employee’s compensation in the base year. In determining an employee’s base year compensation, any money remuneration in a month not in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to $775 as the monthly compensation base for that year bears to $600 shall be taken into account.

The calendar year 2022 monthly compensation base is $1,755. The ratio of $1,755 to $600 is 2.92500000. Multiplying 2.92500000 by $775 produces $2,267. Accordingly, the amount determined under section 2(c) is $2,267 for months in calendar year 2022.

Maximum Daily Benefit Rate

Section 2(a)(3) contains a formula for determining the maximum daily benefit rate for registration periods beginning after June 30, 1989, and after each June 30 thereafter. Legislation enacted on October 9, 1996, revised the formula for indexing maximum daily benefit rates. Under the prescribed formula, the maximum daily benefit rate increases by approximately two-thirds of the cumulative growth in average national wages since 1984. The maximum daily benefit rate for registration periods beginning after June 30, 2022, shall be equal to 5 percent of the monthly compensation base for the base year immediately preceding the beginning of the benefit year. Section 2(a)(3) further provides that if the amount so computed is not a multiple of $1, it shall be rounded down to the nearest multiple of $1.

The calendar year 2022 monthly compensation base is $1,710. Multiplying $1,710 by 0.05 yields $85.50. Accordingly, the maximum daily benefit rate for days of unemployment and days of sickness beginning in registration periods after June 30, 2022, is determined to be $85.

By Authority of the Board.

Stephanie Hillyard,
Secretary to the Board.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[SEC File No. 270–638, OMB Control No. 3235–0687]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon Written Request Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of FOIA Services, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–2736

Extension: Rule 239

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) is soliciting comments on the collection of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for extension and approval.

Rule 239 (17 CFR 230.239) provides exemptions under the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.), the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) and the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 (U.S.C. 77aaa et seq.) for security-based swaps issued by certain clearing agencies satisfying certain conditions. The purpose of the information required by Rule 239 is to make certain information about security-based swaps that may be cleared by the registered or the exempt clearing agencies available to eligible contract participants and other market participants. We estimate that each registered or exempt clearing agency issuing security-based swaps in its function as a central counterparty will spend approximately 2 hours each time it provides or updates the information in its agreements relating to security-based swaps or on its website. We estimate that each registered or exempt clearing agency will provide or update the information approximately 20 times per year. In addition, we estimate that 75% of the 2 hours per response (1.5 hours) is prepared internally by the clearing agency for a total annual reporting burden of 180 hours (1.5 hours per response × 20 times × 6 respondents).

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden imposed by the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number.

Please direct your written comment to David Bottom, Director/Chief Information Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, c/o John Pezzullo, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549 or send an email to: PRA_ Mailbox@sec.gov.

Dated: November 15, 2021.

J. Matthew DeLesDernier,
Assistant Secretary.

[FRR Doc. 2021–25170 Filed 11–17–21; 8:45 am]
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Self-Regulatory Organizations: The Nasdaq Stock Market LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend Equity 7, Section 118 of the Fee Schedule

November 12, 2021

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 November 1, 2021, The Nasdaq Stock Market LLC (“Nasdaq” or “Exchange”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC” or “Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III, below, which Items have been incorporated by reference in this notice.

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

The Exchange proposes to amend the Exchange’s pricing schedule at Equity 7, Section 118(a), as described further below.


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

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed

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

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

The purpose of the proposed rule change is to amend the Exchange’s schedule of credits, at Equity 7, Section 118(a). Specifically, the Exchange proposes to amend the criteria for two existing credits of $0.0029 per share executed with respect to its schedule of credits for displayed quotes/orders (other than Supplemental Orders or Designated Retail Orders) that provide liquidity in Tapes A, B and C. The Exchange proposes to amend two existing credits in Tapes A, B and C of $0.0029 per share executed. One of the existing credits applies to members (i) with shares of liquidity provided in all securities through one or more of its Nasdaq Market Center MPIDs that represent more than 0.675% of Consolidated Volume during the month. The other credit applies to members (i) with shares of liquidity accessed in all securities through one or more of its Nasdaq Market Center MPIDs that represent more than 0.80% of Consolidated Volume during the month, and (ii) with shares of liquidity provided in all securities through one or more of its Nasdaq Market Center MPIDs that represent more than 0.60% of Consolidated Volume.

