

Required fields are shown with yellow backgrounds and asterisks.

Page 1 of * <input type="text" value="24"/>	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549 Form 19b-4	File No.* SR - <input type="text" value="2016"/> - * <input type="text" value="27"/>	Amendment No. (req. for Amendments *) <input type="text"/>
---	--	--	--

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

Initial * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amendment * <input type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawal <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 19(b)(2) * <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 19(b)(3)(A) * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Section 19(b)(3)(B) * <input type="checkbox"/>
			Rule		
Pilot <input type="checkbox"/>	Extension of Time Period for Commission Action * <input type="checkbox"/>	Date Expires * <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(1)	<input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(4)	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(2)	<input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(5)	
			<input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(3)	<input 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) * <input type="checkbox"/>	Section 806(e)(2) * <input type="checkbox"/>
Section 3C(b)(2) * <input type="checkbox"/>	

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

**Description**

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

Proposal to amend the Exchange Access Services fees under Chapter VIII of the Exchange Pricing Schedule

**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 * <input type="text" value="Sean"/>	Last Name * <input type="text" value="Bennett"/>
Title * <input type="text" value="Associate General Counsel"/>	
E-mail * <input type="text" value="Sean.Bennett@nasdaq.com"/>	
Telephone * <input type="text" value="(301) 978-8499"/>	Fax <input type="text"/>

**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 <input type="text" value="02/11/2016"/>	Executive Vice President and General Counsel
By <input type="text" value="Edward S. Knight"/>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 40px; background-color: #f0f0f0;"></div>

(Name \*)

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.

edward.knight@nasdaq.com

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) NASDAQ PHLX LLC (“Exchange”), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”)<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> is filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) a proposal to amend the Exchange’s Access Services fees under Chapter VIII of the Exchange’s Pricing Schedule to: (i) assess a \$25/port/month Disaster Recovery Port fee for Disaster Recovery Ports used with FIX Trading Ports, OUCH, RASH, and DROP ports; and (ii) assess a \$100/port/month fee for Trading Ports used in Test Mode.

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

(b) Not applicable.

(c) Not applicable.

2. Procedures of the Self-Regulatory Organization

The proposed rule change was approved by senior management of the Exchange pursuant to authority delegated by the Board of Directors (the “Board”) on July 1, 2015. Exchange staff will advise the Board of any action taken pursuant to delegated authority. No other action is necessary for the filing of the rule change.

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

T. Sean Bennett  
Associate General Counsel  
Nasdaq, Inc.  
(301) 978-8499

---

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 78s(b)(1).

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

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

a. Purpose

The purpose of the proposed rule change is to amend the Exchange's Access Services fees under Chapter VIII of the Exchange's Pricing Schedule to: (i) assess a \$25/port/month Disaster Recovery Port fee for Disaster Recovery Ports used with FIX Trading Ports, OUCH, RASH, and DROP ports; and (ii) assess a \$100/port/month fee for Trading Ports used in Test Mode.

First Change

The Exchange is in the process of transitioning its Disaster Recovery ("DR") functionality for the U.S. equities and options markets from Ashburn, VA to its new Chicago, IL data center. The Exchange has invested and installed new equipment in the Chicago data center for client connectivity and for the infrastructure of Exchange systems. The Exchange chose Chicago as the location of its new DR data center as many other exchanges are using this same location for a disaster recovery or a primary location and, as a result, many of our market participants have a presence or connection at this location, thus making it easier and less expensive for many market participants to connect to the Exchange for DR.

Under Chapter VIII of the Exchange's Pricing Schedule, member firms may subscribe to DR ports, which provide backup connectivity in the event of a failure or disaster rendering their primary connectivity at Carteret, NJ subscribed to under Chapter VIII of the Exchange's Pricing Schedule unavailable. To date, the Exchange has transitioned FIX Trading Ports, OUCH, RASH, and DROP Ports to the Chicago center from Ashburn. Currently, the Exchange does not assess a fee for any DR ports.

The Exchange has incurred an initial cost associated with moving DR ports to the Chicago center, including the purchase of upgraded hardware and physical space to house the DR ports, which is more expensive than the Ashburn location. The Exchange also incurs ongoing costs in maintaining the DR ports, including costs incurred maintaining servers and their physical location, monitoring order activity, and other support, which is collectively more expensive in Chicago than Ashburn. Accordingly, the Exchange is proposing to assess a fee of \$25 per port, per month for DR Ports used with FIX Trading Ports, OUCH, RASH, and DROP Ports.

