

and would support the identified need for greater regional Tribal resources.

- i. How would you see a tribal arts council benefiting your community?
- ii. What regional needs would apply to tribal arts councils?
- iii. Would a government point of contact specific to arts grants be beneficial?
- iv. What support would Tribal Arts Councils require from NEA?
- v. Do you currently work with your State and/or Local Arts Agency?

Dated: August 24, 2023.

**RaShaunda Thomas,**

*Deputy Director, Office of Administrative Services & Contracts, National Endowment for the Arts.*

[FR Doc. 2023–19550 Filed 9–18–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537–01–P

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. MC2023–265 and CP2023–268; MC2023–267 and CP2023–270; MC2023–268 and CP2023–271]

### New Postal Products

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.  
**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is noticing a recent Postal Service filing for the Commission’s consideration concerning a negotiated service agreement. This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* September 21, 2023.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission’s Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Docketed Proceeding(s)

### I. Introduction

The Commission gives notice that the Postal Service filed request(s) for the Commission to consider matters related to negotiated service agreement(s). The request(s) may propose the addition or removal of a negotiated service agreement from the Market Dominant or the Competitive product list, or the

modification of an existing product currently appearing on the Market Dominant or the Competitive product list.

Section II identifies the docket number(s) associated with each Postal Service request, the title of each Postal Service request, the request’s acceptance date, and the authority cited by the Postal Service for each request. For each request, the Commission appoints an officer of the Commission to represent the interests of the general public in the proceeding, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505 (Public Representative). Section II also establishes comment deadline(s) pertaining to each request.

The public portions of the Postal Service’s request(s) can be accessed via the Commission’s website (<http://www.prc.gov>). Non-public portions of the Postal Service’s request(s), if any, can be accessed through compliance with the requirements of 39 CFR 3011.301.<sup>1</sup>

The Commission invites comments on whether the Postal Service’s request(s) in the captioned docket(s) are consistent with the policies of title 39. For request(s) that the Postal Service states concern Market Dominant product(s), applicable statutory and regulatory requirements include 39 U.S.C. 3622, 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR part 3030, and 39 CFR part 3040, subpart B. For request(s) that the Postal Service states concern Competitive product(s), applicable statutory and regulatory requirements include 39 U.S.C. 3632, 39 U.S.C. 3633, 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR part 3035, and 39 CFR part 3040, subpart B. Comment deadline(s) for each request appear in section II.

### II. Docketed Proceeding(s)

1. *Docket No(s).*: MC2023–265 and CP2023–268; *Filing Title:* USPS Request to Add Priority Mail Express International, Priority Mail International & First-Class Package International Service Contract 27 to Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing Materials Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* September 13, 2023; *Filing Authority:* 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR 3040.130 through 3040.135, and 39 CFR 3035.105; *Public Representative:* Jennaca D. Upperman; *Comments Due:* September 21, 2023.

2. *Docket No(s).*: MC2023–267 and CP2023–270; *Filing Title:* USPS Request to Add Priority Mail Express, Priority Mail & USPS Ground Advantage Contract 8 to Competitive Product List

<sup>1</sup> See Docket No. RM2018–3, Order Adopting Final Rules Relating to Non-Public Information, June 27, 2018, Attachment A at 19–22 (Order No. 4679).

and Notice of Filing Materials Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* September 13, 2023; *Filing Authority:* 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR 3040.130 through 3040.135, and 39 CFR 3035.105; *Public Representative:* Kenneth R. Moeller; *Comments Due:* September 21, 2023.

3. *Docket No(s).*: MC2023–268 and CP2023–271; *Filing Title:* USPS Request to Add USPS Ground Advantage Contract 3 to Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing Materials Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* September 13, 2023; *Filing Authority:* 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR 3040.130 through 3040.135, and 39 CFR 3035.105; *Public Representative:* Kenneth R. Moeller; *Comments Due:* September 21, 2023.

This Notice will be published in the **Federal Register**.

**Erica A. Barker,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2023–20263 Filed 9–18–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–98375; File No. SR–BX–2023–022]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; Nasdaq BX, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend Equity 7, Section 118(e)

September 13, 2023.

