

Required fields are shown with yellow backgrounds and asterisks.

Filing by NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC.
Pursuant to Rule 19b-4 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934

Initial *	Amendment *	Withdrawal	Section 19(b)(2) *	Section 19(b)(3)(A) *	Section 19(b)(3)(B) *
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Rule		
Pilot	Extension of Time Period for Commission Action *	Date Expires *	<input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(1)	<input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(4)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(2)	<input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(5)	
			<input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(3)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(6)	

Notice of proposed change pursuant to the Payment, Clearing, and Settlement Act of 2010	Security-Based Swap Submission pursuant to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934
Section 806(e)(1) *	Section 806(e)(2) *
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Section 3C(b)(2) *
	<input type="checkbox"/>

Exhibit 2 Sent As Paper Document	Exhibit 3 Sent As Paper Document
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Description

Provide a brief description of the action (limit 250 characters, required when Initial is checked *).

A proposal to amend Rule 1009 (Criteria for Underlying Securities) to allow the listing of options overlying Exchange-Traded Fund Shares.

Contact Information

Provide the name, telephone number, and e-mail address of the person on the staff of the self-regulatory organization prepared to respond to questions and comments on the action.

First Name *	Jurij	Last Name *	Trypupenko
Title *	Associate General Counsel		
E-mail *	jurij.trypupenko@nasdaq.com		
Telephone *	(301) 978-8132	Fax	(301) 978-8472

Signature

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934,

has duly caused this filing to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned thereunto duly authorized.

(Title *)

Date	03/16/2015	Executive Vice President and General Counsel
By	Edward S. Knight	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 20px;"></div>
	(Name *)	

edward.knight@nasdaq.com

NOTE: Clicking the button at right will digitally sign and lock this form. A digital signature is as legally binding as a physical signature, and once signed, this form cannot be changed.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549

For complete Form 19b-4 instructions please refer to the EFFF website.

Form 19b-4 Information *

Add Remove View

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

Exhibit 1 - Notice of Proposed Rule Change *

Add Remove View

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

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

Add Remove View

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

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

Add Remove View

Exhibit Sent As Paper Document

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

Exhibit 3 - Form, Report, or Questionnaire

Add Remove View

Exhibit Sent As Paper Document

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

Exhibit 4 - Marked Copies

Add Remove View

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

Exhibit 5 - Proposed Rule Text

Add Remove View

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

Partial Amendment

Add Remove View

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

1. Text of the Proposed Rule Change

(a) Pursuant to the provisions of Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”)¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,² NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC (“Phlx” or “Exchange”)³ is filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) a proposal to amend Rule 1009 (Criteria for Underlying Securities) to allow the listing of options overlying Exchange-Traded Fund Shares (“ETFs”) that are listed pursuant to generic listing standards on equities exchanges for series of portfolio depository receipts (“PDRs”) and index fund shares (“IFSs”) based on international or global indexes, pursuant to which a comprehensive surveillance agreement⁴ is not required.

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

(b) Not applicable.

(c) Not applicable.

2. Procedures of the Self-Regulatory Organization

The proposed rule change was approved by senior management of the Exchange pursuant to authority delegated by the Board of Directors of the Exchange (“Board”) on

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

³ The Exchange, The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC (“NASDAQ”), and NASDAQ OMX BX, Inc. (“BX”) are self-regulatory organizations (“SROs”) that are wholly owned subsidiaries of The NASDAQ OMX Group, Inc. (the “Group”).

⁴ Surveillance agreements are also referred to in Exchange rules as “surveillance sharing agreements” or “comprehensive surveillance sharing agreements” (“CSSA”). See e.g. Rules 1009 and 803.

July 16, 2014. Exchange staff will advise the Board of any action taken pursuant to delegated authority. No other action by the Exchange is necessary for the filing of the rule change.

Questions and comments on the proposed rule change may be directed to Jurij Trypupenko, Associate General Counsel, The NASDAQ OMX Group, Inc. at (301) 978-8132.

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

a. Purpose

The Exchange proposes to amend Commentary .06 to Rule 1009 to allow the listing of options overlying ETFs⁵ that are listed pursuant to generic listing standards on equities exchanges for series of PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes under which a CSSA is not required.⁶ Adding proposed new Commentary .06(b)(i) to Rule 1009 will enable the Exchange to list and trade options on ETFs without a CSSA provided that the underlying ETF is listed on an equities exchange pursuant to the generic listings standards that do not require a CSSA pursuant to Rule 19b-4(e) of the Exchange Act.⁷

⁵ ETFs are also referred to in Exchange rules as "Fund Shares." See, e.g., Rules 1009 and 1009A.

⁶ NASDAQ is the principal exchange within the Group for listing ETFs. NASDAQ has generic listing standards for PDRs and IFSs. See NASDAQ Rule 5705(b)(3)(A)(ii) regarding IFSs and 5705(a)(3)(A)(ii) regarding PDRs (IFSs and PDRs are together known as ETFs in NASDAQ Rule 5705). See also NYSE MKT Rule 1000 Commentary .03(a)(B); NYSE Arca Equities Rule 5.2(j)(3) Commentary .01(a)(B); and BATS Rule 14.1 1(b)(3)(A)(ii).

⁷ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(e).

Rule 19b-4(e) provides that the listing and trading of a new derivative securities product by an SRO shall not be deemed a proposed rule change, pursuant to paragraph (c)(1) of Rule 19b-4⁸ if the Commission has approved, pursuant to Section 19(b) of the Act,⁹ the SRO's trading rules, procedures and listing standards for the product class that would include the new derivatives securities product, and the SRO has a surveillance program for the product class.¹⁰ This proposal allows the Exchange to list and trade options on ETFs based on international or global indexes that meet the generic listing standards.¹¹

The Surveillance Agreement Requirement for Options on Exchange-Traded Funds

The surveillance agreement requirement (also known as the “requirement” or “regime”) was initially put into effect for options on ETFs well over a decade ago but has proven to have anti-competitive effects that are detrimental to investors.¹² Specifically,

⁸ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(c)(1).

⁹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b).

¹⁰ When relying on Rule 19b-4(e), the SRO must submit Form 19b-4(e) to the Commission within five business days after the SRO begins trading the new derivative securities products. See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 40761 (December 8, 1998), 63 FR 70952 (December 22, 1998).

¹¹ See NASDAQ Rule 5705(a)(3)(A)(ii) and (b)(3)(A)(ii); NYSE MKT Rule 1000, Commentary .03(a)(B); NYSE Arca Equities Rule 5.20(3), Commentary .01(a)(B); and BATS Rule 14.11(b)(3)(A)(ii).

¹² See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43921 (February 2, 2001), 66 FR 9739 (February 9, 2001)(SR-Phlx-2000-107)(notice of filing and approval order regarding trading of options on ETFs with surveillance agreements)(the “ETF approval order”). At about the same time, the Exchange instituted surveillance agreement requirements for options on Trust Issued Receipts (“TIRs”), and thereafter other products. See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 44709 (August 16, 2001), 66 FR 44194 (August 22, 2001)(SR-Phlx-2001-71)(notice of filing and approval order regarding trading of options on TIRs with surveillance

the requirement limits the investing public's ability to hedge risk or engage in options strategies that may be afforded to other investors in domestic securities.¹³

The Exchange allows for the listing and trading of options on ETFs. Commentary .06 to Rule 1009 provides the listings standards for options on ETFs, which includes ETFs with non-U.S. component securities, such as ETFs based on international or global indexes. Currently, Commentary .06 to Rule 1009 regarding options on ETFs has a three-level surveillance agreement requirement (reproduced in relevant part):

- (i) whether any non-U.S. component stocks on which the Fund Shares are based that are not subject to comprehensive surveillance agreements do not in the aggregate represent more than 50% of the weight of the index or portfolio;
- (ii) stocks for which the primary market is in any one country that is not subject to a comprehensive surveillance agreement do not represent 20% or more of the weight of the index; and
- (iii) stocks for which the primary market is in any two countries that are not subject to comprehensive surveillance agreements do not represent 33% or more of the weight of the index.¹⁴

agreements). Other exchanges have similar requirements. The changes proposed herein relate only to surveillance agreements for options on global or international ETFs.

¹³ Moreover, as noted below the surveillance agreement requirement is present for the derivative options on ETFs but not for the underlying ETFs.

¹⁴ See Commentary .06(b)(i)-(iii) to Rule 1009, which is re-numbered as Commentary .06(b)(ii)(A)-(C) to Rule 1009.

