

WELCOME TO THE JANUARY 2018 EDITION OF

Upload

IN THIS ISSUE

How to: protect your company name through the Company Names Tribunal
Matthew Atkins

Focus on: HR matters
Tim Tyndall

Legal update: the 'Brexit' effect on European Union Trade Marks [EUTMs]
Nellie Jackson

Legal update: Rubik's Cube solved
Matthew Atkins

Compliance: GDPR compliance step plan
Kitty Rosser

Compliance: lessons from Advertising Standards Authority ruling - the true measure of success
Nellie Jackson

Commentary: the Internet of Things
Maria Peyman

Commentary: 3D printing
Maria Peyman

AI and the march of the machines
Kitty Rosser

Best Employer Eastern Region 2018

Welcome to our first edition of Upload, where we reflect on a number of current issues affecting the technology sector, and also take this opportunity to introduce you to our team.



Adrian Seagers

Partner

01223 326613

adrian-seagers@birketts.co.uk

You will almost certainly have read about the effects that GDPR is likely to have on your approach to gathering, managing and protecting data, our article on page 8 is an easy-to-read guide to establishing your compliance step plan. We also comment on the effect Brexit is expected to have on trade mark protection, an area where we are already seeing a number of clients with European portfolios now adopting a different strategic approach to registration and renewal.

[Tim Tyndall](#) comments on legal issues relating to employee incentivisation and immigration – frequent characteristics of the technology scene.

Birketts' digital technology practice also gives us insights into the trends that clients are talking to us about. On page 11 we reflect on 'the Internet of Things', and [Maria Peyman](#) highlights important intellectual property issues concerning 3D printing technology on page 13.

[Kitty Rosser](#) provides thoughts on AI and the march of the machines.

For me personally, the article on the Rubik's cube brought back memories of a teenage summer locked in a three-dimensional battle; my brother held the school record, under a minute... It is gratifying (ironic?), in one of the world's leading centres for technological advancement, to hark back to those years.

There is something here for everyone. We hope you enjoy *Upload* and, of course, please let us know if there are any specific areas you'd like us to explore in more detail in future editions.

To keep up-to-date with the latest news, legal updates and seminar information, please [register](#) and select the areas that are of interest to you.

Wishing you a happy, healthy and prosperous 2018!

IN THIS ISSUE

How to: protect your company name through the Company Names Tribunal

Focus on: HR matters

Legal update: the 'Brexit' effect on European Union Trade Marks (EUTMs)

Legal update: Rubik's Cube solved

Compliance: GDPR compliance step plan

Compliance: lessons from Advertising Standards Authority ruling - the true measure of success

Commentary: the Internet of Things

Commentary: 3D printing

AI and the march of the machines

Best Employer Eastern Region 2018



How to: protect your company name through the Company Names Tribunal



Matthew Atkins

Partner

01473 406211

matthew-atkins@birketts.co.uk



Importantly, the applicant does not have to have a registered company name before making the application.

Back in 1999 the Court of Appeal (in the 'One in a Million' case) recognised the threat posed by 'cyber squatters' registering domain names with the sole intention of exhorting others to pay an inflated price to acquire them.

The domain name registries quickly developed their own dispute resolution procedures to address this problem, the use of which is now established and widespread. Less well used, however, is the Company Names Tribunal (CNT).

The CNT was unveiled on 1 October 2008 to deal with opportunistic company name registrations, in essence those situations where the dominant purpose of registering the company name was to extract money from a third party, or to prevent someone with a better right to the name from registering it. Importantly, the applicant does not have to have a registered company name before making the application. However, the applicant will need to demonstrate that, in the absence of registration, there was goodwill/reputation in the name at the time that it was registered by the respondent.

Much like the dispute resolution procedure operated by the domain name registries, the reference to the CNT is intended to be straightforward and inexpensive. Application is made on a standard form, accompanied by a fee (which is currently £400). The form is sent to the respondent (the registered holder of the name) who has the opportunity to file a response (again, on a standard form, and again accompanied by a fee, currently £150). If the respondent fails to respond, then the Tribunal will order the respondent to change the name of the company to a name which does not offend. If a response is filed, a timetable will be set for evidence to be filed. Once evidence has been filed, a decision can be made with or without a hearing, and in most cases it will be for the parties to determine whether they wish a hearing to take place. The CNT has the ability to make an award of costs, and the court (in this case the High Court) has a limited appellate function.

