NISTIR 8271

Ongoing Face Recognition Vendor Test (FRVT)

Part 2: Identification - Algorithm Report Cards

Patrick Grother
Mei Ngan
Kayee Hanaoka
Information Access Division
Information Technology Laboratory

This publication is available free of charge from:
https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2020/03/27

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

National Institute of
Standards and Technology
U.S. Department of Commerce

NISTIR 8271

Ongoing Face Recognition Vendor Test (FRVT)

Part 2: Identification - Algorithm Report Cards

Patrick Grother
Mei Ngan
Kayee Hanaoka
Information Access Division
Information Technology Laboratory

2020/03/27

U.S. Department of Commerce
Wilbur Ross, Secretary

National Institute of Standards and Technology
Walter Copan, Director

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm 3divi_0 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm 3divi_0 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm 3divi_0 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: 3divi_0

Developer: 3Divi

Submission Date: 2018_02_09

Template size: 4096 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 390 msec

Template time (median): 423 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 486 msec

Investigation rank 153 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0318 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 160 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2540
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm 3divi_1 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm 3divi_1 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm 3divi_1 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: 3divi_1

Developer: 3Divi

Submission Date: 2018_02_15

Template size: 4224 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 392 msec

Template time (median): 425 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 486 msec

Investigation rank 154 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0349 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 158 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2533
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm 3divi_2 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm 3divi_2 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm 3divi_2 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: 3divi_2

Developer: 3Divi

Submission Date: 2018_02_15

Template size: 528 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 391 msec

Template time (median): 425 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 489 msec

Investigation rank 159 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0379 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 159 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2534
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm 3divi_3 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm 3divi_3 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm 3divi_3 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: 3divi_3

Developer: 3Divi

Submission Date: 2018_06_19

Template size: 512 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 485 msec

Template time (median): 610 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 826 msec

Investigation rank 187 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0833 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 181 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3999
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm 3divi_4 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm 3divi_4 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm 3divi_4 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: 3divi_4

Developer: 3Divi

Submission Date: 2018_06_19

Template size: 4096 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 488 msec

Template time (median): 614 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 838 msec

Investigation rank 128 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0175 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 139 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1686
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm 3divi_5 2020−03−20 13:14:35

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm 3divi_5 2020−03−20 13:14:35

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm 3divi_5 2020−03−20 13:14:35

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: 3divi_5

Developer: 3Divi

Submission Date: 2018_10_26

Template size: 4096 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 505 msec

Template time (median): 639 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 866 msec

Investigation rank 129 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0176 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 136 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1661
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm 3divi_5 2020−03−20 13:14:35

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm 3divi_5 2020−03−20 13:14:35

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm 3divi_5 2020−03−20 13:14:35

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: 3divi_5

Developer: 3Divi

Submission Date: 2018_10_26

Template size: 4096 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 505 msec

Template time (median): 639 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 866 msec

Investigation rank 129 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0176 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 136 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1661
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm 3divi_6 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm 3divi_6 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm 3divi_6 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: 3divi_6

Developer: 3Divi

Submission Date: 2018_10_26

Template size: 528 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 506 msec

Template time (median): 640 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 869 msec

Investigation rank 144 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0240 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 138 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1676
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm 3divi_6 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm 3divi_6 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm 3divi_6 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: 3divi_6

Developer: 3Divi

Submission Date: 2018_10_26

Template size: 528 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 506 msec

Template time (median): 640 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 869 msec

Investigation rank 144 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0240 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 138 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1676
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm alchera_0 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm alchera_0 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm alchera_0 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: alchera_0

Developer: Alchera Inc

Submission Date: 2018_06_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 253 msec

Template time (median): 259 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 289 msec

Investigation rank 124 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0161 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 126 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1380
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm alchera_1 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm alchera_1 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm alchera_1 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: alchera_1

Developer: Alchera Inc

Submission Date: 2018_06_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 62 msec

Template time (median): 66 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 77 msec

Investigation rank 235 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.9869 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 233 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9994
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm alchera_2 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm alchera_2 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm alchera_2 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: alchera_2

Developer: Alchera Inc

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 102 msec

Template time (median): 114 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 139 msec

Investigation rank 188 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0949 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 189 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.4843
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm alchera_3 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm alchera_3 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm alchera_3 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: alchera_3

Developer: Alchera Inc

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 515 msec

Template time (median): 532 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 720 msec

Investigation rank 101 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0104 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 129 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1551
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm allgovision_000 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm allgovision_000 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm allgovision_000 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: allgovision_000

Developer: AllGoVision

Submission Date: 2019_07_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 381 msec

Template time (median): 405 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 631 msec

Investigation rank 108 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0114 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 99 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0878
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm allgovision_000 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm allgovision_000 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm allgovision_000 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: allgovision_000

Developer: AllGoVision

Submission Date: 2019_07_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 381 msec

Template time (median): 405 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 631 msec

Investigation rank 108 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0114 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 99 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0878
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm anke_0 2020−03−20 13:14:35

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm anke_0 2020−03−20 13:14:35

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm anke_0 2020−03−20 13:14:35

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: anke_0

Developer: Anke Investments

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2072 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 367 msec

Template time (median): 430 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 508 msec

Investigation rank 117 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0132 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 114 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1169
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm anke_002 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm anke_002 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm anke_002 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: anke_002

Developer: Anke Investments

Submission Date: 2019_06_27

Template size: 2056 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 622 msec

Template time (median): 624 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 703 msec

Investigation rank 29 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0028 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 31 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0318
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm anke_1 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm anke_1 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm anke_1 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: anke_1

Developer: Anke Investments

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2072 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 370 msec

Template time (median): 431 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 507 msec

Investigation rank 118 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0132 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 120 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1189
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm aware_0 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm aware_0 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm aware_0 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: aware_0

Developer: Aware

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 1564 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 597 msec

Template time (median): 650 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 723 msec

Investigation rank 179 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0614 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 228 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9825
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm aware_1 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm aware_1 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm aware_1 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: aware_1

Developer: Aware

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 1564 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 592 msec

Template time (median): 648 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 726 msec

Investigation rank 176 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0562 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 229 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9965
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm aware_2 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm aware_2 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm aware_2 2020−03−20 13:12:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: aware_2

Developer: Aware

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 2076 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 848 msec

Template time (median): 909 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 989 msec

Investigation rank 177 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0575 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 226 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9772
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm aware_3 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm aware_3 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm aware_3 2020−03−20 13:12:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: aware_3

Developer: Aware

Submission Date: 2018_06_22

Template size: 2076 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 676 msec

Template time (median): 701 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 869 msec

Investigation rank 151 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0306 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 124 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1283
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm aware_4 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm aware_4 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm aware_4 2020−03−20 13:12:32

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: aware_4

Developer: Aware

Submission Date: 2018_06_22

Template size: 92 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 678 msec

Template time (median): 705 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 785 msec

Investigation rank 182 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0679 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 161 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2683
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm aware_5 2020−03−20 13:14:35

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm aware_5 2020−03−20 13:14:35

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm aware_5 2020−03−20 13:14:35

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: aware_5

Developer: Aware

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 3100 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 765 msec

Template time (median): 793 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1280 msec

Investigation rank 152 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0311 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 174 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3622
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm aware_6 2020−03−20 13:14:29

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm aware_6 2020−03−20 13:14:29

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm aware_6 2020−03−20 13:14:29

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: aware_6

Developer: Aware

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 124 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 764 msec

Template time (median): 789 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1280 msec

Investigation rank 184 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0697 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 162 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2754
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm ayonix_0 2020−03−20 13:12:40

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm ayonix_0 2020−03−20 13:12:40

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm ayonix_0 2020−03−20 13:12:40

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: ayonix_0

Developer: Ayonix

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 1036 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 9 msec

Template time (median): 11 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 13 msec

Investigation rank 227 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.4505 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 214 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.8107
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm ayonix_1 2020−03−20 13:12:39

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm ayonix_1 2020−03−20 13:12:39

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm ayonix_1 2020−03−20 13:12:39

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: ayonix_1

Developer: Ayonix

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 1036 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 10 msec

Template time (median): 12 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 14 msec

Investigation rank 222 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.3414 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 217 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.8241
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm ayonix_2 2020−03−20 13:13:58

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm ayonix_2 2020−03−20 13:13:58

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm ayonix_2 2020−03−20 13:13:58

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: ayonix_2

Developer: Ayonix

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1036 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 10 msec

Template time (median): 12 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 14 msec

Investigation rank 222 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.3414 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 216 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.8241
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm camvi_1 2020−03−20 13:12:39

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm camvi_1 2020−03−20 13:12:39

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm camvi_1 2020−03−20 13:12:39

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: camvi_1

Developer: Camvi Technologies

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 167 msec

Template time (median): 176 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 188 msec

Investigation rank 215 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2247 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 207 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.6836
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm camvi_2 2020−03−20 13:12:39

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm camvi_2 2020−03−20 13:12:39

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm camvi_2 2020−03−20 13:12:39

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: camvi_2

Developer: Camvi Technologies

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 756 msec

Template time (median): 770 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 787 msec

Investigation rank 195 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1269 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 194 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.5356
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm camvi_3 2020−03−20 13:16:21

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm camvi_3 2020−03−20 13:16:21

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm camvi_3 2020−03−20 13:16:21

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: camvi_3

Developer: Camvi Technologies

Submission Date: 2018_06_30

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 665 msec

Template time (median): 712 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 746 msec

Investigation rank 175 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0520 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 83 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0711
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm camvi_4 2020−03−20 13:14:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm camvi_4 2020−03−20 13:14:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm camvi_4 2020−03−20 13:14:33

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: camvi_4

Developer: Camvi Technologies

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 669 msec

Template time (median): 686 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 916 msec

Investigation rank 172 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0468 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 84 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0716
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm camvi_5 2020−03−20 13:14:32

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm camvi_5 2020−03−20 13:14:32

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm camvi_5 2020−03−20 13:14:32

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: camvi_5

Developer: Camvi Technologies

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 743 msec

Template time (median): 752 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 824 msec

Investigation rank 181 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0652 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 106 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0995
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm cogent_0 2020−03−20 13:14:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm cogent_0 2020−03−20 13:14:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm cogent_0 2020−03−20 13:14:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: cogent_0

Developer: Thales

Submission Date: 2018_06_20

Template size: 525 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 541 msec

Template time (median): 550 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 579 msec

Investigation rank 102 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0105 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 64 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0527
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm cogent_1 2020−03−20 13:14:32

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm cogent_1 2020−03−20 13:14:32

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm cogent_1 2020−03−20 13:14:32

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: cogent_1

Developer: Thales

Submission Date: 2018_06_20

Template size: 525 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 542 msec

