

GolfTraxx.com



Regulatory Reform: Imposing Corporate Tech Giant Accountability through Standardized Metric Reporting and Enforcement

IN ADDITION to the repeated malicious attacks by these corporate tech giants on my website, as previously reported here in our News/Press and as reported to the FBI, the California Attorney General, the Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission, the US Patent and Trademark Office, and the Federal Communications Commission, and to the corporations themselves, it does in fact appear obvious that many secret “backroom deals” have been forged among some of these tech giants as well.

The tech giant corporations named in previous news posts here are:

1. COMCAST (owner of NBC, NBC Sports, golfnow, golfadvisor, golfpass)
2. Google Corporation and its subsidiary Pocket
3. Microsoft (and subsidiaries Bing, and Azure)
4. Garmin
5. Amazon

In classic corporate sleazy style, the responses from their armies of corporate attorneys range from none to DENY.

<https://golfraxx.com/1stResponsefromBusinessConsumerAlliance.png>

https://golfraxx.com/2nd_ResponsefromBusinessCosumerAlliance.png

The complaints are growing exponentially against these tech giants and regulators are taking actions. There are now three separate antitrust lawsuits against Google brought forth by no less than 49 state attorney generals.

<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/three-additional-states-ask-court-join-justice-department-antitrust-suit-against-google>

The problem is how to **reign in** these corporations who have been granted corporate immunity for their activities in tech, given the “murky waters” in which their actions take place, making visibility of what they actually did extremely limited, and accountability for what they did difficult to impose since the tech giants are the ones with much of the data that would be required to prove intent for criminal prosecution of the wrongdoings they committed.

In this report, I propose **standardized metrics** for the largest offender of this group of tech giants. Of course, it's easy to imagine similar metrics being created for other search engines engaging in similar

practices. I propose that Google Corporation be **required** to report on **each and every one** of these proposed metrics on a **weekly** basis for the top and bottom quartiles of websites across each metric. I propose that regulators fine Google for each and every website in the lowest quartile on a weekly basis where the metrics demonstrate that Google has in fact acted contrary to its claim of democratic rule, in favor of the backroom deals it has made with other giant corporations such as COMCAST. I propose that where the standardized metrics demonstrate that Google and the corporations involved in those backroom deals where Google has in fact shown this favoritism each week **immediately forfeit** their profits from these secret backroom agreements, and redistribute those profits to those websites harmed by Google's extreme favoritism.

I believe that you will agree that the metrics proposed will indeed help less technical audiences **understand** the **ridiculousness** of the favored status received by Google itself and its backroom partners through these agreements, and why redistribution of the profits Google and its backroom partners obtained through cheating **must** be redistributed. Google's claim of fairness and democracy is a **complete farce**.

Standardized Metric One: Sitemap But Not Indexed Ratio: a ratio of the number of pages indexed by Google versus the total number of pages in sitemaps submitted to Google. This will range from 0 to 100%. My website has for several months had a **sitemap but not indexed ratio** less than 5%.

Standardized Metric Two: Sitemap Approved and Indexed Ratio: a ratio of the number of sitemap submitted pages actually indexed by Google versus the total number of pages in sitemaps submitted to Google that **are** approved by Google for display. This will range from 0 to 100%. My website has for several months has had a **sitemap approved and indexed ratio** less than 10%.

Standardized Metric Three: Sitemap Approved But Not Indexed Ratio: a ratio of the number of pages in sitemaps submitted to Google that are waiting to be indexed divided by the total number of pages in sitemaps submitted to Google that are approved pages. This will range from 0 to 100%. For several months my website] has had a **sitemap approved but not indexed ratio** greater than 95%. The higher this ratio, the more likely Google's tendency to keep your site "hidden" from view.

Standardized Metric Four: Sitemap Approved Not Indexed Aging: a product of the number of pages in sitemaps submitted to Google that are approved by Google but which are not yet indexed by Google times the average number of days pending Google's indexing. This will range from 0 to infinity. If a site has submitted one million pages in sitemaps submitted to Google which are approved by Google but all but 50,000 remain non-indexed for several weeks or months or perhaps even years, this metric will be **extremely** large, and provides insight into whether Google is acting equitable or playing fair with respect the site. My website's standardized metric four value is over **3 million**. I will wager that not a single one of Google's backroom agreement partners suffers from such **predatory exclusion**.

Standardized Metric Five: Diluted Distinct Keyword Correspondence Ratio: a ratio of the distinct key word impressions made by Google in a week versus the population of **distinct** keyword metadata contained within pages in sitemaps indexed by Google. This will range from 0 to 100%. Google might show you that it made 1000 separate keyword impressions on behalf of your site but those might have only comprised a few hundred separate keywords or phrases. Of equal importance is whether those impressions corresponded to actual keywords with the site metadata, otherwise they were of **no value**. Recently Google reported that my site received 7,000 impressions in a day. But 40% of those were impressions for phrases having nothing to do with my site like t-mobile. Relevant unique keyword impressions were far less than 1,000. Of the 80,000 approved pages in Google's index, there are

around 400,000 distinct metadata keywords/phrases within the pages. Doing simple math, 4,000 unique keyword impressions would correspond to a 1% Diluted Distinct Keyword Correspondence Ratio. Therefore, my website last less than one-quarter of one percent ratio, even just within the population of Google-indexed pages.