If the respondent can show that it registered the name with a bona fide purpose in mind then the application is likely to fail, but if the applicant can prove that the respondent's dominant purpose in registering their name was to obtain consideration from the applicant, or to prevent the applicant from registering the name, then the application is likely to succeed.

In the event that it becomes apparent that an identical or similar name to your own has been registered by a third party, then this offers a straightforward and reasonably cheap method of protecting your name (including unregistered names where goodwill/reputation have been acquired). Having regard to the threat posed by a company name being used by a fraudster, you should not hesitate to protect your name through the CNT if necessary. Any delay in doing so may reduce the prospect of you being able to take steps in the future, and if you fail to take steps to address such an issue when you first become aware of it may put at risk any insurance that you have in place to cover such problems.

Focus on: HR Matters



Tim Tyndall

Partner

01223 326664

tim-tyndall@birketts.co.uk

Our region, and Cambridge in particular, is blessed with a world class technology sector with a range of companies from international renowned behemoths to exciting start-ups.

A common factor across this spectrum of success has been the ability of the major players to embrace employment policies beyond the norm, particularly in the nature of their incentives and share offerings, and most importantly their ability to attract and retain an international workforce. HR professionals in technology must embrace knowledge beyond statutory employment law to include an understanding of complex immigration rules and procedures, along with a commercial understanding of share and other employee incentives.

Immigration need to know

Currently EU nationals can work in the UK without restriction. The government has stated that following Brexit, it wishes to impose controls on immigration from Europe. However, Theresa May has acknowledged that employers will need time to adapt and so instead of a 'cliff-edge' there should be a two year 'transition period.' During this time EU nationals will be able to come and work in the UK, but will need to register their presence here. After this, it is likely that restrictions in some form or another will be imposed.

However, the ability to recruit EU nationals is not only driven by legislation, but by the practical reality of whether they wish to come and work in the UK. We are competing internationally for skilled workers and unfortunately the current climate has led some to prefer to make their career elsewhere. Whilst technology companies are certainly not pulling out of the UK, many are strengthening their overseas offices in anticipation of these being more attractive destinations for key talent in the future.

“

We are competing internationally for skilled workers and unfortunately the current climate has led some to prefer to make their career elsewhere.

Meanwhile, non-EU workers can still be hired using the Tier 2 visa scheme. The cost of this increased from April 2017 due to an ‘immigration skills charge.’ For large sponsors, this is £1,000 per year of the visa. For small sponsors and charities the charge is reduced to £364 per year. The government wants to encourage employers to train more local workers, by increasing the cost of recruiting from abroad, whilst generating more funding for apprenticeships.

All of this may make it more difficult to attract the right quality and number of employees to sustain the growth seen in the last decade, so what else can be done?

Incentives need to know



Share schemes help attract and recruit the best candidates...

Offering share incentives has been a powerful tool for technology companies and remains so. It has fast become the norm and an expected part of the remuneration package. Share schemes help attract and recruit the best candidates, particularly in the early stages, high growth companies where cash is tight and bumper salaries are not an option. Employees with shares or share options are more likely to align their ideas and interests with the other shareholders and remain incentivised for the longer term.

The right scheme depends upon a number of factors; the shareholders’ aims, the corporate structure, whether direct share ownership is desired (an employee holding shares from day one), or whether a share option is preferred (the right for an employee to acquire shares at some time in the future on conditions). Communication with an employee is key because it is of little incentive if the employee doesn’t understand and/or value the benefit being given. Share schemes can also be a tax-efficient way of remunerating employees.

Most notable for technology companies are Enterprise Management Incentives (EMI schemes/options) - an HMRC tax-advantaged share option scheme.

Providing the company and employee meet qualifying criteria, employees can be granted EMI options over shares worth up to £250,000 at the date of grant. EMI schemes are highly flexible and allow for voting restrictions, forfeiture provisions and vesting and performance conditions, and providing certain conditions are met, allow employees to benefit from the growth in value of a company in a very tax efficient manner.

