

This doc is adapted from a Slack thread. It is of course just a very preliminary attempt to gesture at some broad ideas. This doc is publicly accessible.

My initial thoughts:

- I see results from the [IGM economics expert panels](#) cited somewhat often, and it seems like that's probably a really useful thing to have.
- Idea 1: Does anyone know if there are similar things for other disciplines?
 - E.g., historians, psychologists, international relations scholars?
 - And if there isn't, might it be highly valuable per unit effort to set that up?
 - Obviously lots of individual experts comment on individual things, and there'll sometimes be surveys or the like. But it seems like it could make sense for this sort of thing to be institutionalised in the way the IGM panels are, rather than being ad hoc.
- Idea 2: Does anyone know if it's possible to submit questions to the IGM panel or other panels (if they exist), or to in some other way get them to respond to questions on topics of particular interest to EAs?
- (If people think this sort of thing doesn't exist yet but might be worth thinking more about, I might write a quick EA Forum post/question post/shortform on this.)

Thoughts from colleagues at RP:

- “In the US, the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine does expert opinion in a more formal way for relevant issues e.g., <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/25665/heritable-human-genome-editing>”
- “You hear a lot in the US from the US Army Corps of Engineers.”
- “PhilPapers seems like a natural place to expand polls of philosophers.”
- “I don't know about historians, but wouldn't it be cool if macrohistory/predictive history were more of a thing and they took surveys of their members?”
- Linch Zhang independently listed a somewhat related idea in his doc of ideas for forecasting-related projects