[

GWG_VotingAnalysis

1920×1561 249 KB

](https://global.discourse-cdn.com/apecoin/original/2X/9/9a8dedef166eda9b67fea53f165db1a730f5f643.jpeg)

DISCLAIMER:

The data presented in this report and its accompanying interactive raw data spreadsheets was produced by @LiveFast9986 and written collaboratively with the ApeCoin DAO Governance Working Group (GWG).

The information is intended to stimulate discussion within the ApeCoin DAO community and should not be considered an official pronouncement by the APE Foundation or the GWG.

We ask that you download the contents of the following link before engaging:

https://docs.google.com/file/d/1I5mSB_ZtH8KOBeR0oTpdkaIAIFmihNdE/edit?usp=docslist_api&filetype=msexcel

OUR CURRENT VOTING STRATEGY:

The ApeCoin DAO currently utilizes Snapshot’s “single-choice" voting system, which allows voters to choose for, against, or abstain.

METHODOLOGY:

As of today, we analyzed all 241 AIPs submitted to the ApeCoin DAO Snapshot page (AIP-1 to AIP-416). We examined the number of unique participating wallets and their voting power. We then recalculated the outcomes using three alternative voting strategies: Quadratic Voting, Supermajority Threshold, and 1 Wallet = 1 Vote

.

The downloadable interactive document is available to explore different Supermajority thresholds and simulate voting power distribution. This analysis sheds light on how these alternative strategies might impact future DAO decisions, considering the unlikelihood of Sybil attacks (splitting holdings into multiple wallets) under the current system.

BACKGROUND:

This report builds upon the valuable work of our previous ApeCoin DAO Secretary@Vulkan who established a Dune dashboard compiling AIP data points. Our current analysis expands on this foundation and extend a sincere thank you for his initial contributions.

ALTERNATIVE VOTING STRATEGIES ANALYZED:

Quadratic Voting:

This system emphasizes the number of individual voters rather than the voting power of their APE holdings. Two scenarios were considered: including and excluding abstaining voters (as abstentions affect calculations, though AIP-200 clarifies abstentions don’t impact outcomes).

Supermajority Threshold:

Set at a 2/3rds majority (66.67%).

1 Wallet = 1 Vote: A flat voting structure where each wallet has an equal vote, regardless of APE holdings.

Voting Strategy

# of AIPs Approved

# of AIPs Rejected

and % of AIPs with a different outcome

Single Choice

117

124

Quadratic Voting (w/ Abstain)

130

111

15 (6.22%)

Quadratic Voting (w/o Abstain)

130

111

15 (6.22%)

Super Majority of 66.67%

96

145

21 (8.71%)

1 Wallet = 1 Vote

167

74

56 (23.236%)

OUR FINDINGS:

Quadratic Voting:

Whether including or excluding abstaining voters, 15 AIPs would have had different outcomes (14 rejected to approved, 1 approved to rejected).

Supermajority Voting:

21 AIPs would have changed from approved to rejected, potentially saving the DAO an estimated ~$21,664,222 USD.

1 Wallet = 1 Vote:

This scenario would have resulted in the most significant change, impacting 56 past AIP outcomes.

GENRAL OBSERVATIONS:

ApeCoin DAO has witnessed a concerning decline in voter participation since AIP-4 and AIP-5 with turnout dropping from around 1,700 wallets to an average of 200-250 wallets per AIP. While the rise of delegations might be a contributing factor, further investigation is required.

Examining past AIP voting patterns under the Single Choice system, we observed a strong tendency towards one-sided voting in over 50% of AIPs (high delta). Conversely, 14% of AIPs exhibited close results (low delta). Here’s a breakdown:

- 144 out of 241 AIPs had a delta exceeding 50%
- 68 of those 144 had a delta surpassing 85%
- 34 AIPs had a delta below 20%
- 10 of those had a delta under 10%

ENGAGING THE COMMUNITY:

The ApeCoin DAO Governance Working Group (GWG) is committed to fostering a vibrant and informed community. While we don’t endorse any specific position within the following questions, we encourage healthy discussion and thoughtful consideration of the data provided.

A few things to consider:

1. Impartiality in Voting: Do voters make independent decisions, or are they swayed by current voting trends? Would implementing shielded voting influence behaviour?
2. Evolving Voting Strategies: Should alternative voting methods be explored? How do proposed changes align with current DAO metrics?
3. Desired Voting Outcomes: What kind of outcomes does the community prioritize? Are there alternative voting strategies that could achieve these outcomes more effectively?
4. Voter Apathy: What factors contribute to the decline in voter participation (e.g., market conditions, delegation system, or community engagement)?

In closing, we hope you found value in this document, the first in a series of similar reports we will be collaborating on with LiveFast enabled by the GWG Community Governance Improvement Program (CGIP).

Use the following links to learn more about the CGIP program and participate.

docs.google.com

[

](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSc4ijoNbRMtIVUA4QN6G5o3VHloJtnjxqvCBtKKzFc4pJfnvg/viewform?usp=sf_link)

ApeCoinDAO Community Governance Improvement Program: Idea Submission Form

The Community Governance Improvement Program is an initiative led by the Governance Working Group (GWG) designed to encourage members of the ApeCoinDAO community to offer services and/or practical suggestions that contribute to the improvement of...

docs.google.com

[

](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSd05qmhpNev1-VgMMs_QaOofBT1oyQ9hNZp07MV4oduc8XPyg/viewform)

ApeCoinDAO Community Governance Improvement Program: Community Skillsets Form

The Community Governance Improvement Program is an initiative led by the Governance Working Group (GWG) designed to encourage members of the ApeCoinDAO community to offer services and/or practical suggestions that contribute to the improvement of...