

MINEX
An Evaluation based Program for the Improvement of Minutiae
Interoperability

MINEX II

An Assessment of ISO/IEC 7816 Card Based
Match on Card Capabilities

Patrick Grother and Wayne Salamon
NIST

July 11, 2007

1

Version History

July 12, 2007. Schedule deleted here, and moved to newly establish MINEX II homepage: http://fingerprint.nist.gov/minexII
July 11, 2007. The final set of changes are: – Clarification that the BIT structure is a read only entity in MINEX II. NIST does not intend to update the BIT, nor require card to support updating of the BIT. This means that the finger position information in the BIT will often be incorrect. – Fix datatype for PC based similarity score with that specified for card i.e. use two byte unsigned Integer similarity scores both on card and off card. – Fix match_templates() function - template sizes input values were missing. – Only one BIT required, if the two would otherwise be identical. – Tag '83' is now optional in BIT. – Typos, clarifications.
June 29, 2007. This MOC test specification is a heavily revised version of the May 24 draft. It has been produced in response to the many comments received, and the decisions made at a NIST workshop. A short final comment period will close on July 5, 2007, and a final plan released on July 9. Please note the main changes: – Corrected card APDUs (sec. 8). – PC/SC card reader named (sec 6.3). – Adoption of modified Ongoing MINEX API (sec. 9). – Use of INCITS 378 templates with quality values as progenitors of ISO CC templates (secs. 6.4 and 7.2). Abandon ISO CC generation because ISO CC doesn't have quality values. – Clarified intent of minutia quality values (sec. 7.2.2) – Refined text on how pruning proceeds (sec 10.4). – Allow template generator to return a center for pruning (sec. 10.4.4)
May 24, 2007. This interim version is available for comment until May 31, 2007. The changes from May 8 are shown in blue.
May 8, 2007. NIST is pleased to announce the availability of this draft evaluation plan. The entire content of this document is subject to revision. NIST specifically requests reviewers of the document to submit comments to the authors. These may include suggestions to add, subtract, or change its content.
March 12, 2007. NIST requested comments on the feasibility of MOC. NIST is most appreciative of the numerous, enthusiastic and helpful responses.

2

3

Provisional Timeline

October 1	Phase 2 submission period	Tentative
Late September	Workshop to discuss Phase 1	
Sept 21	Return of Phase 1 results to suppliers	
Sept 11 13	Biometrics Consortium, Baltimore MD	
July 11 Sep 10	NIST will accept applications to participate in Phase 1. This phase will include acceptance testing and execution of Phase 1 trials.	
July 11	Establishment of MINEX II website, http://fingerprint.nist.gov/minexII	
July 9	Final test plan	
July 5	End of comment period	
June 28	Release of draft test plan. NIST invites comments from interested parties.	
May 31	Comment period closes	Past
May 24	sBMOC Workshop at NIST	
May 9	First draft MINEX II, ISO CC + MOC Test Plan	
March 29	Comment period closed	
March 12	MOC Concept document + RFP	

1 Table of Contents

2	1.	Overview	6
3	2.	Scope	6
4	3.	Normative References	7
5	4.	Caution	8
6	4.1.	Relationship between MINEX II and other issues	8
7	4.2.	Relationship between MINEX II and Ongoing MINEX	8
8	5.	Abbreviations.....	8
9	6.	Aspects of the test	9
10	6.1.	Match on card vs. match off card	9
11	6.2.	Fundamental concept of the test	9
12	6.3.	Generic interface hardware and software	9
13	6.4.	INCITS 378:2004 vs. ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 Compact Card	10
14	6.5.	BIT Processing.....	10
15	6.6.	Card matcher combinations.....	10
16	6.7.	Two phase testing.....	10
17	6.8.	Options for participation.....	11
18	6.9.	Three way interoperability	11
19	6.10.	Metrics	11
20	6.11.	Participation	11
21	7.	Profile of MINEX II templates	12
22	7.1.	Overview	12
23	7.2.	INCITS 378:2004 profile	12
24	7.3.	ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 compact card structure.....	13
25	7.4.	Non presence of a header	14
26	7.5.	Minutia uniqueness.....	14
27	7.6.	Failure to acquire	14
28	8.	MOC interface specification	14
29	8.1.	Overview	14
30	8.2.	Approach to the use of ISO/IEC 7816	14
31	8.3.	Establish Communications	14
32	8.4.	Selection of the test application	14
33	8.5.	Store enrollment template on the card	15
34	8.6.	NIST read of the BIT	15
35	8.7.	Verification.....	17
36	8.8.	Reading card identifier.....	19
37	8.9.	Reading matcher identifier	19
38	9.	PC based API specification.....	19
39	9.1.	Overview	19
40	9.2.	INCITS 378:2004 compliant templates.....	20
41	9.3.	Submission	20
42	9.4.	Testing interface	20
43	9.5.	Software and Documentation	22
44	9.6.	Runtime behavior	23
45	10.	NIST conversion of I378 to ISO CC templates.....	24
46	10.1.	Background	24
47	10.2.	Presence of BITs on card.....	24
48	10.3.	Use of BITs.....	24
49	10.4.	Number of minutiae	25
50	10.5.	Sort order of minutiae.....	27
51	10.6.	Ridge count, core and delta and zonal quality information	27
52	11.	References	27
53	Annex A	Comparison of the INCITS 378 and ISO/IEC 19794 2 standards	28
54	A.1	Syntactic differences	28
55	A.2	Semantic differences	28

1	A.3	Simulation protocol	29
2	A.4	Results after re quantization of angle and position	30
3	A.5	Results after reduction in number of minutiae	30
4	A.6	Conclusions	31
5	Annex B	Three way interoperability	33
6	Annex C	Input fingerprint image specifications	35
7	C.1	Format	35
8	C.2	Resolution and dimensions	35
9	C.3	Sensor and impression types	35
10	Annex D	Error Codes and Handling	36
11	Annex E	Predefined SDK Constants	37
12	E.1	Pre defined values	37
13	Annex F	Ambiguities in the standards.....	38
14	F.1	Compact card sorting.....	38
15	F.2	Unique minutia	38
16	F.3	No support for placing reference data on the card	38
17	Annex G	ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 record profile.....	39
18	Annex H	Application to participate in MINEX II.....	41
19	H.1	Who should participate.....	41
20	H.2	How to participate	41
21	H.3	NIST activity.....	41
22	H.4	Points of contact	42
23	H.5	Access to MINEX II validation data	42
24	H.6	Access to MINEX II test data	43
25	H.7	Reporting of results.....	43
26	H.8	Return of the supplied materials.....	43
27	H.9	Agreement to participate.....	44
28	Annex I	NIST mailing address	46
29			

30 List of Figures

31	Figure 1 - Conversion of INCITS 378 to ISO CC	24
32	Figure 2 Use of INCITS 378 for simulation of ISO CC accuracy.....	29
33	Figure 3 - Effect of minutia pruning on FNMR (above) and FMR (below)	32
34	Figure 4 - Native vs. Two way vs. Three way Interoperability	33
35	Figure 5 - Fingerprint image raster scan order	35
36		

37 List of Tables

38	Table 1 - Family of MINEX evaluations	6
39	Table 2 - Abbreviations.....	8
40	Table 3 - MINEX II classes of participation	11
41	Table 4 - MINEX II profile of INCITS 378:2004 standard	12
42	Table 5 - MINEX II profile of ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 standard	13
43	Table 6 - ISO/IEC 19794 2 minutiae template DO	13
44	Table 7 - Command APDU for selection of MOC application.....	14
45	Table 8 - Response APDU from selection of MOC application	15
46	Table 9 - Command APDU for storage of reference template	15
47	Table 10 - Response APDU from storage of reference template	15
48	Table 11 - Command APDU for retrieval of biometric information template.....	15
49	Table 12 - Response APDU from retrieval of biometric information template	16
50	Table 13 ISO/IEC 19794 2 Biometric Information Template	16
51	Table 14 - Command APDU for comparison of biometric templates	17
52	Table 15 - Response APDU from comparison of biometric templates	18
53	Table 16 - Command APDU for retrieval of verification similarity score	18
54	Table 17 - Response APDU for retrieval of verification similarity score	18

1	Table 18 - Command APDU for retrieval of Card identifier	19
2	Table 19 - Response APDU for retrieval of Card identifier	19
3	Table 20 - Command APDU for retrieval of Matcher identifier	19
4	Table 21 - Response APDU for retrieval of Matcher identifier	19
5	Table 22 - NFIQ Mappings	20
6	Table 23 - MINEX create_template API Function	20
7	Table 24 - MINEX API match_templates function	21
8	Table 25 - MINEX API get_pids function	22
9	Table 26 - Minutia encodings of the ISO CC and INCITS 378	28
10	Table 27 - Minutia location quantization of ISO CC and INCITS 378 templates	28
11	Table 28 - Minutia angle quantization of ISO CC and INCITS 378 templates	28
12	Table 29 - Source code for conversion of INCITS 378 to ISO CC	29
13	Table 30 - Relative accuracy of ISO CC and INCITS 378 templates (Fixed FMR)	30
14	Table 31 - Relative accuracy of ISO CC and INCITS 378 templates (fixed t)	30
15	Table 32 - MINEX API return codes	36
16	Table 33 - MINEX API predefined values	37
17	Table 34 - ISO/IEC 19794 2 and ISO/IEC 7816 11 finger position codes	37
18	Table 35 - MINEX II profile of ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 standard	39
19	Table 36 - ISO/IEC 19794 2 minutiae template DO	39
20	Table 37 - Zonal quality data	40

21

22

23

24

25

26 Acknowledgements

27 The authors are grateful to the following contributors, and other anonymous individuals, without whose input
28 this document would not have been concluded.

29 A

30 B ...

1. Overview

The MINEX program is intended to improve template based interoperability from the state reported in MINEX 04¹ and MTIT² toward that achievable with image based implementations. The approach is to conduct several trials, MINEX II, III, IV etc, each of which will embed development, evaluation, targeted feedback and consultation activities between NIST, industry and other interested parties. Within scope is anything to do with fingerprint minutiae as an interoperable biometric for identity management. Typical outcomes will be measurements of accuracy, processing time, template size, and proposals to revise the relevant standards, studies of utility of quality measures, calibration information, and new metrics.

Table 1 gives an overview of the various MINEX activities at NIST, and a context for future work, starting with MINEX II.

Table 1 - Family of MINEX evaluations

MINEX I (MINEX 04 ¹)	This test was conducted as an initial comparison of image vs. minutia based interoperability. It assessed the core algorithmic ability of fingerprint matcher Z to compare minutiae templates from sources X and Y. It compared that case with fully proprietary templates on the same sets of archival data. The test adopted the INCITS 378 template as a base standard. The test is now closed. http://fingerprint.nist.gov/minex04
Ongoing MINEX ³	Ongoing MINEX is a continuing program of interoperability assessment intended to measure conformance and interoperability of INCITS 378:2004 samples. The test uses one expanded partition of the MINEX 04 data to formulate interoperable groups of matchers and template generators. One client of Ongoing MINEX is the US Government's PIV program which has its own set of criteria against which the interoperable group is formed. The test results are available to other applications or programs which may elect to set their own criteria for interoperable performance. The test remains open.
MINEX II	MINEX II will consider Match on Card capabilities using ISO/IEC 19794 2 compact card templates. These will be produced from parent INCITS 378:2004 records. In addition, because NIST considers the compact card template small enough to be rapidly read from a card, the study may be useful for organizations considering Match off Card applications. The test design is complete. This document is intended to be the definitive MINEX II test plan. Errata will be posted on http://fingerprint.nist.gov/minexII
MINEX III	A future program, to be announced in the summer 2007, will return to the issue of core minutia interoperability. The scope is yet to be finalized, but it is likely to focus on development and exploitation of the minutia quality value.

2. Scope

MINEX II is intended to measure the core algorithmic capabilities of fingerprint matching algorithms running on standardized ISO/IEC 7816 smart cards. Specifically the test will

- instantiate a mechanism for MOC testing,
- measure the accuracy of match on card (MOC) implementations using ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 compact card minutiae templates,
- time the various operations,
- test the viability of INCITS 378 to ISO/IEC 19794 2 compact card transcoding,

¹ Minutiae Interoperability Exchange Test, MINEX, [NIST Interagency Report 7296](#), March 21, 2006.

