

(“Commission”) is soliciting comments on the existing collection of information provided for in Rule 301 of Regulation ATS (17 CFR 242.301) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a *et seq.*). The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) for extension and approval.

Regulation ATS provides a regulatory structure for alternative trading systems. Rule 301 of Regulation ATS contains certain record keeping and reporting requirements, as well as additional obligations that apply only to alternative trading systems with significant volume. The Rule requires all alternative trading systems that wish to comply with Regulation ATS to file an initial operation report on Form ATS. Alternative trading systems are also required to supply updates on Form ATS to the Commission describing material changes to the system, file quarterly transaction reports on Form ATS-R, and file cessation of operations reports on Form ATS. An alternative trading system with significant volume is required to comply with requirements for fair access and systems capacity, integrity, and security.

The Commission staff estimates that entities subject to the requirements of Rule 301 will spend a total of approximately 2,983 hours a year to comply with the Rule.

Regulation ATS requires ATSS to preserve any records, for at least three years, made in the process of complying with the system’s capacity, integrity and security requirements.

Written comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission’s estimates of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to

comments and suggestions submitted by November 8, 2024.

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.

Please direct your written comments to: Austin Gerig, Director/Chief Data Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, c/o Oluwaseun Ajayi, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549, or send an email to: *PRA\_Mailbox@sec.gov*.

Dated: September 3, 2024.

**Vanessa A. Countryman,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2024–20199 Filed 9–6–24; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011–01–P**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–100901; File No. SR–SAPPHIRE–2024–26]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; MIA X Sapphire, LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change To Establish Fees for Purge Ports

September 3, 2024.

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 August 21, 2024, MIA X Sapphire, LLC (“MIA X Sapphire” 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 MIA X Sapphire Fee Schedule (the “Fee Schedule”) to adopt certain non-transaction fees for Purge Ports as described below.

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

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange’s website at <https://www.miaxglobal.com/markets/us-options/miax-sapphire/rule-filings>, at the Exchange’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

On July 15, 2024, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) approved the Exchange’s Form 1 application to register as a national securities exchange under Section 6 of the Exchange Act,<sup>3</sup> and the Exchange began operations on August 12, 2024. The Exchange initially filed this proposal on August 9, 2024 (SR–SAPPHIRE–2024–15) to establish fees for Purge Ports, which is functionality that enables Marker Makers<sup>4</sup> to cancel all open orders or a subset of open orders through a single cancel message. The Exchange withdrew SR–SAPPHIRE–2024–15 on August 21, 2024, and submitted this proposal.

<sup>3</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 100539 (July 15, 2024), 89 FR 58848 (July 19, 2024) (File No. 10–240) (order approving application of MIA X Sapphire, LLC for registration as a national securities exchange).

<sup>4</sup> The term “Market Maker” or “MM” means a Member registered with the Exchange for the purpose of making markets in options contracts traded on the Exchange and that is vested with the rights and responsibilities specified in Chapter VI of the Exchange Rules. See the Definitions Section of the Fee Schedule and Exchange Rule 100.

Despite proposing to adopt fees herein, the Exchange also proposes to waive the proposed Purge Port fees for an Initial Waiver Period,<sup>5</sup> which began on the date the Exchange began operations and which is the same date that the Fee Schedule became effective. However, even though the Exchange proposes to fully waive Purge Port fees for the Initial Waiver Period, the Exchange believes that it is appropriate to provide market participants with the overall structure of Purge Port fees by outlining the structure and amounts in the Fee Schedule, so that there is general awareness that the Exchange intends to assess such fees upon the expiration of the defined period of the Initial Waiver Period. Additionally, the Exchange notes that the proposed fees for Purge Ports on MIAX Sapphire are identical to Purge Port fees assessed by the Exchange's affiliated options exchange, MIAX PEARL, LLC ("MIAX Pearl Options").<sup>6</sup>

#### Purge Ports

The Exchange proposes to amend Section 5) d) iii), which was reserved for use by an earlier proposal, to adopt Purge Port Fees to provide that a MIAX Sapphire Market Maker may request and be allocated two (2) Purge Ports per Matching Engine<sup>7</sup> to which it connects and will be charged a monthly fee of \$600 per Matching Engine. The Exchange believes that the proposed fee provides Market Makers with flexibility to control their Purge Port costs based on the number of Matching Engines each Market Maker elects to connect to based on each Market Maker's business needs.

A logical port represents a port established by the Exchange within the Exchange's System for trading and billing purposes. Each logical port grants a Member<sup>8</sup> the ability to accomplish a specific function, such as

<sup>5</sup> The term "Initial Waiver Period" means, for each applicable fee, the period of time from the initial effective date of the MIAX Sapphire Fee Schedule plus an additional six (6) full calendar months after the completion of the partial month of the Exchange launch. See the Definitions Section of the Fee Schedule.

<sup>6</sup> See MIAX Pearl Options Fee Schedule, Section 5) d) Port Fees available at <https://www.miaxglobal.com/markets/us-options/pearl-options/fees>. See also Securities Exchange Act Release No. 100037 (April 26, 2024), 89 FR 35899 (May 2, 2024) (SR-PEARL-2024-20).

<sup>7</sup> "Matching Engine" is a part of the MIAX Sapphire electronic system that processes options orders and trades on a symbol-by-symbol basis. See the Definitions Section of the Fee Schedule.

<sup>8</sup> "Member" means an individual or organization that is registered with the Exchange pursuant to Chapter II of MIAX Sapphire Exchange Rules for purposes of trading on the Exchange as an "Electronic Exchange Member" or "Market Maker." See the Definitions Section of the Fee Schedule.

order entry, order cancellation, access to execution reports, and other administrative information.

