

A: Datasheet

Algorithm: imagus_007

Developer: Imagus Technology Pty Ltd

Submission Date: 2021_11_16

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 552 msec

Template time (median): 610 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 616 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 68 (out of 329) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0020 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime_006

Mugshot webcam ranking 70 (out of 291) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0131 vs. lowest 0.0057 from sensetime_006

Mugshot profile ranking 66 (out of 260) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.3212 vs. lowest 0.0550 from sensetime_006

Immigration visa--border ranking 59 (out of 218) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0038 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime_006

Immigration visa--kiosk ranking 88 (out of 215) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1174 vs. lowest 0.0487 from cubox_000

Identification:

Frontal mugshot ranking 84 (out of 329) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0227, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0017 from nec_005


Mugshot webcam ranking 85 (out of 289) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0733, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0120 from nec_005

Mugshot profile ranking 52 (out of 259) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.8929, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.1331 from cloudwalk_hr_000


Immigration visa--border ranking 66 (out of 217) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0310, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0032 from paravision_009

Immigration visa--kiosk ranking 66 (out of 212) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2675, 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 IMAGUS 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: imagus_007, Dataset: Border-Crossing Ageing
Threshold: 0.529237 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