² Minutiae Template Interoperability Testing, <http://www.mtitproject.com>

³ See the Ongoing MINEX Homepage at <http://fingerprint.nist.gov/minex>

- 1 — formulate comments toward possible revision of the relevant standards, and
- 2 — test conformance to the INCITS 378:2004 record format, as profiled herein.
- 3 The primary outputs of the test will be statements of performance using the following metrics.
- 4 — False non match and false match error rates,
- 5 — Off card template generation times,
- 6 — On card matching times.
- 7 In so doing, this evaluation
- 8 — requires production of INCITS 378:2004 templates, and
- 9 — uses NIST's open source transcoder to convert INCITS 378:2004 templates to ISO/IEC 19794 2 compact
- 10 card format for matching,
- 11 Not in the scope of this evaluation, but the subject of a [separate activity](#)⁴ at NIST is:
- 12 — securing the communications channel, including cryptographic protection of the biometric templates;
- 13 — template integrity protection using digital signatures;
- 14 — authentication of the card to the reader;
- 15 — contactless communications;
- 16 The following are specifically not within the current scope of this evaluation:
- 17 — The ISO/IEC 19794 2 "record" and "card normal" templates,
- 18 — Ridge count, core and delta, and zonal quality extensions,
- 19 — Non standard extensions to any standardized minutia format,
- 20 — Evaluation of readers, including performance, conformance and interoperability,
- 21 — Evaluation of ruggedness or durability of the card,
- 22 — On card template generation (i.e. extraction of minutiae from images),
- 23 — Template update or adaptation,
- 24 — Although the test will use ISO/IEC 7816 parts 4 and 11, and conformance to this subset will be a
- 25 requirement, this study does not constitute a formal test of conformance to any part of ISO/IEC 7816, and
- 26 — Devices not conforming to ISO/IEC 7816, including all sense on card devices that embed proprietary
- 27 template formats.

28 3. Normative References

- 29 The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this document. For dated
30 references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced
31 document (including any amendments) applies.
- 32 — INCITS 378:2004 — American National Standard for Information Technology — Finger Minutiae Format for
 - 33 Data Interchange
 - 34 — ISO/IEC 7816 4:2005 — Identification cards — Integrated circuit cards — Part 4: Organization, security and
 - 35 commands for interchange
 - 36 — ISO/IEC 7816 6:2005 — Identification cards — Integrated circuit cards — Part 6: Interindustry data
 - 37 elements for interchange
 - 38 — ISO/IEC 7816 11:2004 — Identification cards — Integrated circuit cards — Part 11: Personal verification
 - 39 through biometric methods

⁴ See documents linked from here: http://csrc.nist.gov/piv_program/

- 1 — ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 — Information technology — Biometric data interchange formats — Part 2: Finger
- 2 minutiae data
- 3 — ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005/Cor.1:2007 — Information technology — Biometric data interchange formats — Part
- 4 2: Finger minutiae data - Technical Corrigendum 1 (first draft, JTC001 SC37 N 2119, circulated May 2007)
- 5 — ISO/IEC 19785 3:2005 — Common biometric exchange formats framework — Part 3: Patron format
- 6 specifications (FDIS draft, JTC001 SC37 N 2163, circulated June 6, 2007)
- 7 — ISO/IEC FCD 19795 4 — Biometric Performance Testing and Reporting — Part 4: Interoperability
- 8 Performance Testing.

9 4. Caution

10 4.1. Relationship between MINEX II and other issues

11 Neither this document, nor any future execution of MINEX or MOC evaluations by NIST, should be construed as
12 an indication that NIST, nor any other agency of the United States government, has decided for or against the
13 inclusion or exclusion of the items listed below in any current or future government specification or program.

- 14 — Contactless biometric interfaces,
- 15 — MOC implementations,
- 16 — ISO/IEC 19794 2 formats, and
- 17 — Definitive formats for standardized templates to be stored on, or transmitted to, cards.

18 This document is strictly a special notice that is being published to reach a wider audience. It is not a federal
19 procurement action, and no RFQ or RFP is available.

20 In addition, the identification of any commercial product or trade name does not imply endorsement or
21 recommendation by the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

22 4.2. Relationship between MINEX II and Ongoing MINEX

23 MINEX II will use samples drawn from the same population as is used in the Ongoing MINEX process. MINEX II
24 will be conducted in two phases. For reasons of timeliness, Phase I is likely to consider only a subset of those
25 images, and will only examine native or limited cross vendor template interoperability. Phase II will extend
26 the operation toward full interoperability testing, including the kind examined in Ongoing MINEX. Phase II
27 may also employ an expanded set of images or comparison counts.

28 5. Abbreviations

29 The abbreviations and acronyms of Table 2 are used in many parts of this document.

30 **Table 2 - Abbreviations**

APDU	Application Protocol Data Unit as used in ISO/IEC 7816 4
BIT	Biometric Information Template as defined in ISO/IEC 7816 11
DET	Detection error tradeoff characteristic - a plot of FNMR vs. FMR (sometimes as normal deviates, sometimes on log scales)
FMR	False match rate
FNMR	False non match rate
IDMS	Identity management system
INCITS	InterNational Committee on Information Technology Standards
ISO/IEC 7816	Multipart standard for "Identification cards Integrated circuit(s) cards with contacts"
ISO/IEC 19794	Multipart standard of "Biometric data interchange formats"
I378	INCITS 378:2004 as profiled in this standard
ISO CC	The compact card minutia format of clause 8 in ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005
MINEX	Generic name for the series of NIST's Minutia Interoperability Exchange Tests
MOC	Match on card

MXC	Match off card
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
PC/SC	Generic interface specification for PC to smart card connectivity
SC 17	Subcommittee 37 of Joint Technical Committee 1 - developer of smart card standards
SC 37	Subcommittee 37 of Joint Technical Committee 1 - developer of biometric standards
SDK	The term Software Development Kit refers to any library software submitted to NIST

6. Aspects of the test

6.1. Match-on-card vs. match-off-card

The MINEX II test is specifically aimed at testing the efficacy of match on card (MOC) implementations that compare instances of ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 compact card (ISO CC) templates. Thus, one use of MINEX II would be to confirm that performance achieved by a MOC submission to Ongoing MINEX (an off card process) is actually achievable on at least one ISO/IEC 7816 card.

The MINEX II study is initiated in response to near term imperatives to evaluate the technology.

The test is likely to require somewhat customized cards (i.e. not production cards), at least because of the requirement to be able to read similarity scores from the card.

6.2. Fundamental concept of the test

The MOC capability shall be tested in three stages:

- In stage 1, NIST will measure the accuracy of the matching algorithm executing on a PC class machine. The test requires submission of a Pentium class implementation of the same MOC algorithm⁵. This stage is likely to embed hundreds of thousands of genuine and impostor comparisons to support the accuracy measurement goals of the MINEX tests.
- In stage 2, NIST will repeat a small subset of the stage 1 template comparisons on the card. Selected genuine and impostor comparisons will be repeated on the card by successively storing reference templates on the card and sending verification templates to the card for comparison.
- In stage 3, NIST will compare similarity scores retrieved from the card in stage 1 with those generated in stage 3. For any given pair of reference and verification templates, they must be identical.

This three stage strategy assures NIST that the accuracy of the MOC implementation is identical to that of the PC based version of the algorithm, and that the card itself is truly capable of running at the measured accuracy.

6.3. Generic interface hardware and software

NIST intends to access all cards via third party PC/SC hardware owned by NIST. NIST will use the SCR SCM335⁶ reader⁷, and the M.U.S.C.L.E open source drivers⁸ under Linux.

NIST does not currently intend to use other card readers, but reserves the right to do so for any purpose.

As in previous tests, NIST intends to run the PC based portions of the test using software components implementing a simple "C" API.

⁵ While NIST understands that the PC based matcher submission may need to use only fixed point arithmetic, or run underneath an emulator, we do not address means of assuring equivalence of on and off card implementations.

⁶ Specific hardware and software products identified in this plan will be used in order to perform the evaluations described in this document. In no case does identification of any commercial product, trade name, or vendor, imply recommendation or endorsement by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, nor does it imply that the products and equipment identified are necessarily the best available for the purpose.

⁷ The reader is documented at http://www.scmmicro.com/security/view_product_en.php?PID=11.

⁸ See driver software homepage is <http://www.linuxnet.com/middle.html>

1 **6.4. INCITS 378:2004 vs. ISO/IEC 19794-2:2005 Compact Card**

2 In MINEX II, NIST requires submitted template generators to produce INCITS 378:2004 templates, as profiled in
 3 section 7.2 of this document. NIST will convert such templates to ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 compact card
 4 instances before passing them to PC based and card based matching algorithms. Conversion will be done on
 5 the fly and will be parameterized per the BIT(s) read from the target smart card.

6 NIST is not requiring production of ISO CC templates because the following points hold.

- 7 — Three byte ISO CC minutia points are strict "semantic children" of six byte INCITS 378:2004 or ISO/IEC
- 8 19794 2:2005 record format minutia points.
- 9 — The process of conversion of INCITS 378:2004 to ISO CC is trivial and mostly standardized, and that there
- 10 is no additional intellectual property needed to compute an ISO CC template vs. an I378 template.
- 11 — Minutia quality values are required entries in INCITS 378:2004 minutiae records.
- 12 — Minutia quality values are required when preparing ISO CC templates for MOC.
- 13 — The quality field of I378 is considered an essential mechanism for improving minutia based
- 14 interoperability from the state measured in MINEX and MTIT.
- 15 — ISO CC templates can exist only as terminal objects, i.e. they cannot be used in the preparation of other
- 16 standardized minutia records.

17 With regard to issues of minutia selection and placement, NIST draws the attention of template generator
 18 developers to the German national body contribution, N2135, submitted to SC 37 Working Group 3 on May 29,
 19 2007.

20 **6.5. BIT Processing**

21 NIST will read one or two ISO/IEC 7816 11 BITs from each submitted card as a group (see the card APDU in
 22 section 8.6). These parameterize the conversion of I378 templates to ISO CC templates before they are sent
 23 to

- 24 — card based MOC matcher implementations, and
- 25 — PC based MOC match implementations.

26 **6.6. Card-matcher combinations**

27 The primary objective of MINEX II is to ascertain MOC capability by measuring fingerprint algorithm accuracy
 28 in the intended environment (i.e. the card). NIST considers that card vendors may elect to team with several
 29 fingerprint algorithm vendors, and vice versa. NIST further expects that a fingerprint supplier's technology
 30 may demonstrate improved accuracy when implemented on a more capable card.

31 NIST seeks to identify the most capable components and combinations of components and therefore the
 32 participation agreement, Annex H, requires identification of all card and fingerprint technology suppliers,
 33 with responsible signatories from all collaborating organizations.

34 **6.7. Two phase testing**

35 NIST is likely to conduct the test in two phases. The first is intended to be a smaller and faster evaluation of
 36 submitted software and cards that

- 37 — will use a reduced number of images,
- 38 — or only a subset of all interoperability paradigms (see section 6.9),
- 39 — will give feedback and results to the suppliers, and
- 40 — is not intended to include release of results to the sponsors or the public.
- 41 — Suppliers should submit new software and hardware for the second phase. The second phase will include
- 42 the full size test and will result in a final public report.

NIST is particularly interested in facilitating improved performance between Phase 1 and Phase 2. It intends to provide feedback to suppliers and to allow submission of improved software and hardware. NIST remains open to comment on what feedback (metrics, data, or calibration information) would be most useful.

6.8. Options for participation

For phase 1, participants shall provide the components identified in one or more rows of Table 3. All components in a row shall be supplied. Up to four submissions (e.g. 3 Class A + 1 Class B) are permitted to allow

- card suppliers to team with several suppliers of fingerprint template generators, and vice versa, and
- suppliers to submit, say, fast but inaccurate and slow but accurate versions.

Table 3 - MINEX II classes of participation

Class of Participation	Annex H Participation agreement	ISO/IEC 7816 Card + Matcher	PC based ISO CC Template Matcher	PC based INCITS 378:2004 Template Generator
Class A	+	+	+	
Class B	+	+	+	+

These classes of participation may be revised for Phase II.

6.9. Three-way interoperability

NIST anticipates that some cards embed fingerprint matchers that are not accompanied by an associated template generator (i.e. Class A), and may well be used with enrollment and verification templates coming from two different sources. That is card based matcher, M, will compare a reference template produced by X with a verification template from Y. NIST intends to evaluate three way interoperability in Phase 2 of this test, but may in addition do so in Phase 1. The possible implications for accuracy are discussed in Annex B.

Both Class A and Class B submissions may be tested in all combinations of M, X and Y.

6.10. Metrics

NIST intends to report full detection error tradeoff (DET) characteristics for all implementations tested. The DET is primary mechanism for transferring the accuracy results of evaluations into the technology policy arena (e.g. in order to establish security requirements).

In addition, in the full size Phase 2 trial, NIST intends to report performance interoperability matrices⁹. Such tables will report false non match rates at fixed false match rates of 0.0001 as the primary figure of merit. NIST may report other metrics also.

