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Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”), and Rule 19b-4 thereunder, notice is hereby given that on June 10, 2021, Nasdaq BX, Inc. (“BX” or “Exchange”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC” or “Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III, below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. 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 the Exchange’s transaction fees, at Equity 7, Section 118(e), as described further below.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange’s Website at https://listingcenter.nasdaq.com/rulebook/bx/rules, at the principal office of the Exchange, and at the Commission’s Public Reference Room.

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 operates on the “taker-maker” model, whereby it generally pays credits to members that take liquidity and charges fees to members that provide liquidity. Currently, the Exchange has a schedule, at Equity 7, Section 118(e), which consists of several different credits and fees for Retail Orders\(^3\) and Retail Price Improvement Orders\(^4\) under Rule 4780 (Retail Price Improvement Program).

---

\(^3\) Retail Orders shall mean an order type with a Non-Display Order Attribute submitted to the Exchange by a Retail Member Organization (as defined in Rule 4780). A Retail Order must be an agency Order, or riskless principal Order that satisfies the criteria of FINRA Rule 5320.03. The Retail Order must reflect trading interest of a natural person with no change made to the terms of the underlying order of the natural person with respect to price (except in the case of a market order that is changed to a marketable limit order) or side of market and that does not originate from a trading algorithm or any other computerized methodology. See Rule 4702(b)(6).

\(^4\) Retail Price Improving (“RPI”) Orders shall mean an Order Type with a Non-Display Order Attribute that is held on the Exchange Book in order to provide liquidity at a price at least $0.001 better than the NBBO through a special execution process described in Rule 4780. A Retail Price Improving Order may be entered in price increments of $0.001. RPI Orders collectively may be referred to as "RPI Interest." See Rule 4702(b)(5).
Currently, the Exchange charges a fee of $0.0025 per share executed for RPI Orders that provide liquidity. The Exchange proposes to adopt a new fee of $0.0018 per share executed for RPI Orders entered by a member that (i) quotes Retail Price Improvement Orders in at least 2,500 symbols on average per day and (ii) provides liquidity through Retail Price Improvement Orders equal to or exceeding an average daily volume of 2,500,000 shares. The Exchange will continue to charge a fee of $0.0025 per share executed for all other RPI Orders that provide liquidity. The Exchange hopes that the proposed lower fee will encourage member organizations to increase liquidity providing activity on RPI Orders on the Exchange. If the proposal is effective in achieving this purpose, then the quality of the Exchange’s market will improve, particularly with respect to RPI and retail orders to the benefit of all participants, especially those who submit RPI and Retail Orders.

2. **Statutory Basis**

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,\(^5\) in general, and furthers the objectives of Sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act,\(^6\) in particular, in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among members and issuers and other persons using any facility, and is not designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers, or dealers. The proposal is also consistent with Section 11A of the Act relating to the establishment of the national market system for securities.

The Proposal is Reasonable and is an Equitable Allocation of Charges

---


\(^6\) 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4) and (5).
The Exchange’s proposed change to its schedule of credits and charges is reasonable in several respects. As a threshold matter, the Exchange is subject to significant competitive forces in the market for equity securities transaction services that constrain its pricing determinations in that market. The fact that this market is competitive has long been recognized by the courts. In NetCoalition v. Securities and Exchange Commission, the D.C. Circuit stated as follows: “[n]o one disputes that competition for order flow is ‘fierce.’ … As the SEC explained, ‘[i]n the U.S. national market system, buyers and sellers of securities, and the broker-dealers that act as their order-routing agents, have a wide range of choices of where to route orders for execution’; [and] ‘no exchange can afford to take its market share percentages for granted’ because ‘no exchange possesses a monopoly, regulatory or otherwise, in the execution of order flow from broker dealers’…”

The Commission and the courts have repeatedly expressed their preference for competition over regulatory intervention in determining prices, products, and services in the securities markets. In Regulation NMS, while adopting a series of steps to improve the current market model, the Commission highlighted the importance of market forces in determining prices and SRO revenues and, also, recognized that current regulation of the market system “has been remarkably successful in promoting market competition in its broader forms that are most important to investors and listed companies.”

Numerous indicia demonstrate the competitive nature of this market. For  


example, clear substitutes to the Exchange exist in the market for equity security transaction services. The Exchange is only one of several equity venues to which market participants may direct their order flow, and it represents a small percentage of the overall market. It is also only one of several taker-maker exchanges. Competing equity exchanges offer similar tiered pricing structures to that of the Exchange, including schedules of rebates and fees that apply based upon members achieving certain volume thresholds.9

Within this environment, market participants can freely and often do shift their order flow among the Exchange and competing venues in response to changes in their respective pricing schedules.10 Within the foregoing context, the proposal represents a reasonable attempt by the Exchange to increase its market share relative to its competitors.

