

European Commission

DG JRC Study on Age and Ageing in Fingerprints

Javier Galbally, Rudolf Haraksim and Laurent Beslay

European Commission, DG-JRC, E.3

WHY? MOTIVATION

BIOMETRICS PARADIGM: You are your own key.

For this paradigm to be applicable biometric characteristics need to present a high level of **PERMANENCE.**

BIOMETRIC PERMANENCE: ability to reliably acquire and recognise over time a biometric characteristic.

There may be difference in performance among agegroups. Practical implications:

- EU commitment for the rights of the elderly
- Border control: strategies according to age

WHAT? OBJECTIVE

AGE AND AGEING EFFECTS IN FINGERPRINTS



HOW? PROTOCOL

1. DATABASE: real operational conditions. Issuing of Passports. Flat fingerprints, 500 dpi, optical.

- 400K fingerprint images
- 250K different fingers
- 0-25 years and 65-98 years.
- 7 years difference between matching pairs
- **2. QUALITY** experiments: NFIQ2, NFIQ1, VERIQ
 - Quality distributions
 - Evolution mean quality value
- **3. MATCHING experiments: VERIFINGER, NIST**

- Passport: different renewal policies
- Law enforcement: missing children/elders

difference between two samples too large?

time?

- DETs
- Evolution mean genuine matching scores



FINDINGS

- **1.** Most problematic group in terms of quality: THE ELDERLY.
- 2. CHILDREN: low quality for 0-4. Medium quality for 5-12. Quality equivalent to adults for 13-17.
- **3. ELDERLY: linear degradation of quality from 65 to 98.**



AGE EFFECT: Matching Experiments

FINDINGS

- **1.In terms of matching ELDERLY perform somewhat better than children (NOT** consistent with observation on quality)
- 2. CHILDREN: low performance for 0-4. Medium performance for 5-12. Performance equivalent to adults for 13-17.
- 3. ELDERLY: linear degradation of performance from 65 to 98.

4. Linear degradation of quality starts at around 40-45 years of age (estimation).

4. Performance degradation starts at around 40-45 years of age (estimation).

AGEING EFFECT





FINDINGS

- 1. For all age groups a larger time difference between reference and probe samples implies a larger degradation in the genuine scores: AGEING IS CONFIRMED.
- 2. Adults and children 13-17, genuine matching decrease of around 15% in 7 years.
- 3. Children 5-12 and children 0-4, genuine matching decrease of around 50% in 7 years.
- 4. All elderly groups, genuine matching decrease of around 30% in 7 years.

CONCLUSIONS



HYPOTHESES

- **1. HYPOTHESIS 1:** developing specific quality metrics and matching algorithms adpated to the reduced size of children fingerprints could significantly improve both their image quality scores and their overall accuracy.
- 2. HYPOTHESIS 2: new touchless acquisition devices could improve the quality and, therefore, the matching performance of elderly fingerprints.
- **3. HYPOTHESIS 3:** the development of a reliable growth model for fingerprints between 0 and 12 years could help to predict the new position of minutiae points and other distinctive features at a certain point in the future, with respect to the reference template, helping this way to reduce the ageing effect in young children

REFERENCES

- 1. Laurent Beslay, Javier Galbally and Rudolf Haraksim, "Automatic Fingerprint Recognition: from Children to Elderly. Ageing and Age Effects", JRC Technical Reports, EUR 29265 EN. Available at: http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC110173/jrc_fingerprint_children_elderly_study_v.final.pdf
- 2. Javier Galbally, Rudolf Haraksim and Laruent Beslay, "Fingerprint Quality: a Lifetime Story", in Proc. Intl. Conf. of the Biometrics Special Interest Group (BIOSIG), 2018
- 3. Javier Galbally, Rudolf Haraksim and Laurent Beslay, "A Study of Age and Ageing in Fingerprint Biometrics", IEEE Trans. on Information Forensics and Security, 2019 (to appear)