## 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 93 (out of 279) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0048 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime\_005

Mugshot webcam ranking 95 (out of 241) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0220 vs. lowest 0.0062 from sensetime\_005


Identification:

Frontal mugshot ranking 110 (out of 279) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0577, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime\_004

Mugshot webcam ranking 65 (out of 236) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0919, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0122 from sensetime\_003



## 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** Immigration Mugshot visa-border visa-kiosk natural 0.700 -0.500 -0.300 -0.200 -0.100 -0.070 sensetime 004 0.050 -0.030 -0.020 -0.010 -0.007 -Ealse negative identification rate, FNIR(T) 0.003 - 0.000 - 0.000 - 0.500 - 0.200 - 0. enrolment\_style consolidated-ONE-MATE random-ONE-MATE recent-ONE-MATE unconsolidated-ALL-MATES unconsolidated-ANY-MATE 0.100 -0.070 -0.050 -0.030 -0.020 -0.010 -0.007 -0.005 -0.003 -0.002 -0.001 -


\\\ \e^{-0}\frac{3}{2}e^{-0}\frac{1}{2}e^{-0}\frac{3}{2}e^{-0}\frac{1}{2}e


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 -**Enrolled images:** recent N = 1600000 % 3e-02 -2e-02 -1e-02 -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)







K: 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 -Ealse negative identification rate, FNIR(N) 0.002 - 0.001 - 0.000 - 0.050 - 0.050 - 0.030 - 0. enrolment\_style consolidated ---- random --- recent Mugshot Mugshot webcam natural FNIR@Rank = 1 sensetime\_005 toshiba\_1 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





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





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





R: Decline of genuine scores with ageing, with some eventually dropping below typical thresholds shown by the horizontal lines 1.0 -Dataset: 2018 Mugshot N= 3.1M Color encodes FNIR (Rank = 1) 0.9 -0.15 0.10 0.05 Score - 8.0 0.00 **TVAL** - FPIR = 0.001 FPIR = 0.003 0.7 -FPIR = 0.010FPIR = 0.030 0.6 -(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)