# KICKOFF MEETING OCTOBER 31, 2014

ANSI/NIST-ITL Update:2015

# WELCOME

- Barbara Guttman
  - Director, Information Access Division

# SOME OF THE NIST RESEARCH THAT SUPPORTS THE STANDARD

- Fingerprint
  - Compression studies
    - Guidance on converting 1000 ppi to 500 ppi
    - Use of WSQ for 500 ppi and JPEG 2000 for 1000 ppi
  - MINEX
  - ONGOING FPVTE
  - NFIQ2
  - 3D fingerprint calibration targets
- Iris
  - IREX studies
    - Compact formats
- Face
  - Face quality metrics
- Voice
  - Algorithm challenges
- Handwriting
  - Algorithm challenges
- DNA
  - RapidDNA equipment analysis
  - electropherogram ladders, etc.
- Security
  - Hashing algorithms
- Usability
  - Pictograms
- Communication Protocols
  - WS-BD

SHAHRAM ORANDI

# ANSI/NIST-ITL Standard

**Data Format for the Interchange of Fingerprint, Facial and Other Biometric Information**

**Used in over 100 nations for law enforcement, military and disaster victim identification operations**




BRAD WING

# PROJECT OVERVIEW

- Revise ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 starting with the 2013 Update
  - Correct errors and add explanatory material where needed (particularly for lists)
  - Update references to other standards and to the Mobile ID Device BPR
  - Reflect changes to NIEM
  - Consider additional changes
    - Brief Overviews to be presented today
    - Smaller changes without separate overviews

BRAD WING

# UPDATE PROCESS




BRAD WING

# DELETE CODES 29 AND 30 FROM TABLE 8 FOR PALM (RIGHT OTHER AND LEFT OTHER)

- May be irrelevant with codes for grasp and carpal delta now included

- Unknown if codes have been actually used

**Pro**

**Con**

JOHN MAYER-SPLAIN

# EFS TONAL REVERSAL DOES NOT INCLUDE AN 'UNKNOWN' CODE

**Table 36 Tonal reversal codes**

| Code | Description |
|---|---|
| N | Negative – ridges are light and valleys are dark throughout the image. |
| P | Partial – ridges are light and valleys are dark only in portions of the image |

**Pro**

- Field 9.314 (EFS Tonal Reversal) has only two options -- Add 'U' for Unknown for when analyst is unsure and both options should be considered

**Con**

- None

JOHN MAYER-SPLAIN

# NIEM UPDATE (V 2.1 → V 3.0)

- Reasons for the change
- Incorporation of Biometric Domain
- Timetable for Finalization of V 3.0
- Plans for V 3.1

| NIEM 2.1 Element Name | NIEM 3.0 Element Name |
|---|---|
| BinaryBase64Object | Base64BinaryObject |
| LocationGeographicElevation | LocationElevation |
| LocationTwoDemensionalGeographicCoordinate | Location2DGeospatialCoordinate |
| TwoDimensionalGeographicCoordinateType | Location2DGeospatialCoordinateType |
| Year | YearDate |
| YearMonth | YearMonthDate |
| UTMGridZoneID | MGRSGridZoneID |
| MeasurePointValue | MeasureDecimalValue |

JUSTIN STEKERVITZ

# HOW TO REFLECT NIEM UPDATES

- Update Standard to remove any element names in NIEM core
- Remove references to a NIEM version in the standard
- Maintain separate schemas and Annex G for each NIEM version for each A/N-ITL version
- Develop a conversion routine for all combination of NIEM and A/N versions

**Pro**

- Is in spirit of the A/N-ITL 2011 update to make the standard encoding version independent
- May cause confusion among users
- Requires funding and commitment to develop and maintain programs
- Public Outreach will be needed

**Con**

KAMRAN ATRI

# Machine Readable Tables (MRT)

Rachel Wallner

ANSI/NIST-ITL 2015 Kickoff

October 31, 2014

noblis

For the best of reasons

© 2014 Noblis, Inc. Noblis proprietary and confidential.

RACHEL WALLNER

# Agenda

I. What are the Machine Readable Tables (MRT)?

II. Purpose of MRT

III. Format of MRT

IV. Master Content Verification

V. MRT Roles

VI. MRT Lifecycle

VII. MRT in Action – Two Examples

VIII. More MRT Advantages

IX. Current Progress To Date

RACHEL WALLNER

noblis

© 2014 Noblis, Inc. Noblis proprietary and confidential.

# What are the Machine Readable Tables (MRT)?

- Defines machine processible attributes of transactions and fields

ANSI/NIST-ITL



| Field Number | Mnemonic | Content Description | Cond Code | Character Type | Character Min | Character Max | Value Constraints | Occurrence Min | Occurrence Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.001 | | RECORD HEADER | M | encoding specific see Annex B: Traditional encoding scheme; C: NIEM conformant encoding rules | | | encoding specific see Annex B: Traditional encoding scheme; C: NIEM conformant encoding rules | 1 | 1 |
| 1.002 | VER | VERSION NUMBER | M | N | 4 | 4 | VER = 0300 [illegible] | 1 | 1 |
| 1.003 | CNT | TRANSACTION CONTENT | M | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | Subfield: Single set of information items | M | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | FRC | first record category code | M | N | 1 | 1 | FRC = 1 always | 1 | 1 |

**8.1.3 Field 1.003: Transaction content / CNT**

This mandatory field[12] shall specify and identify each of the records in the transaction by record type and its **IDC** value. It also specifies the order in which the remaining records shall appear in the file. It shall consist of two or more subfields. The first subfield shall relate to this **Type-1** record.

- The first information item (**first record category code / FRC**) within this subfield shall be "1". This indicates that the first record in the transaction is a Type-1 record consisting of header information.
- The second information item of this subfield (**content record count / CRC**) shall be the sum of the **Type-2** through **Type-99** records contained in this transaction. This number is also equal to the count of the remaining subfields of **Field 1.003: Transaction content / CNT**. The maximum for **CRC** is 999.

MRT

| TradXML | FieldRef | FieldID | InfoItem | InfoItemCount | InfoItemsVary | Mnemonic | Description | CondCode | XMLcondCode | DataType | MinLength | MaxLength | MinOccur | MaxOccur |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| X | 1 | 01 | | | | | Package Information Record (XML) | M | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| T | 1/LEN:T | 01.001:T | | | | LEN | Record Header | M | | N | 2 | * | 1 | 1 |
| X | 1/XRCC:X | 01.001:X | | | | XRCC | XML Record Category Code | M | | N | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| X | 1/VER_1/ANM | 01.002_01.017 | | | | | Transaction (XML) | M | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| T | 1/VER:T | 01.002:T | | | | VER | Version Number | M | | N | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| X | 1/VER:X1 | 01.002:X1 | | | | VER | Major Version | M | | N | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| X | 1/VER:X2 | 01.002:X2 | | | | VER | Minor Version | M | | N | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| T | 1/CNT:T | 01.003:T | SET | 2 | TYPE | CNT | Transaction Content | M | | | | | 1 | 1000 |
| X | 1/CNT:X | 01.003:X | SET | 2 | TYPE | CNT | Transaction Content (XML) | M | | | | | 1 | 1 |

© 2014 Noblis, Inc. Noblis proprietary and confidential.

