

for non-monetary or unspecified damages. The proposed rule change would also increase filing fees and hearing session fees for customers, associated persons and members bringing claims of more than \$500,000 or claims for non-monetary or unspecified damages. FINRA believes the proposed rule change appropriately allocates the proposed fee increases among users of the forum by allocating the increases among high claim amounts and continuing its policy that the costs of the forum are borne 85 percent by members and 15 percent by customers.³⁵

FINRA also believes the amount of the fee increases are reasonable. FINRA believes that the proposed fee increases would generate sufficient revenue to offset the proposed increases in the arbitrator Chair honoraria without placing an undue burden on users of the forum, particularly customers and claimants with small claims.³⁶ For example, the filing fee increases for non-member claimants will range from \$15 to \$50 (1%–2% increase);³⁷ the hearing session fee increases will range from \$25 to \$75 (2%–5% increase);³⁸ the increases to the member surcharge will range from \$100 to \$300 (3%–4% increase);³⁹ and the filing fee increases for member claimants will range from \$100 to \$200 (4%–6% increase).⁴⁰ FINRA believes these represent “minimal” increases.⁴¹ Similarly, the commenter believes that increasing the filing fees and hearing session fees for customers, associated persons, and members bringing claims of more than \$500,000 or claims for non-monetary or unspecified damages, is a fair, equitable and reasonable allocation of the costs among people using the forum that will be associated with the implementation of the proposed rule amendments.⁴²

The Commission believes that increasing the amount of honoraria paid to arbitrators who chair hearings and pre-hearing conferences in the FINRA

forum as proposed here would help improve the arbitration process for its users. To offset the costs of this improvement, FINRA designed the arbitration fee structure to distribute much of the increased costs of the forum to member firms that are parties to an arbitration proceeding and to parties associated with large claims or non-monetary or unspecified claims. The Commission believes that this proposed distribution of fees will help keep the FINRA arbitration forum accessible. Otherwise, the Commission believes that increasing fees on claimants with small claims could discourage retail investors from bringing their claims.⁴³ Accordingly, the proposed allocation of the fee increases will help ensure that FINRA’s arbitration forum remains accessible and affordable to parties.

As stated above, the filing fee increases for non-member claimants will range from \$15 to \$50; the hearing session fee increases will range from \$25 to \$75; the increases to the member surcharge will range from \$100 to \$300; and the filing fee increases for member claimants range from \$100 to \$200. Because these increases would only apply to claims over \$250,000 and, in some instances, over \$500,000, they represent a small percentage of effected claims (collectively, 1%–6%).

The Commission believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the Exchange Act. In particular, the Commission believes that the proposed rule change is appropriate and designed to protect investors and the public interest, consistent with Section 15A(b)(6) of the Exchange Act. Specifically, the Commission believes that the proposed increase to the hearing day Chair honorarium and the addition of a Chair honorarium for prehearing conferences are in the public interest because they would help improve the arbitration process for its users, including retail investors. Moreover, the Commission believes that the proposed fee increases represent an equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among members and issuers and other persons using any facility, consistent with Section 15A(b)(5). For these reasons, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the Exchange Act and the rules and regulations thereunder.

IV. Conclusion

It is therefore ordered pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Exchange Act⁴⁴

that the proposal (SR–FINRA–2020–035), be and hereby is approved.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.⁴⁵

J. Matthew DeLesDernier,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2020–28310 Filed 12–22–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–90707; File No. SR–NYSENAT–2020–37]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE National, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend the Rule 6.6800 Series

December 17, 2020.

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 December 4, 2020, NYSE National, Inc. (“NYSE National” or 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 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 the Rule 6.6800 Series, the Exchange’s compliance rule (“Compliance Rule”) regarding the National Market System Plan Governing the Consolidated Audit Trail (the “CAT NMS Plan” or “Plan”)³ to be consistent with a conditional exemption granted by the Commission from certain allocation reporting requirements set forth in Sections 6.4(d)(ii)(A)(1) and (2) of the CAT NMS Plan (“Allocation Exemption”).⁴ The proposed rule change is available on the Exchange’s website at www.nyse.com, at the principal office of the Exchange, and at the Commission’s Public Reference Room.

⁴⁵ 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78a.

² 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

³ Unless otherwise specified, capitalized terms used in this rule filing are defined as set forth in the Compliance Rule.

