FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 81 Wednesday,

No. 226 November 23, 2016

Book 1 of 2 Books

Pages 84389–84694

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL REGISTER

The **FEDERAL REGISTER** (ISSN 0097–6326) is published daily, Monday through Friday, except official holidays, by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, under the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. Ch. 15) and the regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register (1 CFR Ch. I). The Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, DC 20402 is the exclusive distributor of the official edition. Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, DC.

The **FEDERAL REGISTER** provides a uniform system for making available to the public regulations and legal notices issued by Federal agencies. These include Presidential proclamations and Executive Orders, Federal agency documents having general applicability and legal effect, documents required to be published by act of Congress, and other Federal agency documents of public interest.

Documents are on file for public inspection in the Office of the Federal Register the day before they are published, unless the issuing agency requests earlier filing. For a list of documents currently on file for public inspection, see *www.ofr.gov.*

The seal of the National Archives and Records Administration authenticates the Federal Register as the official serial publication established under the Federal Register Act. Under 44 U.S.C. 1507, the contents of the **Federal Register** shall be judicially noticed.

The **Federal Register** is published in paper and on 24x microfiche. It is also available online at no charge at *www.fdsys.gov*, a service of the U.S. Government Publishing Office.

The online edition of the **Federal Register** is issued under the authority of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register as the official legal equivalent of the paper and microfiche editions (44 U.S.C. 4101 and 1 CFR 5.10). It is updated by 6:00 a.m. each day the **Federal Register** is published and includes both text and graphics from Volume 59, 1 (January 2, 1994) forward. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800 or 866-512-1800 (toll free). E-mail, *gpocusthelp.com.*

The annual subscription price for the **Federal Register** paper edition is $749 plus postage, or $808, plus postage, for a combined **Federal Register, Federal Register** Index and List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA) subscription; the microfiche edition of the **Federal Register** including the **Federal Register** Index and LSA is $165, plus postage. Six month subscriptions are available for one-half the annual rate. The prevailing postal rates will be applied to orders according to the delivery method requested. The price of a single copy of the daily **Federal Register,** including postage, is based on the number of pages: $11 for an issue containing less than 200 pages; $22 for an issue containing 200 to 400 pages; and $33 for an issue containing more than 400 pages. Single issues of the microfiche edition may be purchased for $3 per copy, including postage. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or charge to your GPO Deposit Account, VISA, MasterCard, American Express, or Discover. Mail to: U.S. Government Publishing Office—New Orders, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000; or call toll free 1-866-512-1800, DC area 202-512-1800; or go to the U.S. Government Online Bookstore site, see *bookstore.gpo.gov.*

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the **Federal Register.**

How To Cite This Publication: Use the volume number and the page number. Example: 81 FR 12345.

Postmaster: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, Federal Register, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, DC 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND COPIES

PUBLIC

Subscriptions:

Paper or fiche	**202–512–1800**
Assistance with public subscriptions	**202–512–1806**
General online information	**202–512–1530; 1–888–293–6498**

Single copies/back copies:

Paper or fiche	**202–512–1800**
Assistance with public single copies	**1–866–512–1800 (Toll-Free)**

FEDERAL AGENCIES

Subscriptions:

Assistance with Federal agency subscriptions:

Email	*FRSubscriptions@nara.gov*
Phone	**202–741–6000**

Contents

Federal Register

Vol. 81, No. 226

Wednesday, November 23, 2016

Separate Parts In This Issue

Reader Aids

Consult the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue for phone numbers, online resources, finding aids, and notice of recently enacted public laws.

To subscribe to the Federal Register Table of Contents electronic mailing list, go to https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/USGPOOFR/subscriber/new, enter your e-mail address, then follow the instructions to join, leave, or manage your subscription.

CFR PARTS AFFECTED IN THIS ISSUE

A cumulative list of the parts affected this month can be found in the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue.

3 CFR

Proclamations:

9544.....85101
9545.....85103

7 CFR

1.....84389
457.....84396
989.....84401
999.....84401

Proposed Rules:

52.....84506
966.....84507
1150.....84510
1160.....84510
1205.....84510
1206.....84510
1207.....84510
1208.....84510
1209.....84510
1210.....84510
1212.....84510
1214.....84510
1215.....84510
1216.....84510
1217.....84510
1218.....84510
1219.....84510
1222.....84510
1230.....84510
1250.....84510
1260.....84510

8 CFR

103.....84403
235.....84403

12 CFR

209.....84415

15 CFR

902 (2 documents) 84419, 84434

19 CFR

12.....84458

21 CFR

101 (3 documents) 84459, 84465
330.....84465

Proposed Rules:

101.....84516

26 CFR

Proposed Rules:

1.....84518

37 CFR

381.....84478
386.....84478

Proposed Rules:

301.....84526
350.....84526
351.....84526

40 CFR

52 (3 documents) 84479, 84481, 85038

43 CFR

45.....84389

44 CFR

62.....84483

47 CFR

Proposed Rules:

51.....84530
63.....84530

49 CFR

Proposed Rules:

701.....84531

50 CFR

221.....84389
635 (2 documents) 84491, 84501
648.....84505
660.....84419
679.....84434

Proposed Rules:

622.....84538
648.....84544
660.....84546

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register
Vol. 81, No. 226
Wednesday, November 23, 2016

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Office of the Secretary

7 CFR Part 1

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

43 CFR Part 45

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 221

[Docket No. 080220223–6961–03]

RINs 0596–AC42, 1090–AA91, and 0648–AU01

Resource Agency Hearings and Alternatives Development Procedures in Hydropower Licenses

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Agriculture; Office of the Secretary, Interior; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Final rules; response to comments.

SUMMARY: The Departments of Agriculture, the Interior, and Commerce are jointly issuing final rules for procedures for expedited trial-type hearings and the consideration of alternative conditions and fishway prescriptions required by the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The hearings are conducted to expeditiously resolve disputed issues of material fact with respect to conditions or prescriptions developed for inclusion in a hydropower license issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission under the Federal Power Act. The final rules make no changes to existing regulations that have been in place since the revised interim rules were published on March 31, 2015, and took effect on April 30, 2015. At the time of publication of the revised interim rules, the Departments also requested public comments on additional ways the rules could be improved. The Departments now respond to the public comments received on the revised interim rules by providing analysis and clarifications in the preamble. The Departments have determined that no revisions to existing regulations are warranted at this time.

DATES: Effective November 23, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mona Koerner, Lands and Realty Management, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 202–205–0880; John Rudolph, Solicitor's Office, Department of the Interior, 202–208–3553; or Melanie Harris, Office of Habitat Conservation, National Marine Fisheries Service, 301–427–8636. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 800–877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Executive Summary

The Departments of Agriculture, the Interior, and Commerce (the Departments) are issuing final rules to implement section 241 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Energy Policy Act of 2005, 109 Public Law 58, 119 Stat. 594, 674, 109 Public Law 58, 2005. Section 241 created additional procedures applicable to conditions or prescriptions that a Department develops for inclusion in a hydropower license issued by Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Specifically, section 241 amended sections 4 and 18 of the Federal Power Act (FPA) to provide for trial-type hearings on disputed issues of material fact with respect to a Department's conditions or prescriptions; and it added a new section 33 to the FPA, allowing parties to propose alternative conditions and prescriptions.

In 2015, the Departments promulgated three substantially similar revised rules—one for each agency—with a common preamble. The revised interim rules became effective on April 30, 2015, so that interested parties and the agencies more immediately could avail themselves of the improvements made to the procedures. At the same time, the Departments requested public comment on additional ways the rules could be improved.

The Departments have reviewed the public comments received on the revised interim rules, and are providing responses to the public comments and further analysis and clarification. The Departments have determined that no changes to existing regulations are warranted in the Final Rules.

II. Background

A. Interim Final Rules

On November 17, 2005, at 70 FR 69804, the Departments jointly published interim final rules implementing section 241 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct), Public Law 109–58. Section 241 of EPAct amended FPA sections 4(e) and 18, 16 U.S.C. 797(e), 811, to provide that any party to a license proceeding before FERC is entitled to a determination on the record, after opportunity for an agency trial-type hearing of no more than 90 days, of any disputed issues of material fact with respect to mandatory conditions or prescriptions developed by one or more of the three Departments for inclusion in a hydropower license. EPAct section 241 also added a new FPA section 33, 16 U.S.C. 823d, allowing any party to the license proceeding to propose an alternative condition or prescription, and specifying the consideration that the Departments must give to such alternatives.

The interim final rules were made immediately effective, but a 60-day comment period was provided for the public to suggest changes to the interim regulations. The Departments stated in the preamble that based on the comments received and the initial results of implementation, they would consider publication of revised final rules.

B. Request for Additional Comment Period

In July 2009, the Hydropower Reform Coalition (HRC) and the National Hydropower Association (NHA) sent a joint letter to the three Departments, asking that an additional 60-day comment period be provided before publication of final rules. The organizations noted that they and their members had gained extensive experience with the interim final rules

since their initial comments were submitted in January 2006, and they now have additional comments to offer on ways to improve the trial-type hearing and alternatives processes. The Departments granted NHA and HRC's request. Instead of publishing final rules, the Departments published revised interim rules, effective on April 30, 2015, with a 60-day comment period.

C. Revised Interim Rules

On March 31, 2015, the Departments jointly published revised interim rules implementing EPAct section 241. 80 FR 17156. The rules and preamble addressed a few issues that remained open in the 2005 rulemaking, such as who has the burden of proof in a trial-type hearing and whether a trial-type hearing is an administrative remedy that a party must exhaust before challenging conditions or prescriptions in court. Additionally, the revised interim rules clarified the availability of the trial-type hearing and alternatives processes in the situation where a Department exercises previously reserved authority to include conditions or prescriptions in a hydropower license.

The revised interim rules went into effect on April 30, 2015, but a 60-day comment period was provided for the public to suggest changes to the revised interim regulations.

D. Comments Received

The Departments received comments on the revised interim rules from Exelon Generation Company, LLC (''Exelon'') and comments submitted jointly by the National Hydropower Association, American Public Power Association, Edison Electric Institute, and Public Utility District no. 1 of Snohomish County, Washington (''Industry Commenters''). Responses to these comments are provided below. The Departments also received a comment that is not relevant to this rulemaking and therefore does not necessitate a response. The reader may wish to consult the section-by-section analysis in the revised interim rules for additional explanation of all the regulations.

Burden of Proof

The Industry Commenters strongly disagree with the Departments' decision in the revised interim final rule to assign the burden of proof to the party requesting a hearing. See 7 CFR 1.657(a), 43 CFR 45.57(a), and 50 CFR 221.57(a). They assert that the burden of persuasion should be assigned, in accordance with § 7(d) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. 556(d), to the party that is ''the proponent of [the] rule or order,'' and that the burden should be assigned to the Departments because they are the proponents of their mandatory conditions or prescriptions which they seek to attach to a licensing order as well as the alleged facts supporting those conditions or prescriptions. The Departments received these comments on the interim final rule and explained the Departments' rationale for disagreeing with the comment in the revised interim rules. 80 FR 17170–17171. For the reasons explained in the revised interim rules, the Departments do not agree with the comment and no changes to the regulations are required.

The Industry Commenters cite *Escondido Mutual Water Co.* v. *La Jolla Band of Mission Indians,* 466 U.S. 765 (1984), in support of the assertion that the Departments are the proponents. In that case the Supreme Court noted that a condition or prescription must be supported by evidence provided by the conditioning agency (or other interested parties). *Id.* at 777 nn.17, 20. The Industry Commenters assert that this is consistent with the APA requirement that the proponent of an order ''has the burden of proof.'' However, the *Escondido* case dealt with an appeal from a U.S. court of appeals' decision that § 4(e) of the FPA required FERC to accept without modification any license conditions recommended by the Secretary of the Interior. As noted by the Supreme Court, FERC's orders, including licenses, are reviewable by a U.S. court of appeals under 18 U.S.C. 825l(b), and the court of appeals, and not FERC, has exclusive authority to determine the validity of a condition or prescription in a license. 466 U.S. at 777 and 777 nn. 19, 21. Because conditions and prescriptions, and whether they are supported by substantial evidence, are only reviewable under § 825l(b), the conditions or prescriptions themselves are not the subject ''orders'' of the trial-type hearing. Rather, the subject of the hearing is the hearing requester's claim that the correct facts are different than the Department's factual basis for the conditions or prescriptions.

