

associated with the information collection requirements.

The estimate of average burden hours is made solely for purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act and is not derived from a comprehensive or even a representative survey or study of the cost of Commission rules. The collection of information required by rule 2a–5 is necessary to obtain the benefits of the rule. Other information provided to the Commission in connection with staff examinations or investigations is kept confidential subject to the provisions of applicable law. If information collected pursuant to rule 2a–5 is reviewed by the Commission’s examination staff, it is accorded the same level of confidentiality accorded to other responses provided to the Commission in the context of its examination and oversight program. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number.

The public may view background documentation for this information collection at the following website: [www.reginfo.gov](http://www.reginfo.gov). Find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice by January 22, 2024 to (i) [MBX.OMB.OIRA.SEC\\_desk\\_officer@omb.eop.gov](mailto:MBX.OMB.OIRA.SEC_desk_officer@omb.eop.gov) and (ii) David Bottom, Director/Chief Information Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, c/o John Pezzullo, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549, or by sending an email to: [PRA\\_Mailbox@sec.gov](mailto:PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov).

Dated: December 18, 2023.

**Sherry R. Haywood,**

*Assistant Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2023–28115 Filed 12–20–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[SEC File No. 270–418, OMB Control No. 3235–0485]

**Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Extension: Rule 15c2–1**

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

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (“PRA”) (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) a request for approval of extension of the previously approved collection of information provided for in Rule 15c2–1, (17 CFR 240.15c2–1), under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a *et seq.*).

Rule 15c2–1 prohibits broker-dealers from commingling under the same lien securities of their margin customers with securities of the broker-dealer and those of other customers without their written consent. The rule also prohibits the re-hypothecation of customers’ margin securities for a sum in excess of the customer’s aggregate indebtedness. Respondents must collect information necessary to prevent the re-hypothecation of customer securities, issue and retain copies of notices of hypothecation of customer securities, and collect written consents from customers.

There are approximately 59 respondents. Each of these respondents makes an estimated 45 responses per year and each response takes approximately 0.5 hours to complete, resulting in an industry-wide annual burden of approximately 1,327 hours.

The retention period for the recordkeeping requirement under Rule 15c2–1 is not less than two years following the date the notice is submitted. The recordkeeping requirement under this rule is mandatory to assist the Commission in monitoring respondents who fail to collect the information required under the rule. This rule does not involve the collection of confidential information.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information under the PRA unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The public may view background documentation for this information collection at the following website: [www.reginfo.gov](http://www.reginfo.gov). Find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent by January 22, 2024 to

(i) [www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain](http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain) and (ii) David Bottom, Director/Chief Information Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, c/o John Pezzullo, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549, or by sending an email to: [PRA\\_Mailbox@sec.gov](mailto:PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov).

Dated: December 18, 2023.

**Sherry R. Haywood,**

*Assistant Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2023–28114 Filed 12–20–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–99189; File No. SR–MRX–2023–25]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; Nasdaq MRX, LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend Options 7, Section 6

December 15, 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 December 5, 2023, Nasdaq MRX, LLC (“MRX” or “Exchange”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC” or “Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

#### I. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange proposes to amend its Rules at Options 7, Section 6, Ports and Other Services.<sup>3</sup>

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange’s website at <https://listingcenter.nasdaq.com/rulebook/mrx/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.

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

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

<sup>3</sup> The Exchange initially filed the proposed pricing changes on November 28, 2023 (SR–MRX–2023–23). On December 5, 2023, the Exchange withdrew that filing and submitted this filing.

*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 Options 7, Section 6, Ports and Other Services. Specifically, the Exchange proposes to amend the monthly caps for SQF Ports<sup>4</sup> and SQF Purge Ports.<sup>5</sup> The Exchange also proposes to remove unnecessary rule text from Options 7, Section 6 related to a technology migration. Both changes are explained below.

Today, MRX assesses \$1,250 per port, per month for an SQF Port as well as an SQF Purge Port. Today, MRX waives one SQF Port fee per Market Maker per month. Also, today, SQF Ports and SQF Purge Ports are subject to a monthly cap of \$17,500, which cap is applicable to Market Makers.

