

11. Each Fund will allocate all expenses incurred by it among the various classes of Shares based on the respective net assets of the Fund attributable to each such class, except that the net asset value and expenses of each class will reflect the expenses associated with the Distribution Plan of that class (if any), shareholder servicing fees attributable to a particular class (including transfer agency fees, if any) and any other incremental expenses of that class. Expenses of the Fund allocated to a particular class of the Fund's Shares will be borne on a pro rata basis by each outstanding Share of that class. Applicants state that each Fund will comply with the provisions of Rule 18f-3 under the Act as if it were an open-end management investment company.

12. Any Fund that imposes a CDSC will comply with the provisions of Rule 6c-10 (except to the extent a Fund will comply with FINRA Rule 2310 rather than FINRA Rule 2341, as such rule may be amended ("FINRA Rule 2341")), as if that rule applied to BDCs. With respect to any waiver of, scheduled variation in, or elimination of the CDSC, a Fund will comply with the requirements of Rule 22d-1 under the Act as if the Fund were an open-end management investment company. Each Fund also will disclose CDSCs in accordance with the requirements of Form N-1A concerning CDSCs as if the Fund were an open-end management investment company.

13. Funds may impose a Repurchase Fee at a rate no greater than 2% of the shareholder's repurchase proceeds if the interval between the date of purchase of the Shares and the valuation date with respect to the repurchase of such Shares is less than a specified period. Any Repurchase Fee will apply equally to all shareholders of the applicable Fund, regardless of class, consistent with Section 18 of the Act and Rule 18f-3 under the Act. To the extent a Fund determines to waive, impose scheduled variations of, or eliminate any Repurchase Fees, it will do so consistently with the requirements of Rule 22d-1 under the Act as if the Repurchase Fee were a CDSC and as if the Fund were an open-end investment company and the Fund's waiver of, scheduled variation in, or elimination of, the Repurchase Fee will apply uniformly to all shareholders of the Fund.

#### *Applicants' Legal Analysis:*

##### Multiple Classes of Shares

1. Section 18(a)(2) of the Act provides that a closed-end investment company may not issue or sell a senior security that is a stock unless certain

requirements are met. Applicants state that the creation of multiple classes of shares of the Funds may violate Section 18(a)(2), which is made applicable to BDCs through Section 61(a) of the Act, because the Funds may not meet such requirements with respect to a class of shares that may be a senior security.

2. Section 18(c) of the Act provides, in relevant part, that a closed-end investment company may not issue or sell any senior security if, immediately thereafter, the company has outstanding more than one class of senior security. Applicants state that the creation of multiple classes of Shares of the Funds may be prohibited by Section 18(c), which is made applicable to BDCs through Section 61(a) of the Act, as a class may have priority over another class as to payment of dividends because shareholders of different classes would pay different fees and expenses.

3. Section 18(i) of the Act provides that each share of stock issued by a registered management investment company will be a voting stock and have equal voting rights with every other outstanding voting stock. Applicants state that multiple classes of shares of the Funds may violate Section 18(i) of the Act, which is made applicable to BDCs through Section 61(a) of the Act, because each class would be entitled to exclusive voting rights with respect to matters solely related to that class.

4. Section 6(c) of the Act provides that the Commission may exempt any person, security or transaction or any class or classes of persons, securities or transactions from any provision of the Act, or from any rule or regulation under the Act, if and to the extent such exemption is necessary or appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors and the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the Act. Applicants request an exemption under Section 6(c) from Sections 18(a)(2), 18(c) and 18(i) (which are made applicable to BDCs by Section 61(a) of the Act) to permit the Funds to issue multiple classes of Shares.

5. Applicants submit that the proposed allocation of expenses relating to distribution and voting rights among multiple classes is equitable and will not discriminate against any group or class of shareholders. Applicants submit that the proposed arrangements would permit a Fund to facilitate the distribution of its Shares and provide investors with a broader choice of fee options. Applicants assert that the proposed BDC multiple class structure does not raise the concerns underlying Section 18 of the Act to any greater

degree than open-end management investment companies' multiple class structures that are permitted by Rule 18f-3 under the Act.

