

The ApeCoin DAO governance is very far from ideal because voting activity is very low for different reasons. There are around 77,000 \$APE holders, but the ApeCoin proposals are receiving ~910 votes on average. And the participation in decline, for example [the most recent proposal](#) got only 470 votes.

One of the main reasons is that voting takes time and efforts, and not everyone can afford to allocate these resources. These holders are becoming the silent majority.

We still want their votes counted, so the best solution that was implemented is delegation. But the solution has its flaws, since small groups of players [can acquire so much voting power that they can turn any voting in their favor](#), making the DAO just centralised and not democratic.

I want to suggest and discuss a few ideas on how to prevent the threat.

1

We should set a nomination/election space to offer equal opportunities for all DAO members to receive delegated votes. My idea is to create a space to post submissions from community members who want to participate in government with delegated votes. A very simple solution that we can implement very fast is to create a thread on the forum for such submissions.

But this option will work only if we will make it visible by large number of \$APE holders. So to inform as many holders as possible the thread with voting should be shared regularly via ApeCoin social media. Also, the link to the space/thread can be reflected in the [snapshot.org](#) descriptions of proposals.

2

As [@0xNameLess suggested](#) to implement a cap on the amount of voting power one wallet can use. This way we will prevent the community of a situation where one highly charismatic influencer will acquire a disproportionate number of votes. Also, this will help to limit governance attacks by whales.

3

To implement a cap on the amount of time a delegate can use each delegated voting power. After the term is over, delegators can check the activity of delegates and assign their voting power again. Thus the voting activity of delegates would be regularly evaluated by delegators.

Do we need these? Any other ideas, opinions?