Template time (median): 551 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 579 msec

Investigation rank 102 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0105 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 64 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0527
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm cogent_2 2020−03−20 13:14:31

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm cogent_2 2020−03−20 13:14:31

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm cogent_2 2020−03−20 13:14:31

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: cogent_2

Developer: Thales

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1043 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 941 msec

Template time (median): 946 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1485 msec

Investigation rank 38 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0036 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 45 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0439
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm cogent_3 2020−03−20 13:14:37

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm cogent_3 2020−03−20 13:14:37

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm cogent_3 2020−03−20 13:14:37

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: cogent_3

Developer: Thales

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1043 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 939 msec

Template time (median): 941 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1025 msec

Investigation rank 40 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0038 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 49 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0457
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm cognitec_0 2020−03−20 13:14:40

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm cognitec_0 2020−03−20 13:14:40

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm cognitec_0 2020−03−20 13:14:40

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: cognitec_0

Developer: Cognitec Systems GmbH

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 170 msec

Template time (median): 174 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 192 msec

Investigation rank 147 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0252 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 133 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1604
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm cognitec_1 2020−03−20 13:18:19

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm cognitec_1 2020−03−20 13:18:19

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm cognitec_1 2020−03−20 13:18:19

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: cognitec_1

Developer: Cognitec Systems GmbH

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 198 msec

Template time (median): 201 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 216 msec

Investigation rank 109 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0117 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 107 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1014
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm cognitec_2 2020−03−20 13:14:48

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm cognitec_2 2020−03−20 13:14:48

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm cognitec_2 2020−03−20 13:14:48

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: cognitec_2

Developer: Cognitec Systems GmbH

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 222 msec

Template time (median): 225 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 240 msec

Investigation rank 65 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0057 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 65 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0528
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm cognitec_3 2020−03−20 13:14:51

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm cognitec_3 2020−03−20 13:14:51

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm cognitec_3 2020−03−20 13:14:51

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: cognitec_3

Developer: Cognitec Systems GmbH

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 265 msec

Template time (median): 297 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 336 msec

Investigation rank 69 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0062 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 62 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0524
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm cognitec_3 2020−03−20 13:14:51

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm cognitec_3 2020−03−20 13:14:51

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm cognitec_3 2020−03−20 13:14:51

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: cognitec_3

Developer: Cognitec Systems GmbH

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 265 msec

Template time (median): 297 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 336 msec

Investigation rank 69 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0062 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 62 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0524
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm cyberlink_000 2020−03−20 13:12:40

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm cyberlink_000 2020−03−20 13:12:40

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm cyberlink_000 2020−03−20 13:12:40

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: cyberlink_000

Developer: Cyberlink Corp

Submission Date: 2019_06_12

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 632 msec

Template time (median): 654 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 974 msec

Investigation rank 44 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0040 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 71 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0563
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm cyberlink_000 2020−03−20 13:12:40

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm cyberlink_000 2020−03−20 13:12:40

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm cyberlink_000 2020−03−20 13:12:40

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: cyberlink_000

Developer: Cyberlink Corp

Submission Date: 2019_06_12

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 632 msec

Template time (median): 654 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 974 msec

Investigation rank 44 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0040 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 71 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0563
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm cyberlink_001 2020−03−20 13:12:40

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm cyberlink_001 2020−03−20 13:12:40

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm cyberlink_001 2020−03−20 13:12:40

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: cyberlink_001

Developer: Cyberlink Corp

Submission Date: 2019_10_07

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 423 msec

Template time (median): 424 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 464 msec

Investigation rank 35 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0035 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 66 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0534
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm dahua_0 2020−03−20 13:12:39

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm dahua_0 2020−03−20 13:12:39

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm dahua_0 2020−03−20 13:12:39

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: dahua_0

Developer: Dahua Technology Co Ltd

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 361 msec

Template time (median): 375 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 407 msec

Investigation rank 95 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0093 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 94 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0861
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm dahua_002 2020−03−20 13:14:38

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm dahua_002 2020−03−20 13:14:38

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm dahua_002 2020−03−20 13:14:38

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: dahua_002

Developer: Dahua Technology Co Ltd

Submission Date: 2019_12_02

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 682 msec

Template time (median): 686 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 750 msec

Investigation rank 14 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0018 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 12 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0150
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm dahua_1 2020−03−20 13:16:20

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm dahua_1 2020−03−20 13:16:20

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm dahua_1 2020−03−20 13:16:20

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: dahua_1

Developer: Dahua Technology Co Ltd

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 353 msec

Template time (median): 369 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 400 msec

Investigation rank 73 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0067 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 86 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0727
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm deepglint_001 2020−03−20 13:16:19

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm deepglint_001 2020−03−20 13:16:19

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm deepglint_001 2020−03−20 13:16:19

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: deepglint_001
Developer: Deepglint
Submission Date: 2019_11_15
Template size: 4096 bytes
Template time (2.5 percentile): 679 msec
Template time (median): 681 msec
Template time (97.5 percentile): 744 msec
Investigation rank 240 −− FNIR not computed
Investigation rank 240 −− FNIR not computed

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm deepsea_001 2020−03−20 13:12:45

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm deepsea_001 2020−03−20 13:12:45

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm deepsea_001 2020−03−20 13:12:45

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: deepsea_001

Developer: Tencent Deepsea Lab

Submission Date: 2019_07_29

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 731 msec

Template time (median): 738 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1038 msec

Investigation rank 49 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0043 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 50 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0461
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm dermalog_0 2020−03−20 13:14:59

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm dermalog_0 2020−03−20 13:14:59

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm dermalog_0 2020−03−20 13:14:59

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: dermalog_0

Developer: Dermalog

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 128 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 304 msec

Template time (median): 341 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 400 msec

Investigation rank 196 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1286 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 190 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.4862
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm dermalog_007 2020−03−20 13:14:46

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm dermalog_007 2020−03−20 13:14:46

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm dermalog_007 2020−03−20 13:14:46

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: dermalog_007

Developer: Dermalog

Submission Date: 2020_02_12

Template size: 128 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 386 msec

Template time (median): 411 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 456 msec

Investigation rank 94 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0092 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 95 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0863
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm dermalog_1 2020−03−20 13:12:44

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm dermalog_1 2020−03−20 13:12:44

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm dermalog_1 2020−03−20 13:12:44

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: dermalog_1

Developer: Dermalog

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 128 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 151 msec

Template time (median): 170 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 201 msec

Investigation rank 199 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1541 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 192 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.5268
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm dermalog_2 2020−03−20 13:12:44

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm dermalog_2 2020−03−20 13:12:44

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm dermalog_2 2020−03−20 13:12:44

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: dermalog_2

Developer: Dermalog

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 304 msec

Template time (median): 340 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 401 msec

Investigation rank 197 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1355 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 191 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.5013
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm dermalog_3 2020−03−20 13:16:27

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm dermalog_3 2020−03−20 13:16:27

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm dermalog_3 2020−03−20 13:16:27

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: dermalog_3

Developer: Dermalog

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 128 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 193 msec

Template time (median): 208 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 249 msec

Investigation rank 193 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1259 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 188 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.4819
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm dermalog_4 2020−03−20 13:16:15

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm dermalog_4 2020−03−20 13:16:15

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm dermalog_4 2020−03−20 13:16:15

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: dermalog_4

Developer: Dermalog

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 128 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 194 msec

Template time (median): 206 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 229 msec

Investigation rank 192 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1251 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 187 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.4798
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm dermalog_5 2020−03−20 13:16:07

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm dermalog_5 2020−03−20 13:16:07

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm dermalog_5 2020−03−20 13:16:07

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: dermalog_5

Developer: Dermalog

Submission Date: 2018_10_26

Template size: 128 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 506 msec

Template time (median): 528 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 583 msec

Investigation rank 123 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0149 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 100 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0880
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm dermalog_6 2020−03−20 13:18:07

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm dermalog_6 2020−03−20 13:18:07

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm dermalog_6 2020−03−20 13:18:07

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: dermalog_6

Developer: Dermalog

Submission Date: 2018_10_26

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 496 msec

Template time (median): 507 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 552 msec

Investigation rank 86 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0081 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 60 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0517
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm everai_0 2020−03−20 13:16:18

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm everai_0 2020−03−20 13:16:18

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm everai_0 2020−03−20 13:16:18

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: everai_0

Developer: Paravision (EverAI)

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 430 msec

Template time (median): 431 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 459 msec

Investigation rank 132 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0188 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 101 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0884
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm everai_1 2020−03−20 13:16:19

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm everai_1 2020−03−20 13:16:19

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm everai_1 2020−03−20 13:16:19

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: everai_1

Developer: Paravision (EverAI)

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 575 msec

Template time (median): 577 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 631 msec

Investigation rank 39 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0038 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 56 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0489
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm everai_2 2020−03−20 13:18:23

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm everai_2 2020−03−20 13:18:23

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm everai_2 2020−03−20 13:18:23

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: everai_2

Developer: Paravision (EverAI)

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 365 msec

Template time (median): 366 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 388 msec

Investigation rank 46 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0040 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 57 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0500
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm everai_3 2020−03−20 13:18:19

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm everai_3 2020−03−20 13:18:19

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm everai_3 2020−03−20 13:18:19

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: everai_3

Developer: Paravision (EverAI)

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 716 msec

Template time (median): 717 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 794 msec

Investigation rank 31 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0031 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 34 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0349
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm everai_paravision_004 2020−03−20 13:22:03

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm everai_paravision_004 2020−03−20 13:22:03

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm everai_paravision_004 2020−03−20 13:22:03

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: everai_paravision_004

Developer: Paravision (EverAI)

Submission Date: 2019_06_19

Template size: 4096 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 670 msec

Template time (median): 672 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 930 msec

Investigation rank 8 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0016 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sense

Identification rank 6 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0100
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm eyedea_0 2020−03−20 13:16:38

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm eyedea_0 2020−03−20 13:16:38

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm eyedea_0 2020−03−20 13:16:38

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: eyedea_0

Developer: Eyedea Recognition

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 4152 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 393 msec

Template time (median): 424 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 465 msec

Investigation rank 220 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2981 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 215 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.8117
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm eyedea_1 2020−03−20 13:16:40

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm eyedea_1 2020−03−20 13:16:40

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm eyedea_1 2020−03−20 13:16:40

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: eyedea_1

Developer: Eyedea Recognition

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 1036 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 280 msec

Template time (median): 310 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 351 msec

Investigation rank 208 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1960 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 202 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.6291
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm eyedea_2 2020−03−20 13:12:46

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm eyedea_2 2020−03−20 13:12:46

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm eyedea_2 2020−03−20 13:12:46

