

other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submissions of responses.

Background

OPM's Human Resources Strategy and Evaluation Solutions performs assessment and related consultation activities for Federal agencies on a reimbursable basis. The assessments are authorized by various statutes and regulations: Section 4702 of Title 5, U.S.C.; E.O. 12862; E.O. 13715; Section 1128 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, Public Law 108-136; 5 U.S.C. 1101 note, 1103(a)(5), 1104, 1302, 3301, 3302, 4702, 7701 note; E.O. 13197, 66 FR 7853, 3 CFR 748 (2002); E.O. 10577, 12 FR 1259, 3 CFR, 1954-1958 Comp., p. 218; and Section 4703 of Title 5, United States Code.

This collection request includes surveys we currently use and plan to use during the next three years to measure Federal leaders' effectiveness. These surveys all measure leadership characteristics. Non-Federal respondents will almost never receive more than one of these surveys. All these surveys consist of Likert-type, mark-one, and mark-all-that-apply items, and may include a small number of open-ended comment items. OPM's Leadership 360™ assessment measures the 28 competencies that comprise the five Executive Core Qualifications and Fundamental Competencies in the OPM leadership model. The OPM Leadership 360™ consists of 116 items and is almost never customized, although customization to meet an agency's needs is possible. OPM's Leadership Potential Assessment consists of 103 items focused on identifying individuals ready to move into supervisory positions. OPM's Personality Assessment for Leaders consists of 236 items that measure leadership personality characteristics within a "Big 5" framework. OPM's Leadership for Engagement and Leadership for Inclusion surveys consist of 140 items that measure 30 leadership behaviors and employees' perceptions of their work unit related to engagement and Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA), respectively. The DEIA Pulse Survey consists of 50 items that provide leaders with information related to the demographics of their workforce, perceptions of the leader's policies, procedures, and practices related to DEIA, and attitudes toward working in the leader's organization. These assessments are almost always administered electronically.

Analysis

Agency: Office of Personnel Management.

Title: Leadership Assessment Surveys.

OMB Number: 3206-0253.

Frequency: On occasion.

Affected Public: Individuals.

Number of Respondents:

Approximately 8,300 annually, 24,900 over 3 years.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 15 minutes for the OPM Leadership 360™ and Leadership Potential Assessment; 45 minutes for the OPM Personality Assessment for Leaders; 20 minutes for the Leadership for Engagement Survey and the Leadership for Inclusion Survey; and 10 minutes for the DEIA Pulse Survey. The OPM Personality Assessment for Leaders will almost never be administered to non-Federal employees so the average time to complete these surveys is approximately 16 minutes.

Total Burden Hours: 2,088 hours annually, 6,264 over 3 years.

Alexys Stanley,

Federal Register Liaison.

[FR Doc. 2024-23813 Filed 10-15-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-43-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-101291; File No. SR-NASDAQ-2024-057]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; The Nasdaq Stock Market LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend the Exchange's Schedule of Credits at Equity 7, Section 118(a)

October 9, 2024.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,² notice is hereby given that on October 1, 2024, The Nasdaq Stock Market LLC ("Nasdaq" 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 the Exchange's schedule of credits at Equity

7, Section 118(a), as described further below.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's website at <https://listingcenter.nasdaq.com/rulebook/nasdaq/rules>, at the principal office of the Exchange, and at the Commission's Public Reference Room.

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

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

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

1. Purpose

The purpose of the proposed rule change is to amend the Exchange's schedule of credits, at Equity 7, Section 118(a). Specifically, with respect to its schedule of credits for non-displayed midpoint orders (other than Supplemental Orders) that provide liquidity, the Exchange proposes to (i) add a new credit in Tapes A, B, and C, (ii) cap the maximum credit per share executed that a member can receive when certain requirements are met within Section 118(a)(1), and (iii) reorder the schedule of credits.

