

PREAMBLE

Hi all - As you all know, since I joined the DAO over two months ago, back on June 29th, I have always advocated for a revision to the DAO's current voting system. On July 20th, I outlined my concerns in my [RFC : Riding The Wings Of Change](#) which I eventually turned into a very detailed [AIP-318](#) from the original idea.

Yesterday, after a Discord altercation ([start here](#)), in what can only be described as frustration and defeatist resignation, I withdrew that AIP, as well as my other DAO related [AIP-312](#) (docs request). My reasoning? Why even bother? An AIP that, for all intent and purposes is destined to fail at vote, is no different from one that's withdrawn. All that AIP ends up doing is creating a record that someone attempted to do it - while knowing the odds weren't good.

I was all but done here, were it not for others who knew what had happened and which resulted in various discussions regarding my involvement and what it means to the DAO. In my game [AIP-316](#), I had specifically

indicated that unless circumstances dictated it, that I wasn't planning on leaving the DAO - regardless of what happens to my AIPs.

Here's the thing. It's very easy to get frustrated when you find yourself spinning your wheels or when you find that despite your best efforts the odds are stacked against you. And when you find yourself in an environment whereby you can't speak your mind without ruffling feathers as that comes with adverse consequences, that's how you know that you might be in a community echo chamber. To wit, today's ApeComms session on Spaces solidified this notion in my mind when someone in the session flat out said - and I am paraphrasing here - that they were in fear

of speaking their mind and risk offending the power players, thus killing any hopes of their AIP ever passing. You should go and [listen to the Spaces recording](#). If nothing else, you will also learn that some members of the Special Council were also in attendance, and hear what they had to say about a variety of things - including voting and AIP creation.

And once again, the issue of voting came up in the Spaces, coupled with the low quality and outright grifters that have come through here with AIPs.

So, today's Spaces prompted me to create this topic and to see how engaged those who come through here will be before it closes in 30 days.

THE VOTING SYSTEM

I will never get over the fact that for a DAO that's now over a year and a half old, that until I came along, nobody

bothered to put up an AIP - let alone an AIP or even a general topic - about the voting system. Yet, literally everyone - far and wide - knows that the voting system is the bane of the DAO.

Here's the thing: It doesn't matter how many AIPs come through here - good, bad, or ugly, if we don't fix the voting system by making it equitable for all, then it's ALL for naught. Some people don't like or want to hear this, but that's a fact.

As Waabam said today in the Spaces, you don't need to listen to people telling you that your AIP will pass or fail. You just have to write it up and let them in the Special Council work through it. Yeah - that's all well and good; but the SC working with AIP authors to tailor their AIP to fit within the DAO guidelines is just one side of the coin. The other side is the, yes, you guessed it - the voting system.

I am a numbers guy, that's my thing. So, since I got here, I have run various models ranging from community engagement to AIP pass/fail trends, to voting wallets, to timings for AIP from idea, to draft, to admin review, to vote. I have all of it. If you wondered how I managed to make TL2 in under two months without actually paying attention to engagement farming and the like, there's your answer. I pay attention - to everything that matters.

The voting system is inequitable in more ways than are visible to a casual onlooker. To the extent that even when I was writing up AIP-318, I literally had to refrain from listing all that needed addressing because I knew that the more things that I listed, the higher the chances of failure.

For example. Take a look at [AIP-288](#) (shield voting) which [failed](#) back on July 19. Well, someone thought that calling it something else, changing a few words here and there etc. would get it to pass. As I type this, that [AIP-313](#) is well on its way to [failing](#). Again.

You have to ask yourself why something as simple and straightforward

as privacy during voting so as to alleviate the angst and stress that comes with one's voting decision, would be voted down. This is the part where I mention that Machi, a whale whose wallet recently grew exponentially to 3.9m \$APE ahead of his upcoming [AIP-304](#) cited his reason for voting it down as "transparency. blockchain dont lie

”

What?

I could cite many - many - other examples of how some really good AIPs - all of which were in the best interests of the DAO

- get voted down. And sadly, most of them don't even give a reason for why they voted against an AIP.

Listen. Nobody - at least sensible people - would want to deal with stuff like that. At all.

If you read nothing in my AIP-318, at least read this [post](#).

DELEGATE OUTREACH

Which brings me to this subject as it relates to AIPs and voting.

There are some among us who strongly believe that AIP authors ought to seek out delegates in a bid to explain your AIP and discuss with them any issues they may have with it. You know why anyone would want to do that? It's because they want their AIP to pass. Well, guess what? That's not how you operate an equitable environment. Especially not a grants

DAO. That's how politics works. And like politics, complete with lobbyists and all manner of shenanigans, stuff like that is rife for abuse and corruption.