NIST will measure and report estimates of the elapsed times of at least the

- template generation process,
- on card and off card template comparisons, and
- the storage of the reference template on the card.

6.11. Participation

Prospective participants should read this document then complete the application form, Annex H.

⁹ Like Table 8 of NIST Interagency Report 7296 *Performance and Interoperability of the INCITS 378 Template*.

7. Profile of MINEX II templates

7.1. Overview

All template generators submitted under the MINEX II program shall produce an INCITS 378:2004 template, as defined in section 7.2. This is specified because a valid minutia quality is required in the preparation of the section 7.3 ISO CC templates sent to the matchers.

7.2. INCITS 378:2004 profile

7.2.1. Record structure

Template generators shall produce records conformant to Table 4. This is identical to the Ongoing MINEX profile¹⁰ except that

- the minutia quality field shall be meaningfully populated¹¹,
- the IBIA vendor code field shall be populated,
- the version number IDs shall be populated.

Table 4 - MINEX II profile of INCITS 378:2004 standard

	Section title and/or field name (I378 clause numbers in parentheses)	Values Allowed	Informative Remarks
1.	Format Identifier (6.4.1)	0x464D5200	i.e. ASCII "FMR\0"
2.	Version Number (6.4.2)	0x20323000	i.e. ASCII " 20\0".
3.	Record Length (6.4.3)	$32 \leq L \leq 800$	26 record header + 4 view header +2 extended data length + 6K. Max K is 128
4.	CBEFF Product Identifier Owner (6.4.4)	> 0	Two byte, IBIA registered, vendor ID.
5.	CBEFF Product Identifier Type (6.4.4)	> 0	Two byte, vendor assigned, version number.
6.	Capture Equipment Compliance (6.4.5)	0	
7.	Capture Equipment ID (6.4.6)	0	
8.	Size of Scanned Image in x direction (6.4.7)	MIT	Inherited directly from input data
9.	Size of Scanned Image in y direction (6.4.8)	MIT	
10.	X (horizontal) resolution (6.4.9)	197	
11.	Y (vertical) resolution (6.4.10)	197	
12.	Number of Finger Views (6.4.11)	1	
13.	Reserved Byte (6.4.12)	0	
14.	Finger Position (6.5.1.1)	MIT	Inherited directly from input data (see 9.4.2)
15.	View Number (6.5.1.2)	0	
16.	Impression Type (6.5.1.3)	0 or 2	Inherited directly from input data
17.	Finger Quality (6.5.1.4)	MIT	Inherited directly from input data
18.	Number of Minutiae (6.5.1.5)	$0 \leq K \leq 128$	K minutiae data blocks
19.	Minutiae Type (6.5.2.1)	01b, 10b, or 00b	
20.	Minutiae Position (6.5.2.2)	MIT	
21.	Minutiae Angle (6.5.2.3)	MIT	
22.	Minutiae Quality (6.5.2.4)	0, $1 \leq Q \leq 100$	0 = unsupported
23.	Extended Data Block Length (6.6.1.1)	0	No bytes shall follow this field.
MIT = mandatory at time of instantiation			

¹⁰ The Ongoing MINEX profile is that given in Table 11 of NIST Special Publication 800 76 1.

¹¹ The operational PIV profile given Table 3 of NIST Special Publication 800 76 1 requires the minutia quality field to be supplied per I378. However all existing minutia standards gives poor guidance on what quality means.

7.2.2. Minutia quality values

The use of a minutia quality value is normatively required by clause 8.3.1 of ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 for the preparation of ISO CC templates, as described later in section 10.4.3.

For MINEX II, the template generator shall generate quality values that are indicative that a minutia is a true minutia. That is, larger values shall indicate decreased likelihood that the minutia is a false minutia. This requirement is specifically distinct from one in which the quality value would be indicative of, for example, the local noise in the original image.

MINEX III will be a cooperative project to develop minutia quality implementations.

7.2.3. ID values

The ID values will be used for internal NIST logging. The version numbers should be distinct between any versions which offer different algorithmically functionality.

7.3. ISO/IEC 19794-2:2005 compact card structure

This section defines precisely what constitutes the data to be sent to PC based and card based MOC implementations. It is included here because ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 and its draft corrigenda and revisions define multiple templates combining

- three encodings (record, card normal, card compact),
- versions with and without headers¹²,
- variants differing in their minutia placement semantics,
- presence of standardized extended data (zonal quality etc), and
- presence of non standard, proprietary, extended data.

The MINEX II evaluation will use ISO CC templates for which

- the record and view headers shall be absent,
- standardized extended data shall be absent, and
- proprietary extended data shall be absent.

NIST will convert the I378 instances of Table 4 to produce Table 5 instances of ISO CC. This process is described in section 10.

Table 5 - MINEX II profile of ISO/IEC 19794-2:2005 standard

1.	X coordinate	8	[0,255]	Expressed in units of 0.1 mm	View data S instances of the minutiae data on lines 17 20 shall be present
2.	Y coordinate	8	[0,255]	Expressed in units of 0.1 mm	
3.	Minutiae type	2			
4.	Minutiae angle	6	[0,63]	Resolution is 5.625 degrees	

MOC implementations shall accept templates in the TLV format of Table 6.

Table 6 - ISO/IEC 19794-2 minutiae template DO

Tag	L	Value				
'7F2E'	L1	Biometric data template				
		Tag	L	Value		
		'81'	L2	Finger minutiae data		
				Field	Size (bits)	Valid Values
				X coordinate	8	[0,255]
				Y coordinate	8	[0,255]

S
instances

¹² Working Group 3 of SC 37 discussed this issue in its January 2007 meeting in New Zealand.

				Minutiae type	2		
				Minutiae angle	6	[0,63]	

7.4. Non-presence of a header

NIST has abandoned plans to require the minutiae data to be preceded by a four byte view header. These plans were advanced in versions of this document circulated before May 26 2007. However, see also section F.3 for a comment regarding standardization.

7.5. Minutia uniqueness

A non ISO requirement is for the minutia points to be unique. Template generators submitted in MINEX II shall output unique (x, y, and theta) tuples and NIST will implement checks to detect deviations from such behavior. This requirement is instituted because non uniqueness impedes some matching algorithms.

7.6. Failure to acquire

Template generators in MINEX evaluations must always produce a Table 4 template, even if no minutiae are found. Such a template will have length 26 bytes, and the value in the "number of minutiae" field shall be 0. NIST considers this a valid template. It is useful for correct accounting of template generator failure (see [MINEX NIST IR 7296 http://fingerprint.nist.gov/minex04/minex_report.pdf](http://fingerprint.nist.gov/minex04/minex_report.pdf) section 5.3).

8. MOC interface specification

8.1. Overview

The following subsections define the mechanism by which all cards shall be accessed for this test. This includes selection of the application, reading and use of the Biometric Information Template (BIT), installation of a reference template, verification, recovery of similarity scores, and retrieval of identifiers. The template generation function, including use of the BIT(s), shall be conducted on PC class computers.

8.2. Approach to the use of ISO/IEC 7816

The following subsections detail the MINEX II MOC interface. It was designed with the following criteria in mind.

- Adherence to the provisions of ISO/IEC 7816 4:2005, 7816 11:2004 and 19794 2:2005.
- When the base standards provide for optional content this specification follows NIST Special Publication 800 73 1 Interfaces for Personal Identity Verification.
- To only define new elements when extant standards are silent on a necessary functionality.

The impact of the second provision is to select odd byte INS values.

8.3. Establish Communications

An Answer to Reset shall be performed to determine (T=0, T=1 or T=CL).

8.4. Selection of the test application

This card shall be supplied with a dedicated NIST MOC testing application. It shall be invoked once by using the SELECT command in Table 7. The response shall be as in Table 8.

Table 7 - Command APDU for selection of MOC application

Command Parameter	Required Value	Meaning
CLA INS	'00' 'A4'	SELECT

P1 P2	'04 0C'	AID follows, 1100b
L _c field	16	Length of AID
Data field	'F0 4E 49 53 54 20 4D 4F 43 20 54 53 54 20 50 31'	AID In ASCII, "≡NIST MOC TST P1" where P1 connotes Phase 1
L _e field	Absent	

Table 8 - Response APDU from selection of MOC application

Response Parameter	Meaning
Data field	Empty
SW1 SW2	See ISO/IEC 7816 4:2005

8.5. Store enrollment template on the card

The APDU for replacing the template on the card is shown in Table 9. It uses the PUT DATA instruction to overwrite the existing reference template.

Table 9 - Command APDU for storage of reference template

Command Parameter	Required Value	Meaning
CLA INS P1 P2	'00' 'DB' '3F FF'	PUT DATA Store anywhere in the current Dedicated File (Application DF)
L _c field	Length of command data field	
Data field	Table 6	Data Object in BER TLV format to be stored (tag '7F 2E')
L _e field	Empty	

Table 10 - Response APDU from storage of reference template

Response Parameter	Meaning
Data field	Empty
SW1 SW2	See ISO/IEC 7816 4:2005

Note that finger position data is not included, because no standard regulates its transmission. In any case, NIST will only conduct comparisons of same finger templates. NIST will not write, nor require support for writing, new BIT(s) to reflect any changes in the finger position value.

NIST considers that the lack of a standard here impedes at least testing, and probably operational issuance systems see Annex F.

8.6. NIST read of the BIT

NIST will use the command of Table 11 to retrieve the BIT group template of Table 13 per the response of Table 12.

Table 11 - Command APDU for retrieval of biometric information template

Command Parameter	Required Value	Meaning
CLA INS P1 P2	'00' 'CB' '3F FF'	GET DATA Retrieve from anywhere in the current Dedicated File (Application DF)
L _c field	'04'	
Data field	'5C' '02' '7F 61'	Data Object identifier to be retrieved (group of BIT)
L _e field	'00'	

Table 12 - Response APDU from retrieval of biometric information template

Response Parameter	Meaning
Data field	Biometric Information Template (see Table 13)
SW1 SW2	See ISO/IEC 7816 4:2005

Table 13 contains two BITS¹³. NIST shall apply the first BIT to enrollment templates. NIST shall apply the second BIT to the verification templates. If only one bit is present, NIST shall apply it to both the enrollment and verification templates. Whether there are one or two BITS, they shall be grouped together as a BIT group template. NIST will read the group of two BITS from each submitted card, and store it. NIST is likely to conduct this read operation only once, but will use the BITS to parameterize all template conversion operations prior to sending templates to the card or to the PC based software matcher.

All instances of a submitted card must have the same BIT group. The BIT(s) shall contain the data as described in Table 13. The BIT(s) may also contain other information (e.g. as allowed by the standards), which NIST shall ignore.

Table 13 - ISO/IEC 19794-2 Biometric Information Template

Tag	Len.	Value	NIST
'7F61'	Var.	BIT group template	Requirements
		Tag Len. Value	
		'02' 1 Number of BITS in the group	2
		'7F60' Var. Biometric Information Template (BIT)	For enrollment
		Tag Len. Value	
		'A1' Var. Biometric Header Template (BHT) conforming to ISO/IEC 19785 3:2005	
		Tag Len. Value	
		'81' 1 08 biometric type (08 = fingerprint)	
		'82' 1 XX biometric subtype (finger position) These values shall be from 7816 11 table (and 19785) and NOT from 19794 2	See NOTE 1 below
		'87' 2 CBEFF BDB format owner	0101 i.e. JTC1/SC37
		'88' 2 CBEFF BDB format type	0005 see sec. 8.6.1
		'B1' Var. Biometric matching algorithm parameters ISO/IEC 19794 2 Table 14	
		Tag Len. Value	
		'81' 2 Min. and max. numbers of minutiae, see ISO/IEC 19794 2 (subclause 8.3.3, Table 10)	See sec. 0
		'82' 1 Minutiae order, see ISO/IEC 19794 2 (subclause 8.3.4 and Tables 11 and 12) ¹⁴	Native, see sec. 10.5
		'83' 1 Feature handling indicator, see ISO/IEC 19794 2 (Table 15)	See NOTE 2 below and sec. 10.6
		'7F60' Var. Biometric Information Template (BIT)	For verification
		Tag Len. Value	
		'A1' Var. Biometric Header Template (BHT)	

¹³ In accordance with the suggestion in Annex D of ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005, NIST seeks to support asymmetric enrollment and verification templates. This allows, for example, higher maximum numbers of minutiae in the reference template than in the verification template. However, NIST will not pass these parameters to the template generator so the PC based API still only contains a generic create_template() function call which does not differentiate between enrollment and verification (see sec. 9.4.2). Instead, this will occur during a pre match post processing of the template.

¹⁴ The text in this line is a corrected version of that in ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 Table 14 second to last line which should reference subclause "8.3.4" not "8.33".

NIST MINEX Match on card Evaluation -Concept and API.