#### *Applicants' Condition:*

Applicants agree that any order granting the requested relief will be subject to the following condition:

1. Each Fund will comply with the provisions of Rules 6c-10 (except to the extent a Fund will comply with FINRA Rule 2310 rather than FINRA Rule 2341), 12b-1, 17d-3, 18f-3, 22d-1, and, where applicable, 11a-3 under the 1940 Act, as amended from time to time, or any successor rules thereto, as if those rules applied to BDCs. In addition, each Fund will comply with FINRA Rule 2310, as amended from time to time, or any successor rule thereto, and will make available to any distributor of a Fund's shares all of the information necessary to permit the distributor to prepare client account statements in compliance with FINRA Rule 2231.

For the Commission, by the Division of Investment Management, under delegated authority.

**J. Matthew DeLesDernier,**

*Assistant Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2020-20562 Filed 9-17-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011-01-P**

## **SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

[Release No. 34-89860; File No. SR-BX-2020-025]

### **Self-Regulatory Organizations; Nasdaq BX, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend the Exchange's Transaction Fees, at Equity 7, Section 118(a)**

September 14, 2020.

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 September 1, 2020, 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.

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

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

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

The Exchange proposes to amend the Exchange's transaction fees, 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/bx/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 Exchange operates on the "taker-maker" model, whereby it generally pays credits to members that take liquidity and charges fees to members that provide liquidity. Currently, the Exchange has a schedule, at Equity 7, Section 118(a), which consists of several different credits that it provides for orders in securities priced at \$1 or more per share that access liquidity on the Exchange and several different charges that it assesses for orders in such securities that add liquidity on the Exchange.

#### Description of the Changes

The Exchange proposes to revise its schedule of charges to add one new fee. Specifically, the Exchange proposes to charge a \$0.0022 per share executed fee for displayed orders that add liquidity entered by a member that: (i) Adds liquidity equal to or exceeding 0.12% of total Consolidated Volume during a month; and (ii) adds at least 35% more liquidity, as a percentage of total Consolidated Volume during a month, than it did during August 2020. The proposed fee represents a discount relative to the standard \$0.0030 per share executed charge for orders that provide liquidity to the Exchange, as

well as a discount relative to the \$0.0024–\$0.0028 per share executed range of existing charges for displayed orders that add liquidity above certain threshold percentages of total Consolidated during a month. Accordingly, the Exchange believes that the proposed new fee will incentivize members to grow their existing level of liquidity adding activity on the Exchange, and in particular, to grow such levels relative to a baseline of such activity. In doing so, the Exchange intends to improve the overall quality and attractiveness of the Nasdaq BX market.

#### Impact of the Changes

Those participants that act as net adders of liquidity from the Exchange will benefit directly from the proposed fee. Other participants will also benefit from the new fee insofar as any ensuing increase in liquidity adding activity will improve the overall quality of the market.

The Exchange notes that its proposal is not otherwise targeted at or expected to be limited in its applicability to a specific segment(s) of market participants nor will it apply differently to different types of market participants.

#### 2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,<sup>3</sup> in general, and furthers the objectives of Sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act,<sup>4</sup> 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 proposal is also consistent with Section 11A of the Act relating to the establishment of the national market system for securities.

#### The Proposal Is Reasonable

The Exchange's proposed change to its schedule of charge is 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'. . . .'<sup>5</sup>

The Commission and the courts have repeatedly expressed their preference for competition over regulatory intervention in determining prices, products, and services in the securities markets. In Regulation NMS, while adopting a series of steps to improve the current market model, the Commission highlighted the importance of market forces in determining prices and SRO revenues and, also, recognized that current regulation of the market system "has been remarkably successful in promoting market competition in its broader forms that are most important to investors and listed companies."<sup>6</sup>

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, and it represents a small percentage of the overall market. It is also only one of several taker-maker exchanges. 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.<sup>7</sup>

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.<sup>8</sup> Separately, the Exchange

<sup>5</sup> *NetCoalition v. SEC*, 615 F.3d 525, 539 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (quoting Securities Exchange Act Release No. 59039 (December 2, 2008), 73 FR 74770, 74782–83 (December 9, 2008) (SR–NYSEArca–2006–21)).

<sup>6</sup> Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808 (June 9, 2005), 70 FR 37496, 37499 (June 29, 2005) ("Regulation NMS Adopting Release").

