



AN INDUSTRY BRIEFING FROM GRAIL

What's Changing in the Roster You're Keeping

Your named senior analysts are taking the calls. Your junior researcher pipeline has quietly collapsed. Your 2030 editorial bench is being shaped by decisions you were not invited to. A briefing for Chief Human Resources Officers at mid-market European B2B media and publishing firms.

PREPARED BY

Johan Grönstedt · GRAIL

FOR

European mid-market B2B media
and publishing people leaders

DATE

April 2026

Tuesday, 8:47 a.m.

Every CHRO at a mid-sized European B2B publisher has had the same Tuesday. Three things in the inbox. Your Head of Talent forwarded Monday evening's resignation conversation: your best senior analyst, ten-year subscriber book, named her own market segment in 2019, accepted a senior-analyst seat at an AI-native intelligence startup. Pitched as employee number four with founder-tier equity. Three subscribers asked for her by name on the renewal call last quarter. Your CFO attached the AI-content-pilot ROI deck to Thursday's GMT calendar invite with a one-line note: "Saved 40% of researcher hours in Q1. When do we cut headcount?" Your Editorial Director forwarded a note from the works council opening framework-agreement consultations on three AI deployments that shipped without HR in the room.

You have held this seat for four years. The pattern used to be simple. Hire the right people. Train them well. Keep the works council in the loop. Protect the by-line trust. The business was understandable.

Something changed. Your junior researcher pipeline compressed quietly through 2024 and 2025 because the article-writing and routine-research work that trained juniors into named senior analysts is running on agents. Your named senior analysts are reading every AI deployment as a signal about whether the firm is being redesigned for them or around them. Your senior analyst who took the call on Monday was not the first warning. Your thriving signal dropped at the last engagement survey and nobody reconstructed the coverage-beat story. Your works council has more evidence of shadow AI use in the editorial team than sanctioned use.

You do not have a content problem. You have an authorship problem about authorship itself. Your firm's workforce strategy is being written every week in decisions you were not invited to. The question is not whether to have one. It is whose handwriting the one you already have is in. Your named senior analysts read it last month. Your works council is decoding it right now. Your 2030 editorial bench is being shaped by decisions that look like budget items and are actually architecture.

This briefing covers what is happening in your sector, what it means for the people function you run, and the three questions your leadership team should answer before the next GMT.

The article-writer pyramid just collapsed in eighteen months

For a century the economic architecture of a B2B publisher ran on a simple exchange. Junior researchers and journalists did the article-writing and routine sector-data work under named-byline supervision. Senior analysts taught judgment by osmosis, the kind of pattern recognition that decides which companies actually matter in a coverage beat. Over a decade or so the best juniors became named senior analysts whose by-line trust carried the subscription product. Article volume was the apprenticeship. By-line trust was the moat. Both ran on the same pyramid.

GPT and Perplexity ate the article-writer layer in eighteen months. Standard sector content, news aggregation, first-pass synthesis are now produced at near-zero cost outside your firm. The AI-native intelligence startups in your category are not experimenting. They launched on the explicit pitch that the legacy publisher pyramid is obsolete, recruited senior analysts directly with founder-tier equity, and ship intelligence products at a fraction of your cost base. Your advertising revenue continues its structural decline. Every mid-market publisher is making the same quiet decision about the junior researcher layer this year. Almost none are rebuilding the pathway.

Your apprenticeship ran for a century on routine work that is no longer yours to give. The question is whether the pathway gets rebuilt before the 2030 senior-analyst opening has no internal candidate.

Subscribers buy the named analyst, not the publication. The top fifteen percent of your senior analysts carry eighty percent of your subscriber retention. With AI-native capital available and the pitch structurally compelling — founder equity, faster product velocity, no legacy advertising drag — the lift-out risk is higher than it has been in a decade. The Editorial Director who cannot articulate a compelling firm-level AI strategy is watching named senior analysts take the call.

Your people function is feeling it every Tuesday

Your talent acquisition. Your best senior analyst took the call on Monday evening. Your best lateral recruit of the last two quarters came from a publisher who hesitated longer than yours. Your graduate journalist programme is holding, but the best graduates are asking in second-round interviews what your firm's AI strategy is, and "we are thinking about it" does not win them. Named senior analysts do not quit on the spot. They start taking the calls quietly. By the time retention moves in the dashboard, they have already decided.

