

will reflect the current registration rate that will be assessed by FINRA as of January 2, 2022. The proposed fee change is identical to that adopted by FINRA for use of Web CRD for the registration of FINRA members and their associated persons. These costs are borne by FINRA when a Non-FINRA member uses Web CRD.

The Exchange believes that its proposal to increase the \$100 fee for each initial Form U4 filed for the registration of a representative or principal to \$125 is equitable and not unfairly discriminatory as the amendment will reflect the current fee that will be assessed by FINRA to all members who require Form U4 filings as of January 2, 2022. Further, the proposal is also equitable and not unfairly discriminatory because the Exchange will not be collecting or retaining these fees; therefore, the Exchange will not be in a position to apply them in an inequitable or unfairly discriminatory manner. The proposed rule change was based on recent fee adjustments currently assessed by FINRA.¹⁶ Thus, the proposed change does not raise any new or novel issues. For these reasons, the Exchange believes that the proposal is consistent with the Act.

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 that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The Exchange believes that its proposal to increase the \$100 fee for each initial Form U4 filed for the registration of a representative or principal to \$125 does not impose an undue burden on competition as the amendment will reflect the current fee that will be assessed by FINRA to all members who require Form U4 filings as of January 2, 2022. Further, the proposal does not impose an undue burden on competition because the Exchange will not be collecting or retaining these fees; therefore, the Exchange will not be in a position to apply them in an inequitable or unfairly discriminatory manner.

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

Written comments were neither solicited nor 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,¹⁷ and Rule 19b-4(f)(2)¹⁸ thereunder. 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. 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-MIAX-2021-64 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Vanessa Countryman, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549-1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR-MIAX-2021-64. 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; 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-MIAX-2021-64 and should be submitted on or before February 9, 2022.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.¹⁹

J. Matthew DeLesDernier,
Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2022-00882 Filed 1-18-22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-93960; File No. SR-NYSEArca-2021-109]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE Arca, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend the NYSE Arca Equities Fees and Charges

January 12, 2022.

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 30, 2021, NYSE Arca, Inc. ("NYSE Arca" or the "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 NYSE Arca Equities Fees and Charges ("Fee Schedule") to adopt an alternative requirement to qualify for the Tape B Tier 3 pricing tier. The Exchange proposes to implement the fee change effective January 3, 2022. The proposed rule change is available on the

¹⁹ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

¹⁷ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

¹⁸ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(2).

¹⁶ See *supra* note 4.

Exchange's website at www.nyse.com, 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 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 Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Exchange proposes to amend the Fee Schedule to adopt an alternative requirement to qualify for the Tape B Tier 3 pricing tier. The Exchange proposes to implement the fee change effective January 3, 2022.

Background

The Exchange operates in a highly competitive market. The Commission has repeatedly expressed its preference for competition over regulatory intervention in determining prices, products, and services in the securities markets. In Regulation NMS, 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."³

While Regulation NMS has enhanced competition, it has also fostered a "fragmented" market structure where trading in a single stock can occur across multiple trading centers. When multiple trading centers compete for order flow in the same stock, the Commission has recognized that "such competition can lead to the fragmentation of order flow in that stock."⁴ Indeed, equity trading is

currently dispersed across 16 exchanges,⁵ numerous alternative trading systems,⁶ and broker-dealer internalizers and wholesalers, all competing for order flow. Based on publicly available information, no single exchange currently has more than 18% market share.⁷ Therefore, no exchange possesses significant pricing power in the execution of equity order flow. More specifically, the Exchange currently has less than 12% market share of executed volume of equities trading.⁸

The Exchange believes that the ever-shifting market share among the exchanges from month to month demonstrates that market participants can move order flow, or discontinue or reduce use of certain categories of products. While it is not possible to know a firm's reason for shifting order flow, the Exchange believes that one such reason is because of fee changes at any of the registered exchanges or non-exchange venues to which a firm routes order flow. With respect to non-marketable order flow that would provide liquidity on an Exchange against which market makers can quote, ETP Holders can choose from any one of the 16 currently operating registered exchanges to route such order flow. Accordingly, competitive forces constrain exchange transaction fees that relate to orders that would provide liquidity on an exchange.