The Exchange proposes to modify the surveillance agreement requirement for options on ETFs that are listed pursuant to generic listing standards for series of PDRs and IFSs, based on international or global indexes - for which case a comprehensive surveillance agreement is not required.

The surveillance agreement requirement was instituted in 2001 when ETFs were, comparatively speaking, in a developmental state.¹⁵ The first ETF introduced in 1993 was a broad-based domestic equity fund tracking the S&P 500 index. The development of ETF products was very limited during the first decade of their existence, such that at the end of 2001, there was a total of only 102 ETFs listed on U.S. markets. Since 2001, however, the ETF market has matured tremendously and grown exponentially, such that at the end of 2012 there were a total of 1,194 listed ETFs.¹⁶ Many of these are very well known, highly traded and liquid products, such as, for example, SPDR S&P 500 Trust ETF (SPY), iShares MSCI Emerging Markets ETF (EEM), and PowerShares QQQ Trust, Series 1 ETF (QQQQ), that market participants from institutional to retail and public investors have been using for trading, hedging, and investing purposes with varying timelines.¹⁷ The ETF market is one of the most highly-developed, sophisticated markets that provide traders and investors the opportunity to access practically all industries and enterprises. In 2012 investor demand for ETFs in all asset classes increased substantially. And in 2011 the demand for global and international equity ETFs, to which the

¹⁵ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43921 (February 2, 2001), 66 FR 9739 (February 9, 2001)(SR-Phlx-2000-107)(ETF approval order).

¹⁶ http://www.icifactbook.org/fb_ch3.html.

¹⁷ These can be from intraday exposure (e.g., using Daily S&P 500 Bear 3x Shares (SPXS)) to long-term 401(k) or retirement fund exposure (e.g., using SPY).

requirement applies, more than doubled.¹⁸ The Exchange believes that the surveillance agreement requirement no longer serves a necessary (or indispensable) function in today's highly developed ETF market,¹⁹ and actually creates a dynamic that negatively impacts the number of markets that can competitively trade ETF option products, to the detriment of market participants.

The current surveillance requirement has, at times, resulted in the investing public having to forego the opportunity to hedge risk or engage in other listed options strategies in a competitive environment. ETFs may lack active options contracts that would be more likely to develop if multiple exchanges could compete to offer and promote them. For example, an investor in the iShare MSCI Indonesia ETF (EIDO) is not permitted to sell call options or purchase protective puts simply because the Exchange cannot obtain a surveillance agreement with Bursa Efek Indonesia. However, an investor in iShare MSCI Emerging Markets Fund (EEM) is afforded the right to engage in listed options trading to hedge risk or execute other beneficial options strategies. Both underlying exchange-traded funds, EIDO and EEM, are listed for trading in the U.S., subject to constant regulatory scrutiny, and permitted to be purchased and sold via registered broker/dealers, yet, options can now be offered only on EEM. The Exchange believes this disparate

¹⁸ http://www.icifactbook.org/fb_ch3.html.

¹⁹ ETFs and ETPs listed in the United States gathered \$24.6 billion USD in net new assets in June 2014 which, when combined with positive market performance, pushed the ETF/ETP industry in the United States to a new record high of \$1.86 trillion USD invested in 1,613 ETFs/ETPs, from 58 providers listed on 3 exchanges. And according to ETFGI, an independent ETF/ETP research and consultancy firm in the U.K., ETFs and ETPs listed globally reached \$2.64 trillion USD in assets, a new record high, at the end of Q2 2014. <http://www.mondovisione.com/media-and-resources/news/according-to-etfgi-etfs-and-etps-listed-globally-reached-us264-trillion-in-as/>.

treatment between investors of foreign-based instruments, especially between those that buy and sell options contracts on ETFs, which currently require surveillance agreements, as opposed to those that buy and sell shares of the underlying ETFs, which currently do not have the same onerous surveillance agreement requirement that ETF options have,²⁰ is not in the best interest. The Exchange therefore proposes to establish that options on generically-listed global or international ETFs would not require surveillance agreements for listing.

The current surveillance agreement requirements, as well as all other requirements to list options on ETFs,²¹ are not affected by this proposal and will continue to remain in place for options on ETFs that do not meet generic listing standards on equities exchanges for ETFs based on international and global indexes

²⁰ While the surveillance agreement requirement for options on ETFs found in Commentary .06 to Rule 1009 (see note 14 and related text) has resulted in significant negative implications for market participants, there is no such surveillance agreement requirement for the underlying ETFs. In particular, when looking to the rules of NASDAQ, the primary ETF listing venue in the Group, NASDAQ Rules 5705 regarding ETFs and 5735 regarding Managed Fund Shares (“MFSs”) have no explicit requirements concerning surveillance agreements for regularly listed (non-generic) ETFs and MFSs, and simply state that FINRA will implement written surveillance procedures. Section 19(b)(2) filings regarding ETFs and MFSs typically indicate that the Exchange may obtain information regarding trading in the shares from FINRA and markets and other entities that are members of the Intermarket Surveillance Group (“ISG”), which includes securities and futures exchanges, or with which the Exchange has in place a surveillance agreement (which is not required by rule). Regarding ETFs and MFSs listed pursuant to generic (19b-4(e)) standards and reviewed and approved for trading under Section 19(b)(2) of the Act, Rules 5705 and 5735 simply note that the Commission's approval order may reference surveillance sharing agreements with respect to non-U.S. component stocks.

²¹ For purposes of brevity, these other requirements are not set forth, but can be found in Commentary .06 to Rule 1009.

Generic Listing Standards for Exchange-Traded Funds

The Exchange notes that the Commission has previously approved generic listing standards pursuant to Rule 19b-4(e) of the Exchange Act²² for ETFs based on indexes that consist of stocks listed on U.S. exchanges including NASDAQ, the ETF listing exchange within the Group.²³ In general, the criteria for the underlying component securities in the international and global indexes are similar to those for the domestic indexes, but with modifications as appropriate for the issues and risks associated with non-U.S. securities.

In addition, the Commission has previously approved proposals for the listing and trading of options on ETFs based on international indexes as well as global indexes (e.g., based on non-U.S. and U.S. component stocks).²⁴ In approving ETFs

²² 17 CFR 240.19b-4(e).

²³ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 54739 (November 9, 2006), 71 FR 66993 (November 17, 2006)(SR-Amex-2006-78)(initial order relating to generic listing standards for ETFs based on international or global indexes). See also NASDAQ Rule 5705(a)(3)(A)(ii) and (b)(3)(A)(ii).

²⁴ See, e.g., Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 57013 (December 20, 2007), 72 FR 73923 (December 28, 2007)(SR-CBOE-2007-140)(approval order to list and trade options on iShares MSCI Mexico Index Fund, when CBOE did not have in place a surveillance agreement with the Bolsa Mexicana de Valores (the “Bolsa”)); 57014 (December 20, 2007), 72 FR 73934 (December 28, 2007)(SR-ISE-2007-111)(approval order to list and trade options on iShares MSCI Mexico Index Fund, when ISE did not have in place a surveillance agreement with the Bolsa); 56778 (November 9, 2007), 72 FR 65113 (November 19, 2007)(SR-AMEX-2007-100)(approval order to list and trade options on iShares MSCI Mexico Index Fund, when AMEX did not have in place a surveillance agreement with the Bolsa); and 55648 (April 19, 2007), 72 FR 20902 (April 26, 2007)(SR-AMEX-2007-09)(approval order to list and trade options on Vanguard Emerging Markets ETF, when AMEX did not have in place a surveillance agreement with the Bolsa). See also Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 50189 (August 12, 2004), 69 FR 51723 (August 20, 2004) (SR-AMEX-2001-05) (approving the listing and trading of certain Vanguard International Equity Index Funds); and 44700 (August 14, 2001), 66 FR 43927 (August 21, 2001) (SR-2001-34)

for equities exchange trading, the Commission thoroughly considered the structure of the ETFs, their usefulness to investors and to the markets, and SRO rules that govern their trading. The Exchange believes that allowing the listing of options overlying ETFs that are listed pursuant to the generic listing standards on equities exchanges for ETFs based on international and global indexes and applying Rule 19b-4(e)²⁵ should fulfill the intended objective of that rule by allowing options on those ETFs that have satisfied the generic listing standards to commence trading, without the need for the public comment period and Commission approval. The proposed rule has the potential to reduce the time frame for bringing options on ETFs to market, thereby reducing the burdens on issuers and other market participants. The failure of a particular ETF to comply with the generic listing standards under Rule 19b-4(e)²⁶ would not, however, preclude the Exchange from submitting a separate filing pursuant to Section 19(b)(2),²⁷ requesting Commission approval to list and trade options on a particular ETF. Moreover, the Exchange notes that the generic standards such as those in proposed Commentary .06(b)(i) to Rule 1009 are not new in the options world, and have been used extensively for listing options on narrow-based and broad-based indexes.²⁸

(approving the listing and trading of series of the iShares Trust based on foreign stock indexes).