Purge Ports are designed to assist Market Makers in the management of, and risk control over, their orders, particularly if the firm is dealing with a large number of securities. For example, if a Market Maker detects market indications that may influence the execution potential of their orders, the Market Maker may use Purge Ports to reduce uncertainty and to manage risk by purging all orders in a number of securities. This allows Market Makers to seamlessly avoid unintended executions, while continuing to evaluate the market, their positions, and their risk levels. Purge Ports are used by Market Makers that conduct business activity that exposes them to a large amount of risk across a number of securities. Purge Ports enable Market Makers to cancel all open orders, or a subset of open orders through a single cancel message. The Exchange notes that Purge Ports increase efficiency of already existing functionality enabling the cancellation of orders.

The Exchange will operate a highly performant system with significant throughput and determinism which should allow participants to enter, update and cancel orders at high rates. Market Makers will have the ability to cancel individual orders through the existing functionality, such as through the use of a mass cancel message by which a Market Maker may request that the Exchange remove all or a subset of its quotations and block all or a subset of its new inbound quotations.<sup>9</sup> Other than Purge Ports being a dedicated line for cancelling quotations, Purge Ports operate in the same manner as a mass cancel message being sent over a different type of port. For example, like Purge Ports, mass cancellations sent over a logical port may be done at either the firm or MPID level. As a result, Market Makers can currently cancel orders in rapid succession across their existing logical ports<sup>10</sup> or through a single cancel message, all open orders or a subset of open orders.

Similarly, Members may also use cancel-on-disconnect control when they experience a disruption in connection to the Exchange to automatically cancel all orders, as configured or instructed by the Member or Market Maker.<sup>11</sup> In

<sup>9</sup> See Exchange Rule 519C(a) and (b).

<sup>10</sup> Current Exchange port functionality supports cancellation rates that exceed one thousand messages per second and the Exchange's research indicates that certain market participants rely on such functionality and at times utilize such cancellation rates.

<sup>11</sup> See Exchange Rule 519C(c).

addition, the Exchange already provides similar ability to mass cancel orders through the Exchange's risk controls, which are offered at no charge and enables Market Makers to establish pre-determined levels of risk exposure, and can be used to cancel all open orders.<sup>12</sup> Accordingly, the Exchange believes that the Purge Ports provide an efficient option as an alternative to available services and enhance a Market Maker's ability to manage their risk.

The Exchange believes that market participants benefit from a dedicated purge mechanism for specific Members and to the market as a whole. Market Makers will have the benefit of efficient risk management and purge tools. The market will benefit from potential increased quoting and liquidity as Market Makers may use Purge Ports to manage their risk more robustly. Only Market Makers that request Purge Ports would be subject to the proposed fees, and other Market Makers can operate without dedicated Purge Ports, but with the additional purging capabilities described above. Further, the Exchange notes that this functionality is similar to functionality on the Exchange's affiliate, MIAX Pearl Options.<sup>13</sup>

#### Implementation

The proposed fee change is immediately effective.

#### 2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,<sup>14</sup> in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act,<sup>15</sup> in particular, in that it is not designed to permit unfair discrimination among customers, brokers, or dealers. The Exchange also believes that its proposed fee is consistent with Section 6(b)(4) of the Act<sup>16</sup> because it represents an equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among market participants.

#### Cost Analysis

In general, the Exchange believes that exchanges, in setting fees of all types, should meet very high standards of transparency to demonstrate why each new fee or fee increase meets the Exchange Act requirements that fees be reasonable, equitably allocated, not unfairly discriminatory, and not create an undue burden on competition among members and markets. In particular, the

<sup>12</sup> See Exchange Rule 517.

<sup>13</sup> See *supra* note 6.

<sup>14</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

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

<sup>16</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4).

Exchange believes that each exchange should take extra care to be able to demonstrate that these fees are based on its costs and reasonable business needs.

In proposing to charge fees for port services, the Exchange is especially diligent in assessing those fees in a transparent way against its own aggregate costs of providing the related service, and in carefully and transparently assessing the impact on Members—both generally and in relation to other Members, *i.e.*, to assure the fee will not create a financial burden on any participant and will not have an undue impact in particular on smaller Members and competition among Members in general. The Exchange believes that this level of diligence and transparency is called for by the requirements of Section 19(b)(1) under the Act,<sup>17</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>18</sup> with respect to the types of information exchanges should provide when filing fee changes, and Section 6(b) of the Act,<sup>19</sup> which requires, among other things, that exchange fees be reasonable and equitably allocated,<sup>20</sup> not designed to permit unfair discrimination,<sup>21</sup> and that they not impose a burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.<sup>22</sup> The Exchange reiterates that the legacy exchanges with whom the Exchange will vigorously compete for order flow and market share, were not subject to any such diligence or transparency in setting their baseline non-transaction fees, most of which were put in place before the Staff Guidance.<sup>23</sup>

As detailed below, the Exchange recently calculated its aggregate annual costs for providing Purge Ports to be \$426,238 (or approximately \$35,518 per month, rounded to the nearest dollar when dividing the annual cost by 12 months). To recoup the costs of providing Purge Ports to its Market Makers going forward, as described below, the Exchange proposes to amend its Fee Schedule to charge a fee of \$600 per Matching Engine for Purge Ports. The Exchange notes that the projected revenue will not be greater than the costs to the Exchange to provide Purge Ports, however the Exchange believes that it is necessary to accept this

condition in order to successfully launch MIAX Sapphire.

