

GDEVS - [SOTR073] SEARCH OFF THE RECORD - 73RD EPISODE – VIDEO

[00:00:10:17] - **John**

Hello, and welcome to another episode of Search Off The Record, a podcast coming to you from the Google Search team discussing all things Search and having some fun along the way. My name is John, and I'm joined today by Lizzi from the Search Relations team, of which I'm also part of. Hi, Lizzi.

[00:00:29:06] - **Lizzi**

Hey, John, what are we going to talk about today?

[00:00:31:23] - **John**

We're going to talk about some old stuff. So I heard people submitted some feedback for the podcast that we should talk about content decay.

[00:00:42:19] - **Lizzi**

Like tooth decay. Is it like something painful?

[00:00:45:22] - **John**

I don't know if content has feelings. So, from that point of view, who knows?

[00:00:52:17] - **Lizzi**

But maybe it's our problem because it's a moldy thing. Like moldy cheese.

[00:00:57:15] - **John**

Moldy cheese?

[00:00:58:21] - **Lizzi**

Yes.

[00:01:00:04] - **John**

It's like cheese decay.

[00:01:01:06] - **Lizzi**

No, I saw this come up, I think, in your feedback form for topics for Search Off the Record podcast that someone thought that we should talk about content decay, and I did not know what that was, and so I thought I should look into it, and then maybe we could talk about it.

[00:01:16:26] - **John**

Okay, cool. Well, it's good that someone knows what it is.

[00:01:21:27] - **Lizzi**

Well, we will find out in this episode.

[00:01:23:25] - **John**

When I looked at it, it sounded like this was a known term, and I felt inadequate when I realized I had no idea what it actually meant, and I had to interpret what it probably means from the name.

[00:01:38:12] - **Lizzi**

From the name, what first comes to mind when someone says content decay? What did you think it was going to be?

[00:01:43:21] - **John**

I don't know, it sounded like something scientific. It's like radioactive decay kind of thing, or it's like...

[00:01:51:21] - **Lizzi**

Like it sounds a little bit negative. A bit negative, yeah. Like, yeah. Like something's probably wrong with the content. Probably it's rotting or something has happened to it over time.

[00:02:02:16] - **John**

I guess it's like if your home page turns into GeoCities and suddenly, you're like, "This is old," but I guess on the internet, it's not that your home page turns old, it's more than the rest of the world kind of evolves, right?

[00:02:19:06] - Lizzi

I guess so, yeah, interest in the thing maybe changes over time.

[00:02:23:12] - John

Cool.

[00:02:24:17] - Lizzi

But that seemed to be like what, from my light research into this matter, it seems to be content decay in the SEO world seems to be about content that is declining in search interest. So it's something that you would notice when you're looking at Search Console that CTR has dropped off slowly over time, and people are not looking at your thing. And this is a signal that potentially your content has decayed over the last decade. I don't know. The time period is unknown.

[00:02:57:08] - John

Decay, decay, decay. So it's like, okay, make sure it's less than nine years old and you should be okay.

[00:03:03:08] - Lizzi

Correct.

[00:03:04:17] - John

Okay. Cool. I think the aspect I also sometimes get questioned about this is whether it means that your website is bad or lower quality or not as helpful as it should be, and then the SEO questions like, do I need to fix my content decay so that Google thinks my website is actually good?

[00:03:25:10] - Lizzi

Well, but is that true? Like, do you need to have all of your pages new at all times? Like everything needs to be, I don't know, less than six months old?

[00:03:34:17] - John

No. Definitely not. I think, like the main problem is people see this as something like a direct SEO factor when it's actually more, I'd say, more of a strategic thing, like what do you want your site to be known for and does it match what people are looking for? Is the information still correct? Those kind of things.

[00:03:56:23] - Lizzi

Okay, so if something's old, it doesn't necessarily mean that it's bad.

[00:04:00:04] - John

Exactly.

[00:04:01:20] - Lizzi

Or that people don't care about it, for example.

[00:04:04:02] - John

Yeah. I mean, it's something where, when you look at reference material, it's kind of by definition old, and it's like people wrote about it because they've studied it for a really long time. So it's like an old thing. But that doesn't mean it's no longer true or no longer useful.

