otherwise known as regulatory arbitrage. In actuality, the proposal is pro-competitive because it promotes fair and orderly markets and investor protection, which in turn will restore investor confidence and attract more investors into U.S. equities markets.

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

Written comments were neither solicited nor received.

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

The Exchange has filed the proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) thereunder. Because the proposed rule change does not: (i) Significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (ii) impose any significant burden on competition; and (iii) become operative prior to 30 days from the date on which it was filed, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, if consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest, the proposed rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act and Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) thereunder.

A proposed rule change filed under Rule 19b–4(f)(6) normally does not become operative prior to 30 days after the date of the filing. However, pursuant to Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii), the Commission may designate a shorter time if such action is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest. The Exchange has asked the Commission to designate an operative date of April 8, 2013. The Commission believes that waiving the operative delay and designating April 8, 2013 as the operative date of the proposed rule change is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest. The proposed rule change is consistent with 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–NASDAQ–2013–045 on the subject line.

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

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–NASDAQ–2013–045. 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 publicly available. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–NASDAQ–2013–045 and should be submitted on or before April 18, 2013.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority. 20

Kevin M. O’Neill,
Deputy Secretary.
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I. Introduction


and a response letter from Nasdaq. On September 12, 2012, the Commission extended the time period for Commission action to October 30, 2012. On October 26, 2012, the Commission instituted proceedings to determine whether to approve or disapprove the accommodation proposal. The Commission then received six additional comment letters on the proposal and a second response letter from Nasdaq. On January 23, 2013, the Commission extended the time period for Commission action to March 29, 2013. This order approves the proposed rule change.

II. Description of Proposal

Pursuant to existing Nasdaq Rule 4626(a), Nasdaq and its affiliates are not liable for any losses, damages, or other claims arising out of the Nasdaq Market Center or its use. However, existing Nasdaq Rule 4626(b) allows Nasdaq to compensate users of the Nasdaq Market Center for losses directly resulting from the systems’ actual failure to correctly process an order, Quote/Order, message, or other data, provided the Nasdaq Market Center has acknowledged receipt of the order, Quote/Order, message, or data. Nasdaq’s payment for all claims made by all market participants related to the use of the Nasdaq Market Center during a single calendar month shall not exceed the larger of $3,000,000 or the amount of the recovery obtained by Nasdaq under any applicable insurance policy.

Nasdaq proposes to add subsection (3) to Nasdaq Rule 4626(b) to establish a voluntary accommodation program for certain claims arising from the initial public offering (“IPO”) of Facebook, Inc. (“Facebook”) on May 18, 2012 (collectively “Facebook IPO”).

Specifically, Nasdaq proposes to compensate market participants for certain claims related to system difficulties in the Nasdaq Halts and Imbalance Cross process (“Cross”) in connection with the Facebook IPO in an amount not to exceed $62 million. Further, as proposed by Nasdaq, claims for compensation must arise solely from realized or unrealized direct trading losses from four specific categories of Cross orders: (i) Sell Cross orders that were submitted between 11:11 a.m. ET and 11:30 a.m. ET on May 18, 2012, that were priced at $42.00 or less, and that did not execute; (ii) sell Cross orders that were submitted between 11:11 a.m. ET and 11:30 a.m. ET on May 18, 2012, that were priced at $42.00 or less, and that executed at a price below $42.00; (iii) buy Cross orders priced at exactly $42.00 and that were executed in the Cross, but not immediately confirmed; and (iv) buy Cross orders priced above $42.00 and that were executed in the Cross, but not immediately confirmed, but only to the extent entered with respect to a customer that was permitted by the member to cancel its order prior to 1:50 p.m. and for which a request to cancel the order was submitted to Nasdaq by the member, also prior to 1:50 p.m.

According to proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(B), the measure of loss for the Cross orders described in (i), (iii), and (iv) above would be the lesser of: (a) the differential between the expected execution price of the orders in the Cross process that established an opening print of $42.00 and the actual execution price received; or (b) the differential between the expected execution price of the orders in the Cross process that established an opening print of $42.00 and a benchmark price of $40.527.8 With respect to Cross orders described in (iv) above, the amount of loss would be reduced by 30 percent. Further, the term “customer” includes any unaffiliated entity upon whose behalf an order is entered, including any unaffiliated broker or dealer. See proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(A).