Legal update: the 'Brexit' effect on European Union Trade Marks (EUTMs)



Nellie Jackson

Senior Associate

01473 299154

nellie-jackson@birketts.co.uk

EUTMs and Registered Community Designs are the only UK property rights that have a pan-European reach and, therefore, the impact of Brexit is unique in this regard.

Whilst EUTMs remain valid and enforceable in the UK for the time being, when the UK formally leaves the EU, as it currently stands, EUTMs will cease to have effect here. However, there will no doubt be transitional provisions put in place to ensure continued protection for existing EUTM owners, as the commercial (and PR) cost of such monetised assets simply expiring would be vast.

The most likely options at present seem to be either:

1. all existing EUTM registrations would be automatically entered onto the UK Register with the same scope of protection and registration date, or
2. all existing EUTM registrations would be entered onto the UK Register, as with option 1, but only if the owner positively opts in to do so.

The benefit of the above two options is that they could be adopted unilaterally by the UK without requiring the agreement of the EU or EUIPO. However, the devil is in the detail and all the possible scenarios raise numerous questions such as additional examination, UK representation and use requirements, in addition to costs, to name just a few.

Whilst we wait to see how these transitional provisions will develop, it's sensible for now to be aware of the possible options, and consider separate and/or additional national protection in the UK when assessing both filing and enforcement strategies with respect to your brands.

Legal update: Rubik's Cube solved



Matthew Atkins

Partner

01473 406211

matthew-atkins@birketts.co.uk

“

It is important not to underestimate the importance of the trade mark registration ...

The Rubik's Cube, named after its inventor Erno Rubik, was invented in 1974, but it was not until 1999 that a three-dimensional EU trade mark was registered.

That registration was, no doubt, encouraged by the number of shape marks registered following changes in the law. In the UK, for example, shape marks had not been allowed until the Trade Marks Act 1994, when the changes enabled the shape of Coca-Cola bottles, Toblerone bars and Mini motorcars to be registered.

It is important not to underestimate the importance of the trade mark registration to the owners of the Rubik's Cube IP rights. Unlike other IP rights, trade marks can last forever on completion of the relevant renewal formalities, and so the effect of the registration of a shape mark is to create a monopoly that, for example, a patent (being of limited life) cannot afford. The Rubik's Cube trade mark represented the only thing between the owners (and the owners' licensed manufacturers) and competition from mass-produced, and no doubt, cheaper copies.

Unsurprisingly the limitless monopoly afforded by shape marks has proved controversial, and in 2016 that controversy led a German toy manufacturer bringing an invalidity claim in relation to the Rubik's Cube trade mark, the claim having finally been decided in the European Court of Justice (ECJ) after almost 10 years of litigation.

The principal issue for the ECJ was whether the trade mark consisted exclusively of 'the shape of goods which is necessary to obtain a technical result'. The General Court and the Board of Appeal took the view that the grid structure on each surface of the cube did not perform any technical function. The ECJ disagreed, saying that the court below should have defined the technical function of the product (a three-dimensional puzzle), and taken this into account when assessing the functionality of the essential characteristics of the sign. It is plain that the ECJ was concerned by the extent of the protection granted by the trade mark registration, which, on the face of it, could extend to every type of puzzle with a similar shape, regardless of technical function.

The ECJ ruled the Rubik's Cube trade mark invalid. Earlier that year the High Court had decided that the shape of KitKat could not be registered as a shape mark (a decision later affirmed by the Court of Appeal). It is possible that these decisions reflect a growing intention on the part of the courts to look rather more closely at applications to register

shape marks, particularly where shape is related to functional characteristics and/or technical result. The monopoly that trade marks afford can, if abused, lead to anti-competitive practices and the courts will be wary of sanctioning the registration of trade marks if the result is to afford a limitless monopoly, particularly where other IP rights with limited protection (such as Patents) are available.

Designers and inventors who design three-dimensional products should carefully consider the IP protection available. Where the design has functional characteristics, and/or where it produces a technical result, then all available IP rights should be considered. In such cases, registering a trade mark alone may well now be the position of last resort.

Compliance: GDPR compliance step plan



Kitty Rosser

Associate

01603 756559

kitty-rosser@birketts.co.uk



With less than a year to go, and clear confirmation that the GDPR will apply regardless of Brexit, organisations are starting to find themselves on the backfoot.

