is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement on Comments from Members, Participants or Others

The Exchange has not solicited, and does not intend to solicit, comments on this proposed rule change. The Exchange has not received any unsolicited written comments from members or other interested parties.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Because the foregoing proposed rule change does not: (i) Significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (ii) impose any significant burden on competition; and (iii) become operative for 30 days from the date on which it was filed, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act &\(^{14}\) and Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) thereunder. The Exchange has asked the Commission to waive the 30-day operative delay so that the proposed rule change becomes effective immediately upon filing. The Commission believes that waiving the 30-day operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest because such waiver will allow the clearly erroneous rules to continue to operate as they did prior to the effectiveness of the Pause Pilot expansion to Phase III Securities so that similarly situated member firms are provided the same opportunity of a clearly erroneous review. Accordingly, the Commission waives the 30-day operative delay requirement and designates the proposed rule change as effective upon filing with the Commission. &\(^{15}\)

At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission’s Internet comment form (http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml);
- Send an e-mail to rule-comments@sec.gov. Please include File Number SR–ISE–2011–53 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Elizabeth M. Murphy, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–ISE–2011–53 and should be submitted on or before September 7, 2011.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.\(^{17}\)

Elizabeth M. Murphy, Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011–20999 Filed 8–16–11; 8:45 am]
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Self-Regulatory Organizations; EDGA Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend EDGA Rule 11.13

August 11, 2011.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Act”), &\(^{2}\) and Rule 19b–4 thereunder, notice is hereby given that on August 8, 2011, the EDGA Exchange, Inc. (the “Exchange” or the “EDGA”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II, below, which items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 11.13, governing clearly erroneous executions, so that the rule will continue to operate in the same manner after changes to the single stock trading pause process are effective. The text of the proposed rule change is attached as Exhibit 5 and is available on the Exchange’s Web site at http://www.directedge.com, at the Exchange’s principal office, and at the Public Reference Room of the Commission.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of, and basis for, the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The
self-regulatory organization has prepared summaries, set forth in
Sections A, B and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Purpose of, and
Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

Background

The Exchanges 3 and FINRA, in consultation with the Commission, have made changes to their respective rules in a concerted effort to strengthen the markets after the severe market disruption that occurred on May 6, 2010. One such effort by the Exchanges and FINRA was to adopt a uniform trading pause process during periods of extraordinary market volatility as a pilot in S&P 500® Index stocks (“Pause Pilot”), approved by the Commission on June 10, 2010.4 On September 10, 2010, the Commission approved the Exchanges’ and FINRA’s proposals to add the securities included in the Russell 1000 Index and specified ETPs to the Pause Pilot.5 On September 10, 2010, the Commission also approved changes proposed by the Exchanges to amend certain of their respective rules to set forth clearer standards and curtail their discretion with respect to breaking erroneous trades.6 The changes, among other things, provided uniform

treatment of clearly erroneous execution reviews in the event of transactions that result in the issuance of an individual stock trading pause pursuant to the Pause Pilot on the listing market and those that occur up to the time the trading pause message is received by the other markets from the single plan processor responsible for consolidation and dissemination of information for the security (“Latency Trades”).

As part of the changes to the clearly erroneous process under Rule 11.13, EDGA replaced existing Rule 11.13(c)(4) with a new rule to provide clarity in the clearly erroneous process when a Pause Pilot trading pause is triggered. Pursuant to Rule 11.13(c)(4), Latency Trades will be broken by the Exchange if they exceed the applicable percentage from the Reference Price, as noted in the table found under Rule 11.13(c)(1).7 The Reference Price, for purposes of Rule 11.13(c)(4), is the price that triggered a trading pause pursuant to the Pause Pilot (the “Trading Pause Trigger Price”). As such, Latency Trades that occur on EDGA would be broken by the Exchange pursuant to Rule 11.13(c)(4) if the transaction occurred at either three, five or ten percent above the Trading Pause Trigger Price.8 On June 23, 2011, the Commission approved a joint proposal to expand the respective Pause Pilot rules of the Exchanges and FINRA to include all remaining National Market System (“NMS”) stocks (“Phase III Securities”). The new pilot rules, which were implemented on August 8, 2011, did not immediately extend the application of the Pause Pilot, but also apply larger percentage moves that trigger a pause to the Phase III Securities. Specifically, the rules of the listing markets were amended so that a pause in a Phase III Security with a closing price on the previous trading day of $1 or more is triggered by a 30 percent price move within a five minute period. A pause in a Phase III Security with closing price on the previous trading day of less than $1 is triggered by a 50 percent price move within a five minute period. If no prior day closing price is available, the last sale reported to the Consolidated Tape on the previous trading day is used.

