Towards a More Trustworthy Facial Analysis System using Self-Auditing

Rahul Dass

UNIVERSITY

OF MIAMI

Ph.D. Student, U-LINK Predoctoral Fellow

April 5, 2021

Dr. Ubbo Visser (Computer Science) Dr. Nick Petersen (Sociology and Law) Dr. Odelia Schwartz (Computer Science)

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI



Overview

- 1. FPT performance what's the deal?
- 2. Highlights from 2020
- 3. Research questions
- 4. "Self-auditing" method
- 5. Results
- 6. On-going / future work
- 7. One more thing...

FPT performance – what's the deal? (1/2)

SUCCESSES: controlled development and evaluation

- Rigorous evaluation by NIST every 6-months for over 200 algorithms in facial processing technology or FPT (Grother et al., 2018)
 - Only 0.2% error rate
 - Since 2010 and 2014: 25% and 20% gains

- Rapid improvements across different components in FPT pipelines
 - Technical solutions (Ryu et al, 2017; Kärkkaäinen & Joo, 2019; Dass et al., 2020)
 - Societal repercussions (Buolamwini & Gebru, 2018; Hanna et al., 2020; Raji & Fried, 2021)
 - Force industrial accountability (Raji & Buolamwini, 2019; Heilweil, 2020)
 - Tech policies for stakeholders (Garvie, 2016; Moy, 2019; Learned-Miller et al., 2020)

FPT performance – what's the deal? (2/2)

FAILURES: real-world deployments and repercussions

- Continued failed pilots by Western law enforcement UK and many states in the U.S. (Raji and Fried, 2021)
- FPT bans and moratoria across the U.S. (Raji and Fried, 2021)
- NIST reporting systemic classification disparities across facial characteristics based on recent varied tests assessing FPT robustness and generalizability (Raji and Fried, 2021)

Highlights from 2020

It's Not Just Black and White: Classifying Defendant Mugshots Based on the Multidimensionality of Race and Ethnicity [Dass et al., 2020]

- Task: predict contemporary notions of racial identification for mugshots by considering race and ethnicity as multidimensional
- Aimed to tackle potential sources of bias within a FPT pipeline:
 - Labeling bias: using 2 sources of ground-truth (court text-based and human's visual-based)
 - Dataset bias: balancing training sample sizes and two data augmentation methods
 - Algorithmic bias: 7 vision architectures with ImageNet weights and fine-tune hyperparameters

From last year...Future Work

- Difference between highest accuracies (Race is 0.37%) and (Race-Ethnicity is 3.31%), models' architecture less contributory when using transfer learning investigate if training DLMs from scratch makes a difference?
- Inference learning via "Balanced Student Race-Ethnicity" SE-ResNet-50 model:
 - Predict race-ethnicity for remaining student annotated mugshots (14K stratified sample)
 - Generate new DLM-based race-ethnicity labels for remaining 180K mugshots and compare performance with Imbalanced Court trained SE-ResNet-50 (81.05%)
- Evaluate how biased each DLM is w.r.t. each race-ethnicity subgroup and assess if the new methodology fosters DLMs to be more demographically inclusive

Research Questions*

*building from last year's talk

- Domain adaptation / transfer learning:
 - To what extent does (1) model architecture and, (2) pretrained weights for out-of or in-domain task classification
 - Generate (missing) race and race-ethnic labels and compare with ground-truths
- Improve DLM engineering:
 - Other face preprocessing methods, vision architectures, pretrained paradigms?
- Create DLM inference and interpretability pipeline:
 - Experimentation-based evaluation on unseen mugshots subject to varying data augmentations (Muthukumar et al., 2018; Balakrishnan et al., 2020)

Results (1/4) - Generate mugshot labels

- Generated approx. 194K mugshots
- High degree of correspondence with generated court labels, r = 0.8143
- Suggests a viable method for generating missing race-ethnicity labels in court databases
- Expand to investigate disparities in criminal justice