### Second Change

Under Chapter VIII of the Exchange's Pricing Schedule, Member firms may subscribe to Trading Ports used in Test Mode, which are trading ports available in primary market location in Carteret, NJ, that are exclusively used for testing purposes, at no cost. These ports may not be used for trading in securities in the System, but rather allow a member firm to test their systems prior to connecting to the live trading environment. Test Ports are identical in all respects to trading ports<sup>3</sup> and share the same infrastructure, but are restricted to only allow order entry into the System in test symbols. A member firm may elect to designate a subscribed trading port as either in "production mode" or in "test mode." A Trading Port that is in production mode allows a member firm to send orders for execution on the Exchange system in the normal course. When a member firm changes a trading port's status to test mode, the Exchange will not allow normal order activity to occur through the port but rather it limits all order activity to test symbols. Under Chapter VIII of the Exchange's Pricing Schedule, member firms are

---

<sup>3</sup> E.g., FIX, RASH, and OUCH.

assessed a monthly fee of \$400 per port for each trading port subscribed in production mode. Member firms are not currently assessed a fee for Trading Ports used in Test Mode.

The Exchange has audited the use of Trading Ports used in Test Mode and found that a majority of Trading Ports used in Test Mode are not used for testing, but rather remain idle. The Exchange incurs costs associated with maintaining such ports, including costs incurred maintaining servers and their physical location, monitoring order activity, and other support. Accordingly, the Exchange is proposing to assess a fee of \$100 per port, per month.<sup>4</sup>

b. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act<sup>5</sup> in general, and furthers the objectives of Sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act<sup>6</sup> in particular, in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among members and issuers and other persons using any facility or system

---

<sup>4</sup> The Exchange bills Access Services subscriptions by prorating the first monthly fee by the number of days that subscription was subscribed and thereafter assesses the full monthly fee, including the full month in which the subscription is cancelled. If a subscriber elects to change a test mode port to a production port in a given month, the Exchange will assess the Trading Ports used in Test Mode fee, which may be prorated if subscribed to in the same month, and will also assess the production port fee, which will be prorated from the date the change is made through the end of the month. Likewise, if a subscriber elects to change a production mode port to a test mode port in a given month, the Exchange will assess the monthly production port fee, which may be prorated if subscribed to in the same month, and will also assess the Trading Ports used in Test Mode fee, which will be prorated from the date the change is made through the end of the month.

<sup>5</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 78f(b).

<sup>6</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 78f(b)(4) and (5).

which the Exchange operates or controls, and is not designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers, or dealers.

The Commission and the courts have repeatedly expressed their preference for competition over regulatory intervention in determining prices, products, and services in the securities markets. In Regulation NMS, while adopting a series of steps to improve the current market model, the Commission highlighted the importance of market forces in determining prices and SRO revenues and, also, recognized that current regulation of the market system “has been remarkably successful in promoting market competition in its broader forms that are most important to investors and listed companies.”<sup>7</sup> Likewise, in NetCoalition v. Securities and Exchange Commission<sup>8</sup> (“NetCoalition”) the D.C. Circuit upheld the Commission’s use of a market-based approach in evaluating the fairness of market data fees against a challenge claiming that Congress mandated a cost-based approach.<sup>9</sup> As the court emphasized, the Commission “intended in Regulation NMS that ‘market forces, rather than regulatory requirements’ play a role in determining the market data . . . to be made available to investors and at what cost.”<sup>10</sup>

Further, “[n]o one disputes that competition for order flow is ‘fierce.’ . . . As the SEC explained, ‘[i]n the U.S. national market system, buyers and sellers of securities, and the broker-dealers that act as their order-routing agents, have a wide range of choices of where to route orders for execution’; [and] ‘no exchange can afford to take its market

---

<sup>7</sup> Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808 at 37499 (June 9, 2005) (“Regulation NMS Adopting Release”).

<sup>8</sup> NetCoalition v. SEC, 615 F.3d 525 (D.C. Cir. 2010).

<sup>9</sup> See NetCoalition, at 534.