The Issue

The recently-approved changes to the Pause Pilot will have the unintended effect of removing the Phase III Securities from the normal clearly erroneous process and potentially result in unfair outcomes in the face of severe volatility in such securities. Phase III Securities are currently subject to the clearly erroneous process under Rule 11.13(c)(1)–(3), which apply to all securities except the current Pause Pilot securities subject to a pause. For purposes of transactions in securities not involving Pause Pilot securities, or transactions involving Pause Pilot securities that occur when there is not a pause pursuant to the Pause Pilot, the Reference Price is the consolidated last sale price immediately prior to the execution(s) under review, subject to certain exceptions.9

As noted above, the Trading Pause Trigger Price is used as the Reference Price when a Pause Pilot pause is in effect. As a consequence, under the current rules a Latency Trade is subject to the clearly erroneous thresholds based on the Trading Pause Trigger Price, which represents a ten percent or greater move in the transacted price of the security in a five-minute period.

Under the new Pause Pilot rules, a Latency Trade in a Phase III Security occurs only after either a 30 or 50 percent (or greater) move in the transacted price of the security in a five-minute period. As a result, a member firm that trades in a Phase III Security that triggers a clearly erroneous threshold of three, five or ten percent from the Reference Price, yet falls below the Pause Pilot trigger of either 30 or 50 percent, would be able to avoid itself of a clearly erroneous review. A similarly situated member firm that trades in the same security as a Latency Trade at a price equal to or greater than the Phase III Security thresholds, yet less than the clearly erroneous thresholds under Rule 11.13(c)(1), would not be able to avoid itself of the clearly erroneous process. Another member firm that transacts in the same security as a Latency Trade that exceeds three, five or ten percent from the Trading Pause Trigger Price would automatically receive clearly erroneous relief. EDGA believes that this would be an inequitable result and an arbitrary application of the clearly erroneous process. Specifically, EDGA believes that, since the 30 and 50

---


6 Pursuant to Rule 11.13(c)(1), a security with a Reference Price of greater than zero and up to and including $25 is subject to a 10% threshold; a security with a Reference Price of greater than $25 and up to and including $50 is subject to a 5% threshold; and a security with a Reference Price of greater than $50 is subject to a 3% threshold.

7 Rule 11.13(c)(4).


9 Id.
percent triggers of the Pause Pilot are substantially greater than the 10 percent threshold of the original Pause Pilot, the Phase III Securities should remain under the current clearly erroneous process of Rule 11.13(c)(1)–(3).

Applying the clearly erroneous process under Rule 11.13(c)(1)–(3) to the Phase III Securities would allow EDGA to review all transactions that exceed the normal clearly erroneous thresholds and Reference Price, and, importantly, avoid arbitrary selection of “winners” and “losers” in the face of severe volatile moves in a security of 30 or 50 percent over a five minute period. For example, a member firm that trades in a Phase III Security that triggers a clearly erroneous threshold of three, five or ten percent, yet falls below the Pause Pilot trigger threshold trading at 29 percent from the prior day’s closing price, would be potentially entitled to a clearly erroneous break pursuant to Rule 11.13(c)(1). Should trading in that same stock trigger a trading pause at a price of 30 or 50 percent greater than the prior day’s close, the member firm would not be entitled to a clearly erroneous trade break unless that trade exceeded three, five or ten percent beyond the price that triggered the pause. This scenario causes an inequity among a group of member firms that have transactions in the Phase III Securities falling between the three, five and ten percent thresholds from the Reference Price under the normal Rule 11.13(c)(1) clearly erroneous process and the Pause Pilot clearly erroneous triggers of three, five or ten percent away from the Trading Pause Trigger Price. Such member firms would not be provided relief under the clearly erroneous rules merely due to the imposition of a Pause Pilot halt, notwithstanding that other member firms with transactions that occur at the same rolling five minute percentage difference would be provided such relief. EDGA believes a better outcome is to afford all members transacting in Phase III Securities the opportunity of having such trades reviewed.

Summary

The expansion of the Pause Pilot to the Phase III Securities will have the unintended consequence of setting the point at which a clearly erroneous transaction occurs once a Pause Pilot pause is initiated far beyond the triggers applied prior to the expansion, which will, in turn, prevent certain market participants from availing themselves of the clearly erroneous rules, notwithstanding that other similarly situated participants are able to do so. EDGA believes that this would be an arbitrary application of the clearly erroneous process in a manner that is unfair and not consistent with the spirit and purpose of the rule. Accordingly, EDGA is proposing to amend Rule 11.13(c)(1)–(4) to specify that Rule 11.13(c)(4) applies only to the current securities of Pause Pilot, and not to Phase III Securities.

