


# The Weekly Listen: The major AI adoption issue we're not talking about, the smart tech that's missing, and how to turn X around

Audio



On today's podcast episode, we discuss the one major hurdle to AI adoption that's not being discussed enough, the smart tech that's missing from your life, how to get X closer to its former glories, if it would be better to have an AI boss than your current human one, a grizzly consequence of global warming, and more. Tune in to the discussion with guest host Bill Fisher, and analysts Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf, Carina Perkins, and Max Willens.

*Subscribe to the “Behind the Numbers” podcast on [Apple Podcasts](#), [Spotify](#), [Pandora](#), [Stitcher](#), [YouTube](#), Podbean or wherever you listen to podcasts. [Follow us on Instagram](#).*



Episode Transcript:

Bill Fisher (00:00):

EMARKETER is your trusted partner for actionable data and insights on marketing, advertising, commerce and more. But did you know, EMARKETER also has a division focused on B2B media solutions? Partner with EMARKETER today and connect your brand messaging with our powerful audiences. Visit [emarketer.com/advertise](https://emarketer.com/advertise) to learn more. Hello, everyone,

and thanks for joining us today for the Behind the Numbers Weekly Listen, an EMARKETER podcast.

**(00:33):**

This is the Friday show, that is usually hosted by Marcus. You may have noticed I am not he. I'm Bill, regular host of the Around the World podcast, and I'm standing in for Marcus this week as he's had the temerity to take some leave, but the accent is similar, so hopefully this will be incredibly seamless. Anyway, this is what we've got in store for you today, "Will carbon emissions be a major issue for further AI adoption?," "What next for smart tech?," "How can X get back on track?," "Should we replace our boss with AI?," and I have an unintended and grisly side effect of global warming. Okay, joining me for this episode, what a team I have for you today.

**(01:21):**

First, she's our senior analyst, covering everything digital advertising, it's Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf. Hi, Evelyn.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf **(01:29):**

Hi, Bill. Hi, everyone.

Bill Fisher **(01:31):**

Great to be on a podcast with you again. Also, a senior analyst, also covering digital advertising, it's Max Willens. Hey, Max.

Max Willens **(01:41):**

Hey, Bill. How's it going?

Bill Fisher **(01:43):**

And we have been on a podcast before as co-guests, and finally another senior analyst, but covering retail and e-commerce for the UK and Western Europe, just to mix things up, it's Carina Perkins. Hey, Carina.

Carina Perkins **(01:54):**

Hi, Bill. How you doing?

Bill Fisher (01:55):

I'm good, and we've definitely been on a podcast together, many podcasts.

Carina Perkins (01:55):

Many of podcasts.

Bill Fisher (02:00):

Right. This is how things are going to play out. We have our story of the week up top, then we have a game in the middle, and we end with some random trivia. It's a tried-and-tested formula that you all know, so let's kick off with our story of the week. And the story this week combines a couple of hot topics.

(02:23):

AI is taking over the world, of course, but sustainability is something that's becoming an ever-increasing consideration for digital advertisers, for retailers in e-commerce, and the broader tech industry. Google has been in the spotlight recently. It stated publicly that it aims to achieve net-zero emissions across its entire operations by 2030, and to reduce by 50% in real-term emissions, again, from 2019 to 2030. However, this month, the company revealed that its greenhouse gas emissions have climbed by nearly 50% over the past five years, so again, from that 2019 base year. So things are going in completely the wrong direction, and it appears that it's AI at the root of the problem.

(03:16):

It's AI ambitions of what are behind this climb. The data centers that are required to fuel this development in AI is absolutely phenomenal. According to research firm, SemiAnalysis, "AI will result in data centers accounting for nearly 5% of all energy generation around the world by 2030," so very significant amount. So, folks, is this going to be a significant hurdle for further AI adoption, or are we just going to ignore it?