In a trial-type hearing, the requester seeks a decision from the ALJ upholding its claim and thus is the proponent of the order and bears the burden of persuasion. *See Schaffer* v. *Weast,* 546 U.S. 49, 62 (2005). The correctness of this position is strongly buttressed by the fact that the same conclusion was reached by all six independent ALJs who ruled on this issue prior to specifically assigning the burden of proof in the revised interim rules. No changes to the regulations are necessary.

Applicability of Rules on Reopener

The Industry Commenters state that the revised interim rules should, but do not appear to, provide for a trial-type hearing or the submission of alternative conditions or fishway prescriptions (alternatives) when an agency imposes conditions and prescriptions during the licensing proceeding, reserves its right to impose additional or modify existing conditions or prescriptions during the license term, and then exercises that reserved right. The Departments disagree with the commenter's premise that the rules do not provide for a trial type-hearing or the submission of alternatives in such a situation.

The revised interim rules provide that where a Department ''has notified or notifies FERC that it is reserving its authority to develop one or more conditions or prescriptions at a later time, the hearing and alternatives processes under this part for such conditions or prescription will be available if and when DOI exercises its authority.'' 7 CFR 1.601(c); 15 CFR 221.1(c); 43 CFR 45.1(c). Accordingly, if a Department exercises reserved authority during the license term to impose additional or modified conditions or prescriptions, the hearing and alternatives processes under this part for such conditions or prescriptions will be available.

The Industry Commenters contend that where a Department imposes new or substantially modified conditions or prescriptions under reserved authority during the license term, the Department has an obligation under the license to justify these changes based on a change in facts. This comment pertains to the justification for a Department's exercise of its reserved authority, which is beyond the scope of this rulemaking, and therefore merits no further response.

Improvements to the Hearing Timeline

The revised interim rules extended a few of the deadlines in the 2005 rules, while not adopting some commenters' recommendations that the Departments significantly expand the hearing schedule. The Industry Commenters assert that these extensions do not go far enough because the compressed timeline set out in the rules imposes extreme hardship on the parties and forces parties to limit the scope of their challenges to agency conditions and prescriptions. They contend that EPAct does not require such a condensed schedule.

Specifically, they reiterate two recommendations rejected in the revised interim rules: (1) Extending the deadline

for filing trial-type hearing requests and proposed alternative conditions or prescriptions from 30 to 45 days after a Department issues its preliminary conditions or prescriptions; see 7 CFR 1.621(a)(2)(i), 43 CFR 45.21(a)(2)(i), and 50 CFR 221(a)(2)(i), and (2) allowing for consecutive rather than concurrent 90-day hearings when there are two unconsolidated hearing requests pending for the same conditions or prescriptions, thus delaying by 90 days the issuance of a decision by the ALJ for one of the hearings. The Departments continue to reject these recommendations for the reasons stated in the revised interim rules, 80 FR 17164–65, including that adding more time to the hearing process raises a significant potential for delay in license issuance, a result Congress expressly sought to avoid in section 241 of EPAct.

The commenters also recommend a rule amendment to allow for supplementation of the exhibit and witness lists which must be filed with the hearing request. The Departments decline to make such an amendment because supplementation is already allowed. See 7 CFR 1.642(b), 43 CFR 45.42(b), and 50 CFR 221.42(b).

Another commenter recommendation is that the rules should mandate rather than merely allow consolidation of hearing requests with common issues of fact. In fact, the rules do require consolidation for all hearing requests with respect to any conditions from the same Department or any prescriptions from the same Department. See 7 CFR 1.623(c)(1) and (2), 43 CFR 45.23(c)(1) and (2), and 50 CFR 221.23(c)(1) and (2).

Regarding all other situations, certainly consolidation may be appropriate to avoid inconsistent decisions, promote economy of administration, and serve the convenience of the parties. However, especially where the commonality is minimal, allowing the requests to be processed separately may be the most economical and streamlined approach, avoiding complicating one process with the numerous, intricate issues of the other process. Consequently, the Departments decline to accept the recommendation, opting to retain the flexibility to determine the best approach based on the unique circumstances of each situation. See 7 CFR 1.623(c)(3), 43 CFR 45.23(c)(3), and 50 CFR 221.23(c)(3).

Definition of Disputed Issue of Material Fact

In the preamble to the revised interim rules, the Departments offered guidance on the types of issues which constitute disputed issues of material fact and are thus appropriate for resolution in a trial-type hearing, stating that legal or policy issues are not issues of material fact. The Industry Commenters contend that the Departments should revisit their guidance, asserting that the Departments' notion of what is a legal or policy issue is overbroad.

However, the focus of their comments is not on the relevant regulation or guidance, but on the positions taken by the Departments during previous trial-type hearings. They reference several instances in which ALJs disagreed with the Departments' litigation positions regarding what constitutes a disputed issue of material fact. The positions the Departments have taken in trial-type hearings are based on the specific facts and circumstances of the issues before the ALJ. The Departments' litigation positions are not the subject of this rulemaking; therefore, these comments do not necessitate a change to the regulations.

The commenters refer the Departments to the Departments preamble statement in the revised interim rules that '''historical facts' such as whether fish were historically present above a dam 'may be resolved based on available evidence and do not involve attempts to predict what may happen in the future.''' 80 FR 17178. The commenters assert that the ''Departments' attempt to distinguish between an 'historical fact' and matters of 'prediction' is a false dichotomy.'' The commenters reason:

> Whether a condition or prescription will, in practice, have the desired effect or achieve an agency's goals is a factual question, not a policy question. All conditions and prescriptions are attempts to achieve a future result, and thus have predictive elements. Parties often disagree with an agency whether its condition or prescription will achieve that result. An essential and fundamental element of the scientific method is prediction. . . . Scientific prediction is a tool for crafting environmental policies. Any disputed issues of material fact with regard to the science behind proposed conditions or prescriptions are appropriate for determination by the ALJ.

The Departments do not agree that the distinction between historical facts and matters of prediction is a false dichotomy. As explained in the revised interim rules, only disputed issues of material fact are appropriate for resolution in a trial-type hearing.80 FR 17177–17178. While the Departments agree that some predictive elements of a condition or prescription may represent disputed issues of material fact in a particular case, such as whether a prescription will result in the passage of fish, other predictive elements of a condition or prescription may represent legal, policy or non-material issues that are not appropriate for resolution in a trial-type hearing. The Departments continue to believe that only disputed issues of material fact are appropriate for determination by the ALJ.

The Industry Commenters also contend that disputed issues with respect to alternatives considered and rejected by a Department are material facts that should be resolved by the ALJ. They assert that if a Department, in issuing a preliminary condition or prescription, considered and rejected other potential conditions or prescriptions, the scientific justification for why those options were rejected is material.

This contention is responsive to the Departments' position in the revised interim rules that immaterial issues not appropriate for ALJ consideration include those that blur the distinction between the EPAct trial-type hearing process and the separate alternatives process created under new FPA section 33. The Departments' position and reasoning remain unchanged in this regard:

> Trial-type hearings are limited to resolving disputed issues of material fact relating to a Department's own preliminary condition or prescription. Where the hearing requester's purpose is to establish facts that may support an alternative proposed under the distinct section 33 process, but that do not otherwise affect the Department's ultimate decision whether to affirm, modify, or withdraw its preliminary prescription or condition, then the issue raised is not ''material'' to that condition or prescription.
>
> Such matters must be resolved by the relevant Department through the section 33 process, and the ALJ should not make findings that would preempt the Department's review.

80 FR 17178. Prohibition against Forum-shopping: (1) Venue selection, (2) ALJ selection.

The Industry Commenters propose changes to the regulations based on the assumption that the Departments exert undue influence over the selection of a venue for the trial-type hearing and the presiding ALJ. The Departments disagree with this assumption and therefore the proposed changes are unnecessary.

Regarding venue selection, they offer purported examples of undue influence in support of a suggested rule change requiring the ALJ to balance the convenience of the parties. The commenters point to the assignment of an ALJ in the Pacific Northwest for FERC Project No. 2206, which involved a licensee based in Raleigh, North Carolina, with counsel in Birmingham, Alabama. However, that hearing was

scheduled to take place in Charlotte, North Carolina, and was settled before a hearing was held.

The commenters also refer to the assignment of an ALJ in Sacramento, California, for FERC Project No. 2082, which involved a licensee based in Portland, Oregon, with counsel in Washington, DC However, the licensee withdrew a motion to hold the hearing in Portland after the overwhelming majority of the parties expressed to the ALJ a preference for a hearing in Sacramento during the prehearing conference. These examples do not demonstrate any undue influence.

Further, the apparent inference that the venue is determined by the location of the ALJ's office is not correct. Nor is it determined solely by balancing the convenience of the parties, as implied by the commenters suggested amendment. As pointed out in the preamble to the revised interim rules:

> the ALJ has discretion to manage hearing locations. As the ALJs have done in prior cases, the Departments expect that an ALJ will take into consideration factors such as convenience to the parties and to the ALJ, the location of witnesses, and the availability of adequate hearing facilities when determining the location of a hearing. 80 FR 17170.

The Departments conclude that no change in the rules is needed regarding hearing venue selection.

Regarding the selection of an ALJ, the Industry Commenters assert that a Department ''should not be allowed to hand pick a Department ALJ or an ALJ with a track record favorable to the Department.'' They identify two potential remedial amendments: (1) Use a lottery system to select an ALJ, or (2) preferably, use FERC ALJs instead of Department ALJs under the assumption that FERC ALJs would be more neutral and have more subject matter expertise.

The Departments disagree with the unsupported assumptions that they are exercising undue influence over the selection of ALJs or that a Department would consider ''hand picking'' an ALJ to obtain an advantage. In accordance with the mandate of 5 U.S.C. 3105, administrative law judges are assigned to cases in rotation so far as practicable, with due consideration given to the demands of existing caseloads and the case to be assigned.

The Departments also dispute the assertion that FERC ALJs are ''more neutral'' or have more germane expertise. In fact, the independence of all ALJs is protected and impartiality fostered by laws which, among other things, exempt them from performance ratings, evaluation, and bonuses (see 5 U.S.C. 4301(2)(D), 5 CFR 930.206); vest the Office of Personnel Management rather than the employing agency with authority over the ALJs' compensation and tenure (see 5 U.S.C. 5372, 5 CFR 930.201–930.211); and provide that most disciplinary actions against ALJs may be taken only for good cause established and determined by the Merit Systems Protection Board on the record after opportunity for a hearing (see 5 U.S.C. 7521). As for expertise, the Departments' ALJs have considerable experience and expertise evaluating natural resource issues similar to those which typically underlie imposition of a condition or prescription.

Furthermore, the use of FERC ALJs would require the agreement of FERC and possibly a statutory amendment. In sum, the Departments disagree with the premises of the comment regarding the selection of ALJs and conclude that no related change in the rules is necessary or desirable.

Stay of Case for Settlement

The Industry Commenters also assert that the revised interim rules should permit settlement negotiations not only for 120 days before a case is referred to an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ)—as provided in the revised interim rules—but also during the period after the ALJ has issued the decision, yet before issuance of the Department's modified conditions. The Industry Commenters add that settlement discussions should not be prohibited under ex parte principles, considering that settlements ought to be encouraged at all points in a hearing process.

