	Method	LFW	CFP-FF	CFP-FP	AgeDB	CALFW	CPLFW	VGG2-FP	Avg.
	Baseline	99.80	99.67	97.95	97.90	96.07	92.58	95.90	**97.12**
w/o uncertainty	MagFace	99.78	99.71	97.96	97.70	95.95	92.13	95.60	96.98
	AdaFace	99.81	**99.82**	97.87	97.98	96.07	**92.83**	94.96	97.05
	PFE (original)	**99.82**	-	93.34	-	-	-	-	-
	GODIN	99.80	99.70	98.08	**98.15**	95.98	91.85	95.64	97.03
w/ uncertainty	Relaxed Softmax	99.68	99.71	97.83	97.97	95.88	92.32	95.50	96.98
	DUL	99.78	99.72	97.92	97.95	**96.15**	92.66	95.22	97.06
	RTS	99.77	99.74	**98.09**	97.98	95.90	92.32	**96.02**	**97.12**

Table 3: Results of recognition trained on DeepGlint (except PFE). The results are all comparably high enough.


Figure 8: Face recognition performance with rejecting low-quality images. The curves show the effectiveness of rejecting low-quality face images in terms of false non-match rate (FNMR) at false match rate (FMR) threshold of 0.001. Training data: DeepGlint.

Figure 9: Balance between FR and OOD performance. Training data: DeepGlint.

and the quality of image.

Face Recognition with Rejecting Low-quality Images. Fig. 8 shows the error-versus-reject curves of rejecting different quality face images in terms of false-non-match rate (FNMR). In order to control variables to illustrate the performance of each model on rejection task, we first obtain image features which are used for calculating FNMR from RTS. For non-uncertainty model (MagFace, AdaFace), we use magnitudes of image features obtained from MagFace and AdaFace to reject low-quality images. And for uncertainty models, we use the proposed OOD score in each model (Details can be seen in 4.4) to reject poor quality samples. Dropping low-quality faces can benefit face recognition performance significantly. As shown in Fig.8, RTS achieves the best FNMR on different ratio of rejected images in all benchmarks except LFW and AgeDB. RTS performs best in the former 20% of LFW-benchmark and former 8% of AgeDB-benchmark (only rejecting a small amount of samples), and has high performance uniformity for various testsets. It is noteworthy that in real application scenarios of face recognition, the proportion of low-quality images is usually small and only a small number of samples will be rejected for recognition. Considering this, our method can achieve best performance in real application. RTS is able to distinguish samples with low-quality and give the corresponding sample a reasonable uncertainty score. Compared with other methods, RTS can stably complete rejection task to improve the performance of face recognition.

4.4 Out-of-Distribution Detection

Uncertainty Scores and Evaluation Metrics. To evaluate the performance of uncertainty models on OOD detection task reasonably, we use the proposed score in each model. For GODIN and Relaxed Softmax, the proposed score is the multiplier or denominator to the logit. For DUL, the proposed score is the harmonic mean of estimated variance. We have shown that the estimated value of $v(\boldsymbol{x})$ in RTS is related to the scale of temperature, and thus reflects the scale of uncertainty in the classification model. We choose $v(\boldsymbol{x})$ as the uncertainty score of our method to detect OOD samples. For non-uncertainty model (MagFace, AdaFace), we use magnitudes of image features obtained from MagFace and AdaFace to detect OOD samples. Following literature (**?**), we use true negative rate at $\{90\%, 95\%\}$ true positive rate (TNR@TPR90, TNR@TPR95) and the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) to evaluate OOD detection performance.

OOD Detection Performance. Table 2 shows that RTS outperforms the other methods on OOD detection task. MagFace, AdaFace and Relaxed Softmax perform well. GODIN has a relatively good OOD result. While DUL cannot detect out-of-distribution data accurately. Besides, the distributions

λ	LFW	CFP-FP	AgeDB	CPLFW	VGG2-FP
0.1	98.43	93.53	87.63	84.12	91.62
1	99.23	95.57	91.97	87.03	93.28
10	**99.43**	**97.50**	**94.43**	**90.55**	**94.56**

Table 4: Results of our models trained with different weights for KL divergence (δ is 16). Training data: CASIA-WebFace.