The Exchange's affiliates<sup>24</sup> previously completed a study of their aggregate costs to produce market data and provide connectivity and port services, defined above as its Cost Analysis.<sup>25</sup> Personnel began to plan for and develop the Exchange beginning in early 2023, and costs included in this Cost Analysis are related to the development and buildout of the Exchange since that time. During the Exchange's development and buildout that occurred throughout 2023 and continues to today, the Exchange routinely studied its aggregate costs to develop and implement the Exchange. The Cost Analysis required a detailed analysis of the Exchange's aggregate baseline costs, including a determination and allocation of costs for core services provided by the Exchange—transaction execution, market data, membership services, physical connectivity, and port access (which provide order entry, cancellation and modification functionality, risk functionality, the ability to receive drop copies, and other functionality). The Exchange separately divided its costs between those costs necessary to deliver each of these core services, including infrastructure, software, human resources (*i.e.*, personnel), and certain general and administrative expenses ("cost drivers").

As an initial step, the Exchange determined the total cost for the Exchange and its affiliated markets for each cost driver as part of the Exchange's 2024 budget review process. The 2024 budget review is a company-wide process that occurs over the course of many months, includes meetings among senior management, department heads, and the Finance Team. Each department head is required to send a "bottom up" budget to the Finance Team allocating costs at the profit and loss account and vendor levels for the Exchange and its affiliated markets based on a number of factors, including server counts, additional hardware and

software utilization, current or anticipated functional or non-functional development projects, capacity needs, end-of-life or end-of-service intervals, number of members, market model (*e.g.*, price time or pro-rata, simple only or simple and complex markets, auction functionality, etc.), which may impact message traffic, individual system architectures that impact platform size,<sup>26</sup> storage needs, dedicated infrastructure versus shared infrastructure allocated per platform based on the resources required to support each platform, number of available connections, and employees allocated time. All of these factors result in different allocation percentages among the Exchange and its affiliated markets, *i.e.*, the different percentages of the overall cost driver allocated to the Exchange and its affiliated markets will cause the dollar amount of the overall cost allocated among the Exchange and its affiliated markets to also differ. Because the Exchange's parent company currently owns and operates five (including MIAX Sapphire) separate and distinct marketplaces, the Exchange must determine the costs associated with each actual market—as opposed to the Exchange's parent company simply concluding that all cost drivers are the same at each individual marketplace and dividing total cost by five (5) (evenly for each marketplace). Rather, the Exchange's parent company determines an accurate cost for each marketplace, which results in different allocations and amounts across exchanges for the same cost drivers, due to the unique factors of each marketplace as described above. This allocation methodology also ensures that no cost would be allocated twice or double-counted between the Exchange and its affiliated markets. The Finance Team then consolidates the budget and sends it to senior management, including the Chief Financial Officer and Chief Executive Officer, for review and approval. Next, the budget is presented to the Board of Directors and the Finance and Audit Committees for each exchange for their approval. The above steps encompass the first step of the cost allocation process.

The next step involves determining what portion of the cost allocated to the Exchange pursuant to the above methodology is to be allocated to each core service, *e.g.*, market data, connectivity, ports, and transaction

<sup>26</sup> For example, MIAX Sapphire maintains 8 matching engines, MIAX maintains 24 matching engines, MIAX Pearl Options maintains 12 matching engines, MIAX Pearl Equities maintains 24 matching engines, and MIAX Emerald maintains 12 matching engines.

<sup>24</sup> The affiliated markets include Miami International Securities Exchange, LLC ("MIAX"); separately, the options and equities markets of MIAX PEARL, LLC ("MIAX Pearl"); and MIAX Emerald, LLC ("MIAX Emerald").

<sup>25</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 100036 (April 26, 2024), 89 FR 35909 (May 2, 2024) (SR-MIAX-2024-22); 100037 (April 26, 2024), 89 FR 35899 (May 2, 2024) (SR-PEARL-2024-20); 100039 (April 26, 2024), 89 FR 35891 (May 2, 2024) (SR-EMERALD-2024-14). The Exchange frequently updates its Cost Analysis as strategic initiatives change, costs increase or decrease, and market participant needs and trading activity (once live trading begins) changes. The Exchange's most recent Cost Analysis was conducted ahead of this filing.

<sup>17</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>18</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

<sup>19</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

<sup>20</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4).

<sup>21</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

<sup>22</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(8).

<sup>23</sup> See Staff Guidance on SRO Rule Filings Relating to Fees (May 21, 2019), available at <https://www.sec.gov/tm/staff-guidance-sro-rule-filings-fees> (the "Staff Guidance").

services. The Exchange and its affiliated markets adopted an allocation methodology with thoughtful and consistently applied principles to guide how much of a particular cost amount allocated to the Exchange should be allocated within the Exchange to each core service. This is the final step in the cost allocation process and is applied to each of the cost drivers set forth below.

This next level of the allocation methodology at the individual exchange level also took into account factors similar to those set forth under the first step of the allocation methodology process described above, to determine the appropriate allocation to connectivity or market data versus allocations for other services. This allocation methodology was developed through an assessment of costs with senior management intimately familiar with each area of the Exchange's operations. After adopting this allocation methodology, the Exchange then applied an allocation of each cost driver to each core service, resulting in the cost allocations described below. Each of the below cost allocations is unique to the Exchange and represents a percentage of overall cost that was allocated to the Exchange pursuant to the initial allocation described above.