						Tag	Len.	Value	
						'81'	1	08 biometric type (08 = fingerprint)	
						'82'	1	XX biometric subtype (finger position) These values shall be from 7816 11 table (and 19785) and NOT from 19794 2	See NOTE 1 below
						'87'	2	CBEFF BDB format owner	0101 i.e. JTC1/SC37
						'88'	2	CBEFF BDB format type	0005 see sec. 8.6.1
						'B1'	Var.	Biometric matching algorithm parameters ISO/IEC 19794 2 Table 14	
						Tag	Len.	Value	
						'81'	2	Min. and max. numbers of minutiae, see ISO/IEC 19794 2 (subclause 8.3.3, Table 10)	See sec. 0
						'82'	1	Minutiae order, see ISO/IEC 19794 2 (subclause 8.3.4 and Tables 11 and 12)	Native, see sec. 10.5
						'83'	1	Feature handling indicator, see ISO/IEC 19794 2 (Table 15)	See NOTE 2 below and sec. 10.6

1 NOTE 1 NIST does not intend to pass finger position information to the card. Therefore, NIST cannot
2 expect correct data in the '82' tag. NIST requires the tag to be present, per ISO/IEC 19785 3:2007, but will
3 not test its value. NIST will never update the BIT, for example when the reference data is changed.

4 NOTE 2 The tag '83' is optional. If present, the value shall be 00000000b. It is included in the table
5 above, to formally indicate that extended data is out of scope of this test.

6 8.6.1. Variants of the ISO/IEC 19794-2 standard

7 Clause 9 of the ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 standard gives the "format type" codes for six variants which differ in
8 the encoding (as in Table 26) and placement requirements on minutiae. Placement variation, such as
9 whether a ridge ending is encoded as the ridge skeleton end point or as the valley bifurcation, remains an
10 open issue in minutiae interoperability. For the current test, NIST will maintain its MINEX requirement of the
11 latter definition. Thus,

- 12 — cards must return a value of 0005 for the "format type" in the BIT tag '88', and
- 13 — encoders should follow the ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 clause 6 guidance on placement.

14 8.7. Verification

15 8.7.1. APDU specifications

16 The verification data is sent using the VERIFY command of Table 14.

17 Table 14 - Command APDU for comparison of biometric templates

Command Parameter	Meaning
CLA	'00'
INS	'21' = VERIFY
P1 P2	'00 00'
L _c field	Length of command data field
Data field	'7F 2E' ISO/IEC 19794 2 minutia template 'xx' Length of template Value Field of the template, identical to Table 6.
L _e field	absent

18 The odd INS value allows the use of P1 P2 parameters with a value of 00 00 as the indication of what is to be
19 verified is given by the tag of the data object presented in the data field of the command.

Table 15 - Response APDU from comparison of biometric templates

Response Parameter	Meaning
Data field	Empty
SW1 SW2	'90 00' (yes) or '63 CX' (register 0) or '63 00'

NOTE that this only returns the status code. The required similarity score is returned in a separate GET DATA command, see section 8.7.2.

8.7.2. Locking of the card

NIST seeks to conduct arbitrary comparisons on the card. However NIST will respect '63 CX' counter values and will also attempt to execute high scoring comparisons with sufficient frequency to ensure that low scoring verification comparisons are infrequent enough to prevent card locking. NIST will discontinue testing of cards for which these mechanisms are insufficient to prevent locking.

PC based implementations of MOC algorithms shall never lock.

8.7.3. Similarity scores

NIST must be able to read a similarity score from the card. NIST will not evaluate cards that produce only a verification decision. These requirements support computation of a full DET characteristic, the primary output of this test. NIST considers matching algorithms that produce only a small number of possible similarity values (naturally or otherwise) to be operationally less useful.

Table 17 specifies return of a two byte similarity score. Native matching scores outside the range [0,65535] should be internally remapped by the implementation.

Table 16 - Command APDU for retrieval of verification similarity score

Command Parameter	Meaning
CLA	'00'
INS	'CB' = GET DATA
P1 P2	'3F FF' = Retrieve from anywhere in the current Dedicated File (Application DF)
L _c field	'03'
Data field	'5C' '01' 'C0' Data Object identifier to be retrieved (two byte similarity score)
L _e field	'04' (2+2) length of BER TLV encoded data object to be retrieved

Table 17 - Response APDU for retrieval of verification similarity score

Response Parameter	NIST required values	Meaning
Data field	'C0' Tag of the score data '02' Length of the score value xx xx Score value	Big endian score from the last comparison on [0 65535]
SW1 SW2	See ISO/IEC 7816 4	

NOTE Using a proprietary tag ('C0') to retrieve the verification similarity score is a guarantee this information will not be available for card applications in operational mode because the information uses a tag which has a meaning for the test application only.

8.7.4. Prohibition of stateful behavior

Although NIST is interested in template update as a potential means of improving operational performance, it is beyond the scope of this test. Any card that attempts update is likely to give answers different from those on produced in the Stage 2 PC testing, where template update is prohibited by 9.6.4.

8.8. Reading card identifier

Table 10 of ISO/IEC 7816 6:2004 provides a structure for card data under constructed data element tag '66'. This structure must be readable using the GET DATA APDU of Table 18.

Table 18 - Command APDU for retrieval of Card identifier

Command Parameter	Meaning
CLA	'00'
INS	'CB' = GET DATA
P1 P2	'3F FF' = Retrieve from anywhere in the current Dedicated File (Application DF)
L _c field	'03' length of command data field
Data field	'5C' '01' '66' Data Object identifier to be retrieved (Card Data)
L _e field	'00'

For administration purposes and to identify the card under test, for example in MINEX II test reports, NIST will use the information contained in the response field of Table 19 which should contain a discretionary field, tag '73', containing the card version information in tag '88'.

Table 19 - Response APDU for retrieval of Card identifier

Response Parameter	Meaning	NIST required values
Data field		
SW1 SW2	See ISO/IEC 7816 4	

8.9. Reading matcher identifier

Table 12 of ISO/IEC 7816 6:2004 provides a structure for application related data under constructed data element tag '6E'. This structure must be readable using the APDU of Table 20 and Table 21. NIST shall include the result of this GET DATA whenever it identifies the algorithm, for example in MINEX II test reports.

Table 20 - Command APDU for retrieval of Matcher identifier

Command Parameter	Meaning
CLA	'00'
INS	'CB' = GET DATA
P1 P2	'3F FF' = Retrieve from anywhere in the current Dedicated File (Application DF)
L _c field	'03' length of command data field
Data field	'5C' '01' '6E' Data Object identifier to be retrieved (Application related data)
L _e field	'00'

The response field should contain a discretionary field, tag '73', containing the matcher identifier in tag '99'.

Table 21 - Response APDU for retrieval of Matcher identifier

Response Parameter	Meaning	NIST required values
Data field		
SW1 SW2	See ISO/IEC 7816 4	

9. PC-based API specification

9.1. Overview

This section describes the MINEX II API. It applies to the PC based Stage 2 accuracy test outlined in section 6.2. The material differences between the MINEX II API and that specified in Ongoing MINEX are as follows.

- 1 — The INCITS 378 template shall conform to section 7.2.
- 2 — The template generator is required to return the coordinates of a logical center, about which minutiae
- 3 pruning will be conducted.
- 4 — The matchers must accept ISO CC instances (not I378 instances).

5 9.2. INCITS 378:2004 compliant templates

6 All templates created shall conform to the specification of 7.2. NIST will test conformance of all generated

7 templates using our own open source code¹⁵.

8 These shall contain the image quality value (line 17 of Table 4) that was input to the SDK by NIST, i.e. the

9 SDK is not to generate this value. This value may be of use to template generators. The value shall be the re

10 mapped NIST NFIQ value given in Table 22.

11 **Table 22 - NFIQ Mappings**

Encoded NFIQ values to be passed as inputs to the template generator			
NFIQ	MINEX 04	800 76 1	MINEX II
1	100	100	100
2	75	80	80
3	50	60	60
4	25	40	40
5	1	20	20

12 "C" macros for finger quality are given in Annex E.

13 9.3. Submission

14 Those wishing to participate in MINEX II testing shall provide NIST with those components identified in the

15 Participation Classes given in section 6.8. Software shall be submitted as an SDK (Software Development Kit)

16 library which complies with the API (Application Programmer Interface) specified in this document. Cards

17 submitted to NIST shall be conformant to ISO/IEC 7816 and support the biometric functionality described in

18 section 8.

19 9.4. Testing interface

20 9.4.1. Requirement

21 MINEX participants shall submit an SDK which presents the "C" prototyped interface given in the following

22 subsections. In MINEX II, Phase 1, the template generation function is optional.

23 9.4.2. Minutiae extraction

24 NIST will create templates using the SDK function call defined in Table 23. The function shall be capable of

25 processing the image data specified in Annex C.

26 **Table 23 - MINEX create_template API Function**

Prototype	INT32 create_template(const BYTE *raw_image, const BYTE finger_quality, const BYTE finger_position, const BYTE impression_type, const UINT16 height, const UINT16 width, UINT16 *xcenter, UINT16 *ycenter,
-----------	---

¹⁵ See <http://www.itl.nist.gov/iad/894.03/nigos/incits.html>

	BYTE *INCITS_378_template);	
Description	This function takes a raw input image and outputs the corresponding I378 conformant template. The memory for the template is allocated before the call i.e. create_template() does not allocate memory for the result. The function returns either success (0) or failure (non zero). Failure indicates a failure to enroll the image and will nevertheless result in the output of a I378 template with zero minutia. This will be used in subsequent comparisons. An error shall result in a template containing only the record and finger view headers. This number of minutiae shall be set to 0, and no minutia data shall be present. The resulting template shall have length of 32 bytes (26 byte Record Header + 4 byte Finger View header + 2 bytes for the Extended Data Block length which shall be set 0x0000). All other fields in the Record and Finger View headers shall be set to their regular and accurate values.	
Input Parameters	raw_image	The uncompressed raw image used for template creation.
	finger_quality	The quality of the fingerprint image (e.g. QUAL_GOOD).
	finger_position	The finger position code (e.g. FINGPOS_RI).
	impression_type	The impression type code (e.g. IMPTYPE_LP).
	height	The number of pixels indicating the height of the image.
	width	The number of pixels indicating the width of the image.
Output Parameters	xcenter	Horizontal and vertical locations of a center point suitable for pruning to be used per section 10.4.3. If this functionality is not supported, the xcenter shall be set to the input width (i.e. outside the bounds of the image).
	ycenter	
	INCITS_378_template	The output template, per Table 4
Return Value	This function returns zero on success or a documented non zero error code otherwise.	

1 9.4.3. Minutiae matching

2 One to one comparisons representative of single finger verification attempts will be made using the function
3 defined in Table 24.

4 **Table 24 - MINEX API match_templates function**

Prototype	<pre>INT32 match_templates(const BYTE *verification_template, const UINT16 verification_template_size, const BYTE *enrollment_template, const UINT16 enrollment_template_size, UINT16 *score);</pre>	
Description	This function compares two Table 5 ISO CC compliant templates and outputs a match score. The verification_template shall be compared to the enrollment_template (in that order where the underlying matcher is order dependent). The returned score is an integer representing the similarity of the parent fingerprint images. It should not be artificially quantized. NIST will allocate memory for this parameter before the call. When the function is called with either or both templates containing zero minutiae (see 7.6) the function shall assign the value 0 to the score, then return a documented error code (see 9.6.3 below).	
Input Parameters	verification_template	A Table 5 template from create_template() as processed by NIST according to the verification BIT.
	verification_template_size	The size, in bytes, of the input verification template $0 \leq N \leq 384$
	enrollment_template	A Table 5 template from create_template() as processed by NIST according to the enrollment BIT.
	enrollment_template_size	The size, in bytes, of the input enrollment template $0 \leq N \leq 384$
Output Parameters	score	A similarity score resulting from comparison of the templates, on the range [0,65535].
Return Value	This function returns zero on success (i.e. a valid score is produced) or a documented non zero error code on failure.	

5 9.4.4. Implementation identifiers

6 The implementation shall support the function of Table 25 to identify itself.

1 **Table 25 - MINEX API get_pids function**

Prototype	INT32 get_pids(UINT32 *template_generator, UINT32 *template_matcher);	
Description	This function retrieves CBEFF PIDs which identify the SDK's supported core template generator and template matcher. Both PIDs shall be four byte fields conforming to the CBEFF Product Identifier (PID) requirements of clause 6.4.4 of INCITS 378:2004. These state that – The two most significant bytes of the field indicate the (corporate) owner. It is a hexadecimal integer assigned by the IBIA (per the requirement of clause 6.5.12.1 of ISO/IEC 19785 1:2006). – The least two significant bytes are an owner assigned version number. The memory for the template generator and matcher parameters will be allocated by NIST before the call. If the SDK does not include a template_generator, the returned value shall be zero.	
Output Parameters	template_generator template_matcher	A PID which identifies the SDK's minutiae extractor A PID which identifies the SDK's matcher.
Return Value	This function returns zero on success or a documented non zero error code on failure. In the latter case, both output parameters shall be set to 0.	