RACHEL WALLNER

# Purpose of MRT

- Make it easier for developers to implement standards and specifications
- Define framework for agencies with application profiles
- Define Machine Readable "Tables" (MRT) layers for
  - Standard Profile: e.g., ANSI/NIST-ITL
  - Application Profile: e.g., FBI EBTS
  - Tool Profile: e.g. FBI EBTS Transaction Tool
    - Defined by tool implementer

RACHEL WALLNER

noblis

© 2014 Noblis, Inc. Noblis proprietary and confidential.

# Format of MRT

- XML = Master Format





```
<FieldDef>
  <TradXML>TX</TradXML>
  <FieldRef>10/IMT</FieldRef>
  <FieldID>10.003</FieldID>
  <Mnemonic>IMT</Mnemonic>
  <Description>Image type</Description>
  <CondCode>M</CondCode>
  <DataType>AS</DataType>
  <MinLength>4</MinLength>
  <MaxLength>11</MaxLength>
  <MinOccur>1</MinOccur>
  <MaxOccur>1</MaxOccur>
  <SpecialChar>-</SpecialChar>
  <ContentType>Data</ContentType>
  <XMLPath>if [10/IMT] IN {"FACE"} then
  itl:PackageFacialAndSMTImageRecord/biom:Fac
else
  itl:PackageFacialAndSMTImageRecord/biom:Phy
endif</XMLPath>
  <CodeTable>IMT</CodeTable>
  <ValueRange>"FACE","SCAR","MARK","TATTOO"</
  <DependOther>false</DependOther>
  <InterFieldOther>false</InterFieldOther>
  <Exception>false</Exception>
  <Summary>Type of image contained in the rec
  <Example>FACE</Example>
  <Notes>See AN2011-LookupCodes MRT for Code
```




© 2014 Noblis, Inc. Noblis proprietary and confidential.

# Master Content Verification




- MRT Verifier
  - Content, structure, and syntax
- MRT Continuous Integration Pipeline
  - As changes are introduced, structure and syntax are checked
  - Inadvertent errors caught and mainline is protected

RACHEL WALLNER

noblis

© 2014 Noblis, Inc. Noblis proprietary and confidential.

# MRT Roles

- Consumers
  - Readers that view standards documents
  - Developers that read / rely on the MRT's directly
    - EBTS Compliance Tool Suite
  - Reviewers that view but do not edit tables
- Editors
  - Designated by FBI and NIST to edit / maintain content
  - Editing and maintenance is editor agnostic

RACHEL WALLNER

noblis

© 2014 Noblis, Inc. Noblis proprietary and confidential.

# MRT Lifecycle




RACHEL WALLNER

noblis

© 2014 Noblis, Inc. Noblis proprietary and confidential.

# MRT IN ACTION – IMPLEMENTING STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS WITHOUT MRT

## Step 1

- Agency determines format to implement standards and specifications

## Step 2

- Agency obtains and records info from standard document (e.g., ANSI/NIST-ITL)

## Step 3

- Agency obtains and records info from specification document (e.g., FBI EBTS)

## Step 4

- Agency records info specific to the Tool (e.g., Transaction Tool)

RACHEL WALLNER

# MRT IN ACTION - IMPLEMENTING STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS WITH MRT

Standard MRT available online for agencies & developers to use

Specification MRT available online for developers to use

## Step 1

[illegible]ncy de[illegible]mines form[illegible] [illegible]o [illegible]mplem[illegible] [illegible]ndard[illegible] [illegible]d sp[illegible]ions

## Step 2

[illegible]ency [illegible]ins an[illegible] rec[illegible] inf[illegible] from [illegible]andar[illegible] (e.g., ANSI/NIST-ITL)

## Step 3

[illegible]ncies [illegible] [illegible] the[illegible] owi[illegible] [illegible]pecif[illegible] [illegible]RT

## Step 4

- Agency records info specific to the Tool

RACHEL WALLNER

# MRT ADVANTAGES

- Quicker Implementations of Standards and Specifications

- Easier to View Standards and Specifications
  - Version Comparison

- Easier to Validate Information

- Increased Interoperability
  - Same format

RACHEL WALLNER

# CURRENT PROGRESS TO DATE

| Completed To Date | Future |
| --- | --- |
| Created MRT for:<br>- A/N 2011<br>- A/N 2013<br>- EBTS v9.3<br>- EBTS v10.0.2 (including Iris Pilot)<br>MRT Verifier | Developing MRT application programming interface (API)<br>Host A/N MRT on NIST website<br>Host EBTS MRT on CJIS website<br>Develop MRT for AN 2015 and future specifications/standards |

RACHEL WALLNER

# CONTACT US!

Want to know more?

Have any suggestions?

Want to keep up to date
with the MRT development?


| | |
|---|---|
| Rachel Wallner, Noblis | Rachel.Wallner@noblis.org |
| Brian Finegold, Noblis | Brian.Finegold@noblis.org |
| Brad Wing, NIST | Bradford.Wing@nist.gov |
| Jennifer Stathakis, FBI | Jennifer.Stathakis@ic.fbi.gov |


RACHEL WALLNER

# Thank you!

RACHEL WALLNER

© 2014 Noblis, Inc. Noblis proprietary and confidential.

# Testing of ANSI/NIST-ITL Annex G and Implementation Domain XML Schemas

Rachel Wallner

ANSI/NIST-ITL 2015 Kickoff
October 31, 2014

noblis
For the best of reasons

© 2014 Noblis, Inc. Noblis proprietary and confidential.

RACHEL WALLNER

# Agenda

I. Current State of XML in ANSI/NIST-ITL

II. Past and Current Issues

III. Possible Solutions

noblis

© 2014 Noblis, Inc. Noblis proprietary and confidential.

