

A: Datasheet

Algorithm: vixvizion\_009

Developer: Vixvizon

Submission Date: 2022\_11\_28

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 856 msec

Template time (median): 907 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 965 msec

Investigation:

Mugshot webcam ranking 102 (out of 343) --- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0126 vs. lowest 0.0055 from sensetime\_008

Mugshot profile ranking 85 (out of 312) --- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2196 vs. lowest 0.0521 from sensetime\_007

Immigration visa-border ranking 107 (out of 270) --- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0046 vs. lowest 0.0006 from cloudwalk\_mt\_001

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 111 (out of 215) --- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0996 vs. lowest 0.0395 from cloudwalk\_mt\_001

Identification:

Frontal mugshot ranking 134 (out of 381) --- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0272, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0013 from sensetime\_008


Mugshot webcam ranking 122 (out of 341) --- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0765, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0090 from sensetime\_008

Mugshot profile ranking 59 (out of 311) --- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.7453, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0698 from cloudwalk\_mt\_001


Immigration visa-border ranking 119 (out of 269) --- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0405, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0013 from cloudwalk\_mt\_001

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 140 (out of 215) --- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.5389, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0532 from cloudwalk\_mt\_001


B: Mugshot natural images, identification mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (sensetime\_008)




C: Evolution of accuracy for VIXVIZION 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\_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: vixvizion\_009, Dataset: Border-Crossing Ageing  
Threshold: 0.523284 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