According to proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(B), the measure of loss for the Cross orders described in (i), (iii), and (iv) above would be the lesser of: (a) the differential between the expected execution price of the orders in the Cross process that established an opening print of $42.00 and the actual execution price received; or (b) the differential between the expected execution price of the orders in the Cross process that established an opening print of $42.00 and a benchmark price of $40.527.8 With respect to Cross orders described in (iv) above, the amount of loss would be reduced by 30 percent. Further, the term “customer” includes any unaffiliated entity upon whose behalf an order is entered, including any unaffiliated broker or dealer. See proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(A).

According to proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(B), the measure of loss for the Cross orders described in (i), (iii), and (iv) above would be the lesser of: (a) the differential between the expected execution price of the orders in the Cross process that established an opening print of $42.00 and the actual execution price received; or (b) the differential between the expected execution price of the orders in the Cross process that established an opening print of $42.00 and a benchmark price of $40.527.8 With respect to Cross orders described in (iv) above, the amount of loss would be reduced by 30 percent. Further, the term “customer” includes any unaffiliated entity upon whose behalf an order is entered, including any unaffiliated broker or dealer. See proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(A).

According to proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(B), the measure of loss for the Cross orders described in (i), (iii), and (iv) above would be the lesser of: (a) the differential between the expected execution price of the orders in the Cross process that established an opening print of $42.00 and the actual execution price received; or (b) the differential between the expected execution price of the orders in the Cross process that established an opening print of $42.00 and a benchmark price of $40.527.8 With respect to Cross orders described in (iv) above, the amount of loss would be reduced by 30 percent. Further, the term “customer” includes any unaffiliated entity upon whose behalf an order is entered, including any unaffiliated broker or dealer. See proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(A).

According to proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(B), the measure of loss for the Cross orders described in (i), (iii), and (iv) above would be the lesser of: (a) the differential between the expected execution price of the orders in the Cross process that established an opening print of $42.00 and the actual execution price received; or (b) the differential between the expected execution price of the orders in the Cross process that established an opening print of $42.00 and a benchmark price of $40.527.8 With respect to Cross orders described in (iv) above, the amount of loss would be reduced by 30 percent. Further, the term “customer” includes any unaffiliated entity upon whose behalf an order is entered, including any unaffiliated broker or dealer. See proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(A).
according to proposed Rule 4626(b)(3)(B), the measure of loss for the Cross orders described in (ii) above would be the differential between the expected execution price of the orders in the Cross process that established an opening price of $42.00 and the actual execution price received.20

With respect to the process for submitting claims pursuant to proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3), all claims must be submitted in writing no later than seven days after this accommodation proposal is approved by the Commission.21 As proposed, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (“FINRA”) would process and evaluate all the claims submitted, using the standards set forth in Nasdaq Rule 4626.22 FINRA would then provide to the Nasdaq Board of Directors and the Board of Directors of The NASDAQ OMX Group, Inc. an analysis of the total value of eligible claims submitted under proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3), and Nasdaq would thereafter file with the Commission a report summarizing the conclusions of the FINRA staff assessing the claims.23

According to proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(B), payments would be made in two tranches.50 First, if the member has provided customer compensation, the member would receive an amount equal to the lesser of the member’s share31 or the amount of customer compensation.32 Second, the member would receive an amount with respect to covered proprietary losses, however, the sum of payments to a member would not exceed the member’s share.33 According to proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(G), if the amount calculated under the first tranche (i.e., customer compensation) exceeds $62 million, accommodation would be prorated among members eligible to receive accommodation under the first tranche. If the first tranche is paid in full and the amount calculated under the second tranche exceeds the funds remaining from the $62 million accommodation pool, such funds would be prorated among members eligible to receive accommodation under the second tranche.34

III. Summary of Comments and Nasdaq’s Responses

As previously noted, the Commission received a total of seventeen comment letters on the accommodation proposal and two response letters from Nasdaq.36 Fourteen commenters raised concerns with respect to the accommodation proposal,37 two commenters expressed their support for the accommodation proposal,38 and one commenter addressed the issue of exchange liability more broadly.39