⁴ See Securities Exchange Act Rel. No. 90223 (October 19, 2020), 85 FR 67576 (October 23, 2020) (“Allocation Exemptive Order”).

³⁵ See Notice at 67799; see also Notice at note 9 (stating that the FINRA Dispute Resolution Task Force suggested raising arbitration fees to fund arbitrator honoraria increases consistent with the current arbitration fee structure, which assigns a majority of the costs of the forum to firms through the member surcharge and process fees).

³⁶ See Notice at 67796.

³⁷ See Table 2 (Filing Fees for Customers, Associated Persons or Other Non-Member Claimants) *supra*; see also Notice at 67797.

³⁸ See Table 5 (Hearing Session Fees for Session with Three Arbitrators) *supra*; see also Notice at 67798.

³⁹ See Table 4 (Member Process Fee Schedule) *supra*; see also Notice at 67797.

⁴⁰ See Table 3 (Filing Fees for Member Claimant) *supra*; see also Notice at 67797.

⁴¹ See Notice at 67794.

⁴² See Caruso Letter.

⁴³ See Notice at 67801.

⁴⁴ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

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 self-regulatory organization 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 those 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 parts of such statements.

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

1. Purpose

The purpose of this proposed rule change is to amend the Rule 6.6800 Series to be consistent with the Allocation Exemption. The Commission granted the relief conditioned upon the Participants' adoption of Compliance Rules that implement the alternative approach to reporting allocations to the Central Repository described in the Allocation Exemption (referred to as the "Allocation Alternative").

(1) Request for Exemptive Relief

Pursuant to Section 6.4(d)(ii)(A) of the CAT NMS Plan, each Participant must, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to record and report to the Central Repository, if the order is executed, in whole or in part: (1) An Allocation Report;⁵ (2) the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the clearing broker or prime broker, if applicable; and the (3) CAT-Order-ID of any contra-side order(s). Accordingly, the Exchange and the other Participants implemented Compliance Rules that require their Industry Members that are executing brokers to submit to the Central Repository, among other things, Allocation Reports and the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the clearing broker or prime broker, if applicable.

On August 27, 2020, the Participants submitted to the Commission a request

⁵ Section 1.1 of the CAT NMS Plan defines an "Allocation Report" as "a report made to the Central Repository by an Industry Member that identifies the Firm Designated ID for any account(s), including subaccount(s), to which executed shares are allocated and provides the security that has been allocated, the identifier of the firm reporting the allocation, the price per share of shares allocated, the side of shares allocated, the number of shares allocated to each account, and the time of the allocation; provided for the avoidance of doubt, any such Allocation Report shall not be required to be linked to particular orders or executions."

for an exemption from certain allocation reporting requirements set forth in Sections 6.4(d)(ii)(A)(1) and (2) of the CAT NMS Plan ("Exemption Request").⁶ In the Exemption Request, the Participants requested that they be permitted to implement the Allocation Alternative, which, as noted above, is an alternative approach to reporting allocations to the Central Repository. Under the Allocation Alternative, any Industry Member that performs an allocation to a client account would be required under the Compliance Rule to submit an Allocation Report to the Central Repository when shares/contracts are allocated to a client account regardless of whether the Industry Member was involved in executing the underlying order(s). Under the Allocation Alternative, a "client account" would be any account that is not owned or controlled by the Industry Member.

In addition, under the Allocation Alternative, an "Allocation" would be defined as: (1) The placement of shares/contracts into the same account for which an order was originally placed; or (2) the placement of shares/contracts into an account based on allocation instructions (e.g., subaccount allocations, delivery versus payment ("DVP") allocations). Pursuant to this definition and the proposed Allocation Alternative, an Industry Member that performs an Allocation to an account that is not a client account, such as proprietary accounts and events including step outs,⁷ or correspondent flips,⁸ would not be required to submit an Allocation Report to the Central Repository for that allocation, but could do so on a voluntary basis. Industry Members would be allowed to report Allocations to accounts other than client accounts; in that instance, such Allocations must be marked as

⁶ See letter from the Participants to Vanessa Countryman, Secretary, Commission, dated August 27, 2020 (the "Exemption Request").

