

Dear Juror:

The discussion here goes around how valid is my video because I overlay the eth address. But perhaps the most important part of the discussion is what we are trying to do here:

1) Are we trying to prove that this video belongs to me, well there is enough proof of that on all the evidence that I presented that the video belongs to me. Even having me answering and defending the way I am should be enough proof of my identity. on top of that here is another proof.

<https://youtube.com/shorts/hu7Ni2hEzsU?feature=share>

2) Are we trying to discuss the potential risk for POH of any video being faked? Well any video can be faked...but what is the danger of a video being faked....if some is trying to create a duplicate identity of myself, then it would be flagged as duplicated as it has the same name, and challenged in this same way. If some is trying to use my picture and video with a different name, people would not vouch it, because they know it will be a fake profile and it will be challenged in this same way I'm being challenged today.

3) Hence the argument of a potential fake video does not have any risk and does not affect the integrity of POH. Again, any video in POH can be edited with more or less effort.

4) Remember that there's a lot of money at stake on every challenge, the deposit, so people will find it if it is duplicate with the same passion they are challenging my case.... **The only reason left for this challenge is the economic benefit that will go to the challenger if this case is voted in favor.**

Finally my answers to each item of the new evidence presented by [0x89C4...8a25](#) below. Every argument used on these evidence, is answered and challenged by me.

1.- The Proof of Humanity policy reads "submitter displaying a sign", this must be understood literally as the action of displaying a sign where the wallet number is shown.

**Answer by Martin Migoya:** I'm displaying it, it is not specified how this can or can not be done. Even it says in the contract that "it can be a screen", and in this case is a screen....

2.- This is corroborated by the document "Proof of Humanity - An Explainer" on which it is explained that this is for the sole purpose of minimizing the likelihood of deep-fakes, "yes deepfakes are getting better but this particular method is still hard to falsify" (PoH - An Explainer, How do I register section)

**Answer by Martin Migoya:** Reading the full document it does not say it can not be an address placed within the video. It says it must have an address and it can be a screen. Both criteria are met. It is on a screen and the address is displayed.

3.- This is in correspondence with the nature and meaning of Proof of Humanity, which is precisely a proof of humanity, prove that the person uploading the video is indeed a human person and is alive (as indicated in the PoH documents)

**Answer By Martin Migoya:** I am a human, Im answering this, I have all kinds of proofs, from verified twitter account to any kind of link to my professional life...this argument is vague and poor. check @migoya on twitter....

4.- Consequently, it is not the support in which humanity is credited (video) that accounts for it but the content of that support, that is, the image itself of the submitter that accounts for a real and lived circumstance, since precisely an edited video implies a greater possibility of manipulation and fraud on the existence of the human being that appears in the video.

**Answer by Marti Migoya:** The content of the video is exactly what is requested in the instructions, and in the registry policy. You can check it here. <https://ipfs.kleros.io/ipfs/Qmc7ag5XohnSAozvsKsLCUbvaFyasyLtyi3H7g3mmxznPU/proof-of-humanity-registry-policy.pdf>

5.- The requirement that the submitter is the one who physically shows the sign with the wallet, whether it is done on a handwritten paper or on an electronic device that is in their hands or supported by a physical medium in which the wallet can be observed, reduces to the maximum the possibilities of fraud given the contemporaneity and instantaneity of the moment in which it manifests «I certify that I am a real human and that I am not already registered in this registry» and shows the “sign” with the wallet number in the moment when the video is created. That is, what is shown in the video support occurred at that precise moment and not in a later one and nothing was added or taken away from that vital moment in which said action takes place, which proves the humanity of the person who appears there.

**Answer by Martin Migoya:** The video includes the address, and the argument about that it can not be edited is not included in any of the documents nor instructions, just in the imagination of the challenger. Please demonstrate where editing the video to place the address is forbidden.

6.- This is so because there are several technical hints that allow determining that the video is not a fraudulent image. For example: video editing software applies mathematical functions to introduce effects like blurring that were not in the original scene, so by closely analyzing a blurred border (often using math based analysis) it is possible to decide if the blurred area is an effect of the specific take (e.g. optical imperfections, depth of field, movement blur, etc) or an a-posteriori introduced one. Thus, adulterating a video implies adulterating at least 24 pictures per each second of video (most probably 60 fps), preserving during the process the illumination, shadows, colors, resolution, physics of movements among others. Only a single frame not fulfilling the requirements can be used to identify its fakeness. 7.- Minimizing fraud avoids distorting the quality of the PoH records since PoH does not require data from the States on the existence and proof of life of the person appearing in the video. 8.- This would violate the purpose of PoH as a decentralized registry of humans and would render it meaningless in its

nature, objective and means (decentralized, universal, non-tamperable, etc.) by which it functions. 9.- It would also mean having to make agreements with the states to prove the existence and not death of that person at the time the video was recorded and would even depend on the proper registration of their citizens by them, which may very well be inaccurate or outdated. 10.- Therefore, it is only the video itself, what it says and what it shows, the proof of the essential humanity of PoH to obtain the UBI cryptocurrency. 11.- I insist, an edited video, whatever the level of editing, prevents clearly sustaining the inexistence of fraud and does not allow to affirm with a minimum margin of error that the person who appears in the video is a living human person which in turn has access to the registered wallet.

**Answer by Martin Migoya:** This technical analysis is very poor and it goes in the direction I have been explaining. Every video (including the founder's Santiago Siris video) can be edited and there is no way to determine if that edition happened or not, if the edition has been properly done. It is just about changing a single character in the address for the video to be faked...and it is a video of just 5/6 seconds...not many frame to edit by hand if you want to use the most rustic technic.

But what is the potential problem with a fake video? if some is trying to create a duplicate identity of myself, then it would be flagged as duplicated as it has the same name. If some is trying to use my picture and video with a different name, people would not vouch it, because they know it will be a fake profile and it will be challenged in this same way. Dear Jurors remember that there's a lot of money at stake on this challenge, so people will find it if ti is duplicate with the same passion the are challenging my case...so the argument of a potential fake video does not have any risk and does not affect the integrity of POH. Again, any video in POH can be edited with more or less effort.

12.- Therefore, the submitter 0x9E2a1Ab058047e4513B210f251eaFf99088F13FE's video does not meet the requirements to reliably accredit the humanity test and, therefore, does not meet the reliability conditions required by the PoH registration.

Answer by Martin Migoya: This is the funny part. It is me talking for 6 seconds, defending the case and arguing in my favor. Is it possible to still think that I'm not a human? Is it possible to think I'm a robot? Is it possible to think that the person here <https://youtube.com/shorts/hu7Ni2hEzsU?feature=share> is not the same as in the video that was uploaded from the same address to my profile....

Finally the last argument about what is required and what is not, is absolutely invalid. EVERY aspect of the POH requirements and instructions were met by my video.

@proofofhumanity may just change the instructions and clarify the situation if needed, but if this challenge results a success, it will be just for the challenger not for proof of humanity. I will loose my address, my deposit and my application and need to resubmit again for something is not a mistake neither is against the instructions.

Thanks again for reading all these and looking forward for a favorable resolution for the best of Proof of Humanity.