

3DiVi BAF Session Intelligence Report – March 2026

0. Executive Summary

- No breaches of planned performance indicators for both products during the reporting period (March) (APCER = 0%, BPCER ≈ 0.5%).
- No missed attacks. Two replay attacks found in BAF DI – both were successfully rejected.
- **Main risk this month:** High false positive reject-rate due to quality checks (mainly due to glasses detection). See sections 2–3 and Appendix B7 for details and recommendations.

1. What Was Discovered / Verified

- Verified deployed and current model versions on submitted data.
- Manually verified the presence of attacks in the dataset.
- Verified causes of rejects in Quality and Liveness checks.

2. Current Top Risks by Priority

- Primary risk this month: Relatively high false positive reject-rate due to quality assessment.

3. Recommendations and Focus Areas for Next Month

- Disable glasses detection in the Quality Control module and measure the resulting change in quality reject rate.

4. Key Attack Cases of the Quarter

- 2 attacks found in BAF DI – both successfully rejected. Attack types: replay from mobile phones.
- Attack case details are provided in Appendix B6.

B1. Summary of Latest Versions

Summary of latest module versions on client data.

Product	Latest version	Quality Reject Rate	Measured Liveness BPCER	Measured Liveness APCER
BAF Kiosks	1.17.3	4 (0.86 %)	0.65 %	0.00 %
BAF Digital Identification (DI)	1.17.3	516 (4.80 %)	0.56 %	0.00 %

B2. Gap Analysis: Claimed vs. Actual

Product	Metric	Claimed (product)	Actual	Gap	Verdict
BAF Kiosks	Quality Control	5.00 %	0.86 %	-4.14 p.p.	✓ OK
BAF Kiosks	Liveness BPCER	1.00 %	0.65 %	-0.35 p.p.	✓ OK
BAF Kiosks	Liveness APCER	3.00 %	0.00 %	-3.00 p.p.	✓ OK
BAF Digital Identification (DI)	Quality Control	5.00 %	4.80 %	-0.20 p.p.	✓ OK
BAF Digital Identification (DI)	Liveness BPCER	1.00 %	0.56 %	-0.44 p.p.	✓ OK
BAF Digital Identification (DI)	Liveness APCER	3.00 %	0.00 %	-3.00 p.p.	✓ OK

B3. Liveness Analysis by Version

Comparison of liveness versions by product. BPCER and APCER calculations include only faces that passed quality control.

BAF Kiosks

Metric	1.15.6	1.17.3
Total samples	467	467
Single face	466 (99.79 %)	466 (99.79 %)
Multiple faces	1 (0.21 %)	1 (0.21 %)
No detections	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)
BPCER (All images)	0.22 %	0.65 %
BPCER (Single-face only)	0.22 %	0.65 %
APCER (All images)	0.00 %	0.00 %
APCER (Single-face only)	0.00 %	0.00 %
Missed attacks	None	None
Total attacks found	0	0

BAF Digital Identification (DI)

Metric	1.15.6	1.17.3
Total samples	10761	10761
Single face	7161 (66.55 %)	7161 (66.55 %)

Multiple faces	3600 (33.45 %)	3600 (33.45 %)
No detections	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)
BPCER (All images)	0.39 %	0.56 %
BPCER (Single-face only)	0.37 %	0.50 %

Metric	1.15.6	1.17.3
APCER (All images)	0.00 %	0.00 %
APCER (Single-face only)	0.00 %	0.00 %
Missed attacks	0	0
Total attacks found	2	2

B4. Quality Analysis

BAF Kiosks

Manually checked: 4 out of 4 poor-quality samples (100.00%).

Reason	Count	Category	Description
Failed Quality Control	4 (0.86 %)	Quality	Sample filtered by quality control.
Multiple faces	1 (0.21 %)	Quality	Multiple faces in a sample – a wrong face could be selected.
Quality: Poor illumination	~0.86 %	Client	Face overexposed or too darkened.

Detailed Breakdown of Failed Quality Control (QC) Checks

QC check	Trigger count
glasses	3
dynamic_range	1

Reviewers' Fails on Normal Samples

This table shows QC checks for 0 manually checked/labeled samples that failed a quality check.

QC check	Count	Share among OK-labeled samples
No data on OK-labeled samples	-	-

BAF Digital Identification (DI)

Manually checked: 154 out of 516 poor-quality samples (29.84%).

Reason	Count	Category	Description
Multiple faces	3600 (33.45 %)	Quality	Multiple faces in a sample – a wrong face could be selected.
Failed Quality Control	516 (4.80 %)	Quality	Sample filtered by quality control.
Quality: Poor illumination	~2.40 %	Client	Face overexposed or too darkened.
Quality: Reviewer failure	~2.33 %	Reviewer	No obvious issue; likely reviewer error.
Quality: Sunglasses	~0.07 %	Client	Client wearing sunglasses.

Detailed Breakdown of Failed Quality Control (QC) Checks

QC check	Trigger count
glasses	371
dynamic_range	109
sharpness	53
face_size_on_image	14
noise	4
pitch	3

Reviewers' Fails on Normal Samples

This table shows the QC checks for 75 manually checked/labeled samples that failed the quality check.

QC check	Count of OK samples	Share among OK-labeled samples
glasses	69	92.00 %
face_size_on_image	6	8.00 %

B5. False Reject Real Analysis

BAF Kiosks

- False reject real in BPCER (all): 3
- False reject real in BPCER (single-face): 3

Examples of false reject real with found images:

Attempt ID	Score	Number of faces
294998	0.5800	1
296842	0.8157	1
301043	0.5038	1

BAF Digital Identification (DI)

- False reject real в BPCER (all): 57
- False reject real в BPCER (single-face): 34

Examples of false reject real with found images:

Attempt ID	Score	Number of faces
291797	0.5657	1
292470	0.8135	2
292945	0.4869	1
294576	0.9059	1
294869	0.7933	2
295694	0.7519	2
296253	0.8406	1
296519	0.8843	2
296558	0.7974	2
300179	0.8388	1

B6. Attacks Found

BAF Kiosks

Attempt ID	Type	Score (1.15.6)	Score (1.17.3)	Status	Hypothesis
-	-	-	-	No attacks found	-

BAF Digital Identification (DI)

Attempt ID	Type	Score (1.15.6)	Score (1.17.3)	Status	Hypothesis
300461	-	0.5952	0.1853	✓ Detected	
302064	-	0.0427	0.0368	✓ Detected	

B7. Intelligence Findings

Early Signals

- Number of technical failures: 523. Most are related to the glasses detection parameter (examples: {290671}, {290739}, {290765}).

Critical Recommendations

- Disable glasses detection.
- Many overexposed or underexposed faces in False Reject + Quality reject (examples: {294642}, {296253}, {289890}, {291496}).
 - We recommend repositioning the kiosks. Reliable rejection of more complex attacks requires visibility of the eye area and face boundary.

Appendices

No appendices collected.