Commenters raised concerns in the following areas, each of which is discussed in greater detail below: (1) The requirement that market participants release all other potentially valid claims as a condition to participation in the accommodation program; (2) Nasdaq’s calculation and use of a benchmark price of $40.527; (3) the categories of claim-eligible trading losses; (4) the amount of the accommodation pool; (5) regulatory immunity from private suits and limitations on liability; (6) the applicability of Nasdaq Rule 4626; (7) the impact of approval of the accommodation proposal on pending litigation; and (8) two procedural issues.
claimants is conditioned upon the member firm executing a release of claims by the firm or its affiliates against Nasdaq for losses associated with the Facebook IPO on May 18, 2012. Specifically, one commenter indicated that requiring execution of the release as a precondition to participation in the accommodation proposal creates a “fundamentally unfair dilemma” for members. According to the commenter, Nasdaq members must choose to execute a release of claims and participate in the accommodation program, which may not make the member whole, or pursue the “cost-and-resource-intensive alternative avenues of recovery.” This commenter believes that members should be able to both participate in the accommodation program and be able to pursue other avenues of recourse. According to this commenter, any recovery under the accommodation program should be “setoff against future claims,” but should not preclude future claims against Nasdaq, especially for claims for losses that are not eligible for compensation under the accommodation program. This commenter further stated that any release requirement should be limited to the categories of claim-eligible trading losses—allowing other avenues of recourse for losses that are not eligible to receive compensation under the accommodation program. Another commenter noted that releases of claims are typically the product of commercial, arms-length negotiation and not part of a rule imposed by a regulatory authority. Finally, one commenter suggested that Nasdaq members be given the option to “opt in” to the accommodation program on an order by order basis or a firm by firm basis.

In response, Nasdaq asserted that the release requirement is fair, reasonable, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act because it is “aimed at avoiding unnecessary litigation and ensuring equal treatment of all members receiving funds under the accommodation proposal.”

Moreover, Nasdaq noted that participation in the accommodation program and execution of the release are entirely voluntary. Accordingly, members that wish to forgo participation in the accommodation program and pursue claims against Nasdaq instead remain free to do so. Nasdaq also noted that the use of a release is routine in the context of a payment in settlement of a disputed claim, including those brought against regulated entities. Finally, Nasdaq argued that allowing members to participate in the accommodation program without releasing Nasdaq from other claims related to the Facebook IPO Cross would, in effect, “subsidize the costs of future litigation against itself.”

B. Nasdaq’s Uniform Benchmark Price

Several commenters expressed concern with Nasdaq’s calculation and use of the uniform benchmark price of $40.527 to determine the amount of compensation owed to a member under the accommodation proposal. Generally, these commenters stated that, contrary to Nasdaq’s assertion, a “reasonably diligent member” would not have mitigated losses during the first forty-five minutes after execution reports were delivered to firms. More specifically, two commenters stated that the uniform benchmark price should be based on a VWAP of Facebook stock on Monday, May 21, 2012.

In response, Nasdaq asserted that the use of the VWAP of Facebook stock during the 45 minute window after 1:50 p.m. is appropriate as the benchmark price because 45 minutes provided members enough time to identify and mitigate any unexpected losses or unanticipated positions. Nasdaq argued that an objective benchmark, rather than a subjective benchmark premised on an evaluation of each individual member’s circumstances and trading decisions, is necessary to avoid inconsistent and potentially discriminatory distributions under the accommodation proposal. Additionally, because Nasdaq is not prepared to increase the size of the $62 million accommodation pool, Nasdaq believes that “a change in the benchmark price would actually reduce the funds available to claimants that acted quickly to mitigate their losses, for the benefit of those that did not.”

C. Nasdaq’s Categories of Claim-Eligible Trading Losses

Several commenters stated that the types of orders eligible to receive compensation under the accommodation proposal are too narrowly defined. Two commenters believe that Nasdaq should provide compensation for losses resulting from “downstream operational, technological and customer issues.” One commenter stated that Nasdaq’s system failures, specifically the failure to deliver execution reports for more than two hours after trading began, “caused direct and severe damage” to the commenter and other market participants and led to direct trading losses. Another commenter argued that customer orders entered before

56 See Nasdaq Letter I, supra note 5, at 3. Specifically, Nasdaq noted that: (i) All orders and cancellations, including those entered between 11:11 a.m. and 11:30 a.m., were “executed, cancelled, or released into the market” by 1:50 p.m.; (ii) confirmations of all trades and cancellations had been disseminated to members by 1:50 p.m.; and (iii) Nasdaq began reporting a firm bid and ask to the tape and all data feeds were operating normally by 1:50 p.m. See id. at 3–4. Nasdaq also stated that it issued a “System Status message” informing members that all systems were operating normally by 1:57 p.m. See id. at 4.