Notwithstanding the Industry Commenters' assertion, the Industry Commenters also offered support for the new 120-day stay period for purposes of facilitating settlement. We agree that both the length of this period and its placement at the pre-referral stage could lead to more settlements and avoid the more formal stages of the hearing process. We also agree with the Industry Commenters that settlements should be permitted whenever reached by parties. Yet here we note that the availability of a stay period is not the only mechanism or incentive by which settlements can be facilitated, and that parties are at liberty to conduct robust and meaningful settlement discussions concurrently with the ongoing hearing process, at any stage in such process. Further, given that Congress established in EPAct a short 90-day time limit for completion of the trial-type hearing to avoid the potential for substantial delay in license issuance, it would be unworkable to provide for any additional amount of time beyond the revised interim rules' 120 day-period for a stay in proceedings in which to pursue a settlement.

Other Minor Modifications

1. Discovery

In the preamble to the revised interim rules, the Departments declined to amend the discovery provisions for the trial-type hearing in response to comments that the rules needlessly limit discovery by requiring authorization from the ALJ or agreement of the parties. The commenters recommended that the Departments adopt the approach of the FERC regulations at 18 CFR 385.402(a) and 385.403(a), which authorize discovery to begin without the need for ALJ involvement unless there are discovery disputes. Industry Commenters have reiterated these comments, further arguing that section 241 of EPAct guarantees the availability of discovery, not that such discovery must be first agreed to by the parties or authorized by the ALJ.

The Departments continue to disagree that the regulations should be changed for the reasons detailed in the preamble to the revised interim rules. See 80 FR 17168–69. In summary, the Departments' rules do allow for rapid initiation of discovery and the criteria for allowing discovery are fairly similar to those utilized by FERC and federal courts. More importantly, discovery limits are necessary in this specialized trial-type hearing context to fit within the expedited time frame mandated by section 241 of EPAct, and wide-ranging discovery should not be necessary, given the typical documentation generated during the license proceeding, including the record supporting the conditions or prescriptions.

Also, the fact that section 241 provides for ''the opportunity to undertake discovery'' does not guarantee unlimited discovery.

> It is fundamental that the scope of discovery is not limitless and is restricted by the concepts of relevancy. *United States Lines (S.A.) Inc.—Petition for Declaratory Order Re: The Brazil Agreements,* 24 S.R.R. 1387, 1388 (ALJ 1988). *See also* 4 James W. Moore et al., Moore's Federal Practice, P 26.56[1], at 26–96 (2d ed. 1993).

American President Lines, LTD v *Cyprus Mines Corp.,* 1994 FMC LEXIS 33, *31–32 (Jan. 31, 1994); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d)(1). Further, as noted by the Supreme Court, even the liberal discovery rules of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedures,

> are subject to the injunction of Rule 1 that they ''be construed to secure the just, *speedy,* and *inexpensive* determination of every action.'' To this end, the requirements of Rule 26(d)(1) that the material sought in

discovery be ''relevant'' should firmly be applied, and the . . . courts should not neglect their power to restrict discovery where ''justice requires [protection for] a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense . . . . '' Rule 26(c). With this authority at hand, judges should not hesitate to exercise appropriate control over the discovery process.

Herbert v. *Lands,* 441 U.S. 153, 177 (1979) (emphasis in original).

The revised interim rules reasonably incorporate similar standards for discovery, see 7 CFR 1.641(b), 43 CFR 45.41(b), and 50 CFR 221.41(b), to be applied by the administrative law judges to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of each case. The Industry Commenters have not addressed how application of those standards would unduly limit discovery. Because the Departments conclude that the standards are fair and reasonable, no change in the discovery provisions is warranted.

2. Page Limitations

In preamble to the revised interim rules, the Departments declined to extend the page limits for hearing requests in response to comments requesting that the limit for describing each issue of material fact be increased from two pages to five pages and that the limit for each witness identification be increased from one to three pages. The Departments did conclude that the required list of specific citations to supporting information and the list of exhibits need not be included in the page restrictions and amended the rules accordingly. See 7 CFR 1.621(d), 43 CFR 45.21(d), and 50 CFR 221.21(d).

The Industry Commenters renew the same requests without offering any new reasons why the requests should be granted. The Departments continue to believe that the page limits are generally appropriate and provide sufficient space for parties to identify disputed issues, particularly in light of the expedited nature of the proceeding. The Departments further note that they are bound by the same page limits in submitting an answer. See 7 CFR 1.622, 43 CFR 45.22, and 50 CFR 221.22. Therefore, for the reasons stated in the preamble to the revised interim rules, the Departments decline to amend the page limitations.

3. Electronic Filing

In the preamble to the revised interim rules, the Departments rejected commenter suggestions to revise the regulations to allow parties to file documents electronically, using email or FERC's eFiling system. The Departments did agree that, in many circumstances, the electronic transmission of documents is a preferable means of providing documents to another party and revised the rules to allow for electronic *service* of documents on a party who consents to such service. However, the Departments noted that ALJ offices do not currently have the capacity or resources to accept electronically and print off the large volume of documents typically filed in connection with a trial-type hearing.

The Industry Commenters again suggest that electronic filing should be allowed at the ALJ's discretion, citing the example of a Coast Guard ALJ allowing filing by email pursuant to the agreement of the parties at a prehearing conference addressing a trial-type hearing request. For the reasons discussed in the revised interim rules, the Departments decline to adopt regulations that permit filing by email with the ALJ offices. 80 FR 17161–17612. Email is not a substitute for a dedicated electronic filing system in which administrative, information technology, and policy issues such as document management, storage, security, and access can be systematically addressed. Because none of the ALJ Offices have a dedicated system, the Departments will not authorize filing by electronic means.

Equal Consideration Statements

The Industry Commenters request that the Departments revisit their interpretation of section 33 of the Federal Power Act (FPA section 33) as described in the revised interim rules. 80 FR 17176–17177. In the revised interim rules, the Departments interpreted FPA section 33 to require a Department to prepare an equal consideration statement only when a party has submitted an alternative condition or prescription.

The commenters state that the Departments' interpretation is contrary to the plain language of section 33(a)(4) and (b)(4), which they suggest should be read to require that a Department prepare an equal consideration statement whenever a Department submits any condition or prescription, regardless of whether a party submits an alternative. The commenters assert that the Departments' contextual analysis of FPA section 33, as described in the revised interim rules, is flawed because FPA section 33 unambiguously supports the commenters' interpretation. The Departments disagree with this comment.

As the Departments explained in the revised interim rules, the requirement that the Departments prepare an equal consideration statement must be read in the context of the overall statutory scheme. 80 FR 17177. Section 33 of the FPA is titled ''Alternative Conditions and Prescriptions,'' and it sets forth a series of sequential steps for considering an alternative and reaching a final determination. Section 33(a)(l) permits any party to a hydropower license proceeding to propose an alternative condition. Under section 33(a)(2), the Secretary must accept an alternative if it ''(A) provides for the adequate protection and utilization of the reservation; and (B) will either, as compared to the condition initially [deemed necessary] by the Secretary[,] (i) cost significantly less to implement; or (ii) result in improved operation of the project works for electricity production.'' 16 U.S.C. 823d(a)(2). When evaluating an alternative, section 33(a)(3) directs the Secretary to consider evidence otherwise available concerning ''the implementation costs or operational impacts for electricity production of a proposed alternative.'' The Departments continue to believe that a contextual analysis of FPA section 33 demonstrates that section 33 requires the preparation of an equal consideration statement only when a party submits an alternative condition or prescription. No changes to the regulations are needed in response to the comment.

The commenters also disagree with the Departments' perspective, as explained in the revised interim rules, that in the absence of an alternative the Departments will generally lack sufficient information to provide a meaningful equal consideration analysis of the factors required by FPA section 33(a)(4) and (b)(4). The commenters state that ample information is available to the Departments in the licensing application at the time the Departments adopt a condition or prescription, regardless of whether any alternatives were proposed under FPA section 33. The commenters observe that ''[w]ithout this information, the Departments presumably would not have sufficient information to draft meaningful preliminary conditions and prescriptions.''

The Departments note FPA sections 4(e) and 18, which authorize the Departments to issue conditions and prescriptions, do not require the Departments to consider certain types of information otherwise required by FPA section 33 when evaluating alternatives, such as ''the implementation costs or operational impacts for electricity production of a proposed alternative.'' 16 U.S.C. 823d(a)(3). Accordingly, the

Departments generally lack related information until such time that the Departments evaluate an alternative and prepare an equal consideration statement, which occurs after the Departments prepare preliminary conditions and prescriptions.

When preparing an equal consideration statement, the Departments must evaluate ''such information as may be available to the Secretary, including information voluntarily provided in a timely manner by the applicant and other parties.'' 16 U.S.C. 823d(a)(4) and (b)(4). The revised interim rules require a proponent of an alternative to submit information necessary to evaluate the alternative and prepare an equal consideration statement pursuant to FPA section 33. While such information may or may not be available in licensing applications prepared for FERC, the Departments will generally lack sufficient information to provide a meaningful equal consideration pursuant to FPA section 33 until such time as the proponent of an alternative submits the information with an explanation of how the alternative meets the criteria set forth in FPA section 33. No changes to the regulations are needed in response to the comment.

Hearings on Modified Conditions and Prescriptions

Commenters request that the Departments address perceived loopholes in the revised interim rules that would allow the Departments to avoid trial-type hearings in three scenarios. The commenters state that the interim final rules were silent as to whether a right to a trial-type hearing exists in situations where (1) the Department issues no preliminary conditions or prescriptions, but reserves the right to submit mandatory conditions or prescriptions later in the licensing process; (2) the Department adds conditions or prescriptions that were not included with its preliminary conditions or prescriptions; or (3) the Department's modified conditions or prescriptions include factual issues or justifications that were not presented with its preliminary conditions or prescriptions. The commenters write that the revised interim rules addresses the second scenario by handling it on a case-by-case basis, but do not address the first and third scenarios. The Departments believe that the revised interim rules address all three of these scenarios and no changes to the regulations are needed. The Departments again note that in several instances, the commenters discuss specific licensing proceedings. As stated above, such proceedings are not the subject of the rulemaking and therefore, the comments about them do not necessitate a change to the regulations.

The revised interim rules address the commenters' first scenario, in which a Department issues no preliminary conditions or prescriptions, but reserves a right to submit conditions and prescriptions later in the licensing process. The Departments received comments on the interim final rules that requested the availability of a trial-type hearing when a Department reserves its authority to include conditions or prescriptions in a license. The Department responded to this comment by stating that ''under EPAct, it is only when a Department affirmatively exercises its discretion to mandate a condition or prescription that the hearing and alternatives processes are triggered. Allowing for trial-type hearings and alternatives when the agencies have not exercised this authority would be both inconsistent with the legislation and an inefficient use of the Departments' resources. Consequently, these final rules continue to provide that the hearing and alternatives processes are available only when a Department submits a preliminary condition or prescription to FERC, either during the initial licensing proceeding or subsequently through the exercise of reserved authority.'' 80 FR 17159. Thus, the revised interim rules addressed the commenters' first scenario by providing a right to a trial-type hearing only when a Department submits a preliminary condition or prescription to FERC during the initial licensing proceeding, or when a Department submits a condition or prescription to FERC through the exercise of reserved authority after FERC has issued a license.

In discussing their first scenario, the commenters' language suggests that they may not be concerned about a Department's reservation of authority to submit conditions or prescriptions, but instead may actually be concerned with the availability of a trial-type hearing when a Department issues no preliminary conditions or prescriptions, but submits conditions and prescriptions outside of the timeframe contemplated in FERC's regulations for filing preliminary conditions or prescriptions, which is ''no later than 60 days after the notice of acceptance and ready for environmental analysis.'' 18 CFR 5.23(a). See also 18 CFR 4.34(b). The Departments note that in this scenario, the Departments would not be exercising reserved authority to submit preliminary conditions or prescriptions because, as long as a licensing proceeding is pending, a Department has authority to submit conditions and prescriptions without the need to ''reserve'' its authority. A reservation of authority is only necessary for submission of conditions or prescriptions after FERC has issued a license.

