

4. Video of the submitter displaying a sign with his Ethereum address - Required - The sign should display in a readable manner the full Ethereum address of the submitter (No ENS; no ellipsis). The sign can be a screen. The submitter must show the sign in the right orientation to be read on the video.

Having not funded the initial challenge, nor being the profile in question, reading the opposition's arguments, I cannot help but find some seemingly faulty logic.

First, opposition starts with:

*"The video requirements for PoH submissions in are clear: My **interpretation** of "video of the submitter displaying a sign" is that the submitter should be **performing the physical action of displaying a sign.**" ... "This **interpretation** is further confirmed by the latter text in the same paragraph "The submitter must show the sign'."*

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. However, I would like to state that this is not a fault of the opposition, but of the current ambiguous Proof of Humanity guidelines. The guidelines **did not** explicitly state only physical signs may be used. Mr. Migoya may have believed he was satisfying the requirements of "displaying a sign with his Ethereum address" by displaying a digital sign instead.

The guideline does states: **"The sign can be a screen. The submitter must show the sign in the right orientation to be read on the video."** As it stands, the PoH guideline only **explicitly** mentions that the sign **can** be a screen, but this wording does not explicitly exclude digital signs. As far as I can tell, as well, his digital sign seems to be in the "right orientation to be read on the video".

Further down the opposition's argument:

"In the video submitted by Mr Migoya there is no physical sign and he is not displaying it. Instead, there's a digitally generated banner inserted in a post-recording edition. How could anyone be sure that he himself has actually made the edition and not someone else who had access to the video and edited it before submitting the profile on behalf of Mr. Migoya?"

Again, what if Mr. Migoya interpreted displaying his Ethereum address digitally over his video as a sign that fulfilled the requirement: **"display in a readable manner the full Ethereum address of the submitter"**?

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.**

Opposition continues with:

"This kind of video submission should not be accepted in this registry because it's impossible to know whether he truly has access to the Ethereum wallet. That's why the registry rules require "displaying a sign" and specify that the sign could be a screen."

An option Mr. Migoya may explore is providing a video of himself with alternative methods of displaying his Ethereum address, such as with a screen with his Ethereum address already typed in, or with a physical piece of paper with his Ethereum address written onto it. I do not believe this is necessary, as he followed the guidelines currently listed, (the guideline did not explicitly state to display a physical sign to verify the submitter truly has access to the Ethereum wallet listed) but it may help alleviate jurors potential concerns of potential implications. Whether he chose to or not is up to him.

Lastly, opposition attempts to refute the proposed solution mentioned above with:

“Even if the submitter presents evidence with a new video with his ethereum address in a sign, the submission shouldn’t be accepted, because doing so will discourage future challenges and make the list more vulnerable to attacks.”

Whether it be Mr. Migoya, whom has been publicized to be CEO of the 9 billion dollar company, or an impoverished individual in need of UBI, we are all humans, and no one deserves to be deprived of their initial deposit based on an interpretation of which signs qualify and which do not without it being explicitly stated in the Proof of Humanity submission guidelines.

Whether the jurors decide to vote for, or against Mr. Migoya, the **bigger pressing issue** is that of the ambiguous guidelines that need to be revised. As it stands, amendments may be done through proposals in the DAO governance. We should not be penalizing individuals, regardless of socioeconomic status, who have read the rules and faithfully followed all requirements listed. Until changes are made, a number of future applicants will submit profiles with digital signs displaying their Ethereum address, oblivious that they should not use digital signs.

The opposition suggests that by setting Mr. Migoya (an applicant who simply followed the rules) as an example, this will dissuade future applicants from displaying digital signs of their Ethereum wallet. Again, until explicitly stated in an amended PoH guideline that digital displays, banners, or signs of Ethereum address are **NOT** allowed, 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. The reality is, many will be penalized and lose their entire deposits, all for pursuing the right for Universal Basic Income.

To conclude, despite the potential implications of having a digital sign on display, as opposed to a physical sign, the jurors **must** focus on if the applicant satisfied his terms of the contract when he submitted his profile.

“4. Video of the submitter displaying a sign with his Ethereum address - Required - The sign should display in a readable manner the full Ethereum address of the submitter (No ENS; no ellipsis). The sign can be a screen. The submitter must show the sign in the right orientation to be read on the video.”

migoya
Father, Engineer, Entrepreneur,
Music Lover, Founder of GLobant

Vouchers	Deposit
1/1	100%

Dispute [#593](#)

Martin Migoya (migoya)
0x9e2a1ab058047e4513b210f251eaff99088f13fe

0x9E2a1Ab058047e4513B210f251eaFf99088F13FE

- Video of the submitter displaying a sign with his Ethereum address - Required ✓
- The sign should display in a readable manner the full Ethereum address of the submitter (No ENS; no ellipsis). The sign *can* be a screen. ✓
- The submitter must show the sign in the right orientation to be read on the video. ✓