

The Practitioner's Guide to Biometrics

William Sloan Coats Amy Bagdasarian Tarek J. Helou and Taryn Lam







The Practitioner's Guide to Biometrics

William Sloan Coats Amy Bagdasarian Tarek Helou and Taryn Lam





Cover design by ABA Publishing

The materials contained herein represent the opinions and views of the authors and/or the editors, and should not be construed to be the views or opinions of the law firms or companies with whom such persons are in partnership with, associated with, or employed by, nor of the American Bar Association nor of the American Bar Association or the Section of Science & Technology Law unless adopted unless adopted pursuant to the bylaws of the Association.

Nothing contained in this book is to be considered as the rendering of legal advice for specific cases, and readers are responsible for obtaining such advice from their own legal counsel. This book and any forms and agreements herein are intended for educational and informational purposes only.

© 2007 American Bar Association. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher. For permission contact the ABA Copyrights & Contracts Department, copyright@abanet.org or via fax at (312) 988-6030.

11 10 09 08 07 5 4 3 2 1

Cataloging-in-Publication data is on file with the Library of Congress.

Biometrics / William Sloan Coats, editor

Discounts are available for books ordered in bulk. Special consideration is given to state bars, CLE programs, and other bar-related organizations. Inquire at Book Publishing, ABA Publishing, American Bar Association, 321 North Clark Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610.

www.ababooks.org

About the Editors

Amy Bagdasarian is an associate in the Palo Alto office of White & Case LLP. Her practice focuses on intellectual property litigation, including patent, trade secret, and copyright litigation. Ms. Bagdasarian has assisted in the representation of diverse high-technology clients in software, video imaging, portable electronics, semiconductor chip technology, and biomedical technology, among other industries.

Ms. Bagdasarian received her bachelor of arts degree from UCLA and her juris doctor degree from Santa Clara University. She is a member of the California State Bar, the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

William Sloan Coats is the executive partner in charge of the Palo Alto office of White & Case LLP. As an intellectual property attorney, Mr. Coats focuses his practice on cases involving software copyrights, patents, trademarks, and trade secret disputes for the software, electronics, and movie industries and bankruptcy issues. He represents leading business, computer, and entertainment hardware and software companies in complex intellectual property matters.

Mr. Coats has held various leadership positions within the American Bar Association's technology-related sections and divisions. He is currently the chair of the ABA Task Force on Biometrics and chair-elect of the Science and Technology Law Section and was a past chair of the Computer Law Division. Mr. Coats is also a member of the Delegation to the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law Working Group on Electronic Commerce.

Throughout his career, Mr. Coats has given many speeches and presentations and has published numerous articles on intellectual property issues in the computer, entertainment, and music industries. Most recently, Mr. Coats

gave a presentation titled "Investor Liability After *Grokster*" at the Fourth Annual Rocky Mountain Intellectual Property & Technology Institute Conference. He also gave a presentation on biometric technology at the Fifth Annual Global Privacy Symposium.

Mr. Coats is a member of the California State Bar, the U.S District Courts for the Northern, Central, Eastern, and Southern Districts of California, the U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and the Federal Circuit and the U.S. Supreme Court.

Tarek Helou is an associate in Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP's San Francisco office. He is the chairman of the ABA's Committee on Biometrics.

Mr. Helou's practice focuses on white-collar criminal investigations, securities enforcement actions, and intellectual property litigation. He spoke on a panel at the ABA's 2005 Summer Intellectual Property Law Conference. He earned a B.A. from Johns Hopkins University and a J.D. from New York University School of Law.

Taryn Lam is an associate in the Palo Alto office of White & Case LLP. Her practice focuses on intellectual property litigation, including patent, trade secret, and copyright litigation. Ms. Lam has assisted in the representation of high-technology clients in state, federal, and foreign courts.

Ms. Lam received her bachelor of arts degree from Pomona College and her juris doctor degree from the University of California, Berkeley. During law school, she served as an associate editor of the *Asian Law Journal*. She is a member of the California State Bar and the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. Ms. Lam is currently vice chair of the American Bar Association's Committee on Biometrics.

