

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-78565; File No. SR-BOX-2016-40]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; BOX Options Exchange LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change To Amend Its Fee Schedule To Adopt a New Fee in Section V (Technology Fees) of the BOX Fee Schedule

August 12, 2016.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Act”),¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,² notice is hereby given that on August 3, 2016, BOX Options Exchange LLC (the “Exchange”) 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 by the Exchange. The Exchange filed the proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act,³ and Rule 19b-4(f)(2) thereunder,⁴ which renders the proposal 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 the Terms of the Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange is filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) a proposed rule change to amend the Fee Schedule to adopt a new fee in Section V (Technology Fees) of the BOX Fee Schedule on the BOX Market LLC (“BOX”) options facility. The text of the proposed rule change is available from the principal office of the Exchange, at the Commission’s Public Reference Room and also on the Exchange’s Internet Web site at <http://boxexchange.com>.

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 Exchange 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

The Exchange proposes to amend Section V (Technology Fees) in the Fee Schedule. Specifically, the Exchange proposes to establish Section V.B. (High Speed Vendor Feed (“HSVF”) in the BOX Fee Schedule and adopt a fee of \$750.00 per month for all market participants for receiving the HSVF. This fee will be payable by any market participant that receives the HSVF through a direct connection to BOX and will be assessed once per market participant.

In February 2013, the Exchange made its proprietary direct market data product, the HSVF, available to all market participants at no cost.⁵ The BOX HSVF is a proprietary product that provides: (i) Trades and trade cancellation information; (ii) best-ranked price level to buy and the best-ranked price level to sell; (iii) instrument summaries (including information such as high, low, and last trade price and traded volume); (iv) the five best limit prices for each option instrument; (v) request for Quote messages;⁶ (vi) PIP Order, Improvement Order and Block Trade Order (Facilitation and Solicitation) information;⁷ (vii) orders exposed at NBBO;⁸ (viii) instrument dictionary (*e.g.*, strike price, expiration date, underlying symbol, price threshold, and minimum trading increment for instruments traded on BOX); (ix) options class and instrument status change notices (*e.g.*, whether an instrument or class is in pre-opening, continuous trading, closed, halted, or prohibited from trading); and (x) options class opening time.

The Exchange notes that data connection fees are charged by other options markets such as International Securities Exchange (“ISE”), Bats BZX Exchange (“BATS”), Chicago Board Options Exchange (“CBOE”), The NASDAQ Options Market (“NOM”), Miami International Securities Exchange LLC (“MIAX”), NASDAQ BX,

⁵ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 68833 (February 5, 2013), 78 FR 9758 (February 11, 2013) (SR-BOX-2013-04).

⁶ See Exchange Rules 100(a)(57), 7070(h) and 8050.

⁷ As set forth in Exchange Rules 7150 and 7270, respectively.

⁸ As set forth in Exchange Rules 7130(b)(3) and 8040(d)(6), respectively.

Inc. (“BX”), and NASDAQ PHLX LLC (“Phlx”).⁹

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that the proposal is consistent with the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act,¹⁰ in general, and Section 6(b)(4) and (5) of the Act,¹¹ in particular, in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees, and other charges among BOX Participants and other persons using the Exchange’s facilities and is not designed to permit unfair discrimination among them.

In adopting Regulation NMS, the Commission granted self-regulatory organizations and broker-dealers increased authority and flexibility to offer new and unique market data to the public.

The Commission concluded that Regulation NMS—by deregulating the market in proprietary data—would itself further the Act’s goals of facilitating efficiency and competition:

[E]fficiency is promoted when broker-dealers who do not need the data beyond the prices, sizes, market center identifications of the NBBO and consolidated last sale information are not required to receive (and pay for) such data. The Commission also believes that efficiency is promoted when broker-dealers may choose to receive (and pay for) additional market data based on their own internal analysis of the need for such data.¹²

By removing “unnecessary regulatory restrictions” on the ability of exchanges to sell their own data, Regulation NMS advanced the goals of the Act and the principles reflected in its legislative history. If the free market should determine whether proprietary data is sold to broker-dealers at all, it follows that the price at which such data is sold should be set by the market as well. The HSVF is precisely the sort of market data product that the Commission envisioned when it adopted Regulation NMS.

The decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of

⁹ See the ISE Fee Schedule, available at: https://www.ise.com/assets/documents/OptionsExchange/legal/fee/ISE_fee_schedule.pdf, the BATS Fee Schedule, available at: https://batstrading.com/support/fee_schedule/bzx/, the CBOE Fee Schedule, available at https://www.cboe.org/framed/pdf/framed.aspx?content=/publish/mdxfees/mdxfee_scheduleforchoedatafeeds.pdf§ion=SEC_MDX_CSM&title=CBOE_MDX_Fees_Schedule; the NOM Fee Schedule, available at <http://www.nasdaqtrader.com/Micro.aspx?id=optionsPricing>, the MIAX Fee Schedule, available at: <https://www.miaxoptions.com/content/fees> and the Phlx Fee Schedule, available at: <http://www.nasdaqtrader.com/Micro.aspx?id=phlxpricing>.

¹⁰ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

¹¹ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4) and (5).

¹² See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808 (June 9, 2005), 70 FR 37496 (June 29, 2005).

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

³ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

⁴ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(2).

Columbia Circuit in *NetCoalition v. SEC*, 615 F.3d 525 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (“*NetCoalition I*”), upheld the Commission’s reliance upon competitive markets to set reasonable and equitably allocated fees for market data. “In fact, the legislative history indicates that the Congress intended that the market system ‘evolve through the interplay of competitive forces as unnecessary regulatory restrictions are removed’ and that the SEC wield its regulatory power ‘in those situations where competition may not be sufficient,’ such as in the creation of a ‘consolidated transactional reporting system.’ *NetCoalition I*, at 535 (quoting H.R. Rep. No. 94–229, at 92 (1975), as reprinted in 1975 U.S.C.C.A.N. 321, 323). The court agreed with the Commission’s conclusion that “Congress intended that ‘competitive forces should dictate the services and practices that constitute the U.S. national market system for trading equity securities.’”¹³

The Court in *NetCoalition I*, while upholding the Commission’s conclusion that competitive forces may be relied upon to establish the fairness of prices, nevertheless concluded that the record in that case did not adequately support the Commission’s conclusions as to the competitive nature of the market for NYSE Arca’s data product at issue in that case. As explained below in BOX’s Statement on Burden on Competition, however, BOX believes that there is substantial evidence of competition in the marketplace for data that was not in the record in the *NetCoalition I* case, and that the Commission is entitled to rely upon such evidence in concluding fees are the product of competition, and therefore in accordance with the relevant statutory standards.¹⁴ Accordingly, any findings of the court with respect to that product may not be relevant to the product at issue in this filing.

BOX believes that the allocation of the proposed fee is fair and equitable in accordance with Section 6(b)(4) of the Act, and not unreasonably discriminatory in accordance with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act. As described above, the proposed fee is based on pricing conventions and distinctions that exist in BOX’s current fee schedule. These distinctions are each based on principles of fairness and equity that

have helped for many years to maintain fair, equitable, and not unreasonably discriminatory fees, and that apply with equal or greater force to the current proposal.

As described in greater detail below, if BOX has calculated improperly and the market deems the proposed fees to be unfair, inequitable, or unreasonably discriminatory, firms can discontinue the use of their data because the proposed product is entirely optional to all parties. Firms are not required to purchase data and BOX is not required to make data available or to offer specific pricing alternatives for potential purchases. BOX can discontinue offering a pricing alternative (as it has in the past) and firms can discontinue their use at any time and for any reason (as they often do), including due to their assessment of the reasonableness of fees charged. BOX continues to establish and revise pricing policies aimed at increasing fairness and equitable allocation of fees among subscribers.