By allocating segmented costs to each core service, the Exchange was able to estimate by core service the potential margin it might earn based on different fee models. The Exchange notes that it has five primary sources of revenue that it can potentially use to fund its operations: transaction fees,

connectivity and port service fees, membership fees, regulatory fees, and market data fees. Accordingly, the Exchange must cover its expenses from these five primary sources of revenue. The Exchange also notes that as a general matter each of these sources of revenue is based on services that are interdependent. For instance, the Exchange's system for executing transactions is dependent on physical hardware and connectivity; only Members and parties that they sponsor to participate directly on the Exchange may submit orders to the Exchange; some Members (but not all) consume market data from the Exchange in order to trade on the Exchange; and, the Exchange consumes market data from external sources in order to comply with regulatory obligations. Accordingly, given this interdependence, the allocation of costs to each service or revenue source required judgment of the Exchange and was weighted based on estimates of the Exchange that the Exchange believes are reasonable, as set forth below. While there is no standardized and generally accepted methodology for the allocation of an exchange's costs, the Exchange's methodology is the result of an extensive review and analysis and will be consistently applied going forward for any other cost-justified potential fee proposals. In the absence of the Commission attempting to specify a methodology for the allocation of exchanges' interdependent costs, the Exchange will continue to be left with

its best efforts to attempt to conduct such an allocation in a thoughtful and reasonable manner.

Through the Exchange's extensive updated Cost Analysis, which was again recently further refined, the Exchange analyzed every expense item in the Exchange's general expense ledger to determine whether each such expense relates to the provision of connectivity and port services, and, if such expense did so relate, what portion (or percentage) of such expense actually supports the provision of Purge Port services, and thus bears a relationship that is, "in nature and closeness," directly related to Purge Port services. In turn, the Exchange allocated certain costs more to physical connectivity and others to ports, while certain costs were only allocated to such services at a very low percentage or not at all, using consistent allocation methodologies as described above. Based on this analysis, the Exchange estimates that the aggregate monthly cost to provide Purge Port services is \$35,518, as further detailed below.

Costs Related to Offering Purge Ports

The following chart details the individual line-item costs considered by the Exchange to be related to offering Purge Ports as well as the percentage of the Exchange's overall costs that such costs represent for each cost driver (e.g., as set forth below, the Exchange allocated approximately 3.5% of its overall Human Resources cost to offering Purge Ports).

Cost drivers	Allocated annual cost <sup>a</sup>	Allocated monthly cost <sup>b</sup>	% of all
Human Resources .....	\$363,954	\$30,329	3.6
Connectivity (external fees, cabling, switches, etc.) .....	112	9	0.4
Internet Services and External Market Data .....	654	54	0.4
Data Center .....	6,764	564	1.1
Hardware and Software Maintenance and Licenses .....	2,185	182	0.4
Depreciation .....	19,518	1,626	1.6
Allocated Shared Expenses .....	33,051	2,754	1.2
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>426,238</b>	<b>35,518</b>	<b>2.7</b>

<sup>a</sup> The Annual Cost includes figures rounded to the nearest dollar.

<sup>b</sup> The Monthly Cost was determined by dividing the Annual Cost for each line item by twelve (12) months and rounding up or down to the nearest dollar.

Below are additional details regarding each of the line-item costs considered by the Exchange to be related to offering Purge Ports. While some costs were attempted to be allocated as equally as possible among the Exchange and its affiliated markets, the Exchange notes that some of its cost allocation percentages for certain cost drivers differ when compared to the same cost drivers for the Exchange's affiliated

markets in their similar proposed fee changes for Purge Ports. This is because the Exchange's cost allocation methodology utilizes the actual projected costs of the Exchange (which are specific to the Exchange and are independent of the costs projected and utilized by the Exchange's affiliated markets) to determine its actual costs, which may vary across the Exchange and its affiliated markets based on

factors that are unique to each marketplace. The Exchange provides additional explanation below (including the reason for the deviation) for the significant differences.

Human Resources

The Exchange notes that it and its affiliated markets anticipate that by year-end 2024, there will be 289 employees (excluding employees at

non-options/equities exchange subsidiaries of Miami International Holdings, Inc. (“MIH”), the holding company of the Exchange and its affiliated markets), and each department leader has direct knowledge of the time spent by each employee with respect to the various tasks necessary to operate the Exchange. Specifically, twice a year, and as needed with additional new hires and new project initiatives, in consultation with employees as needed, managers and department heads assign a percentage of time to every employee and then allocate that time amongst the Exchange and its affiliated markets to determine each market’s individual Human Resources expense. Then, managers and department heads assign a percentage of each employee’s time allocated to the Exchange into buckets including network connectivity, ports, market data, and other exchange services. This process ensures that every employee is 100% allocated, ensuring there is no double counting between the Exchange and its affiliated markets.

For personnel costs (Human Resources), the Exchange calculated an allocation of employee time for employees whose functions include providing and maintaining Purge Ports and performance thereof (primarily the Exchange’s network infrastructure team, which spends most of their time performing functions necessary to provide port and connectivity services). As described more fully above, the Exchange’s parent company allocates costs to the Exchange and its affiliated markets and then a portion of the Human Resources costs allocated to the Exchange is then allocated to port services. From that portion allocated to the Exchange that applied to ports, the Exchange then allocated a weighted average of 4.8% of each employee’s time from the above group to Purge Ports.

The Exchange also allocated Human Resources costs to provide Purge Ports to a limited subset of personnel with ancillary functions related to establishing and maintaining such ports (such as information security, sales, membership, and finance personnel). The Exchange allocated cost on an employee-by-employee basis (*i.e.*, only including those personnel who support functions related to providing Purge Ports) and then applied a smaller allocation to such employees’ time to Purge Ports (2.2%). This other group of personnel with a smaller allocation of Human Resources costs also have a direct nexus to Purge Ports, whether it is a sales person selling port services, finance personnel billing for port services or providing budget analysis, or information security ensuring that such

ports are secure and adequately defended from an outside intrusion.

