

similar to the rules of FINRA for Common Members of BX and FINRA, and Nasdaq and FINRA. Therefore, modifications to the Certification need not be filed with the Commission as an amendment to the Amended Plan, provided that the Parties are only adding to, deleting from, or confirming changes to BX or Nasdaq rules in the Certification in conformance with the definition of Common Rules provided in the Amended Plan. However, should the Parties decide to add a BX and Nasdaq rule to the Certification that is not substantially similar to a FINRA rule; delete a BX and Nasdaq rule from the Certification that is substantially similar to a FINRA rule; or leave on the Certification a BX and Nasdaq rule that is no longer substantially similar to a FINRA rule, then such a change would constitute an amendment to the Amended Plan, which must be filed with the Commission pursuant to Rule 17d-2 under the Act.¹⁶

Under paragraph (c) of Rule 17d-2, the Commission may, after appropriate notice and comment, declare a plan, or any part of a plan, effective. In this instance, the Commission believes that appropriate notice and comment can take place after the proposed amendment is effective. The primary purpose of the Amended Plan is to allocate surveillance, investigation, and enforcement responsibilities for Rule 14e-4 under the Act, to reflect the name change of Boston Stock Exchange, Incorporated to Nasdaq BX, Inc., and to add Nasdaq as a Participant to the Plan. The Commission notes that the prior version of this plan immediately prior to this proposed amendment was published for comment and the Commission did not receive any comments thereon.¹⁷ Furthermore, the Commission does not believe that the amendment to the plan raises any new regulatory issues that the Commission has not previously considered.

VI. Conclusion

This order gives effect to the Amended Plan filed with the Commission in File No. 4-575. The Parties shall notify all members affected by the Amended Plan of their rights and obligations under the Amended Plan.

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 17(d) of the Act, that the

¹⁶ The addition to or deletion from the Certification of any federal securities laws, rules, and regulations for which FINRA would bear responsibility under the Amended Plan for examining, and enforcing compliance by, Common Members, also would constitute an amendment to the Amended Plan.

¹⁷ See *supra* note 11 (citing to Securities Exchange Act Release No. 59218).

Amended Plan in File No. 4-575, between the FINRA, BX, and Nasdaq, filed pursuant to Rule 17d-2 under the Act, hereby is approved and declared effective.

It is further ordered that BX and Nasdaq are relieved of those responsibilities allocated to FINRA under the Amended Plan in File No. 4-575.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.¹⁸

J. Matthew DeLesDernier,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2021-21113 Filed 9-28-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-93113; File No. SR-Phlx-2021-55]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Nasdaq PHLX LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend the Exchange's Pricing Schedule at Equity 7, Section 3(a)

September 23, 2021.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act"),¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,² notice is hereby given that on September 13, 2021, Nasdaq PHLX LLC ("Phlx" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III, below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

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

The Exchange proposes to amend the Exchange's pricing schedule at Equity 7, Section 3(a), as described further below.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's website at <https://listingcenter.nasdaq.com/rulebook/phlx/rules>, at the principal office of the Exchange, and at the Commission's Public Reference Room.

¹⁸ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(34).

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 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 schedule of credits, at Equity 7, Section 3(a). Specifically, the Exchange proposes to eliminate an existing credit of \$0.0033 per share executed to members that provide liquidity for displayed quotes/orders executed. The Exchange currently provides a \$0.0033 per share executed credit for displayed quotes/orders executed at or between \$1.00 and \$5.00 per share.

The Exchange proposes to eliminate the existing credit as it has not been effective in accomplishing its intended purpose, which is to incent members to increase their liquidity adding activity. This credit has served to neither sufficiently increase activity on, nor improved the market quality of, the Exchange. The Exchange therefore proposes to eliminate it.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,³ in general, and furthers the objectives of Sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act,⁴ in particular, in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among members and issuers and other persons using any facility, and is not designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers, or dealers. The proposal is also consistent with Section 11A of the Act relating to the establishment of the national market system for securities.

³ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

⁴ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4) and (5).

The Proposal Is Reasonable

The Exchange's proposal is reasonable in several respects. As a threshold matter, the Exchange is subject to significant competitive forces in the market for equity securities transaction services that constrain its pricing determinations in that market. The fact that this market is competitive has long been recognized by the courts. In *NetCoalition v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, the D.C. Circuit stated as follows: "[n]o one disputes that competition for order flow is 'fierce.' . . . As the SEC explained, '[i]n the U.S. national market system, buyers and sellers of securities, and the broker-dealers that act as their order-routing agents, have a wide range of choices of where to route orders for execution'; [and] 'no exchange can afford to take its market share percentages for granted' because 'no exchange possesses a monopoly, regulatory or otherwise, in the execution of order flow from broker dealers'" ⁵

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." ⁶

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

Within this environment, market participants can freely and often do shift their order flow among the Exchange and competing venues in response to changes in their respective pricing

schedules. The credit was an attempt to increase liquidity but was not as successful as the Exchange expected.