[00:04:23:16] - Lizzi

Okay.

[00:04:24:23] - John

So I guess we could maybe look at it from a practical point of view and look at the Search developer documentation. What do you think?

[00:04:32:02] - Lizzi

That sounds good. I think that was one of the first things that popped into my mind, just because my primary day job is I'm the librarian of the Search Central website, and I think of it as kind of I'm caretaking for it. And I want to know, like, are there any rotting pieces of cheese hiding out in Onesie, our website and how would I go about thinking about where to find them and then fixing them up. Like is there something that I could save or is it working as intended? But this sounds like a good test case for this episode.

[00:05:07:00] - **John**

Yeah, I think for once, maybe cheese is not a good comparison, because old cheese is sometimes even better than new cheese. So it's like if you have a slightly rotting cheese, you're like, "This is good." And it's like, if it's very rotting, then you're like, "Oh, too late." I don't know if that maps so well to documentation.

[00:05:29:15] - **Lizzi**

Or compost.

[00:05:30:22] - **John**

Compost. Okay.

[00:05:32:04] - **Lizzi**

Because then it can turn into something that's useful for the next tree or something. But maybe the analogies are not good.

[00:05:39:17] - **John**

Yeah. I don't know if you can do that with web pages. It's like you just keep them forever until they rot for a really long time and suddenly they bloom again. I don't know.

[00:05:48:25] - **Lizzi**

I think it depends which type of content that we're talking about within Onesie. I think that some of the content, the oldest content that we have lives in our blog. We have pages that are dating back to 2005, which one might say those are decomposing. I don't know. Have they reached their age limit in which people are searching for these things? And would that mean that the content has decayed or expired?

[00:06:19:03] - **John**

That's an interesting point. 2005. That's almost 20 years now. That's pretty cool. Two decades of decay. Yeah. I think with regards to blog posts in particular and any kind of news or time, I don't know what you would call it, like time-associated content, that feels like the kind of thing you'd almost want to keep just as a historical reference even.

[00:06:43:01] - **Lizzi**

I agree. I think from a research or archival perspective, we want to keep that with the original publish date. Even if we did update it, like, I don't know, we've announced something and then there's an update to that thing or we want to put a notice, I still want to retain the original piece of content as it was, in case we need to look back or refer to it, and to change it or rehabilitate it into a new thing would almost be worth republishing as a new blog post if we had that much additional things to say about it.

[00:07:19:08] - **John**

Yeah, I think that makes a lot of sense, especially with blog posts. It's like, I don't know, if we publish something in 2005 and we changed it last year, that would feel kind of weird to just rewrite the blog post. It's almost like you're rewriting history.

[00:07:35:29] - **Lizzi**

Well, and it's also incorrect. Like, if we went back and we replaced everything, like where we said Google Webmasters or Webmaster Tools, if we replaced Search Console everywhere where we said Webmaster Tools, it would be factually incorrect.

[00:07:49:23] - **John**

Yeah.

[00:07:52:16] - **Lizzi**

Because Search Console didn't exist at that point. It was Webmaster Tools. So, if we say, "Now Search Console is replacing Search Console," it doesn't make sense for that blog post where we announce the rebrand. So it's a weird circular, like you can't just do like a mass find and replace for every time we used Webmaster Tools.

[00:08:12:03] - **John**

Yeah, yeah. Oh man, that would be...

[00:08:15:01] - **Lizzi**

It breaks your brain a little bit.

[00:08:16:29] - **John**

That would be terrible. Or, if you change the screenshots, I guess even with features, because sometimes we announce things and they're long gone now, which is awkward on its own.

[00:08:26:23] - Lizzi

Like some report in Search Console and it doesn't exist anymore, maybe it's been deprecated at this point or renamed to something else, going back to that blog post and renaming it, and then it doesn't match the screenshots. Then you end up with this thing that's just factually incorrect, and we often reference back to something, so we almost want it to be whatever it was. If we want to do a call back to when we initially started something, and now it's evolved to be this other thing, it's good from a reference or a citation point of view to maintain how it was at that point to show the growth or evolution of something.