At this time, the Exchange proposes to increase the SQF Port and SQF Purge Port monthly cap fee of \$17,500 per month to \$27,500 per month. The Exchange is not amending the \$1,250 per port, per month SQF Port and SQF Purge Port fees and the Exchange would continue to waive one SQF Port fee per Market Maker per month. As is the case

<sup>4</sup> "Specialized Quote Feed" or "SQF" is an interface that allows Market Makers to connect, send, and receive messages related to quotes, Immediate-or-Cancel Orders, and auction responses to the Exchange. Features include the following: (1) options symbol directory messages (e.g., underlying and complex instruments); (2) system event messages (e.g., start of trading hours messages and start of opening); (3) trading action messages (e.g., halts and resumes); (4) execution messages; (5) quote messages; (6) Immediate-or-Cancel Order messages; (7) risk protection triggers and purge notifications; (8) opening imbalance messages; (9) auction notifications; and (10) auction responses. The SQF Purge Interface only receives and notifies of purge requests from the Market Maker. Market Makers may only enter interest into SQF in their assigned options series. Immediate-or-Cancel Orders entered into SQF are not subject to the (i) Order Price Protection, Market Order Spread Protection, and Size Limitation Protection in Options 3, Section 15(a)(1)(A), (1)(B), and (2)(B) respectively, for single leg orders, or (ii) Complex Order Price Protection as defined in Options 3, Section 16(c)(1) for Complex Orders. See Supplementary Material .03(c) to Options 3, Section 7.

<sup>5</sup> SQF Purge is a specific port for the SQF interface that only receives and notifies of purge requests from the Market Maker. Dedicated SQF Purge Ports enable Market Makers to seamlessly manage their ability to remove their quotes in a swift manner. The SQF Purge Port is designed to assist Market Makers in the management of, and risk control over, their quotes. Market Makers may utilize a purge port to reduce uncertainty and to manage risk by purging all quotes in their assigned options series. Of note, Market Makers may only enter interest into SQF in their assigned options series. Additionally, the SQF Purge Port may be utilized by a Market Maker in the event that the Member has a system issue and determines to purge its quotes from the order book.

today, the Exchange would not assess a Member an SQF Port or SQF Purge Port fee beyond the monthly cap once the Member has exceeded the monthly cap for the respective month. Despite increasing the monthly cap for SQF Ports and SQF Purge Ports from \$17,500 per month to \$27,500 per month, the Exchange will continue to offer Members the opportunity to cap their SQF Port and SQF Purge Port fees so that they would not be assessed these fees beyond the cap. Further, an MRX Market Maker requires only one SQF Port to submit quotes in its assigned options series into MRX. An MRX Market Maker may submit all quotes through one SQF Port and utilize one SQF Purge Port to view its purge requests. While a Market Maker may elect to obtain multiple SQF Ports and SQF Purge Ports to organize its business,<sup>6</sup> only one SQF Port and SQF Purge Port is necessary for a Market Maker to fulfill its regulatory quoting obligations.<sup>7</sup>

The Exchange proposes to remove the italicized language in Options 7, Section 6 related to a technology migration that took place in 2022. In 2022, MRX filed a pricing change<sup>8</sup> to permit Members to request certain duplicative ports at no additional cost, from November 1, 2022 through December 30, 2022, to facilitate a technology migration. The rule text related to the 2022 technology migration is no longer necessary because the migration is complete and the pricing is no longer applicable. At this time, the Exchange proposes to remove this rule text.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,<sup>9</sup> in general, and furthers the objectives of Sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act,<sup>10</sup> in particular, in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees, and other charges

<sup>6</sup> For example, a Market Maker may desire to utilize multiple SQF Ports for accounting purposes, to measure performance, for regulatory reasons or other determinations that are specific to that Member.

<sup>7</sup> MRX Market Makers have various regulatory requirements as provided for in Options 2, Section 4. Additionally, MRX Market Makers have certain quoting requirements with respect to their assigned options series as provided in Options 2, Section 5. SQF Ports are the only quoting protocol available on MRX and only Market Makers may utilize SQF Ports. The same is true for SQF Purge Ports.

<sup>8</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 96120 (October 21, 2022), 87 FR 65105 (October 27, 2022) (SR-MRX-2022-21) (Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend Options 7 in Connection With a Technology Migration).

<sup>9</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

<sup>10</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4) and (5).