<sup>7</sup> See CBOE EDGA Fee Schedule, at [https://markets.cboe.com/us/equities/membership/fee\\_schedule/edga/](https://markets.cboe.com/us/equities/membership/fee_schedule/edga/); NYSE National Fee Schedule, at [https://www.nyse.com/publicdocs/nyse/regulation/nyse/NYSE\\_National\\_Schedule\\_of\\_Fees.pdf](https://www.nyse.com/publicdocs/nyse/regulation/nyse/NYSE_National_Schedule_of_Fees.pdf).

<sup>8</sup> The Exchange perceives no regulatory, structural, or cost impediments to market participants shifting order flow away from it. In particular, the Exchange notes that these examples of shifts in liquidity and market share, along with many others, have occurred within the context of market participants' existing duties of Best Execution and obligations under the Order Protection Rule under Regulation NMS.

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

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

has provided the SEC staff with multiple examples of instances where pricing changes by BX and other exchanges have resulted in shifts in exchange market share. Within the foregoing context, the proposal represents a reasonable attempt by the Exchange to increase its liquidity and market share relative to its competitors.

The Exchange has designed its proposed schedule of charges to provide increased overall incentives to members to increase their liquidity adding activity on the Exchange. An increase in liquidity adding activity on the Exchange will, in turn, improve the quality of the Nasdaq BX market and increase its attractiveness to existing and prospective participants. Generally, the proposed new charge will be comparable to, if not favorable to, those that its competitors provide.<sup>9</sup>

The Exchange notes that those participants that are dissatisfied with the proposed charge are free to shift their order flow to competing venues that offer them lower fees.

#### The Proposal Is an Equitable Allocation of Charges

The Exchange believes its proposal will allocate its proposed new charge fairly among its market participants. It is equitable for the Exchange to charge a discounted fee to participants whose displayed orders add liquidity to the Exchange as a means of incentivizing increased liquidity adding activity on the Exchange as well as to tie the charge to the member engaging in a threshold volume of liquidity adding activity on the Exchange. An increase in liquidity adding activity on the Exchange will improve the quality of the Nasdaq BX market and increase its attractiveness to existing and prospective participants.

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

#### The Proposed Charge Is not Unfairly Discriminatory

The Exchange believes that the proposal is 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 incentivizes customer activity that increases liquidity, enhances price discovery, and improves the overall quality of the equity markets.

The Exchange intends for its proposal to improve market quality for all members on the Exchange and by extension attract more liquidity to the market, improving market wide quality and price discovery. Both net removers and net adders of liquidity to the Exchange stand to benefit directly from the proposed change. That is, to the extent that the proposed change increases liquidity adding activity on the Exchange, this will improve market quality and the attractiveness of the Nasdaq BX market, to the benefit of all existing and prospective participants.

Moreover, any participant that is dissatisfied with the proposed new charge is free to shift their order flow to competing venues that provide more favorable 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 proposal will place any category of Exchange participant at a competitive disadvantage. As noted above, all members of the Exchange will benefit from any increase in market activity that the proposal effectuates. Members may grow or modify their businesses so that they can receive the discounted fee. Moreover, members are free to trade on other venues to the extent they believe that the fee charged 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. The Exchange notes that the tier structure is consistent with broker-dealer fee practices as well as the other industries, as described above.

##### Intermarket Competition

Addressing whether the proposal could impose a burden on competition on other SROs that is not necessary or

appropriate, the Exchange believes that its proposed modifications to its schedule of charges will not impose a burden on competition because the Exchange's execution services are completely voluntary and subject to extensive competition both from a multitude of other live exchanges and off-exchange venues. 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.

The proposed new charge is reflective of this competition because, as a threshold issue, the Exchange is a relatively small market so its ability to burden intermarket competition is limited. In this regard, even the largest U.S. equities exchange by volume has less than 17–18% market share, which in most markets could hardly be categorized as having enough market power to burden competition. Moreover, as noted above, price competition between exchanges is fierce, with liquidity and market share moving freely between exchanges in reaction to fee and credit changes. This is in addition to free flow of order flow to and among off-exchange venues which presently comprises approximately 44% of industry volume.