57 See Nasdaq Letter II, supra note 9, at 4.

58 See id.

59 See UBS Letter I, supra note 4, at 2–3; Citi Letter, supra note 4, at 7–10; and UBS Letter II, supra note 8, at 3.

60 See UBS Letter I, supra note 4, at 3. See also UBS Letter II, supra note 8, at 3; and Citi Letter, supra note 4, at 7–10 (noting that “[i]n some cases, investors submitted multiple redundant orders based on the belief that the orders were not going through” and “[i]n other cases, investors submitted cancellations before receiving order confirmations, but were stuck with the stock.”).

61 See UBS Letter I, supra note 4, at 3; and UBS Letter II, supra note 8, at 3 urging the Commission to condition approval of the accommodation proposal on expansion of the categories of losses eligible for compensation).
11:11 a.m. on May 18, 2012, that were “cancel/replaced” between 11:11 a.m. and 11:30:09 a.m. should be treated differently from other orders entered during such time and should be entitled to full compensation.62

Another commenter observed that the accommodation proposal provides no direct compensation to “ordinary retail investors” and does not guarantee that retail investors would receive any compensation for losses.63 Because Nasdaq’s proposal contemplates paying retail customers through Nasdaq member broker-dealers, the commenter expressed concern that there is no guarantee that compensation will ultimately be passed back to the retail investor, especially in instances where the member’s “customer” is another broker-dealer.64 Nasdaq responded by stating that the question before the Commission is only whether the proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Act.65 Nasdaq asserted that commenters have not argued that the proposal “discriminates unfairly” among members or that it is otherwise inconsistent with the requirements of the Act.66 Nasdaq stated its belief that none of the comments provide a basis for the Commission to determine that a modification to the methodology and criteria it proposed “is necessary to remedy any inconsistency with the Exchange Act.”67 With respect to retail investors, Nasdaq stated that its accommodation proposal would benefit retail investors with eligible claims even though Nasdaq has no direct relationship with them.68 Nasdaq noted that the accommodation proposal requires each member to submit an attestation regarding the amount of compensation provided or to be provided by the member to its customers.69 Moreover, Nasdaq pointed out that accommodation payments are to be made in two tranches with the first tranche going toward retail customer claims.70

D. $62 Million Accommodation Pool is Insufficient

Several commenters argued that the proposed $62 million accommodation pool is an insufficient amount to compensate market participants harmed by Nasdaq’s systems issues.71 One commenter expressed concern that the second tranche of payments, which would provide compensation for covered proprietary losses72 (the majority of this commenter’s losses), may not be reimbursed at all as claims for customer losses disbursed in the first tranche will likely exhaust the entire accommodation pool.73 Nasdaq responded that commenters’ objections to the amount of compensation are “unpersuasive” because the Commission has already determined that rules, such as existing Nasdaq Rule 4626, limiting exchange liability are consistent with the Act.74 Furthermore, according to Nasdaq, if the accommodation proposal is disapproved, the current (much lower) limitation on liability of $500,000 would apply.75 Nasdaq emphasized that members who believe the amount of compensation offered is insufficient or otherwise dislike the accommodation proposal may elect not to participate.76 Nasdaq stated that it is not prepared to increase the size of the $62 million dollar accommodation pool.77 According to Nasdaq, the purpose of the accommodation proposal is “to modify an existing rule that limits Nasdaq’s liability to $500,000 in order to make additional funds available to compensate members and their customers for the categories of loss defined in the [accommodation] proposal * * *.”78 Nasdaq stated that “[t]he purpose of the [accommodation] proposal is not to pay all claims of losses alleged with respect to the trading of Facebook stock, nor even all claims of losses alleged to have been incurred on May 18, 2012.”79 As to one commenter’s concern that the accommodation pool will be exhausted before any payments are made in the second tranche for covered proprietary losses, Nasdaq stated that it believes that the $62 million “will be sufficiently fully to compensate valid claims under the terms” of the accommodation proposal.80 Moreover, Nasdaq argued, that it believes “the proposed regulatory organization in favor of members who have or will pass compensation on to their customers is consistent with the Act.”81

