Proposal to amend the transaction fees at Rule 7018(a) to establish a new fee for orders with Midpoint pegging that receive an execution price that is better than the midpoint of the National Best Bid and Offer.
### Form 19b-4 Information *

The self-regulatory organization must provide all required information, presented in a clear and comprehensible manner, to enable the public to provide meaningful comment on the proposal and for the Commission to determine whether the proposal is consistent with the Act and applicable rules and regulations under the Act.

### Exhibit 1 - Notice of Proposed Rule Change *

The Notice section of this Form 19b-4 must comply with the guidelines for publication in the Federal Register as well as any requirements for electronic filing as published by the Commission (if applicable). The Office of the Federal Register (OFR) offers guidance on Federal Register publication requirements in the Federal Register Document Drafting Handbook, October 1998 Revision. For example, all references to the federal securities laws must include the corresponding cite to the United States Code in a footnote. All references to SEC rules must include the corresponding cite to the Code of Federal Regulations in a footnote. All references to Securities Exchange Act Releases must include the release number, release date, Federal Register cite, Federal Register date, and corresponding file number (e.g., SR-[SRO] -xx-xx). A material failure to comply with these guidelines will result in the proposed rule change being deemed not properly filed. See also Rule 0-3 under the Act (17 CFR 240.0-3).

### Exhibit 1A - Notice of Proposed Rule Change, Security-Based Swap Submission, or Advance Notice by Clearing Agencies *

The Notice section of this Form 19b-4 must comply with the guidelines for publication in the Federal Register as well as any requirements for electronic filing as published by the Commission (if applicable). The Office of the Federal Register (OFR) offers guidance on Federal Register publication requirements in the Federal Register Document Drafting Handbook, October 1998 Revision. For example, all references to the federal securities laws must include the corresponding cite to the United States Code in a footnote. All references to SEC rules must include the corresponding cite to the Code of Federal Regulations in a footnote. All references to Securities Exchange Act Releases must include the release number, release date, Federal Register cite, Federal Register date, and corresponding file number (e.g., SR-[SRO] -xx-xx). A material failure to comply with these guidelines will result in the proposed rule change, security-based swap submission, or advance notice being deemed not properly filed. See also Rule 0-3 under the Act (17 CFR 240.0-3).

### Exhibit 2 - Notices, Written Comments, Transcripts, Other Communications

Copies of notices, written comments, transcripts, other communications. If such documents cannot be filed electronically in accordance with Instruction F, they shall be filed in accordance with Instruction G.

### Exhibit 3 - Form, Report, or Questionnaire

Copies of any form, report, or questionnaire that the self-regulatory organization proposes to use to help implement or operate the proposed rule change, or that is referred to by the proposed rule change.

### Exhibit 4 - Marked Copies

The full text shall be marked, in any convenient manner, to indicate additions to and deletions from the immediately preceding filing. The purpose of Exhibit 4 is to permit the staff to identify immediately the changes made from the text of the rule with which it has been working.

### Exhibit 5 - Proposed Rule Text

The self-regulatory organization may choose to attach as Exhibit 5 proposed changes to rule text in place of providing it in Item I and which may otherwise be more easily readable if provided separately from Form 19b-4. Exhibit 5 shall be considered part of the proposed rule change.

### Partial Amendment

If the self-regulatory organization is amending only part of the text of a lengthy proposed rule change, it may, with the Commission's permission, file only those portions of the text of the proposed rule change in which changes are being made if the filing (i.e. partial amendment) is clearly understandable on its face. Such partial amendment shall be clearly identified and marked to show deletions and additions.
1. **Text of the Proposed Rule Change**

   (a) Nasdaq BX, Inc. (“BX” or “Exchange”), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”)\(^1\) and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,\(^2\) is filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC” or “Commission”) a proposal to amend the Exchange’s transaction fees at Rule 7018(a) to establish a new fee for orders with Midpoint pegging that receive an execution price that is better than the midpoint of the National Best Bid and Offer (“NBBO”), as described further below.

   While these amendments are effective upon filing, the Exchange has designated the proposed amendments to be operative on May 1, 2018.

   A notice of the proposed rule change for publication in the Federal Register is attached as Exhibit 1. The text of the proposed rule change is attached as Exhibit 5.

   (b) Not applicable.

   (c) Not applicable.

2. **Procedures of the Self-Regulatory Organization**

   The proposed rule change was approved by senior management of the Exchange pursuant to authority delegated by the Board of Directors (the “Board”) on September 19, 2017. Exchange staff will advise the Board of any action taken pursuant to delegated authority. No other action is necessary for the filing of the rule change.