²⁵ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(e).

²⁶ Id.

²⁷ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

²⁸ Rule 1009A has, for example, weighting, capitalization, trading volume, and minimum number of components standards for listing options on narrow-based and broad-based indexes. For a definition of broad-based index (market index) and narrow-based index (industry index), see Rule 1000A(b)(11) and (12), respectively.

Requirements for Listing and Trading Options Overlying ETFs Based on International and Global Indexes

Options on ETFs listed pursuant to these generic standards for international and global indexes would be traded, in all other respects, under the Exchange's existing trading rules and procedures that apply to options on ETFs and would be covered under the Exchange's surveillance program for options on ETFs.

Pursuant to proposed Commentary .06 (b)(i) to Rule 1009, the Exchange may list and trade options on an ETF without a CSSA provided that the ETF is listed pursuant to generic listing standards for series of PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes, in which case a comprehensive surveillance agreement is not required. As noted, one such rule, which discusses things such as weighting, capitalization, trading volume, minimum number of components, and where components are listed, is NASDAQ Rule 5705(b)(3)(A)(ii) regarding ETFs (IFSs and PDRs).²⁹ The

²⁹ NASDAQ Rule 5705(b)(3)(A)(ii) regarding IFSs, for example, has the following requirements (reproduced in relevant part): a. component stocks (excluding Derivative Securities Products) that in the aggregate account for at least 90% of the weight of the index or portfolio (excluding Derivative Securities Products) each shall have a minimum market value of at least \$100 million; b. component stocks (excluding Derivative Securities Products) that in the aggregate account for at least 70% of the weight of the index or portfolio (excluding Derivative Securities Products) each shall have a minimum worldwide monthly trading volume of at least 250,000 shares, or minimum global notional volume traded per month of \$25,000,000, averaged over the last six months; c. the most heavily weighted component stock (excluding Derivative Securities Products) shall not exceed 25% of the weight of the index or portfolio, and, to the extent applicable, the five most heavily weighted component stocks (excluding Derivative Securities Products) shall not exceed 60% of the weight of the index or portfolio; d. the index or portfolio shall include a minimum of 20 component stocks; provided, however, that there shall be no minimum number of component stocks if either one or more series of Index Fund Shares or Portfolio Depositary Receipts constitute, at least in part, components underlying a series of Index Fund Shares, or one or more series of Derivative Securities Products account for 100% of the weight of the index or portfolio; and e. each U.S. Component Stock shall be listed on a national securities exchange and shall be an NMS Stock as defined in Rule

Exchange believes that these generic listing standards are intended to ensure that securities with substantial market capitalization and trading volume account for a substantial portion of the weight of an index or portfolio.

The Exchange believes that this proposed listing standard for options on ETFs is reasonable for international and global indexes, and, when applied in conjunction with the other listing requirements, will result in options overlying ETFs that are sufficiently broad in scope and not readily susceptible to manipulation. The Exchange also believes that allowing the Exchange to list options overlying ETFs that are listed on equities exchanges pursuant to generic standards for series of PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes under which a CSSA is not required, will result in options overlying ETFs that are adequately diversified in weighting for any single security or small group of securities to significantly reduce concerns that trading in options overlying ETFs based on international or global indexes could become a surrogate for trading in unregistered securities.³⁰

The Exchange believes that ETFs based on international and global indexes that have been listed pursuant to the generic standards are sufficiently defined so as to make options overlying such ETFs not susceptible instruments for manipulation. The

600 of Regulation NMS under the Act, and each Non-U.S. Component Stock shall be listed and traded on an exchange that has last-sale reporting.

NASDAQ Rule 5705(a)(3)(A)(ii) has similar standards, but tailored for PDRs.

³⁰ The Exchange also notes that not affording retail investors the ability to trade on a regulated exchange can be detrimental. While products can be traded off exchange in the over the counter (“OTC”) market, which has increased settlement, clearing, and market risk as opposed to exchanges, the relatively unregulated OTC market is usually not a viable option for retail and public investors.

Exchange believes that the threat of manipulation is, as discussed below, sufficiently mitigated for underlying ETFs that have been listed on equities exchanges pursuant to generic listing standards for series of PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes under which a comprehensive surveillance agreement is not required and for the overlying options; the Exchange does not see the need for a CSSA to be in place before listing and trading options on such ETFs. The Exchange notes that its proposal does not replace the need for a CSSA as provided in current Commentary .06(b) to Rule 1009. The provisions of Commentary.06(b), including the need for a CSSA, remain materially unchanged and will continue to apply to options on ETFs that are not listed on an equities exchange pursuant to generic listing standards for series of PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes. Instead, proposed Commentary .06(b)(i) adds an additional listing mechanism for certain qualifying options on ETFs to be listed on the Exchange.

Finally, to account for proposed Commentary .06(b) to Rule 1009 and make Commentary .06 easier to follow, the Exchange proposes technical changes to the formatting of this section of the rule. The Exchange proposes re-numbering Commentary .06(b)(i), (ii) and (iii) as Commentary .06(b)(ii)(A), (B), and (C), respectively; and re-numbering Commentary .06(b)(iv) and (v) as Commentary .06(b)(iii) and (iv), respectively. This is merely re-numbering and there are no changes to the language of these sections of Commentary .06.

No Economic Risk

The proposal does not raise a concern regarding economic risk or manipulation. The proposal does not increase the risk of manipulation of the ETF itself, as the ETF trades in the U.S. and trading is subject to the U.S. surveillance requirement and follows

Exchange rules. One might try to argue that the proposal raises a concern about a theoretical manipulation risk of the underlying international components of the ETF trading in the U.S. If such manipulation were successful, the argument would go, then the ETF could be fairly priced relative to its components but the price of the components potentially may not reflect fair market value. The Exchange firmly believes that the proposal does not raise any such theoretical concern.

For manipulation to be successful the expected cost of the contemplated manipulation must be less than the expected gain. In other words, manipulation will not be attempted if the prospective profit from the attempt is zero or less, even ignoring the quite real costs associated with regulatory risk. In approving the rules for narrow based indices, it was thought that the costs of manipulating such an index based on component securities with the same parameters as those proposed ETFs would be prohibitive relative to any prospective gains. The Exchange's proposal does not suggest a different paradigm.

Moreover, the Commission reviewed and approved the ability to list ETFs without surveillance agreements if they meet the generic listing standards for ETFs based on international or global indices. The Exchange believes that the argument and economic conclusion that allowing the listing of options on these same underlying ETFs with components outside the U.S. that are sufficiently large, transparent, diversified, and liquid to make manipulation unprofitable is valid.

A second theoretical source of manipulation risk may be seen to be the creation/redemption process for ETFs. If the creation/redemption process could be manipulated then the market price of the ETF could materially differ from the fair value

of the ETF derived from a fair market value of the components. Again, the Exchange does not agree that this is a significant manipulation risk for ETFs, let alone options on ETF. As noted, ETFs are a much more mature asset class today than in 2001 when the current rules were adopted. The development of ETFs as an established asset class and the listing and trading of ETFs, including the creation/redemption process, has developed immensely since the introduction of ETFs, and options on them. Since manipulation of the creation/redemption process would create economic profits for the manipulator, but such manipulation has not been manifest during the significant expansion of ETFs as an international asset class, this offers convincing evidence that manipulation risk in the creation/redemption process is, indeed, theoretical and not an increased risk with this proposal regarding the listing of ETF options. The Exchange believes that its proposal will not lead to increased economic risk.