[\$ cat mtCt2s_vgg19.csv | head -10 Jail_ID,Black_Prob,White_Prob,Prediction 110068060,0.999995,5e-05,Black 12000006,0.24984,0.75016,White 120000034,0.99997,3e-05,Black 120000104,0.9838,0.0162,Black 120000109,0.00037,0.99963,White 120000164,0.99998,2e-05,Black 120000171,0.99997,3e-05,Black 120000182,0.99999,1e-05,Black 120000195,1.0,0.0,Black

r <mark>dass@sickles</mark> ~/Research/ULINK/2020_Image_Vision_Computing/cat4_full_dataset nvidia-smi Mon Jun 1 00:01:40 2020											
NVID	NVIDIA-SMI 384.81 Driver Version: 384.81										
GPU Fan	Name Temp	Perf	Persis Pwr:Us	tence-Ml age/Capl	Bus-Id		Disp.A ry-Usage	-+- \ :	Volatile l GPU-Util	Jncorr. EC Compute M	C .
0 N/A +	Tesla 44C	P100- P0	-PCIE 43W	Off / 250W	0000000 14074M	0:04: iB /	00.0 Off 16276MiB		12%	Defaul	0 t +
1 N/A +	Tesla 40C	P100- P0	-PCIE 37W /	Off / 250W	0000000 14145M	0:82: iB /	00.0 Off 16276MiB	; ; ; +;	0%	Defaul	0 t +
+ Proc										GPU Memor	+ y
I GPU		PID	Туре	Process	name					Usage	
0	23	 8987	C	rdas	s/Resear	ch/te	nsorflow	/Env	//bin/pytho	on 723Mi	B
0	23	3995	C	rdas	s/Resear	ch/te	nsorflow	En	//bin/pytho	on 1957Mi	BI
0	26	5953	C	rdas	s/Resear	ch/te	nsorflow	En	//bin/pytho	on 723Mi	BI
0	26	973	Ć	rdas	s/Resear	ch/te	nsorflow	En/	/bin/pyth	on 194/Mi	BI
	21	275	C	raas	s/Kesear	ch/te	nsortlow	En\	//bin/pytho	on 723Mi	BI
1 0	21	180 2T2	Ċ	raas	s/Resear	ch/te	nsorflow	Env	//bin/pythe	on 723Mi	D I D I
1 0	31	799	c	nython	s/ Resear				v o in py in	1279Mi	RI
0	36	5250	c	rdas	s/Resear	ch/te	nsorflow	۶n۱	/hin/nvth	on 1945Mi	RI
1 0	36	5519	č	rdas	s/Resear	ch/te	nsorflow	En	/bin/pyth	on 3299Mi	BI
1	23	3987	č	rdas	s/Resear	ch/te	nsorflow	En	/bin/pyth	on 2145Mi	ΒI
1	26	6953	С	rdas	s/Resear	ch/te	nsorflow	En	/bin/pytho	on 2161Mi	ΒI
1	27	275	С	rdas	s/Resear	ch/te	nsorflow	En	/bin/pytho	on 3259Mi	ΒI
1	27	7315	С	rdas	s/Resear	ch/te	nsorflow	En	/bin/pytho	on 3299Mi	ΒI
1	31	L480	C	rdas	s/Resear	ch/te	nsorflow	En	/bin/pytho	on 3259Mi	ΒI

Results (2/4) – Extent of Face preprocessing

Original [varying resolution]



Original resized [299 x 299]



OpenFace [299 x 299]



MTCNN [299 x 299]







[N = 195,174]





[N = 194,957] [N = 195,162] -217 -12

[Source: Dass et al., 2021a – working paper]

Results (3/4) - Improve DLM engineering

Vision architectures: DenseNet161

Pre-trained paradigms: ImageNet vs. Random vs. Face

Table 1: Comparing the validation accuracies of 7 DLMs subject to varying pretrained paradigms usingMTCNN preprocessed mugshots for binary (Black vs. White) classification