The Exchange intends for the proposed change to its schedule of fees to increase member incentives to engage in the addition of liquidity to the Exchange. These changes are procompetitive and reflective of the Exchange's efforts to make it an attractive and vibrant venue to market participants.

In sum, if the changes 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

<sup>9</sup> See n. 7, *supra*.

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.<sup>10</sup>

At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is: (i) Necessary or appropriate in the public interest; (ii) for the protection of investors; or (iii) otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission shall institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule should be approved or disapproved.

**IV. Solicitation of Comments**

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

*Electronic Comments*

- Use the Commission's internet comment form (<http://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-BX-2020-025 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-2020-025. 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 (<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. Persons submitting comments are cautioned that we do not redact or edit personal identifying information from comment submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR-BX-2020-025 and should be submitted on or before October 9, 2020.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>11</sup>

**J. Matthew DeLesDernier,**

*Assistant Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2020-20568 Filed 9-17-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011-01-P**

**SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

**[Docket No. AB 290 (Sub-No. 409X)]**

**Norfolk Southern Railway Company—Abandonment Exemption—in the City of Clifton, Passaic County, NJ**

Norfolk Southern Railway Company (NSR) has filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR part 1152 subpart F—*Exempt Abandonments* to abandon an approximately 0.4-mile rail line extending from milepost IA 12.5 to milepost IA 12.9 in the City of Clifton in Passaic County, N.J. (the Line). The Line traverses U.S. Postal Service Zip Code 07011.

NSR has certified that: (1) No local traffic has moved over the Line for at least two years; (2) no overhead traffic has moved over the Line for at least two years, and overhead traffic, if there were any, could be rerouted over other lines; (3) no formal complaint filed by a user of rail service on the Line (or by a state or local government entity acting on behalf of such user) regarding cessation of service over the Line either is pending with the Surface Transportation Board (Board) or with any U.S. District Court or has been

decided in favor of complainant within the two-year period; and (4) the requirements at 49 CFR 1105.7 and 1105.8 (notice of environmental and historic report), 49 CFR 1105.12 (newspaper publication), and 49 CFR 1152.50(d)(1) (notice to governmental agencies) have been met.

Any employee of NSR adversely affected by the abandonment shall be protected under *Oregon Short Line Railroad—Abandonment Portion Goshen Branch Between Firth & Ammon, in Bingham & Bonneville Counties, Idaho*, 360 I.C.C. 91 (1979). To address whether this condition adequately protects affected employees, a petition for partial revocation under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) must be filed.

Provided no formal expression of intent to file an offer of financial assistance (OFA) has been received,<sup>1</sup> the exemption will be effective on October 18, 2020, unless stayed pending reconsideration. Petitions to stay that do not involve environmental issues,<sup>2</sup> formal expressions of intent to file an OFA under 49 CFR 1152.27(c)(2), and interim trail use/rail banking requests under 49 CFR 1152.29 must be filed by September 28, 2020.<sup>3</sup> Petitions to reopen or requests for public use conditions under 49 CFR 1152.28 must be filed by October 8, 2020, with the Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20423-0001.

A copy of any petition filed with the Board should be sent to NSR's representative, William A. Mullins, Baker & Miller PLLC, 2401 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20037.

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void ab initio.

NSR has filed a combined environmental and historic report that addresses the potential effects, if any, of the abandonment on the environment and historic resources. OEA will issue a Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA) by September 25, 2020. The Draft

<sup>1</sup> Persons interested in submitting an OFA must first file a formal expression of intent to file an offer, indicating the type of financial assistance they wish to provide (*i.e.*, subsidy or purchase) and demonstrating that they are preliminarily financially responsible. See 49 CFR 1152.27(c)(2)(i).

<sup>2</sup> The Board will grant a stay if an informed decision on environmental issues (whether raised by a party or by the Board's Office of Environmental Analysis (OEA) in its independent investigation) cannot be made before the exemption's effective date. See *Exemption of Out-of-Serv. Rail Lines*, 5 I.C.C.2d 377 (1989). Any request for a stay should be filed as soon as possible so that the Board may take appropriate action before the exemption's effective date.

<sup>3</sup> Filing fees for OFAs and trail use requests can be found at 49 CFR 1002.2(f)(25) and (27), respectively.

<sup>10</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

<sup>11</sup> 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).