The Exchange requests approval of its proposal to allow the listing of options overlying ETFs (PDRs and IFSSs) based on international or global indexes, without a comprehensive surveillance agreement. The proposal will, as discussed, be beneficial to investors and is in conformity with the Act.

b. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act³¹ in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act³² in particular, in that it is designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national

³¹ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

³² 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

market system, and, in general to protect investors and the public interest. In particular, the proposed rule change has the potential to reduce the time frame for bringing options on ETFs to market, thereby reducing the burdens on issuers and other market participants. The Exchange also believes that enabling the listing and trading of options on ETFs pursuant to this proposed new listing standard will benefit investors by providing them with valuable risk management tools. The Exchange notes that its proposal does not replace the need for a CSSA as provided in Commentary .06 to Rule 1009. The provisions of current Commentary .06, including the need for a CSSA, remain materially unchanged and will continue to apply to options on ETFs that are not listed on an equities exchange pursuant to generic listing standards for series of PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes under which a comprehensive surveillance agreement is not required. Instead, proposed Commentary .06(b)(i) to Rule 1009 adds an additional listing mechanism for certain qualifying options on ETFs to be listed on the Exchange in a manner that is 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 facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanisms of a free and open market and a national market system and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest.

The proposal would promote just and equitable principles of trade. The surveillance agreement requirement was instituted in 2001 when ETFs were,

comparatively speaking, in a developmental state.³³ The first ETF introduced in 1993 was a broad-based domestic equity fund tracking the S&P 500 index. After the introduction of the first ETF in 1993, the development of ETF products was very limited during the first decade of their existence. Since the end of 2001, when there was a total of only 102 ETFs listed on U.S. markets, however, the ETF market has matured tremendously and grown exponentially. With a total of 1,194 listed ETFs at the end of 2012, the ETF market is now one of the most highly-developed, sophisticated markets with many very well known, highly traded and liquid products that provide traders and investors the opportunity to access practically all industries and enterprises. While investor demand for ETFs in all asset classes increased substantially, in 2011 the demand for global and international equity ETFs, to which the requirement applies, more than doubled.³⁴ The Exchange believes that the current surveillance requirement no longer serves a necessary function in today's highly developed market, and, as discussed, actually creates a dynamic that negatively impacts the number of markets that can competitively trade ETF option products. This hurts market participants. The Exchange therefore proposes to establish that pursuant to proposed Commentary .06(b)(i) to Rule 1009 options may be listed on certain ETFs that are based on global and international funds and meet generic listing standards.

The proposal would in general protect investors and the public interest. The Exchange believes that modifying the surveillance agreement requirement for ETFs would not hinder the Exchange from performing surveillance duties designed to protect

³³ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43921 (February 2, 2001), 66 FR 9739 (February 9, 2001)(SR-Phlx-2000-107)(ETF approval order).

³⁴ http://www.icifactbook.org/fb_ch3.html.

investors and the public interest. There are various data consolidators, vendors, and outlets that can be used to access data and information regarding ETFs and the underlying securities (e.g., Bloomberg, Dow Jones, FTEN). In addition, firms that list ETFs on an exchange receive vast amounts of data relevant to their products that could be made available to listing exchanges as needed. The Exchange has access to the activity of the direct underlying instrument and the ETF, and through the Intermarket Surveillance Group (“ISG”) the Exchange can obtain such information related to the underlying security as needed.³⁵ Moreover, other than the surveillance agreement requirement there are, as discussed, numerous requirements in Rule 1009 that must be met to list options on ETFs on the Exchange.

The proposal would remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system. Multiple listing of ETFs, options, and other securities and competition are some of the central features of the current national market system. The Exchange believes that the surveillance agreement requirement has led to clearly anti-competitive results in a market that is based on competition. As such, the Exchange believes that the surveillance agreement requirement for options on certain ETFs is no longer necessary and proposes new Commentary .06(b)(i) to Rule 1009. The proposed rule change will significantly benefit market participants. As discussed at length, the proposed rule will negate the negative anti-competitive effect of the current surveillance agreement requirement that has resulted in de facto regulatory monopolies where only solitary exchanges, or only a few exchanges, are able to list certain ETF options products. The Exchange believes this is inconsistent with Commission policies

³⁵ See <https://www.isgportal.org/home.html>. Another global organization similar to ISG is The International Organization of Securities Commissions (“IOSCO”).

and the developing national market system, as well as the competitive nature of the market, and therefore proposes amendment.³⁶ The Exchange believes that the proposal would encourage a more open market and national market system based on competition and multiple listing. The generic listing standards for ETFs based on global or international indexes have specific requirements regarding relative weighting, minimum capitalization, minimum trading volume, and minimum number of components that have been approved by the Commission years ago for foreign ETFs.³⁷ Moreover, such listing standards have been in continuous use for listing options on narrow-based and broad-based indexes on the Exchange.³⁸ Allowing the listing of options on underlying ETFs based on global and international indexes that meet generic listing standards would encourage a free and open market and national market system to the benefit of market participants.

Finally, the Exchange's proposal for limiting the necessity of surveillance agreements to list options on ETFs does not, as discussed above, raise a concern regarding manipulation. The Exchange believes that its proposal is not indicative of increased economic risk.

³⁶ As discussed, the Exchange is decidedly not proposing that the surveillance agreement requirement be deleted entirely, but rather that only those options on ETFs that do not meet very specific generic listing standards need to have surveillance agreements in order to list on the Exchange.

³⁷ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 54739 (November 9, 2006), 71 FR 66993 (November 17, 2006)(SR-Amex-2006-78)(initial order relating to generic listing standards for ETFs based on international or global indexes). See also NASDAQ Rule 5705(a)(3)(A)(ii) and (b)(3)(A)(ii).

³⁸ See Rule 1009A(b) and (d).

For the above reasons, the Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act.

4. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. To the contrary, the Exchange believes that the proposal is, as discussed, decidedly pro-competitive and is a competitive response to the inability to list products because of the surveillance agreement requirement. The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change will result in additional investment options and opportunities to achieve the investment objectives of market participants seeking efficient trading and hedging vehicles, to the benefit of investors, market participants, and the marketplace in general. Competition is one of the principal features of the national market system. The Exchange believes that this proposal will expand competitive opportunities to list and trade products on the Exchange as noted.

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

No written comments were either solicited or received.

6. Extension of Time Period for Commission Action

Not applicable.

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

The proposed rule change is filed for immediate effectiveness pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)³⁹ of the Act and Rule 19b-4(f)(6) thereunder.⁴⁰ The Exchange asserts that

³⁹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

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 for 30 days after its filing date, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate if consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest. The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change does not significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest because this proposal allows the Exchange, similarly to other markets, to list and trade options overlying ETFs that are listed pursuant to generic listing standards on equities exchanges for PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes. This is beneficial to the Exchange and its traders, investors, and market participants in general. The Exchange believes that the proposal is pro-competitive because the Exchange would be able to provide traders, investors, and market participants the opportunity to more effectively tailor their trading, investing and hedging needs. The Exchange believes the rule change qualifies for immediate effectiveness as a “non-controversial” rule change under Rule 19b-4(f)(6) of the Act.

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.

A proposed rule change filed under Rule 19b-4(f)(6) normally does not become operative prior to 30 days after the date of filing. Rule 19b-4(f)(6)(iii), however, permits

⁴⁰ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(6).

the Commission to designate a shorter time if such action is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest. The Exchange requests the Commission to waive the noted operative delay so that, as discussed, the Exchange has rules regarding surveillance agreements for options on certain ETFs that are similar to that of another options exchange, Miami International Securities Exchange LLX (“MIAX”).⁴¹ The Exchange believes that good reason exists for the Commission to waive the operative effectiveness delay, and that such waiver would be consistent with the protection of investors and in the public interest. Waiver of the operative delay would allow the Exchange to list and trade certain ETF options on the same bases as another options market, which would be beneficial to market participants and would help to eliminate the potential for investor confusion.

Furthermore, Rule 19b-4(f)(6)(iii) requires a self-regulatory organization to give the Commission written notice of its intent to file a proposed rule change under that subsection at least five business days prior to the date of filing, or such shorter time as designated by the Commission. The Exchange provided such notice.

8. Proposed Rule Change Based on Rules of Another Self-Regulatory Organization or of the Commission

The proposal is based on MIAX Rule 402.⁴²

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

Not applicable.

⁴¹ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 74509 (March 13, 2015) (SR-MIAX-2015-04) (order approving proposal to amend MIAX Rule 402).

⁴² Id. The operative language regarding surveillance agreements in proposed Commentary .06(b)(i) is, as discussed, exactly the same as that in MIAX Rule 402, but is adapted to appropriately work within the current language of Commentary .06.

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

Not applicable.