RACHEL WALLNER

# PAST AND CURRENT ISSUES

- Discrepancies between XML schemas and Annex G

```
<xsd:element name="UpperLipCharacterizationCodeList" type="biom:LipCharacterizationCodeListType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation> An upper lip print characterization code list</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
    </xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:complexContent>
        <xsd:extension base="s:ComplexObjectType">
            <xsd:sequence>
                <xsd:element ref="biom:LipCharacterizationCode" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="5"/>
            </xsd:sequence>
        </xsd:extension>
    </xsd:complexContent>
</xsd:complexType>
```

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10.049[48] | CID | biom:CheiloscopicImageInformation | 0..1 |
| “ | LPW | biom:LipPrintWidth | 0..1 |
| “ | LPH | biom:LipPrintHeight | 0..1 |
| “ | PHW | biom:PhiltrumWidth | 0..1 |
| “ | PHH | biom:PhiltrumHeight | 0..1 |
| “ | ULCL | biom:UpperLipCharacterizationCodeList | 0..5 |
| “ | LLCL | biom:LowerLipCharacterizationCodeList | 0..5 |
| “ | LCLD | biom:LipContactLineDescriptorCode | 0..1 |

RACHEL WALLNER

# PAST AND CURRENT ISSUES (CONT.)

```xml
<!--Changed new element to more properly represent the Audio Radio Transmission Format -->
<xsd:complexType name="SourceAcquisitionType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>A data type for an acquisition method for the source representation</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:complexContent>
        <xsd:extension base="s:ComplexObjectType">
            <xsd:sequence>
                <xsd:element ref="biom:AcquisitionSourceCode"/>
                <xsd:element ref="biom:AcquisitionDigitalConversionDescriptionText" minOccurs="0"/>
                <xsd:element ref="biom:AcquisitionRadioTransmissionFormatDescriptionText" minOccurs="0"/>
                <xsd:element ref="biom:AcquisitionSpecialCharacteristicsText" minOccurs="0"/>
            </xsd:sequence>
        </xsd:extension>
    </xsd:complexContent>
</xsd:complexType>
<!-- Added new element to use for Radio Transmission Format-->
```

≠

| Field ID | Mnemonic | XML element name | Cardinality |
|---|---|---|---|
| 20.014 | AQS | biom:SourceAcquisition | 1..9 |
| " | AQT | biom:AcquisitionSourceCode | 1..1 |
| " | A2D | biom:AcquisitionDigitalConversionDescriptionText | 0..1 |
| " | FDN | biom:AcquisitionFormatDescriptionText | 0..1 |
| " | AQSC | biom:AcquisitionSpecialCharacteristicsText | 0..1 |

RACHEL WALLNER

# POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

- Testing
  - Entire Annex G and XML schemas need to be examined closely
  - Need several eyes on Annex G and XML schemas
  - Determine if…
    - XML elements and cardinality match in Annex G and schemas
    - All XML child elements are included within a parent
    - Consistency across XML elements for same field type
    - Indentation in Annex G is clear
- Automatically update Annex G (remove manual updates)

RACHEL WALLNER

# Any Comments?

RACHEL WALLNER

noblis

© 2014 Noblis, Inc. Noblis proprietary and confidential.

# ANNEX G - CURRENT APPROACH

| Field ID | Mnemonic | XML element name | Cardinality |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | - | biom:FaceImage[32] | 0..1[33] |
| - | - | biom:PhysicalFeatureImage[34] | 0..1 |
| 10.999 | DATA | nc:BinaryBase64Object | 1..1 |
| - | - | biom:ImageCaptureDetail | 1..1 |
| 10.998 | GEO | biom:CaptureLocation | 0..1 |
| " | GRT | nc:LocationDescriptionText | 0..* |
| " | - | nc:LocationGeographicElevation | 0..1 |
| " | ELE | nc:MeasurePointValue | 1..1 |
| " | - | biom:LocationTwoDimensionalGeographicCoordinate | 0..1 |
| " | - | nc:GeographicCoordinateLatitude | 1..1 |
| " | LTD | nc:LatitudeDegreeValue | 1..1 |

MANOJ BISHT

# ANNEX G - PROPOSED APPROACH




MANOJ BISHT

# ANNEX G - PROPOSED APPROACH




MANOJ BISHT

# CONFORMANCE TESTING UPDATE

- Annex G difficult to keep in sync with the schema and the layout is subject to misinterpretation
- Laying out the strict conformance testing logic highlights some possible different interpretations of the standard's text
- Range value restrictions found to be different for similar elements – points out the need to treat them as separate concepts and and elements rather than keeping them the same elements with different ranges allowed.

DYLAN YAGA

# BioCTS

# BIOMETRIC CONFORMANCE TEST SOFTWARE


- Dylan Yaga
- Fernando Podio
- Computer Security Division
- Information Technology Laboratory
- National Institute of Standards and Technology


DYLAN YAGA

NIST

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

# NIST/ITL COMPUTER SECURITY DIVISION (CSD) BIOCTS TEAM EFFORTS

- NIST/ITL CSD supports the development of biometric conformance testing methodology standards and other conformity assessment efforts through active technical participation in the development of these standards and the development of associated conformance test architectures and test suites.
- These test tools are developed to promote adoption of these standards and to support users that require conformance to selected biometric standards, product developers and testing labs.

DYLAN YAGA

NIST

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

# NIST/ITL CSD BIOCTS TEAM CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ANSI/NIST-ITL STANDARDS

- NIST/ITL CSD's BioCTS team developed and provided the initial set of requirements, test assertions, and supporting test assertion syntax for ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 to the *NIST/ITL Conformance Testing Methodology Working Group*, chaired by Elham Tabassi from NIST/ITL Information Access Division (IAD)
- NIST/ITL CSD's BioCTS team acted as the editors for the resulting document, *NIST Special Publication 500-295, Conformance Testing Methodology for ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011, Data Format for the Interchange of Fingerprint, Facial & Other Biometric Information* (NIST SP 500-295)
- The test assertions that became a part of NIST SP 500-295 were the documentation of tests that had been developed by the BioCTS team and implemented within the software titled: BioCTS for ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011
  - Over 100 pages, and 1,200+ test assertions were developed

Special Publication 500-295

Conformance Testing Methodology for ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011, Data Format for the Interchange of Fingerprint, Facial & Other Biometric Information (Release 1.0)

*NIST/ITL Conformance Testing Methodology Working Group*

Fernando L. Podio
Dylan Yaga
Christofer J. McGinnis
Editors

http://dx.doi.org/10.6028/NIST.SP.500-295

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

NIST

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

# BENEFITS OF DEVELOPING CONFORMANCE TEST ASSERTIONS

- Documented and organized Requirements, extracted from all around the standard
- Development of Test Assertions that can serve as a basis for software development
- NIST/ITL CSD's BioCTS for ANSI/NIST Software
- Provides an additional critical evaluation of the base standard
- Must consider the entire range of values allowed by the standard
- Implementing the assertions often leads to asking questions, and intensive research to answer them
- May uncover multiple interpretations of requirements – and as part of feedback, can help to clarify them
- Helps to provide technical contributions back to the standard

