A: Datasheet

Algorithm: kedacom_001

Developer: Kedacom International Pte

Submission Date: 2019_09_16

Template size: 292 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 504 msec

Template time (median): 507 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 808 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 164 (out of 329) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0077 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime_006

Mugshot webcam ranking 180 (out of 291) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0356 vs. lowest 0.0057 from sensetime_006

Mugshot profile ranking 235 (out of 260) — FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.9722 vs. lowest 0.0550 from sensetime_006

Immigration visa-border ranking 150 (out of 218) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0342 vs. lowest 0.0009 from sensetime_006

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 150 (out of 215) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2366 vs. lowest 0.0487 from cubox_000

Identification:


Frontal mugshot ranking 82 (out of 329) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0225, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0017 from nec_005

Mugshot webcam ranking 83 (out of 289) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0722, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0120 from nec_005


Mugshot profile ranking 100 (out of 259) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9860, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.1331 from cloudwalk_hr_000

Immigration visa-border ranking 97 (out of 217) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0552, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0032 from paravision_009

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 76 (out of 212) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3062, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0728 from paravision_009




C: Evolution of accuracy for KEDACOM 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 -0.050 kedacom 001 0.030 -0.020 -0.010 -0.007 - 0.005 - 0.005 - 0.002 - 0.001 - 0.700 - 0.500 - 0.200 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 -


False positive identification rate, FPIR(T)


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











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) 0.20 0.5 -0.15 0.10 0.05 Score - 0.0 0.00 **TVAL** - FPIR = 0.001 FPIR = 0.003 FPIR = 0.010 -0.5 -FPIR = 0.030

-1.0 -

(00,02]

(02,04]

(04,06]

(06,08]

(08,10]

Time lapse between search and initial encounter enrollment (years)

(10,12]

(12,14]

(14,18]