The Exchange proposes to amend the credits in all three Tapes by also requiring a member to execute an average daily volume (“ADV”) of at least 350,000 shares of Midpoint Extended Life Orders (“M–ELOs”) during the month. The proposed amendments will increase the extent to which members engage in M–ELO activity on the Exchange and grow the extent of such activity over time. From time to time, the Exchange believes it is reasonable to recalibrate the criteria for credits such as these to ensure that the credits remain appropriately challenging for participants to attain in light of changes to their levels of activity on the Exchange.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposals are consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,6 in general, and further the objectives of Sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act,7 in particular, in that they provide for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among members and issuers and other persons using any facility, and are not designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers, or dealers. The proposals are also consistent with Section 11A of the Act relating to the establishment of the national market system for securities.

The Proposals Are Reasonable

The Exchange’s proposals are reasonable in several respects. As a threshold matter, the Exchange is subject to significant competitive forces in the market for equity securities transaction services that constrain its pricing determinations in that market. The fact that this market is competitive has long been recognized by the courts. In NetCoalition v. Securities and Exchange Commission, the D.C. Circuit stated as follows: ‘[i]n one dispute 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’. . . ’.

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.”7

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

Within this environment, market participants can freely and often do shift their order flow among the Exchange and competing venues in response to changes in their respective pricing schedules. Within the foregoing context, the proposals represent reasonable attempts by the Exchange to increase its liquidity and market share relative to its competitors.

The Exchange believes that it is reasonable to amend the credit of $0.0029 per share executed, which applies to members (i) with shares of liquidity provided in all securities through one or more of its Nasdaq Market Center MPIDs that represent more than 0.675% of Consolidated Volume during the month, and the credit of $0.0029 per share executed, which applies to members (i) with shares of liquidity accessed in all securities through one or more of its Nasdaq Market Center MPIDs that represent more than 0.80% of Consolidated Volume. The proposed additional requirement of executing an ADV of at least 350,000 shares of M–ELOs during the month will encourage members that currently qualify for the credit to increase the extent to which members engage in M–ELO activity.

From time to time, the Exchange believes it is reasonable to recalibrate the criteria for credits such as this one to ensure that the credits remain appropriately challenging for participants to attain in light of changes to their levels of activity on the Exchange. The Exchange has limited resources at its disposal to devote to incentives and it periodically reassesses the allocation of those resources when they prove to be ineffective.

---

3 Pursuant to Equity 4, Rule 4702(b)(14), a “Midpoint Extended Life Order” is an Order Type with a Non-Display Order Attribute that is priced at the midpoint between the NBBO and that will not be eligible to execute until a minimum period of 10 milliseconds has passed after acceptance of the Order by the System.


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

Additionally, these proposals are reasonable because they will provide extra incentives to members to engage in substantial amounts of MELO-related activity on the Exchange during a month. The Exchange believes that if such incentives are effective, then any ensuing increase in M–ELOs and executions on the Exchange will improve the quality of the M–ELO market, and the market overall, to the benefit of M–ELO and all market participants.

The Exchange notes that those market participants that are dissatisfied with the proposals are free to shift their order flow to competing venues that offer more generous pricing or less stringent qualifying criteria.

The Proposals Are Equitable Allocations of Credits

The Exchange believes that it is an equitable allocation to modify the eligibility requirements for its transaction credits because the proposals will encourage members to increase the extent to which they add liquidity to the Exchange. To the extent that the Exchange succeeds in increasing the levels of liquidity and activity on the Exchange, including in segments for which there is an observed need or demand, such as non-displayed, MELO, and Tape B securities, then the Exchange will experience improvements in its market quality, which stands to benefit all market participants. The Exchange also believes it is equitable to recalibrate or revise existing criteria for its credits to ensure that the credits remain appropriately challenging for participants to attain in light of changes to their levels of activity on the Exchange.