DYLAN YAGA

# BENEFITS OF DEVELOPING CONFORMANCE TEST ASSERTIONS




DYLAN YAGA

NIST

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

# NIST/ITL CSD'S BIOCTS FOR ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011

- Initial version (Beta 1.0) was released in August 2012
- Several iterations have been released over the years, adding additional features, and modifications to the Conformance Test Architecture (CTA), as well as additional tests implemented within the Conformance Test Suite (CTS)
- BioCTS for ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 supports CTSs for both Traditional Encoding, as well as NIEM-XML Encoding
- Tests multiple files in a Batch Test mode, as well as provides an editor for Traditionally Encoded Transactions

DYLAN YAGA

# NIST/ITL CSD'S BIOCTS FOR ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011, CONTINUED

- The CTSs for ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 provides conformance testing support* for several Record Types and tests:
  - Transaction-wide Tests
  - Type 1, Transaction Information Record
  - Type 4, High-resolution grayscale fingerprint image
  - Type 10, Facial and SMT image
  - Type 13, Variable-resolution latent image
  - Type 14, Variable-resolution fingerprint image
  - Type 15, Palm print image
  - Type 17, Iris image

- **BioCTS accepts Transactions containing any Record Type, however, only basic conformance tests are performed on Records not listed above*

DYLAN YAGA

# NIST/ITL CSD'S BIOCTS FOR ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 AND ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 UPDATE: 2013

- Beta version 1.2.5353.15785 Released September 10, 2014 is the latest version of BioCTS that supports the ANSI/NIST line of standards
- Includes updated versions of the ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 CTSs
- Includes new CTSs for ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 Update: 2013, which is still under development. The initial release provides conformance testing support* for several Record Types and tests (both Traditional and NIEM-XML Encodings):
  - Transaction-wide Tests
  - Record Type 1, Transaction Information Record
  - Record Type 4, High-resolution grayscale fingerprint image
  - Record Type 10, Photographic body part imagery (including face and SMT)
- Support for additional Record Types is under development

- **BioCTS accepts Transactions containing any Record Type, however, only basic conformance tests are performed on Records not listed above*

DYLAN YAGA

# ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 UPDATE: 2013 CONFORMANCE TESTING METHODOLOGY FRAMEWORK

- NIST/ITL CSD's BioCTS team has documented the set of requirements, test assertions and supporting test assertion syntax for ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 Update: 2013, and is awaiting publication as NIST SP 500-304. This document contains all the tests that have been implemented within the BioCTS for ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 Update: 2013 CTSs.
- NIST SP 500-304 covers:
  - Transaction Wide Test Assertions
  - Record Type 1 Test Assertions
- Additional Documents are under development and cover additional Record Type test assertions, each Record Type assertions will be an individual NIST IRs


Special Publication 500-304

Conformance Testing Methodology Framework for ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 Update: 2013, Data Format for the Interchange of Fingerprint, Facial & Other Biometric Information

Christofer J. McGinnis
Dylan J. Yaga
Fernando L. Podio

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

NIST

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

# BIOCTS CONFORMANCE TEST SUITES: TRADITIONAL ENCODING TRANSACTION

DYLAN YAGA

NIST

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

# BIOCTS TRADITIONAL ENCODING TRANSACTION CTSS DETAILS

- The CTSs for Traditional Encoding have several phases of operation:
  - Parse – The first phase is to attempt to parse the Transaction. If the Transaction fails to parse, an error will be reported and testing does not proceed to the next phase.
  - Level 1 – The second phase is to perform Level 1 testing, which includes Value constraints, length constraints, character constraints and correct field contents (Fields, subfields and information items).
  - Level 2 – The third phase is to perform Level 2 testing, first within each Record Type individually, then at a cross Record Type level. Finally, Transaction wide tests are performed.
  - Test Log Generation – The last phase is to generate Test Logs. Both Text based, and XML based Test Log Output can be generated.

DYLAN YAGA

# BIOCTS TRADITIONAL TRANSACTION BATCH TEST IN ACTION




DYLAN YAGA

NIST

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

# BIOCTS ON APACHE™ HADOOP® 2/3




DYLAN YAGA

NIST

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

# BIOCTS ON APACHE™ HADOOP® 3/3

cloudera@localhost:~/BioCTS_Hadoop_Complete

File Edit View Search Terminal Help

```
*******************************************************************************
Running BioCTS Mono MapReduce Streaming Job on Sequence File
*******************************************************************************
packageJobJar: [BioCTS_Map.exe, GOV.CSD.ITL.NIST.AN_CTS.dll, GOV.CSD.ITL.NIST.CT
S.AN2K11.dll, GOV.CSD.ITL.NIST.Library.dll, /tmp/hadoop-cloudera/hadoop-unjar446
480409140550764/] [] /tmp/streamjob438005420679515892.jar tmpDir=null
14/09/04 06:52:54 WARN mapred.JobClient: Use GenericOptionsParser for parsing th
e arguments. Applications should implement Tool for the same.
14/09/04 06:52:54 INFO mapred.FileInputFormat: Total input paths to process : 1
14/09/04 06:52:54 INFO streaming.StreamJob: getLocalDirs(): [/tmp/hadoop-clouder
a/mapred/local]
14/09/04 06:52:54 INFO streaming.StreamJob: Running job: job_201409040622_0002
14/09/04 06:52:54 INFO streaming.StreamJob: To kill this job, run:
14/09/04 06:52:54 INFO streaming.StreamJob: /usr/lib/hadoop-0.20-mapreduce//bin/
hadoop job  -Dmapred.job.tracker=localhost.localdomain:8021 -kill job_2014090406
22_0002
14/09/04 06:52:55 INFO streaming.StreamJob: Tracking URL: http://0.0.0.0:50030/j
obdetails.jsp?jobid=job_201409040622_0002
14/09/04 06:52:56 INFO streaming.StreamJob:  map 0%  reduce 0%
14/09/04 06:53:11 INFO streaming.StreamJob:  map 50%  reduce 0%
14/09/04 06:53:12 INFO streaming.StreamJob:  map 100%  reduce 0%
14/09/04 06:53:15 INFO streaming.StreamJob:  map 100%  reduce 100%
14/09/04 06:53:15 INFO streaming.StreamJob: Job complete: job_201409040622_0002
14/09/04 06:53:15 INFO streaming.StreamJob: Output: /user/cloudera/an/StreamingR
```

DYLAN YAGA

# MANY OTHER TOOLS… RECURSIVE DIRECTORY HASHER

- Verify local BioCTS installs against posted Hash Summary values on the BioCTS Website