Proposed Rule Change

Currently, under the Tape B Tier 3 pricing tier, an ETP Holder could qualify for a credit of \$0.0025 per share⁹ for adding liquidity in Tape B Securities if such ETP Holder (1) has Adding ADV of Tape B CADV that is equal to at least 0.20% of the Tape B CADV and (2) has Market Maker Electronic Posting

⁵ See Cboe U.S. Equities Market Volume Summary, available at https://markets.cboe.com/us/equities/market_share. See generally <https://www.sec.gov/fast-answers/divisionsmarketregmr-exchangesshtml.html>.

⁶ See FINRA ATS Transparency Data, available at <https://otctransparency.finra.org/otctransparency/AtsIssueData>. A list of alternative trading systems registered with the Commission is available at <https://www.sec.gov/foia/docs/atlist.htm>.

⁷ See Cboe Global Markets U.S. Equities Market Volume Summary, available at http://markets.cboe.com/us/equities/market_share/.

⁸ See *id.*

⁹ Under Section III of the Fee Schedule—Standard Rates, ETP Holders receive a credit of \$0.0020 per share for orders that add liquidity in Tape B securities. Additionally, in securities priced at or above \$1.00, an additional credit in Tape B securities may be available to LMMs and to Market Makers affiliated with LMMs that add displayed liquidity based on the number of Less Active ETP Securities in which the LMM is registered as the LMM. The applicable tiered-credits are noted in the Fee Schedule under LMM Transaction Fees and Credits.

Volume of TCADV of at least 0.50% by an OTP Holder or OTP Firm affiliated with the ETP Holder.

The Exchange proposes to adopt an alternative requirement to qualify for Tape B Tier 3 credit. As proposed, an ETP Holder could qualify for the Tape B Tier 3 credit of \$0.0025 per share for adding liquidity in Tape B securities if such ETP Holder has Adding ADV of Tape B CADV that is equal to at least 0.15% over the ETP Holder's April 2020 Adding ADV taken as a percentage of Tape B CADV.

The Exchange is not proposing any change to the level of Tape B Tier 3 credits.

The proposed rule change to adopt an alternative requirement to qualify for the existing credit is designed to incentivize ETP Holders to increase liquidity-providing orders in Tape B securities they send to the Exchange, which would support the quality of price discovery on the Exchange and provide additional liquidity for incoming orders.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,¹⁰ in general, and furthers the objectives of Sections 6(b)(4) and (5) of the Act,¹¹ in particular, because it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees, and other charges among its members, issuers and other persons using its facilities and does not unfairly discriminate between customers, issuers, brokers or dealers.

As discussed above, the Exchange operates in a highly fragmented and competitive market. The Commission has repeatedly expressed its preference for competition over regulatory intervention in determining prices, products, and services in the securities markets. Specifically, in Regulation NMS, 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."¹²

The Exchange believes that the ever-shifting market share among the exchanges from month to month demonstrates that market participants can shift order flow, or discontinue or reduce use of certain categories of

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, 37499 (June 29, 2005).

³ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808 (June 9, 2005), 70 FR 37496, 37499 (June 29, 2005) (File No. S7-10-04) (Final Rule) ("Regulation NMS").

⁴ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 61358, 75 FR 3594, 3597 (January 21, 2010) (File No. S7-02-10) (Concept Release on Equity Market Structure).

products, in response to fee changes. With respect to non-marketable orders that provide liquidity on an Exchange, ETP Holders can choose from any one of the 16 currently operating registered exchanges to route such order flow. Accordingly, competitive forces reasonably constrain exchange transaction fees that relate to orders that would provide displayed liquidity on an exchange. Stated otherwise, changes to exchange transaction fees can have a direct effect on the ability of an exchange to compete for order flow.

In particular, the Exchange believes the proposed rule change is reasonable because it provides an additional opportunity for ETP Holders to receive an existing rebate on qualifying orders in a manner that incentivizes order flow on the Exchange's equities platform. The Exchange believes the proposed change to adopt an alternative requirement to qualify for the Tape B Tier 3 pricing tier is reasonable because it provides ETP Holders with an additional way to qualify for the pricing tier's credit by providing liquidity in Tape B securities each month over a predetermined baseline, and which does not include an options component. The Exchange believes that the proposed alternative to qualify for the pricing tier utilizing an equities-only requirement is reasonable because the proposal provides firms that do not have an affiliation with an OTP Holder or OTP Firm the ability to reach the proposed volume tier by sending liquidity providing orders in tape B securities, thereby creating an incentive for ETP Holders to bring increased order flow to a public exchange.