⁷ "A step-out allows a broker-dealer to allocate all or part of a client's position from a previously executed trade to the client's account at another broker-dealer. In other words, a step-out functions as a client's position transfer, rather than a trade; there is no exchange of shares and funds and no change in beneficial ownership." See FINRA, Trade Reporting Frequently Asked Questions, at Section 301, available at: <https://www.finra.org/filing-reporting/market-transparency-reporting/trade-reporting-faq>.

⁸ Correspondent clearing flips are the movement of a position from an executing broker's account to a different account for clearance and settlement, allowing a broker-dealer to execute a trade through another broker-dealer and settle the trade in its own account. See, e.g., The Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation, Correspondent Clearing, available at: <https://www.dtcc.com/clearing-services/equities-tradecapture/correspondent-clearing>.

Allocations to accounts other than client accounts.

(A) Executing Brokers and Allocation Reports

To implement the Allocation Alternative, the Participants requested exemptive relief from Section 6.4(d)(ii)(A)(1) of the CAT NMS Plan, to the extent that the provision requires each Participant to, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members that are executing brokers, who do not perform Allocations, to record and report to the Central Repository, if the order is executed, in whole or in part, an Allocation Report. Under the Allocation Alternative, when an Industry Member other than an executing broker (e.g., a prime broker or clearing broker) performs an Allocation, that Industry Member would be required to submit the Allocation Report to the Central Repository. When an executing broker performs an Allocation for an order that is executed, in whole or in part, the burden of submitting an Allocation Report to the Central Repository would remain with the executing broker under the Allocation Alternative. In certain circumstances this would result in multiple Allocation Reports—the executing broker (if self-clearing) or its clearing firm would report individual Allocation Reports identifying the specific prime broker to which shares/contracts were allocated and then each prime broker would itself report an Allocation Report identifying the specific customer accounts to which the shares/contracts were finally allocated.

The Participants stated that granting exemptive relief from submitting Allocation Reports for executing brokers who do not perform an Allocation, and requiring the Industry Member other than the executing broker that is performing the Allocation to submit such Allocation Reports, is consistent with the basic approach taken by the Commission in adopting Rule 613 under the Exchange Act. Specifically, the Participants stated that they believe that the Commission sought to require each broker-dealer and exchange that touches an order to record the required data with respect to actions it takes on the order.⁹ Without the requested exemptive relief, executing brokers that do not perform Allocations would be required to submit Allocation Reports. In addition, the Participants stated that, because shares/contracts for every execution must be allocated to an

⁹ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 67457 (July 18, 2012), 77 FR 45722, 45748 (August 1, 2012).

account by the clearing broker in such circumstances, there would be no loss of information by shifting the reporting obligation from the executing broker to the clearing broker.

(B) Identity of Prime Broker

To implement the Allocation Alternative, the Participants also requested exemptive relief from Section 6.4(d)(ii)(A)(2) of the CAT NMS Plan, to the extent that the provision requires each Participant to, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to record and report to the Central Repository, if an order is executed, in whole or in part, the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the prime broker, if applicable. Currently, under the CAT NMS Plan, an Industry Member is required to report the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the clearing broker or prime broker in connection with the execution of an order, and such information would be part of the order's lifecycle, rather than in an Allocation Report that is not linked to the order's lifecycle.¹⁰ Under the Allocation Alternative, the identity of the prime broker would be required to be reported by the clearing broker on the Allocation Report, and, in addition, the prime broker itself would be required to report the ultimate allocation, which the Participants believe would provide more complete information.

The Participants stated that associating a prime broker with a specific execution, as is currently required by the CAT NMS Plan, does not reflect how the allocation process works in practice as allocations to a prime broker are done post-trade and are performed by the clearing broker of the executing broker. The Participants also stated that with the implementation of the Allocation Alternative, it would be duplicative for the executing broker to separately identify the prime broker for allocation purposes.

The Participants stated that if a particular customer only has one prime broker, the identity of the prime broker can be obtained from the customer and account information through the DVP accounts for that customer that contain the identity of the prime broker. The Participants further stated that Allocation Reports related to those executions would reflect that shares/contracts were allocated to the single prime broker. The Participants believe that there is no loss of information through the implementation of the

Allocation Alternative compared to what is required in the CAT NMS Plan and that this approach does not decrease the regulatory utility of the CAT for single prime broker circumstances.