The Exchange proposes to provide a new supplemental credit of \$0.0001 with a maximum cap of \$0.0029 for midpoint orders (excluding buy (sell) orders with Midpoint pegging that receive an execution price that is lower (higher) than the midpoint of the NBBO) if the member executes a daily average of at least 5 million shares of non-displayed liquidity through M-ELO. This change will apply to Tapes A, B, and C. The purpose of the new credit is to incentivize liquidity adding activity and provide an incentive to members that provide non-displayed liquidity to the Exchange to do so through M-ELO. The Exchange believes that if such incentive is effective, then any ensuing increase in liquidity to the Exchange will improve market quality, to the benefit of all participants.

The Exchange currently provides a supplemental credit for midpoint orders

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

(excluding buy (sell) orders with Midpoint pegging that receive an execution price that is lower (higher) than the midpoint of the NBBO), in addition to the other credits provided for non-displayed orders that provide liquidity, if the member executes a requisite ADV of shares through M–ELO, as follows: (a) member that (i) executes at least 0.35% of Consolidated Volume through providing midpoint orders and through M–ELO during the month, and (ii) executes at least 0.20% of Consolidated Volume through providing midpoint orders during the month. A member receiving this supplemental credit may receive combined credits (regular and supplemental) of up to a maximum of \$0.0028 per share executed.

The existing supplemental credit will continue alongside the new one. The proposed credit has a cap of \$0.0029, allowing members to use the new \$0.0001 without affecting other credits. This applies to Tapes A, B, and C. The goal is to encourage liquidity-adding activity and incentivize members providing non-displayed liquidity via M–ELO.

The Exchange notes that it proposes to cap combined regular and supplemental credits at \$0.0029 to manage the costs to the Exchange of providing these incentives. The Exchange has only limited resources available to it for incentive programs, and it must ensure that it allocates such resources appropriately to optimize their intended impacts.

Lastly, for clarifying purposes, the Exchange proposes to reorder the schedule of credits for non-displayed orders (other than Supplemental Orders) that provide liquidity by adding the aforementioned supplemental credit to the rebate schedule as number 4 and moving “All other non-displayed orders” to number 5.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,³ in general, and furthers the objectives of Sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act,⁴ in particular, in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among members and issuers and other persons using any facility, and is not designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers, or dealers.

The Proposals Are Reasonable

The Exchange’s proposed changes to its schedule of credits are reasonable in several respects. As a threshold matter, the Exchange is subject to significant competitive forces in the market for equity securities transaction services that constrain its pricing determinations in that market. The fact that this market is competitive has long been recognized by the courts. In *NetCoalition v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, the D.C. Circuit stated as follows: “[n]o one disputes that competition for order flow is ‘fierce.’ . . . As the SEC explained, ‘[i]n the U.S. national market system, buyers and sellers of securities, and the broker-dealers that act as their order-routing agents, have a wide range of choices of where to route orders for execution’; [and] ‘no exchange can afford to take its market share percentages for granted’ because ‘no exchange possesses a monopoly, regulatory or otherwise, in the execution of order flow from broker dealers’”⁵

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.”⁶

Numerous indicia demonstrate the competitive nature of this market. For example, clear substitutes to the Exchange exist in the market for equity security transaction services. The Exchange is only one of several equity venues to which market participants may direct their order flow. Competing equity exchanges offer similar tiered pricing structures to that of the Exchange, including schedules of rebates and fees that apply based upon members achieving certain volume thresholds.

Within this environment, market participants can freely and often do shift their order flow among the Exchange and competing venues in response to

changes in their respective pricing schedules. As such, the proposal represents a reasonable attempt by the Exchange to increase its liquidity and market share relative to its competitors.

The Exchange believes that it is reasonable to establish a new supplemental credit of \$0.0001 with a maximum of up to \$0.0029 for midpoint orders (excluding buy (sell) orders with Midpoint pegging that receive an execution price that is lower (higher) than the midpoint of the NBBO) if the member executes an ADV of at least 5 million shares of non-displayed liquidity through M–ELO for Tapes A, B, and C. This proposal is reasonable because it will incentivize liquidity adding activity and provide an incentive to members that provide non-displayed liquidity to the Exchange to do so through midpoint orders. The Exchange believes that if such incentive is effective, then any ensuring increase in liquidity to the Exchange will improve market quality, to the benefit of all participants.