DYLAN YAGA

NIST

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

# MANY OTHER TOOLS… ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 FORMATTED RECORD AND FIELD EXTRACTOR

- Easily extract any data from an ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 Formatted File
- E.g.,
  - All Fields xx.999 – Biometric Sample data such as Fingerprint, face, iris images
  - All Record Types 04, and 14




DYLAN YAGA

NIST

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

# AN-2015 AND BEYOND

- NIST/ITL CSD expects to…
  - Continue its efforts to develop test assertions for an updated ANSI/NIST-ITL standard
  - Continue to submit technical comments on the ANSI/NIST-ITL standard
  - Continue to develop BioCTS Conformance Test Suites to support the additions and changes made to the ANSI/NIST-ITL standard

DYLAN YAGA

# DATE FORMATS: EXAMPLE THAT VALID RANGE IS NOT SPECIFIED

DYLAN YAGA

### *7.7.2.3 Local date*

The local date is recorded as YYYYMMDD. It may be a different date than the GMT, due to time zone differences. It is handled differently for each encoding.

| Field Number | Mnemonic | Content Description | Cond Code | Character | | | Value Constraints | Occurrence | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Type | Min # | Max # | | Min # | Max # |
| 1.005 | DAT | DATE | M | See Section 7.7.2.3 Local date encoding specific: see Annex B: Traditional encoding or Annex C: NIEM-conformant | | | See Section 7.7.2.3 Local date encoding specific: see Annex B: Traditional encoding or Annex C: NIEM-conformant | 1 | 1 |

### 8.1.5 Field 1.005: Date / DAT

This mandatory field shall contain the local date that the transaction was submitted. See **Section 7.7.2.3.**

# DATE FORMATS: EXAMPLE THAT VALID RANGE IS SPECIFIED TO ALLOW ZEROS TO INDICATE EXACT DATE IS UNKNOWN

***7.7.2.3 Local date***

The local date is recorded as YYYYMMDD. It may be a different date than the GMT, due to time zone differences. It is handled differently for each encoding.

| Field Number | Mnemonic | Content Description | Cond Code | Character | | | Value Constraints | Occurrence | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Type | Min # | Max # | | Min # | Max # |
| | DPBD | subject - person birth date | O | see Section 7.7.2.3 | | | see Section 7.7.2.3 | 0 | 1 |

- The fourth information item, **subject – person birth date / DPBD**, is an optional information item. See **Section 7.7.2.3** for the format. If records are available, enter the birth date as known. In forensic examination, enter an approximate date.
- The fifth information item, **subject – range of birth date estimate / DRBD** is entered in the format $\mathbf{Y^{yy}M^{mm}D^{dd}}$. The bold letters are entered with Y indicating years, M indicating months, D indicating days. Not all levels of time need be entered – only the relevant one(s). Leading zeros need not be entered. The range is centered upon **DPBD**. Thus, for a value of **DPBD** being 19910000 (zeros being used to indicate indicate lack of knowledge of month or day), a range might be Y3, indicating plus or minus 3 years from 1991.

DYLAN YAGA

# COMPRESSION GUIDANCE SHOULD BE CLEARER BY RECORD TYPE

**Table 15 Compression codes**

| Code | Label | Algorithm Name | Fidelity | Standard Used |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | NONE | Uncompressed | Lossless | NA |
| 1 | WSQ20 | WSQ[56] (Wavelet Scalar Quantization) | Lossy | Version 3.1:2010 |
| 2 | JPEGB | JPEG (Joint Photographic Experts Group) | Lossy | *ISO/IEC 10918, JFIF 1.02:1992* |
| 3 | JPEGL | JPEG | Lossless | *ISO/IEC 10918, JFIF 1.02:1992* |
| 4 | JP2 | JPEG 2000 | Lossy | *ISO 15444-1:2004* |
| 5 | JP2L | JPEG 2000 | Lossless | *ISO 15444-1:2004* |
| 6 | PNG | PNG (Portable Network Graphics) | Lossless | *ISO/IEC 15948:2004* |

**Type-4** records use the *code*[57] in **Table 15 Compression codes**. Others record types use the *label*. [<2013a]

**500 ppi friction ridge imagery (not including latent imagery):** The specification in *WSQ Gray-scale Fingerprint Image Compression Specification Version 3.1* shall apply. The FBI maintains a list[59] of certified WSQ implementations, based upon testing performed at NIST[60].

**500 ppi latent imagery:** All 500 ppi latent imagery, [2013a>] if compressed, [<2013a] shall be compressed using PNG or other some other lossless compression algorithm as defined in this section. [2013a>] Uncompressed imagery is acceptable for 500 ppi latent prints. [<2013a]

**Legacy systems:** Legacy systems may use JPEGB or JPEGL for compressing 500 ppi class images, but no new system shall be built using JPEGB and JPEGL .

**WSQ caveats:** Any certified WSQ software is able to decode images with an encoder certified for WSQ specification versions 2.0, 3.0 or 3.1. **Field 4.008: Compression algorithm / CGA** only allows the *Code* values of 0 and 1 (See **Table 15 Compression codes**) for new systems, since for such systems only uncompressed or WSQ compressed 500 ppi images may be transmitted in **Type-4** records. [<2013a]

DYLAN YAGA

# SUGGEST REPLACING WITH A SEPARATE TABLE FOR EACH RECORD TYPE

**Type-4 Images**

Type-4 images may only be used at the 500ppi transmitting resolution class, and only WSQ20 may be used for compression. JPEGB and JPEGL are allowed as legacy values. Type-4 is subject to tolerance for resolution values.

**Type-4 Image Constraints**

| | | Compression Algorithm | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | NONE (0) | WSQ20 (1) | JPEGB (2) | JPEGL (3) | JP2 (4) | JP2L (5) | PNG (6) |
| Transmitting Resolution | 500 ppi | Valid | Valid | Legacy | Legacy | X | X | X |
| | Unspecified | Valid | Valid | Legacy | Legacy | X | X | X |

**Type-4 Resolution Constraints**

| Resolution | Min | Max | Tolerance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Transmitting | 500 ppi | 500 ppi | 2% |
| Scanning | 500 ppi | Unbounded* | 2% |

*Must be transmitted at 500ppi.

References:

- Only CGA values of NONE and WSQ20 (0 and 1) are valid for 500ppi as stated in 7.7.9.1.
- CGA values JPEGB and JPEGL are legacy for 500 ppi only as stated in 7.7.9.1.
- The same CGA constraints apply to unspecified resolutions because section 7.7.6 states that Record Type-4 shall not be used for anything but the 500 ppi class.
- Exemplar friction ridge images have a minimum scanning resolution of 500 ppi as stated in 7.7.6.2.1
- The transmitting resolution may only be 500 ppi as stated in 7.7.6.3.1.

