



PART I — The Risk Curve That Has Already Shifted

April 23rd 2026

Prediction markets are often dismissed as curiosities, yet they have a habit of seeing around corners. Polymarket, the most liquid of them, is quietly signalling a future that many advisers have not begun to contemplate. Its most traded artificial-intelligence contract — whether OpenAI will announce AGI before 2027 — sits at roughly 22%. The significance of that figure is not that it concerns some distant horizon. It concerns this year, with roughly seven months remaining. In risk terms, 22% is extraordinary. If a nuclear plant had a similar probability of failure, it would be shut. If a bank faced such odds of collapse, regulators would intervene. If a medicine carried that risk of fatality, it would never be approved.

A 22% probability is not a fringe view. It is a live, funded scenario. And it is being priced by a market that outperformed polling and punditry during the 2024 American election. The deeper implication is unavoidable: if the probability of AGI this year is already that high, the probability for 2028, 2029 and 2030 cannot be only marginally higher. The curve must steepen. The window must narrow. The risk must rise. Nobody serious speaks of 2040 any longer.

Yet the real story is not AGI itself. AGI is the ignition event. ASI — artificial superintelligence — is the explosion that follows. To reach the latter, one must pass through the former, and the transition may be measured in months rather than decades. Some experts put the existential risk above 50%. Even if the true figure were 5%, it would be intolerable. But the market is not pricing 5%. It is pricing something far more urgent.

Across Polymarket's wider AI category, the same pattern emerges. Traders are not betting on incremental improvements. They are betting on acceleration.

They price Anthropic, not OpenAI, as the most likely organisation to produce the best model across multiple domains.

They price Nvidia at 91% to become the world's largest company — a level of certainty that only makes sense if the global economy is reorganising around intelligence production. They price capability jumps in months, not years. And the markets themselves are increasingly dominated by bots: AI systems trading against humans, exploiting mispricing, arbitraging latency and outperforming human forecasters. AI is already beating humans at predicting AI.

The risk is not AGI itself. The risk is what AGI unlocks. And Polymarket is one of the few places where that future is being priced in, trade by trade, long before advisers have grasped its implications.

PART II — The Tools Must Go Down

The advisory professions are ill-equipped for what is coming. Their operating models leave no time to think, let alone to redesign. The daily grind consumes every hour; the regulatory burden consumes the rest. Yet the world is entering a phase in which intelligence is compounding faster than any human team can absorb or respond to. The idea that firms can “fit in” AI strategy between client reviews and compliance checks is a dangerous illusion.

The tools must go down. Not after the next busy period. Not once the inbox is cleared. Now. Professionals need protected time — real time — to step back and understand the scale of the transition. Not the technology. The transition. Because the shift underway is not about adding AI to an existing model. It is about replacing the model itself.

The advisory professions are moving from human advice to digital advice. Not as a supplement. Not as an experiment. As the new centre of gravity. Digital advisers are not tools.

They are the next generation of the advisory function: always available, always consistent, always up-to-date, infinitely scalable and capable of reasoning across a client's entire landscape in a way no human team can match. This is not a marginal improvement. It is a structural re-architecture of how advice is delivered, priced and experienced.

8MDS

INTELLIGENCE BRIEFING FOR
FINANCIAL PROFESSIONALS



The competitive frontier is no longer between firms. It is between human advice and digital advice. The firms that survive will be those that stop trying to fit the future into the present and instead redesign themselves around digital advisers as the primary interface, with human expertise layered on top where it adds genuine value. The firms that fail will be those that continue to believe they can “fit this in” around Mrs Miggins’s annual review.

This moment demands a pivot, not a tweak; a redesign, not an add-on; a re-architecture, not a pilot. Professionals need space, guidance and a structured path to determine what must change. The intelligence curve is steepening. The risk curve is rising. And the organisations that wait for clarity will discover that clarity only arrives once the window has closed.

PART III – The Coming Regulatory Inversion

A quiet assumption runs through the advisory professions: that regulators will intervene to prevent AI from giving advice. It is a comforting belief, and it has the advantage of preserving the status quo. But it is also wrong. The direction of travel is already visible, and it points to a future that many advisers will find deeply unsettling.

Regulators do not fear digital advisers. They fear inconsistent advisers. They fear advisers who forget, overlook, mis-record, mis-explain or mis-judge. They fear advisers who cannot evidence their reasoning. They fear advisers who cannot demonstrate suitability under scrutiny.

And that is the uncomfortable truth: the compliance risk in the system is not the AI. It is the human.

Digital advisers do not get tired. They do not cut corners. They do not forget to document. They do not deviate from process. They do not produce files that collapse under audit. They generate perfect audit trails, perfect rationales and perfect consistency. From a regulator’s perspective, this is not a threat. It is a solution.

The existing regulatory framework was built to manage the variability of human advisers. But as digital advisers mature, the logic flips. The framework that once constrained automation becomes the framework that automation satisfies more effectively than any human ever could. At that point, the question is no longer whether digital advisers will be allowed. The question becomes why a regulator would prefer anything else.

A regulatory regime built around digital advice is cleaner, safer, more transparent and easier to supervise. It produces richer data, clearer reasoning and fewer failures. It reduces consumer harm. It reduces systemic risk. It reduces the burden on enforcement. And once that becomes obvious, the existing framework does not merely evolve. It becomes redundant.

This is the inversion advisers have not yet understood. They believe the regulator will protect them from AI. In reality, the regulator may welcome AI as the answer to the very problems human advisers create. The firms that cling to the belief that “AI will never be allowed to give advice” are the ones most exposed. They are betting their future on a regulatory model designed for a world that is already disappearing. The firms that survive will be those that recognise the direction of travel early and begin building the digital advisory capability that aligns with the regulatory architecture of the future.

When the dust settles, the question will not be whether digital advisers are permitted. The question will be why any firm would still rely on a model regulators increasingly view as the higher risk.

Please don't shoot the messenger! We are here to work with you to help navigate these growing threats and risks to your livelihood, and to the entire advice sector.

NOT ALREADY REGISTERED ON 8MDS?

[Click Here](#)

