

Biometrics

And the Gileadites took the passages of Jordan before the Ephraimites: and it was so, that when those Ephraimites which were escaped said, Let me go over; that the men of Gilead said unto him, Art thou an Ephraimite? If he said, Nay; Then said they unto him, Say now Shibboleth: and he said Sibboleth: for he could not frame to pronounce it right. Then they took him, and slew him at the passages of the Jordan: and there fell at that time of the Ephraimites forty and two thousand.

– JUDGES 12:5–6

17.1 Introduction

The above quotation may be the first recorded military use of a security protocol in which the authentication relies on a property of the human being – in this case his accent. (There had been less formal uses before this, as when Isaac tried to identify Esau by his bodily hair but got deceived by Jacob, or indeed when people recognized each other by their faces – which I’ll discuss later.)

Biometrics identify people by measuring some aspect of individual anatomy or physiology (such as your hand geometry or fingerprint), some deeply ingrained skill or behavior (such as your handwritten signature), or some combination of the two (such as your voice).

In the 21st century the market has really taken off, with three major changes since the second edition of this book in 2008.

1. There are many large-scale programs by states to identify citizens using biometrics, of which the biggest single programme may be India’s Aadhaar project, which has recorded the iris codes and fingerprints of over a billion people. International travel has been speeded up by international standard biometric travel documents, the US-VISIT program that fingerprints visitors to the USA, and face-recognition passport booths at the borders of the European Union.
2. There has been a massive improvement in face recognition technology, brought about by the revolution in deep neural networks since 2012.

This has made passport booths steadily faster and more reliable, made mass surveillance easier, and led to concerns about privacy and human rights – particularly given its deployment in China.

3. Automatic fingerprint readers are no longer a niche product for bank vaults and welfare offices, but are deployed on hundreds of millions of mobile phones. Now that people keep their entire lives in their phones, or on web services for which their phones have the credentials, they are relied on to stop a lost or stolen phone turning from annoyance into disaster.

The biometric systems market has taken off like a rocket, growing from \$50m in 1998 to over \$1.5bn in 2005 [999] and \$33bn in 2019 [2040].

I'll start off by describing the biometric techniques that predate the computer age – handwritten signatures, facial features and fingerprints – then describe how they have been automated, and then go on to explore some more modern techniques.

17.2 Handwritten signatures

Handwritten signatures had been used in classical China, but carved personal seals came to be considered higher status; they are still used for serious transactions in China, Japan and Korea. Europe was the other way round: seals had been used in medieval times, but as writing spread after the Renaissance, people increasingly just wrote their names to assent to documents. Over time, the signature became the standard. Every day, billions of dollars' worth of contracts are still concluded by handwritten signatures; how these will be replaced by electronic mechanisms remains a live policy and technology issue.

Handwritten signatures are a weak authentication mechanism in that they're easy to forge, but they worked well enough for centuries because of the context of their use. An important factor is the liability for forgery. Britain's Bills of Exchange Act 1882 provides that a forged handwritten signature is null and void, and this has survived in the laws of many countries that were part of the British Empire at the time, such as Canada and Australia. In these countries, manuscript signatures are better for the customer, as the bank carries most of the risk, but PINs and electronic tokens can be better for the bank – and so have largely replaced them. Europe also went for electronic signatures following lobbying by the French and German smartcard industries. In the USA, the law makes banks liable for the electronic systems they deploy, so US banks generally stuck with chip and signature cards rather than going for chip and PIN. Courier companies also collect handwritten signatures as proof of receipt as they're the only thing that works for all recipients. So the verification of handwritten signatures continues to matter.

Now the probability that a forged signature will be accepted as genuine mainly depends on the amount of care taken when examining it. Many bank card transactions in stores are accepted without even a glance at the specimen signature on the card – so much so that many Americans don't even bother to sign their credit cards¹. But even diligent signature checking doesn't reduce the risk to zero. An experiment showed that 105 professional document examiners, who each did 144 pairwise comparisons, misattributed 6.5% of documents. Meanwhile, a control group of 34 untrained people of the same educational level got it wrong 38.3% of the time [1012], and the nonprofessionals' performance couldn't be improved by giving them monetary incentives [1013]. Errors made by professionals are a subject of continuing discussion in the industry but are thought to reflect the examiner's preconceptions [199] and context [587]. As the participants in these tests were given reasonable handwriting samples rather than just a signature, it seems fair to assume that the results for verifying signatures on checks or delivery receipts would be even worse.

In most of the English-speaking world, most documents do not need to be authenticated by special measures. The essence of a signature is the intent of the signer, so an illiterate's 'X' on a document is perfectly valid. A plaintext name at the bottom of an email message therefore has full legal force [2044], except where there are specific regulations to the contrary.

The exceptions come from conventions and special rules that vary from one country to another. For example, to buy a house in England using money borrowed from a bank of which you're not an established customer, the procedure is to go to a lawyer's office with a document such as a passport, sign the property transfer and loan contracts, and get them countersigned by the lawyer. The requirement for government-issued photo ID was originally imposed by the lender's insurers, and became a 'know-your-customer' (KYC) provision of anti-money-laundering regulations; the requirement that a real-estate purchase be in writing was imposed centuries ago in order to collect tax on property transactions.

Other types of document (such as expert testimony) may have to be notarized in particular ways. Many of the anomalies go back to the nineteenth century, and the invention of the typewriter. Some countries require that machine written contracts be initialled on each page, while some don't; clashes in conventions still cause serious problems.

It's rare for signatures to be disputed in court cases, as the context mostly makes it clear who did what. So this weak biometric mechanism actually works fairly well in practice – the real problems come from a thicket of procedural

¹Indeed, it's not in the cardholder's interest to give a specimen signature to a thief – if the thief has to make a random signature on a voucher or signature tablet, it's easier for the real cardholder to disown it. Signing the card is in the bank's interest but not the customer's.

rules that vary by country and by application. Lawmakers have made various attempts to sort out the mess, and impose uniform rules for electronic documents.

In section 26.5.2 I discuss the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce ('ESIGN') Act of 2000, which legitimised contracts made by clicking on buttons in web pages, and the much more heavyweight European eIDAS Regulation (910/2014), which requires all Member States to accept electronic signatures made using approved products. This was originally designed to help the smartcard industry, but as many people and firms need to sign things occasionally and don't want to buy special hardware, the latest regulation now allows online signature service firms to generate signatures in their cloud service that are considered legally binding, even though the security of the customer's phone or laptop may leave a lot to be desired. Signature services typically generate an electronic document with a machine-written signature that we're supposed to pretend was handwritten; there's also an electronic signature whose verification by the service provider we're supposed to trust.

A separate topic is the automatic recognition of handwritten signatures, such as on checks. This became one of the earliest topics of serious biometric research in the 1980s by firms selling check-processing equipment to banks. In early systems, an operator was presented with the check image and the customer's reference signature on a screen, and took the decision. To save money, this was only done for amounts over a few thousand dollars; smaller checks just went straight through, and it was up to the account holder to dispute them. From the early 1990s there were signature tablets that record not just the shape of the curve but also its dynamics (the velocity of the hand, where the pen was lifted off the paper, and so on). These are used by delivery drivers to collect receipts for goods and also for credit card transactions. Since the early 1990s some products have been able to compare captured signatures against specimens enrolled previously.