2 **9.5. Software and Documentation**

3 **9.5.1. SDK Library and Platform Requirements**

4 Participants shall provide NIST with binary code only (i.e. no source code) – supporting files such as header
5 (“.h”) files notwithstanding. Such files shall not contain intellectual property of the company nor any
6 material that is otherwise proprietary. It is preferred that the SDK be submitted in the form of a single static
7 library file (ie. “.LIB” for Windows or “.a” for Linux). However, dynamic/shared library files are permitted.

8 If dynamic/shared library files are submitted, it is preferred that the API interface specified by this document
9 be implemented in a single “core” library file with the base filename ‘libminex’ (for example, ‘libminex.dll’
10 for Windows or ‘libminex.so’ for Linux). Additional dynamic/shared library files may be submitted that
11 support this “core” library file (i.e. the “core” library file may have dependencies implemented in these
12 other libraries).

13 **9.5.2. Linking**

14 NIST will link the provided library file(s) to a C language test driver application (developed by NIST) using

- 15 – For windows, version 3.3.3 of the GCC compiler will be used under Cygwin;
- 16 – For RedHat Linux 7.3 platforms, version 2.96 of GCC will be used.

17 All GCC compilers use libc. The link command might be "gcc -o mintest mintest.c L. -lminex"

18 Participants are required to provide their library in a format that is linkable using GCC with the NIST test
19 driver, which is compiled with GCC. All compilation and testing will be performed on x86 platforms running
20 either Windows 2000 or Red Hat Linux 7.3 (dependent upon the operating system requirements of the SDK).
21 Thus, participants are strongly advised to verify library level compatibility with GCC (on an equivalent
22 platform) prior to submitting their software to NIST to avoid linkage problems later on (e.g. symbol name and
23 calling convention mismatches, incorrect binary file formats, etc.).

24 NOTE Dependencies on external dynamic/shared libraries such as compiler specific development
25 environment libraries are discouraged. If absolutely necessary, external libraries must be provided to NIST
26 upon prior approval by the Test Liaison.

27 **9.5.3. Installation and Usage**

28 The SDK must install easily (i.e. one installation step with no participant interaction required) to be tested,
29 and shall be executable on any number of machines without requiring additional machine specific license
30 control procedures or activation.

1 The SDK's usage shall be unlimited. The SDK shall neither implement nor enforce any usage controls or limits
2 based on licenses, execution date/time, number of executions, presence of temporary files, etc.

3 It is recommended that the SDK be installable using simple file copy methods, and not require the use of a
4 separate installation program. Contact the Test Liaison for prior approval if an installation program is
5 absolutely necessary.

6 **9.5.4. Documentation**

7 Participants shall provide complete documentation of the SDK and detail any additional functionality or
8 behavior beyond that specified here. The documentation must define all error and warning codes (see 9.6.3).

9 **9.5.5. Modes of operation**

10 Individual SDKs provided shall not include multiple "modes" of operation, or algorithm variations. No switches
11 or options will be tolerated within one library. For example, the use of two different "coders" by a minutiae
12 extractor must be split across two separate SDK libraries, and two separate submissions.

13 **9.6. Runtime behavior**

14 **9.6.1. Speed**

15 The following limits are instituted to constrain NIST's total MINEX II computational workload.

- 16 — The mean template match operation shall not exceed 10 milliseconds.
- 17 — The mean template creation operation shall not exceed 1.2 seconds (using a 2GHz Pentium IV).

18 **9.6.2. Interactive behavior**

19 The SDK will be tested in non interactive "batch" mode (i.e. without terminal support). Thus, the submitted
20 library shall not use any interactive functions such as graphical user interface (GUI) calls, or any other calls
21 which require terminal interaction e.g. reads from "standard input".

22 **9.6.3. Error codes and status messages**

23 The SDK will be tested in non interactive "batch" mode (i.e. without terminal support). Thus, the submitted
24 library shall run quietly, i.e. it should not write messages to "standard error" and shall not write to "standard
25 output". Instead, the SDK shall conform to the error notification procedures of Annex D.

26 **9.6.4. External communication**

27 Processes running on NIST hosts shall not write any data to external resource (e.g. server, file, connection, or
28 other process) other than those explicitly allowed in this document.

29 **9.6.5. Stateful behavior**

30 All components in this test shall be stateless and idempotent. No component of the test is permitted to
31 maintain state information. This applies to template generation and matching, and to on card and off card
32 activity. NIST will institute appropriate tests to detect stateful behavior in the activities mentioned in the
33 following subsections. If detected, NIST will cease evaluation and inform the provider.

34 NOTE NIST is prohibiting template adaptation, and will accordingly implement checks to detect any stateful
35 behavior and side effects. However NIST is interested in template update as a potential means of improving
36 operational performance, but it is beyond the scope of this and foreseeable testing efforts.

10. NIST conversion of I378 to ISO-CC templates

10.1. Background

NIST intends to maintain its use of the I378 standard as a primary format for off card storage of minutia templates. NIST recognizes the advantages of ISO CC for on card storage or matching. Although the two kinds of templates differ, the accuracy implications seem to be limited see the Annex A simulation of the impact on matching accuracy.

10.2. Presence of BITs on card

Each submitted card shall be populated with one or two BITs per section 8.6. These shall be treated as read only data. These shall be supplied in the structure given in Table 13 which leverage the BIT and BIT grouping structures of ISO/IEC 7816 11:2004 (Tables 1 and 2).

The BITs parameterize the production of templates that a reader, or other system, should send to the requesting card: For a reference template TR, a verification template TV, and a PC or card based matcher, M, the test will compare BIT processed versions of the templates to produce a similarity score

$$s = M(BR(TR), BV(TV))$$

where BR and BV denote the function representing the BIT parameterization.

Operationally the BIT parameters (e.g. maximum number of minutiae) might be sent *as inputs* to a template generator. NIST does not intend to do this because such specialization would be computationally prohibitive in the context of an interoperability test¹⁶. Instead, NIST proposes to standardize the minutiae template reduction process as follows.

10.3. Use of BITs

NIST will treat on card and off card matcher implementations identically. This means that the BITs read from the card will be used to parameterize BOTH the conversion of templates sent to the card and to the PC based match operation.

The conversion operation proceeds with a pruning operation (sec. 10.4.3), a sorting operation (sec. 10.5), and a re encoding (sec. Annex A.1). NIST will conduct this operation using its own software which

- exists within a larger standard biometric data interchange software distribution named BioMDI,
- is entirely open source¹⁷ ISO/IEC 9899:1999 "C" code,
- is available for [download and cooperative development](#)¹⁸ in the open source model, and
- is under formal version control¹⁹.

Figure 1 - Conversion of INCITS 378 to ISO-CC


¹⁶ For example, if a test used T templates, N template generators and C cards, imposes the requirement to execute O(TNC) image to template generations.

¹⁷ See the [license](http://www.itl.nist.gov/iad/894.03/nigos/NIGOS_license_061906.pdf) at http://www.itl.nist.gov/iad/894.03/nigos/NIGOS_license_061906.pdf

¹⁸ The software is available at <http://www.itl.nist.gov/iad/894.03/nigos> and maintained using a [Perforce version control system](#), at <http://www.perforce.com/>, for which clients are freely available. While a nightly zip/tar archive is produced, users should subscribe to NIST's open source server because it automatically sends email notifications of any changes to the software.

¹⁹ Users need to [register](http://www.itl.nist.gov/iad/894.03/nigos/NIGOS_User_Registration.pdf) http://www.itl.nist.gov/iad/894.03/nigos/NIGOS_User_Registration.pdf and may then access the code branches using a client such as [P4V](#) at <http://www.perforce.com/perforce/products/p4v.html>.

NIST MINEX Match on card Evaluation -Concept and API.



1 The items in parentheses are the names of executables present in NIST's BioMDI distribution.

2 10.4. Number of minutiae

3 10.4.1. Limits on number

4 NIST's considers that its role is not to impose algorithmic constraints. However the minimum and maximum
5 numbers of minutia a card may accept are regulated as follows

- 6 – The one byte value implies a range of [0,255],
- 7 – Because some templates will naturally contain 0 minutia (see FTA in section 7.6), minimum values will be
8 ignored,
- 9 – NIST imposed a 128 minutia maximum in all prior MINEX trials. This is arguably too high given that MINEX
10 04, which used four large operational single index finger flat impression datasets, found that the leading
11 systems produced a median of 41 minutiae from each image with the 5% and 95% quantiles being 24 and
12 61 respectively.
- 13 – A T=0 APDU command constrains the maximum number of three byte minutia to 60. Note that T = 0 is
14 not required by NIST.
- 15 – Informative Annex D.1.1 of ISO/IEC 19794 2 recommends the minimum number of minutiae for enrollment
16 to be 16, and for verification, 12. It also recommends the maximum number of minutiae for enrollment
17 and verification is 60. NIST notes that these are recommendations only, but otherwise takes no
18 immediate position on the appropriateness of these numbers beyond the information presented in
19 Annex A.

20 10.4.2. Effect of the BIT

21 NIST will send single view templates to the PC based and card based matching implementations. The
22 reference and verification templates shall be parameterized by their respective BITs, as follows. If,

- 23 – the value indicated in the BIT for the minimum number of minutiae is $0 \leq N \leq 255$,
- 24 – the value indicated in the BIT for the maximum number of minutiae is $0 \leq M \leq 255$,
- 25 – the number of minutia present in a (generally third party) verification template is K, then
- 26 – the number of minutia NIST will send to the card is denoted by S where

$$S = \begin{cases} M & \text{if } K \geq M \\ K & \text{if } K < M \\ K & \text{if } K < N \end{cases}$$

- 1 Note that the BIT parameter N is ignored. This is necessary because some input templates will inevitably
- 2 have zero minutiae. The matcher shall execute successfully when either or both of the input templates
- 3 contains fewer than N minutiae²⁰.
- 4 NIST will reject cards for which $N > M$.

5 **10.4.3. Pruning mechanism**

- 6 When a MOC implementation indicates the capability to take no more than M minutiae, NIST proposes to
- 7 follow a refined version of the guidance given in the last paragraph of clause 8.3.1 of ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005:

If the number of minutiae exceeds the maximum number processible by a card, truncation is necessary. The truncation is a 2 step process. At first, finger minutiae of poor quality are eliminated. If still too many minutiae are there, then truncation shall be made by peeling off minutiae from the convex hull of the minutiae set and before sorting into the order required by the card.

- 8
- 9 Specifically NIST intends to replace the requirement to use the convex hull, with a method based on the
- 10 distance of a minutia from a center. This is based on the ISO/IEC 19794 2 subclause 8.3.4 guidance for polar
- 11 ordering.
- 12 Thus given a I378 template containing K minutiae and a BIT request for no more than M minutiae our software
- 13 will remove $K - M$ minutiae as follows.
- 14 Minutiae with the lowest quality value are removed first. If two or more minutia have an equal quality value,
- 15 then the one with the largest value of the integer quantity

$$r^2 = (x - x_c)^2 + (y - y_c)^2$$

- 16 is removed. Finally if those values are tied, then the ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 polar ordering instruction to
- 17 prioritize small angle minutiae is applied.
- 18 NIST understands that the ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 material on polar coordinates is intended for sorting, not
- 19 pruning, but considers the convex hull approach to be complex, and potentially harmful effects.

20 **10.4.4. Pruning center**

- 21 In MINEX II, all I378 template generators may additionally report the coordinates of an appropriate center
- 22 about which pruning should be conducted. Earlier versions of this test specification established the minutia
- 23 means (center of mass) for (x_c, y_c) , per the ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 sorting guidance. However, this may be
- 24 particularly inappropriate when large numbers of minutia are reported in a noisy part of the image.
- 25 NIST will conduct pruning about
- 26 — the center coordinates from the template generator, if supplied, otherwise
- 27 — the center of mass, per the ISO standard.

28 **10.4.5. Pruning priority**

- 29 It is clear that a quality algorithm producing many levels of quality will cause the pruning operation to prune
- 30 on r^2 only occasionally. Conversely, a quality algorithm producing few levels of quality will cause r^2 pruning
- 31 to be more dominant. An implementer should not supply quality values that are dependent solely of r^2
- 32 because this contradicts the true minutia requirement of section 7.2.2.

²⁰ An unappealing alternative would be to fill with N K randomly generated minutiae.