The Exchange believes that it is reasonable to cap the amount of combined regular and supplemental credits it proposes to offer members that execute an ADV of at least 5 million shares of non-displayed liquidity through M–ELO to \$0.0029 per share executed. This cap will allow the Exchange to manage its costs of providing these incentives. The Exchange has only limited resources available to it for incentive programs, and it must ensure that it allocates such resources appropriately to optimize their intended impacts.

The Exchange also believes that it is reasonable to reorder the schedule of credits for non-displayed orders (other than Supplemental Orders) that provide liquidity to increase clarity in the Rules, consistent with the public interest and protection of investors.

The Proposals are Equitable Allocations of Credits

The Exchange believes that it is equitable to establish a new supplemental transaction credit and otherwise increase the amount of net credit (regular plus supplemental) a member may receive for providing non-displayed liquidity through midpoint orders. To the extent that the Exchange succeeds in increasing the levels of liquidity and activity on the Exchange, the Exchange will experience improvements in its market quality, which stands to benefit all market participants. The Exchange also believes that the proposed clarifying changes (*i.e.*, reordering the schedule of credits) and the proposal to cap rebates at

⁵ *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)).

⁶ Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808 (June 9, 2005), 70 FR 37496, 37499 (June 29, 2005) (“Regulation NMS Adopting Release”).

³ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

⁴ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4) and (5).

\$0.0029 for members receiving certain supplemental credits are equitable because the changes and the cap will be applied uniformly to all members.

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

The Proposals are not Unfairly Discriminatory

The Exchange believes that its proposals are not unfairly discriminatory. As an initial matter, the Exchange believes that nothing about its volume-based tiered pricing model is inherently unfair; instead, it is a rational pricing model that is well-established and ubiquitous in today's economy among firms in various industries—from co-branded credit cards to grocery stores to cellular telephone data plans—that use it to reward the loyalty of their best customers that provide high levels of business activity and incent other customers to increase the extent of their business activity. It is also a pricing model that the Exchange and its competitors have long employed with the assent of the Commission. It is fair because it enhances price discovery and improves the overall quality of the equity markets.

The Exchange believes that its proposals to adopt a new supplemental credit for providing non-displayed liquidity through midpoint orders, impose a cap on the amount of combined regular and supplemental credits it proposes to offer members receiving certain supplemental credits, and make clarifying changes, as described above, are not unfairly discriminatory because the changes are not intended to advantage any particular member and will be applied uniformly to all members. Moreover, the proposals stand to improve the overall market quality of the Exchange, to the benefit of all market participants, by incentivizing members to increase the extent of their liquidity adding activity in midpoint orders on the Exchange.

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

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

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

Intramarket Competition

The Exchange does not believe that its proposals will place any category of Exchange participant at a competitive disadvantage.

As noted above, the Exchange's proposals to add a new supplemental transaction credit, impose a cap on the maximum rebate offered to members receiving certain supplemental credits, and make clarifying changes are intended to have market-improving effects, to the benefit of all members. Any member may elect to achieve the level of liquidity in midpoint orders required to qualify for the new credit. The other proposed changes also apply equally and will be applied uniformly to all members.

The Exchange notes that its members are free to trade on other venues to the extent they believe that the Exchange's fee schedule is not attractive. As one can observe by looking at any market share chart, price competition between exchanges is fierce, with liquidity and market share moving freely between exchanges in reaction to fee and credit changes.

Intermarket Competition

In terms of inter-market competition, the Exchange notes that it operates in a highly competitive market in which market participants can readily favor competing venues if they deem fee levels at a particular venue to be excessive, or rebate opportunities available at other venues to be more favorable. In such an environment, the Exchange must continually adjust its credits and fees to remain competitive with other exchanges and with alternative trading systems that have been exempted from compliance with the statutory standards applicable to exchanges. Because competitors are free to modify their credit and own fees in response, and because market participants may readily adjust their order routing practices, the Exchange believes that the degree to which credit or fee changes in this market may impose any burden on competition is extremely limited.

