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

Because the foregoing proposed rule change does not significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest, does not impose any significant burden on competition, and, by its terms, does not 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 and Rule 19b-4(f)(6) thereunder.11

The Exchange has requested that the Commission waive the 30-day operative delay. The Commission believes that waiver of the operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest because such waiver will allow FINRA to more effectively carry out its enforcement activities on behalf of the Exchange. Therefore, the Commission designates the proposal operative upon filing.12

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 email to rule-comments@sec.gov. Please include File Number SR–NYSEAMEX–2011–93 on the subject line.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.13

Kevin M. O’Neill,
Deputy Secretary.
[FR Doc. 2011–32816 Filed 12–21–11; 8:45 am]
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I. Introduction

On November 4, 2011, ICE Clear Credit LLC (“ICC”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) the proposed rule change SR–ICC–2011–03 pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”)1 and Rule 19b–4 thereunder.2 The proposed rule change was published for comment in the Federal Register on November 10, 2011.3 The Commission received three comment letters regarding the proposal.4 For the reasons discussed below, the Commission is granting approval of the proposed rule change.

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

This rule permits ICC to make certain modifications to its Risk Management Framework for clearing credit default swap (“CDS”) contracts. These modifications are collectively referred to as the “Portfolio Decomposition Model.” A fundamental aspect of ICC’s Portfolio Decomposition Model is the recognition that CDS contracts cleared by ICC referencing broad-based securities indices are essentially compositions of specific single-name CDS contracts. Under the Portfolio Decomposition Model, ICC would, among other things, decompose CDS contracts referencing broad-based

3 Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34–65699 (November 7, 2011), 76 FR 70206 (November 10, 2011). In its filing with the Commission, ICC included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change. The text of these statements is incorporated into the discussion of the proposed rule change in Section II below.

11 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6). In addition, Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(ii) requires the Exchange to give the Commission written notice of the Exchange’s intent to file the proposed rule change, along with a brief description and text of the proposed rule change, at least five business days prior to the date of filing of the proposed rule change, or such shorter time as designated by the Commission. The Exchange has satisfied this requirement.
12 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. 78c(f).
The Commission received three comment letters on the proposed rule change from two commenters, both of which were supportive of the changes. Specifically, one commenter noted that by permitting portfolio margining to occur with respect to clearing participants’ proprietary accounts, ICC’s proposed Portfolio Decomposition Model would optimize more efficient risk management through netting, thereby promoting greater stability for central clearing. This commenter noted that, because of the high degree of correlation between single-name CDS contracts and index CDS contracts, market participants often maintain hedged portfolios of these products, thereby increasingly the impact that these changes are likely to have throughout the market. The second commenter, which represented a group of eight large financial firms, expressed a similar view with respect to the ability of portfolio margining to bring about a more stable central clearing regime and concluded that the proposed rule change represented “an initial positive step for the industry.”

IV. Discussion

Section 19(b)(2)(B) of the Act directs the Commission to approve a proposed rule change of a self-regulatory organization if it finds that such proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to such organization. For example, Section 17A(b)(3)(F) of the Act requires, among other things, that the rules of a clearing agency be designed to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a national system for the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions and to assure the safeguarding of securities and funds in the custody or control of the clearing agency or for which it is responsible.

If approved, the proposed rule change would allow ICC to provide portfolio margining offsets to its participants to the extent that the participants maintain proprietary portfolios that hedge index CDS products against single-name CDS products. ICC believes that these changes promote greater capital efficiency and further contribute to the development of a national system for the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of CDS contracts. The Commission carefully reviewed the proposed changes to ICC’s Risk Management Framework to ensure that those changes continue to allow ICC to adequately manage the risks associated with the clearing of both index and single-name CDS contracts. In particular, the Commission notes that the Portfolio Decomposition Model will introduce new requirements to provide additional margin to address liquidity and jump-to-default risks in connection with the clearing of index CDS products. After considering these changes, including each of the representations made by ICC in the filing, the Commission believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 17A(b)(3)(F) of the Act, including ICC’s obligation to ensure that its rules be designed to assure the safeguarding of securities and funds in the custody or control of the clearing agency or for which it is responsible.

V. Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, the Commission finds that the proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Act and in particular with the requirements of Section 17A of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder.

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act, that the
proposed rule change (File No. SR–ICC–2011–03) be, and hereby is, approved.13

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.14

Kevin M. O’Neill,
Deputy Secretary.
[FR Doc. 2011–32781 Filed 12–21–11; 8:45 am]
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Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934,1 notice is hereby given that on December 12, 2011, The Options Clearing Corporation ("OCC") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("the Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which items have been prepared primarily by OCC. OCC filed the proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act2 and Rule 19b–4(f)(4) thereunder3 so that the proposal was effective upon filing with the Commission. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

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

The proposed rule change would make clarifying amendments to provisions of OCC’s By-Laws relating to the timing of OCC’s acceptance or “novation” of exchange transactions in order to provide clearing members with certainty as to when their credit exposure to the original counterparty to a trade is terminated and OCC becomes obligated with respect to such trades.4

II. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of 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 such statements.

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

Recently, certain OCC clearing members have expressed uncertainty as to the time when an exchange transaction is accepted for clearing and the “novation” of such transaction occurs under OCC’s By-Laws and Rules. The purpose of this proposed rule change is to make clarifying amendments to provisions of OCC’s By-Laws relating to the timing of OCC’s acceptance or “novation” of exchange transactions in order to provide clearing members with certainty as to when their credit exposure to the original counterparty to a trade is terminated and OCC becomes obligated with respect to such trades.

Background

Article VI, Section 5 of OCC’s By-Laws generally establishes that exchange transactions (i.e., matched trades in an option, future, or other cleared contract) are deemed to be accepted by OCC for clearing at the commencement time of such transactions, or in the case of a future, when a matched trade has been properly reported to OCC. The definition of “commencement time” in Article I of OCC’s By-Laws contains substantive provisions establishing specific times when exchange transactions are deemed accepted for clearing for the majority of exchange transactions (i.e., commencement time is when daily position reports are made available to clearing members) as well as exceptions establishing different commencement times for cross-rate currency options, FX Index Options and certain non-competitively executed transactions in cleared futures. However, neither Section 5 of Article VI nor the definition of “commencement time” expressly state that OCC’s “novation” of trades occurs at the term “novation” is used only once in OCC’s By-Laws—in an interpretation following Section 6 of Article IV (Issuance of Cleared Contracts).

Confusion may also arise from the fact that Article VI, Section 5 of the By-Laws states that futures contracts are accepted for clearing when they are properly reported to OCC, rather than at the commencement time of such transactions. This provision appears to give futures contracts more favorable treatment than options, although there is no such result as a practical matter. Section 8 of Article VI provides that, except with respect to trades in certain narrow categories of options, OCC generally has no right to reject any exchange options transaction due to the failure of the purchasing clearing member to pay any amount due to OCC at or before the settlement time.5

Accordingly, exchange transactions in most option products will inevitably be accepted for clearing and novated under the rules at the commencement time of such transactions simply due to the passage of time. Prior to the 1987 crash, OCC reserved the right to reject trades in options due to non-payment of premiums. However, OCC subsequently gave up that right (with limited exceptions) in order to create greater certainty for clearing members.6 Therefore, the right to reject an exchange transaction for non-payment is now the exception rather than the rule. When OCC began clearing futures, it was deemed appropriate to state in the By-Laws that futures contracts would be accepted when properly reported because futures do not require premium payments.7

Proposed By-Law Changes

OCC proposes to amend the definition of “commencement time” in Article I of the By-Laws to (i) remove the substantive provisions establishing the specific times when exchange transactions in various products are deemed accepted for clearing (as such provisions should be placed in the

---

1 In approving the proposed rule change, the Commission considered the proposal’s impact on efficiency, competition and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).
5 The proposed rule change neither alters the rights of members nor the timing of OCC’s novation.
7 Article XII, Section 7 of the By-Laws makes an exception for non-competitively executed futures trades. Because such trades may be executed away from the market price, OCC does not accept them until the initial variation payment is made.

---