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: eyedea_2

Developer: Eyedea Recognition

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 1036 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 353 msec

Template time (median): 426 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 520 msec

Investigation rank 209 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1979 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 212 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.7926
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm eyedea_3 2020−03−20 13:12:46

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm eyedea_3 2020−03−20 13:12:46

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm eyedea_3 2020−03−20 13:12:46

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: eyedea_3

Developer: Eyedea Recognition

Submission Date: 2018_06_18

Template size: 1036 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 351 msec

Template time (median): 383 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 434 msec

Investigation rank 186 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0800 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 179 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3871
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm f8_001 2020−03−20 13:16:35

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm f8_001 2020−03−20 13:16:35

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm f8_001 2020−03−20 13:16:35

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: f8_001

Developer: FarBar Inc

Submission Date: 2019_10_03

Investigation rank 114 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0120 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 135 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1658
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm glory_0 2020−03−20 13:12:44

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm glory_0 2020−03−20 13:12:44

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm glory_0 2020−03−20 13:12:44

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: glory_0

Developer: Glory Ltd

Submission Date: 2018_06_30

Template size: 418 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 153 msec

Template time (median): 159 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 174 msec

Investigation rank 204 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1781 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 175 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3668
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm glory_1 2020−03−20 13:16:25

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm glory_1 2020−03−20 13:16:25

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm glory_1 2020−03−20 13:16:25

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: glory_1

Developer: Glory Ltd

Submission Date: 2018_06_30

Template size: 1726 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 391 msec

Template time (median): 398 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 438 msec

Investigation rank 194 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1268 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 167 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3046
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm gorilla_004 2020−03−20 13:16:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm gorilla_004 2020−03−20 13:16:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm gorilla_004 2020−03−20 13:16:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: gorilla_004

Developer: Gorilla Technology

Submission Date: 2020_01_06

Template size: 2192 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 385 msec

Template time (median): 388 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 423 msec

Investigation rank 70 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0063 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 103 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0889
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm gorilla_1 2020−03−20 13:16:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm gorilla_1 2020−03−20 13:16:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm gorilla_1 2020−03−20 13:16:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: gorilla_1

Developer: Gorilla Technology

Submission Date: 2018_06_19

Template size: 2156 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 141 msec

Template time (median): 167 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 207 msec

Investigation rank 178 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0603 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 182 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.4059
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm gorilla_2 2020−03−20 13:16:53

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm gorilla_2 2020−03−20 13:16:53

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm gorilla_2 2020−03−20 13:16:53

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: gorilla_2

Developer: Gorilla Technology

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 1132 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 312 msec

Template time (median): 339 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 384 msec

Investigation rank 135 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0197 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 142 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1879
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm gorilla_3 2020−03−20 13:12:49

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm gorilla_3 2020−03−20 13:12:49

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm gorilla_3 2020−03−20 13:12:49

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: gorilla_3

Developer: Gorilla Technology

Submission Date: 2018_10_26

Template size: 2156 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 532 msec

Template time (median): 560 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 615 msec

Investigation rank 156 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0361 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 169 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3167
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm hbinno_0 2020−03−20 13:12:49

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm hbinno_0 2020−03−20 13:12:49

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm hbinno_0 2020−03−20 13:12:49

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: hbinno_0

Developer: loginface Corp

Submission Date: 2018_02_01

Template size: 520 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 242 msec

Template time (median): 262 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 297 msec

Investigation rank 219 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2726 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 211 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.7646
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm hik_0 2020−03−20 13:16:32

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm hik_0 2020−03−20 13:16:32

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm hik_0 2020−03−20 13:16:32

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: hik_0

Developer: Hikvision Research Institute

Submission Date: 2018_02_12

Template size: 1808 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 828 msec

Template time (median): 880 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 929 msec

Investigation rank 140 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0210 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 113 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1116
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm hik_1 2020−03−20 13:16:20

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm hik_1 2020−03−20 13:16:20

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm hik_1 2020−03−20 13:16:20

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: hik_1

Developer: Hikvision Research Institute

Submission Date: 2018_02_12

Template size: 1808 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 815 msec

Template time (median): 820 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 842 msec

Investigation rank 121 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0147 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 118 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1173
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm hik_2 2020−03−20 13:16:12

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm hik_2 2020−03−20 13:16:12

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm hik_2 2020−03−20 13:16:12

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: hik_2

Developer: Hikvision Research Institute

Submission Date: 2018_02_12

Template size: 1808 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 813 msec

Template time (median): 819 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 854 msec

Investigation rank 120 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0147 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 119 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1185
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm hik_3 2020−03−20 13:19:56

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm hik_3 2020−03−20 13:19:56

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm hik_3 2020−03−20 13:19:56

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: hik_3

Developer: Hikvision Research Institute

Submission Date: 2018_06_30

Template size: 1408 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 623 msec

Template time (median): 627 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 677 msec

Investigation rank 110 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0117 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 108 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1025
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm hik_4 2020−03−20 13:16:23

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm hik_4 2020−03−20 13:16:23

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm hik_4 2020−03−20 13:16:23

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: hik_4

Developer: Hikvision Research Institute

Submission Date: 2018_06_30

Template size: 1152 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 491 msec

Template time (median): 494 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 655 msec

Investigation rank 107 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0113 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 104 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0986
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm hik_5 2020−03−20 13:16:25

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm hik_5 2020−03−20 13:16:25

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm hik_5 2020−03−20 13:16:25

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: hik_5

Developer: Hikvision Research Institute

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 1408 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 607 msec

Template time (median): 608 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 657 msec

Investigation rank 54 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0046 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 43 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0434
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm hik_6 2020−03−20 13:20:11

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm hik_6 2020−03−20 13:20:11

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm hik_6 2020−03−20 13:20:11

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: hik_6

Developer: Hikvision Research Institute

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 1408 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 598 msec

Template time (median): 598 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 646 msec

Investigation rank 54 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0046 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 51 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0467
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm hik_6 2020−03−20 13:20:11

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm hik_6 2020−03−20 13:20:11

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm hik_6 2020−03−20 13:20:11

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: hik_6

Developer: Hikvision Research Institute

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 1408 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 598 msec

Template time (median): 598 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 646 msec

Investigation rank 54 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0046 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 51 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0467
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm idemia_0 2020−03−20 13:25:30

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm idemia_0 2020−03−20 13:25:30

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm idemia_0 2020−03−20 13:25:30

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: idemia_0

Developer: Idemia

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 364 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 404 msec

Template time (median): 415 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 433 msec

Investigation rank 89 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0088 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 112 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1109
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm idemia_007 2020−03−20 13:22:03

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm idemia_007 2020−03−20 13:22:03

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm idemia_007 2020−03−20 13:22:03

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: idemia_007

Developer: Idemia

Submission Date: 2020_01_17

Template size: 860 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 783 msec

Template time (median): 794 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 866 msec

Investigation rank 26 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0026 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 15 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0181
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm idemia_1 2020−03−20 13:16:43

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm idemia_1 2020−03−20 13:16:43

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm idemia_1 2020−03−20 13:16:43

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: idemia_1

Developer: Idemia

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 364 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 405 msec

Template time (median): 415 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 433 msec

Investigation rank 91 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0090 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 59 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0514
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm idemia_2 2020−03−20 13:16:45

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm idemia_2 2020−03−20 13:16:45

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm idemia_2 2020−03−20 13:16:45

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: idemia_2

Developer: Idemia

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 364 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 405 msec

Template time (median): 415 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 434 msec

Investigation rank 100 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0100 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 61 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0518
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm idemia_3 2020−03−20 13:14:49

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm idemia_3 2020−03−20 13:14:49

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm idemia_3 2020−03−20 13:14:49

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: idemia_3

Developer: Idemia

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 528 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 644 msec

Template time (median): 663 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 941 msec

Investigation rank 77 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0069 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 52 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0470
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm idemia_4 2020−03−20 13:14:55

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm idemia_4 2020−03−20 13:14:55

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm idemia_4 2020−03−20 13:14:55

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: idemia_4

Developer: Idemia

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 528 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 644 msec

Template time (median): 661 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 732 msec

Investigation rank 72 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0066 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 37 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0372
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm idemia_5 2020−03−20 13:18:41

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm idemia_5 2020−03−20 13:18:41

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm idemia_5 2020−03−20 13:18:41

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: idemia_5

Developer: Idemia

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 352 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 359 msec

Template time (median): 371 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 405 msec

Investigation rank 85 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0081 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 46 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0439
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm idemia_6 2020−03−20 13:15:05

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm idemia_6 2020−03−20 13:15:05

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm idemia_6 2020−03−20 13:15:05

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: idemia_6

Developer: Idemia

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 352 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 359 msec

Template time (median): 370 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 402 msec

Investigation rank 98 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0096 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 42 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0432
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm imagus_0 2020−03−20 13:16:38

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm imagus_0 2020−03−20 13:16:38

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm imagus_0 2020−03−20 13:16:38

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: imagus_0

Developer: Imagus Technology Pty Ltd

Submission Date: 2018_02_14

Template size: 512 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 24 msec

Template time (median): 29 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 34 msec

Investigation rank 221 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.3035 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 209 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.7337
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm imagus_2 2020−03−20 13:12:51

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm imagus_2 2020−03−20 13:12:51

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm imagus_2 2020−03−20 13:12:51

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: imagus_2

Developer: Imagus Technology Pty Ltd

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 512 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 62 msec

Template time (median): 69 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 85 msec

Investigation rank 213 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2203 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 210 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.7491
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm imagus_3 2020−03−20 13:16:39

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm imagus_3 2020−03−20 13:16:39

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm imagus_3 2020−03−20 13:16:39

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: imagus_3

Developer: Imagus Technology Pty Ltd

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 512 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 44 msec

Template time (median): 50 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 64 msec

Investigation rank 224 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.3559 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 213 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.8069
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm imperial_000 2020−03−20 13:20:15

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm imperial_000 2020−03−20 13:20:15

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm imperial_000 2020−03−20 13:20:15

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: imperial_000

Developer: Imperial College London

Submission Date: 2019_08_28

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 568 msec

Template time (median): 577 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 790 msec

Investigation rank 24 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0024 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 26 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0259
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm incode_0 2020−03−20 13:12:54

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm incode_0 2020−03−20 13:12:54

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm incode_0 2020−03−20 13:12:54

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: incode_0

Developer: Incode Technologies Inc

Submission Date: 2018_06_29

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 168 msec

Template time (median): 189 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 219 msec

Investigation rank 174 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0489 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 168 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3104
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm incode_004 2020−03−20 13:14:53

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm incode_004 2020−03−20 13:14:53

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm incode_004 2020−03−20 13:14:53