<sup>10</sup> Id. at 537.

share percentages for granted' because 'no exchange possesses a monopoly, regulatory or otherwise, in the execution of order flow from broker dealers' ...."<sup>11</sup>

#### DR Port Fees

The fee assessed for DR Ports is reasonable because it is based on the cost incurred by the Exchange in purchasing and maintaining DR ports in the Chicago data center. Currently, the Exchange does not have a means to recoup its investment and costs associated with providing member firms with DR ports in the Chicago data center. Thus, the Exchange believes that the proposed fee is reasonable because the fee is intended to cover the Exchange's costs incurred in maintaining DR ports.

The proposed fee may also allow the Exchange to make a profit to the extent the costs associated with purchasing and maintaining DR ports are covered. The Exchange believes that the proposed fee is equitably allocated and not unfairly discriminatory because it will apply equally to all subscribers to DR ports based on the number of ports subscribed. Last, the Exchange notes that subscription to DR ports is voluntary, and member firms may subscribe to as many or as few ports they believe is necessary.

#### Trading Ports used in Test Mode Fees

The proposed fee is also reasonable because it is based on the cost incurred by the Exchange in developing and maintaining multiple port connections, which are not used in the production environment and are designated as in test mode.

As noted, the Exchange invests time and capital in initiating, monitoring and maintaining port connections to its system. Currently, the Exchange does not have a means to recoup its investment and costs associated with providing member firms with

---

<sup>11</sup> Id. at 539 (quoting ArcaBook Order, 73 FR at 74782-74783).



Trading Ports used in Test Mode. Thus, the Exchange believes that the proposed fee is reasonable because the fee is intended to cover the Exchange's costs incurred in maintaining test mode ports and is less than what is charged for a trading port in production mode. The proposed fee may also allow the Exchange to make a profit to the extent the costs associated with developing and maintaining Trading Ports used in Test Mode are covered. The Exchange believes that the proposed fee does not discriminate unfairly as it will promote efficiency in the market by incentivizing member firms to either place idle ports into production or cancel them if unneeded.

The proposed fee is also equitably allocated because all Exchange member firms that voluntarily elect to subscribe to trading ports, yet maintain them in test mode, will be charged the fee equally on a per-port basis. Last, the Exchange notes that subscription to Trading Ports used in Test Mode is voluntary, and member firms may subscribe to as many or as few ports they believe is necessary for their testing purposes.

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

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. In terms of inter-market competition, the Exchange notes that it operates in a highly competitive market in which market participants can readily favor competing venues if they deem fee levels at a particular venue to be excessive, or rebate opportunities available at other venues to be more favorable. In such an environment, the Exchange must continually adjust its fees to remain competitive with other exchanges and with alternative trading systems that have been exempted from compliance with the statutory standards applicable to exchanges. Because competitors are free to modify their own fees in response, and because market participants may readily adjust their order routing

practices, the Exchange believes that the degree to which fee changes in this market may impose any burden on competition is extremely limited.

In this instance, the proposed fee merely allows the Exchange to recapture the costs associated with maintaining member ports that are in test mode and DR, and may provide the Exchange with a profit to the extent its costs are covered. The Trading Port used in Test Mode fee is applied uniformly to member firms that have such ports in the Carteret data center, where the Exchange incurs expenses to support this port configuration option.

The proposed fee will also promote efficient use of Trading Ports for testing. Similarly, the Exchange incurs greater costs in offering DR ports in the new Chicago data center, which the Exchange is seeking to cover. Any burden arising from the fees is necessary in the interest of promoting a more efficient market and to cover costs associated with the location of the functionality in Chicago. If the changes proposed herein are unattractive to market participants, it is likely that the Exchange will lose market share as a result as member firms chose one of many alternative venues on which they may trade. Accordingly, the Exchange does not believe that the proposed changes will impair the ability of members or competing order execution venues to maintain their competitive standing in the financial markets.

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

Not applicable.

6. Extension of Time Period for Commission Action

Not applicable.

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

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act,<sup>12</sup> The Exchange has designated this proposal as establishing or changing a due, fee, or other charge imposed by the self-regulatory organization on any person, whether or not the person is a member of the self-regulatory organization, which renders the proposed rule change effective upon filing.