Model	ImageNet		Random		VGG (Scra	Face2 atch)	MS-Celeb-1M (Scratch) VGGFace2 (Fine-Tune)		
	Courts	Students	Courts	Students	Courts	Students	Courts	Students	
AlexNet	92.75%	92.75%	94.50%	93.50%	-	-	-	-	
DenseNet161	96.50%	96.50%	96.00%	92.25%	-	-	-	-	
InceptionV4	96.75%	96.75%	94.25%	91.50%	-	-	-	-	
ResNet50	95.25%	95.25%	94.00%	92.25%	96.00%	94.75%	97.00%	93.25%	
SE-ResNet50	96.75%	96.75%	96.00%	92.00%	96.00%	94.25%	94.75%	93.50%	
SE-ResNeXt-50	96.75%	96.75%	96.00%	90.50%	-	-	-	-	
VGG19_bn	96.75%	96.75%	92.50%	90.00%	-	-	-	-	

[Source: Dass et al., 2021b – working paper]

"Self-auditing" method (1/2)

672 model inference interpretability scenarios= 28 DLMs x 24 data augmentations (unseen mugshots from same dataset)

- Inference: predict binary (Black vs. White) racial categories
 - Extent of face preprocessing: Original resized vs. OpenFace vs. MTCNN
 - Facial orientation: Natural vs. Inverse (upside-down)
 - Ground-truth source: Courts vs. Students
 - Racial category: Black vs. White
- Interpretability: visualize DLM top-layer for "best" and "worst" mugshots
 - Saliency maps: Grad-CAM and guided backpropagation
 - Greatest model confidence: correctly (best) and incorrectly (worst) mugshots

"Self-auditing" method (2/2)

Table 2: Breakdown of 10 test time datasets out of 24 in total based on four data augmentationparameters for model evaluation

Test	Test dataset	Test augmentation parameters					
scenario	size	Ground-truth	Face preprocessing	Face orientation	Racial category		
1	5,931	court	original	natural	Black		
2	6,244	court	original	natural	White		
3	5,924	court	OpenFace	natural	Black		
4	6,242	court	OpenFace	natural	White		
5	5,931	court	MTCNN	natural	Black		
6	6,244	court	MTCNN	natural	White		
7	6,931	court	original	inverted	Black		
8	7,244	court	original	inverted	White		
9	6,924	court	OpenFace	inverted	Black		
10	7,242	court	OpenFace	inverted	White		

[Source: Dass et al., 2021a – working paper]

Result (4/4) - "Self-auditing" pilot results

Ground-truth source (training)	Initialization paradigm	Model architecture	Test scenario	Racial Category	Model accuracy
student	ImageNet	SE-ResNeXt-50	7	Black	99.94%
court	ImageNet	VGG19_bn	16	White	99.76%
court	Random	InceptionV4	21	Black	28.29%
student	Random	AlexNet	8	White	4.14%





(a) Correctly predicted Black mugshot with highest (b) Correctly predicted White mugshot with highest model confidence.



(c) Incorrectly predicted Black mugshot with highest (d) Incorrectly predicted White mugshot with highest model confidence.

[Source: Dass et al., 2021a – working paper]

On-going / future Work

- Detecting Racial Inequalities in Criminal Justice: An Ethical Deep Learning Approach for Generating and Interpreting Racial Identification using Mugshots Rahul K. Dass, Nick Petersen, Marisa Omori, Tamara Lave, Ubbo Visser (2021a) – Working paper
- From ImageNet to Facial Analysis Classification: Rethinking CNN Initialization Paradigms for Out of Domain Adaptation using Self-Auditing Rahul K. Dass, Odelia Schwartz, Ubbo Visser (2021b) – Working paper
- Expanding the *trustworthy* vision methodology to other domains:
 - 2D/3D multi-model object detection (RoboCanes)
 - Retinal fundus images (Bascom Palmer)

One more thing...



April 6, 2021 – Tomorrow @ 5:30 pm!

<u>https://miami.zoom.us/meeting/register/tJ</u> Utce6hrDMpGdy4kEpJzOEH4EWdSwaRE1r4