[00:09:04:18] - John

Mm-hmm. So what shall we do? What do you recommend as librarian?

[00:09:09:15] - Lizzi

As librarian, I think that I permit fixing links as one of them. So there are a few edits that I think are permissible to fix. So, if there is a new place where that thing lives in an old blog post, I will fix a broken link.

[00:09:26:23] - John

Okay, that makes sense.

[00:09:28:10] - Lizzi

Yeah, well, I mean, maybe if you're being, like exactly pedantic about what you should not, like you shouldn't change anything, then maybe that's going a little bit too far. But I think from a usability perspective, people should be able to find wherever that thing moved to in case that site didn't redirect properly. Users should still find where that thing is. But one thing that we've done is we have these banners that we put on the top of blog posts, and we've actually gone back all the way. It took us a while to go back and tag and determine, are these blog posts still up to date or not, and then they got a banner. So we have a default generic banner that's just like, "It's been a while since we published this. Some of this stuff might be out of date." To at least acknowledge that the links might not work, or some of these screenshots might look a little bit weird to you, but just so you know, this is a blog post and sort of a little bit tongue in cheek about like, "Notice the date at which this was published. It's a little bit old." Because we were getting a lot of feedback where people would say like, "Hey, like your screenshot is old here." And then us saying like, "Hello, this is 2008 calling, and we're not going to update this screenshot," because, again, the factual historical accuracy angle. And then we have another banner where we can append it to add an additional sentence that says something about if we need a banner. So, if we want to say, "We published updated documentation about this," or, "This thing has been deprecated now." So there might be something that we want to add on to explain like additional context for that thing about why like you shouldn't be reading this or if we have a new resource to point people to.

[00:11:10:15] - John

Okay.

[00:11:16:19] - Lizzi

So at least we can call their attention to, like, whatever the thing is.

[00:11:21:20] - John

That makes sense. So don't just blindly add a banner on all old pages. Kind of really look at the content and see, does it make sense to just generically call the date to attention? Or should we go further and say, "Well, actually, this is no longer even relevant at all."

[00:11:41:21] - Lizzi

Correct. We did think about that. Like, should we just put on that banner for everything that's older than five years? Should we even be spending time tagging stuff like that? I think even that is then misleading because some of those older blog posts are still best practices. For example, we have some blog posts that's about pagination best practices, and we're still linking to it as like, "Hey, this is a guide that will help you." We haven't had time to migrate it to evergreen documentation, but the practices are still good to follow. So, if we just blindly put a banner there, then people would say like, "Oh, I shouldn't do these things, but you guys are linking to it," a little bit awkward.

[00:12:27:01] - John

The comparison to evergreen content, I think, is also interesting because I feel that's something that we try to do where maybe we do an announcement on the blog, but when it turns into persistent documentation, we try to put it into kind of like an evergreen state.

[00:12:46:08] - **Lizzi**

Yes. And, for that case, I wish that there was something where I could tie those things together, because it almost feels like that would be better to just redirect it. For example, Daniel Weisberg on our team blogged about debugging traffic drops with Search Console in a blog post. And then we worked on that to turn that into documentation and we added content to it. We want people to go look at the new thing, and I would want people to find that new thing in search results as well. So, to me, like that one, I don't know why people would need to find the older version for that, because it's not like an announcement. It was best practice kind of information.

[00:13:23:22] - **John**

Yeah.

[00:13:30:00] - **Lizzi**

So, for that, would it be better to do like a rel=canonical situation?

[00:13:35:02] - **John**

The rel=canonical would be kind of sneaky there because it's not really the same thing. It's kind of like, well--

[00:13:41:05] - **Lizzi**

Oh, because we added on content, like if it was a 1 to 1, then it would be okay to do relcanonical

[00:13:47:16] - **John**

Because it's not equivalent. I always see the rel=canonical as something where you tell the search engines these are actually equivalent, and you can pick whichever one you want, and we're kind of seeing it as like, "Well, these are equivalent, but treat this as a redirect," which I think, from the indexing side, sometimes is a bit tricky because they're like, "Ah, they say rel=canonical, but they actually mean something different."