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 proposed pricing change to increase the monthly cap applicable to SQF Ports and SQF Purge Ports is reasonable in several respects. As a threshold matter, the Exchange is subject to significant competitive forces in the market for options 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>11</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>12</sup>

Numerous indicia demonstrate the competitive nature of this market. 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.

The proposed pricing change to increase the SQF Port and SQF Purge Port monthly cap from \$17,500 per month to \$27,500 per month is reasonable because despite the increase in the monthly cap, the Exchange will

<sup>11</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>12</sup> Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808 (June 9, 2005), 70 FR 37496, 37499 (June 29, 2005) ("Regulation NMS Adopting Release").

continue to offer Members the opportunity to cap their SQF Port and SQF Purge Port fees so that they would not be assessed these fees beyond the cap. Additionally, an MRX Market Maker requires only one SQF Port to submit quotes in its assigned options series into MRX. An MRX Market Maker may submit all quotes through one SQF Port and utilize one SQF Purge Port to view its purge requests. While a Market Maker may elect to obtain multiple SQF Ports and SQF Purge Ports to organize its business,<sup>13</sup> only one SQF Port and SQF Purge Port is necessary for a Market Maker to fulfill its regulatory quoting obligations.<sup>14</sup>

The Exchange's proposed pricing change to increase the SQF Port and SQF Purge Port monthly cap from \$17,500 per month to \$27,500 per month is equitable and not unfairly discriminatory because the Exchange would uniformly not assess any Market Makers that exceeded the proposed monthly cap any SQF Port and SQF Purge Port fees for that month beyond the cap. Market Makers are the only market participants that are assessed SQF Port and SQF Purge Port fees because they are the only market participants that are permitted to quote on the Exchange.

The Exchange's proposal to remove the italicized language in Options 7, Section 6 related to a technology migration that took place in 2022 is reasonable, equitable and not unfairly discriminatory because the rule text related to the technology migration is no longer necessary because the migration is complete and the fees are no longer applicable. No Member is subject to the pricing described for the 2022 technology migration.

#### *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.

#### *Intermarket Competition*

The proposal does not impose an undue burden on intermarket

<sup>13</sup> For example, a Market Maker may desire to utilize multiple SQF Ports for accounting purposes, to measure performance, for regulatory reasons or other determinations that are specific to that Member.

<sup>14</sup> MRX Market Makers have various regulatory requirements as provided for in Options 2, Section 4. Additionally, MRX Market Makers have certain quoting requirements with respect to their assigned options series as provided in Options 2, Section 5. SQF Ports are the only quoting protocol available on MRX and only Market Makers may utilize SQF Ports.

competition. The Exchange believes its proposal remains competitive with other options markets who also offer order entry protocols. 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. In such an environment, the Exchange must continually adjust its fees to remain competitive with other 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.

#### *Intramarket Competition*

The Exchange's proposed pricing change to increase the SQF Port and SQF Purge Port monthly cap from \$17,500 per month to \$27,500 per month does not impose an undue burden on competition because the Exchange would uniformly not assess any Market Makers that exceeded the proposed monthly cap any SQF Port and SQF Purge Port fees for that month beyond the cap. Market Makers are the only market participants that are assessed SQF Port and SQF Purge Port fees because they are the only market participants that are permitted to quote on the Exchange. The Exchange's proposal to remove the italicized language in Options 7, Section 6 related to a technology migration that took place in 2022 does not impose an undue burden on competition because the rule text related to the technology migration is no longer necessary because the migration is complete and the fees are no longer applicable. No Member is subject to the pricing described for the 2022 technology migration.

#### *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>15</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-MRX-2023-25 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-MRX-2023-25. 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 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

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

submissions should refer to file number SR–MRX–2023–25 and should be submitted on or before January 11, 2024.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>16</sup>

**Sherry R. Haywood,**

*Assistant Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2023–28040 Filed 12–20–23; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011–01–P**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[SEC File No. 270–208, OMB Control No. 3235–0213]

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Extension: Rule 17g–1

*Upon Written Request, Copies Available*

From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of FOIA Services, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–2736

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”) has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a request for extension of the previously approved collection of information discussed below.

Rule 17g–1 (17 CFR 270.17g–1) under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the “Act”) (15 U.S.C. 80a–17(g)) governs the fidelity bonding of officers and employees of registered management investment companies (“funds”) and their advisers. Rule 17g–1 requires, in part, the following:

#### Independent Directors’ Approval

The form and amount of the fidelity bond must be approved by a majority of the fund’s independent directors at least once annually, and the amount of any premium paid by the fund for any “joint insured bond,” covering multiple funds or certain affiliates, must be approved by a majority of the fund’s independent directors.