E. Regulatory Immunity from Private Suits and Limitations on Liability

A number of commenters asserted that Nasdaq is not entitled to immunity from liability because it was acting in its “for profit” capacity in its handling of the Facebook IPO, rather than acting in its “regulatory capacity” as a self-regulatory organization.82 However, several commenters stated their belief that the broader issues of regulatory immunity and limitations on exchange liability should be considered separately from Nasdaq’s accommodation proposal.83 Nasdaq responded that the Commission’s task with regard to the accommodation proposal is only to determine whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act, and the Commission does not need to address the issue of regulatory immunity to do so.84

F. Applicability of Nasdaq Rule 4626

According to one commenter, market participants’ losses “resulted not from the type of ordinary system failures contemplated by Rule 4626 * * *, but rather from a known design flaw that resulted in a similar technology issue dating back to Fall 2011, as well as Nasdaq’s high-risk, profit-oriented

62 See Vandham Letter, supra note 4, at 3. The commenter believes that Nasdaq’s failure to properly account for cancel/replaced orders resulted in Nasdaq “taking the profits generated from certain clients to distribute amongst a larger group.” See id.
63 See Thompson Letter I, supra note 4, at 3–4; and Thompson Letter II, supra note 8, at note 1.
64 See Thompson Letter I, supra note 4, at 11. See also Thompson Letter II, supra note 8, at note 1.
65 See Nasdaq Letter I, supra note 5, at 2.
66 See id. But see Robinson Letter, supra note 8, at 1; Abelson Letter, supra note 8, at 2; and Mann Letter, supra note 8, at 1 (generally stating each commenter’s belief that anything less than full compensation for his losses is inconsistent with the “just and equitable principles of trade” and is therefore inconsistent with the requirements of the Act); see also Triad Letter, supra note 4, at 2; Vandham Letter, supra note 4, at 1; 1; UBS Letter I, supra note 4, at 2–3; Thompson Letter I, supra note 4, at 3–4 (generally arguing for greater compensation to market participants for their losses). See Nasdaq Letter I, supra note 5, at 4.
67 See id.
68 See id. at 8.
69 See id. at 8.
70 See id. at 8.
71 See UBS Letter I, supra note 4, at 2 (estimating that its losses are “in excess of $350 million” and describing Nasdaq’s proposal to pay $62 million in the aggregate as “woefully inadequate”); Thompson Letter I, supra note 4, at 4 and 20; Thompson Letter II, supra note 8, at note 1; and UBS Letter II, supra note 8, at 2–4.
72 See supra notes 26, 30–34 and accompanying text.
73 See UBS Letter II, supra note 8, at 2–4.
74 See Nasdaq Letter I, supra note 5, at 2.
75 See id.
76 See id. at 2–3; and Nasdaq Letter II, supra note 9, at 4.
77 See Nasdaq Letter II, supra note 9, at 4.
78 See Nasdaq Letter I, supra note 5, at 4.
79 See id.
80 See Nasdaq Letter II, supra note 9, at 4.
81 See id.
82 See Gill Letter, supra note 4, at 2–4 and 12–15; SIFMA Letter I, supra note 4, at 2–4; Thompson Letter I, supra note 4, at 8–10; Thompson Letter II, supra note 6, at note 1; and UBS Letter II, supra note 8, at 4–5.
83 See Citadel Letter, supra note 4, at 2; Knight Letter, supra note 4, at 2; Thompson Letter II, supra note 8, at note 2; UBS Letter II, supra note 8, at 4–5; SIFMA Letter II, supra note 8, at 5.
84 See Nasdaq Letter I, supra note 5, at 6–7.
behavior prior to and during the IPO.  * * * 85 This commenter argued that it is improper to use Rule 4626 to create an accommodation fund in connection with the Facebook IPO because the losses suffered in connection with the IPO do not fall within the parameters of Rule 4626. 86

Nasdaq emphasized in response that Rule 4626 is a pre-existing Commission approved rule and that the rule squarely applies to Nasdaq’s systems issues related to the Facebook IPO. 87

G. Impact on Pending Litigation

Two commenters expressed concern that Commission approval of the accommodation proposal might negatively impact other adjudications of disputes with Nasdaq regarding the Facebook IPO. 88 The commenters expressed concern that courts or other adjudicative bodies might interpret Commission approval of the accommodation proposal as defining or approving the classes of eligible claimants as restricted only to market participants who submitted one of the four enumerated Cross order types. 89 Nasdaq did not specifically respond to commenters’ concerns on this issue.