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

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

11. Exhibits

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

5. Text of the proposed rule change.

---

<sup>12</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

**EXHIBIT 1**

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
(Release No. \_\_\_\_\_ ; File No. SR-Phlx-2016-27)

February \_\_, 2016

Self-Regulatory Organizations; NASDAQ PHLX LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change to Amend Access Services Fees under Chapter VIII of the Pricing Schedule

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”)<sup>1</sup>, and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> notice is hereby given that on February 11, 2016, NASDAQ PHLX LLC (“Exchange”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC” or “Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III, below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

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

The Exchange proposes to amend the Exchange’s Access Services fees under Chapter VIII of the Exchange’s Pricing Schedule to: (i) assess a \$25/port/month Disaster Recovery Port fee for Disaster Recovery Ports used with FIX Trading Ports, OUCH, RASH, and DROP ports; and (ii) assess a \$100/port/month fee for Trading Ports used in Test Mode.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange’s Website at <http://nasdaqomxphlx.cchwallstreet.com/>, at the principal office of the Exchange, and at the Commission’s Public Reference Room.

---

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 78s(b)(1).

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

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

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

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

1. Purpose

The purpose of the proposed rule change is to amend the Exchange's Access Services fees under Chapter VIII of the Exchange's Pricing Schedule to: (i) assess a \$25/port/month Disaster Recovery Port fee for Disaster Recovery Ports used with FIX Trading Ports, OUCH, RASH, and DROP ports; and (ii) assess a \$100/port/month fee for Trading Ports used in Test Mode.

First Change

The Exchange is in the process of transitioning its Disaster Recovery ("DR") functionality for the U.S. equities and options markets from Ashburn, VA to its new Chicago, IL data center. The Exchange has invested and installed new equipment in the Chicago data center for client connectivity and for the infrastructure of Exchange systems. The Exchange chose Chicago as the location of its new DR data center as many other exchanges are using this same location for a disaster recovery or a primary location and, as a result, many of our market participants have a presence or connection at this location, thus making it easier and less expensive for many market participants to connect to the Exchange for DR.

Under Chapter VIII of the Exchange's Pricing Schedule, member firms may subscribe to DR ports, which provide backup connectivity in the event of a failure or disaster rendering their primary connectivity at Carteret, NJ subscribed to under Chapter VIII of the Exchange's Pricing Schedule unavailable. To date, the Exchange has transitioned FIX Trading Ports, OUCH, RASH, and DROP Ports to the Chicago center from Ashburn. Currently, the Exchange does not assess a fee for any DR ports.

The Exchange has incurred an initial cost associated with moving DR ports to the Chicago center, including the purchase of upgraded hardware and physical space to house the DR ports, which is more expensive than the Ashburn location. The Exchange also incurs ongoing costs in maintaining the DR ports, including costs incurred maintaining servers and their physical location, monitoring order activity, and other support, which is collectively more expensive in Chicago than Ashburn. Accordingly, the Exchange is proposing to assess a fee of \$25 per port, per month for DR Ports used with FIX Trading Ports, OUCH, RASH, and DROP Ports.

### Second Change

Under Chapter VIII of the Exchange's Pricing Schedule, Member firms may subscribe to Trading Ports used in Test Mode, which are trading ports available in primary market location in Carteret, NJ, that are exclusively used for testing purposes, at no cost. These ports may not be used for trading in securities in the System, but rather allow a member firm to test their systems prior to connecting to the live trading environment. Test Ports are identical in all respects to trading ports<sup>3</sup> and share the same infrastructure, but are restricted to only allow order entry into the System in test symbols.

---

<sup>3</sup> E.g., FIX, RASH, and OUCH.

A member firm may elect to designate a subscribed trading port as either in “production mode” or in “test mode.” A Trading Port that is in production mode allows a member firm to send orders for execution on the Exchange system in the normal course. When a member firm changes a trading port’s status to test mode, the Exchange will not allow normal order activity to occur through the port but rather it limits all order activity to test symbols. Under Chapter VIII of the Exchange’s Pricing Schedule, member firms are assessed a monthly fee of \$400 per port for each trading port subscribed in production mode. Member firms are not currently assessed a fee for Trading Ports used in Test Mode.

The Exchange has audited the use of Trading Ports used in Test Mode and found that a majority of Trading Ports used in Test Mode are not used for testing, but rather remain idle. The Exchange incurs costs associated with maintaining such ports, including costs incurred maintaining servers and their physical location, monitoring order activity, and other support. Accordingly, the Exchange is proposing to assess a fee of \$100 per port, per month.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> The Exchange bills Access Services subscriptions by prorating the first monthly fee by the number of days that subscription was subscribed and thereafter assesses the full monthly fee, including the full month in which the subscription is cancelled. If a subscriber elects to change a test mode port to a production port in a given month, the Exchange will assess the Trading Ports used in Test Mode fee, which may be prorated if subscribed to in the same month, and will also assess the production port fee, which will be prorated from the date the change is made through the end of the month. Likewise, if a subscriber elects to change a production mode port to a test mode port in a given month, the Exchange will assess the monthly production port fee, which may be prorated if subscribed to in the same month, and will also assess the Trading Ports used in Test Mode fee, which will be prorated from the date the change is made through the end of the month.