The Exchange believes the proposed change to adopt an alternative method to qualify for existing credits is reasonable as these changes would provide an incentive for ETP Holders to direct their order flow to the Exchange and provide meaningful added levels of liquidity in order to qualify for the existing credit, thereby contributing to depth and market quality on the Exchange.

As noted above, the Exchange operates in a highly competitive environment, particularly for attracting order flow that provides displayed liquidity on an exchange. More specifically, the Exchange notes that greater add volume order flow may provide for deeper, more liquid markets and execution opportunities at improved prices, which the Exchange believes would incentivize liquidity providers to submit additional liquidity and enhance execution opportunities.

The Exchange notes that volume-based incentives and discounts have

been widely adopted by exchanges, including the Exchange, and are reasonable, equitable and not unfairly discriminatory because they are available to all ETP Holders on an equal basis. They also provide additional benefits or discounts that are reasonably related to the value of the Exchange's market quality and associated higher levels of market activity, such as higher levels of liquidity provision and/or growth patterns. Additionally, the Exchange is one of many venues and off-exchange venues to which market participants may direct their order flow, and it represents a small percentage of the overall market. Competing exchanges offer similar tiered pricing structures to that of the Exchange, including schedules of rebates and fees that apply based on members achieving certain volume thresholds.

The Exchange believes its proposal equitably allocates its fees and credits among its market participants.

The Exchange believes that the proposal represents an equitable allocation of fees and credits and is not unfairly discriminatory because it would apply uniformly to all ETP Holders, in that all ETP Holders will be eligible for the existing credit and have the opportunity to meet the tier's criteria and receive the applicable rebate if such criteria is met. The existing rebate would apply automatically and uniformly to all ETP Holders that achieve the corresponding criteria. The proposed change is designed as an incentive to any and all liquidity providers interested in meeting the tier criteria to submit order flow to the Exchange and each will receive the associated rebate if the tier criteria is met. While the Exchange has no way of knowing whether this proposed rule change would definitively result in any particular ETP Holder qualifying for the existing credit by utilizing the proposed alternative requirement, the Exchange anticipates a number of ETP Holders would be able to meet, or will reasonably be able to meet, the proposed criteria. However, without having a view of activity on other markets and off-exchange venues, the Exchange has no way of knowing whether this proposed rule change would result in any ETP Holder meeting the alternative requirement and qualifying for the Tape B Tier 3 rebate. As stated, the proposed alternative requirement to qualify for an existing credit is designed to provide an incentive for ETP Holders to submit additional liquidity in Tape B securities.

The Exchange believes that the proposal is not unfairly discriminatory.

The Exchange believes it is not unfairly discriminatory to provide an

alternative way to qualify for the per share credit under the Tape B Tier 3 pricing tier, as the credit would be provided on an equal basis to all ETP Holders that meet the proposed alternative requirement. Further, the Exchange believes the proposed alternative requirement would incentivize ETP Holders to send their liquidity providing orders in Tape B securities to the Exchange to qualify for the existing rebate.

The Exchange believes that the proposed alternative requirement to qualify for the Tape B Tier 3 credit is not unfairly discriminatory because it would be available to all ETP Holders on an equal and non-discriminatory basis. In this regard, the Exchange notes that ETP Holders that do not meet the proposed alternative requirement would continue to have the opportunity to qualify for the Tape B Tier 3 credit by satisfying the current requirement, which would not change as a result of this proposal.

The Exchange also believes that the proposed rule change is not unfairly discriminatory because it is reasonably related to the value to the Exchange's market quality associated with higher volume. The proposed change to the Tape B Tier 3 pricing tier is designed as an incentive to any and all ETP Holders interested in meeting the tier criteria to submit additional order flow to the Exchange and each will receive the existing rebate if the tier criteria is met. The Exchange also notes that the proposed rule change will not adversely impact any ETP Holder's pricing or its ability to qualify for other tiers. Rather, should an ETP Holder not meet the Tape B Tier 3 pricing tier's criteria, the ETP Holder will merely not receive the corresponding rebate.

In the prevailing competitive environment, ETP Holders are free to disfavor the Exchange's pricing if they believe that alternatives offer them better value. Moreover, this proposed rule change neither targets nor will it have a disparate impact on any particular category of market participant. The Exchange believes that this proposal does not permit unfair discrimination because the changes described in this proposal would be applied uniformly to all similarly situated ETP Holders and all ETP Holders would be subject to the same requirements. Accordingly, no ETP Holder already operating on the Exchange would be disadvantaged by the proposed allocation of fees. The Exchange further believes that the proposed changes would not permit unfair discrimination among ETP Holders because the Tape B Tier 3 credit

would be available equally to all ETP Holders.