H. Procedural Concerns

Several commenters raised procedural concerns regarding the implementation of the accommodation proposal. 90 Two commenters noted that Nasdaq should waive the one-year time limit to bring actions against Nasdaq in Sections 18(H) and 19 of its Service Agreement given the amount of time it could take to implement the compensation process set forth in the proposed rule change. 91

Four commenters stated that Nasdaq member firms should not be required to release Nasdaq from liability before member firms receive notice of a final payment amount pursuant to the accommodation proposal. 92 Nasdaq responded that commenters’ requests to extend the one-year time limit for members to bring claims against Nasdaq improperly ask the Commission to interfere with existing contractual relationships that have no bearing on whether Nasdaq Rule 4626 should be amended. 93 As for concerns that claimants might have to release their claims against Nasdaq prior to receiving compensation under the accommodation proposal, Nasdaq represents that the release will become effective upon payment. 94

IV. Discussion and Commission Findings

As described above, commenters have raised a number of concerns about the proposed rule change. The Commission contends that it is not a fair or equitable approach to compensating market participants harmed by Nasdaq’s system issues. Nasdaq has explained, however, that it did not design the proposed rule change to compensate all claims of loss suffered by market participants relating to Nasdaq’s system difficulties with the Cross. 95 Rather, Nasdaq, in the accommodation proposal, is proposing to change a Nasdaq rule that in its current form strictly limits the amount of compensation that may be paid to users of the Nasdaq Market Center. In considering whether to approve the proposed rule change, the Commission takes into account the existing circumstances and the manner in which the current Nasdaq rules would operate if the Commission disapproved the proposed rule change. 96

The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities exchange designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to, and facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest, and not be designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers, or dealers.

Existing Nasdaq rules state that Nasdaq and its affiliates are not liable for any losses, damages, or other claims arising out of the Nasdaq Market Center or its users. 97 However, as noted above, 98 Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(1)(A) only allows Nasdaq to compensate users of the Nasdaq Market Center for certain types of losses directly resulting from its systems’ actual failures. Under current Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(1), payment for all such claims made by all market participants during a single calendar month cannot exceed the larger of $500,000 or the amount of recovery obtained by Nasdaq under any applicable insurance policy. 99 While the accommodation proposal is not designed to, and would not, compensate all claims of loss suffered by market participants relating to Nasdaq’s system failures, the accommodation proposal provides that any claim, dispute, controversy, or other matter in question arising out of the agreement must be made no later than one year after it has arisen. Section 19 of the agreement provides that any claim, dispute, controversy, or other matter in question arising out of the agreement must be made no later than one year after it has arisen. Section 19 of the agreement provides that any claim, dispute, controversy, or other matter in question arising out of the agreement must be made no later than one year after it has arisen.
difficulties with the Cross, the Commission notes that the accommodation proposal would create a means of providing significantly more compensation for eligible claims, outside of litigation, than would otherwise be available under existing Nasdaq Rule 4626(b). Accordingly, approval of the proposed rule change will make more funds available to compensate investors and Nasdaq members under Nasdaq’s rules, which the Commission believes is in the public interest.

The Commission believes that the proposal sets forth objective and transparent processes to determine eligible claims and how such claims would be paid to Nasdaq members that elect to participate in the accommodation plan. Specifically, Nasdaq proposes to provide additional compensation beyond that available under existing Rule 4626(b)(1) for claims of realized or unrealized direct trading losses arising from four specific categories of Cross orders. Also, as noted above, proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(B) would set forth the methods for calculating the amount of losses for each of the four categories of Cross orders. In addition, proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(D) specifies the time period for a member to submit its claim and provides that FINRA would process and evaluate the claims.

Proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(E) sets forth details regarding FINRA’s review process, the timing of payments by Nasdaq, and the manner of payment (i.e., in cash).

