

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
(Release No. 34-98127; File No. SR-BX-2023-018)

August 14, 2023

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Nasdaq BX, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change to Amend the Exchange’s Schedule of Fees and Credits at Equity 7, Section 118

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 August 1, 2023, Nasdaq BX, Inc. (“BX” 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 schedule of fees and credits at Equity 7, Section 118(e), as described further below.

The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange’s website at <https://listingcenter.nasdaq.com/rulebook/bx/rules>, 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

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

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 operates on the “taker-maker” model, whereby it generally pays credits to members that take liquidity and charges fees to members that provide liquidity. Currently, the Exchange has a schedule, at Equity 7, Section 118(e), which consists of several different credits and fees for Retail Orders<sup>3</sup> and Retail Price Improvement Orders<sup>4</sup> under Rule 4780 (Retail Price Improvement Program).

The purpose of the proposed rule change is to amend the Exchange’s schedule of fees and credits, at Equity 7, Section 118(e). Specifically, the Exchange proposes to (1) establish a new fee for certain RPI Orders that provide liquidity to the Exchange; and (2) specify that certain Retail Orders that access liquidity shall be excluded in the calculation of a member’s volume for purposes of Equity 7, Section 118.

Currently, the Exchange charges certain fees for RPI Orders that provide liquidity, ranging from \$0.0018 per share executed to \$0.0025 per share executed. The Exchange proposes to adopt a new fee of \$0.0003 per share executed for RPI Orders that

---

<sup>3</sup> Retail Orders shall mean an order type with a Non-Display Order Attribute submitted to the Exchange by a Retail Member Organization (as defined in Rule 4780). A Retail Order must be an agency Order, or riskless principal Order that satisfies the criteria of FINRA Rule 5320.03. The Retail Order must reflect trading interest of a natural person with no change made to the terms of the underlying order of the natural person with respect to price (except in the case of a market order that is changed to a marketable limit order) or side of market and that does not originate from a trading algorithm or any other computerized methodology. See Equity 4, Rule 4702(b)(6).

<sup>4</sup> Retail Price Improving (“RPI”) Orders shall mean an Order Type with a Non-Display Order Attribute that is held on the Exchange Book in order to provide liquidity at a price at least \$0.001 better than the NBBO through a special execution process described in Rule 4780. A Retail Price Improving Order may be entered in price increments of \$0.001. RPI Orders collectively may be referred to as “RPI Interest.” See Equity 4, Rule 4702(b)(5).

provide liquidity for accepted Retail Orders greater than or equal to \$10,000. The Exchange hopes that the proposed fee will encourage members to increase liquidity providing activity in RPI Orders greater than or equal to \$10,000 on the Exchange. If the proposal is effective in achieving this purpose, then the quality of the Exchange's market will improve, particularly with respect to RPI and Retail Orders to the benefit of all participants, especially those who submit RPI and Retail Orders.

The Exchange also proposes to exclude accepted Retail Orders greater than or equal to \$10,000 that access liquidity provided by RPI Orders for purposes of determining a member's volume for Equity 7, Section 118.<sup>5</sup> The Exchange has limited resources to devote to incentive programs, and it is appropriate for the Exchange to reallocate these incentives periodically in a manner that best achieves the Exchange's overall mix of objectives.

## 2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,<sup>6</sup> in general, and furthers the objectives of Sections 6(b)(4) and 6(b)(5) of the Act,<sup>7</sup> in particular, in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and

---

<sup>5</sup> For example, pursuant to Equity 7, Section 118(a), the Exchange provides a credit of \$0.0018 per share executed for an Order that accesses liquidity (excluding orders with Midpoint pegging and excluding orders that receive price improvement and execute against an order with a Non-displayed price) entered by a member: (i) whose combined liquidity removing and adding activities equal or exceed 0.15% of total Consolidated Volume during a month; (ii) that accesses liquidity equal to or exceeding 0.05% of total Consolidated Volume during a month; and (iii) that adds liquidity equal to or exceeding an average daily volume of 50,000 shares in a month. The proposed change would exclude accepted Retail Orders greater than or equal to \$10,000 that access liquidity provided by RPI Orders from the volume calculations for purposes of determining whether or not a member qualifies for this \$0.0018 per share executed credit.

<sup>6</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

<sup>7</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4) and (5).

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 Exchange's proposed changes to its fee schedule are reasonable in several respects. As a threshold matter, the Exchange is subject to significant competitive forces in the market for equity securities transaction services that constrain its pricing determinations in that market. The fact that this market is competitive has long been recognized by the courts. In NetCoalition v. Securities and Exchange Commission, the D.C. Circuit stated as follows: “[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>8</sup>

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

---

<sup>8</sup> 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)).

broader forms that are most important to investors and listed companies.”<sup>9</sup>

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. As such, the proposal represents a reasonable attempt by the Exchange to increase its liquidity and market share relative to its competitors.