Carina Perkins (03:50):

I think it's an interesting one because if AI drives kind of huge efficiencies over time, we might see that carbon load come down a little bit, but what's interesting is it might come down because it's replacing people who take longer to do tasks. So I saw one study published on Nature.com that found AI image creation via something like Dall-E or MidJourney produces

310 to 2,900 times less CO2 emissions per image than human creators. So I could see that over time, there might also be some efficiencies that would reduce that carbon emissions, but, of course, those people still existing on the planet and creating emissions and need to have another job. So it's an interesting one, and I think there's also the argument that AI could help companies cut their emissions by kind of planning overcoming sustainability challenges in the long term. So I don't think it's going to stop AI adoption, but I think companies will hopefully think twice about whether they're using it to genuinely drive efficiencies or whether they're using it for the sake of it because everyone else is.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (05:01):

I sort of had a similar take, but from a different perspective, and I think it's a far more cynical one perhaps, mostly because I don't think carbon emissions will be a major issue for further AI adoption because people don't really care, at least businesses don't really care about it. I think they should be a major issue. I think they should be considered, but they should have been considered since climate change was discovered, and time and time again, humanity has demonstrated striking shortsightedness on the issue. It's cheaper to package things in single use plastics, so we, as a society and as a species, can don't single use plastics. There are countless examples of that kind of thing, and so I think there are certainly rewards and capitalism for businesses that pursue sustainability, at least in terms of optics, otherwise, big tech wouldn't have made pledges to reach carbon neutrality or carbon negativity. But AI's carbon footprint won't slow it down any more than its copyright issues, its data privacy issues, the threats it poses to democracy, or any of its other countless issues.

Max Willens (06:13):

I think what's interesting about this whole question is how much some of the kind of greatest, if not of senders than kind of actors in this game are saying the quiet part out loud. There was that story in the Wall Street Journal couple of months ago now about Sam Altman trying to raise \$7 trillion to build a new infrastructure to sort of power AI at a global scale, which anytime you have a number that has the word trillion in it, it's big, but just for frame of reference, that's more than the U.S. federal budget, so you're talking about a truly massive number. And it's also something that if the adoption continues at the pace that some people predict, it is going to become unavoidable. I think that the stat you referenced, Bill, is crazy, especially crazy because the one that I brought to the table to this call was one from a Dutch researcher named Alex de Vries, who said that by 2027, AI would require as much electricity

as the Netherlands does as a country by 2027. That's about 0.5% of global electricity consumption.

(07:25):

And so to go from 0.5% to 5% full stop in the space of three years, if both calculations are accurate, is just crazy. So whether the people want it to or not, this is going to become a bigger part of the conversation around this technology.

Bill Fisher (07:42):

And something that I know you like talking about, Evelyn is regulation. What if tighter regulation was to come in?

Max Willens (07:42):

It doesn't.

Bill Fisher (07:50):

So again, the EU tends to be sort of forward-thinking when it comes to regulation. So in the EU, we have the ... It's called the CSRD, I think, Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive. Is that right? CSRD, yes.

(08:07):

So we have the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive, which requires companies to report on their emissions. I think at the moment, it's only scope 1, so that's the stuff that they're actually responsible for, but it's going to soon incorporate scope 2 and 3, so that's the stuff that the people they partner with has to include that as well. But at the moment, it's a directive. It's not a law. There aren't any kind of fines or anything like that yet for people not meeting them.

(08:38):

They just have to report on it. Are we going to be ... I mean, you're already smirking, Evelyn. Are you pessimistic about this becoming enshrined in law and having fines?

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (08:49):

I'm pessimistic about it becoming law in time for it to make a huge difference because there's a ... I mean, there's a huge difference between the efficacy of regulation that is imposed retroactively versus something that is imposed as technology is being developed, and AI is moving a lot more quickly than most governments are. The EU has been sort of the front-runner, even with AI regulation, of course, with the AI Act, but even still, that quickness has not matched the pace of innovation in AI, and as AI sort of continues to, as you said, take over the world, especially if the EU is like the only global entity standing firm to try and fight for sustainability in this space, I just don't imagine it's going to be enough.

Carina Perkins (09:41):

I think something that's more likely to hinder adoption is that energy usage comes at a cost, right, so especially with energy prices going up so much. So it'll be interesting to see whether company's on balance. There's some of the efficiencies that they say they're going to drive via AI if actually, the energy costs of doing so makes it worthwhile or not.