ADC	out t	ne E	aitors	. Xi
<u>Cha</u> Intre	<u>pter</u> odu	<u>1</u> ctior	n	. 1
Tare	k J. F.	Helou		
I.			ction	
	A.		aat Are Biometrics?	2
	В.		ometrics Are Not a Silver Bullet to Combat Terrorism or	
			ntity Theft	
	C.	ΑI	Description of the Different Types of Biometrics	3
		1.	Physiological Biometrics	4
		2.	Behavioral Biometrics	5
	D.	"Ide	ntification and Verification	5
		1.	Identification	5
		2.	Verification	6
	E.	Adj	justment to Time-Induced Wear on Fingerprints	6
	F.	Bio	ometrics in Use Today	
		1.	National Security and Intelligence	7
		2.	Law Enforcement	7
		3.	Border Control and Immigration	8
		4.	Commercial Applications	8
		5.	Government Benefits	
		6.	Physical and Network Access	9
II.	Ad		ages of Biometrics	
	A.	Bio	metrics Are the Most Accurate Form of Identification	. 10
	В.		metrics Are Unique Personal Identifiers	
III.			as Driven Recent Increases in the Use of Biometrics?	
	Α.	Der	mand for Better Identification and Verification	. 11
		1.	National Security	. 11
		2.	Identity Theft	. 11
	В.	Inci	reased Supply of Biometrics	. 12
IV.	Priv	vacy	Concerns	. 12
	A.	Sec	urity Gains vs. Privacy Rights	. 12
	В.	The	Threat of a "Stolen Biometric" Has Been Exaggerated	
	C.	The	Use of Biometrics as an Identification Tool for Law	
		Enf	Forcement and Intelligence Agencies	. 13

iv Biometrics

	D.	Database Linkage	13
		1. Security and Commercial Improvements Are Directly	
		Proportional to Database Linkage and Interoperability	13
		2. Privacy Concerns Are Directly Proportional to Database	
		Linkage and Interoperability	15
	E.	Cross-Border Privacy Issues	
V.		nclusion	
**	00.	nousion	
Cha	pter	2	
		ing Data Protection Regimes to Enable Global Tracking	
_		Prosecution of Terrorists	19
Willi	am S	loan Coats, Vickie L. Feeman, and Tarek J. Helou	
I.		roduction	19
Π.		e of Biometrics as a Means of Identifying Terrorists	
	A.		
	В.	Biometrics Are Used More Often as Identifiers	
	C.	Biometrics Will Enhance Security	
	D.	The Use of Biometrics Abroad Will Help Fight Terrorism	
	E.	Linked Databases Will Help Fight Terrorism	
	F.	Biometrics Will Enable Security Gains Without Compromising	
		Privacy Rights	25
		1. Biometrics Will Help Combat Identity Theft	
		2. Racial Profiling Will Be Reduced as Investigators	
		Focus on Suspicious Activity	26
		3. Biometrics Can Be Used as Identification Tools for Law	
		Enforcement and Intelligence Agencies	27
III.	The	e Need for the EU to Amend Its Data Protection Directive	
	A	The EU Should Amend Article 26's "Public Interest" Exemption	
	• • • •	1. Verbal Assurances from EU Nations That They Will	
		Interpret the Exemption to Apply to American "Public	
		Interest" Are Inadequate	29
		2. Political Disagreements Hinder Data Sharing Between	
		EU Members and the United States	30
	В.	The EU Should Expand Article 25's "Safe Harbor" Exemption	
	Δ.	Benefits to Apply to Financial Institutions	31
		1. Financial Institution Biometric Databases Will Be the	
		Largest in the Private Sector	31
		2. Intelligence and Law Enforcement Agencies Will	
		Increasingly Rely on Private-Sector Data Collection	32
IV.	Co	nclusion	
⊥ ₹.	CU	'HOLUULUIL	

