

This draft was composed as a response to funders' [comments on the EA forum](#) that they want to fund work that is critical of EA. It will for now be circulated with funders, but I hope to make a future version of it public.

I propose a list of structural changes for organisations that identify as EA institutions.¹ I have reasons for why I propose the specific reforms and research directions, but I will only type them out if I get a clear signal that this is worth my time.

EA Structural Reforms

I have outlined reasons why I think EA needs to reform [here](#).

I mentioned some of the effects of epistemic deterioration [here](#).

Intention: to ensure that EA institutions are likely

- to have a positive effect in the *long-term*
- to converge on correct policies
- to remain a nice environment for most members

I classify the list in two types:

A = ideas I'm pretty sure about and thus believe we should now hire someone full time to work out different implementation options and implement one of them

B = ideas I'm less sure about, but convinced enough such that I believe they are worth structural deliberation, research and concrete proposals -> resources should be allocated to determine whether they should be implemented (moved into list A)

¹ Many thanks to Dr Luke Kemp for his input and comments.

Structural Reforms List A

- Set up **whistleblower protection** schemes for members of EA organisations
 - Legal, financial and social support for those who want to come forward to make information public that is in the public interest
- Transparent listing of funding sources on each website of each institution
- Detailed and comprehensive conflict of interest reporting in grant giving
- Within the next 5 years each EA institution should reduce their reliance on EA funding sources by 50% (ensures you need to convince non-members that your work is of sufficient quality and relevance)
- Within 5 years: EA funding decisions are made collectively
 - First set up experiments for a safe cause area with small funding pots that are distributed according to different collective decision-making mechanisms
 - Subject matter experts are **always** used and weighed appropriately in this decision mechanism
 - Experiment in parallel with: randomly selected samples of EAs are to evaluate the decisions of one existing funding committee - existing decision-mechanisms are thus 'passed through' an accountability layer
 - **All** decision mechanisms have a deliberation phase (arguments are collected and weighed publicly) and a voting phase (majority voting, quadratic voting..)
 - Depending on the cause area and the type of choice, either fewer (experts + randomised sample of EAs) or more people (any EA or beyond) will take part in the funding decision.
- No fireside-chats at EAG with leaders, instead panel/discussions/double cruxing disagreements between widely known and influential EAs and between different orgs and more space for the people that are less known
 - Instead feature people who are less well known / host discussions between leaders and unknown EAs

- Invite external speakers/academics who disagree with EA to give central talks and host debates between external speakers and leaders
- Increase transparency over
 - Who gets accepted/rejected to EAG and why
 - leaders/coordination forum
- Set up: ‘Online forum of concerns’
 - yearly invite all EAs to raise any worries they have about EA central orgs
 - establish voting mechanism: upvotes on worries that seem most pressing
 - top x worries promised to be addressed by a central org (declares this beforehand)

Structural Reforms List B

- quality journalists get full access to EA institutions to investigate
- More non-EAs should work at EA institutions
- EA red team
- Explicit programmes on theory of change: debates, lectures, series of forum posts and competitions, hosting of experts, panel discussions, EAG framed around this question
- Set up survey on cognitive/intellectual diversity within EA
- Prioritise getting greater representation of underrepresented academic fields
- Democratise EA institutions: strategic, funding and hiring decisions should not be made by the institute director or CEO
- Set up a counter foundation that has as its main goal critical reporting, investigative journalism and “counter research” to EA and other philanthropic institutions (a red-team). This body should be run by different, independent people and funded by its own donations, with a “floor” proportional to other EA funding decisions (e.g., at least 1 researcher/community manager/grant program, admin fees in a certain height.)