As discussed in more detail above, several commenters objected to limiting compensation under the accommodation proposal to the four categories of Cross orders. Further, several commenters questioned the adequacy of the amount of compensation that would be provided to Nasdaq members under the accommodation proposal as well as the calculation and use of the benchmark price in determining the amount of loss repayable under the accommodation proposal. In determining that approval of the accommodation proposal is consistent with the Act, the Commission is not reaching any conclusion on the overall adequacy of the amount of the compensation pool, the benchmark price used, or other limitations on eligibility.

In order to receive compensation under proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3), a member must timely submit to Nasdaq an attestation detailing the amount of customer compensation and covered proprietary losses. The proposal would further require the member to maintain books and records that detail the nature and amount of customer compensation and covered proprietary losses. The Commission believes that the proposed attestation and recordkeeping requirements should help incentivize Nasdaq members to accurately determine the amount of customer compensation and covered proprietary losses and submit claims accordingly. Moreover, payments made pursuant to proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3) would be made in two tranches—a member would first receive an amount equal to the lesser of the member’s share or the amount of customer compensation, and then receive an amount with respect to covered proprietary losses. The Commission believes that, because the accommodation proposal would accommodate members for customer losses before accommodating members for proprietary losses, the accommodation proposal should encourage members to compensate their customers for customer losses related to the Facebook IPO.

Lastly, in order to receive payments under proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3), within 14 days after the effective date of a separate proposed rule change setting forth the amount of eligible claims, a member must execute and deliver to Nasdaq a release of all claims by the member or its affiliates against Nasdaq or its affiliates for losses that arise out of, are associated with, or relate in any way to the Facebook IPO Cross or to any actions or omissions related in any way to that Cross. As discussed above, several commenters opposed the proposed waiver of claims. However, although a member must execute a release of claims in order to receive any payment under proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3), participation in the accommodation program is voluntary, which means a member is free to elect not to submit a claim for compensation under the accommodation program and choose instead to pursue other remedies.

For the reasons discussed in this section, the Commission finds that Nasdaq’s proposal to amend its existing Rule 4626 to increase the amount of compensation Nasdaq is authorized to provide from $500,000 to $62 million for certain types of claims arising in connection with the Facebook IPO on May 18, 2012, is consistent with the Section 6(b)(5) of the Act. In reaching its conclusion, the Commission is relying on the representations made by Nasdaq in its accommodation proposal, but is not making any determinations regarding the accuracy of the facts as represented by Nasdaq, and notes that certain commenters have contested Nasdaq’s representation of the facts. In addition, the Commission is not expressing any view with respect to any issue other than whether the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 19(b) of the Act. For example, as discussed above, several commenters questioned whether Nasdaq should be entitled to immunity from liability based on its actions with respect to the Facebook IPO. Other commenters argued that the question of whether regulatory immunity applies should be considered separately from this proposed rule change. Whether regulatory immunity should apply to Nasdaq in connection with its actions related to the Facebook IPO is outside the scope of the proposed rule change and the Commission’s consideration of such proposed rule change. Similarly, as discussed in more detail above, several commenters expressed concern that approval of the proposed rule change could potentially impact pending litigation with Nasdaq regarding the Facebook IPO. The Commission emphasizes that this approval order addresses only whether the proposed change to Nasdaq’s existing

102 See supra note 79 and accompanying text.
103 Several commenters questioned the adequacy of the amount of compensation that would be provided to Nasdaq members under the accommodation proposal as well as the calculation and use of the benchmark price in determining the amount of loss repayable under the accommodation proposal.
104 See proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(A).
105 See supra notes 18–20 and accompanying text.
106 See supra notes 21–23 and accompanying text.
107 See supra notes 23–24 and accompanying text.
108 See supra notes 59–64 and accompanying text.
109 See supra notes 53–55, 71 and accompanying text.
110 See proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(F).
111 See id.
112 See supra note 25 (defining “customer compensation”).
113 See proposed Nasdaq Rule 4626(b)(3)(G).
114 See supra notes 26 (defining “covered proprietary losses”) and 30–35 and accompanying text (explaining how funds are to be allocated).
115 See supra notes 40–46 and accompanying text.
116 The Commission notes that Nasdaq intends to implement the accommodation proposal such that a member would be aware of the results of its claim prior to being required to execute a release and that Nasdaq represents that the release will become effective upon payment. See supra note 94 and accompanying text.
117 See supra note 82 and accompanying text.
118 See supra note 83 and accompanying text.
119 See supra notes 88–89 and accompanying text.
accommodation rule is consistent with Section 19(b) of the Act. The Commission also notes that, given the amount of time it could take to implement the accommodation process set forth in the proposed rule change, several commenters urged Nasdaq to waive the one-year time limit set forth in Nasdaq’s service agreement within which members must bring actions against Nasdaq. Because Nasdaq’s service agreement is not before the Commission as a part of this proposed rule change, the Commission expresses no view with respect to whether Nasdaq should provide an exception under the service agreement. Finally, in issuing this order, the Commission is expressing no view as to whether Nasdaq or any other person may have violated the federal securities laws or any other laws, any rule or regulation thereunder, or the rules of Nasdaq or any other self-regulatory organization, in connection with the Facebook IPO.