11. Exhibits

1. Notice of proposed rule for publication in the Federal Register.
5. Text of the proposed rule change.

EXHIBIT 1

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
(Release No. _____ ; File No. SR-Phlx-2015-27)

March ____, 2015

Self-Regulatory Organizations; NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change Relating to Surveillance Agreements

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 March 16, 2015, NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC (“Phlx” or “Exchange”)³ filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC” or “Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III, below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

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

The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 1009 (Criteria for Underlying Securities) to allow the listing of options overlying Exchange-Traded Fund Shares (“ETFs”) that are listed pursuant to generic listing standards on equities exchanges for series of portfolio depository receipts (“PDRs”) and index fund shares (“IFSs”) based on

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

³ The Exchange, The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC (“NASDAQ”), and NASDAQ OMX BX, Inc. (“BX”) are self-regulatory organizations (“SROs”) that are wholly owned subsidiaries of The NASDAQ OMX Group, Inc. (the “Group”).

international or global indexes, pursuant to which a comprehensive surveillance agreement⁴ is not required.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's Website at <http://www.nasdaqtrader.com/micro.aspx?id=PHLXRulefilings>, 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 proposes to amend Commentary .06 to Rule 1009 to allow the listing of options overlying ETFs⁵ that are listed pursuant to generic listing standards on equities exchanges for series of PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes under which a CSSA is not required.⁶ Adding proposed new Commentary

⁴ Surveillance agreements are also referred to in Exchange rules as "surveillance sharing agreements" or "comprehensive surveillance sharing agreements" ("CSSA"). See, e.g., Rules 1009 and 803.

⁵ ETFs are also referred to in Exchange rules as "Fund Shares." See e.g. Rules 1009 and 1009A.

⁶ NASDAQ is the principal exchange within the Group for listing ETFs. NASDAQ has generic listing standards for PDRs and IFSs. See NASDAQ Rule 5705(b)(3)(A)(ii) regarding IFSs and 5705(a)(3)(A)(ii) regarding PDRs (IFSs

.06(b)(i) to Rule 1009 will enable the Exchange to list and trade options on ETFs without a CSSA provided that the underlying ETF is listed on an equities exchange pursuant to the generic listings standards that do not require a CSSA pursuant to Rule 19b-4(e) of the Exchange Act.⁷

Rule 19b-4(e) provides that the listing and trading of a new derivative securities product by an SRO shall not be deemed a proposed rule change, pursuant to paragraph (c)(1) of Rule 19b-4⁸ if the Commission has approved, pursuant to Section 19(b) of the Act,⁹ the SRO's trading rules, procedures and listing standards for the product class that would include the new derivatives securities product, and the SRO has a surveillance program for the product class.¹⁰ This proposal allows the Exchange to list and trade options on ETFs based on international or global indexes that meet the generic listing standards.¹¹

and PDRs are together known as ETFs in NASDAQ Rule 5705). See also NYSE MKT Rule 1000 Commentary .03(a)(B); NYSE Arca Equities Rule 5.2(j)(3) Commentary .01(a)(B); and BATS Rule 14.11(b)(3)(A)(ii).

⁷ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(e).

⁸ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(c)(1).

⁹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b).

¹⁰ When relying on Rule 19b-4(e), the SRO must submit Form 19b-4(e) to the Commission within five business days after the SRO begins trading the new derivative securities products. See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 40761 (December 8, 1998), 63 FR 70952 (December 22, 1998).

¹¹ See NASDAQ Rule 5705(a)(3)(A)(ii) and (b)(3)(A)(ii); NYSE MKT Rule 1000, Commentary .03(a)(B); NYSE Arca Equities Rule 5.20(3), Commentary .01(a)(B); and BATS Rule 14.11(b)(3)(A)(ii).

The Surveillance Agreement Requirement for Options on Exchange-Traded Funds

The surveillance agreement requirement (also known as the “requirement” or “regime”) was initially put into effect for options on ETFs well over a decade ago but has proven to have anti-competitive effects that are detrimental to investors.¹² Specifically, the requirement limits the investing public’s ability to hedge risk or engage in options strategies that may be afforded to other investors in domestic securities.¹³

The Exchange allows for the listing and trading of options on ETFs. Commentary .06 to Rule 1009 provides the listings standards for options on ETFs, which includes ETFs with non-U.S. component securities, such as ETFs based on international or global indexes. Currently, Commentary .06 to Rule 1009 regarding options on ETFs has a three-level surveillance agreement requirement (reproduced in relevant part):

- (i) whether any non-U.S. component stocks on which the Fund Shares are based that are not subject to comprehensive surveillance agreements

¹² See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43921 (February 2, 2001), 66 FR 9739 (February 9, 2001)(SR-Phlx-2000-107)(notice of filing and approval order regarding trading of options on ETFs with surveillance agreements)(the “ETF approval order”). At about the same time, the Exchange instituted surveillance agreement requirements for options on Trust Issued Receipts (“TIRs”), and thereafter other products. See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 44709 (August 16, 2001), 66 FR 44194 (August 22, 2001)(SR-Phlx-2001-71)(notice of filing and approval order regarding trading of options on TIRs with surveillance agreements). Other exchanges have similar requirements. The changes proposed herein relate only to surveillance agreements for options on global or international ETFs.

¹³ Moreover, as noted below the surveillance agreement requirement is present for the derivative options on ETFs but not for the underlying ETFs.

do not in the aggregate represent more than 50% of the weight of the index or portfolio;

- (ii) stocks for which the primary market is in any one country that is not subject to a comprehensive surveillance agreement do not represent 20% or more of the weight of the index; and
- (iii) stocks for which the primary market is in any two countries that are not subject to comprehensive surveillance agreements do not represent 33% or more of the weight of the index.¹⁴

The Exchange proposes to modify the surveillance agreement requirement for options on ETFs that are listed pursuant to generic listing standards for series of PDRs and IFSs, based on international or global indexes - for which case a comprehensive surveillance agreement is not required.

The surveillance agreement requirement was instituted in 2001 when ETFs were, comparatively speaking, in a developmental state.¹⁵ The first ETF introduced in 1993 was a broad-based domestic equity fund tracking the S&P 500 index. The development of ETF products was very limited during the first decade of their existence, such that at the end of 2001, there was a total of only 102 ETFs listed on U.S. markets. Since 2001, however, the ETF market has matured tremendously and grown exponentially, such that at the end of 2012 there were a total of 1,194 listed ETFs.¹⁶ Many of these are very well

¹⁴ See Commentary .06(b)(i)-(iii) to Rule 1009, which is re-numbered as Commentary .06(b)(ii)(A)-(C) to Rule 1009.

¹⁵ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43921 (February 2, 2001), 66 FR 9739 (February 9, 2001)(SR-Phlx-2000-107)(ETF approval order).

¹⁶ http://www.icifactbook.org/fb_ch3.html.

known, highly traded and liquid products, such as, for example, SPDR S&P 500 Trust ETF (SPY), iShares MSCI Emerging Markets ETF (EEM), and PowerShares QQQ Trust, Series 1 ETF (QQQQ), that market participants from institutional to retail and public investors have been using for trading, hedging, and investing purposes with varying timelines.¹⁷ The ETF market is one of the most highly-developed, sophisticated markets that provide traders and investors the opportunity to access practically all industries and enterprises. In 2012 investor demand for ETFs in all asset classes increased substantially. And in 2011 the demand for global and international equity ETFs, to which the requirement applies, more than doubled.¹⁸ The Exchange believes that the surveillance agreement requirement no longer serves a necessary (or indispensable) function in today's highly developed ETF market,¹⁹ and actually creates a dynamic that negatively impacts the number of markets that can competitively trade ETF option products, to the detriment of market participants.

The current surveillance requirement has, at times, resulted in the investing public having to forego the opportunity to hedge risk or engage in other listed options strategies in a competitive environment. ETFs may lack active options contracts that would be

¹⁷ These can be from intraday exposure (e.g., using Daily S&P 500 Bear 3x Shares (SPXS)) to long-term 401(k) or retirement fund exposure (e.g., using SPY).

¹⁸ http://www.icifactbook.org/fb_ch3.html.