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: incode_004

Developer: Incode Technologies Inc

Submission Date: 2019_06_24

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 454 msec

Template time (median): 476 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 786 msec

Investigation rank 36 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0035 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 68 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0537
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm incode_1 2020−03−20 13:16:37

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm incode_1 2020−03−20 13:16:37

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm incode_1 2020−03−20 13:16:37

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: incode_1

Developer: Incode Technologies Inc

Submission Date: 2018_06_29

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 661 msec

Template time (median): 684 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 744 msec

Investigation rank 126 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0166 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 148 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2115
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm incode_2 2020−03−20 13:16:25

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm incode_2 2020−03−20 13:16:25

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm incode_2 2020−03−20 13:16:25

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: incode_2

Developer: Incode Technologies Inc

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 259 msec

Template time (median): 290 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 338 msec

Investigation rank 130 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0178 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 141 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1838
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm incode_3 2020−03−20 13:18:10

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm incode_3 2020−03−20 13:18:10

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm incode_3 2020−03−20 13:18:10

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: incode_3

Developer: Incode Technologies Inc

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 664 msec

Template time (median): 698 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 765 msec

Investigation rank 116 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0129 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 137 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1667
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm innovatrics_0 2020−03−20 13:16:28

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm innovatrics_0 2020−03−20 13:16:28

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities

Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm innovatrics_0 2020−03−20 13:16:28

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: innovatrics_0

Developer: Innovatrics

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 530 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 303 msec

Template time (median): 513 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 555 msec

Investigation rank 162 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0395 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 156 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2532
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm innovatrics_005 2020−03−20 13:20:01

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm innovatrics_005 2020−03−20 13:20:01

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm innovatrics_005 2020−03−20 13:20:01

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: innovatrics_005

Developer: Innovatrics

Submission Date: 2019_09_30

Template size: 538 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 821 msec

Template time (median): 828 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 928 msec

Investigation rank 24 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0024 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 32 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0338
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm innovatrics_1 2020−03−20 13:16:31

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm innovatrics_1 2020−03−20 13:16:31

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities

Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm innovatrics_1 2020−03−20 13:16:31

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: innovatrics_1

Developer: Innovatrics

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 530 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 299 msec

Template time (median): 316 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 345 msec

Investigation rank 162 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0395 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 156 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2532
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm innovatrics_2 2020−03−20 13:20:16

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm innovatrics_2 2020−03−20 13:20:16

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm innovatrics_2 2020−03−20 13:20:16

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: innovatrics_2

Developer: Innovatrics

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 530 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 250 msec

Template time (median): 251 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 273 msec

Investigation rank 171 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0451 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 154 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2333
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm innovatrics_3 2020−03−20 13:23:46

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm innovatrics_3 2020−03−20 13:23:46

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm innovatrics_3 2020−03−20 13:23:46

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: innovatrics_3

Developer: Innovatrics

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 530 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 250 msec

Template time (median): 251 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 273 msec

Investigation rank 148 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0263 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 150 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2207
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm innovatrics_4 2020−03−20 13:28:17

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm innovatrics_4 2020−03−20 13:28:17

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm innovatrics_4 2020−03−20 13:28:17

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: innovatrics_4

Developer: Innovatrics

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1076 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 396 msec

Template time (median): 399 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 440 msec

Investigation rank 115 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0123 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 125 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1317
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm intsysmsu_000 2020−03−20 13:16:48

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm intsysmsu_000 2020−03−20 13:16:48

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm intsysmsu_000 2020−03−20 13:16:48

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: intsysmsu_000

Developer: Lomonosov Moscow State University

Submission Date: 2019_08_19

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 611 msec

Template time (median): 615 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1057 msec

Investigation rank 198 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1457 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 231 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9983
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm isystems_0 2020−03−20 13:16:50

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm isystems_0 2020−03−20 13:16:50

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm isystems_0 2020−03−20 13:16:50

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: isystems_0

Developer: Alivia / Innovation Sys

Submission Date: 2018_02_14

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 214 msec

Template time (median): 222 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 237 msec

Investigation rank 105 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0110 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 102 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0887
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm isystems_1 2020−03−20 13:16:36

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm isystems_1 2020−03−20 13:16:36

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm isystems_1 2020−03−20 13:16:36

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: isystems_1

Developer: Alivia / Innovation Sys

Submission Date: 2018_02_14

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 214 msec

Template time (median): 222 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 234 msec

Investigation rank 104 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0110 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 97 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0876
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm isystems_2 2020−03−20 13:18:27

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm isystems_2 2020−03−20 13:18:27

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm isystems_2 2020−03−20 13:18:27

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: isystems_2

Developer: Alivia / Innovation Sys

Submission Date: 2018_06_25

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 300 msec

Template time (median): 313 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 343 msec

Investigation rank 71 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0064 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 89 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0779
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm isystems_3 2020−03−20 13:22:22

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm isystems_3 2020−03−20 13:22:22

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm isystems_3 2020−03−20 13:22:22

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: isystems_3

Developer: Alivia / Innovation Sys

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 811 msec

Template time (median): 826 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1316 msec

Investigation rank 61 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0052 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 75 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0587
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm kedacom_001 2020−03−20 13:16:52

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm kedacom_001 2020−03−20 13:16:52

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm kedacom_001 2020−03−20 13:16:52

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: kedacom_001

Developer: Kedacom International Pte

Submission Date: 2019_09_16

Template size: 292 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 504 msec

Template time (median): 507 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 808 msec

Investigation rank 81 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0077 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 22 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0225
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm kneron_000 2020−03−20 13:16:35

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm kneron_000 2020−03−20 13:16:35

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm kneron_000 2020−03−20 13:16:35

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: kneron_000

Developer: kneron

Submission Date: Kneron

Investigation rank 66 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0059 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 235 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9998
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm lookman_005 2020−03−20 13:16:43

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm lookman_005 2020−03−20 13:16:43

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm lookman_005 2020−03−20 13:16:43

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: lookman_005

Developer: Lookman Electroplast Industries

Submission Date: 2019_09_16

Template size: 548 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 503 msec

Template time (median): 506 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 552 msec

Investigation rank 84 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0080 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 30 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0301
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm lookman_3 2020−03−20 13:15:03

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm lookman_3 2020−03−20 13:15:03

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm lookman_3 2020−03−20 13:15:03

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: lookman_3

Developer: Lookman Electroplast Industries

Submission Date: 2018_10_28

Template size: 292 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 334 msec

Template time (median): 336 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 367 msec

Investigation rank 90 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0088 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 44 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0437
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm lookman_4 2020−03−20 13:16:44

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm lookman_4 2020−03−20 13:16:44

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm lookman_4 2020−03−20 13:16:44

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: lookman_4

Developer: Lookman Electroplast Industries

Submission Date: 2018_10_28

Template size: 548 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 318 msec

Template time (median): 320 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 349 msec

Investigation rank 92 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0091 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 48 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0444
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm megvii_0 2020−03−20 13:23:51

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm megvii_0 2020−03−20 13:23:51

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm megvii_0 2020−03−20 13:23:51

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: megvii_0

Developer: Megvii/Face++

Submission Date: 2018_02_15

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 784 msec

Template time (median): 785 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 816 msec

Investigation rank 80 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0073 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 111 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1061
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm megvii_1 2020−03−20 13:16:41

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm megvii_1 2020−03−20 13:16:41

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm megvii_1 2020−03−20 13:16:41

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: megvii_1

Developer: Megvii/Face++

Submission Date: 2018_10_28

Template size: 4096 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 630 msec

Template time (median): 631 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 690 msec

Investigation rank 111 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0118 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 85 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0721
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm megvii_2 2020−03−20 13:13:00

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm megvii_2 2020−03−20 13:13:00

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm megvii_2 2020−03−20 13:13:00

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: megvii_2

Developer: Megvii/Face++

Submission Date: 2018_10_28

Template size: 4096 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 634 msec

Template time (median): 635 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 692 msec

Investigation rank 112 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0118 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 88 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0771
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microfocus_0 2020−03−20 13:16:42

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm microfocus_0 2020−03−20 13:16:42

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microfocus_0 2020−03−20 13:16:42

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microfocus_0

Developer: MicroFocus

Submission Date: 2018_02_12

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 400 msec

Template time (median): 526 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 631 msec

Investigation rank 231 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.5961 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 222 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9332
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microfocus_1 2020−03−20 13:16:30

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm microfocus_1 2020−03−20 13:16:30

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microfocus_1 2020−03−20 13:16:30

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microfocus_1

Developer: MicroFocus

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 403 msec

Template time (median): 529 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 634 msec

Investigation rank 232 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.5961 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 222 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9332
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microfocus_2 2020−03−20 13:19:57

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm microfocus_2 2020−03−20 13:19:57

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microfocus_2 2020−03−20 13:19:57

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microfocus_2

Developer: MicroFocus

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 404 msec

Template time (median): 531 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 636 msec

Investigation rank 233 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.6262 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 224 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9339
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microfocus_3 2020−03−20 13:20:06

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm microfocus_3 2020−03−20 13:20:06

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microfocus_3 2020−03−20 13:20:06

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microfocus_3

Developer: MicroFocus

Submission Date: 2018_06_22

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 226 msec

Template time (median): 265 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 339 msec

Investigation rank 230 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.5942 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 221 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9308
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microfocus_4 2020−03−20 13:16:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm microfocus_4 2020−03−20 13:16:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microfocus_4 2020−03−20 13:16:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microfocus_4

Developer: MicroFocus

Submission Date: 2018_06_22

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 228 msec

Template time (median): 267 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 316 msec

Investigation rank 229 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.5763 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 232 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9994
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microfocus_5 2020−03−20 13:17:28

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm microfocus_5 2020−03−20 13:17:28

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microfocus_5 2020−03−20 13:17:28

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microfocus_5

Developer: MicroFocus

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 225 msec

Template time (median): 263 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 313 msec

Investigation rank 225 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.4242 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 218 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.8352
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microfocus_6 2020−03−20 13:20:21

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm microfocus_6 2020−03−20 13:20:21

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microfocus_6 2020−03−20 13:20:21

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microfocus_6

Developer: MicroFocus

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 224 msec

Template time (median): 263 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 313 msec

Investigation rank 226 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.4268 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 227 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9779
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microsoft_0 2020−03−20 13:25:37

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm microsoft_0 2020−03−20 13:25:37

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microsoft_0 2020−03−20 13:25:37

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microsoft_0

Developer: Microsoft

Submission Date: 2018_01_30

Template size: 512 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 274 msec

Template time (median): 281 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 297 msec

Investigation rank 41 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0038 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 39 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0407
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microsoft_1 2020−03−20 13:29:29

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm microsoft_1 2020−03−20 13:29:29

