This subjects pops every now and again, and in the last ApeComms@Lost and I bantered a bit about how best to address it.

As a software dev and a detail oriented person, I simply cannot be trusted to simplify anything

(in case you didn't know, back in the day, my Battlecruiser series of games sparked the RTFM movement

) related to committing thought into few digital words. And so, I have refrained from writing up an AIP for this; instead, opting to get some ideas from the community to see if it's even an issue worth addressing.

So, what's this all about, then?

Some proposals are highly technical and/or wordy in their nature, thus requiring copious amounts of words and images. This despite the on-going premise that apes (not all of them, tho) either don't like to read or don't read at all.

The complexity of some proposals warrants a lot more attention from the voters who need to absorb and parse this information in order to make an informed decision before voting. And therein lies the rub.

The other aspect to this, as @JasonJape also mentioned in the same ApeComms section, is that while Discourse has a translation option, most of the time it doesn't work as expected.

I don't see how else the AIP Draft Template could be simplified. But that may not even be the issue.

From my view, perhaps we need two specific naming conventions and descriptors as follows:

## AIP Draft Template - Simple

This would be the pre-existing version which needs no further revisions.

## AIP Draft Template - Advanced

This would be a new version which, while having all the same fields as the simple version, also has sections additional [technical] sections.

Though it may not even need any such new sections, the category of the draft itself should probably suffice.

But if we went this route of adding a new technical section, how does that translate over to name/number when an AIP number is assigned? Perhaps Lost's idea in AIP-451 provides a solution. One of the points in that proposal is:

Improving efficiency in the assignment of AIP ID numbers would help to preserve community resources, reduce risks to the ApeCoin brand, and increase the perceived value of AIP ID numbers.

While I have no idea how that was going to be implemented, perhaps we could adopt a naming and/or numbering convention that identifies whether an AIP is a simple or advanced version.

For example, we are currently around AIP-46?. We could keep this numbering scheme as-is for simplified legacy proposals, while adopting something like AIPA-nnn which stands for Ape Improvement Proposal - Advanced

, as in AIPA-0001

Doing it this way preserves the pre-existing draft contents and sections, while the numbering scheme in the proposal name is what prepares voters for an extended read.

Then the question becomes, how does an author know if their proposal is a simple or advanced version? Perhaps a word count?

Let me know what you guys think.

Some examples of an AIPA:

AIP-444: Growing Wellness: Home Harvest's billion dollar opportunity to improve the way we live & eat, powered by grow2earn

AIP-418: APE Builder Developed by Sequence

AIP-396: LFG VENTURES presents: Made by Apes - Powered by ApeCoin

AIP-364: The Battle for Goblin Town - A Bored Game

AIP-316: Fantasy MMORPG Game - Powered Exclusively By ApeCoin// This was mine

AIP-133: Boring Security - For The Long Haul!