#### Terms and Provisions of the Bond

The amount of the bond may not be less than the minimum amounts of coverage set forth in a schedule based on the fund’s gross assets. The bond must provide that it shall not be cancelled, terminated, or modified except upon 60-days written notice to the affected party and to the Commission. In the case of a joint insured bond, 60-days written notice must also be given to each fund covered

by the bond. A joint insured bond must provide that the fidelity insurance company will provide all funds covered by the bond with a copy of the agreement, a copy of any claim on the bond, and notification of the terms of the settlement of any claim prior to execution of that settlement. Finally, a fund that is insured by a joint bond must enter into an agreement with all other parties insured by the joint bond regarding recovery under the bond.

#### Filings With the Commission

Upon the execution of a fidelity bond or any amendment thereto, a fund must file with the Commission within 10 days: (i) a copy of the executed bond or any amendment to the bond, (ii) the independent directors’ resolution approving the bond, and (iii) a statement as to the period for which premiums have been paid on the bond. In the case of a joint insured bond, a fund must also file: (i) a statement showing the amount the fund would have been required to maintain under the rule if it were insured under a single insured bond; and (ii) the agreement between the fund and all other insured parties regarding recovery under the bond. A fund must also notify the Commission in writing within five days of any claim or settlement on a claim under the fidelity bond.

#### Notices to Directors

A fund must notify by registered mail each member of its board of directors of: (i) any cancellation, termination, or modification of the fidelity bond at least 45 days prior to the effective date; and (ii) the filing or settlement of any claim under the fidelity bond when notification is filed with the Commission.

Rule 17g–1’s independent directors’ annual review requirements, fidelity bond content requirements, joint bond agreement requirement, and the required notices to directors are designed to ensure the safety of fund assets against losses due to the conduct of persons who may obtain access to those assets. These requirements also seek to facilitate oversight of a fund’s fidelity bond. The rule’s required filings with the Commission are designed to assist the Commission in monitoring funds’ compliance with the fidelity bond requirements.

Based on conversations with representatives in the fund industry, the Commission staff calculates that for each of the estimated 2,543 active funds (respondents),<sup>1</sup> the average annual

paperwork burden associated with rule 17g–1’s requirements is two hours, one hour each for a compliance attorney and the board of directors as a whole. The time spent by a compliance attorney includes time spent filing reports with the Commission for fidelity losses (if any) as well as paperwork associated with any notices to directors, and managing any updates to the bond and the joint agreement (if one exists). The time spent by the board of directors as a whole includes any time spent initially establishing the bond, as well as time spent on annual updates and approvals. The Commission staff therefore estimates the total ongoing paperwork burden hours per year for all funds required by rule 17g–1 to be 5,086 hours (2,543 funds × 2 hours = 5,086 hours). Commission staff continues to estimate that the filing and reporting requirements of rule 17g–1 do not entail any external cost burdens.

These estimates of average burden hours are made solely for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act. These estimates are not derived from a comprehensive or even a representative survey or study of Commission rules. The collection of information required by Rule 17g–1 is mandatory and will not be kept confidential. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number.

The public may view background documentation for this information collection at the following website: [www.reginfo.gov](http://www.reginfo.gov). Find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice by January 22, 2024 to (i) [MBX.OMB.OIRA.SEC\\_desk\\_officer@omb.eop.gov](mailto:MBX.OMB.OIRA.SEC_desk_officer@omb.eop.gov) and (ii) David Bottom, Director/Chief Information Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, c/o John Pezzullo, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549, or by sending an email to: [PRA\\_Mailbox@sec.gov](mailto:PRA_Mailbox@sec.gov).

Dated: December 18, 2023.

**Sherry R. Haywood,**

*Assistant Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2023–28119 Filed 12–20–23; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011–01–P**

Commission staff calculates there are 2,186 funds (registered open- and closed-end funds, and business development companies) that must comply with the collections of information under rule 17g–1, and which collectively submit an estimated 2,543 filings on Form 17G annually.

<sup>16</sup> 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

<sup>1</sup> Based on a review of fund filings for the three-year period from January 1, 2020 to December 2022,