comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission’s Internet Web site (http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for Web site viewing and printing in the Commission’s Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549 on official business days between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Copies of the filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–CBOE–2014–091 and should be submitted on or before January 9, 2015.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.14

Kevin M. O’Neill, Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–29699 Filed 12–18–14; 8:45 am]
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SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION


Self-Regulatory Organizations: NASDAQ OMX BX; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Changes to Amend Rule 7018 to establish Fees and Rebates in Connection with BX’s Retail Price Improvement (“RPI”) Program

December 15, 2014.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”),1 and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,2 notice is hereby given that on December 3, 2014, NASDAQ OMX BX, Inc. (“BX” 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.3

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

The Exchange is proposing changes to amend BX Rule 7018 to establish fees and rebates in connection with BX’s Retail Price Improvement (“RPI”) Program. The Exchange proposes to implement the proposed rule change on December 1, 2014, contemporaneously with the launch of the RPI Program.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange’s Web site at http://nasdaqomxbx.cchwallstreet.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 Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for 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 this proposal is to amend BX Rule 7018 to establish fees and rebates for execution of orders under BX’s recently filed RPI Program.4 Under the RPI Program, a member (or a division thereof) approved by the Exchange to participate in the program (a “Retail Member Organization” or “RMO”)5 may submit designated “Retail Orders”6 for the purpose of seeking price improvement. All BX members may enter retail price improvement orders (“RPI Orders”),7 a form of non-displayed orders that are priced more aggressively than the Protected National Best Bid or Offer (“NBBO”) by at least $0.001 per share, for the purpose of offering such price improvement. RMOs may use two types of Retail Orders. A Type 1 Retail Order is eligible to execute only against RPI Orders and other orders (such as midpoint pegged orders) that will provide price improvement. Type 2 Retail Orders interact first with available RPI Orders and other price improving orders, and then are eligible to access non-price improving liquidity on the BX book and to route to other trading venues if so designated.

BX proposes to offer a rebate of $0.0025 per share executed to RMOs with respect to Retail Orders that execute against RPI Orders. RMO orders that execute against other orders providing price improvement with respect to the NBBO will receive a rebate otherwise applicable to executions of orders that access liquidity. For Type 2 Retail Orders that execute against non-price improving orders on the BX book, BX will offer a rebate otherwise applicable to execution of orders that access liquidity. Similarly, when Type 2 Retail Orders are routed and execute at another trading venue, BX will charge the fee otherwise applicable to execution of routed orders. For RPI orders that provide liquidity, BX will charge a fee of $0.0025 per share executed. Other orders that provide liquidity to Retail Orders will receive the credit or pay the fee otherwise applicable to orders that provide liquidity.

2. Statutory Basis

BX believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the provisions of Section 6 of the Act,7 in general, and with Sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act,8 in particular, in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among members and issuers and other persons that satisfies the criteria of FINRA Rule 5320.03, that originates from a natural person and is submitted to the Exchange by a Retail Member Organization, provided that no change is made to the terms of the order with respect to price (except in the case that a market order is changed to a marketable limit order) or side of market and the order does not originate from a trading algorithm or any other computerized methodology.”

A Retail Price Improvement Order is defined in BX Rule 4780(a)(2), in part, as “an agency or riskless principal order

________________________
4 A Retail Price Improvement Order is defined in BX Rule 4780(a)(2), in part, as “an agency or riskless principal order
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using any facility or system which BX operates or controls, and is not designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers, or dealers.

The proposed fees with respect to the RPI program are reflective of BX’s ongoing efforts to use pricing incentive programs to attract orders of retail customers to BX and improve market quality. The goal of this program and similar pricing incentives is to provide meaningful incentives for members that represent the orders of retail customers to increase their participation on BX.