## 2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act<sup>5</sup> in general, and furthers the objectives of Sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act<sup>6</sup> in particular, in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among members and issuers and other persons using any facility or system which the Exchange operates or controls, and is not designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers, or dealers.

The Commission and the courts have repeatedly expressed their preference for competition over regulatory intervention in determining prices, products, and services in the securities markets. In Regulation NMS, while adopting a series of steps to improve the current market model, the Commission highlighted the importance of market forces in determining prices and SRO revenues and, also, recognized that current regulation of the market system “has been remarkably successful in promoting market competition in its broader forms that are most important to investors and listed companies.”<sup>7</sup> Likewise, in NetCoalition v. Securities and Exchange Commission<sup>8</sup> (“NetCoalition”) the D.C. Circuit upheld the Commission’s use of a market-based approach in evaluating the fairness of market data fees against a challenge claiming that Congress mandated a cost-based approach.<sup>9</sup> As the court emphasized, the Commission “intended in Regulation

---

<sup>5</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 78f(b).

<sup>6</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 78f(b)(4) and (5).

<sup>7</sup> Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808 at 37499 (June 9, 2005) (“Regulation NMS Adopting Release”).

<sup>8</sup> NetCoalition v. SEC, 615 F.3d 525 (D.C. Cir. 2010).

<sup>9</sup> See NetCoalition, at 534.



NMS that ‘market forces, rather than regulatory requirements’ play a role in determining the market data . . . to be made available to investors and at what cost.”<sup>10</sup>

Further, “[n]o one disputes that competition for order flow is ‘fierce.’ . . . As the SEC explained, ‘[i]n the U.S. national market system, buyers and sellers of securities, and the broker-dealers that act as their order-routing agents, have a wide range of choices of where to route orders for execution’; [and] ‘no exchange can afford to take its market share percentages for granted’ because ‘no exchange possesses a monopoly, regulatory or otherwise, in the execution of order flow from broker dealers’ . . . .”<sup>11</sup>

#### DR Port Fees

The fee assessed for DR Ports is reasonable because it is based on the cost incurred by the Exchange in purchasing and maintaining DR ports in the Chicago data center. Currently, the Exchange does not have a means to recoup its investment and costs associated with providing member firms with DR ports in the Chicago data center. Thus, the Exchange believes that the proposed fee is reasonable because the fee is intended to cover the Exchange’s costs incurred in maintaining DR ports. The proposed fee may also allow the Exchange to make a profit to the extent the costs associated with purchasing and maintaining DR ports are covered. The Exchange believes that the proposed fee is equitably allocated and not unfairly discriminatory because it will apply equally to all subscribers to DR ports based on the number of ports subscribed. Last, the Exchange notes that subscription to DR ports is voluntary, and member firms may subscribe to as many or as few ports they believe is necessary.

---

<sup>10</sup> Id. at 537.

<sup>11</sup> Id. at 539 (quoting ArcaBook Order, 73 FR at 74782-74783).

Trading Ports used in Test Mode Fees

The proposed fee is also reasonable because it is based on the cost incurred by the Exchange in developing and maintaining multiple port connections, which are not used in the production environment and are designated as in test mode.

As noted, the Exchange invests time and capital in initiating, monitoring and maintaining port connections to its system. Currently, the Exchange does not have a means to recoup its investment and costs associated with providing member firms with Trading Ports used in Test Mode. Thus, the Exchange believes that the proposed fee is reasonable because the fee is intended to cover the Exchange's costs incurred in maintaining test mode ports and is less than what is charged for a trading port in production mode. The proposed fee may also allow the Exchange to make a profit to the extent the costs associated with developing and maintaining Trading Ports used in Test Mode are covered. The Exchange believes that the proposed fee does not discriminate unfairly as it will promote efficiency in the market by incentivizing member firms to either place idle ports into production or cancel them if unneeded.

The proposed fee is also equitably allocated because all Exchange member firms that voluntarily elect to subscribe to trading ports, yet maintain them in test mode, will be charged the fee equally on a per-port basis. Last, the Exchange notes that subscription to Trading Ports used in Test Mode is voluntary, and member firms may subscribe to as many or as few ports they believe is necessary for their testing purposes.

