

A: Datasheet

Algorithm: aize\_001

Developer: Tripleize

Submission Date: 2021\_08\_06

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 386 msec

Template time (median): 403 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 428 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 145 (out of 329) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0056 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime\_006

Mugshot webcam ranking 142 (out of 291) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0223 vs. lowest 0.0057 from sensetime\_006

Mugshot profile ranking 127 (out of 260) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.6827 vs. lowest 0.0550 from sensetime\_006

Immigration visa-border ranking 130 (out of 218) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0158 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime\_006

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 127 (out of 215) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1654 vs. lowest 0.0487 from cubox\_000

Identification:

Frontal mugshot ranking 169 (out of 329) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0765, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0017 from nec\_005


Mugshot webcam ranking 156 (out of 289) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1431, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0120 from nec\_005

Mugshot profile ranking 124 (out of 259) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9936, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.1331 from cloudwalk\_hr\_000


Immigration visa-border ranking 125 (out of 217) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1009, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0032 from paravision\_009

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 91 (out of 212) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3877, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0728 from paravision\_009


B: Mugshot natural images, identification mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec\_005)




C: Evolution of accuracy for AIZE 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: aize\_001, Dataset: Border-Crossing Ageing  
Threshold: 785999.000000 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