On 25 May 2018 the GDPR comes into effect bringing about the biggest change to data protection laws in over 20 years.

So significant are the changes introduced by the new law that organisations have been given a 'two year lead-in period' to ensure that they have sufficient time to bring their processes and systems in line with the new requirements before the 2018 deadline.

With increased media coverage driven by the threat of a headline-grabbing €20m cap on fines, awareness that there is change on the horizon is growing. However, many organisations remain unclear as to what action they need to take, or have underestimated the extent of the work required to update their compliance strategies. Others have put their plans on hold in light of the Brexit vote. With less than a year to go, and clear confirmation that the GDPR will apply regardless of Brexit, organisations are starting to find themselves on the back foot.

The Compliance Step Plan below is designed to assist those who want to know what practical steps they should be taking over the next year to ensure they are ready for the GDPR.

1. **Pick your project team:** the work needed to ensure compliance with the GDPR is onerous, time consuming and requires knowledge of every part of the business so try not to put all the responsibility on one person. Ideally your project team should include representatives from marketing, HR, customer services and IT.
2. **Audit your data:** to achieve compliance you need to know what data you hold, where it comes from, what you do with it, where you keep it, who you share it with and what happens to it when it is no longer needed.



individuals have new rights under the GDPR, specifically the right to be forgotten and the right to data portability.

3. **Update your fair processing notices:** whether you refer to them as FPNs, privacy policies, data protection statements or something else entirely, the information that you give to individuals when you collect their data will need to be updated to meet the new information standards in the GDPR.
4. **Review your consent mechanisms:** under the GDPR you must meet a higher standard of consent and record how and when consent was obtained, all of which will require some updating to your current systems. Think about whether you actually need to get consent for a particular processing activity at all; remember that there are plenty of other legal grounds for processing such as contractual necessity and legitimate interests which you may be better off relying on instead.
5. **Streamline your SAR process:** the GDPR reduces the time for providing a response to a Subject Access Request from 40 days to one month (and abolishes the £10 fee).
6. **Don't forget the new rights:** individuals have new rights under the GDPR, specifically the right to be forgotten and the right to data portability. You need to ensure you understand what these rights involve and how you will comply with them.
7. **Record your processing:** from May 2018 you will no longer have to register with the ICO, but you must keep a written record of your processing activities, security measures and data retention practices instead.
8. **Review your contracts:** if you appoint someone to undertake data processing on your behalf (e.g. outsourcing payroll) you will need to have written contracts in place containing certain prescribed clauses. Bear in mind that there are specific requirements around international data transfer if your data processor is based, or uses servers located, outside of the EEA.
9. **Appoint a Data Protection Officer:** for many organisations this will be a mandatory requirement under the GDPR.
10. **Update your breach procedures:** from May 2018 mandatory breach reporting will begin. Most breaches must be notified to the ICO within 72 hours and you must keep a full internal breach register.
11. **Be designed to comply:** the GDPR introduces the concept of data protection by design. You need to ensure you are familiar with the concept and understand what it means for your business in practice.
12. **Train your staff:** staff awareness is absolutely crucial to compliance. Different staff members will require different training depending upon their role and responsibilities, but all staff will require some basic awareness training around the GDPR at the very least.

To request a copy of our free GDPR Compliance Guide, email alison-betts@birketts.co.uk. Details of our data protection training courses can be found [here](#).

Compliance: lessons from Advertising Standards Authority rulings - the true measure of success



Nellie Jackson

Senior Associate

01473 299154

nellie-jackson@birketts.co.uk

A web design company recently fell foul of the UK Code of Non Broadcast Advertising, Sales Promotion and Direct Marketing ('the Code') for a marketing practice that seems to be on the rise, particularly with online businesses.

According to 121 Web Design & Stuff's website, the company had won 'Best Low Cost Web Design Company – Web Design Review Awards' in 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016, which, to the unknowing consumer, clearly attributes a certain reputation and achievement history to the company's services.

However, the claim was challenged, the allegation being that Web Design Review was, in fact, owned by the same company as 121 Web Design & Stuff ('121') and, therefore, the reviews and resulting awards were essentially fabricated and likely to materially mislead consumers as to the quality or otherwise of 121's services.