δ	LFW	CFP-FP	AgeDB	CPLFW	VGG2-FP
8	99.30	97.11	93.75	89.33	94.38
16	**99.43**	**97.50**	**94.43**	**90.55**	**94.56**
32	99.33	97.04	93.47	89.62	93.70

Table 5: Results of our models trained with different values for degree of freedom (λ is 10). Training data: CASIA-WebFace.

of different models are shown in Fig. 5. We can see that our proposed RTS can better discriminate the in-distribution and out-of-distribution data. Both quantitative and distributions results indicate that RTS is an effective technique to model uncertainty and complete OOD detection task.

4.5 Face Recognition Performance

Face verification accuracy on benchmarks. The results of recognition is shown in Table 3. We can see that the recognition performance of RTS is comparable with the state-of-the-art methods on all test sets. This indicates that, besides the ability to reveal uncertainty of images and detect out-of-distribution data, the model trained with RTS can achieve competitive performances in face recognition task.

Balance Between FR and OOD Performance. Fig. 9 shows the performance between face recognition (average verification accuracy of all benchmarks) and out-of-distribution detection (AUC) of non-uncertainty and uncertainty models. The comprehensive performances of Mag-Face, AdaFace and Relaxed Softmax are both close to that of RTS. While MagFace has a great many hyper parameters needed to be adjusted manually and is difficult to reproduce good enough results. Besides, the convergence of Relaxed Softmax is very sensitive to the margin in its prediction head. In comparison, RTS has less hyper parameters and is easier to converge. Our method achieves the best performance in OOD detection task and comparably high enough face verification accuracy, demonstrating that RTS is a unified framework for uncertainty estimation and face recognition.

4.6 Ablation Study

Effects of KL divergence. The KL divergence loss works as a regularization term to prevent the uncertainty scale from growing infinitely. When the weight $\lambda < 0.1$, the model have difficulty in converging, and the performance also deteriorates at last. For large $\lambda (> 10)$, the model tends to predict nearly constant variance $v(\boldsymbol{x})$, which has little effects in modeling data uncertainty. We conduct experiments on

models with $\lambda \in \{0.1, 1, 10\}$. The results are shown in Table 4. Through experiments, we find that the model achieves the best performance when $\lambda = 10$. Thus, we set $\lambda = 10$ for our RTS model.

Effects of degree of freedom. We study the effects of degree of freedom δ, which is a hyperparameter of RTS. Intuitively, δ determines the shape of density of random temperature, t. The results are shown in Table 5. From experimental results, we can see that RTS achieves the best performance when $\delta = 16$. Thus, we set $\delta = 16$ for our RTS model.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we first analysis the connection between temperature scaling and uncertainty modeling in the classification model. Taking a probabilistic view, the temperature scalar is exactly the scale of uncertainty noise implicitly added in the softmax function. Based on this observation, a unified framework, Random Temperature Scaling (RTS), is proposed for uncertainty estimation and face recognition by modeling the uncertainty level by a stochastic distribution.

Experiments show that RTS can adjust the learning strength of different quality samples for stability and accuracy during training. The magnitude of variance in RTS acts as a metric to reveal the image quality and can be used to detect uncertain, low-quality and even OOD samples in testing phase. Face recognition models trained with RTS have higher security and reliability by rejecting untrusted images, especially when deployed in real-world face recognition systems. RTS achieves top performance on both FR and OOD detection tasks. Moreover, models trained with RTS performs robustly on datasets with noise. The proposed module is light-weight and only adds negligible computation cost to the original face recognition model.

Appendix

Cum sit harum inventore facilis dicta omnis odio illum eveniet porro dolores, cupiditate ad temporibus ratione enim.Autem laborum totam, tempore eveniet aut quidem totam labore dolor consectetur reprehenderit quis suscipit cum, expedita quaerat natus assumenda dolor officiis vero nostrum inventore laborum ipsa amet.Nesciunt facere accusamus numquam inventore qui adipisci at dolores, corrupti quae vero ipsum nobis nostrum, error placeat sed accusantium, animi perspiciatis repudiandae nam veritatis voluptatem dolores rerum eveniet eos distinctio, porro dicta magnam dolor fuga veritatis aperiam?Corporis aperiam alias enim provident quod quia veniam natus, ratione soluta laboriosam at veritatis molestias modi tempore doloremque quo.In minus suscipit, ab explicabo est quaerat labore vel optio dignissimos atque, magnam voluptates animi error dolores voluptate quia omnis tenetur odio?Ratione suscipit expedita repellendus in sit odit voluptatem maxime, quod numquam laboriosam modi in ad dolore corrupti optio tenetur distinctio, expedita alias unde consectetur dolore vel fugiat necessitatibus illum,