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microsoft_1 2020−03−20 13:29:29

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microsoft_1

Developer: Microsoft

Submission Date: 2018_02_12

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 341 msec

Template time (median): 348 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 362 msec

Investigation rank 37 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0035 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 40 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0417
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microsoft_2 2020−03−20 13:16:53

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm microsoft_2 2020−03−20 13:16:53

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microsoft_2 2020−03−20 13:16:53

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microsoft_2

Developer: Microsoft

Submission Date: 2018_02_12

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 546 msec

Template time (median): 554 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 575 msec

Investigation rank 44 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0040 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 54 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0474
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microsoft_3 2020−03−20 13:19:00

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm microsoft_3 2020−03−20 13:19:00

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microsoft_3 2020−03−20 13:19:00

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microsoft_3

Developer: Microsoft

Submission Date: 2018_06_20

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 379 msec

Template time (median): 399 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 449 msec

Investigation rank 7 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0016 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sense

Identification rank 29 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0277
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microsoft_4 2020−03−20 13:18:37

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm microsoft_4 2020−03−20 13:18:37

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microsoft_4 2020−03−20 13:18:37

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microsoft_4

Developer: Microsoft

Submission Date: 2018_06_20

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 726 msec

Template time (median): 745 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1095 msec

Investigation rank 5 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0015 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sense

Identification rank 25 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0259
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microsoft_5 2020−03−20 13:22:13

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm microsoft_5 2020−03−20 13:22:13

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microsoft_5 2020−03−20 13:22:13

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microsoft_5

Developer: Microsoft

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 637 msec

Template time (median): 659 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 900 msec

Investigation rank 16 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0019 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 24 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0255
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm microsoft_6 2020−03−20 13:25:52

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm microsoft_6 2020−03−20 13:25:52

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm microsoft_6 2020−03−20 13:25:52

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: microsoft_6

Developer: Microsoft

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 649 msec

Template time (median): 672 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 978 msec

Investigation rank 17 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0020 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 8 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0120
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm nec_0 2020−03−20 13:18:50

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm nec_0 2020−03−20 13:18:50

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm nec_0 2020−03−20 13:18:50

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: nec_0

Developer: NEC

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 2592 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 79 msec

Template time (median): 82 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 89 msec

Investigation rank 127 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0170 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 90 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0788
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm nec_1 2020−03−20 13:18:31

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm nec_1 2020−03−20 13:18:31

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm nec_1 2020−03−20 13:18:31

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: nec_1

Developer: NEC

Submission Date: 2018_06_29

Template size: 2592 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 83 msec

Template time (median): 87 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 96 msec

Investigation rank 139 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0209 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 110 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1055
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm nec_2 2020−03−20 13:18:51

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm nec_2 2020−03−20 13:18:51

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm nec_2 2020−03−20 13:18:51

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: nec_2

Developer: NEC

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1616 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 638 msec

Template time (median): 642 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 699 msec

Investigation rank 2 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0010 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sense

Identification rank 3 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0025
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm nec_3 2020−03−20 13:18:47

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm nec_3 2020−03−20 13:18:47

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm nec_3 2020−03−20 13:18:47

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: nec_3

Developer: NEC

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1712 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 660 msec

Template time (median): 665 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1015 msec

Investigation rank 4 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0014 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sense

Identification rank 2 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0024
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_0 2020−03−20 13:25:29

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_0 2020−03−20 13:25:29

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_0 2020−03−20 13:25:29

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: neurotechnology_0

Developer: Neurotechnology

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 5214 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 671 msec

Template time (median): 693 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 778 msec

Investigation rank 173 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0471 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 164 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2925
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_007 2020−03−20 13:18:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_007 2020−03−20 13:18:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_007 2020−03−20 13:18:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: neurotechnology_007

Developer: Neurotechnology

Submission Date: 2019_10_03

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 161 msec

Template time (median): 161 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 233 msec

Investigation rank 42 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0039 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 77 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0618
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_1 2020−03−20 13:16:46

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_1 2020−03−20 13:16:46

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_1 2020−03−20 13:16:46

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: neurotechnology_1

Developer: Neurotechnology

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 5214 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 650 msec

Template time (median): 656 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 776 msec

Investigation rank 170 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0441 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 165 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2961
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_2 2020−03−20 13:13:06

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_2 2020−03−20 13:13:06

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_2 2020−03−20 13:13:06

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: neurotechnology_2

Developer: Neurotechnology

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 5214 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 650 msec

Template time (median): 656 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 679 msec

Investigation rank 169 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0440 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 166 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2965
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_3 2020−03−20 13:18:36

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_3 2020−03−20 13:18:36

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_3 2020−03−20 13:18:36

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: neurotechnology_3

Developer: Neurotechnology

Submission Date: 2018_06_27

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 526 msec

Template time (median): 540 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 590 msec

Investigation rank 142 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0225 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 203 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.6299
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_4 2020−03−20 13:18:41

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_4 2020−03−20 13:18:41

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_4 2020−03−20 13:18:41

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: neurotechnology_4

Developer: Neurotechnology

Submission Date: 2018_06_27

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 524 msec

Template time (median): 537 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 584 msec

Investigation rank 62 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0056 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 79 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0627
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_5 2020−03−20 13:21:49

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_5 2020−03−20 13:21:49

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_5 2020−03−20 13:21:49

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: neurotechnology_5

Developer: Neurotechnology

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 402 msec

Template time (median): 402 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 442 msec

Investigation rank 48 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0043 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 69 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0538
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_6 2020−03−20 13:20:11

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_6 2020−03−20 13:20:11

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm neurotechnology_6 2020−03−20 13:20:11

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: neurotechnology_6

Developer: Neurotechnology

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 726 msec

Template time (median): 727 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 812 msec

Investigation rank 131 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0180 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 155 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2494
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm newland_2 2020−03−20 13:16:38

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm newland_2 2020−03−20 13:16:38

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm newland_2 2020−03−20 13:16:38

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: newland_2

Developer: Newland Computer Co Ltd

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 823 msec

Template time (median): 855 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 952 msec

Investigation rank 185 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0786 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 184 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.4385
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm noblis_1 2020−03−20 13:18:23

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm noblis_1 2020−03−20 13:18:23

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm noblis_1 2020−03−20 13:18:23

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: noblis_1

Developer: Noblis

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 197 msec

Template time (median): 207 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 230 msec

Investigation rank 217 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2492 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 234 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9996
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm noblis_1 2020−03−20 13:18:23

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm noblis_1 2020−03−20 13:18:23

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm noblis_1 2020−03−20 13:18:23

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: noblis_1

Developer: Noblis

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 197 msec

Template time (median): 207 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 230 msec

Investigation rank 217 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2492 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 234 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9996
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm noblis_2 2020−03−20 13:21:47

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm noblis_2 2020−03−20 13:21:47

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm noblis_2 2020−03−20 13:21:47

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: noblis_2

Developer: Noblis

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 6144 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 506 msec

Template time (median): 517 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 592 msec

Investigation rank 205 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1794 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 230 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9972
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm noblis_2 2020−03−20 13:21:47

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm noblis_2 2020−03−20 13:21:47

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm noblis_2 2020−03−20 13:21:47

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: noblis_2

Developer: Noblis

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 6144 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 506 msec

Template time (median): 517 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 592 msec

Investigation rank 205 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1794 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 230 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9972
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm ntechlab_0 2020−03−20 13:18:44

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm ntechlab_0 2020−03−20 13:18:44

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm ntechlab_0 2020−03−20 13:18:44

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: ntechlab_0

Developer: N−Tech Lab

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 4441 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 711 msec

Template time (median): 729 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 760 msec

Investigation rank 96 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0094 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 91 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0803
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm ntechlab_007 2020−03−20 13:29:00

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm ntechlab_007 2020−03−20 13:29:00

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm ntechlab_007 2020−03−20 13:29:00

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: ntechlab_007

Developer: N−Tech Lab

Submission Date: 2019_06_25

Template size: 3348 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 791 msec

Template time (median): 795 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1016 msec

Investigation rank 27 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0027 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 23 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0255
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm ntechlab_008 2020−03−20 13:31:11

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm ntechlab_008 2020−03−20 13:31:11

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm ntechlab_008 2020−03−20 13:31:11

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: ntechlab_008

Developer: N−Tech Lab

Submission Date: 2020_01_06

Template size: 1300 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 552 msec

Template time (median): 554 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 603 msec

Investigation rank 9 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0017 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sense

Identification rank 10 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0145
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm ntechlab_1 2020−03−20 13:20:48

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm ntechlab_1 2020−03−20 13:20:48

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm ntechlab_1 2020−03−20 13:20:48

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: ntechlab_1

Developer: N−Tech Lab

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 1736 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 387 msec

Template time (median): 404 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 430 msec

Investigation rank 113 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0119 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 105 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0994
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm ntechlab_3 2020−03−20 13:22:32

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm ntechlab_3 2020−03−20 13:22:32

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm ntechlab_3 2020−03−20 13:22:32

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: ntechlab_3

Developer: N−Tech Lab

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 3482 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 806 msec

Template time (median): 827 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 877 msec

Investigation rank 67 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0062 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 67 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0536
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm ntechlab_4 2020−03−20 13:25:40

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm ntechlab_4 2020−03−20 13:25:40

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm ntechlab_4 2020−03−20 13:25:40

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: ntechlab_4

Developer: N−Tech Lab

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 3482 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 901 msec

Template time (median): 923 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 980 msec

Investigation rank 58 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0048 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 38 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0404
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm ntechlab_5 2020−03−20 13:27:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm ntechlab_5 2020−03−20 13:27:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm ntechlab_5 2020−03−20 13:27:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: ntechlab_5

Developer: N−Tech Lab

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1940 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 708 msec

Template time (median): 712 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 753 msec

Investigation rank 55 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0047 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 41 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0423
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm ntechlab_6 2020−03−20 13:22:22

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm ntechlab_6 2020−03−20 13:22:22

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm ntechlab_6 2020−03−20 13:22:22

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: ntechlab_6

Developer: N−Tech Lab

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1940 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 828 msec

Template time (median): 831 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 886 msec

Investigation rank 47 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0041 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 35 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0366
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm paravision_005 2020−03−20 13:22:15

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm paravision_005 2020−03−20 13:22:15

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm paravision_005 2020−03−20 13:22:15

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: paravision_005

Developer: Paravision (EverAI)

Submission Date: 2019_12_11

Template size: 4096 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 828 msec

Template time (median): 831 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 913 msec

Investigation rank 6 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0015 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sense

Identification rank 4 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0041
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm pixelall_002 2020−03−20 13:20:39

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm pixelall_002 2020−03−20 13:20:39