The revised interim rules, when addressing whether a trial-type hearing should be held to address disputed issues of fact at the preliminary or modified condition/prescription stage, impliedly addressed the scenario where the Departments submit conditions and prescriptions outside of the timeframe for doing so in FERC's regulations. The Departments explained the circumstances under which a Department may submit a preliminary condition or prescription later in the licensing process and that the availability of the trial-type hearing process would be decided on a case-by-case basis: ''[E]xceptional circumstances may arise where facts not in existence and not anticipated at an earlier stage necessitate a new preliminary condition or prescription. This circumstance would be handled on a case-by-case basis, in coordination with FERC as necessary.'' 80 FR 17164. The Departments have continued to apply this rationale and process in the final rules.

With respect to the third scenario, the Departments received similar comments on the interim final rule that requested ''the regulations provide for trial type hearings at the modified stage if the modifications are based on new facts that did not exist or were not anticipated at the preliminary stage, or if the agency submits an entirely new condition or prescription at the modified stage.'' 80 FR 17163. The Departments responded by stating that the revised interim rules ''continue the approach taken in the interim regulations of scheduling the trial-type hearing process immediately following the issuance of preliminary conditions and prescription.'' 80 FR 17164. The Departments reasoned that this approach allows trial-type hearings to occur during FERC's licensing time frame as required by Congress, that it promotes efficiency, and that providing for trial-type hearings at the modified stage is not a reasonable or efficient use of resources. 80 FR 17163–17164. The Departments maintain this rationale in the final rules.

Industry commenters state that any final rules must provide a remedy for licensees who object to new conditions and prescriptions imposed at the modified stage, or when the Department's modified conditions or

prescriptions include factual issues or justifications that were not presented with its preliminary conditions or prescriptions. The commenters also state that the final rules must provide a standard for when a modified condition or prescription would trigger the right to a trial-type hearing. The Departments disagree with these comments. For the reasons discussed above and in the revised interim rules, the Departments will continue their approach of scheduling the trial-type hearing process immediately following the issuance of preliminary conditions and prescriptions. The Departments again acknowledge ''that exceptional circumstances may arise where facts not in existence and not anticipated at an earlier stage necessitate a new preliminary condition or prescription. This circumstance would be handled on a case-by-case basis, in coordination with FERC as necessary.'' 80 FR 17164. No changes to the regulations are needed in response to these comments.

Submissions and Acceptance of Alternatives

The Industry Commenters believe the Departments are not complying with the requirements of FPA section 33 to accept a proposed alternative if the alternative: ''(A) provides for the adequate protection and utilization of the reservation; and (B) will either, as compared to the condition initially proposed by the Secretary—(i) cost significantly less to implement; or (ii) result in improved operation of the project works for electricity production.'' 16 U.S.C. 823(a)(2). The Departments disagree with this comment. Notwithstanding this comment, the Industry Commenters do not provide proposed revisions, and the Departments do not believe any changes to the regulations are necessary.

The Industry Commenters also ''commend'' the revised interim rules for adding a new change to allow for a revised alternative within 20 days of an ALJ decision, but express the view that this time period is still ''unnecessarily short,'' given an ALJ opinion's typical length and underlying complexity. The commenters compare this timeframe to the 60-day timeframe in which the Departments may revise conditions and prescriptions, and suggest that the deadline for a revised alternative be, similarly, 60 days.

In response, the Departments note that the FPA specifically provides that the Departments will evaluate alternatives ''based on such information as may be available to the [Departments], including information voluntarily provided in a *timely* manner by the applicant and others.'' 16 U.S.C. 823d(a)(4), (b)(4) (emphasis added). To achieve a proper balance between the Congressional mandate to consider evidence otherwise available to DOI, including information *timely* submitted, and Congressional intent to avoid delays in the FERC licensing process, the Departments established a 20-day period for submittal of revised alternatives.

Exelon submitted comments concerning 43 CFR 45.74(c), which generally provides that DOI will consider information regarding alternatives provided by the deadline for filing comments on FERC's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document. This provision states that ''[f]or purposes of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, DOI will consider evidence and supporting material provided by any license party by the deadline for filing comments on FERC's NEPA document under 18 CFR 5.25(c).'' 43 CFR 45.74(c). Paragraph (a) in 43 CFR 45.74 specifies the evidence and supporting material DOI must consider when deciding whether to accept an alternative. Paragraph (b) in 43 CFR 45.74 identifies the criteria DOI must use to evaluate whether to accept an alternative. Paragraph (c) in 18 CFR 5.25 identifies which FERC hydropower license applications require FERC to issue a draft NEPA document. As discussed below in more detail, the provision's scope is limited to *license applications* under FERC's Integrated License Application Process, as opposed to proposed amendments to existing licenses.

Exelon interpreted 43 CFR 45.74(c) as establishing a strict deadline for submittal of information regarding a proposed alternative. The commenter noted that the subsequent finalization of any conditions or prescriptions may occur much later than this deadline, sometimes because of pending applications for water quality certifications (required under section 401 of the Clean Water Act). Exelon expressed concern that a potentially substantial time gap between the NEPA comment deadline and finalization of a prescription or condition could result in the exclusion of the best and most current scientific research to inform DOI's evaluation of alternative prescriptions and conditions.

DOI does not believe that 43 CFR 45.74(c) will result in the exclusion of the best and most current scientific research to inform the Department's evaluation of alternative conditions and fishway prescriptions. DOI believes that considering information regarding alternatives submitted by any license party by the close of the FERC NEPA comment period will provide the Departments with all reasonably available information to evaluate an alternative condition or fishway prescription in accordance with Section 33 of the Federal Power Act.

Furthermore, as noted in the interim final rule, ''[g]iven the complexity of the issues and the volume of material to be analyzed in the typical case, the Departments cannot reasonably be expected to continue to accept and incorporate new information right up until the FERC filing deadline for modified conditions and prescriptions.'' 80 FR 17156, 17176. Nevertheless, the language of 43 CFR 45.74(c) only sets forth the requirement that DOI must consider pre-deadline submittals, and thus it does not preclude DOI from considering, in exceptional circumstances, evidence and supporting material submitted after the deadline.

It is not unusual for a license applicant to have authorization petitions pending at the time a Department considers an alternative. These types of pending petitions include, but are not limited to, applications for a Clean Water Act section 401 water quality certification.

As a practical matter, the parties and stakeholders share an interest in the timely submittal of evidence and supporting materials in order to ensure a robust alternatives process and avoid delays during FERC's licensing proceedings. The timely submittal of evidence under 43 CFR 45.74(c) also reflects a statutory process that prescribes specific timeframes. The EPAct avoids delay by requiring the hearing process to be completed in a 90-day timeframe and ''within the time frame established by [FERC] for each license proceeding.'' As noted in the revised interim rules, the hearing process was crafted to work within FERC's licensing timeframes. 80 FR 17156, 17163 (Mar. 31, 2015). The process for submitting, evaluating, and adopting alternatives was similarly drafted with the timeframes in mind.

Under FERC's rules, modified conditions and prescriptions, including any adopted alternatives, must be filed within 60 days after the close of FERC's NEPA comment period. 18 CFR 5.25(d). The timely submission of information under 43 CFR 45.74(c) is necessary so DOI has adequate time to consider the information and file modified conditions and prescriptions 60 days after the close of FERC's NEPA comment period.

Additionally, the FPA specifically provides that the Departments will evaluate alternatives ''based on such

information as may be available to the [Departments], including information voluntarily provided in a *timely* manner by the applicant and others.'' 16 U.S.C. 823d(a)(4), (b)(4) (emphasis added). DOI believes that 43 CFR 45.74(c) achieves the proper balance between the Congressional mandate to consider evidence otherwise available to DOI, including information *timely* submitted, and Congressional intent to avoid delays in the FERC licensing process.

Exelon also expressed concern that in instances where DOI exercises its reserved authority to include a condition or prescription in a license that FERC has previously issued, the language in 43 CFR 45.74(c), that the DOI ''will consider'' information submitted prior to the NEPA comment deadline, could potentially preclude the introduction of additional relevant and supporting information that was not submitted during the license-application-related NEPA process. As discussed above, the language of 43 CFR 45.74(c) only sets forth the requirement that DOI must consider pre-deadline submittals. Thus, it does not preclude DOI from considering evidence and supporting material submitted after the deadline in cases where FERC has issued a license and a Department exercises reserved authority. Therefore, notwithstanding Exelon's concern, paragraph (c) of 43 CFR 45.74 does not preclude the introduction of relevant information that would support a proposed alternative condition or prescription after DOI exercises its reserved authority to include a condition or fishway prescription in a FERC license.

VI. Consultation With FERC

Pursuant to EPAct's requirement that the agencies promulgate rules implementing EPAct section 241 ''in consultation with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,'' the agencies have consulted with FERC regarding the content of the revised interim rules. After considering post-promulgation comments, no changes were made to the revised interim final regulations in the final rules.

VII. Conclusion

These final rules have been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866.

OMB has reviewed the information collection in these rules and approved an extension without change of a currently approved collection under OMB control number 1094–0001. This approval expires November 30, 2018.

The Departments have reviewed the comments received in response to the revised interim rules and have determined that no change to the rules is necessary.

Accordingly, the interim rules amending 6 CFR part 1, 43 CFR part 45, and 50 CFR part 221, which were published at 80 FR 17155 on March 31, 2015, are adopted as final without change.

Dated: October 6, 2016.

Robert F. Bonnie,

Undersecretary—Natural Resources and Environment, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Dated: September 22, 2016.

Kristen J. Sarri,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary—Policy, Management and Budget, U.S. Department of the Interior.

Dated: October 31, 2016.

Samuel D. Rauch III,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

[FR Doc. 2016–28063 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3411–15–P; 4310–79–P; 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

7 CFR Part 457

[Docket No. FCIC–16–0003]

RIN 0563–AC52

Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Various Crop Provisions

AGENCY: Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) amends the Small Grains Crop Insurance Provisions, Cotton Crop Insurance Provisions, Extra Long Staple Cotton Crop Insurance Provisions, Sunflower Seed Crop Insurance Provisions, Sugar Beet Crop Insurance Provisions, Hybrid Sorghum Seed Crop Insurance Provisions, Coarse Grains Crop Insurance Provisions, Safflower Crop Insurance Provisions, Popcorn Crop Insurance Provisions, Peanut Crop Insurance Provisions, Onion Crop Insurance Provisions, Tobacco Crop Insurance Provisions, Green Pea Crop Insurance Provisions, Dry Pea Crop Insurance Provisions, Rice Crop Insurance Provisions, Northern Potato Crop Insurance Provisions, Central and Southern Potato Crop Insurance Provisions, Dry Bean Crop Insurance Provisions, Hybrid Seed Corn Crop Insurance Provisions, Processing Sweet Corn Crop Provisions, Processing Bean Crop Insurance Provisions, Canola and Rapeseed Crop Insurance Provisions, Millet Crop Insurance Provisions, and Mustard Crop Insurance Provisions. The purpose of this final rule with comment is to update prevented planting coverage levels through the actuarial documents to improve actuarial considerations and coverage offered, program integrity, and to reduce vulnerability to program fraud, waste, and abuse. The changes to the Crop Provisions made in this rule are applicable for the 2017 and succeeding crop years for all crops with a 2017 contract change date on or after the effective date of the rule, and for the 2018 and succeeding crop years for all crops with a 2017 contract change date prior to the effective date of the rule.

DATES: This rule is effective November 23, 2016 However, FCIC will accept written comments on this final rule until close of business January 23, 2017. FCIC may consider the comments received and may conduct additional rulemaking based on the comments.

ADDRESSES: FCIC prefers interested persons submit their comments electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal. Interested persons may submit comments, identified by Docket ID No. FCIC–16–0003, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Director, Product Administration and Standards Division, Risk Management Agency, United States Department of Agriculture, P.O. Box 419205, Kansas City, MO 64133–6205.

