

The search text ads syndication remedy differs in one important way from the search syndication remedy. The court previously contemplated the possibility of new entrants into the ad platform market. *See* Rem. Op. at 183 (“It is also possible that an independent ad platform could emerge to compete with Google and Microsoft, which are the only current suppliers of general search text ads in the United States.”). Becoming an independent ad platform in the search text ads market takes a near-insurmountable effort in part due to Google’s monopoly. *See* Rem. Tr. at 1794:12–1797:3 (Epstein) (describing “cold start” problems). To be competitive, a potential new entrant would need to be able to offer publishers syndication of high-quality ads. *See id.* at 1798:16–1799:16 (Epstein); *see also* Pls.’ Br. at 20. So, while sub-syndication of search results would be inappropriate for Qualified Competitors looking to compete in search for the reasons explained above, *see supra* Section VI.B, sub-syndication of search text ads would be a useful bridge for a Qualified Competitor looking to compete with Google’s ad platform. Sub-syndication will thus be permitted for search text ads only if “such Qualified Competitor has been certified as a Competitor to a Google ads platform (e.g., Google Ads).” FJ § VI.B.9.