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

The Proposals Are Not Unfairly Discriminatory

The Exchange believes that its proposals are not unfairly discriminatory. As an initial matter, the Exchange believes that nothing about its volume-based tiered pricing model is inherently unfair; instead, it is a rational pricing model that is well-established and ubiquitous in today’s economy among firms in various industries—from co-branded credit cards to grocery stores to cellular telephone data plans—that use it to reward the loyalty of their best customers that provide high levels of business. The Exchange believes that this incentivizes 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 believes that its proposals to amend the qualifying criteria for its transaction credits are not unfairly discriminatory because these credits are available to all members. Moreover, these proposals stand to improve the overall market quality of the Exchange, to the benefit of all market participants, by incentivizing members to increase the extent of their liquidity provision or activity on the Exchange, including in segments for which there is an observed need or demand, such as non-displayed, M–ELO, and Tape B securities. The Exchange also believes it is not unfairly discriminatory to recalibrate or revise existing criteria for its credits to ensure that the credits remain appropriately challenging for participants to attain in light of changes to their levels of activity on the Exchange.

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

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

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

Intramarket Competition

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

As noted above, Nasdaq’s proposals to amend transaction credits are intended to have market-improving effects, to the benefit of all members. Any member may elect to achieve the levels of liquidity or activity required in order to qualify for the amended credits.

The Exchange notes that its members are free to trade on other venues to the extent they believe that the proposed qualification criteria for or amounts of these credits are 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 credit changes. This is in addition to free flow of order flow to and among off-exchange venues which comprises upwards of 44% of industry volume.

The Exchange’s proposals to amend its transaction credits are pro-competitive in that the Exchange intends for the changes to increase liquidity addition and activity on the Exchange, thereby rendering the Exchange a more attractive and vibrant venue to market participants.

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

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

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

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.

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–2021–088 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–NASDAQ–2021–088. 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–NASDAQ–2021–088 and should be submitted on or before December 9, 2021.

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

J. Matthew DeLesDernier,
Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2021–25130 Filed 11–17–21; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 8011–01–P
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Self-Regulatory Organizations; Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc.: Order Disapproving a Proposed Rule Change To List and Trade Shares of the VanEck Bitcoin Trust Under BZX Rule 14.11(e)(4), Commodity-Based Trust Shares

November 12, 2021.

I. Introduction

On March 1, 2021, Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc. (“BZX” or “Exchange”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) 1 and Rule 19b–4 thereunder, 2 a proposed rule change to list and trade shares (“Shares”) of the VanEck Bitcoin Trust (“Trust”) under BZX Rule 14.11(e)(4), Commodity-Based Trust Shares. The proposed rule change was published for comment in the Federal Register on March 19, 2021. 3

4 On April 28, 2021, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Exchange Act, 4 the Commission designated a longer period within which to approve the proposed rule change, disapprove the proposed rule change, or institute proceedings to determine whether to disapprove the proposed rule change. 5 On June 16, 2021, the Commission instituted proceedings under Section 19(b)(2)(B) of the Exchange Act 6 to determine whether to approve or disapprove the proposed rule change. 7 On September 8, 2021, the Commission designated a longer period for Commission action on the proposed rule change. 8

This order disapproves the proposed rule change. The Commission concludes that BZX has not met its burden under the Exchange Act and the Commission’s Rules of Practice to demonstrate that its proposal is consistent with the requirements of Exchange Act Section 6(b)(5), in particular, the requirement that the rules of a national securities exchange be “designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices” and “to protect investors and the public interest.”

When considering whether BZX’s proposal to list and trade the Shares is designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, the Commission applies the same standard used in its orders considering previous proposals to list bitcoin 10-based

1 The bitcoin protocol governs the protocol used by a peer-to-peer computer network through which transactions are recorded on a public transaction ledger known as the “bitcoin blockchain.” The bitcoin protocol governs the creation of new bitcoins and the cryptographic system that secures and verifies bitcoin transactions. See, e.g., Notice, 86 FR 14988.


8 See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 92894, 86 FR 51203 (Sept. 14, 2021). On September 30, 2021, the Exchange filed Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change and withdrew it on October 1, 2021. On October 1, 2021, the Exchange filed Amendment No. 2 to the proposed rule change; and on November 4, 2021, the Exchange filed Amendment No. 3 to the proposed rule change. As discussed below, see Section III.E. infra, the Commission views these amendments as untimely. These amendments also did not materially alter the substance of the proposed rule change, and therefore they are not subject to notice and comment. Furthermore, even if these amendments had been timely filed, they would not alter the Commission’s conclusion that the Exchange’s proposal is not consistent with the Exchange Act. See Section III.E.


10 Bitcoins are digital assets that are issued and transferred via a decentralized, open-source protocol used by a peer-to-peer computer network through which transactions are recorded on a public transaction ledger known as the “bitcoin blockchain.”