Bill Fisher (10:03):

We're thinking it's not really going to hinder AI adoption? Is that where we're landing?

Carina Perkins (10:03):

Yeah.

Bill Fisher (10:07):

Yeah. Okay, cool.

Carina Perkins (10:08):

Probably should, but it won't.

Bill Fisher (10:09):

Yeah.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (10:10):

Yep.

Bill Fisher (10:10):



Well put.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (10:10):

TL;DR.

Bill Fisher (10:12):

Okay. Yeah, interesting stuff. Great conversation, but that's all we've have time for for story of the week. Time to move on to our game of the week. And today's game is the Super Duper Game. I'm sorry about that, mate.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (10:35):

Is that Marcus? Did he do that?

Bill Fisher (10:36):

Yeah. I'm not responsible for the naming. It would have a much better name if I was the regular host. Anyway, how does it work? We have three rounds.

(10:43):

Today, we have fill in the blank CEO for a day and the random scale. The better the answers you give, the more points you get. The points may be merited. They may just be randomly handed out by me. Who knows?

Carina Perkins (11:01):

Good to know.

Bill Fisher (11:02):

Anyway, round one is fill in the blank. I'll give our guests a statement, they have to fill in the blank, surprisingly. And Evelyn will kick this one off for us. Samsung has just launched its latest piece of tech. It's a smart ring wearable.

(11:19):

This is the latest addition to its vast ecosystem of devices. Some are more popular and successful than others. But is this something we really need, and what other smart device

might be useful to you? So here's the statement, "The smart tech missing from my life at the moment is a smart blank." Evelyn, what have you got?

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (11:41):

My playing by the rules answer is that the smart tech missing from my life at the moment is a smart refrigerator. I know they exist, but reviews I've read and watched suggest that the ones on the market barely earn the smart moniker. So I'd rather have a really great, a dumb fridge that's likely cheaper than a supposedly smart fridge that is more expensive but doesn't really deliver on the promised added value. My honest answer is I don't really feel like I'm missing any smart tech from my life. I feel like I found all the right smart items, and I have enough reservations about the data privacy trade-offs about the smart tech that I currently have, so I'm pretty content with my smart menagerie, and I do not think a smart ring is going to make a difference worldwide in that.

Bill Fisher (12:37):

Couldn't agree more. Max, what about you?

Max Willens (12:41):

The smart tech that's missing from my life is a smart pin. I think deep down, I feel more like Evelyn. I feel like I'm smart enough, just not saying much at all, but I do like ... I know that the people at Humane and its potential would be competitors don't like hearing this, but I thought that the Humane Ai Pin was a really cool idea because I really, in an abstract way, really like the idea of being able to access information, but not have to deal with the distraction that's inherent in a smartphone, so a little thing that I could attach to any item of clothing that would give me directions if I was trying to get somewhere, or read me the next step in a recipe if something I'm cooking in my kitchen, or answer a question that I couldn't think of the answer to off the top of my head. That all sounds nice, especially if you can cleave out the tidal wave of notifications I get on my iPhone all the time, so I think my answer is a pin.

Bill Fisher (13:48):

A pin. Just to be clear, you mean like a pin badge or something?

Max Willens (13:49):

That's right.

Bill Fisher (13:49):

Okay.

Max Willens (13:49):

Like a little brooch type thing, a bit more futuristic.

Bill Fisher (13:54):

I love how ... Okay. Got you. Okay. Interesting. Carina, what have you got?

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (13:57):

Wouldn't you be worried about the fashion statement there? Just curious.

Max Willens (14:00):

I would probably have to ... They'd need to be able to have covers that you could snap on and off.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (14:00):

Okay.

Max Willens (14:04):

Because you're right.

Bill Fisher (14:05):

That's smart, and smart, right? Smart-looking and smart.

Max Willens (14:06):

Yeah.

Bill Fisher (14:10):

Very good. Carina, what have you got?