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm pixelall_002 2020−03−20 13:20:39

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: pixelall_002

Developer: Guangzhou Pixel Solutions Co Ltd

Submission Date: 2019_07_01

Template size: 2560 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 188 msec

Template time (median): 191 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 253 msec

Investigation rank 51 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0045 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 109 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1048
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm pixelall_003 2020−03−20 13:20:38

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm pixelall_003 2020−03−20 13:20:38

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm pixelall_003 2020−03−20 13:20:38

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: pixelall_003

Developer: Guangzhou Pixel Solutions Co Ltd

Submission Date: 2019_11_05

Template size: 2560 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 696 msec

Template time (median): 704 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 770 msec

Investigation rank 19 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0021 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 19 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0218
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm quantasoft_1 2020−03−20 13:20:24

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm quantasoft_1 2020−03−20 13:20:24

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm quantasoft_1 2020−03−20 13:20:24

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: quantasoft_1

Developer: Quantasoft

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 367 msec

Template time (median): 386 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 467 msec

Investigation rank 212 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2177 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 205 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.6382
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm rankone_0 2020−03−20 13:15:14

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm rankone_0 2020−03−20 13:15:14

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm rankone_0 2020−03−20 13:15:14

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: rankone_0

Developer: Rank One Computing

Submission Date: 2018_02_07

Template size: 228 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 47 msec

Template time (median): 50 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 56 msec

Investigation rank 168 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0429 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 149 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2165
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm rankone_006 2020−03−20 13:25:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm rankone_006 2020−03−20 13:25:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm rankone_006 2020−03−20 13:25:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: rankone_006

Developer: Rank One Computing

Submission Date: 2019_06_03

Investigation rank 60 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0050 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 36 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0370
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm rankone_007 2020−03−20 13:18:39

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm rankone_007 2020−03−20 13:18:39

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm rankone_007 2020−03−20 13:18:39

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: rankone_007

Developer: Rank One Computing

Submission Date: 2019_11_12

Template size: 165 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 268 msec

Template time (median): 273 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 303 msec

Investigation rank 33 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0034 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 21 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0222
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm rankone_1 2020−03−20 13:20:28

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm rankone_1 2020−03−20 13:20:28

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm rankone_1 2020−03−20 13:20:28

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: rankone_1

Developer: Rank One Computing

Submission Date: 2018_02_15

Template size: 324 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 134 msec

Template time (median): 136 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 143 msec

Investigation rank 141 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0221 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 134 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1650
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm rankone_2 2020−03−20 13:22:16

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm rankone_2 2020−03−20 13:22:16

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm rankone_2 2020−03−20 13:22:16

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: rankone_2

Developer: Rank One Computing

Submission Date: 2018_06_19

Template size: 133 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 107 msec

Template time (median): 111 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 127 msec

Investigation rank 134 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0194 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 116 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1172
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm rankone_3 2020−03−20 13:23:36

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm rankone_3 2020−03−20 13:23:36

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm rankone_3 2020−03−20 13:23:36

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: rankone_3

Developer: Rank One Computing

Submission Date: 2018_06_19

Template size: 133 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 107 msec

Template time (median): 114 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 131 msec

Investigation rank 134 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0194 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 116 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1172
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm rankone_4 2020−03−20 13:22:07

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm rankone_4 2020−03−20 13:22:07

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm rankone_4 2020−03−20 13:22:07

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: rankone_4

Developer: Rank One Computing

Submission Date: 2018_10_09

Template size: 85 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 34 msec

Template time (median): 36 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 41 msec

Investigation rank 167 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0415 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 143 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1927
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm rankone_5 2020−03−20 13:18:38

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm rankone_5 2020−03−20 13:18:38

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm rankone_5 2020−03−20 13:18:38

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: rankone_5

Developer: Rank One Computing

Submission Date: 2018_10_24

Template size: 133 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 89 msec

Template time (median): 92 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 103 msec

Investigation rank 97 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0094 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 76 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0590
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm realnetworks_0 2020−03−20 13:30:28

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm realnetworks_0 2020−03−20 13:30:28

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm realnetworks_0 2020−03−20 13:30:28

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: realnetworks_0

Developer: Realnetworks Inc

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 4100 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 234 msec

Template time (median): 240 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 265 msec

Investigation rank 166 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0402 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 152 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2320
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm realnetworks_003 2020−03−20 13:18:28

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm realnetworks_003 2020−03−20 13:18:28

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm realnetworks_003 2020−03−20 13:18:28

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: realnetworks_003

Developer: Realnetworks Inc

Submission Date: 2019_06_12

Template size: 1848 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 168 msec

Template time (median): 174 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 202 msec

Investigation rank 145 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0242 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 132 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1589
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm realnetworks_004 2020−03−20 13:23:06

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm realnetworks_004 2020−03−20 13:23:06

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm realnetworks_004 2020−03−20 13:23:06

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: realnetworks_004

Developer: Realnetworks Inc

Submission Date: 2019_10_17

Template size: 1848 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 168 msec

Template time (median): 172 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 254 msec

Investigation rank 143 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0236 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 131 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1580
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm realnetworks_1 2020−03−20 13:32:38

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm realnetworks_1 2020−03−20 13:32:38

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm realnetworks_1 2020−03−20 13:32:38

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: realnetworks_1

Developer: Realnetworks Inc

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 4104 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 234 msec

Template time (median): 239 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 259 msec

Investigation rank 166 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0402 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 152 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2320
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm realnetworks_2 2020−03−20 13:22:10

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm realnetworks_2 2020−03−20 13:22:10

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm realnetworks_2 2020−03−20 13:22:10

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: realnetworks_2

Developer: Realnetworks Inc

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 4104 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 236 msec

Template time (median): 242 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 264 msec

Investigation rank 160 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0393 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 151 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2308
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm remarkai_0 2020−03−20 13:24:16

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm remarkai_0 2020−03−20 13:24:16

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm remarkai_0 2020−03−20 13:24:16

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: remarkai_0

Developer: Remark Holdings

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 578 msec

Template time (median): 594 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 814 msec

Investigation rank 88 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0086 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 123 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1276
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm remarkai_0 2020−03−20 13:24:16

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm remarkai_0 2020−03−20 13:24:16

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm remarkai_0 2020−03−20 13:24:16

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: remarkai_0

Developer: Remark Holdings

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 578 msec

Template time (median): 594 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 814 msec

Investigation rank 88 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0086 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 123 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1276
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm remarkai_000 2020−03−20 13:20:53

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm remarkai_000 2020−03−20 13:20:53

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm remarkai_000 2020−03−20 13:20:53

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: remarkai_000

Developer: Remark Holdings

Submission Date: 2019_06_12

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 632 msec

Template time (median): 650 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 883 msec

Investigation rank 34 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0034 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 70 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0550
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm remarkai_2 2020−03−20 13:27:29

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm remarkai_2 2020−03−20 13:27:29

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm remarkai_2 2020−03−20 13:27:29

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: remarkai_2

Developer: Remark Holdings

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 411 msec

Template time (median): 427 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 512 msec

Investigation rank 87 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0081 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 122 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1237
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm scanovate_000 2020−03−20 13:27:39

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm scanovate_000 2020−03−20 13:27:39

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm scanovate_000 2020−03−20 13:27:39

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: scanovate_000

Developer: Scanovate Ltd

Submission Date: 2020_01_15

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 669 msec

Template time (median): 705 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 778 msec

Investigation rank 59 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0050 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 82 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0665
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm sensetime_0 2020−03−20 13:20:44

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm sensetime_0 2020−03−20 13:20:44

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm sensetime_0 2020−03−20 13:20:44

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: sensetime_0

Developer: Sensetime Group

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 4104 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 692 msec

Template time (median): 694 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 746 msec

Investigation rank 21 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0023 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 17 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0207
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm sensetime_002 2020−03−20 13:25:39

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm sensetime_002 2020−03−20 13:25:39

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm sensetime_002 2020−03−20 13:25:39

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: sensetime_002

Developer: Sensetime Group

Submission Date: 2019_06_03

Template size: 2056 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 600 msec

Template time (median): 603 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 847 msec

Investigation rank 119 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0137 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 11 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0148
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm sensetime_003 2020−03−20 13:25:46

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm sensetime_003 2020−03−20 13:25:46

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm sensetime_003 2020−03−20 13:25:46

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: sensetime_003

Developer: Sensetime Group

Submission Date: 2019_12_02

Template size: 2056 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 907 msec

Template time (median): 911 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 991 msec

Investigation rank 1 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0010

Identification rank 1 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0018
FPIR = 0.001

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm sensetime_1 2020−03−20 13:20:43

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm sensetime_1 2020−03−20 13:20:43

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm sensetime_1 2020−03−20 13:20:43

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: sensetime_1

Developer: Sensetime Group

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 4104 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 627 msec

Template time (median): 628 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 810 msec

Investigation rank 22 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0023 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 20 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0219
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm shaman_0 2020−03−20 13:20:29

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm shaman_0 2020−03−20 13:20:29

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm shaman_0 2020−03−20 13:20:29

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: shaman_0

Developer: Shaman Software

Submission Date: 2018_02_12

Template size: 4096 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 544 msec

Template time (median): 546 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 570 msec

Investigation rank 201 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1685 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 186 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.4730
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm shaman_1 2020−03−20 13:25:38

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm shaman_1 2020−03−20 13:25:38

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm shaman_1 2020−03−20 13:25:38

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: shaman_1

Developer: Shaman Software

Submission Date: 2018_02_12

Template size: 4096 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 562 msec

Template time (median): 565 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 588 msec

Investigation rank 202 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1696 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 193 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.5304
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm shaman_2 2020−03−20 13:20:36

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm shaman_2 2020−03−20 13:20:36

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm shaman_2 2020−03−20 13:20:36

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: shaman_2

Developer: Shaman Software

Submission Date: 2018_02_12

Template size: 8192 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 562 msec

Template time (median): 565 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 584 msec

Investigation rank 218 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2600 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 208 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.6990
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm shaman_3 2020−03−20 13:16:59

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm shaman_3 2020−03−20 13:16:59

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm shaman_3 2020−03−20 13:16:59

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: shaman_3

Developer: Shaman Software

Submission Date: 2018_06_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 669 msec

Template time (median): 672 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1074 msec

Investigation rank 190 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1243 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 185 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.4513
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm shaman_4 2020−03−20 13:20:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm shaman_4 2020−03−20 13:20:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm shaman_4 2020−03−20 13:20:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: shaman_4

Developer: Shaman Software

Submission Date: 2018_06_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 634 msec

Template time (median): 639 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 703 msec

Investigation rank 214 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2221 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 199 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.6150
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm shaman_6 2020−03−20 13:24:06

