A: Datasheet

Algorithm: sensetime_006

Developer: Sensetime Group

Submission Date: 2021_07_26

Template size: 1032 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 928 msec

Template time (median): 930 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 970 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 1 (out of 288) –– FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0009

Mugshot webcam ranking 1 (out of 250) –– FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0057

Mugshot profile ranking 1 (out of 219) –– FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0550

Immigration visa–border ranking 1 (out of 177) –– FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0009

Immigration visa–kiosk ranking 3 (out of 174) –– FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0635 vs. lowest 0.0568 from cloudwalk_hr_000

Identification:

Frontal mugshot ranking 2 (out of 288) –– FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0018, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_004

Mugshot webcam ranking 2 (out of 248) –– FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0122, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0122 from sensetime_003

Mugshot profile ranking 136 (out of 218) –– FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9981, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.1331 from cloudwalk_hr_000

Immigration visa–border ranking 1 (out of 176) –– FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0039, FPIR=0.001000

Immigration visa–kiosk ranking 1 (out of 171) –– FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0925, FPIR=0.001000

B: Mugshot natural images, identification mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_004)

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

False negative identification rate (FNIR) at false match rate (FMR) = 0.010000

Date algorithm submitted to FRVT

Dataset
- Mugshot–Mugshot
- Mugshot–ProfileView
- Mugshot–Webcam
- Visa–Border
- Visa–Kiosk

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

Mated

without threshold, all lists have same length, here 50

with low threshold, list length shortens
towards 1 as there is 1 mate

at high threshold, lists
gradually get shorter as mates
fall below threshold (misses)

the pink region shows
[5,95]−percentile of list lengths

Non−Mated

without threshold, all lists have same length, here 50

with low threshold, list length shortens

at high threshold, lists only rarely
have any candidates
here only 1 in 100

Mean candidate list length

Threshold value

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

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_006)

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.

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