Like alarms, most biometric systems have a tradeoff between false-accept and false-reject rates, often referred to in the banking industry as the *fraud* and *insult* rates and in the biometric literature as *type 1* and *type 2* errors. Many systems can be tuned to favor one over the other. The tradeoff is known as the *receiver operating characteristic*, a term first used by radar operators; if you turn up the gain on your radar set too high, you can't see the target for clutter, while if it's too low, you can't see it at all. So the radar operator has to select a suitable point on the curve. The *equal error rate* is when the system is tuned so that the probabilities of false-accept and false-reject are equal. For tablet-based signature recognition systems, the equal error rate is at best 1%; for purely optical comparison, it's several percent. This isn't fatal in an operation such as a check processing centre, as the automated comparison is used as a filter to select checks for human scrutiny. However, it's a show-stopper in a retail store. If one transaction in a hundred fails, the aggravation to customers would be unacceptable.

So back in the 1990s, UK banks set a target for biometrics of a fraud rate of 1% and an insult rate of 0.01%, which was beyond the state of the art in signature verification and fingerprint scanning – as indeed it still is [719]. In fact, even the 1% equal error rate for tablets was achieved by excluding *goats* – a term used by the biometric community for people whose templates don't classify well. Vendors typically exclude people without eyes from statistics on iris scanners and manual workers with worn fingertips from fingerprint statistics. This can lead to deceptive performance claims and hide issues of social exclusion.

In general, biometric mechanisms tend to be more robust in attended operation where they assist a guard rather than replacing them.

17.3 Face recognition

Recognizing people by their facial features is the oldest identification mechanism of all, going back at least to our early primate ancestors. Biologists believe that a significant part of our cognitive function evolved to provide efficient ways of recognizing other people's facial features and expressions [1607]. For example, we are very good at detecting whether another person is looking at us or not.

The human ability to recognize faces is an important baseline for many reasons, of which one is the reliance placed on photo ID. Drivers' licenses, passports and other kinds of identity card are not only used to control entry to computer rooms directly, but also to bootstrap most other systems. The issue of a password, or a smartcard, for access to a system is often the end point of a process that was started by that person presenting photo ID when applying for a job or opening a bank account.

So how good are we at identifying strangers by photo ID, as opposed to identifying friends in the flesh?

The simple answer is that we're not. Psychologists at the University of Westminster conducted a fascinating experiment with the help of a supermarket chain and a bank [1037]. They recruited 44 students and issued each of them four credit cards each with a different photograph on it:

- one of the photos was a 'good, good' one. It was genuine and recent;
- the second was a 'bad, good one'. It was genuine but a bit old, and the student now had different clothing, hairstyle or whatever. In other words, it was typical of the photo that most people have on their photo ID;
- the third was a 'good, bad one'. From a pile of a hundred or so random photographs of different people, investigators chose the one that most looked like the subject. In other words, it was typical of the match that criminals could get with a stack of stolen cards;

- the fourth was a ‘bad, bad’ one. It was chosen at random except that it had the same sex and race as the subject. In other words, it was typical of the match that really lazy, careless criminals would get.

The experiment was conducted in a supermarket after normal business hours, but with experienced cashiers on duty, and aware of the purpose of the experiment. Each student made several trips past the checkout using different cards. It transpired that none of the checkout staff could tell the difference between ‘good, bad’ photos and ‘bad, good’ photos. In fact, some of them could not even tell the difference between ‘good, good’ and ‘bad, bad’. Now this experiment was done under optimum conditions, with experienced staff, plenty of time, and no threat of embarrassment or violence if a card was declined. Real-life performance can be expected to be worse. In fact, many stores do not pass on to their checkout staff the reward offered by credit card companies for capturing stolen cards. So even the most basic incentive is absent. Yet at least two banks that had experimented with photos on credit cards had experienced a substantial drop in fraud [155]. The conclusion was that the benefit to be had from photo ID at the time was basically its deterrent effect [689].

So maybe people won’t use their facial-recognition skills effectively in identification contexts, or maybe the information we use to identify people in social contexts is stored differently in our brains from information we get by looking at a single photo. Recognising passing strangers is in any case much harder than recognising people you know. It’s reckoned that misidentifications are the main cause of false imprisonment, with 20% of witnesses making mistakes in identity parades [2046] – not as bad as the near-random outcomes when comparing faces with photos, but still not good.

Since photo-ID doesn’t work well with human guards, many people have tried to automate the process. Attempts go back to the nineteenth century, when Francis Galton devised a series of spring-loaded “mechanical selectors” for facial measurements [738]. But automated face recognition actually subsumes a number of separate problems, in most of which we don’t have the luxury of taking careful 3-d measurements of the subject. Automated passport control booths may be the easiest: the subject looks straight at the camera under controlled lighting conditions, and their face is compared with the one on file. In forensics, we may be trying to establish whether a suspect’s face fits a low-quality recording on a security video. The hardest of all is surveillance, where we may want to scan a moving crowd of people at an airport and try to pick out anyone who is on a list of thousands of known suspects.

Early applications of face recognition were often just security theater. In 1998, the London borough of Newham placed video cameras prominently in the high street and ran a PR campaign about how their new computer system constantly scanned the faces in the crowd for several hundred known local

criminals. They got a significant reduction in reported burglary, shoplifting and street crime, but later admitted that they only had 20 or 25 villains' faces on the system, and it never recognised any of them [1284]. After 9/11, a number of places tried this. In Tampa, Florida, a similar system was abandoned in 2003 after an ACLU freedom-of-information request discovered that it had recognised no villains [1600]. Face recognition was also tried at Boston's Logan airport; passengers passing through security screening were observed and matched. The system was found to be impractical, with no useful balance between non-matches and false alarms [317]. The Illinois Department of Motor Vehicles adopted face recognition in 2003 to detect people applying for extra drivers' licenses in false names [663]. In such an application, it may be worthwhile to try to detect wrongdoers even if you only catch a quarter of them.

As a baseline, tests done in 2001 by the UK National Physical Laboratory (NPL) of a number of biometric technologies found that face recognition was almost the worst; its single-attempt equal-error rate was almost 10% [1219]. A UK Passport Office trial in 2005, which was a better approximation to field conditions, found it recognised only 69% of users (and only 48% of disabled participants) [1924]. Face recognition was still adopted by the ICAO as a standard for passports and ID cards with embedded chips; iris codes and fingerprints were optional extras. The typical installation has a row of booths relaying both live and file photos to a human operator who is alerted to suspected mismatches.

However, since the neural network revolution began in 2012, the performance of facial recognition has improved remarkably, with error rates falling by an order of magnitude. Getting through a passport booth is often a lot quicker now than in 2010, and you don't always have to take off your glasses. But what about data? The best are probably from NIST's Face Recognition Vendor Test (FRVT) that tests products against millions of law-enforcement mugshots, prison webcam images and wild photos for 1:1 verification, one-to-many identification, face morph detection and face image quality assessment. According to the 2018 report, massive gains in accuracy were achieved in 2013–2018, and largely due to the adoption of convolutional neural networks (CNNs). The most accurate algorithms will find matching entries when present, in galleries containing 12 million individuals, with a miss rate approaching 0.1%; but in about 5% of images the identification succeeds with low confidence and human adjudication is necessary. A few algorithms correctly match side-view photos to galleries of frontal photos; such *pose invariance* has been a long-sought milestone in face recognition research.

