

I've put a lot of effort and time into following the WG0 initiative. But now at the end of its mandate, I voted NO to both steward suggestions

, and thats okay. Everyone is entitled to their own review of the results, and to make their conclusions. For me, I feel it all centered around implementing Ape Assembly elections.

The election system for BORED-AIP was put into place during an emergency.

The stewards had four months to engage users in WG0 and Catapult, but the working groups have not been effective. They are not functional. In nearly 0 cases were people talking about helping proposals, and how to actionably improve the current process. Stage panels did not appropriately address issues or onboard WG participants.

As a key Apecomms member, i've always looked at Apecomms as an optional experience.

Our collective has always been glad to have short zoom meetings and make introductions around the ecosystem. Often we'd simply share examples, but we'd rarely write proposals for others. Together, many community regulars throughout fall and winter have collectively helped proposals here on the forums.

I've always believed that we should focus on helping proposal authors. Apecomms first step, and the one im most proud still happens today, is there is a stage every week for proposal authors to speak to apes.

Last summer was hard. Proposal authors hosted spaces where no apes would show.

There was so little engagement after the bear hit. It was hard times everywhere.

Guess what...! Apecomms still opens it stage to host ALL proposers each week!

It was my hopes in January that working groups would quickly be setup to help proposal authors, to strengthen our core processes, to ensure monthly reporting like AIP-121 was quickly restored.

In some cases, the Twitter Spaces and large calls could leave people more confused than before.

And if I'm truly look at the performance of the Stewards to-date, I would say they are great Twitter Spaces hosts, but I do not want them representing Apecoin in ANY official capacity.

The tough part of my position is that I followed and partook in these processes. It was difficult at time to fit into the panels, to drill into further discussions, or counter things like basic definitions being blurred.

It is possible for people to leave a twitter space more confused than when they entered.

So my stance and reason for voting no, and even for asking delegates and voters to also vote no, is simply that after a performance review of 4 months, I don't think that this system best suits us, and I also don't think the stewards fully utilized their budget to explore structure options.

I don't think its going to be fun to enter into this Ape Assembly or its elections.

So I'm voting no. After a full review, now looking at the results, I don't think they are good for our ecosystem. And I think itll be harder to claw back than is being represented.

And I'm not excited to have gitcoin pass requirements for the Ape Assembly. Or whatever final detail they edited in to the dropdown menus before sending to snapshot. The new Working Group proposals appear to simply be drafts without budgets, and all of them are concepts that are not functional.

My input was not taken, and even my concerns were brushed away by hype.

So I'm voting no on these. And thats okay. I think others should consider it too