The Exchange’s proprietary HSVF is currently available to all market participants at no cost; however, the Exchange now proposes to adopt a new fee of \$750.00 per month for all market participants who receive the HSVF. The Exchange believes that adopting such a fee is reasonable and appropriate as it is within the range that is charged by other options exchanges.¹⁵

In addition, the Exchange believes that its fees are equitable and not unfairly discriminatory because all market participants are charged the same fee for access to the HSVF. Further, the Exchange notes that all market participants who wish to receive the feed may, as the feed is available to anyone willing to pay the proposed \$750 monthly fee.

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

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will result in any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The proposed change to the Fee Schedule will simply allow the Exchange to charge all market participants equally for the costs incurred by connecting to the BOX Network. The HSVF is similar to proprietary data products currently offered by other exchanges, and these other exchanges charge comparable

monthly fees.¹⁶ While connection to the HSVF is required to receive the broadcasts for and participate in the Exchange’s auction mechanisms,¹⁷ the Exchange does not believe the proposed monthly fee will impede competition within these auctions. As discussed above, the Exchange believes that fees for connectivity are constrained by the robust competition for order flow among exchanges and non-exchange markets. Further, excessive fees for connectivity would serve to impair ability to compete for order flow rather than burdening competition. As such, the Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

Notwithstanding its determination that the Commission may rely upon competition to establish fair and equitably allocated fees for market data, the *NetCoalition* court found that the Commission had not, in that case, compiled a record that adequately supported its conclusion that the market for the data at issue in the case was competitive. BOX believes that a record may readily be established to demonstrate the competitive nature of the market in question.

There is intense competition between trading platforms that provide transaction execution and routing services and proprietary data products. Transaction execution and proprietary data products are complementary in that market data is both an input and a byproduct of the execution service. In fact, market data and trade execution are a paradigmatic example of joint products with joint costs. Data products are valuable to many end subscribers only insofar as they provide information that end Subscribers expect will assist them or their customers in making trading decisions.

The costs of producing market data include not only the costs of the data distribution infrastructure, but also the costs of designing, maintaining, and operating the exchange’s transaction execution platform and the cost of regulating the exchange to ensure its fair operation and maintain investor confidence. The total return that a trading platform earns reflects the revenues it receives from both products and the joint costs it incurs. Moreover, an exchange’s Participant’s view the

¹³ *NetCoalition I*, at 535.

¹⁴ It should also be noted that Section 916 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 (“Dodd-Frank Act”) has amended paragraph (A) of Section 19(b)(3) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3), to make it clear that all exchange fees, including fees for market data, may be filed by exchanges.

¹⁵ See *supra*, note 9. CBOE’s data distributor MDX charges a \$500 port fee per month; NOM charges a port fee between \$500 and \$750 a month depending on the port. The Exchange notes the CBOE and NOM charge these fees per port, while the Exchange proposes to assess the fee once per market participant.

¹⁶ See *supra* note 9.

¹⁷ BOX’s auction mechanisms include the Price Improvement Period (“PIP”), Complex Order Price Improvement Period (“COPIP”), Facilitation Auction and Solicitation Auction.

costs of transaction executions and of data as a unified cost of doing business with the exchange. A broker-dealer ("BD") will direct orders to a particular exchange only if the expected revenues from executing trades on the exchange exceed net transaction execution costs and the cost of data that the BD chooses to buy to support its trading decisions (or those of its customers). The choice of data products is, in turn, a product of the value of the products in making profitable trading decisions. If the cost of the product exceeds its expected value, the BD will choose not to buy it. Moreover, as a BD chooses to direct fewer orders to a particular exchange, the value of the product to that BD decreases, for two reasons. First, the product will contain less information, because executions of the BD's orders will not be reflected in it. Second, and perhaps more important, the product will be less valuable to that BD because it does not provide information about the venue to which it is directing its orders. Data from the competing venue to which the BD is directing orders will become correspondingly more valuable.