¹⁹ ETFs and ETPs listed in the United States gathered \$24.6 billion USD in net new assets in June 2014 which, when combined with positive market performance, pushed the ETF/ETP industry in the United States to a new record high of \$1.86 trillion USD invested in 1,613 ETFs/ETPs, from 58 providers listed on 3 exchanges. And according to ETFGI, an independent ETF/ETP research and consultancy firm in the U.K., ETFs and ETPs listed globally reached \$2.64 trillion USD in assets, a new record high, at the end of Q2 2014. <http://www.mondovisione.com/media-and-resources/news/according-to-etfgi-etfs-and-etps-listed-globally-reached-us264-trillion-in-as/>.

more likely to develop if multiple exchanges could compete to offer and promote them. For example, an investor in the iShare MSCI Indonesia ETF (EIDO) is not permitted to sell call options or purchase protective puts simply because the Exchange cannot obtain a surveillance agreement with Bursa Efek Indonesia. However, an investor in iShare MSCI Emerging Markets Fund (EEM) is afforded the right to engage in listed options trading to hedge risk or execute other beneficial options strategies. Both underlying exchange-traded funds, EIDO and EEM, are listed for trading in the U.S., subject to constant regulatory scrutiny, and permitted to be purchased and sold via registered broker/dealers, yet, options can now be offered only on EEM. The Exchange believes this disparate treatment between investors of foreign-based instruments, especially between those that buy and sell options contracts on ETFs, which currently require surveillance agreements, as opposed to those that buy and sell shares of the underlying ETFs, which currently do not have the same onerous surveillance agreement requirement that ETF options have,²⁰ is not in the best interest. The Exchange therefore proposes to establish that options on

²⁰ While the surveillance agreement requirement for options on ETFs found in Commentary .06 to Rule 1009 (see note 14 and related text) has resulted in significant negative implications for market participants, there is no such surveillance agreement requirement for the underlying ETFs. In particular, when looking to the rules of NASDAQ, the primary ETF listing venue in the Group, NASDAQ Rules 5705 regarding ETFs and 5735 regarding Managed Fund Shares (“MFSs”) have no explicit requirements concerning surveillance agreements for regularly listed (non-generic) ETFs and MFSs, and simply state that FINRA will implement written surveillance procedures. Section 19(b)(2) filings regarding ETFs and MFSs typically indicate that the Exchange may obtain information regarding trading in the shares from FINRA and markets and other entities that are members of the Intermarket Surveillance Group (“ISG”), which includes securities and futures exchanges, or with which the Exchange has in place a surveillance agreement (which is not required by rule). Regarding ETFs and MFSs listed pursuant to generic (19b-4(e)) standards and reviewed and approved for trading under Section 19(b)(2) of the Act, Rules 5705 and 5735 simply note that the Commission's approval order may reference surveillance sharing agreements with respect to non-U.S. component stocks.

generically-listed global or international ETFs would not require surveillance agreements for listing.

The current surveillance agreement requirements, as well as all other requirements to list options on ETFs,²¹ are not affected by this proposal and will continue to remain in place for options on ETFs that do not meet generic listing standards on equities exchanges for ETFs based on international and global indexes

Generic Listing Standards for Exchange-Traded Funds

The Exchange notes that the Commission has previously approved generic listing standards pursuant to Rule 19b-4(e) of the Exchange Act²² for ETFs based on indexes that consist of stocks listed on U.S. exchanges including NASDAQ, the ETF listing exchange within the Group.²³ In general, the criteria for the underlying component securities in the international and global indexes are similar to those for the domestic indexes, but with modifications as appropriate for the issues and risks associated with non-U.S. securities.

In addition, the Commission has previously approved proposals for the listing and trading of options on ETFs based on international indexes as well as global indexes (e.g., based on non-U.S. and U.S. component stocks).²⁴ In approving ETFs

²¹ For purposes of brevity, these other requirements are not set forth, but can be found in Commentary .06 to Rule 1009.

²² 17 CFR 240.19b-4(e).

²³ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 54739 (November 9, 2006), 71 FR 66993 (November 17, 2006)(SR-Amex-2006-78)(initial order relating to generic listing standards for ETFs based on international or global indexes). See also NASDAQ Rule 5705(a)(3)(A)(ii) and (b)(3)(A)(ii).

²⁴ See, e.g., Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 57013 (December 20, 2007), 72 FR 73923 (December 28, 2007)(SR-CBOE-2007-140)(approval order to list and

for equities exchange trading, the Commission thoroughly considered the structure of the ETFs, their usefulness to investors and to the markets, and SRO rules that govern their trading. The Exchange believes that allowing the listing of options overlying ETFs that are listed pursuant to the generic listing standards on equities exchanges for ETFs based on international and global indexes and applying Rule 19b-4(e)²⁵ should fulfill the intended objective of that rule by allowing options on those ETFs that have satisfied the generic listing standards to commence trading, without the need for the public comment period and Commission approval. The proposed rule has the potential to reduce the time frame for bringing options on ETFs to market, thereby reducing the burdens on issuers and other market participants. The failure of a particular ETF to comply with the generic listing standards under Rule 19b-4(e)²⁶ would not, however,

trade options on iShares MSCI Mexico Index Fund, when CBOE did not have in place a surveillance agreement with the Bolsa Mexicana de Valores (the “Bolsa”); 57014 (December 20, 2007), 72 FR 73934 (December 28, 2007)(SR-ISE-2007-111)(approval order to list and trade options on iShares MSCI Mexico Index Fund, when ISE did not have in place a surveillance agreement with the Bolsa); 56778 (November 9, 2007), 72 FR 65113 (November 19, 2007)(SR-AMEX-2007-100)(approval order to list and trade options on iShares MSCI Mexico Index Fund, when AMEX did not have in place a surveillance agreement with the Bolsa); and 55648 (April 19, 2007), 72 FR 20902 (April 26, 2007)(SR-AMEX-2007-09)(approval order to list and trade options on Vanguard Emerging Markets ETF, when AMEX did not have in place a surveillance agreement with the Bolsa). See also Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 50189 (August 12, 2004), 69 FR 51723 (August 20, 2004) (SR-AMEX-2001-05) (approving the listing and trading of certain Vanguard International Equity Index Funds); and 44700 (August 14, 2001), 66 FR 43927 (August 21, 2001) (SR-2001-34) (approving the listing and trading of series of the iShares Trust based on foreign stock indexes).

²⁵ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(e).

²⁶ Id.

preclude the Exchange from submitting a separate filing pursuant to Section 19(b)(2),²⁷ requesting Commission approval to list and trade options on a particular ETF.

Moreover, the Exchange notes that the generic standards such as those in proposed Commentary .06(b)(i) to Rule 1009 are not new in the options world, and have been used extensively for listing options on narrow-based and broad-based indexes.²⁸

Requirements for Listing and Trading Options Overlying ETFs Based on International and Global Indexes

Options on ETFs listed pursuant to these generic standards for international and global indexes would be traded, in all other respects, under the Exchange's existing trading rules and procedures that apply to options on ETFs and would be covered under the Exchange's surveillance program for options on ETFs.

Pursuant to proposed Commentary .06 (b)(i) to Rule 1009, the Exchange may list and trade options on an ETF without a CSSA provided that the ETF is listed pursuant to generic listing standards for series of PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes, in which case a comprehensive surveillance agreement is not required. As noted, one such rule, which discusses things such as weighting, capitalization, trading volume, minimum number of components, and where components are listed, is NASDAQ Rule 5705(b)(3)(A)(ii) regarding ETFs (IFSs and PDRs).²⁹ The

²⁷ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

²⁸ Rule 1009A has, for example, weighting, capitalization, trading volume, and minimum number of components standards for listing options on narrow-based and broad-based indexes. For a definition of broad-based index (market index) and narrow-based index (industry index), see Rule 1000A(b)(11) and (12), respectively.

²⁹ NASDAQ Rule 5705(b)(3)(A)(ii) regarding IFSs, for example, has the following requirements (reproduced in relevant part): a. component stocks (excluding Derivative Securities Products) that in the aggregate account for at least 90% of

Exchange believes that these generic listing standards are intended to ensure that securities with substantial market capitalization and trading volume account for a substantial portion of the weight of an index or portfolio.