Carina Perkins (14:13):

So the smart tech missing from my life at the moment is a smart toaster. I feel very much the same that actually, I found all the smart tech I like, I need. I barely use the smart tech that I

have. My smart watch always runs out of battery and I can't be bothered to charge it. I don't feel like I need any more smart technology at the moment, and I don't particularly want to give any more personal data away, but one thing I wouldn't mind giving away of personal data is how toasted I like my toast.

(14:41):

And I burn my toast quite a lot because I get distracted with other things, and it's always slightly underdone or too done, and so a toaster that knew my exact toasting preferences and toasting my toast to that exact amount of toasted would be brilliant. So, yeah, there you go. That's my idea.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (14:58):

That's a fabulous answer. I want to change mine to that.

Carina Perkins (15:00):

Thanks.

Bill Fisher (15:00):

Hmm, I'm not sure. That's just a timer. You just put a timer, at the same time you're [inaudible 00:15:06]-

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (15:06):

No, but it doesn't taste like bread.

Carina Perkins (15:06):

No, because it depends on the toast type.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (15:08):

Yeah.

Carina Perkins (15:09):

Yeah. It depends on the bread, if it's a pita bread, or a toast, or a granary. It's all different, a bagel.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (15:14):

Gluten-free bread is also kind of a pain in the butt, so ...

Carina Perkins (15:14):

Yeah.

Bill Fisher (15:18):

Okay, I'm still not convinced, but anyway, good answers all round. So let me just give you the arbitrary scores. Evelyn leads on four, Max and Carina on three. There we go. Onto the round two, which is CEO for a day.

(15:33):

This is where I put my guests in the shoes of a CEO in a specific situation and ask them, "What would you do?" And Max will go first for this one. The latest on X, formerly Twitter, is coming from the EU, surprisingly, where regulators are claiming that blue checks are deceiving users, and heavy fines could follow for the company as a result. The way that blue checks work is just one in a long line of changes that the platform has made since Elon Musk took the helm, but these changes have coincided with user and advertising losses. So this is a big ask, but if you were the CEO of Twitter, what one thing would you change to try and reverse the firm's fortunes? Max?

Max Willens (16:21):

I think at this point, salvaging Twitter has to be all about managing expectations. And I think that the now, decades-old idea that Twitter and Facebook or Twitter, Instagram might be on the same playing field is over, so what I would do instead is kind of think about it as a niche network that has a clear, and I would say carefully guarded value proposition, and that's to lean into the thing that people used to think of Twitter for, which is live, breaking news information, that can be the sort of tent pole of everything. So really, lean into it, being a place that journalists can feel comfortable on, that world leaders and political figures and public figures can go to to break news, and this simple idea can be extended out into all the other things that Elon Musk and everybody are enamored of. So you can still make all the video content that he wants on there be focused on live programming, you could have all the shopping that they want to do, be focused on live stream shops. So if you're not tuned in at 10:00 AM Pacific, you're not going to be able to buy these sneakers from whatever it is, and just have that be kind of the brand through line that goes through everything.

(17:35):

So just really lean into live, especially because Mark Zuckerberg and Adam Mosseri have remained steadfast in their commitment to not have threads, the supposed X killer be oriented around news and politics. So go where they say they won't go and make hay, that's my plan.

Bill Fisher (17:53):

Really interesting. I'm actually minded of the recent election we had in the UK, which I tried to follow on TV, and I was also following it on X, Twitter, and I was getting the results quicker still on Twitter than on the TV, and I was just so frustrated in how long it was taking them to update me on the TV, so really good answer. Well done, Max. Next is Carina. What have you got?

Carina Perkins (18:19):

I would say mine's probably slightly more controversial, but I would say perhaps stop Elon Musk from posting anything too political on his personal feed because I think there's-

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (18:19):

Or anything at all.

Carina Perkins (18:32):

Or anything at all. There's a real danger about a founder or a spokesperson becoming more overtly political that you're kind of bound to alienate a group, a part of the user base, especially the younger generations, and I think you're also going to upset advertisers. So I think it's quite a dangerous game to play, and I think really, reining that back in would be my first priority.