Finally, the submission of orders to the Exchange is optional for ETP Holders in that they could choose whether to submit orders to the Exchange and, if they do, the extent of its activity in this regard. The Exchange believes that it is subject to significant competitive forces, as described below in the Exchange's statement regarding the burden on competition.

For the foregoing reasons, the Exchange believes that the proposal is consistent with the Act.

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

In accordance with Section 6(b)(8) of the Act,¹³ the Exchange believes that the proposed rule change would not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. Instead, as discussed above, the Exchange believes that the proposed changes would encourage the submission of additional liquidity to a public exchange, thereby promoting market depth, price discovery and transparency and enhancing order execution opportunities for ETP Holders. As a result, the Exchange believes that the proposed change furthers the Commission's goal in adopting Regulation NMS of fostering integrated competition among orders, which promotes "more efficient pricing of individual stocks for all types of orders, large and small."¹⁴

Intramarket Competition. The Exchange believes the proposed amendment to its Fee Schedule would not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The Exchange does not believe that the proposed change represents a significant departure from previous pricing offered by the Exchange or its competitors. The proposed change is designed to attract additional order flow to the Exchange, in particular with respect to Tape B securities. The Exchange believes that the proposed adoption of an alternative requirement to qualify for an established credit under the Tape B Tier 3 pricing tier would incentivize market participants to direct liquidity adding order flow to the Exchange, bringing with it additional execution opportunities for market participants and improved price transparency. Greater overall order flow, trading

opportunities, and pricing transparency benefits all market participants on the Exchange by enhancing market quality and continuing to encourage ETP Holders to send orders to the Exchange, thereby contributing towards a robust and well-balanced market ecosystem.

Intermarket Competition. The Exchange operates in a highly competitive market in which market participants can readily choose to send their orders to other exchange and off-exchange venues if they deem fee levels at those other venues to be more favorable. As noted above, the Exchange's market share of intraday trading (*i.e.*, excluding auctions) is currently less than 12%. In such an environment, the Exchange must continually adjust its fees and rebates to remain competitive with other exchanges and with off-exchange venues. Because competitors are free to modify their own fees and credits in response, and because market participants may readily adjust their order routing practices, the Exchange does not believe its proposed fee change can impose any burden on intermarket competition.

The Exchange believes that the proposed change could promote competition between the Exchange and other execution venues, including those that currently offer similar order types and comparable transaction pricing, by encouraging additional orders to be sent to the Exchange for execution.

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 foregoing rule change is effective upon filing pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)¹⁵ of the Act and subparagraph (f)(2) of Rule 19b-4¹⁶ thereunder, because it establishes a due, fee, or other charge imposed by the Exchange.

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)¹⁷ 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-NYSEArca-2021-109 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-NYSEArca-2021-109. 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 offices 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

¹³ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(8).

¹⁴ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808, 70 FR 37495, 37498-99 (June 29, 2005) (S7-10-04) (Final Rule).

¹⁵ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

¹⁶ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(2).

¹⁷ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)(B).

submissions should refer to File Number SR–NYSEArca–2021–109, and should be submitted on or before February 9, 2022.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.¹⁸

J. Matthew DeLesDernier,
Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2022–00873 Filed 1–18–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–93967; File No. SR–EMERALD–2021–45]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; MIAX Emerald, LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change To Amend Its Fee Schedule

January 12, 2022.

Pursuant to the provisions of 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 30, 2021, MIAX Emerald, LLC (“MIAX Emerald” or “Exchange”), filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) a 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 is filing a proposal to amend the MIAX Emerald Fee Schedule (the “Fee Schedule”).

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange’s website at <http://www.miaxoptions.com/rule-filings/emerald>, at MIAX’s principal office, 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 proposes to amend Section 1(a)(i) of the Fee Schedule to: (i) Decrease Simple Maker (as defined below) rebates in certain Tiers for options transactions in Penny classes (as defined below) for the Market Maker Origin ³; and (ii) make several non-substantive formatting changes to the Exchange Rebates/Fees tables in Section 1(a)(i) of the Fee Schedule.