The Advertising Standards Authority considered that consumers would generally expect, when awards were referenced, that the awards had been received from an independent, impartial body. On investigation, it was understood that the awarding body, WebDesignReview.co.uk, was part of the same group of companies as 121, and it was noted that the Web Design Review Awards were only awarded to companies linked to 121. Therefore, the awards were considered neither independent nor impartial.

Accordingly, the ad was found to be misleading, in contravention of 'the Code', and must not appear in its current form again.

'Fake review sites' are becoming more and more common within industries such as software, web hosting and the like. 121 specifically commented that it did not believe there was anything wrong with creating a site to rate its own businesses, and, unfortunately, until consumer's general reliance on such reviews wanes, it will remain tempting for companies to continue the practice.

“

Fake review sites' are becoming more and more common within industries such as software, web hosting and the like.

Commentary: the Internet of Things



Maria Peyman

Senior Associate

01223 326596

maria-peyman@birketts.co.uk

The 'Internet of Things' (IoT) is a term first coined by Kevin Ashton of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In simple terms the IoT is everyday objects informing and being informed about other objects systematically, via connection and exchange of information over the internet.

The premise is that enabled network devices can exchange information without the involvement of humans. For this reason, it is also incorporates the term machine to machine (M2M).

The uniqueness of the IoT rests largely with the inter-operation of products that previously have had no interconnection or functionality, for example, fridges, heating systems, washing machines, even clothes or furniture.

The development of the IoT is at an early stage but it is estimated by some that over 25 million devices will be online by 2020, with a view that it will change all aspects of people's lives. Despite the IoT being in its infancy, the impact is already being noted with the increase in smart-metering and wearable technology, particularly in the field of fitness.

Regardless of whether it is an emerging technology or not, there are some legal elements which it is already clear will need to be carefully considered.

Intellectual property

Areas of technology and development, inevitably include a wide range of intellectual property rights (IPR) to be aware of. For example, parts of the technology may be protectable by patents. This is not always a straight forward consideration due to the views of different jurisdictions on what is capable of being registered as a patent, however, serious consideration has to be given to this. As well as patents there is know-how and trade secrets.

As with many markets, e.g. that of mobile phones, branding will be a key component. This will largely be met by the protection of trade marks. As the market sector increases, the design of the physical objects will also become more important, and protection for their aesthetic features will need to be considered in the context of design rights. Any other creative elements may be protected by copyright.

Inevitably there will be 'tie-ups' in this field, those with the technology linking with significant brands, and the inevitable licensing agreements as a result.

“

As the market sector increases, the design of the physical objects will also become more important, and protection for their aesthetic features will need to be considered in the context of design rights.

This is not the only area where licensing could end up playing a key role. For the IoT to reach its full potential there needs to be a unified interaction between all products. Looking at established markets where this has already been addressed, e.g. the smartphone sector, a solution to this will be the use of ‘standardised technology’.

However, much of the IoT is being built on established technology and, in particular, technology companies already own many of the key patents, therefore, the use of standardised technology has to be considered in that context. Of course the technology can be licensed (regardless of the protection it has) and there may be an argument for such licenses to be made available on a fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory basis (as seen in the smartphone sector).

Data Protection

Inevitably, due to its nature, the IoT will see a significant amount of data obtained. Much of this data may be of a sensitive, personal nature.

The advent of the IoT, and the risks that it presents in respect of data protection, has been much considered and discussed over the last few years. The European Commission provided an [Opinion in 2014](#). The underlying view is that the IoT, whilst providing significant opportunity, also has inherent risks in light of the quantity and nature of data held. This has been taken into account when the General Data Protection Regulations (which came into effect in May 2016 and will apply from 25 May 2018) were put together.

These regulations introduce significant developments in the field of data protection, and have potential for significant impact on any organisation which operates in the field of the IoT, including, but not limited to, those making the devices, application developers and social platforms.