[00:14:14:10] - **Lizzi**

Is there a better code to use there or like no indexing that thing?

[00:14:19:06] - **John**

I think either redirecting or not redirecting. It's like really saying that it's replaced or keeping both.

[00:14:29:13] - **Lizzi**

What about a crypto redirect?

[00:14:31:15] - **John**

I never understood what that was. Someone made that up.

[00:14:34:24] - **Lizzi**

Someone. Someone. AKA also known as Gary. We have that actually documented in our documentation as a thing that you should only do as a last resort. If you really can't do a proper real redirect, you can do this thing called a crypto redirect, which is a term for like fake redirect. It's like a thing.

[00:14:52:23] - **John**

Oh.

[00:14:57:15] - **Lizzi**

It's like a thing that is more of a last measure: If you can't do it, technically speaking, from your content management system or it doesn't make sense, then you can put this banner at the top to at least tell people that you moved to a new site. Let's say you don't have control with your CMS to actually do redirects then okay, fine, put a note to at least tell people that you moved somewhere else or why.

[00:15:20:26] - **John**

Oh, okay. So, it doesn't have anything to do with like you're paying bitcoin to Googlebot to do something.

[00:15:26:23] - **Lizzi**

No. No, no, no, no.

[00:15:29:27] - **John**

Okay.

[00:15:31:00] - **Lizzi**

And any implications towards cryptocurrencies is not related.

[00:15:36:01] - **John**

Moving from the blog to evergreen content, that makes sense. What about evergreen content that becomes obsolete?

[00:15:41:24] - **Lizzi**

So what would be an example of that? I think something that we deleted recently was the "How to Structure Data" documentation page, which I thought we should just get rid of it. So we did have some discussion at the time that that was going away because the "How to Rich Results" was deprecated. At the time, we needed to communicate what was happening. So we had a blog post, and then the question of like, should we keep that up with a notice so that people know that it's going away? But it almost felt like that's going to be more confusing to leave it up for a period of time, because people might miss the note at the top and still be adding markup to their site. Because, again, like notes at the top, people have banner blindness and they just skip over it. For that case, I didn't see any use to keep that up.

[00:16:30:16] - **John**

Okay.

[00:16:36:17] - **Lizzi**

And actually it would be negative if people are still adding markup, thinking they're going to get something. So what we ended up doing was just delete the page and redirect to the changelog entry so that, if people clicked "How To Structure Data" still, if there was a link somewhere, they could still find out what happened to that feature. So then they land on the note that says like, "This thing was deprecated. Blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Here's the blog post with more information about why this happened."

[00:17:03:00] - **John**

Yeah, I guess it's also a bit unique with our documentation, and probably with other people's documentation as well, if it's the official source and suddenly the official source is gone, then all that's remaining are these kind of like indirect things where some, I don't know, maybe shady SEO has written about how to structure data. And, if you search for it, that's the only thing that pops up, you might be like, "Oh, this is how you do it. I'll just follow these instructions."

[00:17:35:05] - **Lizzi**

True. And I think our usual default is to keep it up for six months if something is going away to sort of like let people know that it's going to go away in six months and then you keep up the banner and it's okay that we're supporting it for that period of time. But, with that change, it was gone right away. But we also have a blog post. So, if somebody wanted to search, it's not like there's no page about how-to to say what happened.

[00:18:00:21] - **John**

Okay. So it's good to have a blog where you keep your kind of timely content in case you end up deleting your evergreen content or renaming it. I guess we have the same problem with Webmaster Tools. Like you mentioned, people might search for Webmaster Tools and they could still find the blog posts and then kind of infer what happened, even if they don't find Webmaster Tools directly or probably they do.

[00:18:27:04] - **Lizzi**

Yeah. And maybe that's one thing that would be still confusing, like when we are trying to get people to switch over to a new name, it means we're not cleaning up all references to our product name, so still some stuff is like hanging around. But I think, for our case, we are okay making that trade-off because we want to preserve historical accuracy.

[00:18:51:15] - **John**

And, with regards to historical accuracy, should there be an last updated date on all pages, what do you think?