Standardized Metric Six: Undiluted Distinct Keyword Correspondence Ratio: a ratio of the distinct key word impressions made by Google in a week versus the population of distinct keywords contained within pages in sitemaps submitted Google. This will range from 0 to 100%. There are approximately 10 million keyword metadata phrases contained within the two million pages of content submitted in site maps to Google. The same 1,000 keywords mention in Metric Five apply. Therefore my site had a less than one one-hundredth of one percent Undiluted Distinct Keyword Correspondence Ratio.

Standardized Metric Seven: Impression Skew Percentage: a ratio of the sum of impressions made by Google for words and phrases not contained in website metadata key words versus the total number of impressions made by Google. This will range from 0 to 100%. My site reported impression skew percentage last week of over 40%.

Standardized Metric Eight: On/Off Topic Impression Ratio: a ratio of the sum of impressions made by Google for words and phrases contained in website metadata versus the total number of impressions made by Google. This will range from 0 to 100%. My site reported an on/off topic impression ratio last week of less than 10%. This is clearly NOT an indicator that Google is acting equitably or fair...

Standardized Metric Nine: Keyword Impressions To Diluted Universe Ratio: a ratio of distinct keyword impressions for site metadata words/phrases divided by the population of distinct keywords/phrases contained within pages in sitemaps submitted to Google that have been indexed by Google. This will range from 0 to 100%. If you have ten million keyword phrases in your metadata and Google includes impressions for less than 1,000 in a day, its going to take 10,000 days (almost 30 years) for your site to receive even a single impression for each key word...IF EVER. The lower this ratio, the more predatory Google is being with your site. If you created two million pages of content, you might have similar concerns.

Standardized Metric Ten: Keyword Impressions To Undiluted Universe Ratio: a ratio of distinct keyword impressions for site metadata words/phrases divided by the population of distinct keywords/phrases contained within pages in sitemaps submitted to Google . This will range from 0 to 100%. If you have ten million keyword phrases in your metadata and Google includes impressions for less than 1,000 in a day, its going to take 10,000 days (almost 30 years) to receive even a single impression for each. The lower this ratio, the more predatory Google is being with your site.

Standardized Metric Eleven: Demonstrated Days Required: an aggregate measure of the total number of days required for Google to make at least one impression for each one of the entire population of distinct keywords/phrases contained within pages in sitemaps submitted to Google that have been indexed. This will range from 0 to infinity. My site remains at infinity for Demonstrated Days Required. The higher this ratio, the more predatory Google is being with your site.

Standardized Metric Twelve: Impression Efficacy Zero Ratio: Google knows and tracks the efficacy of each word or phrase used in impressions. It would appear self-evident that Google would favor the words and phrases where the impression efficacy is maximized in deciding what words and phrases to use. However, with my site, over the past 18 months, it has been observed that Google has made tens or possibly even hundreds of thousands of impressions for terms such as *t-mobile* where the efficacy is

zero. Content-appropriate keyword impressions have been demonstrated to have impression efficacy of as high as 100%. An aggregate measure of the total number of impressions made by Google for terms where impression efficacy is zero versus the total impressions made expressed as a percentage is a measure of Google's trustworthiness. A high impression efficacy zero ratio suggests that Google is not trustworthy in its actions with respect to it's treatment of that site.

Standardized Metric Thirteen: Excluded High Impression Efficacy Ratio: Google knows and tracks the efficacy of each word or phrase used in impressions. It would appear self-evident that Google would favor the words and phrases where the impression efficacy is **maximized** in deciding what words and phrases to use. It becomes immediately apparent that within the entire population of distinct keywords/phrases contained within pages, some key words or phrases have high impression efficacy. This ratio therefore measures the number of pages containing keywords and content having high impression efficacy that were excluded by Google in impressions made during the prior week versus those pages it included having that same high impression efficacy keyword or phrase. This will range from 0 to infinity. My site remains at infinity. Two great examples would be course map or course layout. Combining that key word with 30,000 course names within our metadata would result in FAR more click-laden results than the thousands of impressions made for t-mobile this past week, all of which produced a total of zero clicks. WHO actually thinks Google didn't know this would be the result??

I would welcome your feedback or thoughts. I would LOVE to hear what these metrics are calculated at for your site.

A proposed New Year's resolution for us all: ZERO tolerance and ZERO support for known CHEATERS in sport or in life. And to the narcissistic corporate executives who commit these predatory and illegal acts and **direct** others to do the same for financial gain while you are **knowingly** harming others: you have NO EXCUSE. Make your New Year's resolution to change your evil ways and **make amends** to those you have harmed. To the PGA of America, and PGA Tour as well as the Royal and Ancient Golf Association, please join me in my ZERO TOLERANCE FOR CHEATING and NOT A SINGLE SHRED OF PROFIT TO CORPORATE CHEATERS pledges.

You can HELP by clicking here: https://www.gofundme.com/f/golfraxxcom?utm_source=customer&utm_medium=copy_link&utm_campaign=m_pd+share-sheet

Frank DeBenedetti
GolfTraxx.com