The IoT is anticipated to impact significantly on our lives going forward and there is, without doubt, a wealth of opportunity for a variety of businesses. However, to ensure that the businesses thrive and make the most of the opportunities, businesses need to ensure:

- that, at an early stage, innovations are properly identified and the assets that are developed are properly protected
- embarking on any sector requires careful due diligence, carrying out searches of what is already in existence is useful (although this can sometimes incur significant fees)
- if there is any possibility that the entity will be using someone else’s technology, all the correct licences are in place
- data protection regulations have been taken into account and appropriate policies and methods for dealing with the data are in place.



The IoT is anticipated to impact significantly on our lives going forward...

Commentary: 3D printing



Maria Peyman

Senior Associate

01223 326596

maria-peyman@birketts.co.uk

3D printing technology has advanced significantly in a relatively short period of time. The advances have resulted in it becoming more affordable, leading to an increase in the popularity of self production.

Given the range of products that can be created through 3D printing, any of the ‘traditional’ intellectual property (IP) rights may apply to a printed item. Patents could apply to a printed item as a whole, or component parts of the printed item. Registered designs can protect the appearance of an item or parts of an item, whilst unregistered design rights apply to the shape and configuration of items, and will equally apply to any copies. Copyright may protect the computer aided design (CAD) files, as well as the printed items, if they are ‘artistic works’. Lastly, of course, there is the trade mark aspect which will apply if the items are printed with a brand name or logo.

However, the advent of self-production is not without its side effects. Arguably, self-printing of goods disconnects from the concept of another party’s IP rights, and policing the infringement of your own IP rights is harder.

On a basic level, any copying of an object which is protected by intellectual property laws will be an infringement if it is done without permission; this is no different for traditionally manufactured goods or those produced by 3D printing using a CAD.

On that basis, although infringement actions can be brought through the courts, as in any other infringement claim, the reality is that it may be difficult to identify the infringers.

Traditionally manufactured counterfeit items can be seized on import, and Customs authorities play a vital role in stopping counterfeit goods reaching market. The use of CAD files means that the physical goods will not cross borders in the traditional way; the CAD file can be sent, and the recipient merely needs a 3D printer. In due course, there may be a more active role for Trading Standards to address counterfeit items within the jurisdiction.

Where CAD files are copied and released online, there may be specific actions which can be taken to remove the infringing files, and this is easier if the files have clearly been illegitimately obtained. There is also the possibility of taking action against internet service providers (ISPs) which are easier to locate than the owners of websites. Known as blocking injunctions, these have, particularly in light of recent cases in other areas involving ISPs, the potential to become a popular and potentially cost effective remedy against infringement.

The production of items bearing a brand name or logo, even for individual use, may infringe trade marks.



The production of items bearing a brand name or logo, even for individual use, may infringe trade marks.



In the fields of patent and design law, the making of spare parts can, sometimes, be considered an exception to infringement ...

In the fields of patent and design law, the making of spare parts can, sometimes, be considered an exception to infringement, the result being a potential market for exploitation. However, the courts have given clear guidance as to when spare parts can be manufactured without infringing, so careful analysis must be applied to the spare part to be printed so as to avoid any assertions of infringement.

This potential market may conversely result in manufacturers being keener to register a patent that is specifically directed to spare parts and potential spare parts for their products.

In the fields of patent and design law there is also an exception to infringement where it is for personal use, but this exception does not exist in respect of copyright.

In light of the potential difficulties with addressing infringement, and indeed the potential for perfectly legitimate printing of items, there may be many commercial entities which decide to view the increase in 3D printing as a new opportunity to exploit the assets they hold. For example, design owners licencing use of their design files, providing a one print sale where a design is sent direct to the printer, or using 3D printing technology in store, to provide bespoke items for the client.

AI and the march of the machines



Kitty Rosser

Associate

01603 756559

kitty-rosser@birketts.co.uk

For the avoidance of doubt, I would like to make it clear from the outset that this article has been written by a genuine, bona fide human being and not by a robot.

Whilst this comment may appear to be no more than a slightly glib opening to a piece on artificial intelligence (AI), it is actually rooted in fact. In October the UK's Press Association announced that it will be following in the footsteps of US news giant, Associated Press, by recruiting robot reporters to produce news content within the next few months.

The use of natural language generation engines to produce news content neatly encapsulates many of the current controversies linked to the increasing use of AI. In particular, it highlights many of the issues that surround the potential impact of AI on traditional job roles.