The Exchange believes that it is reasonable to eliminate its existing \$0.0033 per share executed credit for quotes/orders executed at or between \$1.00 and \$5.00 per share. As discussed above, the Exchange has observed that the credit has served to neither meaningfully increase activity on, nor improved the market quality of, the Exchange. Under these circumstances, the Exchange believes it is reasonable to eliminate the credit and reallocate its limited resources to more effective incentive programs.

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

The Proposal Is an Equitable Allocation of Credits

The Exchange believes its proposal will allocate its charges and credits fairly among its market participants.

The Exchange believes that is an equitable allocation to eliminate its existing \$0.0033 per share executed credit for quotes/orders executed at or between \$1.00 and \$5.00 per share. As discussed above, the credit has served to neither meaningfully increase activity on the Exchange nor improve the quality of the Exchange. Under these circumstances, the Exchange believes it is equitable to eliminate the credit and reallocate its limited resources to more effective incentive programs.

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

The Proposal Is Not Unfairly Discriminatory

The Exchange believes that its proposal is not unfairly discriminatory. As an initial matter, the Exchange believes that nothing about its tiered pricing model is inherently unfair; instead, it is a rational pricing model that is well-established and ubiquitous in today's economy among firms in various industries—from co-branded credit cards to grocery stores to cellular telephone data plans—that use it to reward the loyalty of their best customers that provide high levels of business activity and incent other customers to increase the extent of their business activity. It is also a pricing model that the Exchange and its competitors have long employed with the assent of the Commission. It is fair

because it enhances price discovery and improves the overall quality of the equity markets. The proposal is not unfairly discriminatory because the change applies to all market participants.

The proposal to eliminate one of the Exchange's transaction credits is not unfairly discriminatory because the Exchange has observed that the credit has served to neither meaningfully increase activity on, nor improved the market quality of, the Exchange. Under these circumstances, the Exchange believes it is reasonable to eliminate the credit and reallocate its limited resources to more effective incentive programs. The Exchange has limited resources with which to apply to incentives, and it must allocate those limited resources in a manner that prioritizes areas of greatest need and potential effect.

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

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

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

Intramarket Competition

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

The proposed elimination of one of the Exchange's existing transaction credits will have minimal competitive effect insofar as the Exchange offers other means to attain other credit tiers.

The Exchange notes that its members are free to trade on other venues to the extent they believe that the remaining credits are not attractive. As one can observe by looking at any market share chart, price competition between exchanges is fierce, with liquidity and market share moving freely between exchanges in reaction to fee and credit changes.

Intermarket Competition

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

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

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

credits and 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 credits and fees in response, and because market participants may readily adjust their order routing practices, the Exchange believes that the degree to which credit or fee changes in this market may impose any burden on competition is extremely limited.

If the change proposed herein is unattractive to market participants, it is likely that the Exchange will lose market share as a result. Accordingly, the Exchange does not believe that the proposed change will impair the ability of members or competing order execution venues to 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.⁷

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

IV. Solicitation of Comments

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

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's internet comment form (<http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml>); or

- Send an email to rule-comments@sec.gov. Please include File Number SR-Phlx-2021-55 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

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

All submissions should refer to File Number SR-Phlx-2021-55. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's internet website (<http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml>). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for website viewing and printing in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549, on official business days between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Copies of the filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All comments received will be posted without change. Persons submitting comments are cautioned that we do not redact or edit personal identifying information from comment submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR-Phlx-2021-55 and should be submitted on or before October 20, 2021.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.⁸

J. Matthew DeLesDernier,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2021-21112 Filed 9-28-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Investment Company Act Release No. 34381; 812-15250]

The Optima Dynamic Alternatives Fund, et al;

September 24, 2021.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission").

ACTION: Notice.

Notice of an application under section 6(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "Act") for an exemption from sections 18(a)(2), 18(c) and 18(i) of the Act and for an order pursuant to section 17(d) of the Act and rule 17d-1 under the Act.

Summary of Application: Applicants request an order to permit certain registered closed end investment companies to issue multiple classes of shares of beneficial interest with varying sales loads and to impose asset-based distribution and/or service fees.

Applicants: The Optima Dynamic Alternatives Fund (the "Initial Fund"), and Optima Asset Management LLC (the "Adviser").

Filing Dates: The application was filed on July 23, 2021 and amended on September 7, 2021.

Hearing or Notification of Hearing: An order granting the requested relief will be issued unless the Commission orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing on any application by emailing the SEC's Secretary at Secretarys-Office@sec.gov and serving the relevant applicant with a copy of the request by email, if an email address is listed for the relevant applicant below, or personally or by mail, if a physical address is listed for the relevant applicant below.

Hearing requests should be received by the Commission by 5:30 p.m. on October 19, 2021, and should be accompanied by proof of service on applicants, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Pursuant to rule 0-5 under the Act, hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, any facts bearing upon the desirability of a hearing on the matter, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons who wish to be notified of a hearing may request notification by emailing the Commission's Secretary.

ADDRESSES: joshua.deringer@faegredrinker.com and geoffrey.lewis@optima.com.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa Reid Ragen, Branch Chief, at (202) 551-6825 (Division of Investment Management, Chief Counsel's Office).

⁷ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

⁸ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).