Your L&D. Your firm's editorial L&D budget is allocated to media-law refreshers, mandatory compliance modules, and an annual conference. None of it is designed for continuous in-the-work analyst-judgment coaching, agent-paired briefing work, or deliberate cohort rotation across coverage beats. Two populations are forming inside your editorial team whether you designed it or not. The named senior analysts are using AI daily and building judgment that compounds weekly. The rest are practicing not-knowing. Both groups are becoming who they practice being.

Your compensation architecture. Your editorial pay band rewards article volume and time in seat. Agents are compressing the article volume. Your named senior analysts see the math earlier than your committee does. With AI-native startup capital available and the pitch structurally compelling, the top fifteen percent of your analysts are reading every quarter's compensation run for a signal about whether the firm is being redesigned around them or without them. The comp committee that met last month did not see this.

Your employee relations and works council. Your works council has opened framework-agreement consultations on three AI deployments — content-tagging, subscriber-personalization, ad-ops automation — that shipped without HR in the room. The regulatory load on people functions has stacked: AI literacy documentation, high-risk recruiting and performance-management systems, works-council framework agreements, data-minimisation in agentic editorial tools. None of it shows up on the cost-reduction deck on the CFO's desk. All of it lands on you.

Your workforce planning and succession. Your 2030 senior-analyst bench has six names on it. Three of them came through the article-writing and routine-research work that GPT and Perplexity have already absorbed. You have not replaced the pathway. The external senior-analyst hire in 2030 will cost a thirty to forty percent premium, take eighteen months to rebuild by-line trust in the coverage beat, and bring the previous publisher's reader relationships. On a long enough horizon, the CHRO who cut the junior layer in 2024 is the CHRO the board blames for the 2031 senior-analyst opening with no internal candidate.

The apprenticeship clock was always the architecture

Your sector is repricing from below because the article-writer layer collapsed. Your people function is stretched because every deployment decision, every budget line, every framework agreement is a fragment of a workforce strategy that somebody is writing and you are not always in the room when they do. Same force, two altitudes. But there is a third thing happening that most B2B publisher CHROs have not named yet.

Your firm's workforce strategy is being written every week. The AI content-tagging pilot approved in product. The headcount line cut in the research department. The framework agreement opened without HR in the room. Your named senior analysts read the handwriting last month. Your works council is decoding it right now. Your 2030 editorial bench is being shaped by decisions that look like budget items and are actually architecture.

Bloomberg in 2002 produced two decades of named senior analysts because the junior sat next to the senior on the live analyst call from week one, not in a training cohort down the hall. Juniors watched every judgment call in real time. Cross-coverage exposure was structural: the junior on finance sat next to the junior on tech. By-line emergence was earned on the work, not by time in seat. The Wall Street Journal had the same talent in 2002 and shed senior journalism through every restructuring because the apprenticeship architecture was wrong. Same industry. Two outcomes. The architecture decided which.

You can tell which path a publisher is on from a single question. Of your successors on the 2030 senior-analyst list, which ones came through work that still exists? Most mid-market publishers cannot answer. The ones that can have already rebuilt the pathway.

You have twelve to eighteen months to author the answer deliberately, or the cost-reduction deck on the CFO's desk writes it for you. Same technology. Same workforce. Different outcome depending on whose handwriting the answer is in.

What most publishers are doing. What the winners are doing instead.

Every CHRO has had the AI conversation. Most are making the same four decisions. A smaller group is making different ones.

THE DEFAULT PATH

Restrict AI tools for editorial safety

Sixty-nine percent of editorial staff use AI anyway. Named senior analysts read restriction as mistrust and start taking the calls quietly.

Cut the junior researcher layer for this year's number

Cheaper editorial cost in Q1. Empty senior-analyst bench by 2031. External hire at a premium with no by-line trust.

Announce firm-wide editorial redesign top-down

Senior analysts whose comp gets compressed have the power to walk. Lift-out risk rises. AI-native competitor wins.

Ship the annual engagement survey as your main HR deliverable

Your cadence is slower than the CFO's quarterly deck. Cost-reduction writes the workforce answer. You inherit damage.

THE WINNERS' PATH

Publish three rules that defend real trust

Routing by task sensitivity, not by tool. Source-confidentiality work never goes to an agent. Audit trail writes itself.

Ship one coverage beat redesigned as a triad unit

Senior analyst, junior researcher, agent ensemble as one delivery unit. Junior sits inside every analyst call from week one.