2. Statutory Basis

The statutory basis for the proposed rule change is Section 6(b)(5) of the Act,12 which requires the rules of an exchange to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest. The proposed rule change also is designed to support the principles of Section 11A(a)(1)13 of the Act in that it seeks to assure fair competition among brokers and dealers and among exchange markets. EDGA believes that the proposed rule meets these requirements in that it promotes transparency and uniformity across markets concerning decisions to break erroneous trades, yet also ensures fair application of the process so that similarly situated member firms are provided the same opportunity of a clearly erroneous review. EDGA notes that the changes proposed herein will in no way interfere with the operation of the Pause Pilot process, as amended.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement on Burden on Competition

The proposed rule change does not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants or Others

The Exchange has not solicited, and does not intend to solicit, comments on this proposed rule change. The Exchange has not received any unsolicited written comments from members or other interested parties.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Because the foregoing proposed rule change does not: (i) Significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (ii) impose any significant burden on competition; and (iii) become operative for 30 days from the date on which it was filed, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act14 and Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) thereunder.15 The Exchange has asked the Commission to waive the 30-day operative delay so that the proposal may become operative immediately upon filing. The Commission believes that waiving the 30-day operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest because such waiver will allow the clearly erroneous rules to continue to operate as they did prior to the effectiveness of the Pause Pilot expansion to Phase III Securities so that similarly situated member firms are provided the same opportunity of a clearly erroneous review. Accordingly, the Commission waives the 30-day operative delay requirement and designates the proposed rule change as operative upon filing with the Commission.16 At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments
• Use the Commission’s Internet comment form (http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml); or
• Send an e-mail to rule- comments@sec.gov. Please include File Number SR–EDGA–2011–26 on the subject line.

16 For purposes only of waiving the 30-day operative delay, the Commission has considered the proposed rule’s impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. See 15 U.S.C. 78f(f).
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Self-Regulatory Organizations; The Options Clearing Corporation; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change To Revise Its By-Laws and Rules To Establish a Clearing Fund Amount Intended To Support Losses Under a Defined Set of Default Scenarios

August 12, 2011.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”)\(^1\) and Rule 19b–4 thereunder\(^2\) notice is hereby given that on August 3, 2011, The Options Clearing Corporation (“OCC”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared primarily by OCC. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The proposed rule change would change the method by which the size of OCC’s clearing fund is determined.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, OCC included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. OCC has prepared summaries, set forth in sections (A), (B), and (C) below, of the most significant aspects of these statements.\(^3\)

A. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

This proposed rule change would revise OCC’s By-Laws and Rules to establish the size of OCC’s clearing fund as the amount that is required within a confidence level selected by OCC to sustain possible loss under a defined set of scenarios as determined by OCC. The proposed rule change replaces a previously proposed rule change which was withdrawn by OCC.\(^4\) Currently the size of the clearing fund is calculated each month and is equal to a fixed percentage of the average total daily margin requirement for the preceding month provided that this calculation results in a clearing fund of $1 billion or more.\(^5\)

Under the proposed formula for determining the size of the clearing fund, the amount of the fund would be equal to the larger of the amount of the charge to the fund that would result from (i) A default by the single “clearing member group” whose default would be likely to result in the largest draw against the clearing fund or (ii) an event involving the near-simultaneous default of two randomly-selected “clearing member groups,” in each case as calculated by OCC with a specified confidence level. Initially, the confidence levels employed by OCC in calculating the charge likely to result from a default by OCC’s largest “clearing member group” and the default of two randomly-selected “clearing member groups” would be 99% and 99.9%, respectively.\(^6\)

However, OCC would have the discretion to employ different confidence levels in these calculations in the future provided that OCC would not employ confidence levels of less than 99% without filing a rule change with the Commission.\(^7\) The size of the clearing fund would continue to be recalculated monthly based on a monthly averaging of daily calculations for the previous month and subject to a

\(^3\) The Commission has modified the text of the summaries prepared by OCC.
\(^4\) Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34–62371 (June 24, 2010), 75 FR 37966 (June 30, 2010) (SR–OCC–2010–04). OCC withdrew its proposed rule change regarding clearing fund sizing in order to submit this proposed rule change which: Incorporates the amendments that were proposed to the previous proposed rule change; discusses the adaptation of the methodology underlying the formula change made to incorporate the effects of implementing the rule changes described in Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34–58158 (July 15, 2008), 73 FR 42646 (July 22, 2008) (SR–OCC–2008–20) ("Collateral in Margins Filing"); provides updated comparative data about the impact of the proposed clearing fund sizing formula; and makes additional changes to improve the overall readability of certain proposed rule text.

\(^5\) If the calculation does not result in a clearing fund of $1 billion or more, the percentage that results in a fund level of at least $1 billion is applied provided that in no event will the percentage exceed 7%.

\(^6\) “Clearing member group” will be defined in Article I (“Definitions”) of OCC’s By-Laws to mean “a Clearing Member and any Member Affiliates of such Clearing Member.”

\(^7\) Proposed Interpretation and Policy .02 to OCC Rule 1001.