There is measurable racial bias. US-developed algorithms had significantly higher rates of false positives in one-to-one matching of Asians, African Americans and American Indians, while for one-to-many matching the

highest false positive rates were for African American females. Algorithms developed in Asia did equally well for Asians and whites. The remaining errors are in large part due to long-run ageing, facial injury, poor image quality or a second face in shot, such as a face printed on a T-shirt [829].

A 2018 study pitted face recognition algorithms against professional forensic face examiners, untrained superrecognisers (highly talented individuals), and a control group of random people. It found that both types of human expert were significantly better than the control group, and that four deep CNNs, developed between 2015 and 2017, identified faces within the range of human experts, with the most recent scoring above the median of the forensic experts. However, the best results could be achieved if algorithms and human experts worked together [1525].

As for what's under the hood, a 2019 survey paper by Guodong Guo and Na Zhang explores the use of deep learning in face image analysis and recognition, and discusses how systems handle variations in pose, age, illumination and expression [835]. Most systems are CNNs but with a range of adaptations, e.g., with multiple CNNs looking for different types of feature in different regions of two candidate faces simultaneously and an autoencoder looking for common latent features to give pose robustness; there are then various kinds of fusion, aggregation and filtering. There may also be mechanisms to correct for makeup and for facial expressions. There are complex tradeoffs in algorithm choice, with the best algorithm in ROC terms taking time linear in the gallery size, meaning half a second to match against 10m other faces; accuracy can double if three or more mugshots are available, as this enables the CNN to allow for ageing. But blur in video images is still a significant problem, as is matching still images to video and visible-light images to near-infrared.

The face-recognition revolution is continuing apace, with NIST reporting that some algorithms doubled in accuracy during 2018 alone. It is also becoming controversial. Do we face a dystopian future where every other lamp post has a 5G base station with an embedded CCTV that recognises all passers-by? All of a sudden, CCTV changes from a tool for crime-scene forensics to one that does real-time person recognition and tracking. This appears to be the Chinese vision; firms there are training cameras not just to recognise individuals but also groups, with classifiers that alert if the subject appears to be an ethnic Uighur or Tibetan. This has been interrupted by mandatory face masks during the coronavirus pandemic, but it will no doubt resume afterwards. Russia has been using its cameras to spot people breaking coronavirus quarantine orders, and claims to have deployed 178,000 of them [1911]. Even in the West, do we face a future in which the police get a feed not just from the automatic number-plate recognition systems that already track road vehicles, but a system that tracks pedestrians too? Cynics would say that mobile phone location history already works fine even if you're wearing shades or a mask, so what's the fuss about? But there are now companies with much larger collections of faces than law enforcement, as they don't face the legal restrictions, and

whose services help law enforcement solve crimes committed by people with no mugshots on file. These firms appear set to offer services more widely; they could potentially enable users of augmented-reality glasses to identify most of the people they see – whether an attractive stranger on a subway, or a protester at a demonstration. You could find out their names, where they live and what they do online. The company’s backer has a rather casual approach to privacy law: “Laws have to determine what’s legal, but you can’t ban technology. Sure, that might lead to a dystopian future or something, but you can’t ban it” [899].

The political and legal pushback has started. A family in Evanston, Illinois found that photos of their kids that they’d uploaded into Flickr in 2005 had ended up in a database called MegaFace, used to train many of the new recognition systems. This is against Illinois law, and there are now several class actions in progress. As a result, some face-tagging features on social media don’t work in Illinois (or Texas for that matter) [900]. In 2018, Google decided not to make face-recognition APIs available in its cloud platforms until their use was regulated. If you train a system on criminal mugshots, it can look at any passer-by and say ‘This robber is the closest match’. Where the police are trigger-happy, that can kill. In May 2019, San Francisco banned the use of face recognition by its agencies including the transport authority and law enforcement. In June 2020, following worldwide protests over racism and biased policing, Amazon announced a one-year pause in making its Rekognition face-recognition software available to law enforcement; their technology had been criticised for misidentifying people of colour. The ACLU had shown that Amazon’s system generated false matches of 28 members of Congress against mugshots of people who had been arrested. IBM and Microsoft also announced that they would stop selling face-recognition products [2008]. As the technology is now a commodity, the self-restraint of the big four doesn’t stop second-tier firms selling it. So the big four are now pushing for face-recognition products to be regulated. Courts are already engaged: in August 2020, the Court of Appeal in London found that the use of facial recognition by South Wales police breached privacy rights, data protection laws and equality laws [1595].

Finally, facial recognition can be enhanced with special hardware. In 2017, Apple introduced it on the iPhone X, in which a dot projector paints your face with tens of thousands of dots and a camera reads them. This deals with makeup, some sunglasses and facial hair, and was claimed to have a false acceptance rate of one in a million – as opposed to one in 50,000 for the fingerprint reader that previous iPhones used. However my eldest granddaughter’s iPhone can be unlocked by both of her younger siblings, and this is a general problem for families [526].

17.4 Fingerprints

Automatic fingerprint identification systems (AFIS) have been around for years. In 1998, they accounted for 78% of the \$50m sales of biometric

technology; this had fallen to 43.5% of \$1,539m by 2005². AFIS products look at the friction ridges that cover the fingertips and classify patterns of *minutiae* such as branches and endpoints of the ridges. Some also look at the pores in the skin of the ridges [1215].

The use of fingerprints to identify people was discovered independently a number of times. Mark Twain mentions thumbprints in 1883 in *Life on the Mississippi* where he claims to have learned about them from an old Frenchman who had been a prison-keeper; his 1894 novel *Pudd'nhead Wilson* made the idea popular in the USA. Long before that, fingerprints were accepted in a seventh-century Chinese legal code as an alternative to a seal or a signature, and required by an eighth-century Japanese code when an illiterate man wished to divorce his wife. They were also used in India centuries ago. Following the invention of the microscope, they were mentioned by the English botanist Nathaniel Grew in 1684, and by Marcello Malpighi in Italy in 1686; in 1691, 225 citizens of Londonderry in Ireland used their fingerprints to sign a petition asking King William for reparations following the siege of the city.

The first modern systematic use was in India from 1858, by William Herschel, grandson of the astronomer and a colonial magistrate. He introduced handprints and then fingerprints to sign contracts, stop impersonation of pensioners who had died, and prevent rich criminals paying poor people to serve their jail sentences for them. Henry Faulds, a medical missionary in Japan, discovered them independently in the 1870s, and came up with the idea of using latent prints from crime scenes to identify criminals. Faulds brought fingerprints to the attention of Charles Darwin, who in turn motivated Francis Galton to study them. Galton wrote an article in *Nature* [738]; this got him in touch with the retired Herschel, whose data convinced Galton that fingerprints persisted throughout a person's life. Galton went on to collect many more prints and devise a scheme for classifying their patterns [739]. The Indian history is told by Chandak Sengoopta, whose book also makes the point that fingerprinting saved two somewhat questionable Imperial institutions, namely, the indentured labor system and the opium trade [1704].

The practical introduction of the technique owes a lot to Sir Edward Henry, who had been a policeman in Bengal. He wrote a book in 1900 describing a simpler and more robust classification, of *loops*, *whorls*, *arches* and *tents*, that he had developed with his assistants Azizul Haque and Hem Chandra Bose, and that is still in use today. In the same year he became Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police in London from where the technique spread round the world³. Henry's real scientific contribution was to develop Galton's classification into an indexing system. By assigning one bit to whether or not each of

²I don't have comparable figures for 2019 as fingerprint tech is now bundled with phones or with other biometrics in systems such as Aadhaar.

