

A: Datasheet

Algorithm: advance_000

Developer: Advance.AI

Submission Date: 2023_05_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 570 msec

Template time (median): 574 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 579 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 204 (out of 414) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0046 vs. lowest 0.0008 from interna_001

Mugshot webcam ranking 128 (out of 376) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0129 vs. lowest 0.0054 from sensetime_009

Mugshot profile ranking 103 (out of 345) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1863 vs. lowest 0.0517 from sensetime_009

Immigration visa-border ranking 99 (out of 303) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0029 vs. lowest 0.0006 from cloudwalk_mt_002

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 88 (out of 248) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0747 vs. lowest 0.0387 from cloudwalk_mt_002

Identification:

Frontal mugshot ranking 146 (out of 414) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0224, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0011 from idemia_010


Mugshot webcam ranking 283 (out of 374) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2700, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0072 from sensetime_009

Mugshot profile ranking 132 (out of 344) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9734, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0634 from cloudwalk_mt_002


Immigration visa-border ranking 212 (out of 302) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1632, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0010 from cloudwalk_mt_002

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 131 (out of 248) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3116, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0517 from cloudwalk_mt_002


B: Mugshot natural images, identification mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (idemia_010)




C: Evolution of accuracy for ADVANCE 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

Mean candidate list length




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_009)





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: advance_000, Dataset: Border-Crossing Ageing
Threshold: 218.104946 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



R: Decline of genuine scores with ageing, with some eventually dropping below typical thresholds shown by the horizontal lines