Proponents of the new technology argue that news content can now be generated with much greater efficiency and accuracy. A single bot named Xiaomingbot produced over 450 articles on the 2016 Olympics for Chinese news syndication service, Toutiao, whilst the Washington Post relied heavily on in-house automated storyteller, Heliograf, for its own coverage of the 15 day event. Associated Press has been able to achieve a twelve-fold increase in its quarterly earnings reporting using Automated Insights' Wordsmith



Associated Press has been able to achieve a twelve-fold increase in its quarterly earnings reporting using Automated Insights' Wordsmith programme...

programme, and has stated that this has freed up the equivalent of three full-time employees across the organisation. In 2015, Automated Insights itself 'wrote' a total of 1.5 billion individual articles. Not bad for a company with only 50 employees.

So, what has happened to those journalists whose time would previously have been spent in producing content that is now automated? Associated Press has stated that automation has not displaced any reporters but has instead allowed them to re-direct their focus, to think more critically about the bigger picture and produce content which examines the nuances behind the numbers. Put bluntly, the humans can get on with producing quality, insightful journalism whilst the computers take care of the drudge work. In the short term, this looks like a 'win-win' situation but one has to question whether this is a sustainable model in the longer term.

As the use of automated content becomes standard industry practice, and more professional reporters produce an increasing volume of quality content, will we reach a saturation point beyond which there is simply no further demand or outlet for high quality human-generated content? This saturation point would, for most professional journalists, no doubt represent the tipping point – the moment at which AI ceases to be a positive resource to be relied on, and instead becomes, at best, a career redefining hurdle and, at worst, a career destroying hindrance. And to what extent will this situation be further exacerbated by continuing technological development?

As consumers of automatically generated news coverage, we are generally entirely unaware that the article we are reading has not been written by a human. Reg Chua, Executive Editor at Thompson Reuters (another proponent of the technology) reports that in blind testing, automated content actually came out as more readable than human-generated content. Whilst this is testament to the high standard of the existing technology, there is no dispute that, at present, the scope of that technology is limited.

The current generation of robot reporters are, in fact, simply software programmes that can process specific data sets to generate a fairly narrow range of essentially standardised reports on topics such as sports and finance. Those at the forefront of the technology are confident that, in time, AI will be able to produce increasingly complex 'human' content. Kris Hammond of Narrative Science predicts that "a machine will win a Pulitzer one day". However, it is likely that there will be significant technological hurdles to overcome before we see a wholesale replacement of human journalists by cyber-hacks.

Concerned journalists may take some comfort from the recent experience of Microsoft's chatbot, Tay. Tay launched on Twitter earlier this year and was taken offline within 24 hours after posting a variety of tweets containing racist and sexist content, promoting drug taking and denying the Holocaust. It subsequently made a brief return only to meltdown and start tweeting out of control, spamming its 210,000 followers with messages reading, somewhat ironically, "you are too fast, please take a rest..."



...a machine will win a Pulitzer one day.

According to recent research by Oxford University and Deloitte, about 35% of current jobs in the UK are at risk of computerisation over the next twenty years. Interestingly, journalism scored a relatively low 8% likelihood of automation, placing 285th on a list of 366 professions considered. The clergy came in at position 341. The job deemed most likely to be automated is that of telephone sales persons. Those looking to guarantee long term job security are advised to start looking for management opportunities in the hospitality sector. My own job, solicitor, came with a reassuringly low 3.5% likelihood of automation. For now, at least, I can feel some degree of job security as I return to considering who I might sue when my client is defamed by a robo-scribe whilst my lawbot gets busy dealing with my contract drafting.

Best Employer Eastern Region 2018

February sees the launch of the Best Employers Eastern Region 2018. Birketts will be partnering with Pure, and we would love to see you at the launch event in Newmarket on 27 February.

Best Employers Eastern Region is a biennial survey that gives your organisation the opportunity to actively evolve workplace culture, increase engagement and monitor employee satisfaction against your own previous survey results and the results of other businesses in the region.

Come along and find out more about how you can benchmark your organisation against others in the region, and be in with the chance of being crowned one of the region's best employers. [Book your place now.](#)