The proposed credit of $0.0025 per share executed with respect to Retail Orders that access Retail Price Improvement Order liquidity offering price improvement is reasonable because it will result in a significant increase of rebates with respect to such orders, thereby reducing the costs of members that represent retail customers and that take advantage of the program, and potentially also reducing costs to the customers themselves. The change is consistent with an equitable allocation of fees because BX believes that it is reasonable to use rebate increases as a means to encourage greater retail participation in BX. Because retail orders are likely to reflect long-term investment intentions, they promote price discovery. Accordingly, their presence in the BX market has the potential to benefit all market participants. For this reason, BX believes that it is equitable to provide significant financial incentives to encourage greater retail participation in the market. BX further believes that the proposed program is not unreasonably discriminatory because it is offered to firms representing retail customers without regard to the firm’s trading volumes, and is therefore complementary to existing programs, such as the Routable Order Program that already aim to encourage greater retail participation, but that have minimum volume requirements associated with them. The proposed fees and credits with respect to Retail Orders that execute against liquidity other than that provided by Retail Price Improvement Orders or by routing to other trading venues are reasonable, equitably allocated, and not unreasonably discriminatory because they do not reflect a change from the fees and credits currently in effect with respect to orders that access liquidity on BX or route.

The proposed fee with respect to a Retail Price Improvement Order that provides liquidity is reasonable because, as previously recognized by the Commission, it reflects the fact that markets often seek to distinguish between orders of individual retail investors and orders of professional traders. In this instance, the RPI seeks to balance the consideration that “retail investors may [sic] on average be less informed about short-term price movements . . . [than] professional traders” with a fee charged to liquidity providers and a program designed to provide retail investors with price improvement and favorable execution prices. BX further believes that the fee charged with respect to Retail Price Improvement Orders is equitable and not unreasonably discriminatory for this same reason, and also because the use of such orders by liquidity providers is voluntary. Firms that believe that potential advantages of interacting with Retail Orders outweigh the costs of price improvement and the fee charged by BX will employ this new order type. Those that do not are free to forego involvement in the program and pay a fee under BX’s standard price schedule when providing liquidity.

Finally, BX 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, BX must continually adjust its fees to remain competitive with other exchanges and with alternative trading systems that have been exempted from compliance with the statutory standards applicable to exchanges. BX believes that the proposed rule change reflects this competitive environment because it is designed to allow BX to compete with other exchanges and that offer similar price improvement programs for retail orders.

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

BX does not believe that the proposed rule change will result in any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act, as amended. In this instance, the introduction of the RPI program is designed to allow BX to compete more effectively with the New York Stock Exchange (“NYSE”), NYSE MKT LLC (“MKT”), NYSE Arca, Inc. (“Arca”) and the BATS–Y Exchange, all of which offer similar programs designed to attract retail order flow. BX has structured its fees in a manner similar to these exchanges, but as a new “entrant” in the field of those exchanges offering such programs. Specifically, BX will offer a higher credit to Retail Orders than NYSE, MKT, or Arca and will offer the credit with respect to all securities priced above $1 that it trades. BX will, however, offset these higher credits for retail orders by charging a higher fee to liquidity providers than is the case with some of its competitors. BX believes that the proposed higher credits with respect to Retail Orders will enhance competition by drawing additional retail order flow to BX and possibly encouraging other trading venues to make competitive pricing changes.

With respect to the proposed fees for Retail Price Improvement Orders because the market for order execution is extremely competitive, members that provide liquidity may readily opt to forego participation in the BX program if they believe that alternatives offer them better value. For these reasons and the reasons discussed in connection with the statutory basis for the proposed rule change, BX 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) of the Act and paragraph (f) of Rule 19b–4 thereunder. At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission’s Internet comment form (http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml); or
- Send an email to rule-comments@sec.gov. Please include File Number SR–BX–2014–059 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

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

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–BX–2014–059. 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 Web site (http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for Web site viewing and printing in the Commission’s Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549, on official business days between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Copies of such filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–BX–2014–059 and should be submitted on or before January 9, 2015.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.13

