

Working Group Zero (WG0) Stewards:

[@adventurousape](#) [@Amplify](#) [@badteeth](#) [@Halina.eth](#) [@Lost](#) [@Vulkan](#) [@Waabam](#)

OVERVIEW

AIP-1 helped the DAO get off the ground, but as we have experienced this process for the past year it's evident there are improvements that can be made to increase the efficiency of the proposal process. The recommendations below aim to do just that. The goal here isn't to significantly alter AIP-1; we know it works. Instead, the goal is to fine-tune it and make it more efficient.

These are just the Working Group Zero (WG0) Stewards' recommendations based on our experience with the AIP process. These are not set in stone but rather require much more thought and feedback from the community. The idea here is to allow the Governance Working Group to continue leading this discussion to see if anything should be added/removed/altered.

The WG0 Stewards are not proposing any official changes at this time. These recommendations stem from our Working Group Zero mandate in [AIP-196](#).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Additions From Previously Approved AIPs

1. Addition of "Author Description" and "Team Description" to the Draft Template from approved AIP-121
2. Addition of "Abstain" voting choice from approved AIP-200 and clarity on what its purpose is

General

1. The Community Discourse Facilitators will be responsible for the Discourse Moderation process. The Cayman Administrators will still facilitate Snapshot, perform KYC and manage grant agreements / disbursements for grant recipients and contractors.

AIP Idea

1. The AIP Idea Phase would no longer be a mandatory seven day period. Anytime during the AIP Idea Phase, the author may request a Facilitator to have their proposal sent to the Draft phase and begin the rest of the AIP process.
2. Topics would no longer close when they are between the Idea and Draft phases. This was deemed an unnecessary step that did not add value to the process. The AIP topic on Discourse would only be closed after the AIP has found resolution through the DAO process, either being labeled as: "Withdrawn AIPs", "Implemented AIPs", "Accepted AIPs", or "Rejected AIPs".

AIP Draft

1. The AIP Draft Template would no longer require Authors to include a Proposal Category. The Discourse Facilitators will assign AIPs a Proposal Category when they are assigned an AIP number, after the Draft Phase.
2. The Abstract, Motivation and Rationale sections in the current AIP Draft Template always felt similar with a decent amount of overlap between the three so we are proposing the Motivation section should be removed. The Abstract would include motivation for the proposal and the Rationale would include details on how the proposal aligns with the Vision and Guiding Values of the DAO.
3. OKR & Reporting Schedule - Proposal authors should include Objectives and Key Results for their proposal, in addition to the schedule and mediums by which this information will be reported to the ApeCoin DAO. This would increase transparency to the community.
4. If an author has not responded to Facilitators within 14 days (originally 30), the AIP would be recategorized as a "Withdrawn Idea" AIP. This would help clear up the backlog as it develops.

Moderation

1. Discourse Facilitators provide AIP DAR packages to the Ape Foundation, which may highlight risks to the Foundation, but they do not "approve or disapprove" DARs. This would be a change to the wording of AIP-1.

Snapshot

1. AIPs should be posted to Snapshot during the same day/time window each week.
2. Drafts that have been processed and published on Snapshot during the Weekly AIP Release, cannot be edited, but can be removed.

3. Discourse Administrators, not Facilitators, are the only ones that would be able to post AIPs to Snapshot because they must ensure that each one has gone through the correct approvals process.