Bill Fisher (18:59):

Good point. And, Evelyn.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (19:01):

So mine might be a little bit of a cop out, but I would change the leadership. Get Musk out of there, because otherwise ... I mean, any other improvements could be and probably would be undone because Musk has demonstrated himself to be very fickle and short-sighted. So as

long as he does remain at the helm, I don't anticipate the audience composition broadening. Right now, it's small and very niche, and consumers didn't just up and leave for no reason, right?

(19:29):

To both of Carina's and Max's points, they left because they dislike Musk or because they disliked the changes that he made to the platform, because we lost their trust. They're not going to come back until he's gone, and maybe not even then, and so most advertisers can't justify meaningful investment in a platform without a large user base, not to mention the brand safety concerns. So I just can't imagine there being any single change made to the platform that would not be counterbalanced by other things that Musk would potentially do to the platform. So, I think get them out. That's the only way to save it.

Bill Fisher (20:07):

And you'd be brave enough to do that as CEO.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (20:11):

Yeah. Why not? I mean, we got to give it a chance.

Bill Fisher (20:16):

Well, if you're going to be that brave enough, I'm going to give you maximum points for that answer. So you're ahead still on eight.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (20:25):

Wow.

Bill Fisher (20:25):

Max on seven, Carina on six. Still all to play for. Okay. Our final round, round three is the random scale. Our guests have to rank the chances of something happening on a random scale of my own devising, and it's going to be Carina to go first for this one.

(20:46):

Okay. We've spoken many times about the tasks that AI can take on, but taking on the role of your manager, well, this is happening, apparently. Some businesses are using the tech to take

the stress out of management and take some of the more time-consuming tasks off their plates, such as scheduling meetings or workload management. So the question is a loaded one, so be careful. Your manager may be listening.

(21:16):

Would you prefer an AI manager? And the scale from lowest to highest is, "No, thanks, I'm a people person," "Maybe, but give me some human contact," "Interesting idea. Tell me more," or, "Manage us, manager. Bring it on." And we're going to start with Carina for this one.

Carina Perkins (21:41):

Okay, I'm going to go ... Ah, this is tricky, this. So, is it, "Would we prefer an AI manager?," because I think my answer would probably be, "Maybe, but give me some human contact." So that wouldn't be that I would prefer an AI manager, but I could see the benefits in AI assisting my manager in some of the more boring administrative tasks to free up their time to do more of the important stuff, such as meetings and kind of talking to me, because I really think the one thing AI lacks at the moment is kind of empathy, and I think that's something that's really important in a manager. So I certainly wouldn't want my manager, who's fantastic, by the way, to be replaced by a computer or AI, but I could see the benefit in giving them AI to automate some of the sort of repetitive tasks that take up a lot of their time.

Bill Fisher (22:35):

Very diplomatic. You suck up. Okay. Next is Evelyn.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (22:43):

Okay. So personally, in this industry, at this organization and in this role, I'm going to say, "No, thanks, I'm a people person," but broadly, similar to what Carina said, I could see AI being helpful for certain management use cases. Scheduling is one of those things, some project management responsibilities like deadline reminders. The clerical stuff, I could see AI being really helpful for, but AI is not going to develop employees. It's not going to mentor them, it's not going to support them through challenging moments for the business, and layoffs are bad enough, as it is.

(23:19):



Can you imagine getting laid off by an AI manager? Just no. There needs to be a human element there. And if a manager can be wholly replaced by AI, then they are a bad manager. So also, if middle management gets automated away, we'll eventually end up with senior leadership that has never managed any people, and that is not a world I want to live in. So I think I'm certainly on the no end of the scale, and broadly, I think there needs to be a lot more human touch than a completely AI-managed workforce.

Bill Fisher (23:52):

Very good. And Max?

Max Willens (23:55):

Yeah, I agree with most everything that both Evelyn and Carina have said, so I land on, "Maybe, but give me some human contact." I think the point of this technology at this point, and this was largely what was described in the BBC piece, is that it frees up mental resources for managers, which to me is actually a potentially quite appealing use of the technology. I feel like I've worked in numerous jobs, where the person who managed me had so much going on, that they didn't have the bandwidth needed to sort of mentor me in any sustained way or offer any kind of sustained focus on what I was doing. I and colleagues were all just kind of one more thing on a long checklist, and so being able to sort of turn everything into a much more consultative, mentorship-oriented thing actually sounds like kind of a good outcome for this technology. What I will say that also is kind of interesting is late last year I did a presentation on AI and its kind of infiltration of the workforce, and one thing that really stands out to you, when you look at sort of attitudes toward AI and management in countries where AI penetration is deepest, there's actually quite a lot of confidence in sort of AI managerial decision-making.