   Questions and comments on the proposed rule change may be directed to:

   Brett M. Kitt
   Senior Associate General Counsel
   Nasdaq, Inc.
   (301) 978-8132

---

3. **Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change**

   a. **Purpose**

   The purpose of the proposed rule change is to amend the Exchange's transaction fees at Rule 7018 to establish a new fee of $0.0017 per share executed for a buy (sell) order with Midpoint pegging that receives an execution price that is lower (higher) than the midpoint of the NBBO.

   The Exchange operates on the “taker-maker” model, whereby it pays credits to members that take liquidity and charges fees to members that provide liquidity. Among the fees that the Exchange charges to members that submit liquidity-providing orders to the Exchange, the Exchange charges a baseline fee of $0.0030 per share executed for each non-displayed order that adds liquidity. However, for certain types of non-displayed orders that add liquidity, the Exchange charges lower fees relative to the baseline fee as a means of incentivizing additional liquidity. For example, the Exchange charges $0.0015 per share executed for orders with Midpoint pegging\(^3\) or $0.0005 if the order with Midpoint pegging is entered by a member that adds 0.02% of total Consolidated Volume of non-displayed liquidity.

   The new fee that the Exchange proposes to charge for a Midpoint pegging order that executes at a price which is less aggressive than the midpoint of the NBBO will be higher than the $0.0005 or $0.0015 fees that the Exchange charges for Midpoint pegging orders, generally. This is reasonable because Midpoint pegging orders that execute at

---

\(^3\) Pursuant to Rule 4703(d), an order with a “Midpoint pegging” attribute is a non-displayed order whose price is determined with reference to midpoint between the Inside Bid and Inside Offer (the “Midpoint”).
prices less aggressive than the Midpoint of the NBBO provide less price improvement to other participants and execute at better prices (from the perspective of the firm having entered the order with Midpoint pegging) than Midpoint pegging orders that execute at the midpoint. However, the Exchange notes that the proposed fee will still be lower than the baseline $0.0030 fee that the Exchange charges for non-display orders as a means of incenting orders that provide price improvement relative to the Midpoint.

The Exchange also proposes to add language to existing provisions of the fee schedule that also apply to orders with Midpoint pegging to clarify that these other provisions and their associated fees do not apply to orders with Midpoint pegging that receive price improvement relative to the midpoint of the NBBO.

b. **Statutory Basis**

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,\(^4\) in general, and furthers the objectives of Sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act,\(^5\) 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 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


\(^5\) 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4) and (5).
market system “has been remarkably successful in promoting market competition in its broader forms that are most important to investors and listed companies.”

Likewise, in NetCoalition v. Securities and Exchange Commission (“NetCoalition”) the D.C. Circuit upheld the Commission’s use of a market-based approach in evaluating the fairness of market data fees against a challenge claiming that Congress mandated a cost-based approach. As the court emphasized, the Commission “intended in Regulation NMS that ‘market forces, rather than regulatory requirements’ play a role in determining the market data . . . to be made available to investors and at what cost.”

Further, “[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’….’” Although the court and the SEC were discussing the cash equities markets, the Exchange believes that these views apply with equal force to the options markets.

---


7 NetCoalition v. SEC, 615 F.3d 525 (D.C. Cir. 2010).

8 See NetCoalition, at 534 - 535.

9 Id. at 537.

10 Id. at 539 (quoting Securities Exchange Act Release No. 59039 (December 2, 2008), 73 FR 74770, 74782-83 (December 9, 2008) (SR-NYSEArca-2006-21)).
The Exchange believes that its proposed fee is reasonable because it benefits participants by providing a new way in which members may qualify for a reduced transaction fee, while also incentivizing members to add liquidity to the Exchange. It is also reasonable for the Exchange to charge a higher fee for a Midpoint pegging order that receives price improvement relative to the midpoint of the NBBO than it does for a Midpoint pegging order that executes at the Midpoint because the former order receives a better price than the latter one relative to the midpoint of the NBBO.

The Exchange believes that the proposed fee is an equitable allocation and is not unfairly discriminatory because the Exchange will apply the same fee to all similarly situated members.

4. **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. 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 fees to remain competitive with other exchanges and with alternative trading systems that have been exempted from compliance with the statutory standards applicable to exchanges. Because competitors are free to modify their own fees in response, and because market participants may readily adjust their order routing practices, the Exchange believes that the degree to which fee changes in this market may impose any burden on competition is extremely limited.
In this instance, the proposed fee does not impose a burden on competition because the Exchange's execution services are completely voluntary and subject to extensive competition both from other exchanges and from off-exchange venues. The proposed fee will apply to all similarly situated members.

Moreover, the proposal promotes competition because the Exchange intends for it to incentivize members to add liquidity to the Exchange, potentially attracting additional participants to the Exchange.

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

5. **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.

6. **Extension of Time Period for Commission Action**

Not applicable.