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

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. In terms of inter-market competition, the Exchange notes that it operates in a highly

competitive market in which market participants can readily favor competing venues if they deem fee levels at a particular venue to be excessive, or rebate opportunities available at other venues to be more favorable. In such an environment, the Exchange must continually adjust its fees to remain competitive with other exchanges and with alternative trading systems that have been exempted from compliance with the statutory standards applicable to exchanges. Because competitors are free to modify their own fees in response, and because market participants may readily adjust their order routing practices, the Exchange believes that the degree to which fee changes in this market may impose any burden on competition is extremely limited.

In this instance, the proposed fee merely allows the Exchange to recapture the costs associated with maintaining member ports that are in test mode and DR, and may provide the Exchange with a profit to the extent its costs are covered. The Trading Port used in Test Mode fee is applied uniformly to member firms that have such ports in the Carteret data center, where the Exchange incurs expenses to support this port configuration option.

The proposed fee will also promote efficient use of Trading Ports for testing. Similarly, the Exchange incurs greater costs in offering DR ports in the new Chicago data center, which the Exchange is seeking to cover. Any burden arising from the fees is necessary in the interest of promoting a more efficient market and to cover costs associated with the location of the functionality in Chicago. If the changes proposed herein are unattractive to market participants, it is likely that the Exchange will lose market share as a result as member firms chose one of many alternative venues on which they may trade. Accordingly, the Exchange does not believe that the proposed changes

will impair the ability of members or competing order execution venues to maintain their competitive standing in the financial markets.

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

No written comments were either solicited or received.

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

The foregoing rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act.<sup>12</sup>

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

IV. Solicitation of Comments

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

Electronic comments:

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form

(<http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml>); or

---

<sup>12</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

- Send an e-mail to [rule-comments@sec.gov](mailto:rule-comments@sec.gov). Please include File Number SR-Phlx-2016-27 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-2016-27. 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-2016-27 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.<sup>13</sup>

Robert W. Errett  
Deputy Secretary

---

<sup>13</sup> 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

**EXHIBIT 5**

Deleted text is bracketed. New text is underlined.

\* \* \* \* \*

**NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC<sup>1</sup> PRICING SCHEDULE  
THE EXCHANGE CALCULATES FEES ON A TRADE DATE BASIS.**

**POLICY FOR AMENDING BILLING INFORMATION: CORRECTIONS SUBMITTED AFTER TRADE DATE AND PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF AN INVOICE BY THE EXCHANGE MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE EXCHANGE IN WRITING AND MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION. ONLY MEMBERS MAY SUBMIT TRADE CORRECTIONS.**

**ALL BILLING DISPUTES MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE EXCHANGE IN WRITING AND MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION. ALL DISPUTES MUST BE SUBMITTED NO LATER THAN SIXTY (60) DAYS AFTER RECEIPT OF A BILLING INVOICE, EXCEPT FOR DISPUTES CONCERNING NASDAQ OMX PSX FEES, PROPRIETARY DATA FEED FEES AND CO-LOCATION SERVICES FEES. THE EXCHANGE CALCULATES FEES ON A TRADE DATE BASIS. ONLY MEMBERS MAY SUBMIT BILLING DISPUTES**

<sup>1</sup>PHLX<sup>®</sup> is a registered trademark of Nasdaq, Inc.

\* \* \* \* \*

**VIII. NASDAQ OMX PSX FEES**

**Access Services Fees**

The following charges are assessed by the Exchange for ports to establish connectivity to the NASDAQ OMX PSX market, as well as ports to receive data from the NASDAQ OMX PSX market:

OUCH	\$400/port/month
FIX Trading Port (FIX and FIX Lite (FLITE))	\$400/port/month
RASH	\$400/port/month
Multicast TotalView-ITCH (software-based)	\$1,000/port/month
TCP ITCH data feed	\$400/port/month

DROP	\$400/port/month
Trading Ports used in Test Mode	<u>\$100/port/month</u> [No charge]
Data Retransmission Port	No charge
Disaster recovery port ( <u>OUCH, FIX Trading Port, RASH, and DROP</u> )	<u>\$25/port/month</u> [No charge]
Disaster recovery port (all other ports)	<u>No charge</u>

\* \* \* \* \*