<u>Cha</u>			
		States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator hnology Program	27
		R. Hoernlein	3/
I.		roduction	27
II.		rsons Subject to US-VISIT	
III.		-VISIT Procedures	
111.		Visa Application	
	В.	Entry Procedures	
	C.	•	
IV.	~.	als of US-VISIT	
V.		oice of Biometric Identifiers	
VI.		w the Data Is Used/Privacy Issues	
		nclusion	
	•		. 15
<u>Cha</u>	pter	4	
		rics and National Identification Cards	49
Tary	n Lar	n and Cynthia-Clare Martey	
I.		roduction	
II.	Wo	rldwide Use of National Identification Cards	. 50
	A.	Brazil	. 50
	В.	Chile	. 50
	C.	China	. 51
	D.	Croatia	. 51
	E.	Germany	. 51
	F.	Israel	. 51
	G.	Italy	
	H.	Pakistan	. 51
III.	Inte	egration of Biometrics into National Identification Cards	. 52
	A.	Countries Using Biometrics in Their National Identification Card	
		Schemes	
		1. Malaysia: MyKad Smart ID Card	
		2. Hong Kong: A Case Study	
		3. Australia: ePassport	. 55
	В.	Countries Debating National Identification Card Schemes	
		Including Biometries	
		1. The United States	
		2. The United Kingdom	
		3. Canada	. 58

vi Biometrics

IV.	The Policy and Legal Debate Raised by the Use of Biometrics on	5 0
	National ID Cards	
	A. Privacy	
	B. Function Creep	
T 7	C. Discrimination	
V.	Conclusion	. 61
	pter 5	
	Biometric Identifiers Make Us Safer?	67
•	D. Chen	
I.	Introduction	
II.	Effectiveness of Various Biometric Systems in Practice	
	A. Facial Recognition	
	B. Fingerprint Recognition	
	C. Hand Geometry	
	D. Iris Recognition	
	E. Retina Recognition	
	F. Voice Recognition	
	G. Signature Recognition	
III.	Do Various Biometric Systems Make Us Safer?	
IV.	Conclusion	. 76
Cha	pter 6	
The	eft of Biometric Data: Implausible Deniability	79
ian .	Johnson	
<u>Cha</u>	upter 7	
	metric Authentication from a Legal Point of View—	
	A European and German Perspective	87
Astr	id Albrecht	
I.	Introduction	
II.	The Different Aspects of Biometrics	
III.	Interoperability by Standardization	
IV.	Process of Biometric Identification	
V.	Data Security through Biometrics	. 92
VI.	Security of Biometric Systems	. 93
VII.	Security Infrastructures for Biometric Systems	. 93
VIII	I. Implications of Data Protection to Biometrics	. 94
	A. Legal Framework for Data Protection in the European Union	. 95
	1. Legal Basis in Europe	. 95
	2. Core Values of the EC Data Protection Directive	
	3. Article 29 Data Protection Working Party	. 97

	В.	Data Protection in Germany Relating to Biometrics	9
		1. Right to Informational Self-Determination	9
		2. Biometric Data as Personal Data According to German	
		Data Protection Law10	0
		3. Purpose Limitation	2
		4. Materiality Theory	3
		5. Proportionality Principle	3
		6. Prohibition of Discrimination	4
		7. Biometric Data as Sensitive Data	4
		8. Biometrics and the Concept of Privacy-Enhancing	
		Technologies	5
IX.	Bio	metrics and Border Control10	6
	A.	European Development	6
	B.	Biometrics with Regard to Personal Documents in Germany 10	9
		1. Amendments to the Acts Governing Passports and	
		Identity Cards	9
		2. Data Protection and Security Provisions with Biometrics	
		Enhanced Personal Documents	1
X.	Aut	henticity in Legal Transactions Through Biometric Actions 11	
		Functions of the Written Form and Importance of Handwritten	
		Signature	3
	В.	Peculiarities of Electronic Documents	5
	C.	Certainty of Evidence Obtained Through a Signature in	
		the Declaring Person's Own Hand	8
	D.	Biometric Methods and Legal Proof	0
	E.	Facilitated Proof in the Use of Biometrics	
XI.	Trus	st-Building Options in the Law	7
	A.	Standard Terms of Business: Liability Clauses and Duties of	
		Skill and Care	7
XII.	Emp	ployee Data Protection129	9
XIII.	Out	look	1
Char	oter :	8	
		ics in the Private Sector: Trends and Case Studies 139	9
Rocky			_
I.	Intro	oduction	9
II.		work and Physical Access Security14	
III.		metric Payment Systems	
IV.		sonal Data Protection	
V.		vel	
VI.		porate Data Protection	
VII		odards and Commercial Adaptation 14	