Interpretations:

- The tolerance for fingerprint types is either 1% or 2% as specified in 7.7.6.1. This is dependent upon the FAP value, which is not available in Type-4 records. Therefore, 2% tolerance is assumed because it is the least restrictive.

DYLAN YAGA

**Type-13 Images**

Type-13 compression algorithm constraints depend upon the transmitting resolution. The minimum scanning resolution is 1000ppi and the minimum transmitting resolution is 500ppi.

**Type-13 Image Constraints**

| | | Compression Algorithm | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | NONE | WSQ20 | JPEGB | JPEGL | JP2 | JP2L | PNG |
| Transmitting Resolution | 500 ppi | Valid | X | X | Legacy | X | Valid | Valid |
| | 1000 ppi | Valid | X | X | X | X | Valid | X |
| | >= 2000 ppi | Valid | X | X | X | X | Valid | X |
| | Unspecified | Valid | X | X | Legacy* | X | Valid | Valid* |
| *Note that these cases apply only for 500 ppi resolution. | | | | | | | | |

**Type-13 Resolution Constraints**

| Resolution | Min | Max | Tolerance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Transmitting† | 500 ppi | Scanning Resolution | None |
| Scanning | 1000 ppi | Unbounded | None |
| †Increments by 100% | | | |

References:

- CGA of WSQ20, JPEGB, and JP2 are invalid for all resolutions, because they are excluded from Table 90 "Value Constraints" for 13.011-CGA.
- Only CGA values NONE, JP2L, and PNG are valid for 500 ppi as stated in 7.7.9.1.
- CGA value JPEGL is legacy for 500 ppi only as stated in 7.7.9.1.
- Only CGA of JP2L is valid for 1000 ppi (if compressed) as stated in 7.7.9.1.
- Latent images shall have a minimum scanning resolution of 1000 ppi as stated in 7.7.6.2.2.
- The transmitting resolution has a minimum of 500 ppi and must not be greater than the scanning resolution (see 7.7.6.3.2).
- According to section 7.7.6.2.3, the transmitting resolution value for all friction ridge types (Types 4, 13, 14, 15, 19, and sometimes 16 and 20) must be a member of the resolution migration path that starts at 500ppi and increments by 100%: (i.e.: 500ppi, 1000ppi, 2000ppi, 4000ppi…). The scanning resolution does not necessarily follow the resolution migration path, but it must be scaled down or interpolated to achieve the proper value for transmission.

Interpretations:

- CGA value NONE is valid for all resolutions.
- Since no statement is made regarding resolutions greater than 1000 ppi, it is assumed that the recommendations for 1000 ppi should apply for higher resolutions.
- Since no statement is made regarding unspecified resolutions (when THPS/TVPS are aspect ratio for example), it is assumed that the values indicated in Table 90 are valid. JPEGL is treated as legacy. PNG is treated as a 500 ppi class image.
- It is assumed that tolerance does not apply to Type-13. Section 7.7.6.1 indicates that fingerprint types are subject to a 1% or 2% tolerance, but Type-13 is not necessarily a fingerprint.

DYLAN YAGA

# QUESTIONS? CONTACT

- BioCTS Software
  - All Available BioCTS Software Downloads are available from:
  - http://www.nist.gov/itl/csd/biometrics/biocta_download.cfm
- BioCTS Team Email – Send feedback, comments and questions to:
  - biocts@nist.gov
- Dylan Yaga
  - dylan.yaga@nist.gov
- Fernando Podio
  - fernando.podio@nist.gov

BioCTS2014

DYLAN YAGA

NIST

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY

# REMOVING GLASSES FOR PHOTOS

- Improve automated eye-localization & recognition accuracy
- Decrease photo rejections due to occlusions
  - Glare
  - Tint
  - Rims

- Revise standards
- Public outreach
  - Educate
    - Photographers
    - Acceptance agents
    - Customers

**Pro**

**Con**

JOHN MAYER-SPLAIN

# ADDING A NEW FAP 55 CODE FOR 3.2” X 2.0” IN MOBILE PLATFORMS

| Capture[1] | SAP Levels | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 60 | 55 |
| Acquire flat images | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Acquire rolled images | No | No | No | No | Optional | Optional | Optional | Optional | optional |
| Minimum resolution | 500 ppi ± 10 ppi | 500 ppi ± 10 ppi | 500 ppi ± 10 ppi | 500 ppi ± 10 ppi | 500 ppi ±10 ppi [2] | 500 ppi ± 5 ppi | 500 ppi ± 5 ppi | 500 ppi ± 5 ppi | 500 ppi ± 5 ppi |
| Minimum Gray levels | 256 | 256 | 256 | 256 | 256 | 256 | 256 | 256 | 256 |
| Minimum Image Dimensions (wxh) | .5” x .65” | .5” x .65” | .6 ”x .8” | .8 ”x 1.0” | 1.6 ”x 1.5” | 1.6 ”x 1.5” | 2.5” x 1.5” | 3.2” x 3” | 3.2” x 2” |
| Minimum image area | .325 sq in | .325 sq in | .48 sq in | .8 sq in | 2.4 sq in | 2.4 sq in | 3.75 sq in | 9.6 sq in | 6.4 sq. in. |
| Compression algorithm[3] | N/A | WSQ | WSQ | WSQ | WSQ | WSQ | WSQ | WSQ | WSQ |
| Maximum compression ratio | N/A | 10:1 | 10:1 | 10:1 | 15:1 | 15:1 | 15:1 | 15:1 | 15:1 |
| Simultaneous number of fingers | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 to 2 | 1 to 2 | 1 to 3 | 1 to 4 | 1 to 4 |
| Sensor certification | PIV | PIV | PIV | PIV | PIV | Appendix F | Appendix F | Appendix F | Appendix F |
| Minutiae extractor certification | PIV | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| **Interchange** | | | | | | | | | |
| Image / template | Minutiae | Image | Image | Image | Image | Image | Image | Image | Image |
| Standard used | INCITS 378-2004 | ANSI/ NIST Type-4 or Type-14 | ANSI/ NIST Type-4 or Type-14 | ANSI/ NIST Type-4 or Type-14 | ANSI/ NIST Type-4 or Type-14 | ANSI/ NIST Type-4 or Type-14 | ANSI/ NIST Type-4 or Type-14 | ANSI/ NIST Type-4 or Type-14 | ANSI/ NIST Type-4 or Type-14 |

TOM BUSS

# ADDING A NEW FAP 55 CODE FOR 3.2” X 2.0” IN MOBILE PLATFORMS

- FAP45 (two finger) sensors OK for ABIS field enrollment
- FAP45 not accepted by FBI/CJIS/Police for field booking.
- Need for mobile field enrollment is growing in US and international