FCIC will post all comments received, including those received by mail, without change to *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided. Once these comments are posted to this Web site, the public can access all comments at its convenience from this Web site. All comments must include the agency name and docket number or Regulatory Information Number (RIN) for this rule. For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional information, see *http://www.regulations.gov.* If interested persons are submitting comments electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal and want to attach a document, FCIC requests that the document attachment be in a text-based format. If interested persons want to attach a document that is a scanned Adobe PDF file, it must be scanned as text and not as an image, thus allowing FCIC to search and copy certain portions of the submissions. For

questions regarding attaching a document that is a scanned Adobe PDF file, please contact the Risk Management Agency (RMA) Web Content Team at (816) 823–4694 or by email at *rmaweb.content@rma.usda.gov.*

Privacy Act: Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received for any dockets by the name of the person submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an entity, such as an association, business, labor union, etc.). Interested persons may review the complete User Notice and Privacy Notice for *Regulations.gov* at *http://www.regulations.gov/#!privacyNotice.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tim Hoffmann, Director, Product Management, Product Administration and Standards Division, Risk Management Agency, United States Department of Agriculture, Beacon Facility, Stop 0812, Room 421, P.O. Box 419205, Kansas City, MO 64141–6205, telephone (816) 926–7730.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Prior to the FCIC offering coverage for prevented planting, prevented planting payments were linked to USDA program provisions such as the farmer's program yield and the target price. Adjustments to the Federal Crop Insurance Act (Act) from the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 mandated that coverage for prevented planting be a part of crop insurance policies offered under the Federal crop insurance program, as appropriate. Following these changes to the Act, FCIC incorporated preventing planting provisions into the Common Crop Insurance Basic Provisions. A 1996 study by USDA's Economic Research Service (ERS) established the basis for the original prevented planting coverage levels. The study and estimated pre-planting costs were reviewed again by ERS in 2002, and FCIC adjusted prevented planting coverage levels accordingly.

Further, the Office of Inspector General for Audit (OIG) conducted an audit on the Federal crop insurance prevented planting program for 2011–2012 and recommended RMA obtain updated pre-planting cost information, and reevaluate the current prevented planting coverage levels making adjustments consistent with the pre-planting costs for each crop.

FCIC contracted to review the prevented planting policy and determine appropriate pre-planting costs to be covered, evaluate the reasonableness of current prevented planting payments by crop and region, examine alternative methods and approaches to the program, provide alternative payment amounts as appropriate, and develop a plan for routinely updating those amounts. For some crops or crops in certain regions, the contractor suggested FCIC raise or lower the current prevented planting coverage levels. RMA shared this study with stakeholders to determine if the recommendations made sense to growers. This final rule with comment makes changes to allow for revisions to the prevented planting coverage levels, based on the contractor's findings and report, stakeholder comments in response to the contractors report, and FCIC's re-examination of the evaluation and those stakeholder comments received. This rule allows for any new percentages of prevented planting coverage that FCIC determines provides adequate protection for those costs incurred even though the crop was prevented from planting to be specified in the actuarial documents and removes them from the Crop Provisions. The rule also leaves the option for additional prevented planting coverage if offered in the actuarial documents. This will allow FCIC to expedite its update of the percentages in response to changing production conditions.

Effective Date

FCIC is exempt from all requirements in the administrative procedure provisions in 5 U.S.C. 553, which includes the 30-day effective date. This rule allows FCIC to make the changes to the Crop Provisions in time for 2017 spring planted crops. Therefore, this final rule is effective when published in the **Federal Register**.

Executive Order 12866

This rule has been determined to be not significant for the purposes of Executive Order 12866 and, therefore, it has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

Pursuant to the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the collections of information in this rule have been approved by OMB under control numbers 0563–0085, 0563–0083, and 0563–0053.

E-Government Act Compliance

FCIC is committed to complying with the E-Government Act of 2002, to promote the use of the Internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) establishes requirements for Federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector. This rule contains no Federal mandates (under the regulatory provisions of title II of the UMRA) for State, local, and tribal governments or the private sector. Therefore, this rule is not subject to the requirements of sections 202 and 205 of UMRA.

Executive Order 13132

It has been determined under section 1(a) of Executive Order 13132, Federalism, that this rule does not have sufficient implications to warrant consultation with the States. The provisions contained in this rule will not have a substantial direct effect on States, or on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

Executive Order 13175

This rule has been reviewed in accordance with the requirements of Executive Order 13175, ''Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments.'' Executive Order 13175 requires Federal agencies to consult and coordinate with tribes on a government-to-government basis on policies that have tribal implications, including regulations, legislative comments or proposed legislation, and other policy statements or actions that have substantial direct effects on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation has assessed the impact of this rule on Indian tribes and determined that this rule does not, to our knowledge, have tribal implications that require tribal consultation under E.O. 13175. If a Tribe requests consultation, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation will work with the Office of Tribal Relations to ensure meaningful consultation is provided where changes, additions and modifications identified herein are not expressly mandated by Congress.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

FCIC certifies that this regulation will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Program requirements for the Federal crop insurance program are the same for all producers regardless of the size of their farming operation. For instance, all producers are required to submit an application and acreage report to establish their insurance guarantees and compute premium amounts, and all producers are required to submit a notice of loss and production information to determine the amount of an indemnity payment in the event of an insured cause of crop loss. Whether a producer has 10 acres or 1000 acres, there is no difference in the kind of information collected. To ensure crop insurance is available to small entities, the Federal Crop Insurance Act (Act) authorizes FCIC to waive collection of administrative fees from beginning farmers or ranchers and limited resource farmers. FCIC believes this waiver helps to ensure that small entities are given the same opportunities as large entities to manage their risks through the use of crop insurance. A Regulatory Flexibility Analysis has not been prepared since this regulation does not have an impact on small entities, and, therefore, this regulation is exempt from the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605).

Federal Assistance Program

This program is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under No. 10.450.

Executive Order 12372

This program is not subject to the provisions of Executive Order 12372, which require intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. See the Notice related to 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V, published at 48 FR 29115, June 24, 1983.

Executive Order 12988

This rule has been reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12988 on civil justice reform. The provisions of this rule will not have a retroactive effect. The provisions of this rule will preempt State and local laws to the extent such State and local laws are inconsistent herewith. With respect to any direct action taken by FCIC or to require the insurance provider to take specific action under the terms of the crop insurance policy, the administrative appeal provisions published at 7 CFR part 11 must be exhausted before any action against FCIC for judicial review may be brought.

Environmental Evaluation

This action is not expected to have a significant economic impact on the quality of the human environment, health, or safety. Therefore, neither an Environmental Assessment nor an Environmental Impact Statement is needed.

FCIC is issuing this final rule without opportunity for prior notice and comment. The Administrative Procedure Act exempts rules ''relating to agency management or personnel or to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts'' from the statutory requirement for prior notice and opportunity for public comment (5 U.S.C. 553(a)(2)). However, FCIC is providing a 60-day comment period and invites interested persons to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written comments. FCIC will consider the comments received and may conduct additional rulemaking based on the comments.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 457

Crop insurance, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, as set forth in the preamble, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation amends 7 CFR part 457 as follows:

PART 457—COMMON CROP INSURANCE REGULATIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 457 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1506(1), 1506(o).

■ 2. Amend § 457.101 as follows:
■ a. Revise the section heading;
■ b. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ c. Revise section 13.
The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.101 Small grains crop insurance provisions.

* * * * *

The Small Grains Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years in counties with a contract change date of November 30, and for the 2018 and succeeding crop years in counties with a contract change date of June 30, are as follows:

* * * * *

13. Prevented Planting

In counties for which the Special Provisions designate a spring final planting date, your prevented planting production guarantee will be based on your approved yield for spring-planted acreage of the insured crop. Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 3. Amend § 457.104 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 11(b).
The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.104 Cotton crop insurance provisions.

The Cotton Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

11. Prevented Planting

* * * * *

(b) Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 4. Amend § 457.105 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text;
■ b. Amend section 3 to remove the phrase ''(December 17 for the 1998 crop year only)''; and
■ c. Revise section 12(b).
The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.105 Extra long staple cotton crop insurance provisions.

The Extra Long Staple Cotton Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

12. Prevented Planting

* * * * *

(b) Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 5. Amend § 457.108 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 12.
The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.108 Sunflower seed crop insurance provisions.

The Sunflower Seed Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

12. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 6. Amend § 457.109 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 15(b).

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.109 Sugar Beet Crop Insurance Provisions.

The Sugar Beet Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years in counties with a contract change date of November 30, and for the 2018 and succeeding crop years in counties with a contract change date of April 30, are as follows:

* * * * *

15. Prevented Planting

* * * * *

(b) Except in those counties indicated in section 15(a), your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 7. Amend § 457.112 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 13.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.112 Hybrid sorghum seed crop insurance provisions.

The Hybrid Sorghum Seed Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

13. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your amount of insurance for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 8. Amend § 457.113 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 12.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.113 Coarse grains crop insurance provisions.

The Coarse Grains Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

12. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 9. Amend § 457.125 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 12.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.125 Safflower crop insurance provisions.

The Safflower Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

12. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 10. Amend § 457.126 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 15.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.126 Popcorn crop insurance provisions.

The Popcorn Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

15. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 11. Amend § 457.134 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 15(a).

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.134 Peanut crop insurance provisions.

The Peanut Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

15. Prevented Planting

(a) Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

* * * * *

■ 12. Amend § 457.135 as follows
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 15.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.135 Onion crop insurance provisions.

The Onion Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years in counties with a contract change date of November 30, and for the 2018 and succeeding crop years in counties with a contract change date of June 30, are as follows:

* * * * *

15. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your final stage production guarantee for timely planted acreage. Additional prevented planting coverage levels are not available for onions.

■ 13. Amend § 457.136 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 14.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.136 Tobacco crop insurance provisions.

The Tobacco Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

14. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. Additional prevented planting coverage levels are not available for tobacco.

■ 14. Amend § 457.137 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 14.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.137 Green pea crop insurance provisions.

The Green Pea Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

14. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 15. Amend § 457.140 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 14.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.140 Dry pea crop insurance provisions.

The Dry Pea Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

14. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

* * * * *

■ 16. Amend § 457.141 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 13.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.141 Rice crop insurance provisions.

The Rice Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

13. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 17. Amend § 457.142 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 12.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.142 Northern potato crop insurance provisions.

The Northern Potato Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

12. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 18. Amend § 457.147 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 13.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.147 Central and Southern potato crop insurance provisions.

The Central and Southern Potato Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years in counties with a contract change date of November 30, and for the 2018 and succeeding crop years in counties with a contract change date of June 30 and September 30, are as follows:

* * * * *

13. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 19. Amend § 457.150 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text;
■ b. Amend section 4 to remove the phrase ''(December 17 for the 1998 crop year only)''; and
■ c. Revise section 14.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.150 Dry bean crop insurance provisions.

The Dry Bean Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

14. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 20. Amend § 457.152 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 13.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.152 Hybrid seed corn crop insurance provisions.

The Hybrid Seed Corn Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

13. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your amount of insurance for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 21. Amend § 457.154 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 14.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.154 Processing sweet corn crop insurance provisions.

The Processing Sweet Corn Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

14. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 22. Amend § 457.155 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 14.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.155 Processing bean crop insurance provisions.

The Processing Bean Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

14. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting

coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 23. Amend § 457.161 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 14.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.161 Canola and rapeseed crop insurance provisions.

The Canola and Rapeseed Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years in counties with a contract change date of November 30, and for the 2018 and succeeding crop years in counties with a contract change date of June 30, are as follows:

* * * * *

14. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 24. Amend § 457.165 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 12.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.165 Millet crop insurance provisions.

The Millet Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

12. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

■ 25. Amend § 457.168 as follows:
■ a. Revise the first sentence of the introductory text; and
■ b. Revise section 15.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 457.168 Mustard crop insurance provisions.

