

A: Datasheet

Algorithm: canon\_002

Developer: Canon Inc

Submission Date: 2022\_04\_26

Template size: 6200 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 895 msec

Template time (median): 897 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 970 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 18 (out of 353) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0012 vs. lowest 0.0008 from sensetime\_007

Mugshot webcam ranking 90 (out of 315) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0134 vs. lowest 0.0056 from sensetime\_007

Mugshot profile ranking 224 (out of 284) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.9443 vs. lowest 0.0521 from sensetime\_007

Immigration visa-border ranking 180 (out of 242) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0532 vs. lowest 0.0008 from sensetime\_007

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 229 (out of 239) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.8775 vs. lowest 0.0487 from cubox\_000

Identification:

Frontal mugshot ranking 27 (out of 353) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0047, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0014 from sensetime\_007


Mugshot webcam ranking 31 (out of 313) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0271, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0093 from sensetime\_007

Mugshot profile ranking 75 (out of 283) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9523, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.1093 from cloudwalk\_mt\_000


Immigration visa-border ranking 127 (out of 241) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0635, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0024 from cloudwalk\_mt\_000

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 176 (out of 236) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.8814, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0719 from cloudwalk\_mt\_000


B: Mugshot natural images, identification mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (hyperverge\_002)




C: Evolution of accuracy for CANON 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

False {Negative | Positive} Identification Rate

FNIR(T)

FPIR(T)


0.35

0.40


0.45

0.50


Threshold value




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\_007)




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: canon\_002, Dataset: Border-Crossing Ageing  
Threshold: 0.455584 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