Thus, an increase in the fees charged for either transactions or data has the potential to impair revenues from both products. "No one disputes that competition for order flow is 'fierce'." NetCoalition at 24. However, the existence of fierce competition for order flow implies a high degree of price sensitivity on the part of BDs with order flow, since they may readily reduce costs by directing orders toward the lowest-cost trading venues. A BD that shifted its order flow from one platform to another in response to order execution price differentials would both reduce the value of that platform's market data and reduce its own need to consume data from the disfavored platform. Similarly, if a platform increases its market data fees, the change will affect the overall cost of doing business with the platform, and affected BDs will assess whether they can lower their trading costs by directing orders elsewhere and thereby lessening the need for the more expensive data.

Analyzing the cost of market data distribution in isolation from the cost of all of the inputs supporting the creation of market data will inevitably underestimate the cost of the data. Thus, because it is impossible to create data without a fast, technologically robust, and well-regulated execution system, system costs and regulatory costs affect the price of market data. It would be equally misleading, however, to attribute all of the exchange's costs to the market data portion of an exchange's

joint product. Rather, all of the exchange's costs are incurred for the unified purposes of attracting order flow, executing and/or routing orders, and generating and selling data about market activity. The total return that an exchange earns reflects the revenues it receives from the joint products and the total costs of the joint products.

Competition among trading platforms can be expected to constrain the aggregate return each platform earns from the sale of its joint products, but different platforms may choose from a range of possible, and equally reasonable, pricing strategies as the means of recovering total costs. Some exchanges pay rebates to attract orders, charge relatively low prices for market information and charge relatively high prices for accessing posted liquidity. Other platforms may choose a strategy of paying lower liquidity rebates to attract orders, setting relatively low prices for accessing posted liquidity, and setting relatively high prices for market information. Still others may provide most data free of charge and rely exclusively on transaction fees to recover their costs. Finally, some platforms may incentivize use by providing opportunities for equity ownership, which may allow them to charge lower direct fees for executions and data.

In this environment, there is no economic basis for regulating maximum prices for one of the joint products in an industry in which suppliers face competitive constraints with regard to the joint offering. Such regulation is unnecessary because an "excessive" price for one of the joint products will ultimately have to be reflected in lower prices for other products sold by the firm, or otherwise the firm will experience a loss in the volume of its sales that will be adverse to its overall profitability. In other words, an increase in the price of data will ultimately have to be accompanied by a decrease in the cost of executions, or the volume of both data and executions will fall.

The level of competition and contestability in the market is evident in the numerous alternative venues that compete for order flow, including eleven SRO markets, as well as internalizing BDs and various forms of alternative trading systems ("ATs"), including dark pools and electronic communication networks ("ECNs"). Each SRO market competes to produce transaction reports via trade executions, and two FINRA-regulated TRFs compete to attract internalized transaction reports. It is common for BDs to further and exploit this competition by sending their order flow and transaction reports

to multiple markets, rather than providing them all to a single market. Competitive markets for order flow, executions, and transaction reports provide pricing discipline for the inputs of proprietary data products.

The large number of SROs, TRFs, BDs, and ATs that currently produce proprietary data or are currently capable of producing it provides further pricing discipline for proprietary data products. Each SRO, TRF, AT, and BD is currently permitted to produce proprietary data products, and many currently do or have announced plans to do so, including BOX, NYSE, NYSE MKT, NYSE Arca, and BATS/Direct Edge.

Any AT or BD can combine with any other AT, BD, or multiple ATs or BDs to produce joint proprietary data products. Additionally, order routers and market data vendors can facilitate single or multiple BDs' production of proprietary data products. The potential sources of proprietary products are virtually limitless. Notably, the potential sources of data include the BDs that submit trade reports to TRFs and that have the ability to consolidate and distribute their data without the involvement of FINRA or an exchange-operated TRF.

The fact that proprietary data from ATs, BDs, and vendors can by-pass SROs is significant in two respects. First, non-SROs can compete directly with SROs for the production and sale of proprietary data products, as BATS and NYSE Arca did before registering as exchanges by publishing proprietary book data on the internet. Second, because a single order or transaction report can appear in a core data product, a SRO proprietary product, and/or a non-SRO proprietary product, the data available in proprietary products is exponentially greater than the actual number of orders and transaction reports that exist in the marketplace.