The Mustard Crop Insurance Provisions for the 2017 and succeeding crop years are as follows:

* * * * *

15. Prevented Planting

Your prevented planting coverage will be a percentage specified in the actuarial documents of your production guarantee for timely planted acreage. When a portion of the insurable acreage within the unit is prevented from being planted, and there is more than one base contract price applicable to acreage in the unit, the lowest base contract price will be used in calculating any prevented planting payment. If you have additional levels of coverage and pay an additional premium, you may increase your prevented planting coverage if such additional coverage is specified in the actuarial documents.

Dated: November 10, 2016.

Brandon Willis,

Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

[FR Doc. 2016–27720 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Parts 989 and 999

[Doc. No. AMS–SC–16–0065; SC16–989–2 FR]

Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California and Imported Raisins; Removal of Language

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule removes language from the California raisin marketing order's minimum grade standards and the import regulations' grade and size requirements. The marketing order regulates the handling of raisins produced from grapes grown in California, and is administered locally by the Raisin Administrative Committee (committee). The change to the import regulations is required under section 8e of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. Recently, the U.S. Standards for Grades of Processed Raisins (standards) were amended to remove the word ''midget.'' This rule makes the marketing order and the import regulations consistent with the amended standards.

DATES: Effective November 25, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maria Stobbe, Marketing Specialist, or Jeffrey Smutny, Regional Director, California Marketing Field Office, Marketing Order and Agreement Division, Specialty Crops Program, AMS, USDA; Telephone: (559) 487–5901, Fax: (559) 487–5906, or Email: *Maria.Stobbe@ams.usda.gov* or *Jeffrey.Smutny@ams.usda.gov.*

Small businesses may request information on complying with this regulation by contacting Richard Lower, Marketing Order and Agreement Division, Specialty Crops Program, AMS, USDA, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., STOP 0237, Washington, DC 20250–0237; Telephone: (202) 720–2491, Fax: (202) 720–8938, or Email: *Richard.Lower@ams.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This rule is issued under Marketing Agreement and Order No. 989, both as amended (7 CFR part 989), regulating the handling of raisins produced from grapes grown in California, hereinafter referred to as the ''order.'' The order is effective under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674), hereinafter referred to as the ''Act.''

This rule is also issued under section 8e of the Act, which provides that whenever certain specified commodities, including raisins, are regulated under a Federal marketing order, imports of these commodities into the United States are prohibited unless they meet the same or comparable grade, size, quality, or maturity requirements as those in effect for the domestically-produced commodities.

The Department of Agriculture (USDA) is issuing this rule in conformance with Executive Orders 12866, 13563, and 13175.

This final rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This rule is not intended to have retroactive effect.

The Act provides that administrative proceedings must be exhausted before parties may file suit in court. Under section 608c(15)(A) of the Act, any handler subject to an order may file with USDA a petition stating that the order, any provision of the order, or any obligation imposed in connection with the order is not in accordance with law and request a modification of the order or to be exempted therefrom. A handler is afforded the opportunity for a hearing on the petition. After the hearing, USDA would rule on the petition. The Act provides that the district court of the United States in any district in which the handler is an inhabitant, or has his or her principal place of business, has jurisdiction to review USDA's ruling on the petition, provided an action is filed not later than 20 days after the date of the entry of the ruling.

There are no administrative procedures which must be exhausted prior to any judicial challenge to the provisions of import regulations issued under section 8e of the Act.

This rule removes the term ''midget'' from § 989.702(a) of the order and

§ 999.300(b)(1) of the import regulations. This will make the order and the import regulations consistent with the recent changes to the standards.

The committee unanimously recommended that the term ''midget'' be removed from the order at a meeting on June 26, 2014. At a subsequent meeting on August 14, 2014, the committee also unanimously recommended that the word ''midget'' be removed from the standards. As required under the Act, the import regulations must be consistent with the changes to the order. In this instance, the order must also be consistent with changes to the standards.

Paragraph (a) of section 989.702 of the order specifies minimum grade standards for packed Natural (sun-dried) Seedless (NS) raisins, requiring that ''small (midget)'' sizes of raisins shall meet U.S. Grade C tolerances with respect to pieces of stem, and underdeveloped and substandard raisins. The word ''midget'' is redundant with the term ''small,'' and its removal is insignificant.

Pursuant to the recommendation of the committee and consistent with the recent amendment of the standards, the word ''midget'' is removed from the order language.

The committee's recommendations to delete the word ''midget'' from the order and the standards necessitates a corresponding change to the import requirements.

Under the raisin import regulations, in paragraph (b)(1) of section 999.300, raisins imported into the United States are required to meet the same or comparable grade, size, quality, or maturity requirements as those in effect for the domestically-produced commodities, when such commodities are regulated under an order. With the removal of the word ''midget'' from both the standards and the order, removal of ''midget'' is required under the import regulations.

Removal of the word ''midget'' should not impact the application of the order or the import regulations, since the word ''midget'' is redundant and appears in parentheses after the word ''small.'' Thus, removing the word ''midget'' has no effect on interpretation of the order or the import regulations; and, therefore, has no effect on raisin importers.

The final rule removing the word ''midget'' from the standards was published in the **Federal Register** on June 23, 2016 (81 FR 40779). Thus, this rule will make the order and the import regulations consistent with the standards, as recently revised.

Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

Pursuant to requirements set forth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) has considered the economic impact of this action on small entities. Accordingly, AMS has prepared this final regulatory flexibility analysis.

The purpose of the RFA is to fit regulatory actions to the scale of businesses subject to such actions in order that small businesses will not be unduly or disproportionately burdened. Marketing orders issued pursuant to the Act, and rules issued thereunder, are unique in that they are brought about through group action of essentially small entities acting on their own behalf.

There are approximately 3,000 producers of California raisins and approximately 24 handlers subject to regulation under the marketing order. There are approximately 52 importers of raisins as well.

The Small Business Administration defines small agricultural producers as those having annual receipts less than $750,000, and defines small agricultural service firms, such as handlers and importers, as those whose annual receipts are less than $7,500,000. (13 CFR 121.201.)

There are approximately 3,000 California raisin producers and 24 handlers subject to regulation under the marketing order. The Small Business Administration defines small agricultural producers as those having annual receipts less than $750,000, and defines small agricultural service firms, such as handlers and importers, as those whose annual receipts are less than $7,500,000 (13 CFR 121.201).

Based on shipment data and other information provided by the committee, most producers and approximately 13 handlers of California raisins may be classified as small entities. This action should not have any impact on handlers' or growers' benefits or costs.

There is very limited information on the 52 importers. This action should not have any impact on importers' costs.

This rule removes the word ''midget'' from the order regulations in section 989.702(a) and from the import regulations in section 999.300(b)(1), bringing the order and the import regulations into conformance with the recent amendment to the standards.

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the order's information collection requirements have been previously approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and assigned OMB No. 0581–0178, ''Vegetable and Specialty Crops.'' No changes in those requirements as a result of this action are necessary. Should any changes become necessary, they would be submitted to OMB for approval.

This rule will not impose any additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either large or small raisin handlers or on raisin importers. As with all Federal marketing order programs, reports and forms are periodically reviewed to reduce information requirements and duplication by industry and public sector agencies. In addition, USDA has not identified any relevant Federal rules that duplicate, overlap or conflict with this final rule.

AMS is committed to complying with the E-Government Act, to promote the use of the Internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

Further, the committee's meetings were widely publicized throughout the California raisin industry and all interested persons were invited to attend the meetings and encouraged to participate in committee deliberations on all issues. Like all committee meetings, the June 26, 2014, and August 14, 2014, meetings were public meetings and all entities, both large and small, were encouraged to express their views on this issue.

A proposed rule was published in the **Federal Register** on September 16, 2016 (81 FR 63723). Copies of the rule were provided to California raisin handlers and committee members. Finally, the rule was made available through the Internet by USDA and the Office of the Federal Register. A 30-day comment period ending October 17, 2016, was provided for interested persons to respond to the proposal. One supportive comment was received. Accordingly, no changes are being made to the rule.

A small business guide on complying with fruit, vegetable, and specialty crop marketing agreements and orders may be viewed at: *http://www.ams.usda.gov/rules-regulations/moa/small-businesses.* Any questions about the compliance guide should be sent to Richard Lower at the previously-mentioned address in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

In accordance with section 8e of the Act, the United States Trade Representative has concurred with this action.

After consideration of all relevant material presented, including the information and recommendation submitted by the committee and other

available information, it is hereby found that this rule, as hereinafter set forth, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553, it is also found and determined that good cause exists for not postponing the effective date of this rule until 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** because removal of the word ''midget'' should not impact the application of the order or the import regulations, since the word ''midget'' is redundant and appears in parentheses after the word ''small.'' Thus, removing the word ''midget'' has no effect on interpretation of the order or the import regulations; and, therefore, has no effect on handlers or raisin importers. Further, handlers are aware of this rule, which was recommended at two public meetings. Also, a 30-day comment period was provided for in the proposed rule.

List of Subjects

7 CFR Part 989

Grapes, Marketing agreements, Raisins, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 999

Dates, Filberts, Food grades and standards, Imports, Nuts, Prunes, Raisins, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Walnuts.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR parts 989 and 999 are amended as follows:

PART 989—RAISINS PRODUCED FROM GRAPES GROWN IN CALIFORNIA

■ 1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 989 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

§ 989.702 [Amended]

■ 2. Paragraph (a) of § 989.702 is amended by removing ''small (midget-sized)'' and adding ''small sized'' in its place.

PART 999—SPECIALTY CROPS; IMPORT REGULATIONS

■ 3. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 999 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

■ 4. Paragraph (b)(1) of § 999.300 is amended by removing '' small (midget) sized'' and adding ''small sized'' in its place.

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Elanor Starmer,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–28251 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

8 CFR Parts 103 and 235

[Docket No. USCBP–2013–0029; CBP Decision No. 16–20]

RIN 1651–AB01

The U.S. Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program

AGENCY: U.S. Customs and Border Protection; Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule adopts as final, with two changes, interim amendments to the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) regulations published in the **Federal Register** on May 13, 2014 establishing the U.S. Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Business Travel Card Program. The U.S. APEC Business Travel Card Program provides qualified U.S. business travelers engaged in business in the APEC region, or U.S. Government officials actively engaged in APEC business, the ability to access fast-track immigration lanes at participating airports in foreign APEC economies.

DATES: This rule is effective December 23, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Garret Conover, Office of Field Operations, (202) 325–4062, *Garret.A.Conover@cbp.dhs.gov.*

I. Background

A. The Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program

The United States is a member of APEC, which is an economic forum comprised of twenty-one members whose primary goal is to support sustainable economic growth and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region.[1] One of APEC's business facilitation initiatives is the APEC Business Travel Card (ABTC) Program. The operating procedures for the ABTC Program are set out in the APEC Business Travel Card Operating Framework (APEC Framework).[2] Under the ABTC Program, APEC members can issue cards to business travelers and senior government officials who meet certain criteria. The cards provide simpler, short-term entry procedures within the APEC region.

B. U.S. Participation in ABTC

On November 12, 2011, President Obama signed the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards Act of 2011 (APEC Act). Public Law 112–54, 125 Stat. 550. The APEC Act authorizes the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to issue ABTCs through September 30, 2018 to any eligible person, including business persons and U.S. Government officials actively engaged in APEC business. On May 13, 2014, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) published an interim final rule (IFR) in the **Federal Register** (79 FR 27161) amending the DHS regulations to establish the U.S. ABTC Program and an application fee. *See* 8 CFR 235.13 and 8 CFR 103.7.