Background

The Exchange currently assesses transaction rebates and fees to all market participants, which are based upon a threshold tier structure (“Tier”). Tiers are determined on a monthly basis and are based on three alternative calculation methods, as defined in Section 1(a)(ii) of the Fee Schedule. The calculation method that results in the highest Tier achieved by the Member ⁴ shall apply to all Origin types by the Member, except the Priority Customer ⁵ Origin type (calculation of Tiers discussed below). The monthly volume thresholds for each method, associated with each Tier, are calculated as the total monthly volume executed by the Member in all options classes on MIAX Emerald in the relevant Origins and/or applicable liquidity, not including Excluded Contracts, ⁶ (as the numerator) expressed as a percentage of (divided by) Customer Total Consolidated Volume (“CTCV”) (as the denominator). CTCV is calculated as the total national volume cleared at The Options Clearing Corporation (“OCC”) in the Customer range in those classes listed on MIAX

³ The term “Market Maker” refers to “Lead Market Maker” (“LMM”), “Primary Lead Market Maker” (“PLMM”) and “Registered Market Maker” (“RMM”), collectively. See the Definitions Section of the Fee Schedule and Exchange Rule 100.

⁴ “Member” means an individual or organization approved to exercise the trading rights associated with a Trading Permit. Members are deemed “members” under the Exchange Act. See the Definitions Section of the Fee Schedule and Exchange Rule 100.

⁵ “Priority Customer” means a person or entity that (i) is not a broker or dealer in securities, and (ii) does not place more than 390 orders in listed options per day on average during a calendar month for its own beneficial account(s). See Exchange Rule 100, including Interpretation and Policy .01.

⁶ “Excluded Contracts” means any contracts routed to an away market for execution. See the Definitions Section of the Fee Schedule.

Emerald for the month for which fees apply, excluding volume cleared at the OCC in the Customer range executed during the period of time in which the Exchange experiences an “Exchange System Disruption” ⁷ (solely in the option classes of the affected Matching Engine).⁸ In addition, the per contract transaction rebates and fees shall be applied retroactively to all eligible volume once the Tier has been reached by the Member. Members that place resting liquidity, *i.e.*, orders on the MIAX Emerald System, will be assessed the specified “maker” rebate or fee (each a “Maker”) and Members that execute against resting liquidity will be assessed the specified “taker” fee or rebate (each a “Taker”).⁹ Members are also assessed lower transaction fees and smaller rebates for order executions in standard option classes in the Penny Interval Program ¹⁰ (“Penny classes”) than for order executions in standard option classes which are not in the Penny Program (“non-Penny classes”), for which Members will be assessed a higher transaction fees and larger rebates.

For the Priority Customer Origin type, the Tier applied for a Member and its Affiliates ¹¹ is solely determined by

⁷ The term “Exchange System Disruption” means an outage of a Matching Engine or collective Matching Engines for a period of two consecutive hour or more, during trading hours. See the Definitions Section of the Fee Schedule.

⁸ A “Matching Engine” is a part of the MIAX Emerald electronic system that processes options orders and trades on a symbol-by-symbol basis. See the Definitions Section of the Fee Schedule.

⁹ For a Priority Customer complex order taking liquidity in both a Penny class and non-Penny class against Origins other than Priority Customer, the Priority Customer order will receive a rebate based on the Tier achieved.

¹⁰ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 88993 (June 2, 2020), 85 FR 35145 (June 8, 2020) (SR–EMERALD–2020–05) (Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change To Amend Exchange Rule 510, Minimum Price Variations and Minimum Trading Increments, To Conform the Rule to Section 3.1 of the Plan for the Purpose of Developing and Implementing Procedures Designed To Facilitate the Listing and Trading of Standardized Options) (the “Penny Program”).

¹¹ “Affiliate” means (i) an affiliate of a Member of at least 75% common ownership between the firms as reflected on each firm’s Form BD, Schedule A, or (ii) the Appointed Market Maker of an Appointed EEM (or, conversely, the Appointed EEM of an Appointed Market Maker). An “Appointed Market Maker” is a MIAX Emerald Market Maker (who does not otherwise have a corporate affiliation based upon common ownership with an EEM) that has been appointed by an EEM and an “Appointed EEM” is an EEM (who does not otherwise have a corporate affiliation based upon common ownership with a MIAX Emerald Market Maker) that has been appointed by a MIAX Emerald Market Maker, pursuant to the following process. A MIAX Emerald Market Maker appoints an EEM and an EEM appoints a MIAX Emerald Market Maker, for the purposes of the Fee Schedule, by each completing and sending an

¹⁸ 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b–4.