In addition to the competition and price discipline described above, the market for proprietary data products is also highly contestable because market entry is rapid, inexpensive, and profitable. The history of electronic trading is replete with examples of entrants that swiftly grew into some of the largest electronic trading platforms and proprietary data producers: Archipelago, Bloomberg Tradebook, Island, RediBook, Attain, TracECN, BATS Trading and BATS/Direct Edge. A proliferation of dark pools and other ATs operate profitably with fragmentary shares of consolidated market volume.

Regulation NMS, by deregulating the market for proprietary data, has

increased the contestability of that market. While BDs have previously published their proprietary data individually, Regulation NMS encourages market data vendors and BDs to produce proprietary products cooperatively in a manner never before possible. Multiple market data vendors already have the capability to aggregate data and disseminate it on a profitable scale, including Bloomberg and Thomson Reuters. In Europe, Cinnober aggregates and disseminates data from over 40 brokers and multilateral trading facilities.¹⁸

In this environment, a super-competitive increase in the fees charged for either transactions or data has the potential to impair revenues from both products. “No one disputes that competition for order flow is ‘fierce’.” NetCoalition I at 539. The existence of fierce competition for order flow implies a high degree of price sensitivity on the part of BDs with order flow, since they may readily reduce costs by directing orders toward the lowest-cost trading venues. A BD that shifted its order flow from one platform to another in response to order execution price differentials would both reduce the value of that platform’s market data and reduce its own need to consume data from the disfavored platform. If a platform increases its market data fees, the change will affect the overall cost of doing business with the platform, and affected BDs will assess whether they can lower their trading costs by directing orders elsewhere and thereby lessening the need for the more expensive data.

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

No written comments were either solicited or received.

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

The foregoing rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Exchange Act¹⁹ and Rule 19b-4(f)(2) thereunder,²⁰ because it establishes or changes a due, or fee.

At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend the rule change if it appears to the Commission that the

action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or would otherwise further the purposes of the Act. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission shall institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule should be approved or disapproved.

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-BOX-2016-40 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549-1090.
- All submissions should refer to File Number SR-BOX-2016-40. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission’s Internet Web site (<http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml>). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for Web site viewing and printing in the Commission’s Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549 on official business days between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Copies of such filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR-BOX-

2016-40, and should be submitted on or before September 8, 2016.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.²¹

Robert W. Errett,
Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016-19687 Filed 8-17-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-78566; File No. SR-ICC-2016-009]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; ICE Clear Credit LLC; Order Approving Proposed Rule Change To Revise the ICC Treasury Operations Policies and Procedures

August 12, 2016.

I. Introduction

On June 15, 2016, ICE Clear Credit LLC (“ICC”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”)¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,² a proposed rule change to revise the ICC Treasury Operations Policies and Procedures to provide for the use of a committed foreign exchange (“FX”) facility, to make changes to the investment guidelines as well as additional clean-up changes, and to provide additional clarification regarding the calculation of collateral haircuts (SR-ICC-2016-009). The proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on June 30, 2016.³ The Commission did not receive comments on the proposed rule change. For the reasons discussed below, the Commission is approving the proposed rule change.

II. Description of the Proposed Rule Change

ICC will revise its Treasury Operations Policies and Procedures to provide for the use of a committed FX facility. ICC has established a committed FX facility which provides for same day settled spot FX transactions. ICC represents that the facility allows ICC to use available United States Dollars (“USD”) to convert into Euro to meet a Euro liquidity need, for example in the

²¹ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

³ Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34-78205 (June 30, 2016), 81 FR 44357 (July 7, 2016) (SR-ICC-2016-009).

¹⁸ See <http://www.cinnober.com/boat-trade-reporting>.

¹⁹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

²⁰ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(2).