<u>Cha</u> r The		<u>9</u> plication of Biometrics to Payment Verification 1	47
Taryn			•
I.		oduction	147
Π.		w Biometric Technology Can Be Used to Verify Payments	
	Α.		
	В.		
III.		Benefits of Biometric Payment Systems	
		Increased Sales	
		Greater Customer Convenience and Satisfaction	
		2. Faster Transaction Time	
		3. More Effective Customer Loyalty Programs	
	В.	• • •	
	`	1. Lower Transaction Costs	
		2. Fewer Instances of Fraud	157
IV.	Cur	rrent Implementation of Biometric Payments in the Retail Sector	158
V.	Cor	nclusion	159
Chai	oter	10	
Bior	netr	rics and Digital Rights Management	163
		Hoofnagle	
I. ,	Bio	ometrics Overview	
	Α.		
	В.	One-to-One Matching	
	C.	One-to-Many Matching	
	D.	Entering a New Person into the Database	
II.		and Will Not Be Eliminated Through Use of Biometrics	
	A.	There Are Too Many Practical Problems with Biometrics	
	В.	It Is Too Cost-Prohibitive to Use Biometrics on a Wide Scale	
	C.	Some People Will Be Unable to Enroll in Biometric Systems	
	D.	Collection of Information Creates New Threats to Privacy	
	E.	There Are Many Technical Problems with Biometrics	168
		1. Uniqueness of Biometric Data Is Affected by Time,	
		Variability, and Data Collection	168
		2. Collecting Biometric Data Introduces Errors in the Data	168
		3. Increasing the Speed of Biometric Systems Can Introduce	
	_	Error	
III.	•	stems Are Subject to Circumvention	
IV.	_	gital Rights Management and Privacy	
V.	U.S	S. Law and Tradition Have Protected Privacy of Media Consumers	172

ix

<u>Char</u> Unir	oter oten	11 ded Consequences of Biometrics	175
		eep and Theodore F. Claypoole	
I.		oduction	. 175
II.		at Are Companies Measuring?	
III.	Why Is Biometric Information Collected?		
	Α.	Security Influence	
		1. Positive Influence	
		2. Negative Influence	
		3. Example: Positive or Negative Influence?	
	В.	Customer Service	
	C.	Government	
IV.	Cur	rent Trends That Will Predict the Future	. 186
	A.	Privacy Protection under the Current Law	. 186
	B.	American Privacy Model	
	C.	Privacy and Security Practices	. 188
	D.	Law Enforcement and the Constitution	
	E.	Proposals Affecting Biometrics	. 191
	F	Business and Biometrics	
	G.	Is the Legal System Ready?	
V.	Liv	ing on the Fault Line—Biometric Issues That May Arise	. 195
	A.	Acceptance of Biometric Standards	. 195
		1. De Facto Standards versus Chosen Standards	
	В.	Evidentiary and Procedural Issues	. 199
	C.	Database Issues	. 200
		1. Metabases—Government Participation	
		2. Bleeding Data—Centralized versus Distributed Database	
		3. Non-permissive Bleeding	
	D.	Growth of Legal Protections	
	E.	Government ID Cards/Default Cards	
	F.	Collection Issues/Registration	
		1. Notification	
		2. Privacy Policy	
		3. Request for Consent or Opt-In	
		4. Reminders	
		5. Opportunities	
		6. Repeated Consents	
		7. Extension	
	G.	Other Issues	
VI.	Sur	nmary	. 214

