

Case #593

Rebuttal to evidence in favor of submitter.

Dear Kleros jurors, I would like to start answering the points the submitter presented as evidence in this case.

- 1) Is true that all the videos could be manipulated and digitally edited using frame by frame techniques, but a physical sign is significantly more difficult to edit compared with a banner in the video. Almost every person with moderate skills in Windows Movie Maker (or similar) can edit the video and put another banner on top of the original one. Frame by frame edition is a task of an expert user, to be done properly. That's why the policy says: "Showing a sign". The action of showing makes the video fraud harder and less likely to occur. In the submitted video, it's just a static banner in a post-video edition.
- 2) A screen is quite different to a banner. All the registries in this registry were done by showing a physical sign. The unique case I have found (maybe there are others, which should be removed too) is the case of Mr. Joeri (<https://app.prooffofhumanity.id/profile/0x34e5b67f60a8651ecb755eb969d2db9fc4098da6>) who was removed for the same situation and the community has not challenge this removal.

Video not showing a sign with eth addr

He is not showing a sign with addr as required. Instead he digitally inserted it in the video, this video could've been easily adapted to any other addr. The purpose of physically doing this is to make it harder to falsify for deepfakes <https://blog.kleros.io/proof-of-humanity-an-explainer/>



#1 submitted by 0x001fe2c0bee0743679e958c0861dd8788b28b19
8 de abr. de 2021 11:18 ART

- 3) I agree that the video is for proving that you are a human, and that you have access to the declared ethereum wallet. But it's also to make it harder for bots/deep fakes algorithms to trick the registry and be treated as humans when they aren't. The submitter proves that the declared ethereum wallet belongs to him, but it was presented after the challenge. Before this challenge it was impossible to know if he truly had access to this wallet. I'm glad that this wasn't the case, but the potential vulnerability was there. I remember to the members of this jury, that this case should be ruled according to the state at the challenging time.
- 4) This challenge wasn't intended to gain twitter audiences, just to prevent attacks to this registry. In my first evidence I just mentioned the submitter's name (used by him in his registry) but no other personal information, because I'm really focused on having a PoH registry safe from attacks. I truly believe that allowing videos like the object of this dispute is dangerous to this registry.

Now I would like to follow answering the evidence presented as a third party view.

"We cannot be carrying out rules based on only one anonymous individual's "interpretation" of them. If it was not stated that a physical sign must be displayed, then this renders the argument above obsolete and should not be considered by the jurors"

The policies of this registry said: *"The submitter **MUST SHOW** the sign"* it's way clear that the rules are talking about the action of showing a sign. And if you want to show a sign, you need a physical sign. Even, maybe, he could point where he later will add his address in a

post video edition, then we could be discussing if it could be accepted because he's doing the action of showing a sign with his address. In the video submitted in this submission is just a static banner that anyone can edit without any default video edition software in all the computers.

“Where does it state he must physically display a sign? Unless stated, “no digital signs or no digitally generated banner” Mr. Migoya should not be penalized, despite the implications of using digital signs may cause. To reiterate, this is not the fault of the opposition to challenge this, nor is it the fault of Mr. Migoya. They have different interpretations of what constitutes an acceptable sign that displays the Ethereum address. This is the fault of the current guidelines, which needs to be amended to include more concrete language to avoid situations like this in the future.”

I agree that a revision to the guidelines could be made, and if the DAO accepts them, will be the best for all the next humans registering into this registry. But I do not agree with the point that the submitter should not be penalized. All the humans that submit their profile to this registry have used a physical sign, because they understand that from the guidelines. Even, in the tweet made by the submitter some user has answered him that in the same situation, someone asked about it and has later removed his profile and submitted it again to avoid violating the rules. Please see https://twitter.com/_rubensantana/status/1383316015090569220?s=09

In this screen could be seen this user asking if his video with a banner would be accepted and the CTO of Kleros answering him that is against the rules. We all know that neither the Kleros CTO or Santiago Siris has the truth here, this is decentralized, but it's way clear the spirit of the importance of showing a physical sign.

“ [...] the opposition expects every future applicant to review every Kleros Humanity court case to see what precedents have been set in regards to ambiguities on the PoH guideline”

As the challenger I do not expect that. I think that the rules are clear, that's why more than 2000 profiles have been submitted using a physical sign showing their ethereum wallet. If the submitter and the parties supporting his submission guess that this is not really clear, they could write a proposal in the forum (<https://gov.prooffofhumanity.id/>). Even more, I encourage them to do that and I will support them to prevent future submission with this kind of video.

I will like to finalize this presentation answering the first part of the evidence presented by the third party: *“We cannot be carrying out rules based on only one anonymous individual's “interpretation” of them”*

This is not a case about some interpretation of one person. All the rules could be interpreted in different manners except when there is an explicit limitation, but it's the work of the challengers and finally of the Kleros jurors (the community around PoH in other words) to keep safe this registry, and if there are differences in the interpretation is the work of the justice (Kleros jurors) to close that gap.

No matter the result of this dispute,
Justice will be served.