

Great to see so much participation and great minds coming out to play. I am making a new thread specific to this topic. This is an area, which has been discussed multiple times across many threads, but never in a specific thread on this topic.

[REDRESSING THE BALANCE - APE FOUNDATION will delegate 6.3million \\$APE to a community VOTING wallet](#)

We could create several TIERS of different voting power within it.

Example: 1 APE = 1 vote

100 APE = 2 votes

Discord activity (upon checking accounts) = + 1 vote

DAO activity = + 1 vote

Holding 1 BAYC = + 2 votes

Holding 1 MAYC = + 1 vote

Being an AIP winner = + 2 votes

Being an AIP loser = + 1 vote

Specific task 1 = 1 vote

Specific task 2 = 2 votes

Specific task 3 = 3 votes

Capital Contribution

My thought process was not to reduce the principle of 1 APE = 1 Vote, but expand voting capacity. E.g. 1 APE => 1 Vote.

Saying 100 APE = 1 Vote, something that ThankApe and Prop House does already, is very easy to game

. Buy 100 APE and make 100 wallets. This will soon be a near 0 cost proposition when we move to ApeChain and don't have to pay high ETH Gas fees to do so.

Now you have 50x the voting power of a regular guy who owns 100 APE in 1 wallet. (Based on your example above, 100 APE = 2 votes)

We may move to this famous tenet (I changed it a bit)

All APE is equal, but some APE is more equal than others

Capping voting power is way too easy to break and also I would argue (on Foundation level voting) stops APE being a governance token and potentially risks it being classified as another type of token.

ThankApe previously did this, but the rewards of APE usually below 1000 APE made this less of an incentive to game the system. Effort vs Benefit. Hence, why it might be acceptable for Micro Grants but not for large AIPs that are either Grants or Investments.

If an AIP recipient (Think ThankApe) does this with funds they acquired by a grant it is up to them. How they design their company programs is not a foundation decision and hasn't changed the principles of the ApeCoin Foundation of ApeCoin being a governance token.

BAYC/BAYC benefits - I hold both of these NFTs, but I feel that this more a capital contribution more than a labour contribution. Also one could argue we got our reward in the tokens. I bought thinking with high probability that APE was coming and factored it into my purchase price decision.

Holding 1 BAYC = x vote

Holding 1 MAYC = x vote

One of the reasons that MOCA has a high floor price is the ability for it to vote within a large ApeCoin Delegation. Many holders have committed significant capital for this benefit. Again I personally paid 2+ ETH for this.

It could be a labour contribution, if there are benefits for holding various NFTs, perhaps if it is linked to these NFTs having active and functional delegations?

Labour Contribution

This could work as a multiplier on your capital contribution.

Say 1000 APE is the voting weight if purely on Capital allocation, but could be says 1200 APE if Labour multipliers are added. Hence in this example a cap at a +20% multiplier on your capital contribution

Being an AIP accepted author = x votes

Being an AIP submitter (all the way to snapshot) = x vote

Being an AIP submitter (all the way to AR) = x vote

Forum activity (upon checking accounts) = x vote

Forum Level 2 = x vote

Forum Level 3 = x vote

Forum various metrics (think gamification on the forum) = x vote

Forum AIP Update report - x vote

Co-author of an AIP = x vote

Delegating your vote = x vote

Snapshot voting activity = x vote

There are ways to convert labour into capital e.g. APE, ThankApe is already doing this on an additional versus multiplication principle. E.g. you earned 100 APE for X posts over a season. It is a flat amount which gives you an increase in APE, hence provides you with an additional capital contribution (flat increase in voting power), which you could couple with direct labour contributions in the DAO to earn the multiplier on top.

I have reserved (months back) Zealy Apecoin name to look into this.

Specific task 1 = 1 vote

Specific task 2 = 2 votes

Specific task 3 = 3 votes

Questions

Should Labour contributions be working on a multiplier of your capital contribution or an addition to it?

Should the percentages and design of the Algorithm be published or kept secret? If published people will clearly follow specific actions to maximise their benefit. There is no good answer on this one. Think about how a search engine works.

Great to get feedback on this.

[@yatsiu](#) [@LL99Starz](#) [@AllCityBAYC](#) [@furiousanger](#) [@NFD](#) [@0xSword](#) [@LiveFast9986](#) [@Cryptosheep](#) and others.