The IFR became effective on June 12, 2014 and on that date CBP began issuing its own ABTCs (U.S. ABTCs) to qualified U.S. citizens. As provided in the IFR, the U.S. ABTC Program is a voluntary program designed to facilitate travel for bona fide U.S. business persons engaged in business in the APEC region and U.S. government officials actively engaged in APEC business within the APEC region. To participate in the program, an individual must be an existing member, in good standing, of an eligible CBP trusted traveler program or be approved for membership in an eligible CBP trusted traveler program during the U.S. ABTC application process.[3] The application process requires the applicant to self-certify that he or she is a bona fide business person who is engaged in the trade of goods, the provision of services or the conduct of investment activities, or is a U.S. Government official actively engaged in

[1] APEC members are also referred to as 'economies' since the APEC process is primarily concerned with trade and economic issues with the members engaging each other as economic entities. The most recently updated list of members is available at the APEC Web site at *www.apec.org/About-Us/About-APEC/Member-Economies.aspx.* For simplicity, CBP will generally refer to them in the preamble of this document as APEC members.

[2] Although participating members intend to follow the operating principles and procedures outlined, the document is not legally binding. The most recent version of the APEC Framework is Version 19, dated July 7, 2015.

[3] For purposes of the U.S. ABTC Program, eligible CBP trusted traveler programs include Global Entry, NEXUS, and SENTRI.

APEC business. The applicant must also provide a signature, which appears on the face of the U.S. ABTC. CBP collects the applicant's signature at a CBP trusted traveler enrollment center.

Successful applicants receive a U.S. ABTC that enables them to access fast-track immigration lanes at participating airports in foreign APEC member economies. In order to obtain a U.S. ABTC, an individual must meet the eligibility requirements, apply in advance, pay the requisite fee and be approved as a card holder. Details about the program eligibility criteria, the application process, the fee, the benefits, and other aspects of the program, are set forth in the preamble of the IFR, 8 CFR 235.13, and 8 CFR 103.7.

II. Discussion of Comments

A. Overview

Although the interim regulatory amendments were promulgated without prior public notice and comment procedures pursuant to the foreign affairs exemption in 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1), the IFR provided for the submission of public comments that would be considered before adopting the interim regulations as a final rule. The prescribed 30-day public comment period closed on June 12, 2014. During this time, CBP received submissions from five commenters. All five commenters were strongly in support of the U.S. ABTC Program and expressed appreciation for the introduction of the program. Nonetheless, the commenters presented ideas for how to improve the program, and one commenter noted that our calculation of a benefit accrued through the U.S. ABTC was inaccurate. CBP has grouped the issues by topic and provides responses below.

B. Discussion

1. Overseas Interviews and Signature Collection

Comment: All five of the commenters noted that many of the U.S. ABTC applicants will be U.S. business people living and working abroad, who make limited trips to the United States. The commenters asserted that requiring applicants to be physically present in the United States to obtain a U.S. ABTC will reduce the number of applicants and will limit the accessibility of the program. To address these concerns, four of the commenters recommended that CBP conduct enrollment interviews for the CBP trusted traveler programs overseas, and all five of the commenters asked that CBP provide a way for U.S. ABTC signatures to be collected abroad. The commenters suggested several different methods for CBP to conduct enrollment interviews and/or collect signatures overseas, either on a regular basis or intermittently. Their suggestions include having CBP use U.S. embassies or consulates in the Asia-Pacific region, having CBP open a regional office in Asia, or having CBP schedule appointments for interviews and/or signature collections around major U.S. regional business events, such as the annual meeting of the Asia Pacific Council of American Chambers of Commerce. The commenters remarked that conducting enrollment interviews and signature collections overseas would increase the number of applicants for U.S. ABTCs and would allow individuals to obtain a U.S. ABTC more quickly because individuals will not have to wait until they are traveling to the United States to do their interview and provide their signature.

Response: CBP appreciates the commenters' suggestions for alternative arrangements for CBP trusted traveler interviews and ABTC signature collections, but is unable to implement any of them at this time. The personal interview and signature collection process is an integral part of the CBP trusted traveler and U.S. ABTC application processes and these are done at CBP trusted traveler enrollment centers located throughout the United States. CBP does not have the facilities or resources to regularly conduct interviews and collect signatures outside CBP trusted traveler enrollment centers. Furthermore, in order to maintain the integrity of the CBP trusted traveler and ABTC programs, only CBP officers are authorized to conduct interviews, obtain signatures, and approve applications in the Global On-Line Enrollment System (GOES). These functions cannot be delegated to the Department of State or any other entity.

While CBP recognizes that some applicants may find it inconvenient to travel to the continental United States for their CBP trusted traveler program interview and U.S. ABTC signature collection, CBP would like to highlight that there are trusted traveler enrollment centers located in Hawaii and Guam. Furthermore, CBP is encouraged by the fact that there has been a steady stream of applicants thus far, indicating that many people have been able to obtain U.S. ABTCs through the current system. As of December 2015, nearly 21,000 applications have been submitted for the U.S. ABTC Program.[4]

[4] Source: Email correspondence with CBP's Office of Field Operations on February 10, 2016.

2. Appointment Scheduling for Signature Collection

Comment: Two commenters asked CBP to definitively state that an applicant does not need to schedule an appointment for signature collection if the applicant is already a member of a CBP trusted traveler program. Both commenters noted that the FAQs explicitly state that no appointment is necessary while some of the preamble language in the IFR suggests otherwise.

Response: Applicants for the U.S. ABTC Program who are already members of a CBP trusted traveler program do not need to schedule an appointment for signature collection. Applicants should be aware, however, that if they arrive at an enrollment center without an appointment, they may have to wait a considerable length of time before a CBP officer is able to process their signature. By scheduling an appointment, applicants can prevent long wait-times and allow for better time management by CBP officers at enrollment centers. As such, although appointments are not necessary, they are encouraged.

3. Benefits of the U.S. ABTC Program

Comment: One commenter indicated that the average amount of time a U.S. ABTC holder saves on account of the expedited entry procedures associated with the U.S. ABTC Program is greater than anticipated in the IFR. The commenter noted that the actual benefit to a U.S. ABTC holder is greater than the average calculated time savings of 43 minutes per trip because travelers can save a significant amount of time by arriving at the airport later and by catching flights that they would have otherwise missed if not for the U.S. ABTC Program's fast-track immigration clearance.

Response: CBP believes the weighted average time savings of approximately 43 minutes is an appropriate estimate of the time savings a U.S. ABTC holder will receive when clearing foreign immigration services using the fast-track immigration lanes. To the extent that this estimate understates the time saved by U.S. ABTC holders, the benefits of the rule will be higher. Similarly, to the extent that U.S. ABTC holders are able to catch flights they would have otherwise missed due to lengthy immigration waits, the benefits of this rule will be higher.

4. Self-Certification

Comment: One commenter asked that CBP ease the ''manner for determining business travel eligibility'' by allowing applicants to self-certify their status as a business traveler.

Response: The U.S. ABTC Program already allows for such self-certification. When applying for the U.S. ABTC, an applicant must complete and submit an application electronically through the GOES Web site. During the application process, the applicant is prompted to self-certify that he or she is a bona fide business person who is engaged in the trade of goods, the provision of services or the conduct of investment activities, or is a U.S. Government official actively engaged in APEC business, and that he or she is not a professional athlete, news correspondent, entertainer, musician, artist, or person engaged in a similar occupation. *See* 8 CFR 235.13(c)(2).

III. Conclusion—Regulatory Amendments

After careful consideration of the comments received, CBP is adopting the interim regulations published May 13, 2014 as a final rule with the following two changes. First, CBP is changing the validity period of U.S. ABTCs from three years to five years based on revisions in the APEC Framework. Second, CBP is removing all references in the U.S. ABTC regulation to suspension from the program because CBP does not use suspension as a remedial action. Further details about these changes are discussed below. DHS believes that this rule is excluded from APA rulemaking requirements as a foreign affairs function of the United States pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1) because it advances the President's foreign policy goal of facilitating business travel within the APEC region and allows the United States to fulfill its intent under the multilateral APEC Framework. Accordingly, these changes are exempt from notice and comment rulemaking generally required under 5 U.S.C. 553.

A. Change in Validity Period

The IFR provided that the U.S. ABTC is valid for three years or until the expiration date of the card holder's passport if that is earlier, provided participation is not terminated by CBP prior to the end of this period. *See* 8 CFR 235.13(c)(6). However, the IFR noted that any subsequent revisions to the APEC Framework that directly affect the U.S. ABTC may require regulatory changes.[5]

The most recent version of the APEC Framework (Version 19) extended the validity period of ABTCs to ''a maximum period of five years''. (APEC Framework 3.8.1). The Business Mobility Group (BMG), an APEC working group comprised of representatives from all member economies, is responsible for updating the APEC Framework. The BMG has indicated that the ABTC Program is on a trajectory towards requiring a five-year validity period for all ABTCs. Given the time constraints of some participating members' domestic procedures, however, the BMG acknowledges that it may take a significant amount of time for some members to be able to comply with this expectation. Accordingly, provision 3.8.1 of the APEC Framework allows for some variability in validity periods while member economies work towards reaching the goal of extending the validity period of new ABTCs to five years.

In keeping with the United States' intent to follow APEC's operating principles and procedures, CBP is changing the validity period for U.S. ABTCs to five years. Accordingly, CBP is revising 8 CFR 235.13(c)(6) by replacing ''3 years'' with ''five years''. Individuals who submit a U.S. ABTC application or renewal request on or after December 23, 2016 will be eligible to receive a U.S. ABTC with a five-year validity period.[6] This change in validity period does not apply to current U.S. ABTC holders, whose cards will remain valid only until the date printed on their card, subject to earlier revocation by CBP.

CBP notes that this change in validity period will be beneficial to many new U.S. ABTC holders, as they will be able to avail themselves of the program for two additional years. The extension in validity period will also be beneficial to many U.S. ABTC holders in the event that Congress extends the APEC Act.[7] Should the U.S. ABTC Program be extended, individuals who apply concurrently for the U.S. ABTC and a CBP trusted traveler program will be able to take advantage of a more streamlined renewal process. Currently, Global Entry, NEXUS, and SENTRI memberships are all valid for a period of five years, whereas the U.S. ABTC Program membership is only valid for three years. Accordingly, individuals who apply for both programs concurrently must renew their U.S. ABTCs after three years, then renew their CBP trusted traveler program membership two years later. By extending the validity period of the U.S. ABTC to five years, these individuals will be able to initiate the renewal process for both programs at the same time.

B. Removal of References to Suspension From the Program

Although 8 CFR 235.13(f) addresses situations in which an applicant may be suspended or removed from the program, CBP no longer uses suspension as a remedial action. In the event that CBP action is necessary under 8 CFR 235.13, CBP removes the U.S. ABTC holder from the program. Accordingly, CBP is removing all references to ''suspension'' and ''suspended'' from § 235.13(f) and from § 235.13 (c), (g), and (h), which also refer to ''suspension'' and ''suspended''. This change is also in line with the APEC Framework, which provides for cancellation but not suspension of ABTCs.

IV. Statutory and Regulatory Requirements

A. Executive Order 13563 and Executive Order 12866

Executive Orders 13563 and 12866 direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This rule is not a ''significant regulatory action,'' under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed this rule. CBP has prepared the following analysis to help inform stakeholders of the potential impacts of this final rule.

1. Synopsis

This rule adopts as final the interim final rule establishing the U.S. ABTC Program with the following changes: It expands the validity period for new U.S. ABTCs and it removes all references to

[5] Footnote 11 of the IFR states, ''The current version of the APEC Framework is Version 17, agreed to on January 30, 2013. Any subsequent revisions to the APEC Framework that directly affect the U.S. ABTC may require a regulatory change''.

[6] If the card holder's passport will expire before the end of the validity period, CBP will issue the U.S. ABTC with a shorter validity period that matches the passport expiration date. *See* 8 CFR 235.13(c)(6).

[7] The APEC Act authorizes the Secretary to issue U.S. ABTCs only through September 30, 2018. Unless the law is amended to extend that date, CBP will not issue any new U.S. ABTCs or renew any U.S. ABTCs after September 30, 2018. U.S. ABTC holders will retain their membership in the U.S. ABTC Program for the full validity period (even if the validity period extends past September 30, 2018) unless membership is revoked earlier.

suspension from the program.[8] CBP largely adopts the economic analysis for the U.S. ABTC Program's IFR for this final rule. However, this final rule analysis incorporates recent changes to the IFR's U.S. ABTC validity period, applicant projections, application and renewal burdens, and program impacts.