(25:11):

So in countries that sit that, Bill, fewer than half of the respondents said that they wanted managerial decision-making done purely by humans. They wanted at least a little bit of AI mixed into it, so take that for what it's worth.

Bill Fisher (25:26):

Interesting. Good answer. Okay. That's the game of the week over. And with that answer, I'm going to put Max in the lead, finishing with 11 points, Evelyn and Carina tied on 10.

(25:40):

So well done, Max. You get the championship belt apparently, although I haven't been given it to hand over, and also apparently, you get the final word. Do you want the final word? I'm new. I can change the rules if you want.

Max Willens (25:53):

I was so expecting, given the competition, that I would not win, that I did not prepare anything, so ...

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (26:00):

I thought you were going to go another way with that statement.

Max Willens (26:04):

So, no, I'll yield the balance of my time to everybody for their dinner party data.

Bill Fisher (26:08):

Okay, no problem. In that case, moving on to dinner party data. This is the part of the show where we tell you about the most interesting things we have learned this week. You didn't have the final word, but I'm going to let you go first, Max, seeing as you did win. So what have you learned this week?

Max Willens (26:31):

Fantastic. So I, as people who listen to this show and catch me on it regularly know, I really like kind of just digging up odds and sods and pieces of history related to the music business, and so I found this little sacklet, which is that on this day, in 1913, Billboard released its first ever chart. So the very first Billboard Chart was released on July 19th in 1913, featured 10 songs, which had been, I guess the hottest sellers of the week. For those of you who want to know the top-selling recording of that week was Melinda's Wedding Day by Byron Harlan and Arthur Collins. It had been released in February of that year, so it either had some real staying power, or I guess things took longer to pop in the 19 teens, but I listened to it.

(27:33):

Maybe we can put a link to it in the show notes or something, but I have a link to the Library of Congress has a recording of it. Not a bop in my estimation, but tastes change, so yeah. But

anyway, Melinda's Wedding Day hit the top of the charts, the very first charts on this day in 1913.

Bill Fisher (27:53):

Very good. I'm definitely going to give that a listen, and we'll see what we can do about a link. Carina, why don't you go next?

Carina Perkins (27:58):

So the AI adoption story got me thinking about data. So I have some data about data. Approximately, 402.74 million terabytes of data are created each day, around 147 zettabytes of data will be generated this year, by next year that'll be 181 zettabytes. If you want to know what a zettabyte is, it's a trillion gigabytes. Videos account for over half of internet traffic data, and the U.S. has over 2,700 data centers.

Bill Fisher (28:37):

Ah, so it's their fault. I knew it.

Max Willens (28:37):

Broadly, you could always say that.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (28:37):

I think we all knew that, yeah.

Max Willens (28:46):

It's America's fault, sorry.

Bill Fisher (28:48):

Very good, very good, Carina. Okay, Evelyn, what have you learned?

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (28:52):

I have some data on bugs because it is bug season, I'm pretty sure over there in the UK, as well as over here in the U.S. Got spiders all over the house. I hate it, but ... So you have surveyed Americans, sorry, Brits, about bugs and their preferences for different bug types. Butterflies were the bugs that people felt the most positively about, perhaps probably unsurprising.

(29:23):

Fireflies, ladybugs, honeybees are sort of the top cluster. Bottom cluster, also not surprising, ants, wasps, cockroaches, mosquitoes are dead last. So none of that is surprising, but what I did find interesting is that sort of middle of the pack, we have a bug, that on this survey was called roly-polies. And roly-polies, apparently, don't belong to that list at all. They are not insects, they are crustaceans.