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”)<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> notice is hereby given that, on September 1, 2023, Nasdaq BX, Inc. (“BX” or “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 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

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

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 the 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<sup>3</sup> and Retail Price Improvement Orders<sup>4</sup> under Rule 4780 (Retail Price Improvement Program).

The purpose of the proposed rule change is to amend the Exchange's schedule of fees at Equity 7, Section 118(e). Specifically, the Exchange proposes to amend the qualifying criteria for an existing fee for RPI Orders that provide liquidity.

Currently, the Exchange charges a \$0.0018 per share executed fee for RPI Orders entered by a member that (i) quotes RPI Orders in at least 1,200 symbols on average per day and (ii) provides liquidity through RPI Orders

<sup>3</sup> 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).

<sup>4</sup> 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).

equal to or exceeding an average daily volume of 2,500,000 shares. The Exchange proposes to amend the qualifying criteria for the \$0.0018 fee by eliminating the requirement to quote RPI Orders in at least 1,200 symbols on average per day. Thus, a member could qualify for the \$0.0018 per share executed fee for RPI Orders if the member provides liquidity through RPI Orders equal to or exceeding an average daily volume of 2,500,000 shares.

The Exchange hopes that the less strict qualifying criteria (*i.e.*, removing the requirement to quote RPI Orders in at least 1,200 symbols on average per day) will encourage members to increase liquidity providing 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.

#### 2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with section 6(b) of the Act,<sup>5</sup> in general, and furthers the objectives of sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act,<sup>6</sup> 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 Exchange's proposed change to its schedule of fees 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'. . . ."<sup>7</sup>

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."<sup>8</sup>

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. 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.

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. As such, the proposal represents a reasonable attempt by the Exchange to increase its liquidity and market share relative to its competitors.

The Exchange believes it is reasonable and equitable to amend the qualifying criteria for the \$0.0018 per share executed fee for RPI Orders by eliminating the requirement to quote RPI Orders in at least 1,200 symbols on average per day. As discussed above, the Exchange's goal is to increase liquidity adding activity in RPI Orders on its platform. It is reasonable and equitable to address this need by easing the qualification requirements as an incentive for members 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.

<sup>7</sup> *NetCoalition v. SEC*, 615 F.3d 525, 539 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (quoting Securities Exchange Act Release No. 59039 (December 2, 2008), 73 FR 74770, 74782-83 (December 9, 2008) (SR-NYSEArca-2006-21)).

<sup>8</sup> Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808 (June 9, 2005), 70 FR 37496, 37499 (June 29, 2005) ("Regulation NMS Adopting Release").

<sup>5</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

<sup>6</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4) and (5).

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 Exchange to all existing and prospective retail participants.

Any participant that is dissatisfied with the proposal is free to shift their order flow to competing venues that provide more generous pricing or less stringent qualifying criteria.

#### *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. The proposal eases the qualification requirements for the \$0.0018 per share executed fee for RPI Orders. Members may modify their businesses so that they can meet the required threshold and pay lower charges. As noted above, all members of the Exchange will benefit from any increase in market activity that the proposal effectuates. 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.

#### *Intermarket Competition*

The Exchange believes that its proposed modification to its schedule of fees will not impose a burden on competition because the Exchange's execution services are completely voluntary and subject to extensive competition both 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 change 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 20% 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 comprises more than 40% of industry volume.

In sum, the Exchange intends for the proposed change to its fees to increase member incentives to engage in the addition of liquidity on the Exchange. If the change 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 change 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.<sup>9</sup>

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 (<https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml>); or
- Send an email to [rule-comments@sec.gov](mailto:rule-comments@sec.gov). Please include file number SR-BX-2023-022 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-2023-022. 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 (<https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml>). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements

<sup>9</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

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 a.m. and 3 p.m. Copies of the filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. Do not include personal identifiable information in submissions; you should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. We may redact in part or withhold entirely from publication submitted material that is obscene or subject to copyright protection. All submissions should refer to file number SR-BX-2023-022 and should be submitted on or before October 10, 2023.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>10</sup>

**Sherry R. Haywood,**

*Assistant Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2023-20167 Filed 9-18-23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-98378; File No. SR-BX-2023-023]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; Nasdaq BX, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend Equity 4, Rules 4702 and 4703

September 13, 2023.