Six senior analysts author their own beat redesigns first

Eight-week council cadence. They bring the redesign to the editorial committee as work they authored, not approved.

Publish the for-them memo in first 100 days

Two pages, co-signed by the CEO, referenced every quarter. Every AI deployment gets decoded against it.

Same workforce. Same twelve months. Opposite outcomes. The difference is whose hand is on the pen.

Talent Gravity. Capability Compounding. Succession Readiness.

Three questions every CHRO is tracking. None of them used to be the same question. They are now.

01 · TALENT GRAVITY

Are your named senior analysts staying because of you, or despite you?

Your best senior analyst took the call on Monday. Your best lateral recruit last quarter came from a publisher who hesitated longer than yours. Your graduate journalist programme is holding, but the best graduates are asking what your AI strategy is in second-round interviews. Named analysts watch which way you lean the first time something goes wrong. The ones who start taking the calls have already decided.

02 · CAPABILITY COMPOUNDING

Is the median researcher sharper in December than they were in January?

Two populations are forming in every editorial team. The named senior analysts are using AI daily and building judgment that compounds weekly. The rest are practicing not-knowing. Your L&D budget funds media-law refreshers and an annual conference. Neither moves the median. The publishers pulling ahead are making the analyst-and-agent workflow the firm's default workflow.

03 · SUCCESSION READINESS

Of your 2030 senior-analyst bench, how many came through work that still exists?

Your successor list has six names. At least three of them came through the article-writing and routine-research work that GPT and Perplexity have already absorbed. You have not replaced the pathway. The external senior-analyst hire in 2030 costs a thirty to forty percent premium and brings the previous publisher's reader relationships. The apprenticeship architecture gets rebuilt now or gets inherited as a gap.

What the publishers winning this play are actually doing

Four concrete moves any CHRO can start this quarter. Each addresses one sub-function. Pulled together, they become one answer the firm compounds on.

1

Talent: publish the for-them memo in your first 100 days

Two pages, signed by the CEO. What this firm believes humans are for. Which named senior analysts the firm is investing in. Which roles are being redesigned around analyst judgment and agent partnership. What happens to someone whose role changes materially. Referenced every quarter. Every AI deployment after it gets decoded against this memo. Without the memo, every deployment is decoded against rumour.

2

L&D: ship one coverage beat redesigned as a triad unit this quarter

Senior analyst, junior researcher, and agent ensemble as one inseparable delivery unit. The junior does not write first drafts the senior throws out. The junior operates the agent ensemble and sits next to the senior on the live analyst call from week one. The senior makes the judgment calls in real time. Exposure-to-judgment hours for that junior go from one hundred fifty a year on the old apprenticeship to fourteen hundred on this one. The named-byline emergence clock compresses from twelve years to seven. Start with one beat. Template the next three.

3

Succession: six senior analysts author their own beat redesigns first

Do not ship a firm-wide editorial redesign top-down. That move fails because the senior analysts whose comp gets compressed have the option to walk to an AI-native competitor. Invert. Assemble six senior analysts — the ones whose subscriber books are largest and whose lift-out risk is highest — as the authoring council. Their first assignment: redesign their own coverage beat at the task level in eight weeks. They bring it to the editorial committee as work they authored. The six loudest possible critics become the six loudest possible defenders.

4

Trust: publish three rules, one escalation, one red line

Three rules about what the editorial team can do with AI without asking permission. One rule about what requires review before publication. One rule about what never goes to an agent — source-confidentiality work, sensitive-source conversation, the ethics call. Published. Defended to the board when an experiment fails. Your named senior analysts watch which way you lean the first time something goes wrong. Published rules create real capability.

The only firm that joins workforce authorship to working infrastructure

The B2B publisher CHRO has four places to go. None can do what we do.

The media and publishing benchmark consultancies (FIPP, Press Gazette analyst services, Specialist Media Group, RBI advisory peers) describe the publisher economics that have always run. When the article-writer layer is eaten by GPT, the benchmark becomes a liability.

The Big Four human-capital practices (Deloitte, Mercer, Korn Ferry, Willis Towers Watson) run survey-benchmark models with audit-relationship conflicts. Every publisher's answer looks different. A benchmark smooths the differences that actually matter.