The estimates of Human Resources cost were therefore determined by consulting with such department leaders, determining which employees are involved in tasks related to providing Purge Ports, and confirming that the proposed allocations were reasonable based on an understanding of the percentage of time such employees devote to those tasks. This includes personnel from the Exchange departments that are predominately involved in providing Purge Ports: Business Systems Development, Trading Systems Development, Systems Operations and Network Monitoring, Network and Data Center Operations, Listings, Trading Operations, and Project Management. Again, the Exchange allocated 4.8% of each of their employee’s time assigned to the Exchange for Purge Ports, as stated above. Employees from these departments perform numerous functions to support Purge Ports, such as the installation, re-location, configuration, and maintenance of Purge Ports and the hardware they access. This hardware includes servers, routers, switches, firewalls, and monitoring devices. These employees also perform software upgrades, vulnerability assessments, remediation and patch installs, equipment configuration and hardening, as well as performance and capacity management. These employees also engage in research and development analysis for equipment and software supporting Purge Ports and design, and support the development and on-going maintenance of internally-developed applications as well as data capture and analysis, and Member and internal Exchange reports related to network and system performance. The above list of employee functions is not exhaustive of all the functions performed by Exchange employees to support Purge Ports, but illustrates the breadth of functions those employees perform in support of the above cost and time allocations.

Lastly, the Exchange notes that senior level executives’ time was only allocated to the Purge Ports related Human Resources costs to the extent that they are involved in overseeing tasks related to providing Purge Ports. The Human Resources cost was calculated using a blended rate of compensation reflecting salary, equity and bonus compensation, benefits, payroll taxes, and 401(k) matching contributions.

Connectivity (External Fees, Cabling, Switches, etc.)

The Connectivity cost driver includes external fees paid to connect to other exchanges and third parties, cabling and switches required to operate the Exchange. The Connectivity cost driver is more narrowly focused on technology used to complete connections to the Exchange and to connect to external markets. The Exchange notes that its connectivity to external markets vendors is required in order to receive market data to run the Exchange’s matching engine and basic operations compliant with existing regulations, primarily Regulation NMS.

The Exchange relies on various connectivity providers for connectivity to the entire U.S. options industry, and infrastructure services for critical components of the network that are necessary to provide and maintain its System Networks and access to its System Networks via 10Gb ULL connectivity. Specifically, the Exchange utilizes connectivity providers to connect to other national securities exchanges and the Options Price Reporting Authority (“OPRA”). The Exchange understands that these service providers provide services to most, if not all, of the other U.S. exchanges and other market participants. Connectivity provided by these service providers is critical to the Exchanges daily operations and performance of its System Networks which includes Purge Ports. Without these services providers, the Exchange would not be able to connect to other national securities exchanges, market data providers or OPRA and, therefore, would not be able to operate and support its System Networks, including Purge Ports. In addition, the connectivity is necessary for the Exchange to notify OPRA and other market participants that an order has been cancelled, and that quotes may have been cancelled as a result of a Market Maker purging quotes via their Purge Port. Also, like other types of ports offered by the Exchange, Purge Ports leverage the Exchange’s existing 10Gb ULL connectivity, which also relies on connectivity to other national securities exchanges and OPRA. The Exchange does not employ a separate fee to cover its connectivity provider expense and recoups that expense, in part, by charging for Purge Ports.

Internet Services and External Market Data

The next cost driver consists of internet services and external market data. Internet services includes third-party service providers that provide the

internet, fiber and bandwidth connections between the Exchange's networks, primary and secondary data centers, and office locations in Princeton and Miami. For purposes of Purge Ports, the Exchange also includes a portion of its costs related to external market data. External market data includes fees paid to third parties, including OPRA, to receive and consume market data from other markets. The Exchange includes external market data costs towards Purge Ports because such market data is necessary to offer certain services related to such ports, such as checking for market conditions (e.g., halted securities). External market data is also consumed at the Matching Engine level for, among other things, as validating quotes on entry against the national best bid or offer ("NBBO").<sup>27</sup> Purge Ports are a component of the Matching Engine, and used by Market Makers to cancel multiple resting quotes within the Matching Engine. While resting, the Exchange uses external market data to manage those quotes, such as preventing trade-throughs, and those quotes are also reported to OPRA for inclusion in this consolidated data stream. The Exchange also must notify OPRA and other market participants that an order has been cancelled, and that quotes may have been cancelled as a result of a Market Maker purging quotes via their Purge Port. Thus, since market data from other exchanges is consumed by the Matching Engine to validate quotes and check market conditions, the Exchange believes it is reasonable to allocate a small amount of such costs to Purge Ports.

For the reasons set forth above, the Exchange believes it is reasonable to allocate a small amount of such costs to Purge Ports since market data from other exchanges is consumed at the Exchange's Purge Port level to validate purge messages and the necessity to cancel a resting quote via a purge message or via some other means.

#### Data Center

Data Center costs includes an allocation of the costs the Exchange incurs to provide Purge Ports in the third-party data centers where it maintains its equipment as well as related costs for market data to then enter the Exchange's System. The Exchange does not own the Primary Data Center or the Secondary Data Center, but instead, leases space in data

centers operated by third parties. The Exchange has allocated a percentage of its Data Center cost (1.1%) to Purge Ports because the third-party data centers and the Exchange's physical equipment contained therein are necessary for providing Purge Ports. In other words, for the Exchange to operate in a dedicated physical space with direct connectivity by market participants to its trading platform, the data centers are a critical component to the provision of Purge Ports. If the Exchange did not maintain such a presence, then Purge Ports would be of little value to market participants.

