

I had written [AIP-497: Restore Elections Data Visibility](#) so that we would have access to prior elections for historical data tracking.

During admin review, the SC rightfully determined that something like this shouldn't be a time-wasting proposal. And thus the new [Prior Elections](#) category was born. Yay! While I applaud the outcome, I can't help but feel that I was unjustly robbed of the "Accepted AIP Author" tag since this would have been an easy win. lol. Foiled again

Below are all my data related proposals currently making the rounds:

[AIP-508: Update AIP Tracking Data](#)

[AIP-507: APE Foundation DAO Transparency Reports](#)

[AIP-506: Update treasury dashboard to reflect pre-allocated funds](#)

[AIP-497: Restore Elections Data Visibility](#) // completed

[AIP-477: Special Council To Clarify The APE Foundation](#)

Anyway, this begs the question(s).

1. Do we need a procedure for getting questions and minor data updates like this done via the Facilitators? e.g. here is another request that's currently making the rounds [The phase after Admin Review](#)
2. If so, how would that work? Looking at the visit/posting trends (yes - I checked; and [@bigbull](#) is by far the most active - everywhere

) of the GwG, Facilitators and Special Council, most of them are literally absentee landlords

who don't actually engage with the community in any way, shape or form - even when tagged in posts. To wit [The phase after Admin Review](#). This ofc doesn't include the Facilitators who manage the proposals behind-the-scenes; since I have found all of them to be super punctual and efficient.