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm shaman_6 2020−03−20 13:24:06

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm shaman_6 2020−03−20 13:24:06

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: shaman_6

Developer: Shaman Software

Submission Date: 2018_10_26

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 704 msec

Template time (median): 707 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 776 msec

Investigation rank 164 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0398 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 127 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1409
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm shaman_7 2020−03−20 13:23:41

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm shaman_7 2020−03−20 13:23:41

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm shaman_7 2020−03−20 13:23:41

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: shaman_7

Developer: Shaman Software

Submission Date: 2018_10_26

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 704 msec

Template time (median): 707 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 778 msec

Investigation rank 163 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0396 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 128 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1413
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm siat_0 2020−03−20 13:23:51

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm siat_0 2020−03−20 13:23:51

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm siat_0 2020−03−20 13:23:51

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: siat_0

Developer: Shenzhen Inst Adv Integrated Tech CAS

Submission Date: 2018_02_14

Template size: 1096 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 349 msec

Template time (median): 351 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 369 msec

Investigation rank 82 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0079 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 98 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0877
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm siat_1 2020−03−20 13:20:38

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm siat_1 2020−03−20 13:20:38

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm siat_1 2020−03−20 13:20:38

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: siat_1

Developer: Shenzhen Inst Adv Integrated Tech CAS

Submission Date: 2018_06_30

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 777 msec

Template time (median): 829 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 927 msec

Investigation rank 11 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0018 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 13 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0176
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm siat_2 2020−03−20 13:18:48

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm siat_2 2020−03−20 13:18:48

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm siat_2 2020−03−20 13:18:48

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: siat_2

Developer: Shenzhen Inst Adv Integrated Tech CAS

Submission Date: 2018_02_30

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 842 msec

Template time (median): 900 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 981 msec

Investigation rank 12 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0018 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 18 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0215
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm smilart_0 2020−03−20 13:23:11

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm smilart_0 2020−03−20 13:23:11

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm smilart_0 2020−03−20 13:23:11

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: smilart_0

Developer: Smilart

Submission Date: 2018_02_15

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 154 msec

Template time (median): 169 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 183 msec

Investigation rank 206 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1910 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 200 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.6192
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm smilart_1 2020−03−20 13:30:32

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm smilart_1 2020−03−20 13:30:32

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm smilart_1 2020−03−20 13:30:32

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: smilart_1

Developer: Smilart

Submission Date: 2018_02_15

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 650 msec

Template time (median): 658 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 719 msec

Investigation rank 211 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2167 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 206 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.6400
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm smilart_2 2020−03−20 13:32:42

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm smilart_2 2020−03−20 13:32:42

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm smilart_2 2020−03−20 13:32:42

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: smilart_2

Developer: Smilart

Submission Date: 2018_02_15

Template size: 1024 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 463 msec

Template time (median): 556 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 687 msec

Investigation rank 207 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1924 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 201 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.6272
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm smilart_4 2020−03−20 13:23:41

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm smilart_4 2020−03−20 13:23:41

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm smilart_4 2020−03−20 13:23:41

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: smilart_4

Developer: Smilart

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 512 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 149 msec

Template time (median): 168 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 191 msec

Investigation rank 234 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.9648 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 225 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9682
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm synesis_0 2020−03−20 13:27:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm synesis_0 2020−03−20 13:27:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm synesis_0 2020−03−20 13:27:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: synesis_0

Developer: Synesis

Submission Date: 2018_02_15

Template size: 512 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 233 msec

Template time (median): 236 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 249 msec

Investigation rank 200 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1599 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 197 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.5516
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm synesis_003 2020−03−20 13:26:10

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm synesis_003 2020−03−20 13:26:10

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm synesis_003 2020−03−20 13:26:10

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: synesis_003

Developer: Synesis

Submission Date: 2019_07_04

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 200 msec

Template time (median): 212 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 244 msec

Investigation rank 125 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0162 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 80 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0651
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm synesis_3 2020−03−20 13:27:44

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm synesis_3 2020−03−20 13:27:44

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm synesis_3 2020−03−20 13:27:44

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: synesis_3

Developer: Synesis

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 4096 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 98 msec

Template time (median): 100 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 117 msec

Investigation rank 203 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1700 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 198 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.5821
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm tech5_001 2020−03−20 13:27:16

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm tech5_001 2020−03−20 13:27:16

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm tech5_001 2020−03−20 13:27:16

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: tech5_001

Developer: Tech5 SA

Submission Date: 2019_08_19

Template size: 1536 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 861 msec

Template time (median): 887 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 974 msec

Investigation rank 45 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0040 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 72 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0569
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm tevian_0 2020−03−20 13:27:29

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm tevian_0 2020−03−20 13:27:29

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm tevian_0 2020−03−20 13:27:29

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: tevian_0

Developer: Tevian

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 360 msec

Template time (median): 395 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 426 msec

Investigation rank 138 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0203 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 146 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1995
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm tevian_1 2020−03−20 13:20:49

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm tevian_1 2020−03−20 13:20:49

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm tevian_1 2020−03−20 13:20:49

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: tevian_1

Developer: Tevian

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 364 msec

Template time (median): 398 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 435 msec

Investigation rank 138 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0203 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 146 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1995
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm tevian_2 2020−03−20 13:20:49

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm tevian_2 2020−03−20 13:20:49

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm tevian_2 2020−03−20 13:20:49

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: tevian_2

Developer: Tevian

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 363 msec

Template time (median): 398 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 429 msec

Investigation rank 136 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0202 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 144 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1994
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm tevian_3 2020−03−20 13:20:34

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm tevian_3 2020−03−20 13:20:34

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm tevian_3 2020−03−20 13:20:34

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: tevian_3

Developer: Tevian

Submission Date: 2018_06_20

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 265 msec

Template time (median): 301 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 335 msec

Investigation rank 122 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0147 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 140 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1773
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm tevian_4 2020−03−20 13:25:42

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm tevian_4 2020−03−20 13:25:42

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm tevian_4 2020−03−20 13:25:42

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: tevian_4

Developer: Tevian

Submission Date: 2018_06_20

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 263 msec

Template time (median): 300 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 336 msec

Investigation rank 106 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0113 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 114 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1169
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm tevian_5 2020−03−20 13:20:41

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm tevian_5 2020−03−20 13:20:41

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm tevian_5 2020−03−20 13:20:41

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: tevian_5

Developer: Tevian

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 368 msec

Template time (median): 405 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 611 msec

Investigation rank 79 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0073 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 96 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0873
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm tiger_0 2020−03−20 13:17:05

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm tiger_0 2020−03−20 13:17:05

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm tiger_0 2020−03−20 13:17:05

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: tiger_0

Developer: TigerIT Americas LLC

Submission Date: 2018_06_29

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 389 msec

Template time (median): 426 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 478 msec

Investigation rank 180 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0616 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 180 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3901
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

Report for algorithm tiger_1 2019−04−22 11:36:07

Dependence on T by image type



FNIR(N, T, L+1) vs. nec_3



FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. microsoft_4



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

Report for algorithm tiger_1 2019−04−22 11:36:07

Datasheet

Algorithm: tiger_1
Developer: TigerIT Americas LLC
Submission Date: 2018_06_27
Template size: 2052 bytes
Template time (median): 610 msec
Template time (90 percentile): 734 msec
Investigation Rank 186 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.3083 vs. lowest 0.0028 from nec_2
Identification Rank 157 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.4905
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0044 from nec_3

DETs by enrollment type



FNIR(N, R, 0) by probe type



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm tiger_2 2020−03−20 13:24:12

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm tiger_2 2020−03−20 13:24:12

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm tiger_2 2020−03−20 13:24:12

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: tiger_2

Developer: TigerIT Americas LLC

Submission Date: 2018_10_29

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 424 msec

Template time (median): 461 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 513 msec

Investigation rank 64 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0056 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 93 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0857
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm tiger_3 2020−03−20 13:23:46

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm tiger_3 2020−03−20 13:23:46

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm tiger_3 2020−03−20 13:23:46

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: tiger_3

Developer: TigerIT Americas LLC

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 427 msec

Template time (median): 462 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 512 msec

Investigation rank 64 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0056 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 92 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0857
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm tongyitrans_0 2020−03−20 13:23:56

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm tongyitrans_0 2020−03−20 13:23:56

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm tongyitrans_0 2020−03−20 13:23:56

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: tongyitrans_0

Developer: TongYi Transportation Technology

Submission Date: 2018_06_29

Template size: 2070 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 176 msec

Template time (median): 180 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 269 msec

Investigation rank 76 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0069 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 87 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0743
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm tongyitrans_1 2020−03−20 13:20:43

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm tongyitrans_1 2020−03−20 13:20:43

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm tongyitrans_1 2020−03−20 13:20:43

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: tongyitrans_1

Developer: TongYi Transportation Technology

Submission Date: 2018_06_29

Template size: 2070 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 176 msec

Template time (median): 180 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 269 msec

Investigation rank 76 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0069 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 81 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0661
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm toshiba_0 2020−03−20 13:19:16

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm toshiba_0 2020−03−20 13:19:16

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm toshiba_0 2020−03−20 13:19:16

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: toshiba_0

Developer: Toshiba

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1548 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 875 msec

Template time (median): 876 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1661 msec

Investigation rank 50 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0045 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 78 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0620
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm toshiba_1 2020−03−20 13:25:11

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm toshiba_1 2020−03−20 13:25:11

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm toshiba_1 2020−03−20 13:25:11

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: toshiba_1

Developer: Toshiba

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2060 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 873 msec

Template time (median): 875 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1659 msec

Investigation rank 57 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0048 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 74 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0577
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vd_0 2020−03−20 13:30:36

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vd_0 2020−03−20 13:30:36

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vd_0 2020−03−20 13:30:36

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vd_0

Developer: Visidon

Submission Date: 2018_06_20

Template size: 1028 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 319 msec

Template time (median): 337 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 366 msec

Investigation rank 228 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.4737 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 220 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.9168
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vd_1 2020−03−20 13:32:45

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vd_1 2020−03−20 13:32:45

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vd_1 2020−03−20 13:32:45

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vd_1

Developer: Visidon

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2052 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 648 msec

Template time (median): 668 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1098 msec

Investigation rank 150 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0276 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 147 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2015
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_0 2020−03−20 13:23:46

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_0 2020−03−20 13:23:46

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_0 2020−03−20 13:23:46

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vigilantsolutions_0

Developer: Vigilant Solutions

Submission Date: 2018_02_08

Template size: 1544 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 795 msec

Template time (median): 825 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 878 msec

Investigation rank 189 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1230 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 195 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.5366
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_1 2020−03−20 13:20:59