[00:18:57:28] - **Lizzi**

On the blog, you mean? Should there be like a--

[00:19:04:20] - **John**

I guess on the blog, definitely. Like you should have the post date.

[00:19:07:29] - **Lizzi**

So we have published date. And the thing that messes with this is the blog's landing page uses this dynamic content widget thing to pull in the most recent posts, and it sorts by date. So, if I started messing with that date, then all the blog posts would be flowing in out of chronological order, so that date has to be the original published date. If there

was another field, then maybe that would be okay. But I also don't know how useful that would be to people, because the only update I'm making is fixing a link. So it's also not meaningfully changed and shouldn't change.

[00:19:52:03] - **John**

Oh, okay, so I might almost be misleading to people in that they think this is completely correct, but actually there was a typo that was fixed or something small.

[00:20:02:26] - **Lizzi**

If we do have a meaningful update to a previous blog post, we add either a note box or like a horizontal line and then say like, "Update on March 17th, 2021: We did this thing. We added another announcement or a clarification because we got so many comments about something." And sometimes we do that when the update is like less than a paragraph and it's not enough to warrant a whole new blog post, and it's still related to the initial announcement, then we will do that, but at least they know that this was an addition. So, again, with the historical accuracy, it's not like we're going back and adding a new paragraph and nobody knows that "Oh, there was a new paragraph there."

[00:20:41:14] - **John**

I guess what we could do is just put updated for 2024 in the title.

[00:20:46:16] - **Lizzi**

What? And then Google will know that all of my content is fresh and recent and relevant to people because it's all 2024. Would that work?

[00:21:02:24] - **John**

I will just stop saying things because people--

[00:21:05:24] - **Lizzi**

You're giving me ideas.

[00:21:07:09] - **John**

No, don't do it. Don't do it. No.

[00:21:10:04] - **Lizzi**

Why, why why. Would it be bad?

[00:21:12:17] - **John**

I think it almost comes across a bit as clickbait.

[00:21:18:06] - **Lizzi**

Yeah.

[00:21:19:10] - **John**

I don't know, I see that a lot on the internet where like, "Oh, it's updated for 2024." And you look at it and it's like, "Oh, it's the same list of fax machines as you had ten years ago." It's like, "What do you mean updated?" It's like, "Come on." It's misleading.

[00:21:34:26] - **Lizzi**

But sometimes I wish or I almost wonder if it would help to put the date in more prominently. I don't know. I'll give you an example. So we're currently having a problem with people writing in lots of feedback about the Mobile-Friendly Test because we have a blog post that the title is something like "The Mobile-Friendly Test is Here," or something kind of vague. It's a blog post, but it's not clear that, like, the point of this blog post was announcing that the Mobile-Friendly Test is now a tool from years ago, and that's now ranking very well because the Mobile-Friendly Test is deprecated.

[00:22:13:25] - **John**

Oh, it's gone.

[00:22:15:15] - **Lizzi**

So this is a page that people are still finding this because they're looking for information about the Mobile-Friendly Test. And this blog post happens to have that thing in the title, and people are going there and then clicking the link and then writing in to me to say that the link is broken like, "It's a 404. Where is the Mobile-Friendly Test?" And that thing is deprecated. And so, even though I've put a deprecation notice up, people are still writing in about it. So one of the thoughts could be like, should I add in a title or a date that's way in the past, because actually I don't want

it to be in 2024. It's almost like I want to do de-SEOing like, "This is from 2017.", "Announcing Mobile-Friendly Tests in...", "The year was..."

[00:23:01:13] - **John**

Oh my gosh. Yeah. That's kind of challenging, I think. It's almost like you'd have to set up a landing page for something that no longer exists. I mean, I've seen that with some e-commerce sites where they'll say, "We don't have any coupons," and they explicitly put up a page for our company and coupons, and you go to the page and it's like, "We don't do this," kind of thing, just so that they have an official source out there saying ranking for this company, plus coupons, and you go there and it's like, "Oh, they don't exist." So therefore anyone else who's trying to write about this is like, I can keep that in mind. Okay?