The Exchange believes that this proposed listing standard for options on ETFs is reasonable for international and global indexes, and, when applied in conjunction with the other listing requirements, will result in options overlying ETFs that are sufficiently broad in scope and not readily susceptible to manipulation. The Exchange also believes that allowing the Exchange to list options overlying ETFs that are listed on equities exchanges pursuant to generic standards for series of PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes under which a CSSA is not required, will result in options overlying ETFs that are adequately diversified in weighting for any single security or small group of securities to significantly reduce concerns that trading in

the weight of the index or portfolio (excluding Derivative Securities Products) each shall have a minimum market value of at least \$100 million; b. component stocks (excluding Derivative Securities Products) that in the aggregate account for at least 70% of the weight of the index or portfolio (excluding Derivative Securities Products) each shall have a minimum worldwide monthly trading volume of at least 250,000 shares, or minimum global notional volume traded per month of \$25,000,000, averaged over the last six months; c. the most heavily weighted component stock (excluding Derivative Securities Products) shall not exceed 25% of the weight of the index or portfolio, and, to the extent applicable, the five most heavily weighted component stocks (excluding Derivative Securities Products) shall not exceed 60% of the weight of the index or portfolio; d. the index or portfolio shall include a minimum of 20 component stocks; provided, however, that there shall be no minimum number of component stocks if either one or more series of Index Fund Shares or Portfolio Depositary Receipts constitute, at least in part, components underlying a series of Index Fund Shares, or one or more series of Derivative Securities Products account for 100% of the weight of the index or portfolio; and e. each U.S. Component Stock shall be listed on a national securities exchange and shall be an NMS Stock as defined in Rule 600 of Regulation NMS under the Act, and each Non-U.S. Component Stock shall be listed and traded on an exchange that has last-sale reporting.

NASDAQ Rule 5705(a)(3)(A)(ii) has similar standards, but tailored for PDRs.

options overlying ETFs based on international or global indexes could become a surrogate for trading in unregistered securities.³⁰

The Exchange believes that ETFs based on international and global indexes that have been listed pursuant to the generic standards are sufficiently defined so as to make options overlying such ETFs not susceptible instruments for manipulation. The Exchange believes that the threat of manipulation is, as discussed below, sufficiently mitigated for underlying ETFs that have been listed on equities exchanges pursuant to generic listing standards for series of PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes under which a comprehensive surveillance agreement is not required and for the overlying options; the Exchange does not see the need for a CSSA to be in place before listing and trading options on such ETFs. The Exchange notes that its proposal does not replace the need for a CSSA as provided in current Commentary .06(b) to Rule 1009. The provisions of Commentary.06(b), including the need for a CSSA, remain materially unchanged and will continue to apply to options on ETFs that are not listed on an equities exchange pursuant to generic listing standards for series of PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes. Instead, proposed Commentary .06(b)(i) adds an additional listing mechanism for certain qualifying options on ETFs to be listed on the Exchange.

Finally, to account for proposed Commentary .06(b) to Rule 1009 and make Commentary .06 easier to follow, the Exchange proposes technical changes to the

³⁰ The Exchange also notes that not affording retail investors the ability to trade on a regulated exchange can be detrimental. While products can be traded off exchange in the over the counter (“OTC”) market, which has increased settlement, clearing, and market risk as opposed to exchanges, the relatively unregulated OTC market is usually not a viable option for retail and public investors.

formatting of this section of the rule. The Exchange proposes re-numbering Commentary .06(b)(i), (ii) and (iii) as Commentary .06(b)(ii)(A), (B), and (C), respectively; and re-numbering Commentary .06(b)(iv) and (v) as Commentary .06(b)(iii) and (iv), respectively. This is merely re-numbering and there are no changes to the language of these sections of Commentary .06.

No Economic Risk

The proposal does not raise a concern regarding economic risk or manipulation. The proposal does not increase the risk of manipulation of the ETF itself, as the ETF trades in the U.S. and trading is subject to the U.S. surveillance requirement and follows Exchange rules. One might try to argue that the proposal raises a concern about a theoretical manipulation risk of the underlying international components of the ETF trading in the U.S. If such manipulation were successful, the argument would go, then the ETF could be fairly priced relative to its components but the price of the components potentially may not reflect fair market value. The Exchange firmly believes that the proposal does not raise any such theoretical concern.

For manipulation to be successful the expected cost of the contemplated manipulation must be less than the expected gain. In other words, manipulation will not be attempted if the prospective profit from the attempt is zero or less, even ignoring the quite real costs associated with regulatory risk. In approving the rules for narrow based indices, it was thought that the costs of manipulating such an index based on component securities with the same parameters as those proposed ETFs would be prohibitive relative to any prospective gains. The Exchange's proposal does not suggest a different paradigm.

Moreover, the Commission reviewed and approved the ability to list ETFs without surveillance agreements if they meet the generic listing standards for ETFs based on international or global indices. The Exchange believes that the argument and economic conclusion that allowing the listing of options on these same underlying ETFs with components outside the U.S. that are sufficiently large, transparent, diversified, and liquid to make manipulation unprofitable is valid.

A second theoretical source of manipulation risk may be seen to be the creation/redemption process for ETFs. If the creation/redemption process could be manipulated then the market price of the ETF could materially differ from the fair value of the ETF derived from a fair market value of the components. Again, the Exchange does not agree that this is a significant manipulation risk for ETFs, let alone options on ETF. As noted, ETFs are a much more mature asset class today than in 2001 when the current rules were adopted. The development of ETFs as an established asset class and the listing and trading of ETFs, including the creation/redemption process, has developed immensely since the introduction of ETFs, and options on them. Since manipulation of the creation/redemption process would create economic profits for the manipulator, but such manipulation has not been manifest during the significant expansion of ETFs as an international asset class, this offers convincing evidence that manipulation risk in the creation/redemption process is, indeed, theoretical and not an increased risk with this proposal regarding the listing of ETF options. The Exchange believes that its proposal will not lead to increased economic risk.

The Exchange requests approval of its proposal to allow the listing of options overlying ETFs (PDRs and IFSSs) based on international or global indexes, without a

comprehensive surveillance agreement. The proposal will, as discussed, be beneficial to investors and is in conformity with the Act.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act³¹ in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act³² in particular, in that it is designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade, 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. In particular, the proposed rule change has the potential to reduce the time frame for bringing options on ETFs to market, thereby reducing the burdens on issuers and other market participants. The Exchange also believes that enabling the listing and trading of options on ETFs pursuant to this proposed new listing standard will benefit investors by providing them with valuable risk management tools. The Exchange notes that its proposal does not replace the need for a CSSA as provided in Commentary .06 to Rule 1009. The provisions of current Commentary .06, including the need for a CSSA, remain materially unchanged and will continue to apply to options on ETFs that are not listed on an equities exchange pursuant to generic listing standards for series of PDRs and IFSs based on international or global indexes under which a comprehensive surveillance agreement is not required. Instead, proposed Commentary .06(b)(i) to Rule 1009 adds an additional listing mechanism for certain qualifying options on ETFs to be listed on the Exchange in a manner that is designed to prevent fraudulent and

³¹ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

³² 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanisms of a free and open market and a national market system and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest.

The proposal would promote just and equitable principles of trade. The surveillance agreement requirement was instituted in 2001 when ETFs were, comparatively speaking, in a developmental state.³³ The first ETF introduced in 1993 was a broad-based domestic equity fund tracking the S&P 500 index. After the introduction of the first ETF in 1993, the development of ETF products was very limited during the first decade of their existence. Since the end of 2001, when there was a total of only 102 ETFs listed on U.S. markets, however, the ETF market has matured tremendously and grown exponentially. With a total of 1,194 listed ETFs at the end of 2012, the ETF market is now one of the most highly-developed, sophisticated markets with many very well known, highly traded and liquid products that provide traders and investors the opportunity to access practically all industries and enterprises. While investor demand for ETFs in all asset classes increased substantially, in 2011 the demand for global and international equity ETFs, to which the requirement applies, more than doubled.³⁴ The Exchange believes that the current surveillance requirement no longer serves a necessary function in today's highly developed market, and, as discussed, actually creates a dynamic that negatively impacts the number of markets that can

³³ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43921 (February 2, 2001), 66 FR 9739 (February 9, 2001)(SR-Phlx-2000-107)(ETF approval order).

³⁴ http://www.icifactbook.org/fb_ch3.html.

competitively trade ETF option products. This hurts market participants. The Exchange therefore proposes to establish that pursuant to proposed Commentary .06(b)(i) to Rule 1009 options may be listed on certain ETFs that are based on global and international funds and meet generic listing standards.

The proposal would in general protect investors and the public interest. The Exchange believes that modifying the surveillance agreement requirement for ETFs would not hinder the Exchange from performing surveillance duties designed to protect investors and the public interest. There are various data consolidators, vendors, and outlets that can be used to access data and information regarding ETFs and the underlying securities (e.g., Bloomberg, Dow Jones, FTEN). In addition, firms that list ETFs on an exchange receive vast amounts of data relevant to their products that could be made available to listing exchanges as needed. The Exchange has access to the activity of the direct underlying instrument and the ETF, and through the Intermarket Surveillance Group (“ISG”) the Exchange can obtain such information related to the underlying security as needed.³⁵ Moreover, other than the surveillance agreement requirement there are, as discussed, numerous requirements in Rule 1009 that must be met to list options on ETFs on the Exchange.