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_1 2020−03−20 13:20:59

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_1 2020−03−20 13:20:59

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vigilantsolutions_1

Developer: Vigilant Solutions

Submission Date: 2018_02_14

Template size: 2056 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 726 msec

Template time (median): 735 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 783 msec

Investigation rank 210 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2017 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 204 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.6359
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_2 2020−03−20 13:27:44

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_2 2020−03−20 13:27:44

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_2 2020−03−20 13:27:44

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vigilantsolutions_2

Developer: Vigilant Solutions

Submission Date: 2018_02_14

Template size: 1544 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 795 msec

Template time (median): 825 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 873 msec

Investigation rank 216 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.2366 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 219 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.8753
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_3 2020−03−20 13:27:38

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_3 2020−03−20 13:27:38

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_3 2020−03−20 13:27:38

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vigilantsolutions_3

Developer: Vigilant Solutions

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 1544 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 794 msec

Template time (median): 825 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 885 msec

Investigation rank 183 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0694 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 183 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.4079
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_4 2020−03−20 13:27:49

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_4 2020−03−20 13:27:49

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_4 2020−03−20 13:27:49

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vigilantsolutions_4

Developer: Vigilant Solutions

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 1544 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 807 msec

Template time (median): 812 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 888 msec

Investigation rank 191 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.1249 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 196 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.5485
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_5 2020−03−20 13:27:21

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_5 2020−03−20 13:27:21

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_5 2020−03−20 13:27:21

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vigilantsolutions_5

Developer: Vigilant Solutions

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1544 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 757 msec

Template time (median): 762 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 861 msec

Investigation rank 93 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0092 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 178 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3861
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_6 2020−03−20 13:27:33

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_6 2020−03−20 13:27:33

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vigilantsolutions_6 2020−03−20 13:27:33

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vigilantsolutions_6

Developer: Vigilant Solutions

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 1544 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 810 msec

Template time (median): 817 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 892 msec

Investigation rank 99 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0099 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 171 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3446
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm visionlabs_008 2020−03−20 13:22:38

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm visionlabs_008 2020−03−20 13:22:38

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm visionlabs_008 2020−03−20 13:22:38

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: visionlabs_008

Developer: VisionLabs

Submission Date: 2019_06_18

Template size: 512 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 272 msec

Template time (median): 272 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 298 msec

Investigation rank 18 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0020 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 9 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0130
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm visionlabs_3 2020−03−20 13:20:53

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm visionlabs_3 2020−03−20 13:20:53

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm visionlabs_3 2020−03−20 13:20:53

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: visionlabs_3

Developer: VisionLabs

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 219 msec

Template time (median): 232 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 245 msec

Investigation rank 74 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0068 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 55 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0479
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm visionlabs_4 2020−03−20 13:22:24

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm visionlabs_4 2020−03−20 13:22:24

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm visionlabs_4 2020−03−20 13:22:24

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: visionlabs_4

Developer: VisionLabs

Submission Date: 2018_06_22

Template size: 256 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 281 msec

Template time (median): 313 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 354 msec

Investigation rank 28 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0027 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 73 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0577
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm visionlabs_5 2020−03−20 13:27:21

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm visionlabs_5 2020−03−20 13:27:21

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm visionlabs_5 2020−03−20 13:27:21

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: visionlabs_5

Developer: VisionLabs

Submission Date: 2018_06_22

Template size: 512 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 284 msec

Template time (median): 284 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 388 msec

Investigation rank 23 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0024 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 58 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0500
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm visionlabs_6 2020−03−20 13:22:43

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm visionlabs_6 2020−03−20 13:22:43

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm visionlabs_6 2020−03−20 13:22:43

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: visionlabs_6

Developer: VisionLabs

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 512 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 289 msec

Template time (median): 289 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 308 msec

Investigation rank 14 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0018 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 28 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0265
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm visionlabs_7 2020−03−20 13:17:10

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



2. Report for algorithm visionlabs_7 2020−03−20 13:17:10

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm visionlabs_7 2020−03−20 13:17:10

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: visionlabs_7

Developer: VisionLabs

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 512 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 289 msec

Template time (median): 289 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 308 msec

Investigation rank 10 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0018 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 27 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0265
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vocord_0 2020−03−20 13:20:39

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vocord_0 2020−03−20 13:20:39

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vocord_0 2020−03−20 13:20:39

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vocord_0

Developer: Vocord

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 608 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 518 msec

Template time (median): 528 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 558 msec

Investigation rank 158 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0378 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 177 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3812
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vocord_1 2020−03−20 13:24:18

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vocord_1 2020−03−20 13:24:18

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vocord_1 2020−03−20 13:24:18

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vocord_1

Developer: Vocord

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 608 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 518 msec

Template time (median): 528 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 557 msec

Investigation rank 157 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0377 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 163 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.2881
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vocord_2 2020−03−20 13:23:51

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vocord_2 2020−03−20 13:23:51

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vocord_2 2020−03−20 13:23:51

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vocord_2

Developer: Vocord

Submission Date: 2018_02_16

Template size: 2048 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 621 msec

Template time (median): 631 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 662 msec

Investigation rank 155 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0357 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 170 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3359
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vocord_3 2020−03−20 13:24:01

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vocord_3 2020−03−20 13:24:01

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vocord_3 2020−03−20 13:24:01

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vocord_3

Developer: Vocord

Submission Date: 2018_06_30

Template size: 896 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 650 msec

Template time (median): 696 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 829 msec

Investigation rank 68 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0062 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 121 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1222
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vocord_4 2020−03−20 13:20:48

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vocord_4 2020−03−20 13:20:48

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vocord_4 2020−03−20 13:20:48

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vocord_4

Developer: Vocord

Submission Date: 2018_06_30

Template size: 896 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 479 msec

Template time (median): 516 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 648 msec

Investigation rank 83 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0079 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 173 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3548
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vocord_5 2020−03−20 13:19:24

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vocord_5 2020−03−20 13:19:24

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vocord_5 2020−03−20 13:19:24

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vocord_5

Developer: Vocord

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 768 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 778 msec

Template time (median): 781 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1210 msec

Investigation rank 78 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0070 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 130 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.1551
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm vocord_6 2020−03−20 13:26:45

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm vocord_6 2020−03−20 13:26:45

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm vocord_6 2020−03−20 13:26:45

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: vocord_6

Developer: Vocord

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 10240 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 783 msec

Template time (median): 785 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 1212 msec

Investigation rank 236 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 1.0000 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 236 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 1.0000
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm yisheng_0 2020−03−20 13:30:40

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm yisheng_0 2020−03−20 13:30:40

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm yisheng_0 2020−03−20 13:30:40

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: yisheng_0

Developer: Zhuhai Yisheng Electronics Technology

Submission Date: 2018_02_14

Template size: 2108 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 593 msec

Template time (median): 613 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 650 msec

Investigation rank 146 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0243 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 176 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3766
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm yisheng_1 2020−03−20 13:32:50

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm yisheng_1 2020−03−20 13:32:50

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm yisheng_1 2020−03−20 13:32:50

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: yisheng_1

Developer: Zhuhai Yisheng Electronics Technology

Submission Date: 2018_06_19

Template size: 3704 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 363 msec

Template time (median): 384 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 423 msec

Investigation rank 149 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0265 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sen

Identification rank 172 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.3460
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm yitu_0 2020−03−20 13:25:28

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm yitu_0 2020−03−20 13:25:28

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm yitu_0 2020−03−20 13:25:28

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: yitu_0

Developer: Shanghai Yitu Technology

Submission Date: 2018_02_12

Template size: 4136 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 623 msec

Template time (median): 624 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 700 msec

Investigation rank 56 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0047 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 53 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0472
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm yitu_1 2020−03−20 13:21:04

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm yitu_1 2020−03−20 13:21:04

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm yitu_1 2020−03−20 13:21:04

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: yitu_1

Developer: Shanghai Yitu Technology

Submission Date: 2018_02_12

Template size: 4136 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 918 msec

Template time (median): 920 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 997 msec

Investigation rank 52 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0045 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 47 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0443
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm yitu_2 2020−03−20 13:29:24

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm yitu_2 2020−03−20 13:29:24

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm yitu_2 2020−03−20 13:29:24

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: yitu_2

Developer: Shanghai Yitu Technology

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 4138 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 802 msec

Template time (median): 871 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 966 msec

Investigation rank 14 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0018 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 14 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0177
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm yitu_3 2020−03−20 13:29:28

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm yitu_3 2020−03−20 13:29:28

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm yitu_3 2020−03−20 13:29:28

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: yitu_3

Developer: Shanghai Yitu Technology

Submission Date: 2018_06_21

Template size: 4138 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 804 msec

Template time (median): 871 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 964 msec

Investigation rank 30 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0029 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 16 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0184
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm yitu_4 2020−03−20 13:29:37

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm yitu_4 2020−03−20 13:29:37

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm yitu_4 2020−03−20 13:29:37

Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: yitu_4

Developer: Shanghai Yitu Technology

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2070 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 865 msec

Template time (median): 898 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 986 msec

Investigation rank 3 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0013 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sense

Identification rank 5 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0095
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

1. Report for algorithm yitu_5 2020−03−20 13:28:59

Fig 1: Investigational mode: FNIR(N, 1, 0) vs. most accurate (yitu_4)



Fig 2: DETs by enrollment type



Fig 3: Identifcation mode: FNIR(N, L+1, T) vs. most accurate (nec_3)



Fig 4: DET for various N. Links connect points of equal threshold.



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

2. Report for algorithm yitu_5 2020−03−20 13:28:59

Fig 5: Dependence on T by number enrolled identities



Fig 6: FPIR dependence on T by probe type



Fig 7: Investigational mode: FNIR(1600000, R, 0) by probe type



Fig 8: FPIR vs. Selectivity



This publication is available free of charge from: https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8271

3. Report for algorithm yitu_5 2020−03−20 13:28:59

Fig 9: Solo−Twin and Twin−Twin similarity scores



Fig 10: Template duration; search duration vs. N



Fig 11: Datasheet

Algorithm: yitu_5

Developer: Shanghai Yitu Technology

Submission Date: 2018_10_30

Template size: 2070 bytes

Template time (2.5 percentile): 852 msec

Template time (median): 853 msec

Template time (97.5 percentile): 928 msec

Investigation rank 20 −− FNIR(1600000, 0, 1) = 0.0023 vs. lowest 0.0010 from sens

Identification rank 7 −− FNIR(1600000, T, L+1) = 0.0101
FPIR = 0.001 vs. lowest 0.0018 from sensetime_003

Fig 12: Decline of genuine scores with ageing



Fig 13: Identification FNIR(N, T, L+1) and Investigational FNIR(N, 0, R) under ageing