[00:23:43:25] - **Lizzi**

Okay. I mean, we do do that for other things like the meta keywords thing or things that Google doesn't support anymore or are not a thing. Like we have to do this like anti-pattern or like this thing is not here. So at least like we have a statement on this thing. It's almost like, I guess, I don't know, I should go look up. This is a to do for myself, to see what was the blog post where we announced the deprecation of the Mobile-Friendly Test? Because that probably is not a clear enough title, that people are not able to find, like, "What happened to you, Mobile-Friendly Test?" I think we packaged that with another announcement. And that's why the paper trail for what happened to this thing is just not there.

[00:24:26:01] - **John**

Oh yeah. Of course, sometimes we try to write something friendly so that it doesn't sound bad when we deprecate something which is always sad.

[00:24:34:25] - **Lizzi**

Oh.

[00:24:37:05] - **John**

Okay. So how do we do that with the Structured Data Testing Tool. That's similar, right?

[00:24:40:25] - **Lizzi**

Yes. And I think that came about because they needed, I don't know, I should go back to the Mobile-Friendly Test people and see like, "Would you be interested in doing a similar approach?" Because the Structured Data Testing Tool deprecation, they asked when they were doing the migration to schema.org and moving around the tool that they needed somewhere to redirect to, and because there were going to be two new tools that people can use, they need to pick between Rich Results Test and the schema.org validator. We needed a page that explains like what happened and where are these two new tools. So like redirecting to pick one of them didn't make sense to just redirect to because there are two choices and two different use cases for that thing. So now we have this landing page that allows you to pick between one or two, option A, option B, and then an explanation to like, "Oh, are you still looking for the Structured Data Testing Tool? Well, here is the backstory. If you don't know like this is what happened to it." So, for Mobile-Friendly Tests, I don't like it when they just like automatically redirect to another thing. I think the solution there is to redirect to Chrome Lighthouse or something where you can look at the Mobile-Friendly Test, but it doesn't tell you what happened to the tool.

[00:26:03:11] - **Lizzi**

So, if I'm trying to find out like what happened, I almost need that first thing to know. Like, "What happened to you?" And, otherwise, it feels almost like an error. Like, "Did I click a wrong link or they redirect to the wrong thing?"

[00:26:17:24] - **John**

Yeah, kind of like an explanation for why we're sending you to somewhere else.

[00:26:23:10] - **Lizzi**

That could be like an intermediary step where maybe you don't do that forever, but you do it during the transition period where, for like six months, you have them go funnel them to the explanation, and then after that, all right, call it a day. Like enough people know about it. Enough time has passed. We can just redirect right to the thing and people aren't as confused anymore.

[00:26:44:19] - **John**

I guess, almost for our site, when it comes to old content, it's a lot more, "How do we avoid confusing people?"

[00:26:50:03] - **Lizzi**

Yes.

[00:26:55:19] - **John**

People come to our site for whatever reason, then we should make sure that they find information that's helpful for them and that they understand the context. And, if something is old and they search for it, they should be able to recognize, "Oh, maybe I have to rethink what I wanted to do because what I was searching for doesn't exist anymore or is completely different now."

[00:27:12:29] - **Lizzi**

Correct.

[00:27:14:05] - **John**

Okay. What else do we need to cover with regards to old content?

[00:27:18:19] - **Lizzi**

I think there's a couple things that I don't know what to do with. So, for example, we have a case studies section on our site with stuff that is old, like 2019. Some site added markup to their site, and they used old tools. Like, I think one of them used Structured Data Testing Tool, which doesn't exist anymore. Do their success metrics expire? Like, is there a point in which a case study is no longer relevant or has too much time has passed in which people are like, "Oh, I don't need to reference this thing anymore." Do I keep it up forever?

[00:28:01:14] - **John**

That almost feels like a blog post. It's tied to a specific point in time and maybe we just add a banner. I don't know.

[00:28:11:03] - **Lizzi**

I don't know. Because we don't really have a process to archive that kind of stuff. And, if it's a blog post, then people can't find the case studies because they kind of are hidden in the blog. So they live somewhere else. So, if we were to demote it, how would we go about that? And I don't know, at what point do we think a case study is still relevant.