7. **Basis for Summary Effectiveness Pursuant to Section 19(b)(3) or for Accelerated Effectiveness Pursuant to Section 19(b)(2)**

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, the Exchange has designated this proposal as establishing or changing a due, fee, or other charge imposed by the self-regulatory organization on any person, whether or not the person is a member of the self-regulatory organization, which renders the proposed rule change effective upon filing.

---

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.

   or of the Commission

   Not applicable.

9. Security-Based Swap Submissions Filed Pursuant to Section 3C of the Act

   Not applicable.

10. Advance Notices Filed Pursuant to Section 806(e) of the Payment, Clearing and
    Settlement Supervision Act

    Not applicable.

11. Exhibits


    5. Text of the proposed rule change.
Self-Regulatory Organizations; Nasdaq BX, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change to Amend Rule 7018(a) to Establish a New Fee for Orders with Midpoint Pegging that Execute at a Price Better than the Midpoint of the NBBO

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 April 30, 2018, Nasdaq 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.

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

The Exchange proposes to establish a new fee for orders with Midpoint pegging that receive an execution price that is better than the midpoint of the National Best Bid and Offer (“NBBO”), as described further below.

While these amendments are effective upon filing, the Exchange has designated the proposed amendments to be operative on May 1, 2018.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange’s Website at http://nasdaqbx.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 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 transaction fees at Rule 7018 to establish a new fee of $0.0017 per share executed for a buy (sell) order with Midpoint pegging that receives an execution price that is lower (higher) than the midpoint of the NBBO.

The Exchange operates on the “taker-maker” model, whereby it pays credits to members that take liquidity and charges fees to members that provide liquidity. Among the fees that the Exchange charges to members that submit liquidity-providing orders to the Exchange, the Exchange charges a baseline fee of $0.0030 per share executed for each non-displayed order that adds liquidity. However, for certain types of non-displayed orders that add liquidity, the Exchange charges lower fees relative to the baseline fee as a means of incentivizing additional liquidity. For example, the Exchange charges $0.0015 per share executed for orders with Midpoint pegging\(^3\) or $0.0005 if the order with

---
\(^3\) Pursuant to Rule 4703(d), an order with a “Midpoint pegging” attribute is a non-displayed order whose price is determined with reference to midpoint between the Inside Bid and Inside Offer (the “Midpoint”).
Midpoint pegging is entered by a member that adds 0.02% of total Consolidated Volume of non-displayed liquidity.

The new fee that the Exchange proposes to charge for a Midpoint pegging order that executes at a price which is less aggressive than the midpoint of the NBBO will be higher than the $0.0005 or $0.0015 fees that the Exchange charges for Midpoint pegging orders, generally. This is reasonable because Midpoint pegging orders that execute at prices less aggressive than the Midpoint of the NBBO provide less price improvement to other participants and execute at better prices (from the perspective of the firm having entered the order with Midpoint pegging) than Midpoint pegging orders that execute at the midpoint. However, the Exchange notes that the proposed fee will still be lower than the baseline $0.0030 fee that the Exchange charges for non-display orders as a means of incenting orders that provide price improvement relative to the Midpoint.

The Exchange also proposes to add language to existing provisions of the fee schedule that also apply to orders with Midpoint pegging to clarify that these other provisions and their associated fees do not apply to orders with Midpoint pegging that receive price improvement relative to the midpoint of the NBBO.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,\(^4\) in general, and furthers the objectives of Sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act,\(^5\) in particular, in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and


\(^5\) 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4) and (5).
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 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.”

Likewise, in NetCoalition v. Securities and Exchange Commission (“NetCoalition”) the D.C. Circuit upheld the Commission’s use of a market-based
approach in evaluating the fairness of market data fees against a challenge claiming that
Congress mandated a cost-based approach. As the court emphasized, the Commission
“intended in Regulation NMS that ‘market forces, rather than regulatory requirements’
play a role in determining the market data . . . to be made available to investors and at
what cost.”

Further, “[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

---

(June 29, 2005) (“Regulation NMS Adopting Release”).

7 NetCoalition v. SEC, 615 F.3d 525 (D.C. Cir. 2010).

8 See NetCoalition, at 534 - 535.

9 Id. at 537.
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’….“10 Although the court
and the SEC were discussing the cash equities markets, the Exchange believes that these
views apply with equal force to the options markets.

The Exchange believes that its proposed fee is reasonable because it benefits
participants by providing a new way in which members may qualify for a reduced
transaction fee, while also incentivizing members to add liquidity to the Exchange. It is
also reasonable for the Exchange to charge a higher fee for a Midpoint pegging order that
receives price improvement relative to the midpoint of the NBBO than it does for a
Midpoint pegging order that executes at the Midpoint because the former order receives a
better price than the latter one relative to the midpoint of the NBBO.

The Exchange believes that the proposed fee is an equitable allocation and is not
unfairly discriminatory because the Exchange will apply the same fee to all similarly
situated members.