The Exchange believes it is reasonable and equitable to adopt a new $0.0018 per share executed fee for RPI Orders entered by a member that (i) quotes Retail Price Improvement Orders in at least 2,500 symbols on average per day and (ii) provides liquidity through Retail Price Improvement Orders equal to or exceeding an average daily volume of 2,500,000 shares. As discussed above, the Exchange’s goal is to increase

---


10 The Exchange perceives no regulatory, structural, or cost impediments to market participants shifting order flow away from it. In particular, the Exchange notes that these examples of shifts in liquidity and market share, along with many others, have occurred within the context of market participants’ existing duties of Best Execution and obligations under the Order Protection Rule under Regulation NMS.
liquidity adding activity in RPI Orders on its platform. It is reasonable and equitable to address this need by providing a lower fee to member organizations that meet the proposed thresholds as an incentive for them to increase their liquidity activity in RPI Orders on the Exchange. If the proposal is effective in achieving this purpose, then the quality of the Exchange’s market will improve, particularly with respect to RPI and Retail orders to the benefit of all participants, especially those who submit RPI and Retail Orders.

The Proposed Fee is not Unfairly Discriminatory

The Exchange believes that the proposal is not unfairly discriminatory. As an initial matter, the Exchange believes that nothing about its volume-based tiered pricing model is inherently unfair; instead, it is a rational pricing model that is well-established and ubiquitous in today’s economy among firms in various industries – from co-branded credit cards to grocery stores to cellular telephone data plans – that use it to reward the loyalty of their best customers that provide high levels of business activity and incent other customers to increase the extent of their business activity. It is also a pricing model that the Exchange and its competitors have long employed with the assent of the Commission. It is fair because it incentivizes customer activity that increases liquidity, enhances price discovery, and improves the overall quality of the equity markets.

The Exchange intends for its proposal to improve market quality for all members that submit RPI and Retail Orders on the Exchange and by extension attract more liquidity to the market, improving market wide quality and price discovery. Although net adders of liquidity for RPI Orders will benefit most from the proposal, this result is fair insofar as increased liquidity adding activity in RPI Orders will help to improve market
quality and the attractiveness of the Nasdaq BX market to all existing and prospective retail participants.

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

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.

Intramarket Competition

The Exchange does not believe that its proposal will place any category of Exchange participant at a competitive disadvantage. As noted above, all member organizations of the Exchange will benefit from any increase in market activity that the proposal effectuates. Member organizations may modify their businesses so that they can meet the required thresholds and pay lower charges. Moreover, members are free to trade on other venues to the extent they believe that the fees assessed, and credits provided, are not attractive. As one can observe by looking at any market share chart, price competition between exchanges is fierce, with liquidity and market share moving freely between exchanges in reaction to fee and credit changes. The Exchange notes that the tier structure is consistent with broker-dealer fee practices as well as the other industries, as described above.

Intermarket Competition

The Exchange believes that its proposed modifications to its schedule of credits and charges will not impose a burden on competition because the Exchange’s execution services are completely voluntary and subject to extensive competition from the other live exchanges and from off-exchange venues, which include alternative trading systems that trade national market system stock. The Exchange notes that it operates in a highly
competitive market in which market participants can readily favor competing venues if
they deem fee levels at a particular venue to be excessive, or rebate opportunities
available at other venues to be more favorable. In such an environment, the Exchange
must continually adjust its fees to remain competitive with other exchanges and with
alternative trading systems that have been exempted from compliance with the statutory
standards applicable to exchanges. Because competitors are free to modify their own fees
in response, and because market participants may readily adjust their order routing
practices, the Exchange believes that the degree to which fee changes in this market may
impose any burden on competition is extremely limited.

The proposed charge for adding liquidity is reflective of this competition because,
as a threshold issue, the Exchange is a relatively small market so its ability to burden
intermarket competition is limited. In this regard, even the largest U.S. equities exchange
by volume has less than 17-18% market share, which in most markets could hardly be
categorized as having enough market power to burden competition. Moreover, as noted
above, price competition between exchanges is fierce, with liquidity and market share
moving freely between exchanges in reaction to fee and credit changes. This is in
addition to free flow of order flow to and among off-exchange venues which comprised
more than 40% of industry volume in recent months.

In sum, the Exchange intends for the proposed change to its fees for RPI Orders,
in the aggregate, to increase member incentives to engage in the addition of liquidity on
the Exchange. If the additional fee proposed herein is unattractive to market participants,
it is likely that the Exchange will lose market share as a result. Accordingly, the
Exchange does not believe that the proposed changes will impair the ability of members
or competing order execution venues to maintain their competitive standing in the
financial markets.

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 Act. ¹¹

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: (i) Necessary or appropriate in the public interest; (ii) for
the protection of investors; or (iii) otherwise in furtherance of 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 e-mail to rule-comments@sec.gov. Please include File Number SR-BX-2021-028 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-BX-2021-028. This file number should be included on the subject line if e-mail 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 website (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 website 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 the filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All comments received will be posted without change. Persons submitting comments are cautioned that we do not redact or edit personal identifying information from comment submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR-BX-2021-028 and should be submitted on or before [INSERT DATE 21 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].
For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.\footnote{12}

\textbf{J. Matthew DeLesDernier,}

\textit{Assistant Secretary.}

\footnotetext[12]{17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).}