

I'd like to propose a pragmatic approach to deal with these types of challenges in a way which is fully compliant with the current policy. Both the challenger and the submitter look suspicious to me, so I don't know who is telling the truth (maybe neither are).

The policy states:

Deceased: The submitter has existed but does not exist anymore.

- The challenger can provide evidence that the submitter is dead such as a death certificate, an obituary, or public records.
- The challenged submitter can provide a video of himself reading a recent block hash. Submitters not able to give recent proof of life are to be considered deceased.

First note that by literal interpretation of the policy, it's not required by any party to provide any particular evidence ("can", not "must").

On the challenger side, it can become really difficult to show "a death certificate, an obituary, or a public record", especially if the death is recent. Even if the challenger provided the evidence, these certificates, and their availability, may vary greatly from country to country and it would become an impossible task (or a very difficult one) for jurors to determine the legitimacy of the legal document. As far as I know, death certificates don't have the necessary information to link them to a PoH profile. Additionally, showing this kind of certificate would decrease privacy.

On the other hand, the challenged profile can easily record a new video with a sign showing a blockhash, which is very similar to the video required for the PoH submission. More importantly, the policy is explicit here: Submitters not able to give recent proof of life are to be considered deceased. If the submitter fails to provide evidence supporting his position, he must be considered deceased. Also noticed that there is no way to check the date of the current video, which means that we don't know if it was recorded a few days ago or 3 months ago.

From an incentives perspective, the challenger is risking a lot of money while the submitter can easily prove them wrong and resolve the dispute in their favor.

Taking all of this into consideration, in order to lower the total workload of the system and potentially increase the efficacy of dispute resolution of "deceased" challenges, I think that the party providing evidence should be the submitter and not the challenger. Placing the burden of proof on the challenger's side would make "Deceased" challenges and removal requests impractical.