In cases where a customer maintains relationships with multiple prime brokers, the Participants asserted that the executing broker will not have information at the time of the trade as to which particular prime broker may be allocated all or part of the execution. Under the Allocation Alternative, the executing broker (if self-clearing) or its clearing firm would report individual Allocation Reports identifying the specific prime broker to which shares/contracts were allocated and then each prime broker would itself report an Allocation Report identifying the specific customer accounts where the shares/contracts were ultimately allocated. To determine the prime broker for a customer, a regulatory user would query the customer and account database using the customer's CCID at broker-dealers. The Participants state that when a customer maintains relationships with multiple prime brokers, the customer typically has a separate DVP account with each prime broker, and the identities of those prime brokers can be obtained from the customer and account information.

(C) Additional Conditions to Exemptive Relief

In the Exemption Request, the Participants included certain additional conditions for the requested relief. Currently, the definition of Allocation Report in the CAT NMS Plan only refers to shares. To implement the Allocation Alternative, the Participants proposed to require that all required elements of Allocation Reports apply to both shares and contracts, as applicable, for all Eligible Securities. Specifically, Participants would require the reporting of the following in each Allocation Report: (1) The FDID for the account receiving the allocation, including subaccounts; (2) the security that has been allocated; (3) the identifier of the firm reporting the allocation; (3) the price per share/contracts of shares/contracts allocated; (4) the side of shares/contracts allocated; (4) the number of shares/contracts allocated; and (5) the time of the allocation.

Furthermore, to implement the Allocation Alternative, the Participants proposed to require the following information on all Allocation Reports: (1) Allocation ID, which is the internal allocation identifier assigned to the allocation event by the Industry

Member; (2) trade date; (3) settlement date; (4) IB/correspondent CRD Number (if applicable); (5) FDID of new order(s) (if available in the booking system);¹¹ (6) allocation instruction time (optional); (7) if the account meets the definition of institution under FINRA Rule 4512(c);¹² (8) type of allocation (allocation to a custody account, allocation to a DVP account, step out, correspondent flip, allocation to a firm owned or controlled account, or other non-reportable transactions (e.g., option exercises, conversions); (9) for DVP allocations, custody broker-dealer clearing number (prime broker) if the custodian is a U.S. broker-dealer, DTCC number if the custodian is a U.S. bank, or a foreign indicator, if the custodian is a foreign entity; and (10) if an allocation was cancelled, a cancel flag, which indicates that the allocation was cancelled, and a cancel timestamp, which represents the time at which the allocation was cancelled.

(2) Proposed Rule Changes To Implement Exemptive Relief

On October 29, 2020, the Commission granted the exemptive relief requested in the Exemption Request. The Commission granted the relief conditioned upon the adoption of Compliance Rules that implement the reporting requirements of the Allocation Alternative. Accordingly, the Exchange proposes the following changes to its Compliance Rule to implement the reporting requirements of the Allocation Alternative.

(A) Definition of Allocation

The Exchange proposes to add a definition of "Allocation" as new paragraph (c) to Rule 6.6810.¹³ Proposed

¹¹ The Participants propose that for scenarios where the Industry Member responsible for reporting the Allocation has the FDID of the related new order(s) available, such FDID must be reported. This would include scenarios in which: (1) The FDID structure of the top account and subaccounts is known to the Industry Member responsible for reporting the Allocation(s); and (2) the FDID structure used by the IB/Correspondent when reporting new orders is known to the clearing firm reporting the related Allocations.

¹² FINRA Rule 4512(c) states the for purposes of the rule, the term "institutional account" means the account of: (1) A bank, savings and loan association, insurance company or registered investment company; (2) an investment adviser registered either with the SEC under Section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act or with a state securities commission (or any agency or office performing like functions); or (3) any other person (whether a natural person, corporation, partnership, trust or otherwise) with total assets of at least \$50 million.

¹³ The Exchange proposes to renumber the definitions in Rule 6.6810 to accommodate the addition of this new definition of "Allocation" and the new definition of "Client Account" discussed below.

¹⁰ The Participants did not request exemptive relief relating to the reporting of the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of clearing brokers.

paragraph (c) of Rule 6.6810 would define an “Allocation” to mean “(1) the placement of shares/contracts into the same account for which an order was originally placed; or (2) the placement of shares/contracts into an account based on allocation instructions (e.g., subaccount allocations, delivery versus payment (“DVP”) allocations).” The SEC stated in the Allocation Exemption that this definition of “Allocation” is reasonable.

