
0.005
0.003
0.002
0.001
1e−04
3e−04
1e−03
3e−03
1e−02
3e−02
1e−01
3e−01
1e+00
1
3
10
30
50
False positive identification rate, FPIR or Rank, R


N: Decline of genuine scores with ageing
1.0
0.9
0.8
0.7
0.6
Score
(00,02]
(02,04]
(04,06]
(06,08]
(08,10]
(10,12]
(12,14]
(14,18]
Time lapse between search and initial encounter enrollment (years)
Dataset:
2018 Mugshot
N= 3.1M
FNIR (Rank = 1)
0.20
0.15
0.10
0.05
0.00
TVAL
FPIR = 0.001
FPIR = 0.003
FPIR = 0.010
FPIR = 0.030