³In the Spanish version of history, they were first used in Argentina where they secured a murder conviction in 1892; while Cuba, which set up its fingerprint bureau in 1907, beat the USA whose

a suspect's ten fingers had a whorl – a type of circular pattern – he divided the fingerprint files into 1024 bins. In this way, it was possible to reduce the number of records that had to be searched by orders of magnitude. Meanwhile, as Britain had stopped sending convicted felons to Australia, there was a perceived need to identify previous offenders, so that they could be given longer jail sentences.

Fingerprints are used by the world's police forces for essentially two different purposes: identifying people (their main use in the USA), and crime scene forensics (their main use in Europe).

17.4.1 Verifying positive or negative identity claims

In America nowadays – as in nineteenth-century England – quite a few criminals change their names and move somewhere new on release from prison. This is fine when offenders go straight, but what about fugitives and recidivists? American police forces have historically used fingerprints to identify arrested suspects to determine whether they're currently wanted by other agencies, whether they have criminal records and whether they've previously come to attention under other names. The FBI maintains the *Next Generation Identification* (NGI) service system for this purpose; it identifies about eight thousand fugitives a month [1813]. Anyone wanting a US government clearance at Secret or above must have an FBI fingerprint check, and checks are also run on some people applying to work with children or the elderly. Up to 100,000 checks are made a day, and about a million federal, local and state officers have access. There's a 'rap-back' service to alert the employer of anyone with a clearance who gets into trouble with the law [1380]; it's also used to track reoffending by probationers, parolees and sex offenders. The Department of Homeland Security's IDENT system holds fingerprints on 200 million aliens who have arrived at US ports; it matches them against a watch list of bad guys, compiled with the help of police forces and intelligence services worldwide.

These are examples of one type of identity verification – checking against a blacklist. The other type is where the system checks a claim to identity, with the main US applications being building entry control and welfare payment [588]. Banks have used them for years to identify customers in countries such as India and Saudi Arabia, where the use of ink fingerprints was already common thanks to high levels of illiteracy. India now has a national system, Aadhaar, with fingerprints and iris codes of most residents, designed initially to support

first conviction was in Illinois in 1911. The Croatian version notes that the Argentinian system was developed by one Juan Vucetich, who had emigrated from Dalmatia. The German version refers to Professor Purkinje of Breslau, who wrote about fingerprints in 1828. Success truly has many fathers!

welfare payments and ensure that nobody can claim twice. Its use has become mandatory for many other transactions too.

Fingerprints have never taken off for authenticating bank customers in North America or Europe, though a few US banks do ask for fingerprints if you cash a check there and are not a customer. They find this cuts check fraud by about a half. Some have gone as far as fingerprinting new customers, and found that customer resistance is less than expected, especially if they use scanners rather than ink and paper [716]. These applications are not authentication, but rather an attempt to identify and even deter customers who later turn out to be bad – another example being the large British van-hire company that demands a thumbprint when you rent a van. If the vehicle isn't returned, or if it's used in a crime, the thumbprint is given to the police. They're thus really a crime-scene forensics application, which I'll discuss in the following section.

So how good are automatic fingerprint identification systems? A good rule of thumb (if one might call it that) is that to verify a claim to identity, it may be enough to scan a single finger, while to check someone against a blacklist of millions of felons, you had better scan all ten. After the US DHS program set out to scan the two index fingers of each arriving visitor, it was overwhelmed by false matches. With 6,000,000 bad guys on the database, the false match rate in 2004 was 0.31% and the missed match rate 4% [2031]. The program moved to '10-prints', where each visitor must present the four fingers of each hand, and then both thumbs, in three successive scans. The European Union will be adopting a combination of 4-prints plus facial recognition from 2020; nonresidents will need both to get in, and either to get out.

This is all about the trade-off between false negatives and false positives – the receiver operating characteristic, described in the previous section. The better systems have an equal error rate of slightly below 1% per finger. False accepts happen because of features incorporated to reduce the false-reject rate – such as allowance for distortion and flexibility in feature selection [1613]. Spotting returning fugitives with high enough probability to deter them and high enough certainty to detain them (which means keeping false alarms at manageable levels) requires several fingers to be matched – perhaps eight out of ten. This does cause delays; a UK Passport Office study found that about 20% of participants failed to register properly when taking a 10-print, and that 10-print verification took over a minute [1924]. This is approximately my experience while flying in and out of the USA during the 2010s. The cost of fingerprinting everybody is that a US airport getting a planeload of 300 international arrivals every 15 minutes needs an extra 10 working immigration lanes. The extra building and staffing costs swamp anything spent on hardware and software. (For more on algorithms and systems, see [975,1213,1215].)

Errors are not uniformly distributed. A number of people such as manual workers and pipe smokers damage their fingerprints frequently, and both

the young and the old have faint prints [394]. Automated systems also have problems with amputees, people with birth defects such as extra fingers, and the (rare) people born without conventional fingerprint patterns at all [1122]. When I was a kid, I slashed my left middle finger while cutting an apple, and this left a scar about half an inch long. When I presented this finger to the system used in 1989 by the FBI for building entry control, my scar crashed the scanner. (It worked OK when I tried again ten years later.)

Fingerprint identification systems can be attacked in many ways. An old trick was for a crook to distract (or bribe) the officer fingerprinting him, so that the officer takes the fingers in the wrong order and instead of the hand being indexed under the Henry system as '01101' it becomes perhaps '01011', so his record isn't found and he gets the lighter sentence due a first offender [1122].

The first high-profile technical attack was in 2002, when Tsutomu Matsumoto and colleagues showed that fingerprints could be molded and cloned quickly and cheaply using cooking gelatin [1248]. He tested eleven commercially available fingerprint readers and easily fooled all of them. This prompted the German computer magazine *C'T* to test a number of biometric devices that were offered for sale at the CeBIT electronic fair in Hanover – nine fingerprint readers, one face-recognition system and one iris scanner. They were all easy to fool – the low-cost capacitive sensors fell to such simple tricks as breathing on a finger scanner to reactivate a latent print left by a previous user [1880]. Latent fingerprints can also be reactivated – or transferred – using adhesive tape. The more expensive thermal scanners could still be defeated by rubber molded fingers.

In 2013, Apple introduced a fingerprint scanner on the iPhone 5S and other phone makers raced to follow suit. Hackers duly demonstrated attacks, with a 2014 CCC presentation of a model of the German defence minister's finger, created from a photograph [314]. Scanners on phones typically store 8–12 partial prints on registration and will unlock against any of them, which makes the scanner more usable but also more vulnerable. In 2016, Aditi Roy and colleagues invented the 'masterprint': a fake fingerprint that can be worn on your fingertip and that's designed to match at least one of the partial prints derived from a typical finger; it works against 6% of users' prints [1628]. In 2017, Apple moved from fingerprints to face recognition, as I discussed above, but most Android OEMs still use fingerprints. In 2019, it turned out that a new ultrasonic scanner on the Samsung S10 enrolled the screen protector instead of the customer's finger, leading to the phone being blocked from running a number of banks' apps [467].

There are other angles too. For example, the San Bernardino shooter used an iPhone 5C, the last made without a scanner; if he'd used a later version, the FBI could have unlocked it by taking it to the morgue and pressing it against his finger, or by making a fingertip mould from his file print. And as government agencies collect more and more prints, they will be less and less private.