**Current situation**

- LES (film/TFT based) FAP55 sensor can take shape compatible with cell phone size and thickness goals.
- FAP55 (3.2” x 2”) size meets “type 4” enrollment standard suitable for field booking (10print rolls)

**Reasons for adding FAP55**

TOM BUSS

# REVISION OF TABLE 7 TO HANDLE: MULTISPECTRAL, CONTACTLESS, AND OTHER TYPES




- Impression Types are "flat" coded [0..39]
- Table 7 *hierarchy* can be revised w/o changes to existing codes

MIKE GARRIS

# REVISION OF TABLE 7 TO HANDLE: MULTISPECTRAL, CONTACTLESS, AND OTHER TYPES




- Multispectral
  - International Users – requested by Swedish Police
  - Where does it fit?
  - Contact/Optical but different from FTIR (legacy)
  - "OTHER(28)" – not useful

MIKE GARRIS

# REVISION OF TABLE 7 TO HANDLE: MULTISPECTRAL, CONTACTLESS, AND OTHER TYPES




1. Break down Optical into FTIR (legacy) and Multispectral
   - Existing codes 20 and 21 are unchanged
2. Should Non-Optical also be broken down?
   - Existing codes 22 and 23 deprecated/made legacy?
3. Need to draft guidance on use between Non-Optical and OTHER(28)

MIKE GARRIS

# REVISION OF TABLE 7 TO HANDLE: MULTISPECTRAL, CONTACTLESS, AND OTHER TYPES




- Contactless
  - Optical vs. Non-Optical does not apply
  - Plain & Rolled are *Contact*-based terms – do not apply

MIKE GARRIS

# REVISION OF TABLE 7 TO HANDLE: MULTISPECTRAL, CONTACTLESS, AND OTHER TYPES

**PROPOSED**

CONTACTLESS

- 2D
  - PHOTO
  - ….
  - ??
- 3D
  - DEPTH
  - SURFACE

1. Break down Contactless into 2D and 3D
   - 2D has arrived, no 3D (yet!)
2. Is 3D ready to be addressed in this update?
   - Type 14,15,19 – exclude 3D, include 3D-to-2D under OTHER(28)
   - Type 22 for images "not standard 2D photography"
   - Depth = Sensors producing point cloud
   - Surface = Sensors producing triangular mesh

MIKE GARRIS

# REVISION OF TABLE 7 TO HANDLE: MULTISPECTRAL, CONTACTLESS, AND OTHER TYPES




1. Break down Contactless into 2D and 3D
   - 2D has arrived, no 3D (yet!)
2. Is 3D ready to be addressed in this update?
   - Type 14,15,19 – now exclude 3D,
     now include 3D-to-2D under OTHER(28)
   - Type 22 for images "not standard 2D photography"
   - Depth = Sensors producing point cloud
   - Surface = Sensors producing triangular mesh

MIKE GARRIS

# REVISION OF TABLE 7 TO HANDLE: MULTISPECTRAL, CONTACTLESS, AND OTHER TYPES




- Break down 2D/PHOTO into Wrapped and Unwrapped
- Native = image data as sensed
- TTC = Transformed To Contact (made to look like FTIR/legacy)
- PL-EQ = Plain Equivalent; RO-EQ = Rolled Equivalent
  - These are coded OTHER(28) right now

MIKE GARRIS

# REVISION OF TABLE 7 TO HANDLE: MULTISPECTRAL, CONTACTLESS, AND OTHER TYPES




- PL-EQ & RO-EQ now coded OTHER(28)
  - Update should at least address these codes
- Full 3D in this update will require:
  - New Section: Terminology, Concepts, Formats, Compression
  - New 3D Image Record Type?

MIKE GARRIS

# PROPOSED


LIVESCAN
OTHER (28)
CONTACT
OPTICAL
NON-OPTICAL
FTIR
MULTISPECTRAL
CAPACITIVE
ULTRASOUND
PLAIN (20)
ROLLED (21)
PLAIN (40)
PLAIN (41)
ROLLED (42)
PLAIN (43)
ROLLED (44)
CONTACTLESS
2D
3D
PHOTO
DEPTH
SURFACE
WRAPPED
UNWRAPPED
NATIVE (51)
TTC
NATIVE (54)
TTC
NATIVE (45)
TTC
NATIVE (48)
TTC
PL-EQ (52)
RO-EQ (53)
PL-EQ (55)
RO-EQ (56)
PL-EQ (46)
RO-EQ (47)
PL-EQ (49)
RO-EQ (50)



# BIOMETRIC QUALITY STANDARDIZATION

elham.tabassi@nist.gov

http://www.nist.gov/itl/iad/ig/development_nfiq_2.cfm

October 31, 2014

ANSI/NIST Workshop

# QUALITY ASSESSMENT FOR ERROR SUPPRESSION

Quality problem: “The Last 1%”

Or maybe “The Last 0.1% or 10%”

» Fraction of samples that should not be sent to the matcher

- Core algorithmic capability of current matchers are reaching their asymptote. Performance improvements should be and could be achieved by improving data quality and integrity.
- Quality assessment should be done based on only one instance most of the times (representation).
- Providing constructive feedback only possible if cause of poor quality is known

character

behavior

environment

Imaging/system

ELHAM TABASSI

# PREVENT GIGO













ELHAM TABASSI

# NIST FINGERPRINT IMAGE QUALITY

NFIQ1.0 → quality number =5

NFIQ's 5 levels of quality are intended to be predictive of the relative performance of a minutia based fingerprint matching system.

NFIQ=1 indicates high quality samples, so lower FRR and/or FAR is expected.

NFIQ=5 indicates poor quality samples, so higher FRR and/or FAR is expected.

ELHAM TABASSI

# NFIQ – RANK STATISTIC FOR PERFORMANCE




ELHAM TABASSI

# CHALLENGES IN DEVELOPMENT A BIOMETRIC QUALITY ASSESSMENT ALGORITHM

- Agnostic to comparison algorithm
  - Capability to predict performance of different comparison algorithms
- Sufficient resolution
  - How many levels are too many?
- Pairwise quality
  - $Q_1 = F(image_1)$ ; $Q_2 = F(image_2)$;
  - $Q_{12} = G(F(image_1), F(image_2))$
- Calibration
  - What FNMR is expected for each quality level/score?
- Quality of quality
  - Performance measures

- Get a good representation of the current (state-of-the-art) comparison algorithm for training
  - Include as many as possible
    - Requires building community
- We really don't know.
- Robust method for labeling training data + ultimately visual inspection
- Devise + revise metrics and visualization techniques

