Respectfully, a chunk of the community is wary of the lock-up periods given their opacity and the lack of clarity about how exactly lock-up schedules are broken up. I strongly empathize with this given the numerous staking rugs I've seen from other cryptocurrencies where VCs and initial investors dump once staking is live to dump on a new set of users that are highly incentivized to hold and essentially act as funnels from users to whales. I also empathize with this given the lack of invites for apes to join in the first round of funding and the relatively small supply of tokens for NFT holders

The ApeCoin site says:

[

image

923×201 55.8 KB

](https://global.discourse-cdn.com/apecoin/original/2X/7/7234e5b603957c9cf793ae0ce4d88b7a6ffe9878.png)

…however it gives no insight on the proportion of tokens split up per lock-up schedule. This would not be an issue if all initial lock-up expirations were at 1 year, but one is at 6 months.

How can holders of ApeCoin not expect a massive dump at 6 months if we don't know how the supply is split up? For all we know 12% of tokens are in this schedule and 2% are in the 1 year expiration ones. Couple this with the recent push for AIP-21 and AIP-22, which forcibly paused all other staking proposals, this feels like a perfect VC dump set-up

Can we get more clarity on these lock-up schedules and the percent of that 14% supply in each of the schedules? Even more transparently, a list of investors (even if anonymized) and their specific lock-up schedules would be tremendously helpful and transparent.

tl;dr we should make the lock-up periods more transparent so we know exactly how many tokens are unlocked at each period, otherwise holders are blind to risks of major dumping by VCs and launch contributors at specific periods