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What is this talk about?

• How to use Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) to recognize faces and ...

• How a since September 2014 a University-only team built a deep learning based face recognition system that:
  • Can compute face representations that are comparable, searchable, indexable and clusterable.
  • Compares well to the performance of forensic face examiners in hard face matching tasks.

• Evaluating our system and understanding where it can improve.

• Summarize what we learned, and things we still don’t know.
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Face Recognition 10 years ago

• Methods used:
  • Most if not all methods followed the same pattern
    • Compute gradients, optionally smooth the image before doing so
    • Pool the gradients
    • Train a classifier
  • Two common examples:
    • Histogram of Oriented Gradients/Dense Histogram Oriented Gradients
      • Compute gradients
      • Build histogram
    • LBP
      • Stand at each pixel x build a 1-0 descriptor based on each neighbor being > or <= than x
      • Build a histogram over each cell for each 1-0 pattern
Labeled Faces in the Wild (2008)

• Images from news stories from 2002-2004
• Images mostly of politicians (and other people in the news)
• Professional photographer
  • Probably selected as the “best image” from a set of 10 or 20
• Mostly frontal
• Still significantly more difficult than what was being done in face recognition back then
Labeled Faces in the Wild (2008)

- There were still some difficult images by today’s standards:
  - Actors and actresses
  - Not frontal
  - Event photography
The Good, the Bad and the Ugly (2007-2012)

- Frontal images
- Acquired throughout an academic year
- Indoor and outdoor
- Carefully analyzed
  - We know which pairs are easy and which are hard
The Breakthrough

• Hindsight:
  • Gradients are just a simple type of convolution
  • Building a histogram is just a pooling operation
  • We can learn convolutions to describe faces from data
    • Need lots of data
AlexNet

Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever and Geoffrey E. Hinton

*ImageNet Classification with Deep Convolutional Neural Networks*

NIPS 2012

This is the face descriptor
Example: Marbles on a Table

• If the table is too small there won’t be enough space
• If the table is too big you will be wasteful organizing the marbles
• But if the relationship of space to colors is just right, you will be able to organize the marbles in such a way that you will be able find a location even for colors you’ve never before
Changes in the last 10-15 years

• Back then:
  • Features were fixed – defined by the researcher and not obtained from the data or task.
  • We learned classifiers on those fixed features

• Now:
  • Features are learned from the data – learned by applying backpropagation on the data to classify it effectively.
  • Classifiers are trained on those learned features
Why didn’t this work before?

• New insights (2012-):
  • Disconnect the head (or decapitate), use the previous layer as features for recognition
    • High level visual features are pretty generic
  • ReLU:
    • Activations between layer add non-linearities
    • Sigmoid and tanh were used originally
  • GPU, faster CPUs, more storage
    • Everything is bigger and faster than 20 years ago
  • Data augmentation
    • Flip faces
    • Center cropping

Alice J. O’Toole, Carlos D. Castillo, Connor J. Parde, Matthew Q. Hill, Rama Chellappa
Face Space Representations in Deep Convolutional Neural Networks
Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 2018
Training Datasets Used these Days

• Publicly Available Datasets:
  • MS1M: 100,000 individuals, 10 million images
  • CASIA: 10,575 individuals, 494K images
  • VGG: 2.6M images of 2622 subjects
  • VGG2: 3.31 million images of 9131 subjects
  • CelebA: 10,177 individuals, 202K images
  • UMDFaces: 8,277 individuals, 367K images
    • UMDFaces (videos): 3000 individuals, 3.7 million frames

• Companies:
  • Facebook: has a paper in which they train with a 10 million identity dataset with more than 80 million images
  • Google: more than 200 million faces
Evaluation Datasets

- IJB-A, IJB-B and IJB-C and CS2/3/4, CS 5 (huge gallery) and CS 6 (surveillance)
  - Really unconstrained
    - In different ways
  - Some images, some frames from videos
    - Cure for the photographic bias in LFW
  - Template based: a template is a set of images of the same person
  - Many tasks: verification, search, covariates, clustering, uncurated search, video probes.
Evaluation Datasets

* Conceptual diagram, relative sizes are correct, absolute sizes are not
Evaluation Tasks

• This a selection of the tasks on which we are evaluated:
  • Template to template verification experiment with $10^{12}$ evaluation pairs
  • 1:N template search with a gallery with 1.1 million templates
  • 1:N search of uncurated probes against a large gallery
  • Clustering of templates into identities
  • Video uncurated search

• Athletes and Events – Algorithms and Tasks
Our Approach: The Decathlete

Events:
- 100 m
- Long jump
- Shot put
- High jump
- 400 m
- 110 m
- Discus throw
- Pole vault
- Javelin throw
- 1500 m
UltraFace

• First order of business:
  • Reliably be able to detect and obtain key points and estimate attributes on images like these:

Idea: explore performing all of these tasks in an all in one approach.
UltraFace

• **Task-based**
  • shrinks the solution space of $\theta_s$ such that the learned parameter vector is in consensus with all the tasks