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Act"),<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> notice is hereby given that on September 5, 2023, Nasdaq BX, Inc. ("BX" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared 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 Equity 4, Rules 4702 and 4703.

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 proposes amendments to its Rules to address inconsistencies between the Rule Text and observed System behavior as well as behavior unaccounted for in the existing Rule text, as follows. This proposal is similar to a rule change filed by the Exchange's sister exchange, the Nasdaq Stock Market, LLC on August 16, 2023.<sup>3</sup>

###### First Rule Change

The first proposed rule change addresses an edge case of inconsistency between the Rule text and System behavior, this time regarding Market Maker Peg Orders.<sup>4</sup> Rule 4702(b)(7)(A)

<sup>3</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34-98225 (August 16, 2023), 88 FR 60255 (August 31, 2023) (SR-NASDAQ-2023-030). The Exchange's proposal differs from that of Nasdaq in that it excludes changes to Order Types and Attributes that are inapplicable to the Exchange due to its absence of opening and closing crosses.

<sup>4</sup> Pursuant to Rule 4702(b)(7)(A), a "Market Maker Peg Order" is an Order Type designed to allow a Market Maker to maintain a continuous two-sided quotation at a displayed price that is compliant with the quotation requirements for Market Makers set forth in Equity 2, Section 5(a)(2). The displayed price of the Market Maker Peg Order is set with reference to a "Reference Price" in order to keep the displayed price of the Market Maker Peg Order within a bounded price range. The Reference Price for a Market Maker Peg Order to buy (sell) is the then-current National Best Bid (National Best Offer), or if no such National Best Bid or National Best Offer, the most recent reported last-sale eligible

states that, if after entry of a Market Maker Peg Order that has a displayed price based on the NBBO, and the NBBO subsequently shifts such that the displayed price of the Market Maker Peg Order to buy (sell) is equal to or greater (less) than the National Best Bid (or National Best Offer), the Market Maker Peg Order will not be subsequently repriced until a new reference price is established that is more aggressive than the displayed price of the Market Maker Peg Order. System testing revealed that the System does not reprice Market Maker Peg Orders in this scenario, but only if such Orders are in round lot sizes, whereas it does reprice such Orders when they are in odd lot sizes. After evaluation, the Exchange determined to maintain this System behavior and amend the Rule to conform to it. The Exchange proposes to do so because the existing language proscribing repricing only makes sense within the context of round lot Market Maker Peg Orders, which this scenario would set a new NBBO and when they do so, cannot reprice with respect to the reference price they just set. By contrast, odd lot Market Maker Peg Orders are ineligible to set the NBBO, and do not have this same problem. Accordingly, the Exchange proposes to amend Rule 4702(b)(7)(A) to clarify that the prohibition against repricing only applies to Market Maker Peg Orders in round lot sizes.

###### Second Rule Change

The second proposal would amend Equity 4, Rule 4703(h), to correct its description of behavior of the Non-Displayed portion of Orders with the Reserve Attribute.<sup>5</sup> Rule 4703(h) provides as follows, in pertinent part:

In all cases, if the remaining size of the Non-Displayed Order is less than the fixed or random amount stipulated by the Participant, the full remaining size of the Non-Displayed

trade from the responsible single plan processor for that day, or if none, the previous closing price of the security as adjusted to reflect any corporate actions (e.g., dividends or stock splits) in the security.

<sup>5</sup> "Reserve Size" is, in part, an Order Attribute that "permits a Participant to stipulate that an Order Type that is displayed may have its displayed size replenished from additional non-displayed size." Rule 4703(h). The Rule also states that Reserve "is not available for Orders that are not displayed; provided, however, that if a Participant enters Reserve Size for a Non-Displayed Order with a Time-in-Force of IOC, the full size of the Order, including Reserve Size, will be processed as a Non-Displayed Order." *Id.* In addition to the change proposed above, the Exchange proposes to eliminate from the immediately preceding language "with a Time-in-Force of IOC" because the Exchange does not assess a reason to include this qualifier. The statement that a Non-Displayed Order with Reserve will be entirely non-displayed is true even as to Non-Displayed Orders with other TIFs.

<sup>10</sup> 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.