10.5. Sort order of minutiae

10.5.1. Support for ordering

Although template generators are likely to produce templates whose minutiae have an arbitrary order, the ISO CC standard defines several geometric orderings of the minutia. The x y and y x sorting methods support extension of the spatial range of a fingerprint (e.g. for rolled prints) in one dimension. The polar method supports a center first sort.

Currently NIST intends to support at least the unsorted, Cartesian y x, Cartesian x y and polar sorting methods, because the standard defines these as options. NIST will publish open source "C" code in due course. NIST does not intend to accept commercial code for this purpose, although we may institute a conformance test for implementations that do.

However, NIST is aware that commercial readers will need to include such software in addition to the pruning software. This adds complexity and a "degree of freedom" that would better be handled as a natural property of the matching algorithm. Although NIST notes the European Citizen Card specification, CEN/TS 15480 2, requires implementations to accept arbitrarily sorted data, NIST prefers not to ignore the SC37/WG3 intent to allow sorting. NIST does consider that the exact requirements of ISO/IEC 19794 2 clause 8 are unclear.

10.5.2. Modulo sorting for large images

Note that archival imagery used in all planned MINEX evaluations is at most 500 pixels in width and height, and is scanned at 19.7 pixels mm¹, and therefore all possible minutiae coordinates can be encoded in 8 bits without modulo sorting (or removal).

The ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 standard needs modification, see Annex F.1.

10.6. Ridge count, core and delta and zonal quality information

The ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 standard allows the BIT to indicate the "extended data" defined in clause 7.5 of that standard. However in Table 13, the binary value 00000000b indicates that ridge count, core and delta and zonal quality information are out of the scope of this test. Suppliers must adhere to the zero specification here.

NIST is interested in possible performance improvement associated with the use of richer templates, but past experience with INCITS 378 extensions (MINEX 04) has not suggested large improvements are available. However NIST will, on request from any interested party, consider conducting tests of templates that include extended data. Particularly, what benefits would zonal quality allow beyond that associated with a (calibrated) minutia quality value.

11. References

- [1] C. Wilson et al., "Biometric Data Specification for Personal Identity Verification," NIST Special Publication 800 76 1 http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/800_76_1/SP800_76_1_012407.pdf
- [2] P. Grother et al., "Performance and Interoperability of the INCITS 378 Template," NIST IR 7296 http://fingerprint.nist.gov/minex04/minex_report.pdf
- [3] E. Tabassi et al. "Finger Print Image Quality," NISTIR 7151 2004 (Gaithersburg, MD: National Institute of Standards and Technology, August 2004) http://www.itl.nist.gov/iad/894.03/quality/reports/ir_7151.pdf
- [4] American National Standard for Information Technology - Finger Minutiae Format for Data Interchange, ANSI/INCITS 378 2004, www.incits.org

Annex A

Comparison of the INCITS 378 and ISO/IEC 19794-2 standards

CBEFF Format Owner = 0101 for ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 37.

CBEFF Format Type = 0005 for ridge endings encoded as valley bifurcation points, as in INCITS 378.

The INCITS 378 standard's record format and the ISO/IEC 19794 2 compact card format differ syntactically and semantically. These differences are presented in the next two subsections. Thereafter we address the implications for transcoding between the standards, and the MINEX requirements.

A.1 Syntactic differences

The INCITS 378:2004 and ISO CC templates differ as follows. In ISO CC

- the (x,y) coordinates are encoded in 8 bits as opposed to 14 bits,
- the spatial resolution is fixed at 10 pixels per millimeter as opposed to variable resolution,
- the angle is encoded in 6 bits as opposed to 8 bits, and
- the minutia quality value is absent.

These differences are depicted in Table 26. Note that ridge count and core and delta information is not being evaluated in this test, and therefore the BIT entry defined in ISO/IEC 19794 2 Table 14, shall be set to 0, and ignored.

Table 26 - Minutia encodings of the ISO-CC and INCITS 378

	Byte 1	Byte 2	Byte 3	Byte 4	Byte 5	Byte 6
ISO/IEC 19794 2 Compact Card Format	x coord.	y coord.	t	angle		
	8	8	2	6		
ISO/IEC 19794 2 Record Format and INCITS 378	t	x coord.	r	y coord	angle	quality
	2	14	2	14	8	8
	t = type		r = reserved			

A.2 Semantic differences

The abbreviated 8 bit (x,y) encodings in the ISO CC standard support "typical" single finger images by specifying a hard wired resolution of 10 pixels per millimeter (ISO/IEC 19794 2, subclause 8.2). This is approximately half of typical enrollment data gathered on 500 ppi (19.7 pixels per millimeter) optical scanners. This is summarized in Table 27. The effect would be that minutia can not extend over a region larger than $255 / 10 = 25.5$ mm. However the ISO CC standard provides for coordinate wraparound wherein the minutia coordinates are sorted such that the actual value may extend beyond the range by encoding it as $x \bmod 256$. Reconstruction of the actual value is possible because sorting is applied.

Table 27 - Minutia location quantization of ISO-CC and INCITS 378 templates

Standard	Allowed values (units)	Allowed values (mm)	Allowed values (mm), at 500 ppi
INCITS 378:2004 record format	[0,16383]	Depends on the encoding resolution	[0, 0.051, 0.1015, 0.1523, ..., 831.6]
ISO/IEC 19794 2 record format			
ISO/IEC 19794 2 compact card	[0,255]	[0, 0.1, 0.2 ... 25.5]	N/A

As shown in Table 28, the three different angular encodings support minutia encodings of varying precision. Whether this difference materially affects performance is dependent on the sensitivity of the matching algorithm, and on how accurately template generators measure the angle.

Table 28 - Minutia angle quantization of ISO-CC and INCITS 378 templates


Standard	Allowed values (units)	Quantization	
		Degrees per unit	Radians per unit
INCITS 378:2004 record	[0,179]	$360 / 180 = 2$	$2\pi / 180 = 0.0349$
ISO/IEC 19794 2 record	[0,255]	$360 / 256 = 1.4063$	$2\pi / 256 = 0.0245$
ISO/IEC 19794 2 compact card	[0,63]	$360 / 64 = 5.625$	$2\pi / 64 = 0.0982$

1

2 A.3 Simulation protocol

3 To quantify the effects of the ISO CC encoding vs. the INCITS 378 record format, NIST simulated the
 4 production of ISO CC templates by quantizing the coordinates and angles in sets of INCITS 378 templates
 5 produced in NIST's existing MINEX testing.

6 **Figure 2 - Use of INCITS 378 for simulation of ISO-CC accuracy**



7 The C code fragments to effect these transformations are shown in Table 29. This code is part of the
 8 "fmrcompact" program distributed²¹ by NIST as part of a suite of libraries and applications that support
 9 various INCITS biometric standards.

10 **Table 29 - Source code for conversion of INCITS 378 to ISO-CC**

Angular re quantization	
<pre>// The ISO minutia record has 6 bits for the angle, so // we have 64 possible values to represent 360 degrees. for (m = 0; m < mcount; m++) // for all minutiae { const int theta = 2 * (int)fmds[m]->angle; // 378 has 2 degrees const double isotheta = round((64.0 / 360.0) * (double)theta); // CC has 5.625 deg fmds[m]->angle = (unsigned char)round(((360.0 / 64.0) * isotheta) / 2.0); // Put back in 378 }</pre>	
Spatial re quantization	
<pre>for (m = 0; m < mcount; m++) // for all minutiae { const double x = (double)fmds[m]->x_coord; // cast from unsigned short const double y = (double)fmds[m]->y_coord; // cast from unsigned short const double xmm = 10.0 * x / (double)xres; // millimeters, because INCITS 378 resolution const double ymm = 10.0 * y / (double)yres; // values are in pixels per centimeter const double xunits = xmm / 0.1; // units of 0.1 pix per mm which is the CC const double yunits = ymm / 0.1; // card format's hardwired sampling freq const unsigned short xcc = (unsigned short)(0.5 + xunits); // round the value - this is what would be const unsigned short ycc = (unsigned short)(0.5 + yunits); // stored in "typical" say 500 dpi operation fmds[m]->x_coord = (unsigned short)((double)xcc * (double)xres * 0.01); // Now put back fmds[m]->y_coord = (unsigned short)((double)ycc * (double)yres * 0.01); // in 378 format }</pre>	

²¹ This is available for download; see <http://www.itl.nist.gov/iad/894.03/nigos/incits.html>

We took five vendors and applied their matchers to INCITS 378 templates derived from the outputs of that vendor's template generator. They are applied natively, that is to enrollment and verification templates from the same supplier's INCITS 378 generator. The five matching algorithms, identified in the first columns, are some of the more accurate ones assessed in the Ongoing MINEX evaluation.

All results apply to single finger matching using the POEBVA collection of left and right index fingers, as used in the Ongoing MINEX evaluation. The FNMR computation is conducted over 15 disjoint sets each containing 16000 genuine scores. The FMR computation is likewise conducted over 15 disjoint sets each containing 16000 impostor scores.

A.4 Results after re-quantization of angle and position

Table 30 gives the change in FNMR when the matcher operating threshold is set to achieve FMR values of 0.01 on INCITS 378 templates and then reset to achieve those FMRs on ISO CC templates. This thresholding strategy is representative of the situation where thresholds can be set for the ISO CC template independently of any INCITS 378 matcher trial or calibration.

Table 30 - Relative accuracy of ISO-CC and INCITS 378 templates (Fixed FMR)

	Base FMR	Base FNMR	Change in FNMR
A1	0.01	0.0140	0.0005 +/- 0.0006 p 2e 03
A2	0.01	0.0158	0.0018 +/- 0.0007 p 3e 08
A3	0.01	0.0133	0.0007 +/- 0.0007 p 2e 03
A4	0.01	0.0183	0.0006 +/- 0.0005 p 6e 05
A5	0.01	0.0159	0.0008 +/- 0.0005 p 9e 05

Table 31 gives changes in FMR and FNMR when the matcher operating threshold is set to achieve FMR values of 0.01, on the unaltered INCITS 378 templates. This thresholding strategy is representative of the situation where a ISO CC template is sent, with transcoding, to an INCITS 378 matcher.

Table 31 - Relative accuracy of ISO-CC and INCITS 378 templates (fixed t)

Change in FMR and FNMR when ISO CC encoding is synthesized from instances of the INCITS 378 record format "MIN:A" templates.					
	Base FMR	Change in FMR	Base FNMR	Change in FNMR	
A1	0.01	0.0013 +/- 0.0008 p 7e 06	0.0140	0.0008 +/- 0.0008 p 5e 04	
A2	0.01	0.0008 +/- 0.0011 p 1e 02	0.0158	0.0020 +/- 0.0007 p 4e 09	
A3	0.01	0.0006 +/- 0.0008 p 6e 03	0.0133	0.0007 +/- 0.0006 p 5e 04	
A4	0.01	0.0004 +/- 0.0006 p 1e 02	0.0183	0.0007 +/- 0.0007 p 7e 04	
A5	0.01	0.0008 +/- 0.0009 p 1e 03	0.0159	0.0010 +/- 0.0008 p 1e 04	

Thus when going from INCITS 378 to ISO CC

- Table 30 shows small but statistically significant increases in FNMR. The worst case is A2 whose FNMR goes from 0.0158 to 0.0176 at a FMR of 0.01 corresponding to about 11% more missed matches.
- At a fixed threshold for both kinds of template, Table 31 shows small that FMR is slightly but significantly lower for ISO CC than for INCITS 378, but that FNMR is again higher.

The presence of an algorithm effect (some implementations are more sensitive than others, viz. A2 over A3, means that vendors should consider this issue for their implementations.

NOTE The change in performance for less accurate matchers and template generators has not been studied.

A.5 Results after reduction in number of minutiae

The plots of Figure 3 show the effect of apply the pruning operation of section 10.4.3 to raw INCITS 378 (not ISO CC) templates. The effect on accuracy is shown for the same five leading matcher providers as used above. The matchers are applied natively i.e. the matcher from provider X is applied to compare templates from X's generator. For each matcher, the threshold is set to the value that gives a FMR of 0.001 on the entire unpruned corpus. The error rates are then recomputed after removing zero or more minutia to

1 achieve a maximum of N in each template. The top graph shows the effect of retaining all minutiae in the
2 enrollment template and minutiae in the verification template. The lower graph shows the effect of pruning
3 both.

4 The conclusions are

- 5 — FNMR increases for all matchers algorithms, with approximately 60 minutia being a reasonably "lossless"
6 value. Note that the 95% percentiles for number of minutiae are 60, 65, 60, 64, and 63.
- 7 — FNMR has increased by an order of magnitude (from ~2% to ~20%) when fewer than 20 minutia are used.
- 8 — FMR values also change significantly, beginning at the same 60 minutiae breakpoint, and substantially
9 below about 20 minutiae. Some systems improve (decline in FMR) and some degrade (increase in FMR).
10 NIST is concerned that any increase in FMR associated with transactions involving small numbers of
11 minutiae is a security hazard.