#### Hardware and Software Maintenance and Licenses

Hardware and Software Licenses includes hardware and software licenses used to operate and monitor physical assets necessary to offer Purge Ports for each Matching Engine of the Exchange. This hardware includes servers, network switches, cables, optics, protocol data units, and cabinets, to maintain a state-of-the-art technology platform. Without hardware and software licenses, Purge Ports would not be able to be offered to market participants because hardware and software are necessary to operate the Exchange's Matching Engines, which are necessary to enable the purging of quotes. The Exchange also routinely works to improve the performance of the hardware and software used to operate the Exchange's network and System. The costs associated with maintaining and enhancing a state-of-the-art exchange network is a significant expense for the Exchange, and thus the Exchange believes that it is reasonable and appropriate to allocate a certain percentage of its hardware and software expense to help offset those costs of providing Purge Port connectivity to its Matching Engines.

#### Depreciation

The vast majority of the software the Exchange uses to provide Ports has been developed in-house and the cost of such development, which takes place over an extended period of time and includes not just development work, but also quality assurance and testing to ensure the software works as intended, is depreciated over time once the software is activated in the production environment. Hardware used to provide Purge Ports includes equipment used for testing and monitoring of order entry infrastructure and other physical equipment the Exchange purchased and is also depreciated over time.

All hardware and software, which also includes assets used for testing and

monitoring of order entry infrastructure, were valued at cost, depreciated or leased over periods ranging from three to five years. Thus, the depreciation cost primarily relates to servers necessary to operate the Exchange, some of which is owned by the Exchange and some of which is leased by the Exchange in order to allow efficient periodic technology refreshes. The Exchange allocated 0.8% [sic] of all depreciation costs to providing Purge Ports. The Exchange allocated depreciation costs for depreciated software necessary to operate the Exchange because such software is related to the provision of Purge Ports. As with the other allocated costs in the Exchange's updated Cost Analysis, the Depreciation cost driver was therefore narrowly tailored to depreciation related to Purge Ports.

#### Allocated Shared Expenses

Finally, a portion of general shared expenses was allocated to overall Purge Port costs as without these general shared costs the Exchange would not be able to operate in the manner that it does and provide Purge Ports. The costs included in general shared expenses include general expenses of the Exchange, including office space and office expenses (e.g., occupancy and overhead expenses), utilities, recruiting and training, marketing and advertising costs, professional fees for legal, tax and accounting services (including external and internal audit expenses), and telecommunications costs. The Exchange notes that the cost of paying directors to serve on its Board of Directors is included in the calculation of Allocated Shared Expenses, and thus a portion of such overall cost amounting to less than 2% of the overall cost for directors was allocated to providing Purge Ports.

#### Approximate Cost for Purge Port per Month

Based on projected 2024 data, the total monthly cost allocated to Purge Ports is \$35,518. This total is divided by the total number of Matching Engines (8) in which Market Makers may use Purge Ports for each month, divided by the anticipated number of Market Makers results in an approximate cost of \$634 per Matching Engine per month for Purge Port usage (when rounding to the nearest dollar). The Exchange notes that the flat fee of \$600 per month per Matching Engine entitles each Market Maker to two Purge Ports per Matching Engine. The Exchange anticipates that the majority of Market Makers will connect to all eight of the Exchange's Matching Engines and utilize Purge Ports on each Matching Engine. The

<sup>27</sup> The term "NBBO" means the national best bid or offer as calculated by the Exchange based on market information received by the Exchange from OPRA. See Exchange Rule 100.

Exchange recognizes that costs are greater than anticipated revenues but accepts this condition as a necessary cost to be incurred when launching a new exchange.

#### Cost Analysis—Additional Discussion

In conducting its Cost Analysis, the Exchange did not allocate any of its expenses in full to any core services (including Purge Ports) and did not double-count any expenses. Instead, as described above, the Exchange allocated applicable cost drivers across its core services and used the same Cost Analysis to form the basis of this proposal. For instance, in calculating the Human Resources expenses to be allocated to Purge Ports based upon the above described methodology, the Exchange has a team of employees dedicated to network infrastructure and with respect to such employees the Exchange allocated network infrastructure personnel with a higher percentage of the cost of such personnel (21.7%) given their focus on functions necessary to provide Ports. The salaries of those same personnel were allocated only 4.8% to Purge Ports and the remaining 95.2% was allocated to connectivity, other port services, transaction services, membership services and market data. The Exchange did not allocate any other Human Resources expense for providing Purge Ports to any other employee group, outside of a smaller allocation of 2.2% for Purge Ports, of the cost associated with certain specified personnel who work closely with and support network infrastructure personnel. This is because a much wider range of personnel are involved in functions necessary to offer, monitor and maintain Purge Ports but the tasks necessary to do so are not a primary or full-time function.

In total, the Exchange allocated 3.6% of its personnel costs to providing Purge Ports. In turn, the Exchange allocated the remaining 96.4% of its Human Resources expense to membership services, transaction services, connectivity services, other port services and market data. Thus, again, the Exchange's allocations of cost across core services were based on real costs of operating the Exchange and were not double-counted across the core services or their associated revenue streams.

As another example, the Exchange allocated depreciation expense to all core services, including Purge Ports, but in different amounts. The Exchange believes it is reasonable to allocate the identified portion of such expense because such expense includes the actual cost of the computer equipment, such as dedicated servers, computers,

laptops, monitors, information security appliances and storage, and network switching infrastructure equipment, including switches and taps that were purchased to operate and support the network. Without this equipment, the Exchange would not be able to operate the network and provide Purge Port services to its Market Makers. However, the Exchange did not allocate all of the depreciation and amortization expense toward the cost of providing Purge Port services, but instead allocated approximately 0.8% [sic] of the Exchange's overall depreciation and amortization expense to Purge Ports. The Exchange allocated the remaining depreciation and amortization expense (approximately 99.2% [sic]) toward the cost of providing transaction services, membership services, connectivity services, other port services, and market data.