Chapter I

Introduction

Tarek J. Helou*

I. Introduction

he use of biometric identifiers had been increasing before members of al-Qaeda hijacked four airliners on September 11, 2001. Government agencies had already required biometric identifiers to control access to some secure buildings and areas. Private companies had started to use biometric identifiers to facilitate retail payments. September 11 led to an increase in calls for the use of biometrics. Most planned new uses have sought to address security shortcomings.

In the near future, you will pay for things, go through airport security, and log onto your computer simply by scanning your iris, retina, or fingerprint. Biometrics are the most accurate form of identifiers and, when used properly, can greatly simplify life. However, biometrics raise new questions about personal privacy, surveillance, and the effects of government and corporate databases that register and hold fingerprint data and other biometric information. Despite these concerns, advocates in the government and private sector claim that the use of biometrics will enhance privacy and reduce identity theft by decreasing reliance on credit cards, Social Security numbers, and passwords, all of which can be lost or stolen easily. Biometrics also raise novel questions of intellectual property law, including who will own the copyrights to data related to or derived from your biometrics and who will have the right to use that data.

Like all technological advancements, biometrics must be used carefully. However, like all technological advancements, biometrics cannot be prohib-

^{*} Tarek J. Helou is an associate at Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP, San Francisco.

ited from flourishing because of concerns over misuse. Society must adapt to technology because failing to do so is impossible and impedes the advancement of civilization.

A. What Are Biometrics?

Biometrics represent the measurement of any physiological characteristic or personal trait that is distinctive to an individual or a behavioral characteristic. Colloquially, it has come to mean the measurement and matching of physiological characteristics for purposes of identification or verification. Physiological characteristics are unique identifiers because no two people—not even identical twins—have identical biometric measurements. In this sense, biometrics are more accurate than other forms of identification, even DNA testing.²

In practice, however, biometric data collection relies upon the creation of a template based on a person's unique characteristics. These characteristics include physical features, such as fingerprints, iris scans, and voice scans. They also include behavioral features, such as gait and handwriting. Therefore, because biometric identifiers use a template, they are highly reliable but neither perfect nor unique.

As opposed to being a consistently replicable string of data, such as a Social Security number, biometric samples differ with each recording. For example, the same fingerprint will generate a slightly different sample every time it is recorded. The differences are attributable to several factors, including dissimilar finger placement, poorly maintained collection devices, and even changes in weather conditions, such as humidity or temperature. Some biometrics, like fingerprints, retinal patterns, and iris patterns, are relatively stable and change only through time, injury, or disease. Others, such as facial and voice patterns, are inherently unstable and change frequently. Thus, they are more prone to disguise, manipulation, and incorrect readings.

To deal with these issues, biometric collection devices create algorithms based on user biometrics. A user's stored biometric and the biometric he or she presents to a biometric system would appear different because a small percentage of the biometric data changes with each placement in a biometric scanner. Thus, the biometric-based systems create algorithms that approximate the user's biometric. A biometric algorithm that was a unique identifier would never allow the wrong person to pass for someone (a false accep-

Introduction 3

tance), but would also result in many instances in which an individual's biometric was not matched to the stored biometric (false rejections). By contrast, a system using a biometric algorithm that permits a match with decreased sensitivity will increase false acceptances but decreases false rejections. The use of two biometrics, although more costly and time-consuming, reduces false acceptances and false rejections.

B. Biometrics Are Not a Silver Bullet to Combat Terrorism or Identity Theft

Many people view the use of biometrics as a panacea to future terrorist attacks. This belief caused biometrics to leap to the forefront of national and international debates on security after September 11. This view persists because the use of biometric identifiers is often seen as a foolproof way to identify an individual or verify his or her identity. However, no method of verification or identification is foolproof and no single technology or system—or group of them—can guarantee security. Although biometric identifiers are not infallible, they can increase security significantly and they are the most accurate available form of identification.