• **Domain-based**
  • $\theta_s$ adapts to the complete set of domains instead of fitting to a task-specific domain
UltraFace Architecture

- Parameters initialized from face identification network
- Subject-independent tasks (face-detection, fiducials, pose, smile) share the lower layers of the network
- Subject-specific features are pooled from deeper layers of the network
Descriptors and their L2 Norms

(1) Low norm descriptor:

(2) Medium norm descriptor:

(3) High norm descriptor:

Connor J. Parde, Carlos D. Castillo, Matthew Q. Hill, Y Ivette Colon, Swami Sankaranarayanan, JC Chen, Alice J O’Toole
Face and Image Representation in Deep CNN Features
FG 2017
Performance Grouped by Norm of the Descriptors

1: Low L2-Norm
2: Medium L2-Norm
3: High L2-Norm

True Accept Rate vs. False Accept Rate (in log scale)

Probability of false alarm
Idea: control the capacity of the descriptor space

Softmax: descriptors can fall anywhere

L2-Sofmax: descriptors need to fall on the surface of a hypersphere

Rajeev Ranjan, Carlos D. Castillo, Rama Chellappa
L2-constrained softmax loss for discriminative face verification
Arxiv
Crystal Loss (L2 Softmax)

\[
\text{minimize} \quad -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \log \frac{e^{W_{y_i}^T f(x_i) + b_{y_i}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{C} e^{W_{j}^T f(x_i) + b_{j}}}
\]

subject to \quad \|f(x_i)\|_2 = \alpha, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \ldots, M,
Embedding Quality

Softmax

Crystal Loss
Results (Identification/ Verification IJB-A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IJB-A Verification (TAR @ FAR)</th>
<th>IJB-A Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGG-Face</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masi et al.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UltraFace</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswhite et al.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R101+L2S+ TPE</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RX101+L2S+ TPE</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IJB-C Results with 1:1 Templates
CS5 1:1, template to template, ROC

![ROC curve graph]

- True Accept Rate (%) vs False Accept Rate (probability of false alarm)
- Two curves: UMD_3E-Datacall and UMD_3B-Datacall
CS5 Search in a Gallery with 1M Individuals

- Define two galleries with a 1.1M individuals
- Perform 332K searches in each gallery
- Some searches have a matching item, some do not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-g1</td>
<td>96.62</td>
<td>97.21</td>
<td>97.40</td>
<td>97.51</td>
<td>97.59</td>
<td>97.68</td>
<td>97.78</td>
<td>97.96</td>
<td>98.05</td>
<td>98.12</td>
<td>98.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA_g1</td>
<td>96.99</td>
<td>97.47</td>
<td>97.61</td>
<td>97.70</td>
<td>97.76</td>
<td>97.85</td>
<td>97.92</td>
<td>98.06</td>
<td>98.14</td>
<td>98.19</td>
<td>98.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA_g1 (Index)</td>
<td>96.95</td>
<td>97.43</td>
<td>97.57</td>
<td>97.66</td>
<td>97.71</td>
<td>97.80</td>
<td>97.88</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>98.08</td>
<td>98.13</td>
<td>98.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Set Metrics for CS5 Search

- Probability of accepting a person not enrolled in the gallery
- Probability of rejecting a person enrolled in the gallery
Is this good compared to humans?

• We compared high-end systems like UMD’s to humans of different levels of abilities
  • Students, fingerprint examiners, super-recognizers, reviewers, examiners
• Will not say much, it has already been presented today by my coauthors, but I will give you my quick take.


Face recognition accuracy of forensic examiners, superrecognizers, and face recognition algorithms
PNAS 2018
Facial Recognition Experts Perform The Best With An AI Sidekick

Scientists are working on a kickass new twist to the classic buddy cop movie genre. Get this: cyberterrorist Marcus Hurricane is going to walk free unless police detective Rick Danger can place him at the scene of the crime. But all he has to go on are some grainy security camera images, and he can’t quite make out Hurricane’s signature badass face scars. Enter: detective Danger’s trusty AI cyborg sidekick, Sparky. Together, they have what it takes to save the day.
Fusion of Examiners and Algorithms
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One Examiner
Two Examiners
One Examiner+A2017b
One Examiner+A2017a
One Examiner+A2016
One Examiner+A2015
Algorithms

Group
Things we’ve Learned that are Important for High Performance in FR

• Appearance is not identity and identity is not appearance

• Amount of data is key:
  • Number of images
  • Many identities
  • Carefully curated

• Loss functions
  • Being able to make sense of subtleties of face appearance/fine grained classification
  • Converging to useful solutions in datasets with many classes

• Alignment
  • Getting accurate key points throughout the pose continuum is still important, this enables accurate alignment.
Things we don’t know

• Current state of the art methods for face recognition require:
  • (1) Lots of training data and (2) fully labeled data
  • How to handle the situation when we walk back those two requirements?
• How can computers and humans work together in verification and search tasks?
  • Are your reading glasses your sidekick?
The Future
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