The HR-tech vendors (Workday, SuccessFactors, Eightfold, Gloat, Phenom, Personio) sell platform software. The data encoding which named senior analysts hold which subscriber relationships IS your editorial moat in machine-readable form. Building on the vendor stack licenses it back to the vendor.

The L&D platforms and HR academies (LinkedIn Learning, Coursera, Sana Labs, Josh Bersin Academy) sell content libraries. The named-senior-analyst pathway is a pattern-exposure problem, not a content-library problem. A platform that sells modules cannot rebuild the pattern-exposure architecture agents have collapsed.

The market offers four things you have already said no to. GRAIL is the fifth option.

WHAT YOU GET

Senior advisory that speaks GMT, not HR-deck

Working infrastructure your team uses the same week

One coverage beat redesigned at task level with the analyst in the room

A for-them memo the CEO co-signs in your first 100 days

No vendor lock-in at any phase of the engagement

WHY IT MATTERS

Founded by operators who have carried people-adjacent seats

Business first, technology second

Three weeks from first meeting to working infrastructure

Your team keeps the infrastructure, you own the IP

Every next step earned by what just shipped, never assumed

Three sessions with your people leadership. Working infrastructure from week one.

We start with your people leadership team because the change cannot outrun the team's personal understanding of what is possible. Three workshops. Each delivers standalone value. Each earns the right to the next.

WORKSHOP 01

How to think

Walk through what is happening in your sector and inside your people function. Draft the first page of your for-them memo in the room, with your CEO present. Your leadership team leaves with a shared view of what the firm believes humans are for and the first draft of the document the CEO will co-sign.

WORKSHOP 02

Your people infrastructure

A half-day build. Your Head of Talent, Head of L&D, Head of Compensation, and Head of Employee Relations each leave with working infrastructure tuned to their function. Task-level beat-mapping agent. Senior-analyst council facilitation architecture. Framework-agreement drafting for the works council. Three-rules trust document. Infrastructure your team is using the same week.

WORKSHOP 03

Ready to run

Refined infrastructure based on real use. The first coverage beat redesigned as a triad unit with the analyst in the room. The published for-them memo, co-signed. The senior-analyst council kickoff agenda. The CFO conversation with numbers the Editorial Director can check: external-hire premium math, cohort-retention forecast, successor-readiness count.

Three weeks. No IT project. No editorial committee vote needed to start. The infrastructure your people function is already running on when we finish.

For your next GMT

The questions where your people leadership cannot agree on an answer are the ones worth an hour on the agenda. Ask these honestly.

If you asked three of your named senior analysts privately tomorrow whether the firm's AI strategy is being done for them or to them, what would they say? Do you know the names, and can you describe the evidence for what they would say?

Walk me through one coverage beat in your firm that has been redesigned at the task level in the last twelve months. Who did the redesign, what did it change, and what does the senior analyst do with their week that they did not do before?

Of the six names on your 2030 senior-analyst bench, how many came through the article-writing and routine-research work that GPT and Perplexity have already absorbed? What is replacing the pathway for the ones whose pathway is gone?

Your workforce strategy is being written this quarter in deployment decisions, budget lines, and framework-agreement openings. How many of those fragments are you the author of, and how many are you decoding after they ship?

Of your named senior analysts — the top fifteen percent of editorial who carry eighty percent of subscriber retention — have any of them been asked to author the redesign yet, or are they waiting to be presented with a decision on yours?

If any of these produces a disagreement in your people leadership, that is the conversation worth having before the editorial committee meets.

IN THIS SERIES

There's a version of this briefing for every seat at the table.

GRAIL has produced industry briefings calibrated to the specific reality of each C-suite role.

CEO

Revenue. Margin. Valuation.

Three numbers your board reads. AI is rewriting all three in your industry.

CFO

Capital. Forecast. Story.

What you allocate this year is the story your board reads next year.

COO

Cheaper. Better. Faster.

The triple threat that used to be a tradeoff is now table stakes.

CHRO

▶ YOU ARE READING

Capacity. Capability. Promise.

The biggest talent transition of a career. Compete on capacity, not headcount.

CPTO

Moat. Speed. Allocation.

The platform moat that survives 2028 is being chosen this year.

CCO

Margin. Pace. Position.

The whole GTM playbook is being rewritten in real time, across every commercial team at once.

Visit grail.works for the full series.

GRAIL

An AI-native management consultancy helping European mid-market leadership teams figure out what fundamentally changes about their business as AI enters their industry.

www.grail.works