The Exchange notes that its revenue estimates are based on projections across all potential revenue streams and will only be realized to the extent such revenue streams actually produce the revenue estimated. The Exchange does not yet know whether such expectations will be realized. For instance, in order to generate the revenue expected from Purge Ports, the Exchange will have to be successful in retaining existing Market Makers that wish to maintain Purge Ports or in obtaining new Market Makers that will purchase such services. Similarly, the Exchange will have to be successful in retaining a positive net capture on transaction fees in order to realize the anticipated revenue from transaction pricing.

The Exchange notes that the Cost Analysis is based on the Exchange's 2024 fiscal year of operations and projections. It is possible, however, that actual costs may be higher or lower. To the extent the Exchange sees growth in use of connectivity services it will receive additional revenue to offset future cost increases. However, if use of port services is static or decreases, the Exchange might not realize the revenue that it anticipates or needs in order to cover applicable costs. Accordingly, the Exchange is committing to conduct a one-year review after implementation of these fees. The Exchange expects that it may propose to adjust fees at that time, to increase fees in the event that revenues fail to cover costs and a reasonable mark-up of such costs. Similarly, the Exchange may propose to decrease fees in the event that revenue materially exceeds our current projections. In addition, the Exchange will periodically conduct a review to inform its decision making on whether a fee change is appropriate (e.g., to

monitor for costs increasing/decreasing or subscribers increasing/decreasing, etc. in ways that suggest the then-current fees are becoming dislocated from the prior cost-based analysis) and would propose to increase fees in the event that revenues fail to cover its costs and a reasonable mark-up, or decrease fees in the event that revenue or the mark-up materially exceeds our current projections. In the event that the Exchange determines to propose a fee change, the results of a timely review, including an updated cost estimate, will be included in the rule filing proposing the fee change. More generally, the Exchange believes that it is appropriate for an exchange to refresh and update information about its relevant costs and revenues in seeking any future changes to fees, and the Exchange commits to do so.

#### Projected Revenue<sup>28</sup>

The proposed fees will allow the Exchange to cover certain costs incurred by the Exchange associated with providing and maintaining necessary hardware and other network infrastructure as well as network monitoring and support services; without such hardware, infrastructure, monitoring and support the Exchange would be unable to provide port services. Much of the cost relates to monitoring and analysis of data and performance of the network via the subscriber's connection(s). The above cost, namely those associated with hardware, software, and human capital, enable the Exchange to measure network performance with nanosecond granularity. These same costs are also associated with time and money spent seeking to continuously improve the network performance, improving the subscriber's experience, based on monitoring and analysis activity. The Exchange routinely works to improve the performance of the network's hardware and software. The costs associated with maintaining and enhancing a state-of-the-art exchange network is a significant expense for the Exchange, and thus the Exchange believes that it is reasonable and appropriate to help offset those costs by amending fees for Purge Port services. Subscribers, particularly those of Purge Ports, expect the Exchange to provide this level of support so they continue to receive the performance they expect. This differentiates the Exchange from its competitors. As detailed above, the Exchange has five primary sources of

<sup>28</sup> For purposes of calculating projected 2024 revenue for Purge Ports, the Exchange is using estimated projections.



revenue that it can potentially use to fund its operations: transaction fees, fees for connectivity services (connections and ports), membership and regulatory fees, and market data fees. Accordingly, the Exchange must cover its expenses from these five primary sources of revenue.

The Exchange's Cost Analysis estimates the annual cost to provide Purge Port services will equal \$426,238. Based on projected Purge Port services usage, the Exchange would generate annual revenue of approximately \$403,200. The Exchange estimates it will incur a 5.7% loss when comparing revenues to the cost of providing Purge Port services.

Based on the above discussion, the Exchange believes that even if the Exchange earns the above revenue or incrementally more or less, the proposed fees are fair and reasonable because they will not result in pricing that deviates from that of other exchanges or a supra-competitive profit, when comparing the total expense of the Exchange associated with providing Purge Port services versus the total projected revenue of the Exchange associated with network Purge Port services.

#### The Proposed Fees Are Also Equitable, Reasonable, and Not Unfairly Discriminatory

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change would promote just and equitable principles of trade and remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market because offering Market Makers optional Purge Port services with a flexible fee structure promotes choice, flexibility, and efficiency. The Exchange believes Purge Ports enhance Market Makers' ability to manage orders, which would, in turn, improve their risk controls to the benefit of all market participants. The Exchange believes that Purge Ports foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities because designating Purge Ports for purge messages may encourage better use of such ports. This may, concurrent with the ports that carry orders and other information necessary for market making activities, enable more efficient, as well as fair and reasonable, use of Market Makers' resources. The Exchange believes that proper risk management, including the ability to efficiently cancel multiple orders quickly when necessary is valuable to all firms, including Market Makers that have heightened quoting obligations that are not applicable to other market participants.