The proposed new supplemental credit is reflective of this competition because, as a threshold issue, even as one of the largest U.S. equities exchanges by volume, the Exchange has less than 20% market share, which in most markets could hardly be categorized as having enough market power to burden competition. Moreover, price competition between exchanges is fierce, with liquidity and market share moving freely between exchanges in reaction to credit and fee changes. This

is an addition to free flow of order flow to and among off-exchange venues which comprises more than 40% of industry volume in recent months.

The Exchange's proposal to add a new supplemental transaction credit is pro-competitive in that the Exchange intends for the credit to increase liquidity addition activity in midpoint orders on the Exchange, thereby rendering the Exchange more attractive and vibrant to participants.

In sum, if the changes proposed herein are unattractive to market participants, it is likely that the Exchange will lose market share as a result. Accordingly, the Exchange does not believe that the proposed changes will impair the ability of members or competing order execution venues to maintain their competitive standing in the financial markets.

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

No written comments were either solicited or received.

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

The foregoing rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act.⁷

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. Please include file number SR-NASDAQ-2024-057 on the subject line.

⁷ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

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–NASDAQ–2024–057. 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–NASDAQ–2024–057 and should be submitted on or before November 6, 2024.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.⁸

Sherry R. Haywood,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2024–23801 Filed 10–15–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–101295; File No. SR–NYSE–2024–44]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; New York Stock Exchange LLC; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change To Adopt a Provision That the Exchange Will Not Review a Compliance Plan Submitted by a Listed Company That Is Below Compliance With a Continued Listing Standard if the Company Owes Any Unpaid Fees to the Exchange and Will Instead Immediately Commence Suspension and Delisting Procedures if Such Fees Are Not Paid in Full

October 9, 2024.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1)¹ of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”)² and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,³ notice is hereby given that on September 27, 2024, New York Stock Exchange LLC (“NYSE” or the “Exchange”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

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

The Exchange proposes to adopt a provision that the Exchange will not review a compliance plan submitted by a listed company that is below compliance with a continued listing standard if the company owes any unpaid fees to the Exchange and will instead immediately commence suspension and delisting procedures if such fees are not paid in full by the plan submission deadline or at the time of any required periodic review of such plan. The text of the proposed rule change is set forth in Exhibit 5 attached hereto. The proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's website at www.nyse.com, at the principal office of the Exchange, and at the Commission's Public Reference Room.

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

In its filing with the Commission, the self-regulatory organization included

statements concerning the purpose of, and basis for, the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of those statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant parts of such statements.

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

1. Purpose

Section 802.02 (“Evaluation and Follow-Up Procedures for Domestic Companies”) of the NYSE Listed Company Manual (“Manual”) provides that when the Exchange identifies a domestic listed company as being below certain continued listing criteria set forth in Section 802.01 of the Manual (and not able to otherwise qualify under an original listing standard), the Exchange will notify the company of such noncompliance by letter and provide the company with an opportunity to provide the Exchange with a plan (the “Plan”) advising the Exchange of definitive action the company has taken, or is taking, that would bring it into conformity with continued listing standards within 18 months of receipt of the letter. Similarly, Section 802.03 (“Continued Listing—Evaluation and Follow-up Procedures for Non-U.S. Companies”) sets forth provisions under which non-U.S. listed companies can submit a Plan to cure noncompliance with continued listing standards.

If a company submits a Plan pursuant to Sections 802.02 or 802.03, it must identify specific quarterly or semi-annual milestones against which the Exchange will evaluate the company's progress. The company has 45 days (in the case of a domestic company subject to Section 802.02) (the “Domestic Plan Deadline”) or 90 days (in the case of a non-U.S. company subject to Section 802.03) (the “Non-U.S. Plan Deadline”) and, together with the Domestic Plan Deadline, the “Plan Deadline”) from the receipt of a letter from the Exchange identifying an event of noncompliance to submit its Plan to the Exchange for review; otherwise, suspension and delisting procedures will commence in accordance with Section 804.00 of the Manual. The Plan must demonstrate how the company will return to compliance with the applicable continued listing standard by the end of the Plan period. All companies submitting a Plan must include

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 15 U.S.C. 78a.

³ 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

⁸ 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).