

A: Datasheet

Algorithm: pangiam_000

Developer: Pangiam

Submission Date: 2022_02_22

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 626 msec

Template time (median): 636 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 654 msec

Investigation:

Frontal mugshot ranking 19 (out of 341) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0012 vs. lowest 0.0008 from sensetime_007

Mugshot webcam ranking 17 (out of 303) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0077 vs. lowest 0.0056 from sensetime_007

Mugshot profile ranking 20 (out of 272) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0742 vs. lowest 0.0521 from sensetime_007

Immigration visa-border ranking 21 (out of 230) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0020 vs. lowest 0.0008 from sensetime_007

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 14 (out of 227) -- FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0649 vs. lowest 0.0487 from cubox_000

Identification:

Frontal mugshot ranking 32 (out of 341) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0060, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0014 from sensetime_007


Mugshot webcam ranking 34 (out of 301) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0298, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0093 from sensetime_007

Mugshot profile ranking 13 (out of 271) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3179, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.1093 from cloudwalk_mt_000

Immigration visa-border ranking 31 (out of 229) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0093, FPIR=0.001000 vs. lowest 0.0024 from cloudwalk_mt_000

Immigration visa-kiosk ranking 16 (out of 224) -- FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1051, 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 (nec_005)




C: Evolution of accuracy for PANGIAM 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: pangiam_000, Dataset: Border-Crossing Ageing
Threshold: 725694.475005 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