(The Chinese already got all US federal employees' prints via the OPM hack I discussed in section 2.2.2.) Fingerprint systems have also expanded rapidly into low-assurance applications, from entry into golf club car parks to automatic book borrowing in school libraries. (Most European countries' privacy authorities have banned fingerprint scanners in schools; Britain allows them, which causes pushback from privacy-conscious parents [191].) And the latest twist comes from a Mitre project that developed software to harvest people's fingerprints from photos they post on social media; these often show fingers in enough detail to get matches against FBI databases [322].

One final reason for the success of fingerprint identification systems is their deterrent effect, which is particularly pronounced in welfare payments. Even though the cheap fingerprint readers used to authenticate welfare claimants have an error rate as much as 5% [385], they turned out to be such an effective way of reducing the welfare rolls that they were adopted in one place after another during the nineties [1317].

17.4.2 Crime scene forensics

The second use of fingerprint recognition is in crime scene forensics – the main application in Europe. Prints found at a crime scene are matched against database records, and any that match to more than a certain level are taken as evidence that a suspect visited the crime scene. They are often enough to secure a conviction on their own. In many countries, fingerprints are required from all citizens and all resident foreigners.

The forensic error rate has become extremely controversial in recent years, the critical limitation being the size and quality of the image taken from the crime scene. The quality and procedure rules vary from one country to another. The UK used to require that fingerprints match in sixteen *points* (corresponding minutiae), and a UK police expert claimed that this will only happen by chance somewhere between one in four billion and one in ten billion matches [1122]. Greece accepts 10, Turkey 8, while the USA has no set limit (it certifies examiners instead). This means that in the USA, matches can be found with poorer quality prints but they can be open to challenge in court.

In the UK, fingerprint evidence went for almost a century without a successful challenge; a 16-point fingerprint match was considered hanging evidence. The courts' confidence was shattered by the McKie case [1275]. Shirley McKie, a Scottish policewoman, was prosecuted on the basis of a fingerprint match on the required sixteen points, verified by four examiners of the Scottish Criminal Records Office. She denied that it was her fingerprint, and found that she could not get an independent expert in Britain to support her; the profession closed ranks. She called two American examiners who presented testimony that it is not an identification. The crime scene and file prints are side-by-side at Figure 17.1.




Figure 17.1: The prints in the McKie case

She was acquitted, which led to a political drama that ran on for years [1274]. The first problem was the nature of the case against her [1275]. A number of senior police officers had tried to persuade her to make a false statement in order to explain the presence, at the scene of a gruesome murder, of the misidentified print. Her refusal to do so led to her being prosecuted for perjury, as a means of discrediting her. Her acquittal cast doubt on the reliability of police testimony, not just in her specific case but more generally. The man convicted of the murder was acquitted on appeal and sued the police for compensation. The government panicked at the prospect of dozens more appeals in other cases, and prosecuted its four fingerprint experts for perjury. That didn't get anywhere either. The issue went back to the Scottish parliament again and again. The police refused to reinstate Shirley McKie, the officers involved got promoted, and the row got ever more acrimonious. Eventually she won £750,000 compensation from the government [190].

The case led to wide discussion among experts of the value of fingerprint identification, and to fingerprint evidence being successfully challenged in a number of other countries [761]. Two high-profile cases in the USA were Stephan Cowans and Brandon Mayfield. Stephan Cowans had been convicted of shooting a police officer in 1997 following a robbery, but was acquitted on appeal six years later after he argued that his print was a misidentification and saved up enough money to have the evidence tested for DNA. The DNA didn't match, which got the Boston and State police to reanalyze the fingerprint, whereupon they realised it was not a match after all. Brandon Mayfield was an Oregon lawyer who was mistakenly identified by the FBI as one of the perpetrators of the Madrid bombing, and held for two weeks until the Madrid police arrested another man whose fingerprint was a better match. The FBI, which had called their match 'absolutely incontrovertible', agreed to pay Mayfield \$2m in 2006.

In a subsequent study, psychologist Itiel Dror showed five fingerprint examiners a pair of prints, told them they were from the Mayfield case, and asked them where the FBI had gone wrong. Three of the examiners decided that the prints did not match and pointed out why; one was unsure; and one maintained that they did match. He alone was right. The prints weren't the Mayfield set, but were in each case a pair that the examiner himself had matched in a recent criminal case [586]. Dror repeated this with six experts who each looked at eight prints, all of which they had examined for real in the previous few years. Only two of the experts remained consistent; the other four made six inconsistent decisions between them. The prints had a range of difficulty, and in only half of the cases was misleading contextual information supplied [587].

Prosecutors and police still insist to juries that forensic results are error-free, when FBI proficiency exams have long had an error rate of about one percent [206], and misleading contextual information can push this up to ten percent or in some cases over fifty percent.

Four comments are in order.

- As Figure 17.1 should make clear, fingerprint impressions are often very noisy, being obscured by dirt. So mistakes are quite possible, and the skill (and prejudices) of the examiner enter into the equation in a much bigger way than was accepted until uproar caused by the McKie and Mayfield cases. Dror's work confirmed that the cases in which misidentifications occur tend to be the difficult ones [587]. Yet the forensic culture was such that only certainty was acceptable; the International Association for Identification, the largest forensic group, held that testifying about "possible, probable or likely identification shall be deemed ... conduct unbecoming" [206].
- Even if the probability of a false match on sixteen points were one in ten billion (10^{-10}) as claimed by police optimists, once many prints are compared against each other, probability theory starts to bite. A system that worked fine in the old days as a crime scene print would be compared manually with the records of a hundred and fifty-seven known local burglars, breaks down once thousands of prints are compared every year with an online database of millions. It was inevitable that sooner or later, enough matches would have been done to find a 16-point mismatch. Indeed, as most people on the fingerprint database are petty criminals who will not be able to muster the resolute defence that Shirley McKie did, I would be surprised if there hadn't been other wrongful convictions already. And things may get worse, because European police forces now link up their biometric databases (both fingerprints and DNA) so that police forces can search for matches across all EU member states [1909]. They may eventually need more robust ways of handling false positives.

- The belief that any security mechanism is infallible creates the complacency and carelessness needed to undermine its proper use. No consideration appears to have been given to increasing the number of points required from sixteen to (say) twenty with the introduction of computer matching. Sixteen was tradition, and nobody wanted either to challenge the system or make public funds available for defendants' experts. In the UK, all the experts were policemen or former policemen, so there were no independents available for hire anyway. Even so, it would have been possible to use randomised matching with multiple experts; but if the fingerprint bureau had had to tell the defence in the perhaps 5–10% of cases when (say) one of four experts disagreed, then more defendants would have been acquitted.
- A belief of infallibility ensures that the consequences of the eventual failure will be severe. As with the Munden case described in section 12.4.3, which helped torpedo claims about cash machine security, an assumption that a security mechanism is infallible causes procedures, cultural assumptions and even laws to spring up to ensure that its eventual failure will be denied for as long as possible, and will thus have real impact when it can no longer be postponed. In the Scottish case, there appears to have arisen a hierarchical risk-averse culture in which examiners were predisposed to confirm identifications made by colleagues (especially senior colleagues). This risk aversion backfired when four of them were tried for perjury.