Biometrics are not perfect and never will be. However, that does not mean that we should not implement better systems. The goal with biometrics, as with any other identification system, is improvement, not perfection.

C. A Description of the Different Types of Biometrics

Physiological biometrics, which are more common and generally more accurate than behavioral biometrics, include fingerprint scans, iris scans, retina scans, hand scans, and facial scans. Behavioral biometrics, which incorporate time and data based on user action, include voice recognition programs, keystroke recognition, and signature recognition. Biometrics can be as simple as recognizing a familiar face or as complicated as a computerized system that analyzes fingerprints and voices.

The most commonly used biometric systems are fingerprints, iris scans, face recognition, and hand geometry. These technologies vary not only in terms of their accuracy but also in the types of applications and facilities for which they are best suited.

1. Physiological Biometrics

a. Fingerprints

According to the International Biometric Group, fingerprints represent almost half the market share of biometric technologies. Fingerprints are most common in government settings because they are among the most accurate and least expensive of all biometrics. Fingerprints suffer from a high failure-to-enroll rate because some people cannot generate a clean fingerprint image and accuracy decreases with age. Fingerprint accuracy can be improved when multiple fingers from each individual are enrolled in a system. Fingerprint readers often use poroscopy, measure body heat, and incorporate pulse readers to ensure that the fingerprint offered is from a living person and it is a real finger (as opposed to a fake hand or a latent print). Fingerprints are also the least intrusive and most familiar of all biometrics.

b. Iris Scans

Systems that use iris scans represent approximately 10 percent of the market share of biometric technologies. Iris scans are the most accurate of all biometric technologies. Consequently, many high-security areas use iris scans. Iris scans are more intrusive than fingerprints, as the individual needs to place his or her eye very close to the reader, which also increases the amount of time for each scan. Iris scanners are becoming more powerful and are effective from increased distances. Iris scan systems are more expensive than other types of biometrics scanners.

c. Facial Recognition

Facial recognition systems represent approximately 10 percent of the market share of biometric technologies. One advantage of face recognition systems is that it can be easily confirmed by a system operator, such as a guard, by comparing a picture in a database with the individual's face. Face recognition systems are less intrusive than any biometric but are also less accurate and rely on several external factors, such as camera quality, facial position, facial expression, and other features such as facial hair or sunglasses.

d. Hand Geometry

Systems that use hand geometry represent approximately 10 percent of the market share of biometric technologies. Hand-geometry devices have a Introduction 5

higher false acceptance rate than fingerprint scanners. Like fingerprint readers, hand-geometry readers require little user training. Hand-geometry readers are relatively inexpensive.

2. Behavioral Biometrics

a. Voice Recognition

Voice or speech patterns represent a small percentage of the market share of biometric technologies. A person says specific words that the system records at enrollment. The system then prompts the person to say one or more of those words when the person is using the system. The system analyzes the speech pattern and determines whether the voice matches the prerecorded version of the words. Voice recognition systems are susceptible to changes in voices created by illness or background noise.

b. Keystroke Recognition

Keystroke recognition analyzes the way an individual types. Users enroll in a system by typing the same word or words several times. The system verifies the user by recognizing the distinctive rhythm a person uses while typing.

c. Signature Recognition

Signature recognition identifies an individual's handwritten signature by scrutinizing the unique way in which a signature is written. Signature verification is different from signature comparison. Signature comparison only examines how the signature looks. Signature verification assesses how the signature was created—instead of addressing the shape of the signature, it looks at changes in the shape, speed, stroke, pressure, and timing that occur during the act of signing.

D. Identification and Verification

The use of biometrics serves two closely related purposes, identification and verification. Identification systems perform "one-to-many" matches and verification systems perform "one-to-one" matches.