

A: Datasheet

Algorithm: acer_001

Developer: Acer Incorporated

Submission Date: 2021_11_08

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 184 msec

Template time (median): 185 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 187 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 126 (out of 316) --- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0051 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime_006

Mugshot webcam ranking 114 (out of 278) --- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0202 vs. lowest 0.0057 from sensetime_006

Mugshot profile ranking 70 (out of 247) --- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.4223 vs. lowest 0.0550 from sensetime_006

Immigration visa-border ranking 92 (out of 205) --- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0081 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime_006

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 46 (out of 202) --- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0977 vs. lowest 0.0487 from cubox_000

Identification:

Frontal mugshot ranking 137 (out of 316) --- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0559, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_004


Mugshot webcam ranking 115 (out of 276) --- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1087, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0122 from sensetime_003

Mugshot profile ranking 177 (out of 246) --- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9994, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.1331 from cloudwalk_hr_000


Immigration visa-border ranking 98 (out of 204) --- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0684, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0039 from sensetime_006

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 101 (out of 199) --- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.5111, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0729 from cubox_000


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




C: Evolution of accuracy for ACER 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_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.

Algorithm: acer_001, Dataset: Border-Crossing Ageing
Threshold: 767422.000000 set to achive 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

