## A: Datasheet

Algorithm: cogent\_004

Developer: Thales

Submission Date: 2021\_02\_10

Template size: 2053 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 943 msec

Template time (median): 948 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 967 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 30 (out of 265) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0020 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime\_005

Mugshot webcam ranking 33 (out of 227) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0131 vs. lowest 0.0062 from sensetime\_005

Mugshot profile ranking 117 (out of 196) — FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.9220 vs. lowest 0.0591 from sensetime\_005

Immigration visa-border ranking 29 (out of 148) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0040 vs. lowest 0.0013 from visionlabs\_010

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 40 (out of 145) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1125 vs. lowest 0.0568 from hr\_000

Identification:


Frontal mugshot ranking 55 (out of 265) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0323, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime\_004


Mugshot webcam ranking 25 (out of 225) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0506, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0122 from sensetime\_003

Mugshot profile ranking 109 (out of 195) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9974, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.1331 from hr\_000

Immigration visa-border ranking 21 (out of 146) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0220, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0049 from hr\_000

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 58 (out of 141) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.4567, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0996 from hr\_000







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 -Ealse negative identification rate, FNIR(T) 0.002 - 0.002 - 0.001 - 0.500 - 0.500 - 0.200 - 0. enrolment\_style random-ONE-MATE recent-ONE-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-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)






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 - 0.000 - 0.050 enrolment\_style - random ---- recent Mugshot Mugshot webcam natural FNIR@Rank = 1 cogent\_004 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