[00:28:38:04] - **John**

I've looked up old case studies before. I think, if the the date is obvious enough, when you look at it, you kind of have to make that judgment call yourself. But it's been interesting looking up, I don't know what it was, but old case studies where I knew they existed and I just wanted to see how did they write up about it back then? What could I learn from that? Or could I look up the site and see what they're doing now? That's a

[00:29:07:20] - **Lizzi**

That's a Good point. Okay, so we keep it and then maybe delete it if the feature goes away, for example.

[00:29:11:05] - **John**

Yeah.

[00:29:14:22] - **Lizzi**

So, if it's like about how to structure data and that thing isn't a thing anymore, then we shouldn't have a case study for it because it's not going to be useful to people.

[00:29:24:05] - **John**

Yeah, that makes sense. So almost like a mix between evergreen content and a blog post, it's like somewhere in between. Okay.

[00:29:33:06] - **Lizzi**

What about event websites?

[00:29:35:13] - **John**

Event websites? I think those are more temporary and could be archived after a couple of years.

[00:29:43:29] - **Lizzi**

But what if somebody speaks at a Search Central Live event and wants to use that as a reference that they spoke at one of our events? They would have no citation to list on their personal website of experience that they, you know, maybe have experience public speaking. How else could they cite this thing?

[00:30:02:07] - **John**

I don't know, I think if we choose a time that is long enough, then that kind of works, where it's like, "Oh, I spoke at this event ten years ago," and it's like, is that still a reference? I don't know. I also think the the setup that we use for event websites automatically expires. So that's kind of this interesting thing.

[00:30:22:26] - **Lizzi**

I just saw a notification. I don't know if you got the same notification, but there was one this morning, I think, about the Unconference from two years ago, the Virtual Unconference. And it said like, "This is scheduled for... After two years, it will be auto-archived." You can stop me if you want, but the little bot is programmed to just archive. So two years is like okay, maybe.

[00:30:47:08] - **John**

That's kind of short, but okay. Yeah.

[00:30:48:27] - **Lizzi**

We have even faster setup to remind us to go and audit existing content. Oh, so we have a little robot to come and remind us, "Hey, you should come investigate this documentation page. It's been x amount of time. Please come and look at it again to make sure that all of your links are still up to date, that it's still fresh," I mean like current/fresh in the sense that the advice is still current and what we want to say about x topic.

[00:31:18:26] - **John**

That's cool. Okay.

[00:31:20:05] - **Lizzi**

That's one way to like, I don't know, try to spread it out. I think one thing that we noticed was that we did all of our spring cleaning at the same time last year, and so then the bot came back 12 months later and then reminded us about all of those things in the same week, which was like, "Oh, no, like, that's too much workload." So almost we need to spread that out so that when it comes to remind you, you have enough time to actually do the audit properly.

[00:31:45:16] - **John**

Cool.

[00:31:48:22] - **Lizzi**

Okay. So I think that's probably it. We can just delete our whole site now. Archive everything. No?

[00:31:53:05] - **John**

No. No, no, no. We have to wait two years or a couple of years more and then we can retire. Yeah. No, we have to keep our blog, we said. We will just put banners everywhere.

[00:32:04:16] - **Lizzi**

In this episode?

[00:32:05:29] - **John**

Even this episode. Yeah, well, this episode is not on our blog, so that's a little bit tricky. I don't know how we can put banners on here. Yeah, the whole YouTube side is also something where it's not really our content management system. So we'll have to figure something out there to. That was it for this episode, and this recording is now old. Now that you're listening to it, it's been a while since we recorded it. Ah, sorry. In the next episode, we're going to talk about office hours. What do you know about office hours? Are they good?

[00:32:45:09] - **Lizzi**

I'm going to find out. And I think that we're going to have two guests who also know about office hours come on and talk with us.

[00:32:52:28] - **John**

Ooh, fantastic. Cool. Okay, well, thank you, folks, for listening in and goodbye.

[00:33:03:24] - **Lizzi**

We've been having fun with this podcast and I hope you, the listener, have found it both entertaining and insightful too. Feel free to drop us a note on Twitter @GoogleSearchC or chat with us at one of the next events we go to if you have any thoughts. And, of course, don't forget to like and subscribe. Thank you and goodbye.