12 Not shown here is distributional information on the numbers of minutiae produced by template generators.
13 NIST has observed variation in the numbers found from a single image. Also not shown are interoperable
14 results (cross vendor) and NIST suggests that an incorrect conclusion from the graphs would be that template
15 generators finding more minutiae are better performing.

16 **A.6 Conclusions**

17 The ISO CC template can offer performance approaching that of the INCITS 378 template. However, some
18 implementations exhibit degraded performance. This study, however, only approximates actual ISO CC
19 performance because providers may be able to improve algorithmic functionality if they specifically know the
20 target result is ISO CC.

1

Figure 3 - Effect of minutia pruning on FNMR (above) and FMR (below)



2


3

Annex B
Three-way interoperability

NIST anticipates that some cards embed fingerprint matchers that are not accompanied by an associated template generator, and may well be used with enrollment and verification templates coming from two different sources. That is card based matcher, M, will compare a reference template produced by X with a verification template from Y. NIST will evaluate three way interoperability in this test. MINEX participants should be aware that the MINEX 04 measurements of Figure 4, show three way interoperability (green) will generally offer poorer performance

- than in two way (cyan) or native (horizontal bar) cases, and
- in situations (matchers 1 and 4) in which the provider of a matcher supplies a template generator that is less effective than its peers.

Figure 4 - Native vs. Two-way vs. Three-way Interoperability



NIST acknowledges that not requiring a card/matcher provider to team with a template generator provider is inconsistent with the requirement in section 6.6 to require pairing of card and matcher combinations. However this seeming inconsistency is undertaken in light of the following:

NIST MINEX Match on card Evaluation -Concept and API.

- 1 — Cards and matching algorithms may well be bound at time of manufacture;
- 2 — Cards and reference templates are bound at time the card issuance or IDMS software was shipped by an
- 3 integrator;
- 4 — Although software matcher implementations (e.g. Java applets) exist (and are eligible for testing) and
- 5 these could be selected during integration or even issuance, they are reported to run significantly more
- 6 slowly.
- 7 Further NIST is motivated by a desire to improve performance, both in this evaluation and in fielded
- 8 operation. Given that NIST has demonstrated that some template generators are better than others, NIST
- 9 seeks to measure card matcher template generator compatibility.


Annex C

Input fingerprint image specifications

C.1 Format

The SDK must be capable of processing fingerprint images supplied to the SDK in uncompressed raw 8 bit (one byte per pixel) grayscale format. Each image shall appear to have been captured in an upright position and approximately centered horizontally in the field of view. The image data shall appear to be the result of a scanning of a conventional inked impression of a fingerprint. Figure 1 illustrates the recording order for the scanned image. The origin is the upper left corner of the image. The x coordinate (horizontal) position shall increase positively from the origin to the right side of the image. The y coordinate (vertical) position shall increase positively from the origin to the bottom of the image.

Figure 5 - Fingerprint image raster scan order



Raw 8 bit grayscale images are canonically encoded. The minimum value that will be assigned to a "black" pixel is zero. The maximum value that will be assigned to a "white" pixel is 255. Intermediate gray levels will have assigned values of 1 254. The pixels are stored left to right, top to bottom, with one 8 bit byte per pixel. The number of bytes in an image is equal to its height multiplied by its width as measured in pixels; there is no header. The image height and width in pixels will be supplied to the SDK as supplemental information.

C.2 Resolution and dimensions

All images for this test will employ 500 PPI resolution (horizontal and vertical).

The dimensions of the fingerprint images will vary from 150 to 812 pixels in width, and 166 to 1000 pixels in height.

Note - the SDK must be capable of processing images with any dimensions in these specified ranges without the use of separately invoked cropping or padding facilities. For example, SDKs which require cropping of large images must do so internal to the operation of the create_template (see below) API call.

C.3 Sensor and impression types

All images used for testing in MINEX come from the POEBVA data set described in NISTIR 7296 [2] (see Appendix B, Table 23 page 47) and thus have been obtained from live scan sensors (Smiths Heimann ACCO 1394 and Cross Match 300A). All images tested in MINEX are plain impression type images.

Annex D

Error Codes and Handling

Each participant shall provide their SDK with text documentation of all (non zero) error or warning return codes (see section 9.5.4, Documentation).

The application should include error/exception handling so that in the case of a fatal error, the return code is still provided to the calling application.

At minimum the return codes of Table 32 shall be used.

Table 32 - MINEX API return codes

Return code	Explanation
0	Success
1	Image size not supported
2	Failed to extract minutiae - unspecified error
3	Failed to extract minutiae - impression type not supported
4	Failed to match templates - null probe or gallery template
5	Failed to match templates - unable to parse probe template
6	Failed to match templates - unable to parse gallery template

All messages which convey errors, warnings or other information shall be suppressed.

Annex E

Predefined SDK Constants

E.1 Pre-defined values

The pre defined values (constants) of Table 33 are for use in specifying parameters to the MINEX testing interface:

Table 33 - MINEX API predefined values

// Finger quality values #define QUAL_POOR 20 // NFIQ value 5 #define QUAL_FAIR 40 // NFIQ value 4 #define QUAL_GOOD 60 // NFIQ value 3 #define QUAL_VGOOD 80 // NFIQ value 2 #define QUAL_EXCELLENT 100 // NFIQ value 1	// Finger position codes #define FINGPOS_UK 0x00 // Unknown finger #define FINGPOS_RT 0x01 // Right thumb #define FINGPOS_RI 0x02 // Right index finger #define FINGPOS_RM 0x03 // Right middle finger #define FINGPOS_RR 0x04 // Right ring finger #define FINGPOS_RL 0x05 // Right little finger #define FINGPOS_LT 0x06 // Left thumb #define FINGPOS_LI 0x07 // Left index finger #define FINGPOS_LM 0x08 // Left middle finger #define FINGPOS_LR 0x09 // Left ring finger #define FINGPOS_LL 0x0A // Left little finger
// Impression type codes #define IMPTYPE_LP 0x00 // Live scan plain #define IMPTYPE_NP 0x02 // Nonlive scan plain	

Note that the finger position codes differ in the fingerprint standards, and the smart card standards.

For all interactions with the card ISO/IEC 7816 11:2004 finger position codes shall be used. For all interactions with PC based implementations ISO/IEC 17994 2:2005 finger positions shall be used. NIST will transcode any values using the Table 34 associations whenever needed. The table summarizes the two base standards and is included here for informative purposes only.

Table 34 - ISO/IEC 19794-2 and ISO/IEC 7816-11 finger position codes

Finger ID Biometric subtype	ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005		ISO/IEC 7816 11:2004	
	Binary value	Hex Value	Binary value	Hex Value
No information given	00000b	00	00000b	00
right thumb	00001b	01	00101b	05
right index	00010b	02	01001b	09
right middle	00011b	03	01101b	0D
right ring	00100b	04	10001b	11
right little	00101b	05	10101b	15
left thumb	00110b	06	00110b	06
left index	00111b	07	01010b	0A
left middle	01000b	08	01110b	0E
left ring	01001b	09	10010b	12
left little	01010b	0A	10110b	16

Annex F

Ambiguities in the standards

F.1 Compact card sorting

The last line of ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 clause 8.3.4 "The same construction principle may be applied also for the Y coordinate" should be changed to "The same construction principle may alternatively be applied to the Y coordinate. Using this construction on X and Y together is not possible."

Clause 8.3.4 is very long. To enable easy citation of the standard, it needs to be broken up into named (or even unnamed) subparagraphs.

The text in ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 Table 14 second to last line references subclause "8.33" which should be "8.3.4".

F.2 Unique minutia

There should be a normative requirement for minutia (x,y,theta) triples to be unique. The issue of requiring unique (x,y) values seems to be in conflict with the reporting of trifurcations which would have same (x,y).

F.3 No support for placing reference data on the card

ISO/IEC FDIS 19785 3:2007(E) establishes the CBEFF TLV encoded CEBFF patron format for the tag associated with biometric subtype data (in this case finger position). This value is '82'. Neither ISO/IEC 7816 11:2004, nor ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 include normative specifications for this location. However, there is no standardized mechanism for finger position information to be sent to the card when storing a reference template. Indeed, none of the relevant standards advance a normative prescription for a ISO/IEC 7816 4:2005 command for this purpose. Yes, ISO/IEC 7816 11:2004 includes the use of a CHANGE REFERENCE DATA command as an example in informative Annex B, but that text does not advance a method for passing the biometric subtype to the card.

NIST sees the lack of a standardized command as an impediment to MINEX II (see discussion in section 8.5).

NIST sees the lack of a standardized mechanism for transmission of biometric subtype data to the card as an inhibitor toward (future) multi finger applications.

NIST is interested in standardization of the transmission of reference data to the card.

A revision of ISO/IEC 19794 2 might usefully include definitive procedures for enrolling fingerprint minutiae templates on the card. It should recommend CHANGE REFERENCE DATA or PUT DATA and particularly should establish tags for finger position (biometric subtype). NIST notes that there is no support for unsegmented fingerprints.

Annex G

ISO/IEC 19794-2:2005 record profile

Table 35 - MINEX II profile of ISO/IEC 19794-2:2005 standard

	Field name and ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 clause numbers in parentheses	Values Allowed	Informative Remarks
5.	Format Identifier (7.3.1)	0x464D5200	i.e. ASCII "FMR\0"
6.	Version Number (7.3.2)	0x20323000	i.e. ASCII " 20\0".
7.	Record Length (7.3.3)	$32 \leq L \leq 800$	26 record header + 4 view header +2 extended data length + 6K. Max K is 128
8.	Capture Equipment Certifications (7.3.4)	0	
9.	Capture Device Type ID (7.3.5)	0	
10.	Size of Scanned Image in x direction (7.3.6)	MIT	Inherited directly from input data
11.	Size of Scanned Image in y direction (7.3.7)	MIT	
12.	X (horizontal) resolution (7.3.8)	197	
13.	Y (vertical) resolution (7.3.9)	197	
14.	Number of Finger Views (7.3.10)	1	
15.	Reserved Byte (7.3.11)	0	
16.	Finger Position (7.4.1.1)	MIT	Inherited directly from input data
17.	View Number (7.4.1.2)	0	
18.	Impression Type (7.4.1.3)	0 or 2	Inherited directly from input data
19.	Finger Quality (7.4.1.4)	MIT	Inherited directly from input data
20.	Number of Minutiae (7.4.1.5)	$0 \leq K \leq 128$	K minutiae data blocks
21.	Minutiae Type (7.4.2.1)	01b, 10b, or 00b	
22.	Minutiae Position (7.4.2.2)	MIT	
23.	Minutiae Angle (7.4.2.3)	MIT	
24.	Minutiae Quality (7.4.2.4)	$0, 1 \leq Q \leq 100$	0 = unsupported
25.	Extended Data Block Length (7.5.1.1)	≥ 0	Either 0 for no extended data, or the length of a zonal quality block
26.	Extended Data Area Type Code (7.5.1.2)	0x0003	Optional, only present if (7.5.1.1) is > 0 .
27.	Zonal Q. Cell Width and Height (7.5.4.1)	$1 \leq NPIX \leq W$	Optional, only present if (7.5.1.1) is > 0 .
	Zonal Q. Cell Width and Height (7.5.4.1)	$1 \leq NPIX \leq H$	Optional, only present if (7.5.1.1) is > 0 .
28.	Zonal Q. Cell Quality Info. Depth (7.5.4.2)	1, 2, 4, 8	Optional, only present if (7.5.1.1) is > 0 . This value shall not be 0.
29.	Zonal Q. Cell Quality Data (7.5.4.3)		Optional, only present if (7.5.1.1) is > 0 .
MIT = mandatory at time of instantiation			

Table 36 - ISO/IEC 19794-2 minutiae template DO

Tag	L	Value				
'7F2E'	L1	Biometric data template				
		Tag	L	Value		
		'81'	L2	Finger minutiae data		
				Field	Size (bits)	Valid Values
				X coordinate	8	[0,255]
				Y coordinate	8	[0,255]
				Minutiae type	2	
				Minutiae angle	6	[0,63]
		'94'	L3	Zonal Quality Data	5+var	See Table 37

S instances	
1 instance	

where the zonal quality block shall conform to Table 37. This data is a modified version of that inserted into ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 by the draft Technical Corrigendum 1, SC 37 N2119.