This is what I said on Discord yesterday about this.

[

apecoin-discord-01

1097×211 68.6 KB

](<https://global.discourse-cdn.com/apecoin/original/2X/0/0965f4af6fc314d36855cc960511a3463ef76c23.jpeg>)

[

apecoin-discord-05

1157×369 72.3 KB

](<https://global.discourse-cdn.com/apecoin/original/2X/4/49e0afc4e835b05dcd9c793369d70c682c7c51a7.jpeg>)

Let me use [AIP-313](#) as an example of why I believe that this is a terrible thing.

My personal opinion is that this is a good AIP that's worthy of the telling of an NFT project that sparked a [dying] revolution. And it's by an established and talented team led by [@wags5000](#) who I had the pleasure to being with in a Spaces recently.

So, guess what? After being advised that his AIP stands little chance of passing unless he reached out to the whale delegates, here is a small example of the author's journey. It's harrowing to say the least.

[

apecoin-discord-02

1144×383 88.1 KB

](<https://global.discourse-cdn.com/apecoin/original/2X/3/315fc540f7ea52d6939a16ebbf3525a31b5b213a.jpeg>)

[

apecoin-discord-03

1143×112 15.4 KB

](<https://global.discourse-cdn.com/apecoin/original/2X/a/a6d79cb320c8587eb811e7dc78349ffae8b72cb1.jpeg>)

[

apecoin-discord-04

1147×90 13.9 KB

](<https://global.discourse-cdn.com/apecoin/original/2X/f/fe3c78e54b5cf658493edccf78c23ecfef0eb5ca.jpeg>)

Oh and Machi, the largest voting wallet to date, voted against that one too. "Documentary looks great. I believe Yuga should find it

"

I don't even...moving along...

Then there's the case for [AIP-299](#) by [@normie](#) which, after reaching out to delegates, barely passed.

[

apecoin-discord-06

1149x220 55.5 KB

](https://global.discourse-cdn.com/apecoin/original/2X/0/064fa77a8ddbd3953b3db044439ef71f41aed206.jpeg)

Then there's this.

[

apecoin-discord-07

1152x125 21.1 KB

](https://global.discourse-cdn.com/apecoin/original/2X/b/b03b8acf7fd79ffd55e25239b794da1de7e3b249.jpeg)

What? I disagree with this in its entirety

.

When you go out to get a grant - for anything - you never, ever, have to do any

of that. You write up your grant, stick within the guidelines, present the materials needed in support of the request. Then wait to hear back. That's it. And that's precisely

what the founders of the DAO envisioned. And they put it in writing - right [here](#).

Let me take this one step further. When an [AIP-262](#) was written and subsequently [passed](#) (100% For), it called for a section that defined how the AIP benefits the DAO.

Here's the abstract:

ABSTRACT

This proposal seeks to update the AIP Templates to include a section entitled "Benefit to ApeCoin Ecosystem".

The purpose of this proposal is to address a recurrent issue in the ApeCoin DAO where AIPs go up to vote without a clear explanation of how they will benefit the ApeCoin ecosystem.

It would require AIP authors to explain how their proposals will benefit the ApeCoin ecosystem. If an AIP is requesting funding, it would need to explain in detail the benefit in relation to the amount of funding requested.

To me, that's pretty clear and straightforward.

So, if you write an AIP, you would already have identified how it benefits

the DAO. That means, voters - including delegates - should be able to read the AIP prior to voting. And doing that, provides all the details needed - including a section that specifically

spells out the benefits to the DAO. Sure, the onus is on the author to have already clearly defined those benefits in the AIP itself, but the onus is on the voters to read the AIP and to make a determination based on that.

We absolutely do not need to be promoting this notion that authors have to chase down voters - especially whales and delegates - to get their AIP in front of them. It's just not right. Forget about the whole privacy implications for a minute; but just imagine a new author coming here to write an AIP, then being advised that's what he needs to do in order to get it to pass. Do you think that person is going to bother?

CLOSING THOUGHTS

We have to fix the voting system. But the sad reality is that, in my opinion - and that of well-paid lawyers - only the Ape Foundation can do it if they are of the opinion that the voting system is detrimental to the DAO. No AIP is going to fix it. Which means that unless and until the Ape Foundation sees it fit to do so, the status quo will remain. Even as \$APE rapidly heads to zero unabated.

If we can't fix the voting system either via the Ape Foundation or an AIP, then there's no other alternative but to create a new DAO (e.g. ApeCoin Redux DAO) from scratch, and close this one.