(B) Definition of Allocation Report

The Exchange proposes to amend the definition of “Allocation Report” set forth in Exchange Rule 6.6810(c) to reflect the requirements of the Allocation Exemption. Exchange Rule 6.6810(c) defines the term “Allocation Report” to mean:

a report made to the Central Repository by an Industry Member that identifies the Firm Designated ID for any account(s), including subaccount(s), to which executed shares are allocated and provides the security that has been allocated, the identifier of the firm reporting the allocation, the price per share of shares allocated, the side of shares allocated, the number of shares allocated to each account, and the time of the allocation; provided, for the avoidance of doubt, any such Allocation Report shall not be required to be linked to particular orders or executions.

The Exchange proposes to amend this definition in two ways: (1) Applying the requirements for Allocation Reports to contracts in addition to shares; and (2) requiring the reporting of additional elements for the Allocation Report.

(i) Shares and Contracts

The requirements for Allocation Reports apply only to shares, as the definition of “Allocation Report” in Rule 6.6810(c) refers to shares, not contracts. In the Allocation Exemption, the Commission stated that applying the requirements for Allocation Reports to contracts in addition to shares is appropriate because CAT reporting requirements apply to both options and equities. Accordingly, the SEC stated that the Participants would be required to modify their Compliance Rules such that all required elements of Allocation Reports apply to both shares and contracts, as applicable, for all Eligible Securities. Therefore, the Exchange proposes to amend Rule 6.6810(c) (to be renumbered as Rule 6.6810(d)) to apply to contracts, as well as shares. Specifically, the Exchange proposes to add references to contracts to the definition of “Allocation Report” to the following phrases: “the Firm Designated ID for any account(s), including subaccount(s), to which executed

shares/contracts are allocated,” “the price per share/contract of shares/contracts allocated,” “the side of shares/contracts allocated,” and “the number of shares/contracts allocated to each account.”

(ii) Additional Elements

The Commission also conditioned the Allocation Exemption on the Participants amending their Compliance Rules to require the ten additional elements in Allocation Reports described above. Accordingly, the Exchange proposes to require these additional elements in Allocation Reports. Specifically, the Exchange proposes to amend the definition of “Allocation Report” in Rule 6.6810(c) (to be renumbered as Rule 6.6810(d)) to include the following elements, in addition to those elements currently required under the CAT NMS Plan:

(6) the time of the allocation; (7) Allocation ID, which is the internal allocation identifier assigned to the allocation event by the Industry Member; (8) trade date; (9) settlement date; (10) IB/correspondent CRD Number (if applicable); (11) FDID of new order(s) (if available in the booking system); (12) allocation instruction time (optional); (12) if account meets the definition of institution under FINRA Rule 4512(c); (13) type of allocation (allocation to a custody account, allocation to a DVP account, step-out, correspondent flip, allocation to a firm owned or controlled account, or other non-reportable transactions (e.g., option exercises, conversions); (14) for DVP allocations, custody broker-dealer clearing number (prime broker) if the custodian is a U.S. broker-dealer, DTCC number if the custodian is a U.S. bank, or a foreign indicator, if the custodian is a foreign entity; and (15) if an allocation was cancelled, a cancel flag indicating that the allocation was cancelled, and a cancel timestamp, which represents the time at which the allocation was cancelled.

(C) Allocation Reports

(i) Executing Brokers That Do Not Perform Allocations

The Commission granted the Participants an exemption from the requirement that the Participants, through their Compliance Rule, require executing brokers that do not perform Allocations to submit Allocation Reports. The Commission stated that it understands that executing brokers that are not self-clearing do not perform allocations themselves, and such allocations are handled by prime and/or clearing brokers, and these executing brokers therefore do not possess the requisite information to provide Allocation Reports. Accordingly, the Exchange proposes to eliminate Rule

6.6830(a)(2)(A)(i),¹⁴ which requires an Industry Member to record and report to the Central Repository an Allocation Report if the order is executed, in whole or in part, and to replace this provision with proposed Rule 6.6830(a)(2)(F) as discussed below.