Kevin M. O’Neill, 
Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–29698 Filed 12–18–14; 8:45 am]
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OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Determination of Trade Surplus in Certain Sugar and Syrup Goods and Sugar-Containing Products of Chile, Morocco, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Colombia, and Panama

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with relevant provisions of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS), the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) is providing notice of its determination of the trade surplus in certain sugar and syrup goods and sugar-containing products of Chile, Morocco, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Colombia, and Panama. As described below, the level of a country’s trade surplus in these goods relates to the quantity of sugar and syrup goods and sugar-containing products for which the United States grants preferential tariff treatment under (i) the United States-Chile Free Trade Agreement (Chile FTA); (ii) the United States-Morocco Free Trade Agreement (Morocco FTA); (iii) the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA–DR); (iv) the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement (Peru TPA); (v) the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement (Colombia TPA); and (vi) the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement (Panama TPA).

DATES: Effective Date: January 1, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Inquiries may be mailed or delivered to Ronald Baumgarten, Director of Agricultural Affairs, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ronald Baumgarten, Office of Agricultural Affairs, telephone: (202) 395–6127 or facsimile: (202) 395–4579.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Chile: Pursuant to section 201 of the United States-Chile Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. L. 108–302; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note), Presidential Proclamation No. 7971 of December 22, 2005 (70 FR 76651) implemented the Chile FTA on behalf of the United States and modified the HTS to reflect the tariff treatment provided for in the Chile FTA.

Note 12(a) to subchapter XI of HTS chapter 99 provides that USTR is required to publish annually in the Federal Register a determination of the amount of Chile’s trade surplus, by volume, with all sources for goods in Harmonized System (HS) subheadings 1701.11, 1701.12, 1701.91, 1701.99, 1702.20, 1702.30, 1702.40, 1702.60, 1702.90, 1806.10, 2101.12, 2101.20, and 2106.90, except that Chile’s imports of goods classified under HS subheadings 1702.40 and 1702.60 that qualify for preferential tariff treatment under the Chile FTA are not included in the calculation of Chile’s trade surplus. (HS subheading 1701.11 was reclassified as 1701.13 and 1701.14 by Proclamation 8771 of December 29, 2011, 77 FR 413.)

Note 12(b) to subchapter XI of HTS chapter 99 provides duty-free treatment for certain sugar and syrup goods and sugar-containing products of Chile entered under subheading 9911.17.05 in an amount equal to the lesser of Chile’s trade surplus or the specific quantity set out in that note for that calendar year. U.S. Note 12(c) to subchapter XI of HTS chapter 99 provides preferential tariff treatment for certain sugar and syrup goods and sugar-containing products of Chile entered under subheading 9911.17.10 through 9911.17.85 in an amount equal to the amount by which Chile’s trade surplus exceeds the specific quantity set out in that note for that calendar year.

During calendar year (CY) 2013, the most recent year for which data is available, Chile’s imports of sugar and syrup goods and sugar-containing products described above exceeded its exports of those goods by 413,505 metric tons according to data published by the Servicio Nacional de Aduana (Chile Customs). Based on this data, USTR determines that Chile’s trade surplus is negative. Therefore, in accordance with U.S. Note 12(b) and U.S. Note 12(c) to subchapter XI of HTS chapter 99, goods of Chile are not eligible to enter the United States duty-free under subheading 9911.17.05 or at preferential tariff rates under subheading 9911.17.10 through 9911.17.85 in CY 2015.

Morocco: Pursuant to section 201 of the United States-Morocco Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. L. 108–302; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note), Presidential Proclamation No. 7971 of December 22, 2005 (70 FR 76651) implemented the Morocco FTA on behalf of the United States and modified the HTS to reflect the tariff treatment provided for in the Morocco FTA.

Note 12(a) to subchapter XII of HTS chapter 99 provides that USTR is required to publish annually in the Federal Register a determination of the amount of Morocco’s trade surplus, by
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