V. Conclusion

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act, that the proposed rule change (SR–NASDAQ–2012–090) be, and hereby is, approved.

By the Commission.

Kevin M. O’Neill,
Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013–07192 Filed 3–27–13; 8:45 am]
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March 22, 2013.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Act”) and Rule 19b–4 thereunder, notice is hereby given that on March 18, 2013, National Stock Exchange, Inc. (“NSX” or the “Exchange”) proposed to make a ministerial change to Rule 11.11(c)(2)(A). The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant parts of such summaries.

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

1. Purpose

On October 10, 2012, the Exchange filed a proposed rule change for immediate effectiveness with the Commission to amend Rules 11.11(c)(2)(A), 11.11(c)(2)(D), 11.14(a)(4) and Rule 11.15(a)(iv) to clarify that the Exchange will not execute a Zero Display Reserve Order when a protected bid is priced higher than a protected offer (i.e., a crossed market). The Exchange now proposes to expand upon this rule change to amend its Rules to allow ETP Holders to instruct the Exchange, on an order-by-order basis, not to execute a Zero Display Reserve Order during a locked market. Specifically, the Exchange proposes to amend Rules 11.11(c)(2)(D), 11.14(a)(4) and Rule 11.15(a)(iv) to: (i) Provide Users with the ability to instruct the Exchange not to execute a Zero Display Reserve Order during a locked market; (ii) clarify that a Zero Display Reserve Order will be eligible for execution after the market is no longer locked; and (iii) clarify that a Zero Display Reserve Order will retain time priority if it is not executed during a locked market. The Exchange also proposes to make a ministerial change to Rule 11.11(c)(2)(A). The Exchange has designated this proposal as non-controversial and provided the Commission with the notice required by Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) under the Act.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange’s Web site at http://www.nsx.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 parts of such statements.

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

1. Purpose

On October 10, 2012, the Exchange filed a proposed rule change for immediate effectiveness with the Commission to amend Rules 11.11(c)(2)(A), 11.11(c)(2)(D), 11.14(a)(4)

3 In sum, Exchange Rule 1.5 defines the term “user” as “any ETP Holder or Sponsored Participant who is authorized to obtain access to the System pursuant to Rule 11.9.”

4 Under Exchange Rule 11.11(c)(2)(A), a “Market Peg Zero Display Reserve Order” is a “pegged Zero Display Reserve Order which tracks the opposite side of the market” (e.g., the buy-side of the Protected BBO for a sell order or the sell-side of the Protected BBO for a buy order) and a “Midpoint Peg Zero Display Reserve Order” is a “pegged Zero Display Reserve Order that tracks the midpoint” of the Protected BBO.

5 Under Exchange Rule 11.14(a)(4), the Exchange noted that a displayed order maintains time priority ahead of an unlocked order, such as a Zero Display Reserve Order, at the same price.


7 Under Exchange Rule 1.5, the “Protected BBO” is defined as the better of the “[a] Protected NBBO or (b) [t]he displayed Top of Book.” Orders that may be posted to the NSX Book at or between the Protected Bid and Offer (“BBO”) or post undisplayed liquidity on the NSX Book. Users post Zero Display Reserve Orders to the NSX Book to avoid potential negative market impact that could result from publicly displaying their trading interest.

8 Under Exchange Rule 11.14(a)(4), the Exchange noted that a displayed order maintains time priority ahead of an unlocked order, such as a Zero Display Reserve Order, at the same price.

9 See also footnote 432 to Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51608 (June 9, 2005), 70 FR 37496 (June 29, 2005) (Regulation NMS Adopting Release).