(ii) Industry Members That Perform Allocations

The Allocation Exemption requires the Participants to amend their Compliance Rules to require Industry Members to provide Allocation Reports to the Central Repository any time they perform Allocations to a client account, whether or not the Industry Member was the executing broker for the trades. Accordingly, the Commission conditioned the Allocation Exemption on the Participants adopting Compliance Rules that require prime and/or clearing brokers to submit Allocation Reports when such brokers perform allocations, in addition to requiring executing brokers that perform allocations to submit Allocation Reports. The Commission determined that such exemptive relief would improve efficiency and reduce the costs and burdens of reporting allocations for Industry Members because the reporting obligation would belong to the Industry Member with the requisite information, and executing brokers that do not have the information required on an Allocation Report would not have to develop the infrastructure and processes required to obtain, store and report the information. The Commission stated that this exemptive relief should not reduce the regulatory utility of the CAT because an Allocation Report would still be submitted for each executed trade allocated to a client account, which in certain circumstances could still result in multiple Allocation Reports,¹⁵ just not necessarily by the executing broker.

In accordance with the Allocation Exemption, the Exchange proposes to add proposed Rule 6.6830(a)(2)(F) to the Compliance Rule. Proposed Rule 6.6830(a)(2)(F) would require Industry Members to record and report to the Central Repository “an Allocation Report any time the Industry Member

¹⁴ The Exchange proposes to renumber Rule 6.6830(a)(2)(A)(ii) and (iii) as Rules 6.6830(a)(2)(A)(i) and (ii) in light of the proposed deletion of Rule 6.6830(a)(2)(A)(i).

¹⁵ As noted above, under the Allocation Alternative, for certain executions, the executing broker (if self-clearing) or its clearing firm would report individual Allocation Reports identifying the specific prime broker to which shares/contracts were allocated and then each prime broker would itself report an Allocation Report identifying the specific customer accounts to which the shares/contracts were finally allocated.

performs an Allocation to a Client Account, whether or not the Industry Member was the executing broker for the trade.”

(iii) Client Accounts

In the Allocation Exemption, the Commission also exempted the Participants from the requirement that they amend their Compliance Rules to require Industry Members to report Allocations for accounts other than client accounts. The Commission believes that allocations to client accounts, and not allocations to proprietary accounts or events such as step-outs and correspondent flips, provide regulators the necessary information to detect abuses in the allocation process because it would provide regulators with detailed information regarding the fulfillment of orders submitted by clients, while reducing reporting burdens on broker-dealers. For example, Allocation Reports would be required for allocations to registered investment advisor and money manager accounts. The Commission further believes that the proposed approach should facilitate regulators’ ability to distinguish Allocation Reports relating to allocations to client accounts from other Allocation Reports because Allocations to accounts other than client accounts would have to be identified as such. This approach could reduce the time CAT Reporters expend to comply with CAT reporting requirements and lower costs by allowing broker-dealers to use existing business practices.

To clarify that an Industry Member must report an Allocation Report solely for Allocations to a client account, proposed Rule 6.6830(a)(2)(F) specifically references “Client Accounts,” as discussed above. In addition, the Exchange proposes to add a definition of “Client Account” as proposed Rule 6.6810(l). Proposed Rule 6.6810(l) would define a “Client Account” to mean “for the purposes of an Allocation and Allocation Report, any account or subaccount that is not owned or controlled by the Industry Member.”

(D) Identity of Prime Broker

The Exchange also proposes to amend Rule 6.6830(a)(2)(A)(ii) to eliminate the requirement for executing brokers to record and report the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the prime broker. Rule 6.6830(a)(2)(A)(ii) states that each Industry Member is required to record and report to the Central Repository, if the order is executed, in whole or in part, the “SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier

of the clearing broker or prime broker, if applicable.” The Exchange proposes to delete the phrase “or prime broker” from this provision. Accordingly, each Industry Member that is an executing broker would no longer be required to report the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the prime broker.

As the Commission noted in the Allocation Exemption, exempting the Participants from the requirement that they, through their Compliance Rules, require executing brokers to provide the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the prime broker is appropriate because, as stated by the Participants, allocations are done on a post-trade basis and the executing broker will not have the requisite information at the time of the trade. Because an executing broker, in certain circumstances, does not have this information at the time of the trade, this relief relieves executing brokers of the burdens and costs of developing infrastructure and processes to obtain this information in order to meet the contemporaneous reporting requirements of the CAT NMS Plan.

