

Face Quality and Vulnerability in eIDV

Does facial quality effect system vulnerability and/or PAD ?

Dr Ted Dunstone and Somya Singh Biometix and BixeLab

eIDV Solutions

- The use of unsupervised selfies and image capture from a document allows captures with a wide range of quality variation.
- Question: Because an attacker has the ability to affect quality on both probe and document, does this lead to higher vulnerability?
- For this analysis we assume that changing the document image directly can be detected.



Solutions known as electronic identity verification, or eIDV, verify documents and biometrics remotely via a users mobile device

Biometric Risk Pyramid



Quality Vs Accuracy

4

Examples of Quality Variations



Good Quality



Salt Pepper Noise



Gaussian Noise



Blur

Effect of quality degradation on comparison score



Zoo Plot of Quality (each dot represents a person)



Quality Vs Vulnerability Scenario

Scenario PAD Attacker Good Quality Transactions



Scenario Attacker Poor Quality Transactions



Scenario PAD Attacker Poor Quality Transactions



Distribution of biometric comparison scores and liveness scores for attack presentations



Distribution of scores for presentation attacks colored by enrolment image quality

Conclusions

Current Findings

- Poor quality in eIDV
 - Can increase the chance of higher non-mated scores for impostors
 - May result in attack instruments being more likely to be accepted
- More results from PAD are needed to draw high confidence conclusions
- Results depend on the system and the configuration
- Good quality control
 - is likely protective against attacks
 - and provides a good audit trail

Next Steps

- Enhanced PAD versus quality evaluation
- Use of synthetic generated data for testing
- Effectiveness of morphing using GAN faces



- We have a new evaluation tool in beta test, reach out if your interested.
 - ted@bixelab.com