The Exchange believes it is reasonable and equitable to adopt a new \$0.0003 per share executed fee for RPI Orders that provide liquidity for accepted Retail Orders greater than or equal to \$10,000. As discussed above, the Exchange’s goal is to increase liquidity adding activity in RPI Orders, particularly those greater than or equal to \$10,000, on its platform. It is reasonable and equitable to address this need by providing a lower fee to members that meet the proposed threshold as an incentive for them to increase their liquidity activity in RPI Orders greater than or equal to \$10,000 on the Exchange. If the proposal is effective in achieving this purpose, then the quality of the Exchange’s market will improve, particularly with respect to RPI and Retail Orders to the benefit of all participants, especially those who submit RPI and Retail Orders. The

---

<sup>9</sup> Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808 (June 9, 2005), 70 FR 37496, 37499 (June 29, 2005) (“Regulation NMS Adopting Release”).

Exchange's proposal to exclude accepted Retail Orders greater than or equal to \$10,000 that access liquidity provided by RPI Orders for purposes of determining a member's volume for Equity 7, Section 118 is also reasonable because the Exchange has limited resources to devote to incentive programs, and it is appropriate for the Exchange to reallocate these incentives periodically in a manner that best achieves the Exchange's overall mix of objectives.

The Exchange believes that the proposal is not unfairly discriminatory. The Exchange intends for its proposal to improve market quality for all members that submit RPI and Retail Orders on the Exchange (particularly in Orders greater than or equal to \$10,000) and by extension attract more liquidity to the market, improving market wide quality and price discovery. Although net adders of liquidity for RPI Orders (particularly of RPI Orders greater than or equal to \$10,000) will benefit most from the proposal, this result is fair insofar as increased liquidity adding activity in RPI Orders greater than or equal to \$10,000 will help to improve market quality and the attractiveness of the Nasdaq BX market to all existing and prospective retail participants. The Exchange's proposal to exclude accepted Retail Orders greater than or equal to \$10,000 that access liquidity provided by RPI Orders for purposes of determining a member's volume for Equity 7, Section 118 is equitable and not unfairly discriminatory because the exclusion will apply to all members. The Exchange notes that it has limited funds to apply in the form of incentives, and thus must deploy those limited funds to incentives that it believes will be the most effective at improving market quality in areas that the Exchange determines are in need of improvement. Any member 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.

As noted above, all members of the Exchange will benefit from any increase in market activity that the proposal effectuates. Members may modify their businesses so that they can meet the required thresholds and pay lower charges. The Exchange's proposal to exclude accepted Retail Orders greater than or equal to \$10,000 that access liquidity provided by RPI Orders for purposes of determining a member's volume for Equity 7, Section 118 does not impose an undue burden on competition because such exclusion applies to all members. The Exchange notes that its members are free to trade on other venues to the extent they believe that the proposal is 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 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.

The proposal is reflective of this competition because, as a threshold issue, the Exchange is a relatively small market so its ability to burden intermarket competition is limited. In this regard, even the largest U.S. equities exchange by volume has less than 20% market share, which in most markets could hardly be categorized as having enough market power to burden competition. Moreover, as noted above, price competition between exchanges is fierce, with liquidity and market share moving freely between exchanges in reaction to fee and credit changes. This is in addition to free flow of order flow to and among off-exchange venues which comprised more than 40% of industry volume.

In sum, the Exchange intends for the proposed changes, in the aggregate, to increase member incentives to engage in the addition of liquidity on the Exchange. If the changes proposed herein are unattractive to market participants, it is likely that the Exchange will lose market share as a result. Accordingly, the Exchange does not believe



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

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

No written comments were either solicited or received.

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

The foregoing rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act.<sup>10</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 (<https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml>); or
- Send an email to rule-comments@sec.gov. Please include file number SR-BX-

---

<sup>10</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

2023-18 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-BX-2023-018. 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 (<https://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 a.m. and 3 p.m. Copies of the filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. Do not include personal identifiable information in submissions; you should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. We may redact in part or withhold entirely from publication submitted material that is obscene or

subject to copyright protection. All submissions should refer to file number SR-BX-2023-18 and should be submitted on or before [INSERT DATE 21 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*].

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>11</sup>

**Sherry R. Haywood,**  
*Assistant Secretary.*

---

<sup>11</sup> 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).