As the Commission noted in the Allocation Exemption, although executing brokers would no longer be required to provide the prime broker information, regulators will still be able to determine the prime broker(s) associated with orders through querying the customer and account information database. If an executing broker has only one prime broker, the identity of the prime broker can be obtained from the customer and account information associated with the executing broker. For customers with multiple prime brokers, the identity of the prime brokers can be obtained from the customer and account information which will list the prime broker, if there is one, that is associated with each account.

2. Statutory Basis

NYSE National believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the provisions of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act,¹⁶ which require, among other things, that the Exchange’s rules must be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest, and Section 6(b)(8) of the Act,¹⁷ which requires that the Exchange’s rules not

impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate.

NYSE National believes that this proposal is consistent with the Act because it is consistent with, and implements, the Allocation Exemption, and is designed to assist the Exchange and its Industry Members in meeting regulatory obligations pursuant to the Plan. In approving the Plan, the SEC noted that the Plan “is necessary and appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors and the maintenance of fair and orderly markets, to remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of a national market system, or is otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.”¹⁸ To the extent that this proposal implements the Plan, and applies specific requirements to Industry Members, the Exchange believes that this proposal furthers the objectives of the Plan, as identified by the SEC, and is therefore consistent with the Act.

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

NYSE National 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. NYSE National notes that the proposed rule changes are consistent with the Allocation Exemption, and are designed to assist the Exchange in meeting its regulatory obligations pursuant to the Plan. NYSE National also notes that the proposed rule changes will apply equally to all Industry Members. In addition, all national securities exchanges and FINRA are proposing this amendment to their Compliance Rules. Therefore, this is not a competitive rule filing and does not impose a burden on competition.

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

No written comments were solicited or received with respect to the proposed rule change.

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

The Exchange has filed the proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act¹⁹ and Rule 19b-4(f)(6) thereunder.²⁰ Because the

¹⁸ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 79318 (November 15, 2016), 81 FR 84696, 84697 (November 23, 2016).

¹⁹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(iii).

²⁰ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(6).

¹⁶ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(6).

¹⁷ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(8).

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 prior to 30 days from the date on which it was filed, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, if consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest, the proposed rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act and Rule 19b-4(f)(6)(iii) thereunder.

At any time within 60 days of the filing of such 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. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission shall institute proceedings under Section 19(b)(2)(B) ²¹ of the Act to determine whether the proposed rule change 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-NYSENAT-2020-37 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-NYSENAT-2020-37. 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 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-NYSENAT-2020-37, and should be submitted on or before January 13, 2021.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.²²

J. Matthew DeLesDernier,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2020-28312 Filed 12-22-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meetings

FEDERAL REGISTER CITATION OF PREVIOUS ANNOUNCEMENT: 85 FR 81961, December 17, 2020

PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED TIME AND DATE OF THE MEETING: Monday, December 21, 2020 at 11:00 a.m.

CHANGES IN THE MEETING: The Closed Meeting scheduled for Monday, December 21, 2020 at 11:00 a.m. has been changed to Monday, December 21, 2020 at 10:00 a.m.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: For further information and to ascertain what, if any, matters have been added, deleted or postponed, please contact Vanessa A. Countryman from the Office of the Secretary at (202) 551-5400.

Dated: December 18, 2020.

Vanessa A. Countryman,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2020-28540 Filed 12-21-20; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[SEC File No. 270-118, OMB Control No. 3235-0095]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon Written Request Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of FOIA Services, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549-2736

Extension:

Rule 236

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") is soliciting comments on the collection of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for extension and approval.

Securities Act Rule 236 (17 CFR 230.236) provides an exemption from registration under the Securities Act for the offering of shares of stock or similar securities to provide funds to be distributed to security holders in lieu of fractional shares, scrip certificates or order forms, in connection with a stock dividend, stock split, reverse stock split, conversion, merger or similar transaction. Issuers wishing to rely upon the exemption are required to furnish specified information to the Commission at least 10 days prior to the offering. The information is needed to provide notice that the issuer is relying on the exemption. Approximately 10 respondents file the information required by Rule 236 at an estimated 1.5 hours per response for a total annual reporting burden of 15 hours (1.5 hours per response × 10 responses).

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether this proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden imposed by the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to

²¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)(B).

²² 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).