

A: Datasheet

Algorithm: ptakuratsatu_000

Developer: Akurat Satu Indonesia

Submission Date: 2020_10_23

Template size: 538 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 898 msec

Template time (median): 906 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1012 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 62 (out of 279) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0030 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime_005

Mugshot webcam ranking 66 (out of 241) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0166 vs. lowest 0.0062 from sensetime_005

Mugshot profile ranking 75 (out of 210) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.6050 vs. lowest 0.0587 from xforwardai_002

Immigration visa-border ranking 43 (out of 168) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0051 vs. lowest 0.0013 from visionlabs_010

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 36 (out of 165) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1050 vs. lowest 0.0568 from cloudwalk_hr_000

Identification:

Frontal mugshot ranking 67 (out of 279) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0366, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_004


Mugshot webcam ranking 98 (out of 236) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1238, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0122 from sensetime_003

Mugshot profile ranking 40 (out of 209) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9241, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.1331 from cloudwalk_hr_000


Immigration visa-border ranking 49 (out of 167) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0463, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0047 from idemia_008

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 29 (out of 162) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2326, 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 PTAKURATSATU 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




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.


Algorithm: ptakuratsu_000, Dataset: Border-Crossing Ageing N = 1600000
Text encodes FNIR, Color encodes log(FNIR)



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: ptakuratsatu_000, Dataset: Border-Crossing Ageing
Threshold: 59.634400 set to achieve 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