Purge Ports do not relieve Market Makers of their quoting obligations or firm quote obligations under Regulation NMS Rule 602.<sup>29</sup> Specifically, any interest that is executable against a Member's or Market Maker's orders that is received by the Exchange prior to the time of the removal of orders request will automatically execute. Market Makers that purge their orders will not be relieved of the obligation to provide continuous two-sided orders on a daily basis, nor will it prohibit the Exchange from taking disciplinary action against a Market Maker for failing to meet their continuous quoting obligation each trading day.<sup>30</sup>

The Exchange also believes that offering Purge Ports at the Matching Engine level promotes risk management across the industry, and thereby facilitates investor protection. Some market participants, in particular the larger firms, could and do build similar risk functionality in their trading systems that permit the flexible cancellation of orders entered on the Exchange at a high rate. Offering Matching Engine level protections ensures that such functionality is widely available to all firms, including smaller firms that may otherwise not be willing to incur the costs and development work necessary to support their own customized mass cancel functionality.

The Exchange also believes that moving to a per Matching Engine fee for Purge Ports is reasonable due to the Exchange's architecture that provides the Exchange the ability to provide two (2) Purge Ports per Matching Engine.

The Exchange believes that the proposed Purge Port fees are equitable because the proposed Purge Ports are completely voluntary as they relate solely to optional risk management functionality.

The Exchange also believes that the proposed amendments to its Fee Schedule are not unfairly discriminatory because they will apply uniformly to all Market Makers that choose to use the optional Purge Ports. Purge Ports are completely voluntary and, as they relate solely to optional risk management functionality, no Market Maker is required or under any regulatory obligation to utilize them. All Market Makers that voluntarily select this service option will be charged the same amount for the same services. Market Makers have the option to select any port or connectivity option, and there is no differentiation among Market

Makers with regard to the fees charged for the services offered by the Exchange.

#### 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. Purge Ports are completely voluntary and are available to all Market Makers on an equal basis at the same cost. While the Exchange believes that Purge Ports provide a valuable service, Market Makers can choose to purchase, or not purchase, these ports based on their own determination of the value and their business needs. No Market Maker is required or under any regulatory obligation to utilize Purge Ports. Accordingly, the Exchange believes that Purge Ports offer appropriate risk management functionality to firms that trade on the Exchange without imposing an unnecessary or inappropriate burden on competition.

The Exchange also does not believe the proposal would cause any unnecessary or inappropriate burden on intermarket competition as other exchanges are free to introduce their own purge port functionality and lower their prices to better compete with the Exchange's offering. The Exchange does not believe the proposed rule change would cause any unnecessary or inappropriate burden on intramarket competition. Particularly, the proposal would apply uniformly to any market participant, in that it does not differentiate between Market Makers. The proposal would allow any interested Market Maker to purchase Purge Port functionality based on their business needs.

#### 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,<sup>31</sup> and Rule 19b-4(f)(2)<sup>32</sup> 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

<sup>29</sup> See Exchange Rule 604. See also generally Chapter VI of the Exchange's Rules.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.*

<sup>31</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

<sup>32</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(2).



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 (<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-SAPPHIRE-2024-26 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-SAPPHIRE-2024-26. 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 submissions should refer to file number

SR-SAPPHIRE-2024-26 and should be submitted on or before September 30, 2024.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>33</sup>

**Vanessa A. Countryman,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2024-20172 Filed 9-6-24; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011-01-P**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-100897; File No. SR-NSCC-2024-007]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; National Securities Clearing Corporation; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Modify the NSCC Rules & Procedures To Accommodate Fractional Share Trading Programs

September 3, 2024.

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 August 21, 2024, National Securities Clearing Corporation (“NSCC”) 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 clearing agency. NSCC filed the proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act<sup>3</sup> and Rule 19b-4(f)(6) thereunder.<sup>4</sup> The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

#### I. Clearing Agency's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The proposed rule change consists of modifications to the NSCC Rules & Procedures (“Rules”) to accommodate the Member submission and trade recording of certain trades executed in connection with fractional share trading programs, as described in greater detail below.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>33</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.

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

<sup>4</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(6).

<sup>5</sup> Capitalized terms not defined herein shall have the meaning assigned to such terms in the Rules, available at [www.dtcc.com/legal/rules-and-procedures](http://www.dtcc.com/legal/rules-and-procedures).

#### II. Clearing Agency's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the clearing agency 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 clearing agency has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

##### (A) Clearing Agency's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

###### 1. Purpose

The purpose of this proposed rule change is to amend the real-time trade submission requirements in NSCC Rule 7 and Procedure II to accommodate the Member submission and trade recording of certain trades representing transactions from fractional share trading programs. The proposed rule change is discussed in detail below.

###### Background

NSCC Rule 7, Section 7 requires that trade data submitted to NSCC for trade recording be submitted in “Real-time,”<sup>6</sup> and on a trade-by-trade basis, in the form executed without any form of “pre-netting” of such trades prior to their submission (collectively, the “Real-time Trade Submission Requirement”). Cleared contract information is then reported out to submitting firms by NSCC's Universal Trade Capture (“UTC”) system<sup>7</sup> upon trade comparison and validation. The receipt of trade data in real-time enables NSCC to report to Members trade data as it is received, thereby promoting intra-day reconciliation of transactions at the Member level, and also facilitates efficient risk management for both NSCC and its Members.

From an operational perspective, NSCC is only able to accept trades for clearing in units of full shares. Moreover, stocks do not trade on exchanges in units of less than one share, and trades may only be reported to a trade reporting facility in multiples

<sup>6</sup> NSCC Procedure XIII defines “Real-time” to mean the “submission of trade data on a trade-by-trade basis promptly after trade execution, in any format and by any communication method acceptable to [NSCC].” See NSCC Procedure XIII, *supra* note 5.

<sup>7</sup> NSCC's UTC system validates and reports equity transactions that are submitted to NSCC throughout the trading day by an exchange or by a Qualified Special Representative that is an NSCC Member.