However, even when we do have a correct match, its implications are not always entirely obvious. Fingerprints can be transferred using adhesive tape, and moulds can be made, using techniques originally devised for police use. So it's possible that the suspect whose print is found at the crime scene was framed by another criminal (or by the police – most fabrication cases involve law-enforcement personnel rather than other suspects [255]). And even if the villain wasn't framed, he can always claim that he was (and the jury might believe him).

In the USA, the Supreme Court in its Daubert judgment held that trial judges should screen the principles and methodology behind forensic evidence to ensure it is relevant and reliable [516]. The judge ought to consider the refereed scientific literature – and in the case of fingerprints this has been lacking, as law enforcement agencies have been generally unwilling to submit their examination procedures to rigorous double-blind testing. A number of Daubert hearings relating to forensic fingerprint evidence have been held in US trials, and the FBI has generally prevailed [762]. However, the bureau's traditional line that fingerprint examination has a zero error rate is now widely ridiculed [1813].

17.5 Iris codes

We turn now from the traditional ways of identifying people to the modern and innovative. Recognizing people by the patterns in the irises of their eyes has far and away the best error rates of any automated biometric system when measured under lab conditions. The initial research was funded by the Department of Energy, which wanted the best possible way of securing entry to premises such as plutonium stores, and the technology is now used in applications from immigration to welfare. The international standards for machine-readable travel documents mandate the use of photographs, and permit both fingerprints and irises.

So far as is known, every human iris is measurably unique. It is fairly easy to detect in a video picture, it does not wear out, and it is isolated from the external environment by the cornea (which in turn has its own cleaning mechanism). The iris pattern contains a large amount of randomness, and appears to have many times the number of degrees of freedom of a fingerprint. It is formed between the third and eighth months of gestation, and (like the fingerprint pattern) appears to be under limited genetic influence; the mechanisms that form it appear to be chaotic. The patterns are different even for identical twins (and for the two eyes of a single individual), and they appear to be stable throughout life.

Leonard Flom and Aran Safir patented the idea of an iris identification system in 1987, observing that every iris is different. In 1993, John Daugman figured out how to make the idea work, developing signal-processing techniques that extract the information from an image of the iris into a 256 byte *iris code*. This involves a circular wavelet transform taken at a number of concentric rings between the pupil and the outside of the iris (Figure 17.2). The resulting iris codes have the neat property that two codes computed from the same iris will typically match in 90% of their bits [517]. This is much simpler than in fingerprint scanners where orienting and classifying the minutiae is a fiddly computational task. The speed and accuracy of iris coding, and the expiry of the Daugman patents, have led to a number of commercial iris recognition products [2000]. Iris codes provide the lowest false-accept rates of any known verification system – zero, in tests conducted by both the US Department of Energy and the NPL [1219]. The equal error rate has been shown to be better than one in a million, and if one is prepared to tolerate a false-reject rate of one in ten thousand, then the theoretical false-accept rate would be less than one in a trillion. In practice, the false-reject rate is significantly higher than this; many things, from eyelashes to hangovers, can cause the camera to not see enough of the iris. The US Department of Defense found a 6% false-reject rate in its 2002 field trials [1260]; a UK Passport Office trial found 4% for normal users and 9% for disabled users [1924]. A further problem is failure to enrol; the Passport




Figure 17.2: an iris with iris code (courtesy John Daugman)

Office trial failed to enrol 10% of participants, and the rate was higher among black users, the over-60s and the disabled.

One practical problem with iris scanning used to be getting the picture cheaply without being too intrusive. The iris is small (less than half an inch) and an image with several hundred pixels of iris is needed. A cooperative subject can place his eye within a few inches of a video camera, and the best standard equipment will work up to a distance of two or three feet. All current iris scanning systems use infrared light, and some people feel uncomfortable when this is shone in their eyes. Given more sophisticated cameras, with automatic facial feature recognition, pan and zoom, it is now possible to capture iris codes from airline passengers covertly as they walk along a corridor [1242], and the cost came down after the key patent ran out in 2011.

The first large-scale deployment was in the United Arab Emirates, which wanted to track people expelled from the country, particularly for prostitution offences. Expellees would turn up again some weeks later with new and completely valid passports from certain Asian countries, obtained by corruption. Since its deployment in 2003, this has led to the detention of over 330,000 people attempting to enter the country despite a ban or with false papers.

The largest deployment is the Aadhaar system in India, under which all residents had their fingerprints and irises scanned. They get an Aadhaar card with

a 10-digit number that enables a verifier to look up their profile in a database. The initial motivation for the project was to enable the 300 million Indians who live below the poverty line and get welfare, to move into the cities to seek work. Previously welfare was only available in their towns or villages. The system enrolled a billion people between 2011 and 2016, and all iris codes were checked against each other for uniqueness. Aadhaar is now mandatory for many purposes, and the collected fingerprints are also made available to the police for crime scene forensics.

Possible attacks on iris recognition systems include – in unattended operation at least – a simple photograph of the target’s iris. There are terminals that will detect such simple fakes, for example by measuring *hippus* – a natural fluctuation in the diameter of the pupil that happens at about 0.5 Hz. But the widely-sold cheap terminals don’t do this, and if liveness detection became widespread then no doubt attackers would try more sophisticated tricks, such as printing the target’s iris patterns on a contact lens.

The system in active use the longest is the UAE’s system for detecting deportees who return with false papers. A typical attack was for the returning deportee to take atropine eyedrops on the plane, dilating her pupils; nowadays such travelers are held in custody until their eyes return to normal. As for Aadhaar, the main abuses and disputes happen around the system rather than through it. In 2019, a hot issue is the authorities’ reluctance to register Muslims in Assam and other border regions, part of a larger policy of trying to portray them as illegal immigrants. The Supreme Court of India has ruled that services should not be withheld from people who are not registered, but this has not stopped registration being a requirement in practice for opening a bank account, buying a phone or SIM card, and school enrolment.

Despite the difficulties, iris codes are in some sense the most powerful biometric as they can, in the correct circumstances, assure you that the individual in front of you is the same human as the one whose iris was initially registered. They alone can meet the goal of automatic recognition with zero false acceptances.

17.6 Voice recognition and morphing

Voice recognition – also known as *speaker recognition* – is the problem of identifying a speaker from a short utterance. While *speech recognition* systems are concerned with transcribing speech and need to ignore speech idiosyncrasies, voice recognition systems need to amplify and classify them. There are many subproblems, such as whether the recognition is text-dependent or not, whether the environment is noisy, whether operation must be real time and whether one needs only to verify speakers or to recognize them from a large set.

As with fingerprints, the technology is used for both identification and forensics. In *forensic phonology*, the task is usually to match a recorded telephone conversation, such as a bomb threat, to speech samples from a number of suspects. Typical techniques involve filtering and extracting features from the spectrum; for more details see [1060]. A more straightforward biometric authentication objective is to verify a claim to identity in some telephone systems. These range from telephone banking to the identification of military personnel, with the NSA maintaining a standard corpus of test data for evaluating speaker recognition systems. In the UK, asylum seekers are required to ring in several times every week [1906]. Such systems tend to use caller-ID to establish where people are, and are also used for people like football hooligans who're under court orders not to go to certain places at certain times. The only system I've used personally is run by one of the banks I use, and authenticates you to their phone app when you change your phone. But a major UK bank was embarrassed when it fielded a voice biometric system in a phone app in 2016, only to have it broken the following year by a BBC reporter who got his non-identical twin to mimic his voice [1748].