The proposal would remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system. Multiple listing of ETFs, options, and other securities and competition are some of the central features of the current national market system. The Exchange believes that the surveillance agreement requirement has led to clearly anti-competitive results in a market that is based on competition. As such,

³⁵ See <https://www.isgportal.org/home.html>. Another global organization similar to ISG is The International Organization of Securities Commissions (“IOSCO”).

the Exchange believes that the surveillance agreement requirement for options on certain ETFs is no longer necessary and proposes new Commentary .06(b)(i) to Rule 1009. The proposed rule change will significantly benefit market participants. As discussed at length, the proposed rule will negate the negative anti-competitive effect of the current surveillance agreement requirement that has resulted in de facto regulatory monopolies where only solitary exchanges, or only a few exchanges, are able to list certain ETF options products. The Exchange believes this is inconsistent with Commission policies and the developing national market system, as well as the competitive nature of the market, and therefore proposes amendment.³⁶ The Exchange believes that the proposal would encourage a more open market and national market system based on competition and multiple listing. The generic listing standards for ETFs based on global or international indexes have specific requirements regarding relative weighting, minimum capitalization, minimum trading volume, and minimum number of components that have been approved by the Commission years ago for foreign ETFs.³⁷ Moreover, such listing standards have been in continuous use for listing options on narrow-based and broad-based indexes on the Exchange.³⁸ Allowing the listing of options on underlying ETFs based on global and international indexes that meet generic listing standards would

³⁶ As discussed, the Exchange is decidedly not proposing that the surveillance agreement requirement be deleted entirely, but rather that only those options on ETFs that do not meet very specific generic listing standards need to have surveillance agreements in order to list on the Exchange.

³⁷ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 54739 (November 9, 2006), 71 FR 66993 (November 17, 2006)(SR-Amex-2006-78)(initial order relating to generic listing standards for ETFs based on international or global indexes). See also NASDAQ Rule 5705(a)(3)(A)(ii) and (b)(3)(A)(ii).

³⁸ See Rule 1009A(b) and (d).

encourage a free and open market and national market system to the benefit of market participants.

Finally, the Exchange's proposal for limiting the necessity of surveillance agreements to list options on ETFs does not, as discussed above, raise a concern regarding manipulation. The Exchange believes that its proposal is not indicative of increased economic risk.

For the above reasons, the Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act.

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 that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. To the contrary, the Exchange believes that the proposal is, as discussed, decidedly pro-competitive and is a competitive response to the inability to list products because of the surveillance agreement requirement. The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change will result in additional investment options and opportunities to achieve the investment objectives of market participants seeking efficient trading and hedging vehicles, to the benefit of investors, market participants, and the marketplace in general. Competition is one of the principal features of the national market system. The Exchange believes that this proposal will expand competitive opportunities to list and trade products on the Exchange as noted.

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 proposed rule change is filed for immediate effectiveness pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)³⁹ of the Act and Rule 19b-4(f)(6) thereunder.⁴⁰ The Exchange asserts that 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 for 30 days after its filing date, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate if consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest. The Exchange believes the rule change qualifies for immediate effectiveness as a “non-controversial” rule change under Rule 19b-4(f)(6) of the Act.

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:

³⁹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

⁴⁰ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(6).

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (<http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml>); or
- Send an e-mail to rule-comments@sec.gov. Please include File Number SR-Phlx-2015-27 on the subject line.

Paper comments:

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

All submissions should refer to File Number SR-Phlx-2015-27. This file number should be included on the subject line if e-mail is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (<http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml>).

Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for website viewing and printing in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 100 F Street, NE, Washington, DC 20549, on official business days between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Copies of the filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR-Phlx-2015-27 and should be submitted on or before [insert date 21 days from publication in the Federal Register].

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.⁴¹

Kevin M. O'Neill
Deputy Secretary

⁴¹ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

EXHIBIT 5

Proposed new text is underlined. Deleted text is [bracketed].

NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC Rules**Options Rules**

* * * * *

Rule 1009. Criteria for Underlying Securities

(a) – (c) No Change.

••• *Commentary:* -----

.01 - .05 No Change.

.06 Securities deemed appropriate for options trading shall include share or other securities ("Exchange-Traded Fund Shares"), including but not limited to Partnership Units as defined in Commentary .08 to Rule 1009, that are principally traded on a national securities exchange and are defined as an "NMS stock" under Rule 600 of Regulation NMS, and that (i) represent an interest in a registered investment company organized as an open-end management investment company, a unit investment trust or a similar entity which holds securities and/or financial instruments including, but not limited to, stock index futures contracts, options on futures, options on securities and indexes, equity caps, collars and floors, swap agreements, forward contracts, repurchase agreements and reverse repurchase agreements (the "Financial Instruments"), and money market instruments, including, but not limited to, U.S. government securities and repurchase agreements (the "Money Market Instruments") constituting or otherwise based on or representing an investment in an index or portfolio of securities and/or Financial Instruments and Money Market Instruments, or (ii) represent commodity pool interests principally engaged, directly or indirectly, in holding and/or managing portfolios or baskets of securities, commodity futures contracts, options on commodity futures contracts, swaps, forward contracts and/or options on physical commodities and /or non-U.S. currency ("Commodity Pool ETFs") or (iii) represent interests in a trust or similar entity that holds a specified non-U.S. currency or currencies deposited with the trust or similar entity when aggregated in some specified minimum number may be surrendered to the trust by the beneficial owner to receive the specified non-U.S. currency or

currencies and pays the beneficial owner interest and other distributions on the deposited non-U.S. currency or currencies, if any, declared and paid by the trust ("Currency Trust Shares"), or (iv) represent interests in SPDR Gold Trust, iShares COMEX Gold Trust, iShares Silver Trust, or ETFS Gold Trust ("SGOL") provided:

(a)

(i) the Exchange-Traded Fund Shares meet the criteria and guidelines for underlying securities set forth in Commentary .01 to this Rule 1009; or

(ii) The Exchange-Traded Fund Shares must be available for creation or redemption each business day in cash or in kind from the investment company, commodity pool or other entity at a price related to the net asset value. In addition, the investment company, commodity pool or other entity shall provide that fund shares may be created even though some or all of the securities and/or cash needed to be deposited have not been received by the unit investment trust or the management investment company, provided the authorized creation participant has undertaken to deliver the shares and/or cash as soon as possible and such undertaking has been secured by the delivery and maintenance of collateral consisting of cash or cash equivalents satisfactory to the fund which underlies the option as described in the fund or unit trust prospectus; and

(b) The Exchange-Traded Fund Shares meet the following criteria:

(i) The Fund Shares are listed pursuant to generic listing standards for series of portfolio depositary receipts and index fund shares based on international or global indexes, in which case a comprehensive surveillance agreement is not required; or

[(i)](ii)(A) any non-U.S. component stocks in the index or portfolio on which the Fund Shares are based that are not subject to comprehensive surveillance agreements do not in the aggregate represent more than 50% of the weight of the index or portfolio;

[(ii)](B) stocks for which the primary market is in any one country that is not subject to a comprehensive surveillance agreement do not represent 20% or more of the weight of the index; and

[(iii)](C) stocks for which the primary market is in any two countries that are not subject to comprehensive surveillance agreements do not represent 33% or more of the weight of the index.

(iii)[iv]) For Commodity Pool ETFs that engage in holding and/or managing portfolios or baskets commodity futures contracts, options on commodity futures contracts, swaps, forward contracts, options on physical commodities, options on non-U.S. currency and/or securities, the Exchange has entered into a

comprehensive surveillance sharing agreement with the marketplace or marketplaces with last sale reporting that represent(s) the highest volume in such commodity futures contracts and/or options on commodity futures contracts on the specified commodities or non-U.S. currency, which are utilized by the national securities exchange where the underlying Commodity Pool ETFs are listed and traded.

(iv[v]) For Currency Trust Shares, the Exchange has entered into a comprehensive surveillance sharing agreement with the marketplace or marketplaces with last sale reporting that represent(s) the highest volume in derivatives (options or futures) on the specified non-U.S. currency, which are utilized by the national securities exchange where the underlying Currency Trust Shares are listed and traded.

.07 - .09

No Change.

* * * * *