Table 37 - Zonal quality data

	Field	Length (bytes)	Values Allowed	Informative Remarks
1	Horizontal Resolution of the Quality Map (8.4.1.1.2)	1		See Note 1 and Example 1
2	Vertical Resolution of the Quality Map (8.4.1.1.2)	1		
3	Quality Map Width (8.4.1.1.3)	1		# cells in x horizontal direction
4	Quality Map Height (8.4.1.1.3)	1		# cells in y vertical direction
5	Cell Quality Information Depth (8.4.1.1.4)	1	1, 2, 4, 8	Not 0.
6	Cell Quality Data (8.4.1.1.5)	L		Packed bits

NOTE 1 The first draft Technical Corrigendum 1, SC37N2119 has one field for cell quality resolution, i.e. it assumes the x y resolutions are equal. However, the ISO REC standard allows different cell resolutions in x and y. Therefore, if the ISO REC to ISO CC transcoding process is to become viable operationally, then card zonal quality data needs to support anisotropic resolutions. NIST will comment on the update of N2119 (to be circulated for ballot in the latter half of 2007).

EXAMPLE 1 If the horizontal cell dimension in a ISO REC zonal quality block (clause 7.5.4.1 of ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005) is 20 pixels, and the corresponding horizontal resolution is 197 pixels per centimeter (clause 7.3.8 of ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005), then the value of the entry on line 1 of this table (i.e. the number of cells per decimeter) will be $\text{round}(10 * 197 / 20) = 99$, where the rounding operator is nowhere standardized.

Annex H

Application to participate in MINEX II

H.1 Who should participate

Providers of ISO/IEC 7816 card based MOC implementations using ISO/IEC 19794 2:2005 minutia based templates are invited to participate in MINEX II. In addition, companies, research organizations, or universities that have developed mature prototypes or who research fingerprint matching of interoperable templates are invited to participate.

The fingerprint template generation and matching software need not be “operational,” nor a production system, nor commercially available. However, the system must, at a minimum, be a stable implementation capable of being “wrapped” (formatted) in the API specification that NIST has specified in section 9 for this evaluation.

Anonymous participation will not be permitted. This means that signatories to this Agreement acknowledge that they understand that the results (see sections 6.8 and Annex H.7) of the evaluation of the software and/or hardware will be published with attribution to their organization(s).

H.2 How to participate

H.2.1 Application form

In order to request participation in MINEX II, potential participants must

- fill out this Annex H, Agreement Application to Participate in MINEX II,
- identify the Responsible Parties and the Points of Contact,
- print and sign the form, and
- send to the address given in Annex I.

H.2.2 Parties

The Responsible Party is an individual with the authority to commit the organization to the terms in this document.

The Point of Contact is an individual with detailed knowledge of the system applying for participation.

H.3 NIST activity

H.3.1 Initiation

Upon receipt of the signed Annex H form by NIST, the organization or organizations, if teaming, shall be classified as a “Participant”. NIST must receive the form during the submission period described in the [MINEX II Calendar](#).

H.3.2 Supplier validation

Registered Participants should download the small Validation Dataset available on the website. Prior to submission of their SDK the Participant needs to verify that their software executes on the validation data, and produces correct similarity scores and templates.

H.3.3 Submission of hardware to NIST

Suppliers shall send five identical instances of the smart card to NIST at the address given in Annex I. Suppliers commit to assisting NIST in resolving deviations from the specifications of this document, errors, defects or inconsistencies.

1 H.3.4 Submission of software to NIST

2 After the Participant has executed his software on the validation imagery, the participants shall send the
3 software and its validation output to NIST. All submitted SDKs shall be encrypted using GnuPG (gpg) by
4 downloading the MINEX Test Liaison [public key here](#)²² and

- 5 — Importing it into your keyring using: `gpg --import minex_pk.asc`
- 6 — Using it to encrypt your SDK (with ASCII armor if submitting via email): `gpg --r minex --a mysdk.zip`

7 The result shall either be

- 8 — emailed to minex@nist.gov or
- 9 — sent to NIST on CD media to the address given in Annex I.

10

11 H.3.5 Acceptance testing

12 Cards submitted shall implement the APDU specifications of section 8.

13 Software submitted shall implement the MINEX II API Specification of section 9.

14 Upon receipt of the SDK and validation output, NIST will attempt to reproduce the output by executing the
15 SDK on the validation imagery, using a NIST computer. In the event of disagreement in the output, or other
16 difficulties, the Participant will be notified.

17 In the event cards or software is found to be non functional or non compliant with this document's
18 specifications, or where the validation dataset results cannot be replicated by NIST, Participants will be
19 notified with a detailed description of the problem(s) and given a reasonable opportunity to resubmit (as time
20 allows) according to the discretion of the MINEX II Liaison.

21 H.3.6 Limits of testing

22 NIST will use the Participant's cards and SDK software only for the testing described in this document. The
23 provided hardware and software will also be used to resolve any errors identified subsequent to the test or
24 publication of results.

25 NIST agrees not to use the Participants software for purposes other than indicated herein, without express
26 permission by the Participant.

27 H.4 Points of contact

28 The MINEX II Liaison is the government point of contact for MINEX II. All correspondence should be directed
29 to minex@nist.gov, which will be received by the MINEX II Liaison and other MINEX II personnel.

30 These correspondences may be posted on the FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions) area of the [MINEX II website](#)
31 at the discretion of the MINEX II Liaison. The identity of those persons or organizations whose
32 correspondences lead to FAQ postings will not be made public in the FAQ.

33 H.5 Access to MINEX II validation data

34 The MINEX II Validation Data is supplied to Participants to assist in preparing for MINEX II.

35 The fingerprints in the MINEX II Validation Data are representative of the MINEX II Test Data only in their
36 format. Image quality, collection device and other characteristics are likely to vary between the Validation
37 and Test Datasets.

²² The URL is http://fingerprint.nist.gov/minex/minex_pk.asc and the key's fingerprint is: 448F 3828 719D B6B0 FDC5 3DE6 715B 6C72 062A 520A.

1 **H.6 Access to MINEX II test data**

2 The MINEX II Test Datasets are protected under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a), and will be treated as
3 Sensitive but Unclassified and/or Law Enforcement Sensitive.

4 MINEX II Participants shall have no access to MINEX II Test Data, either before, during or after the test.
5 Information about the images data has been previously published in MINEX 04 report, [NIST IR 7296](#)²³.

6 **H.7 Reporting of results**

7 **H.7.1 Reports**

8 The Government will combine appropriate results into one or more MINEX II Reports. Together these will
9 contain, at a minimum, descriptive information concerning MINEX II, descriptions of each experiment, and
10 aggregate test results. NIST will include

- 11 — DET performance metrics as the primary indicators of one to one verification accuracy,
- 12 — ISO/IEC 19795 4 interoperability matrices as the primary measures of interoperability, and
- 13 — enrollment and verification timing statistics.

14 NIST may compute and report other aggregate statistics.

15 NIST intends to release Phase 1 results to the participant only.

16 NIST intends to publish Phase 2 results in one or more NIST Interagency Reports.

17 The Phase 2 reports will:

- 18 — contain the names of Phase 1 participants,
- 19 — not contain the results from Phase 1 participants' implementations,
- 20 — contain the names of Phase 2 participants, and
- 21 — contain the results of all Phase 2 participants' implementations which will associated with the
- 22 participants names.

23 **H.7.2 Pre-publication review**

24 Participants will have an opportunity to review and comment on the reports. Participants' comments will be
25 either incorporated into the main body of the report (if it is decided NIST reported in error) or published as
26 an addendum. Comments will be attributed to the participant.

27 **H.7.3 Citation of the report**

28 After the release of the Phase II Final Report, Participants may decide to use the results for their own
29 purposes. Such results shall be accompanied by the following phrase: "Results shown from the Minutiae
30 Interoperability Exchange Test (MINEX II) do not constitute endorsement of any particular system by the U. S.
31 Government." Such results shall also be accompanied by the URL of the MINEX II Report on the MINEX II
32 website, <http://fingerprint.nist.gov/minexII>.

33 **H.7.4 Rights and ownership of the data**

34 Any data obtained during MINEX (excepting the submitted SDK itself), as well as any documentation required
35 by the Government from the participants, becomes the property of the Government. Participants will not
36 possess a proprietary interest in the data and/or submitted documentation.

37 **H.8 Return of the supplied materials**

38 **H.8.1 Returning software to vendors**

39 NIST will not return any supplied software, documentation, or other material to vendors.

²³ MINEX Report NIST IR 7296 PDF is here: http://fingerprint.nist.gov/minex04/minex_report.pdf

1 H.8.2 Returning cards to vendors

2 NIST will not return cards to the provider. NIST will destroy the cards within ninety days of publication of the
 3 results for that card or notification to the vendor that the card is inoperable. This requirement is needed
 4 because template data on the card is protected and because NIST has no mechanism to assure deletion of
 5 templates from the card. However, NIST to support debugging NIST may, at its sole discretion, return cards
 6 during the initial acceptance testing phase.

7 H.9 Agreement to participate

8 With the signing of this form, Participants attest that they will not file any MINEX II related claim against
 9 MINEX II Sponsors, Supporters, staff, contractors, or agency of the U.S. Government, or otherwise seek
 10 compensation for any equipment, materials, supplies, information, travel, labor and/or other participant
 11 provided services.

12 The Government is not bound or obligated to follow any recommendations that may be submitted by the
 13 Participant. The United States Government, or any individual agency, is not bound, nor is it obligated, in any
 14 way to give any special consideration to MINEX II Participants on future contracts, grants or other activities.

15 With the signing of this form, Participants realize that any test details and/or modifications that are provided
 16 in the [MINEX II website](#) supersede the information on this form.

17 With the signing of this form, Participants realize that they can withdraw from the MINEX II at any time prior
 18 to the end of the Phase 1 submission window, without their participation and withdrawal being documented
 19 in the MINEX II Final Report.

This form shall be completed by all suppliers of ISO/IEC 7816 cards and providers of fingerprint technology electing to participate in the MINEX II trials. When more than one supplier is part of a team to provide an implementation, a Responsible Party from each party shall complete an executed copy of this agreement.				
Card identifier (identical to value returned in sec. 8.8). Required for Class A + B (sec. 6.8) submissions.		Fingerprint matcher identifier (identical to value returned in sections 8.9 and 9.4.4). Required for Class A + B (sec. 6.8) submissions.		Fingerprint template generator identifier (identical to that return in sec. 9.4.4). Required only for Class B (sec. 6.8) submissions.
Hex Vendor ID		Hex Vendor ID (IBIA assigned)		Hex Vendor ID (IBIA assigned)
Hex vendor assigned version no.		Hex vendor assigned version no.		Hex vendor assigned version no.
Responsible Party for supplier of smart card				
Company / Organization Name				
Title	First Name	MI	Last Name	Suffix
Street Address				
City		State	Zip	Country
Phone	Fax		Email	
Technical point of contact	Phone		Email	
Responsible Party for supplier of fingerprint matcher technology (i.e. any algorithms present on the card or in the SDK library).				
Company / Organization Name				
Title	First Name	MI	Last Name	Suffix

NIST MINEX Match on card Evaluation -Concept and API.

Street Address				
City		State	Zip	Country
Phone	Fax		Email	
Technical point of contact	Phone		Email	
Responsible Party for supplier of fingerprint minutiae template generator technology (i.e. any algorithms present in the SDK library).				
Company / Organization Name				
Title	First Name	MI	Last Name	Suffix
Street Address				
City		State	Zip	Country
Phone	Fax		Email	
Technical point of contact	Phone		Email	

1

2 With my signature, I agree that this document is a sufficient description of the test to be conducted.

3 With my signature, I hereby request consideration as a Participant in the Minutia Interoperability Exchange
4 Test II (MINEX II), and I am authorizing my company or organization to participate in MINEX II according to the
5 rules and limitations listed in this document.

6 With my signature, I also state that I have the authority to accept the terms stated in this document

7

8

9

10

11 _____
SIGNATURE OF CARD SUPPLIER RESPONSIBLE PARTY DATE

12

13

14

15

16 _____
SIGNATURE OF FIRST FINGERPRINT SOFTWARE SUPPLIER RESPONSIBLE PARTY DATE

17

18

19

20

21 _____
SIGNATURE OF SECOND FINGERPRINT SOFTWARE SUPPLIER RESPONSIBLE PARTY DATE

Annex I

NIST mailing address

The address given below shall be used for all mail or courier delivery to NIST. This includes delivery of MINEX II participation agreements and all MINEX II cards and software.

MINEX II Test Liaison
National Institute of Standards and Technology
Information Access Division (894)
100 Bureau Drive, Stop 8940
Gaithersburg, MD 20899 8940
USA

In cases where the courier needs a phone number please use NIST S+H 301 nine seven five six two nine six.