Quite apart from the possibility that a relative or a villain might somehow manage to imitate you, there are some powerful attacks. In [730] there is a description of a 1990s system fielded in US EP-3 aircraft that breaks up intercepted messages from enemy aircraft and ground controllers into quarter second segments that are then cut and pasted to provide new, deceptive messages. That was primitive compared with what can now be done two decades later. There are now many videos online of public figures appearing to say inappropriate things, and 'Deepfake' editing software now enables such voice and image morphing to be done in near real time. Most recently, criminals used AI to impersonate a chief executive's voice and order a payment of €220,000: the victim of that deception wasn't even a machine, but another executive [1845]. This may be the first case of voice morphing software being used in a real fraud; we can be sure it won't be the last.

17.7 Other systems

Many other biometric technologies have been proposed [1317]. Typing patterns were used in products in the 1980s but don't appear to have been successful (typing patterns, also known as keystroke dynamics, had a famous precursor in the wartime technique of identifying wireless telegraphy operators by their *fist*, the way in which they used a Morse key). Vein patterns have been used in one or two systems but don't seem to have been widely sold (in the NPL trials, the vein was the worst of the lot [1219]). Hand geometry was used for a while in some airports, and has a historic predecessor in the system of Bertillonage,

whereby the French police in the 19th century identified criminals by a system of physical measurements.

There has been growing interest recently in *stylometry*, the science of identifying authors, whether of text or of code, from their writing styles. This goes back at least a century; as a young man, the famous cryptologist William Friedman was hired along with his wife Elizebeth by an eccentric millionaire to study whether Bacon wrote Shakespeare. (They eventually debunked the idea but got interested in cryptography in the process.) Computers make it possible to run ever more subtle statistical tests, and modern applications range from trying to identify people who post to cybercrime markets and extremist web forums to the detection of plagiarism by college students [3]. Researchers have shown that people can change their writing styles enough to defeat simple stylometry if they try [319]. But most people don't, and with a bit more work, the fact of an attempted obfuscation can usually be detected [28]. Stylometry also extends to code; programmers can be recognised from their coding style [372].

Other proposals include *facial thermograms* (maps of the surface temperature of the face, derived from infrared images), the shape of the ear, gait, lip prints and electrocardiograms. Bertillon used the shape of the ear in nineteenth-century Paris. And perhaps the huge investment in developing digital noses for quality control in the food and drink industries may lead to personal devices that recognize their master by scent.

One final biometric deserves mention – DNA. This has become a valuable tool for crime scene forensics and for determining parenthood in child support cases, but it is way too slow and expensive for real-time applications. Being genotypic rather than phenotypic, its accuracy is limited by the incidence of monozygotic twins: about one white person in 120 has an identical twin. There's also a privacy problem in that it is possible to reconstruct a growing amount of information about an individual from their DNA sample. There have been major procedural problems, with false matches resulting from sloppy lab procedure. And there are also major data quality problems; the UK police have the biggest DNA database in the world, with records on almost six million people, but got the names misspelled or even wrong for about half a million of them [880]. They also had court judgments against them for retaining the DNA of innocent people, from acquitted suspects to bystanders [103]. The processes that work for local policing don't always scale nationally – small errors from mistyped records, to suspects giving false names that were never discovered because they weren't prosecuted, accumulate along with lab errors until the false-positive rate becomes a serious operational and political issue. In this context, many were concerned when in 2019, a Florida detective managed to get a warrant to search all million records held by a private DNA testing company GEDmatch [901]. It will be interesting to see whether this undermines the business of the larger consumer

DNA firms, such as 23andMe and ancestry.com, enough for them to lobby for stronger privacy laws.

17.8 What goes wrong

As with other aspects of security, we find the usual crop of failures due to bugs, blunders and complacency. In section 3.4.9 I noted a report that the firm which supplies biometric building entry control systems to 5,700 organisations in 83 countries left its database unprotected online. And the second time Uber lost its London operating licence, it was because they failed to stop banned drivers re-registering, thanks to a photo checking bug [311]. And the main problem faced by DNA typing was an initially high rate of false positives, due to careless laboratory procedure. This led to disputed court cases and miscarriages of justice. As with fingerprints, any system that's believed to be infallible will make its operators careless enough to break it.

Biometrics are also like many other physical protection mechanisms (alarms, seals, tamper sensing enclosures, ...) in that environmental conditions can cause havoc. Noise, dirt, vibration and unreliable lighting conditions all take their toll. Some systems, like speaker recognition, are vulnerable to alcohol intake and stress. Changes in environmental assumptions, such as from closed to open systems, from small systems to large ones, from attended to stand-alone, from cooperative to recalcitrant subjects, and from verification to identification, can all break things.

Many interesting attacks are more specific to biometric systems and apply to more than one type of biometric.

- Forensic biometrics often don't tell as much as one might assume. Apart from the possibility that a fingerprint or DNA sample might have been planted by the police, it may just be old. The age of a fingerprint can't be determined directly, and prints on areas with public access say little. A print on a bank door says much less than a print in a robbed vault. So in premises vulnerable to robbery, cleaning procedures may be critical for evidence. If a suspect's prints are found on a bank counter, and he claims that he had gone there three days previously, he may be convicted by evidence that the branch counter is polished every evening. Putting this in system terms, freshness is often a critical issue, and some quite unexpected things can find themselves inside the 'trusted computing base'.
- Another aspect of freshness is that most biometric systems can, at least in theory, be attacked using suitable recordings. We mentioned direct attacks on voice recognition, attacks on iris scanners by photos on a contact lens, and moulds of fingerprints. Even simpler still, in countries like South Africa where fingerprints are used to pay pensions, there

are persistent tales of ‘Granny’s finger in the pickle jar’ being the most valuable property she bequeathed to her family. The lesson to be learned here is that unattended operation of biometric authentication devices is tricky. Attacks aren’t always straightforward; although it’s easy to make a mould from a good fingerprint [408], the casual prints that people leave lying around on doorknobs, beer glasses and so on are often too smudged and fragmentary to pass an identification system. But attacks are definitely possible, and definitely happen. Defences are also possible; voice recognition systems can demand that you read out an unpredictable challenge to thwart recordings, while one version of the app that EU citizens use to apply for residence in the UK post-Brexit took a video of your face as colours change on the phone screen in front of you.

- Most biometrics are not as accurate for all people, and some of the population can’t be identified as reliably as the rest (or even at all). The elderly, and manual workers, often have damaged or abraded fingerprints; there’s a tradition of hardcore criminals doing this deliberately. People with dark eyes, and large pupils, give poorer iris codes. Disabled people with no fingers, or no eyes, risk exclusion. (That’s one reason Aadhaar uses both irises and fingerprints.) Illiterates who make an ‘X’ are more at risk from signature forgery. Biometric engineers sometimes refer to such subjects dismissively as ‘goats’, but this is foolish and discriminatory. A biometric system that is (or is seen to be) socially regressive – that puts the disabled, the poor, the old and ethnic minorities at greater risk of impersonation – should meet with principled resistance. It might be defeated by legal challenges [1555]. It may also be defeated by villains who pretend to be disabled. And sometimes the lack of heed for minority population groups is so offensive as to be unlawful. For example, in 2019 the UK Home Office deployed a passport app despite knowing that it didn’t work properly for black people [1954].
- A point that follows from this is that systems may be vulnerable to collusion. Alice opens a bank account and her accomplice Betty withdraws money from it; Alice then complains of theft and produces a watertight alibi. Quite apart from simply letting Betty take a rubber impression of her fingertip, Alice might voluntarily decrease handwriting ability; by giving several slightly different childish sample signatures, she can force the machine to accept a lower threshold than usual. She can spend a couple of weeks building a wall in her garden, and wear her fingerprints flat, so as to degrade registration in a fingerprint system. She might register for a voice recognition system when drunk.