(29:52):

That's one thing I learned about that particular category. It's ew. But also, if you have no idea what a roly-poly is, that's probably because you call them something else. I'm referring to the small, greyish creature that rolls up into a ball when you touch it. They go by many names.

(30:12):

Roly-poly is the most common here in the U.S., according to a random linguistic survey that I found on Reddit. They're also called pill bugs, potato bugs, woodlice, doodlebugs, and either sowbugs or sowbugs, among other names. So I thought I would also ask you, Brits over there, and Max, what you call this crustacean?

Bill Fisher (30:34):

Yeah, I was wondering. I was completely puzzled until you said woodlice.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (30:37):

Yeah.

Carina Perkins (30:39):

Woodlice, yeah.

Bill Fisher (30:39):

And then I knew. Yeah.

Carina Perkins (30:39):

Yeah.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (30:39):

Yeah.

Max Willens (30:41):

You just named four things that I thought were distinct creatures that are all apparently the same thing, so it shows you what I know.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (30:48):

I call them roly-polies. So I saw it, and then I kind of moved on, and then I was like, "Wait." I just buried in the back of my mind. I was like, "I feel like that's one that maybe might not be called roly-poly everywhere." And I also wonder then if it would have changed its ranking in the survey, had they included different monikers for it.

Carina Perkins (31:07):

Cute name.

Bill Fisher (31:10):

Yeah, because roly-poly sounds really nice.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (31:11):

It does.

Bill Fisher (31:12):

That's what we call a forward roll, you know, like a gymnastic roll, [inaudible 00:31:18].

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (31:18):

Oh, really?

Bill Fisher (31:19):

Yeah, that's what we call it.

Carina Perkins (31:21):

Yeah. If you roll down a hill, roly polies down the hill.

Bill Fisher (31:22):

Yeah. Yeah.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (31:23):

That's funny.

Bill Fisher (31:25):

Interesting. Ah, well, thanks for that, Evelyn. That was very interesting, actually. We've learnt lots of new things there. Okay, I have a quick one for you.

(31:36):

I'm going to bring things down now, I'm afraid. We started the show talking about emissions, so I have an environmental fact for you, and it's not particularly pleasant, I'm afraid. Global warming is having a somewhat alarming and unintended consequence in the furthest reaches of our planet. We know all about retreating ice caps. Well, as the ice melts, so things get uncovered.

(32:01):

And earlier this month, the remains of an American climber were found in Peru. After 22 years, he'd been buried under an avalanche on the country's largest mountain, but accelerated melting of the snow on the peak uncovered his perfectly mummified remains. Last month, meanwhile, five bodies were revealed on Mount Everest as ice melts revealed these gory finds, and I can assume we'll expect more and more as global warming continues.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (32:32):

Bill.

Carina Perkins (32:34):

[inaudible 00:32:34]. Thanks, Bill. Great way to end the podcast.

Bill Fisher (32:36):

Let's talk about roly-polies again.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (32:36):

I mean, I think it's definitely cool.

Bill Fisher (32:37):

Roly-poly. Yeah-

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (32:41):

I, for sure will be listening to podcasts about that 100%, but maybe not this podcast.

Bill Fisher (32:47):

Yeah, yeah. I'm sorry, folks. I'm new. It is a mistake. Anyway, that's the end of the show. Thank you to Evelyn for chatting with us today.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (32:58):

Thanks, Bill. This was fun.

Bill Fisher (32:59):

Max, pleasure having you on the show.

Max Willens (33:01):

Thank you, Bill.

Bill Fisher (33:02):

And, Carina, thanks also for joining us.

Carina Perkins (33:05):

Thanks, Bill. Great job hosting, apart from the end.

Bill Fisher (33:05):

Apart from the end.

Evelyn Mitchell-Wolf (33:05):

100%.

Carina Perkins (33:05):

Yeah.

Bill Fisher (33:11):

Thanks also to Victoria who edits the show, Stuart who runs the whole shebang, Sophie who does our social media, and Lance who runs our video podcast, and thanks to everybody for listening in. We hope to see you all on Monday for the Behind the Numbers Daily, an EMARKETER Podcast. Happy weekends.