**Technical** | **Way forward**

ELHAM TABASSI

# CHALLENGES IN DEVELOPMENT A BIOMETRIC QUALITY ASSESSMENT ALGORITHM

- Data + Data sharing issues
  - training (particularly low quality)
  - testing (Images with specific defects)
- Agnostic to application scenario
  - `sufficient quality' is different for enrolment vs. verification
  - Ditto 1:1 and 1:N.
- Meet unknown System requirements
  - Timing, hardware, etc.
- Robust
  - Zero failure to compute rate

- Data cannot leave a site, but an open source algorithm can be ran on the data and Results can then be shared
- Go for the best recommended by the community
- Develop technical guidance and best practice
  - In collaboration with end users of the particular application
- Good coding practice

| Technical, etc. | Way forward |
|---|---|

ELHAM TABASSI

# ACTIONABLE QUALITY FEED BACK TO USER/OPERATOR

- Empty / Uniform / no minutiae
- Wet / dry
  - High/low pressure
- Centeredness
  - Singularity detection
- Incompleteness
  - Entropy of orientation flow
- Ghost images

- occlusion
- non-frontal gaze
- Low contrast
- Non-centered



ISO/IEC 29794

ANSI/NIST-ITL

# STANDARDIZATION :: TOWARDS A VECTOR OF QUALITY COMPONENTS

ELHAM TABASSI

# STANDARDISATION - THEN

- Information technology - Biometrics sample quality Part 1: Framework
- Definitions
  - quality: "the degree to which a biometric sample fulfils specified requirements for a targeted application"
  - quality score: "a quantitative expression of quality"
  - utility: "the observed performance of a biometric sample or set of samples in one or more biometric systems"
- Quality score from 0 to 100

| description | | size | valid values | notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Quality Blocks | | 1 byte | [0,255] | This field is followed by the number of 5-byte Quality Blocks reflected by its value (see **Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden.**).<br>A value of zero (0) means that no attempt was made to assign a quality score. In this case, no Quality Blocks are present. |
| Quality Block | Quality Score | 1 byte | [0,100]<br>255 | 0: lowest<br>100: highest<br>255: failed attempt to assign a quality score |
| | Quality Algorithm Vendor ID | 2 bytes | [1,65535] | Quality Algorithm Vendor ID shall be registered with IBIA as a CBEFF biometric organization. Refer to CBEFF vendor ID registry procedures in ISO/IEC 19785-2. |
| | Quality Algorithm ID | 2 bytes | [1,65535] | Quality Algorithm ID may be optionally registered with IBIA as a CBEFF Product Code. Refer to CBEFF product registry |

**ISO/IEC IS 29794-1:2009**

**5-byte Quality Block**

# ISO STANDARDIZATION OF IRIS IMAGE QUALITY

- Defines and quantifies iris image quality components.
  - for a single image
  - for two images being compared
  - for acquisition device.
- Considers subject, environment and device covariates.
- For each quality component, it specifies
  - description, computation method, units, and valid values/threshold.
- **FDIS Ballot**

- Required
  1. Usable iris area [70,100]
  2. Iris-sclera contrast [5,100]
  3. Iris pupil contrast [30,100]
  4. Pupil boundary circularity
  5. Grey scale utilisation [6,20]
  6. Iris radius [80,253]
  7. Pupil dilation [20,70]
  8. Iris pupil concentricity [90,100]
  9. Margin adequacy [80,100]
  10. Sharpness
- Recommended
  11. Frontal gaze-elevation
  12. Frontal gaze-azimuth
  13. Motion blur

ELHAM TABASSI

# NFIQ 2.0

ELHAM TABASSI

# NFIQ 2.0

- Improved feature
- More level (0-100)
- Faster, lighter
- Actionable feedback
- NFIQ 2.0 mobile
- Slap
- Better performance
- Modular design
- Calibration
- Conformance testing

**Promises, promises**

- Many features, somehow improved
- More level (0-100)
- Faster, lighter
- Actionable feedback
- Towards NFIQ Mobile
- In progress – need FpVTE
- Better performance
- Plug and play
- Mapping to FNMR
- Underway
- Standard features

**So far, we have achieved**

ELHAM TABASSI

# AT A GLANCE

- 5 levels.
  - 1(highest) to 5(lowest)
- 11 features
- Comparison scores of 3 algorithms used for training
- 3400 training images
- ~300 msec per image

**NFIQ 1.0**

- 100 levels
  - 0(lowest) to 100(highest)
- 15 features
- Comparison scores of 7 algorithms used for training
- ~5000 training images
- ~ 100 msec per image
- Actionable quality
  - Flags for blank image, low contrast
- Design for NFIQ Mobile

**NFIQ 2.0**

ELHAM TABASSI

## NIST Biometric Quality Program

Push Towards Zero Error Biometrics

| Strengthening Science | Advancing metrology | Developing Standards | Developing Tool Box | Best Practice Guidance | Enumerative Bibliography | Coordination+ Collaborations |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Failure Analysis | Performance Evaluation | Requirements Specifications | Open source Public domain | Instructional + Guidance | Technical Literature | |
| Identifying the likely causes of recognition error, quantifying their effect and ways to mitigate them. | Quantitative means of assessing performance of quality assessment algorithms (IREX II IQCE) | On image properties affecting performance, and on capture device | Reference implementations of quality assessment algorithm, iris segmentation | Materials for quality score summarization + Best capture practice + example images of various quality | Reports, white papers, publications relevant to biometric quality and iris image quality in particular | Workshops, Conferences<br>Grants (WVU, NYU Poly) |
| Research | Evaluation | Standard | Software | Report | Webpage | |
| NIST IR 7155<br>ICIP 2005<br>NIST IR 7820 | NIST IR 7820<br>PAMI 2007<br>ICPR 2010 | ISO/IEC 29794<br>ISO/IEC 19794 | NFIQ 1.0<br>NFIQ 2.0<br>NIIQ 1.0 | NIST IR 7422<br>NIST IR 8XXX | www.nist.gov/itl/iad/ig/bio_quality.cfm | BQW 2006, 07<br>IBPC 2010, 12<br>NFIQ 2010,12 |

# THANK YOU.


- Elham Tabassi
- 301 975 5292
- tabassi@nist.gov


ELHAM TABASSI

# ADDITION OF A SPECIFIC FIELD FOR NFIQ2 RESULTS

- NFIQ (version 1) has its own field (14.022) Users may want a separate field to clearly indicate and distinguish NFIQ2 from any other metric.

**Pro**

- Field 14.024 already exists (Fingerprint quality metric) for metrics that use a scale of 1 to 100. It could be confusing to have a separate field for just NIFQ2. All that is needed is to specify that the algorithm is NFIQ2.

**Con**

BRAD WING

# DENTAL CODING TRANSLATOR




BRUCE BANDINI

# OPEN DISCUSSION

- Additional topics to be considered
- Develop working groups
  - Select chairs
  - Solicit volunteers
- Develop a Timetable

BRAD WING