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. 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

10 Id. at 539 (quoting Securities Exchange Act Release No. 59039 (December 2,
2008), 73 FR 74770, 74782-83 (December 9, 2008) (SR-NYSEArca-2006-21)).
must continually adjust its fees to remain competitive with other exchanges and with alternative trading systems that have been exempted from compliance with the statutory standards applicable to exchanges. Because competitors are free to modify their own fees in response, and because market participants may readily adjust their order routing practices, the Exchange believes that the degree to which fee changes in this market may impose any burden on competition is extremely limited.

In this instance, the proposed fee does not impose a burden on competition because the Exchange's execution services are completely voluntary and subject to extensive competition both from other exchanges and from off-exchange venues. The proposed fee will apply to all similarly situated members.

Moreover, the proposal promotes competition because the Exchange intends for it to incentivize members to add liquidity to the Exchange, potentially attracting additional participants to the Exchange.

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

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

No written comments were either solicited or received.
III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

The foregoing rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act.11

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 (
  http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml); or
- Send an e-mail to rule-comments@sec.gov. Please include File Number SR-BX-2018-018 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-2018-018. This file number should be included on the subject line if e-mail 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 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 10:00 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-BX-2018-018 and should be submitted on or before [insert date 21 days from publication in the Federal Register].

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.\textsuperscript{12}

Eduardo A. Aleman
Assistant Secretary

\textsuperscript{12} 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).
Rules of Nasdaq BX

* * * * *

7018. Nasdaq BX Equities System Order Execution and Routing
(a) The following charges and credits shall apply to the use of the order execution and routing services of the Nasdaq BX Equities System by members for all securities priced at $1 or more per share that it trades. As used in this rule, the term "Consolidated Volume" shall mean the total consolidated volume reported to all consolidated transaction reporting plans by all exchanges and trade reporting facilities during a month in equity securities, excluding executed orders with a size of less than one round lot. For purposes of calculating Consolidated Volume and the extent of a member's trading activity the date of the annual reconstitution of the Russell Investments Indexes shall be excluded from both total Consolidated Volume and the member's trading activity. As used in this rule, "price improvement" shall mean instances when the accepted price of an order differs from the executed price of an order.

Credit for entering order that accesses liquidity in the Nasdaq BX Equities System:

No change.

Charge for providing liquidity through the Nasdaq BX Equities System:

Displayed order entered by a member that adds liquidity equal to or exceeding 0.55% of total Consolidated Volume during a month:

$0.0013 per share executed

Displayed order entered by a member that adds liquidity equal to or exceeding 0.25% of total Consolidated Volume during a month:

$0.0014 per share executed

Displayed order entered by a member that adds liquidity equal to or exceeding 0.15%
of total Consolidated Volume during a month:

Displayed order entered by a member that adds liquidity equal to or exceeding the member's Growth Target. The Growth Target is the liquidity the member added in January 2017 as a percent of total Consolidated Volume plus 0.04% of total Consolidated Volume:

$0.0018 per share executed

Order with Midpoint pegging entered by a member that adds 0.02% of total Consolidated Volume of non-displayed liquidity excluding a buy (sell) order that receives an execution price that is lower (higher) than the midpoint of the NBBO:

$0.0005 per share executed

Order with Midpoint pegging entered by another member excluding a buy (sell) order that receives an execution price that is lower (higher) than the midpoint of the NBBO:

$0.0015 per share executed

Buy (sell) order with Midpoint pegging that receives an execution price that is lower (higher) than the midpoint of the NBBO:

$0.0017 per share executed

Non-displayed orders (other than orders with Midpoint pegging) entered by a member that adds 0.06% of total Consolidated Volume of non-displayed liquidity:

$0.0024 per share executed

All other non-displayed orders:

$0.0030 per share executed

All other orders:

$0.0020 per share executed

Charge for BSTG or BSCN order that executes in a venue other than the Nasdaq BX Equities System:

$0.0030 per share executed at NYSE

$0.0030 per share executed at venues other than NYSE
Charge for BMOP order that executes in a venue other than the Nasdaq BX Equities System:

- $0.0035 per share executed at NYSE
- $0.0035 per share executed at venues other than NYSE

Charge for BTFY order that executes in a venue other than the Nasdaq BX Equities System:

- $0.0030 per share executed at NYSE
- $0.0030 per share executed at Nasdaq
- $0.0030 per share executed at Nasdaq PSX
- $0.0007 per share executed at venues other than NYSE, Nasdaq and Nasdaq PSX

Charge for BCRT order that executes in a venue other than the Nasdaq BX Equities System:

- $0.0030 per share executed at Nasdaq PSX
- $0.0030 per share executed at Nasdaq

Charge for BDRK and BCST order that executes in a venue other than the Nasdaq BX Equities System:

- $0.0010 per share executed

(b) – (e) No change.

* * * * *