- The next issue is compulsion. If you get arrested in China, and since August 2020 in Hong Kong, the police will hold your finger to your phone to unlock it. If it uses face recognition, they'll pin your head and point your phone at you; if you want to resist, you have to close your eyes and scrunch up your face [1350].
- The statistics are often not understood by system designers, and the birthday theorem is a big soft spot. With 10,000 biometrics in a database, for example, there are about 50,000,000 pairs. So even with a false-accept rate of only one in a million, the likelihood of there being at least one false match will rise above one-half as soon as there are somewhat over a thousand people enrolled⁴. So identification is a lot tougher than verification. The practical consequence is that a system designed for authentication may fail when you try to rely on it for evidence.
- Another aspect of statistics comes into play when designers assume that by combining biometrics they can get a lower error rate. But a combination will often improve either the false-accept rate or the false-reject rate, while making the other worse. If you install two different burglar alarms at your home, then the probability that they will be simultaneously defeated goes down while the number of false alarms goes up.
- The statistics are often somewhat uneven, so that as well as so-called 'goats', whose biometrics typically fall outside the normal parameter range, there may be 'lambs' who are particularly easy to impersonate, and 'wolves' who are particularly good at impersonating others. So it is vital to test systems thoroughly on substantial and diverse populations before deployment.
- Many vendors have claimed that their products protect privacy, as what's stored is not the image of your face or fingerprint or iris, but rather a template that's derived from it, somewhat like a one-way hash, and from which you can't be identified. It's been argued from this that biometric data are not personal data, in terms of privacy law, and can thus be passed around without restriction. These claims were exploded by Andy Adler who came up with an interesting *hill-climbing attack* on face recognition systems. Given a recogniser that outputs how close an input image is to a target template, the input face is successively altered to increase the match. With the tested systems, this led rapidly to a recognizable image of the target – a printout of which would be accepted as the target's face [24].

⁴More precisely, 1177: a false match pairing in a database of N people becomes likelier than not as soon as $N > \sqrt{1.386/f}$ where f is the single false-match rate, here 10^{-6} [519]. Check: 1177 people make $1177 \times 1176 / 2 = 692,076$ pairings, and the probability that none of these makes a false match is: $0.999999^{692,076} = 0.500$.

He then showed how this hill-climbing technique could be used to attack other biometrics, including some based on fingerprints [25].

- It's worth thinking what happens when humans and computers disagree. Iris data can't be matched by unaided humans at all; most of the iris code is derived from phase information to which the human eye is not sensitive. But what happens when a guard and a program disagree on whether a subject's face matches a file photo? Psychologists advise that biometric systems should be used in ways that support and empower human cognition and that work within our social norms [586]. Yet we engineers often find it easier to treat the users as a nuisance that must adapt to our technology. This may degrade the performance of the humans. For example, when an automated fingerprint database pulls out what it thinks is the most likely print and presents it to the examiner: is he not likely to be biased in its favour? Would it not perhaps be better for the computer to test the examiner's alertness constantly by giving him the three best matches plus two poor matches, or would that be too annoying?
- Finally, Christian fundamentalists are uneasy about biometrics. They find Revelation 13:16-18 talking about the Antichrist: 'And he causes all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and slave, to receive a mark on their right hand or on their foreheads, and that no one may buy or sell except one who has the mark or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.'

So there are some non-trivial problems. But biometrics have now gone mainstream, and a good security engineer needs to know how to use them appropriately.

17.9 Summary

Biometric measures of one kind or another have been used to identify people since ancient times, with handwritten signatures, facial features and fingerprints being the traditional methods. Three systems are now deployed at scale: fingerprint recognition on our phones, iris recognition in India and the Middle East, and facial recognition – which has become rapidly more accurate thanks to the neural network revolution. These systems have different strengths and weaknesses, and the statistics of error rates can be deceptively difficult.

When a biometric becomes very widely used, there may be an increased risk of forgery in unattended operation: photographs of irises, fingerprint moulds and even good old-fashioned forged signatures must all be thought of in system design. Context matters; even a weak biometric like handwritten signature verification can be effective if it is well embedded in the social and legal matrix.

Biometrics are usually more powerful in attended operation, where with good system design the relative strengths and weaknesses of the human and the machine may complement one another. Forensic uses are problematic, and courts are much less blindly trusting of even fingerprint evidence than they were ten years ago. Historically, many biometric systems achieved most of their effect by deterring criminals rather than actually identifying them. And although there's now the prospect of identifying people at scale from face recognition, and authoritarian countries like Russia and China are doing it, there's now serious debate about whether we should allow the large-scale routine use of this technology in democracies.

Research problems

Many practical research problems relate to the design, or improvement, of biometric systems. The hot topic in 2019 is the scalability of mass surveillance CCTV systems, and the policy questions this raises about privacy, autonomy and sovereignty. Given that facial recognition technology is still improving rapidly and finding new applications, the debate is likely to run for some time and to drive technical research on related topics.

One idea I thought up while writing this chapter for the first edition in 2000 was instrumenting a car so as to identify a driver by the way in which he operated the gears and the clutch. If your car thinks it's been stolen, it phones a control center that calls you to check. There is now research showing that users of haptic systems can be recognised by the way in which they use tools [1480]. So here's another idea. Can we identify humans, and AI/ML systems, by other learned skills? For example, the quote at the head of this chapter – where the Ephraimites were spotted and killed for their inability to say the Hebrew letter 'shin' – is actually about a skill that people learn when young or, with more difficulty, as an adult. The ability to speak a language fluently in the local dialect is one of the most universal and visceral ways of identifying the in-group from the out-group. The cool crowd speak the latest slang and dance the latest dance. Now that robots, as well as humans, have skills that are acquired only with effort, does this lead anywhere interesting?

Further reading

The standard British history of fingerprints is by Commander G.T.C. Lambourne [1122], while the history in India is told by Chandak Sengupta [1704]. The McKie case is described in a book by Ian McKie and Michael Russella [1275]. A good technical reference on automated fingerprint

identification systems is the book by Davide Maltoni, Dario Maio, Anil Jain and Salil Prabhakar [1215]. As for facial recognition, see Guodong Guo and Na Zhang [835]. The standard work on iris codes is by John Daugman [517]. For speaker recognition forensics, see Richard Klevans and Robert Rodman [1060].

As for the future, the US Department of Homeland Security is building a new Homeland Advanced Recognition Technology (HART) database that will include multiple forms of biometrics, from face recognition to DNA, and consolidate records on both US residents and foreigners; there's a description and a discussion of the policy implications by the EFF [1198]. And the errors in biometric forensics are mirrored in other forensic techniques; a 2009 report from the US National Research Council showed that apart from DNA analysis, most forensic methods were unreliable in various ways, relating not only to the underlying science and technology but also to the fragmented nature of forensic practice, the lack of standards and poor governance [1415]. As a recent example, Sophie Nightingale and Hany Farid found that a common method of identifying denim clothes by seam patterns was nowhere near as reliable or reproducible as forensic examiners had claimed for many years [1449].