Pursuant to the authorizing statute, the Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to set a U.S. ABTC Program fee. CBP has determined that a $70 fee is necessary to recover its costs of administering the U.S. ABTC Program.[9] As shown in Table 1, initial U.S. ABTC applicants incur the $70 U.S. ABTC fee and an opportunity cost associated with obtaining a U.S. ABTC. Because participation in a CBP trusted traveler program is a prerequisite for obtaining a U.S. ABTC, individuals who are not already members of such a program need to concurrently apply for a U.S. ABTC and a CBP trusted traveler program, and pay the programs' applicable fees. CBP assumes that individuals not already in a CBP trusted traveler program will choose to join Global Entry because it, like the U.S. ABTC Program, provides expedited clearance in the air environment. The application fee for Global Entry is currently $100.[10] CBP estimates the opportunity cost to initially obtain a U.S. ABTC for those who are already members of a CBP trusted traveler program to be $73.69. CBP estimates the opportunity cost to initially obtain a U.S. ABTC for individuals who are not members of a CBP trusted traveler program to be $105.27. Accounting for application fees and opportunity costs, the total cost of initially obtaining a U.S. ABTC ranges from almost $144 for U.S. ABTC applicants who are already in a CBP trusted traveler program to $275 for U.S. ABTC applicants who are not already in a CBP trusted traveler program, as shown in Table 1. Table 1 also shows that the costs to renew U.S. ABTCs are much lower than these initial application costs. CBP will provide additional details about these estimates later in the analysis.

The U.S. ABTC Program is a voluntary program that enables card holders to access fast-track immigration lanes at participating airports in the 20 other APEC member economies.[11] CBP estimates that U.S. ABTC holders will experience a time savings of approximately 43 minutes when clearing foreign immigration services using the fast-track immigration lanes.[12] As the U.S. ABTC Program is voluntary, the perceived benefits of reduced wait time have to equal or exceed the cost of the program over five years (the new validity period of the U.S. ABTC) for new potential enrollees to determine whether the program is worthwhile. As discussed later in further detail, CBP estimates that a U.S. ABTC applicant who is already enrolled in a CBP trusted traveler program will need to take a minimum of four trips across the U.S. ABTC's five-year validity period for the benefits of the U.S. ABTC Program to exceed the costs associated with joining the program. Additionally, CBP estimates that a U.S. ABTC applicant who is not already a CBP trusted traveler member will need to take a minimum of six trips between the United States and an APEC economy over the five-year validity period for the benefits of the U.S. ABTC Program to exceed the costs associated with joining the program. Current U.S. ABTC holders will need to take even fewer trips per year for the benefits of renewing their program memberships to outweigh the costs.

TABLE 1—TOTAL COST BY APPLICANT TYPE

Applicant type	Cost category	Initial costs	Renewal costs
U.S. ABTC Applicants Already in a CBP Trusted Traveler Program.	U.S. ABTC Fee	$70	$70
	Global Entry Fee*	n/a	n/a
	U.S. ABTC Opportunity Cost†	$73.69 (1.17 hrs)	$10.53 (0.17 hrs)
Total (rounded to nearest $1)		$144	$81
U.S. ABTC Applicants *Not* Already in a CBP Trusted Traveler Program.	U.S. ABTC Fee	$70	$70
	Global Entry Fee*	$100	$100
	U.S. ABTC and Global Entry Opportunity Cost†	$105.27 (1.67 hrs)	$10.53 (0.17 hrs)
	Total (rounded to nearest $1)	$275	$181

*CBP anticipates that those U.S. ABTC applicants who must choose a CBP trusted traveler program when applying for the U.S. ABTC will choose to join Global Entry because, like the U.S. ABTC Program, Global Entry provides expedited clearance in the air environment.

†This value is based on the U.S. Department of Transportation's (DOT) guidance regarding the valuation of travel time for business travelers in 2013 U.S. dollars, adjusted to 2017 U.S. dollars using the DOT's recommended annual growth rate of one percent. Source: U.S. Department of Transportation, Office of Transportation Policy. *The Value of Travel Time Savings: Departmental Guidance for Conducting Economic Evaluations Revision 2 (2015 Update).* ''Table 4 (Revision 2-corrected): Recommended Hourly Values of Travel Time Savings.'' 2015. Available at *http://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/docs/Revised%20Departmental%20Guidance%20on%20Valuation%20of%20Travel%20Time%20in%20Economic%20Analysis.pdf.* Accessed February 16, 2016.

Note: There are two categories of U.S. ABTC applicants: Those who are already in a CBP trusted traveler program and those who are not. CBP does not consider the cost of joining a CBP trusted traveler program for those applicants who are already members of a CBP trusted traveler program. These applicants have already, independent of any decision to join the U.S. ABTC Program, determined that the benefits of a CBP trusted traveler program outweigh the costs associated with the program they have chosen to join.

2. Background

The U.S. ABTC Program is a voluntary program that allows U.S. citizens with U.S. ABTCs to access fast-track immigration lanes at participating airports in the 20 other APEC member economies. In order to be eligible for a U.S. ABTC, a U.S. citizen is required to be a bona fide business person engaged in business in the APEC region or a U.S. Government official actively engaged in APEC business. Additionally, the U.S. ABTC applicant must be a member in good standing of a CBP trusted traveler

[8] 79 FR 27167, May 13, 2014.

[9] CBP performed a fee study to determine the yearly costs of the program and the cost to establish the program for all relevant parties. This fee study, entitled ''Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Fee Study,'' is posted on the docket as supplemental materials on *www.regulations.gov.*

[10] 8 CFR 103.7.

[11] Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, ''Member Economies.'' Available at *http://www.apec.org/About-Us/About-APEC/Member-Economies.aspx.* Accessed July 8, 2015.

[12] Based on data from Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. ''Reducing Business Travel Costs: The Success of APEC's Business Mobility Initiatives.'' November 2011. Available at *http://publications.apec.org/publication-detail.php?pub_id=1214.* Accessed May 23, 2012.

program or approved for membership in a CBP trusted traveler program during the U.S. ABTC application process. U.S. ABTC applicants who are not already CBP trusted traveler program members must also apply for membership to a CBP trusted traveler program with their U.S. ABTC application.[13] Since the publication of the U.S. ABTC IFR, APEC members (including the United States) endorsed increasing the validity period of the ABTC to ''a maximum period of five years.'' However, APEC's BMG has indicated that the ABTC Program is on a trajectory towards requiring a five-year validity period for all ABTCs. In keeping with the United States' intent to follow APEC's operating principles and procedures, CBP is changing the validity period for U.S. ABTCs from three years to five years (or until the expiration date of the card holder's passport if that is earlier) through this rule. With this expansion, the U.S. ABTC's validity period will now match that of CBP's trusted traveler programs.

Individuals who submit a U.S. ABTC application or renewal request on or after this final rule's effective date may be eligible to receive a U.S. ABTC with a five-year validity period. If the card holder's passport will expire before the end of the five-year validity period, CBP will issue the U.S. ABTC with a shorter validity period that matches the passport expiration date. If the card holder's CBP trusted traveler program membership expires during their U.S. ABTC's validity period, CBP may revoke the U.S. ABTC since membership in a CBP trusted traveler program is necessary for the entire duration of the U.S. ABTC. This change in validity period does not apply to current U.S. ABTC holders, whose cards will remain valid only until the date printed on their card, subject to earlier revocation by CBP. Similar to CBP trusted traveler programs, a U.S. ABTC holder will be required to renew his or her membership prior to expiration to continue enjoying the benefits of the program.

3. U.S. ABTC Applicant Categories

There are two categories of initial U.S. ABTC applicants (*i.e.,* individuals who are not renewing their U.S. ABTC membership) that CBP discusses separately in this analysis: Those who are already part of a CBP trusted traveler program and those who are not. This distinction is necessary because those applicants who are not already part of a CBP trusted traveler program will bear an additional opportunity cost and fee associated with applying for a CBP trusted traveler program to be eligible for a U.S. ABTC.

a. U.S. ABTC Applicants Who Are Already Members of a CBP Trusted Traveler Program

If an initial U.S. ABTC applicant is already a member of a CBP trusted traveler program, the applicant will have to apply for a U.S. ABTC by self-certifying, via the GOES Web site, that: He or she is an existing member in good standing in a CBP trusted traveler program; he or she is either a bona fide U.S. business person engaged in business in the APEC region or a U.S. Government official actively engaged in APEC business; and he or she is not a professional athlete, news correspondent, entertainer, musician, artist, or person engaged in a similar occupation. In addition to the self-certification, the U.S. ABTC applicant will also be required to pay the U.S. ABTC fee via the GOES Web site and visit a CBP trusted traveler enrollment center in order for his or her signature to be digitally captured for the U.S. ABTC. CBP estimates that U.S. ABTC applicants will experience an opportunity cost of 10 minutes to complete the U.S. ABTC self-certification, pay the U.S. ABTC fee, and have their signature digitally captured at an enrollment center.[14] These applicants will also experience a one-hour opportunity cost to travel to and from an enrollment center and wait to have their signature digitally captured. For the purposes of this rule, CBP does not consider the costs or benefits of joining a CBP trusted traveler program as impacts of this rule for those U.S. ABTC Program applicants who are already members of a CBP trusted traveler program. These applicants have previously, independent of any decision to join the U.S. ABTC Program, determined that the benefits of a CBP trusted traveler program outweigh the costs associated with the program they have chosen to join. They have not chosen to join the U.S. ABTC Program as a direct result of this rule.

b. U.S. ABTC Applicants Who Are Not Already Members of a CBP Trusted Traveler Program

An initial U.S. ABTC applicant who is not already a member of a CBP trusted traveler program will be required to apply for a U.S. ABTC and a CBP trusted traveler program, and self-certify that: He or she has submitted an application to a CBP trusted traveler program; he or she is either a bona fide U.S. business person engaged in business in the APEC region or a U.S. Government official actively engaged in APEC business; and he or she is not a professional athlete, news correspondent, entertainer, musician, artist, or person engaged in a similar occupation. Because these applicants would not have joined a CBP trusted traveler program if not for the U.S. ABTC Program, CBP includes the costs and benefits for these applicants to join these programs in this analysis.

CBP anticipates that those initial U.S. ABTC applicants who must choose a CBP trusted traveler program when applying for the U.S. ABTC Program will choose to join Global Entry because, like the U.S. ABTC Program, Global Entry provides expedited clearance in the air environment. As described in the Global Entry final rule, CBP estimates that a Global Entry applicant will experience an opportunity cost of 40 minutes to complete the Global Entry application in GOES.[15] When concurrently applying for a U.S. ABTC and Global Entry, CBP anticipates that the U.S. ABTC applicant will be able to complete the Global Entry application, complete the U.S. ABTC self-certification, schedule their required Global Entry enrollment interview, pay the program application fees, and have their signature digitally captured for the U.S. ABTC Program in the 40 minutes estimated for the Global Entry application.[16] Based on the Global Entry final rule, CBP estimates that Global Entry applicants also applying for a U.S. ABTC will experience an opportunity cost of one hour to travel to and from a CBP trusted traveler enrollment center and undergo the required Global Entry interview.[17]

4. Number of U.S. ABTC Applicants

In the U.S. ABTC IFR, CBP projected that 12,750 U.S. citizens would enroll in the U.S. ABTC Program within the first three years of the program's start date based on National Center for Asia-

[13] As stated in the U.S. ABTC IFR, CBP assumes that a U.S. ABTC applicant who is not already a member of a CBP trusted traveler program will concurrently apply for a CBP trusted traveler program and a U.S. ABTC.

[14] 80 FR 1650, January 13, 2015.

[15] 77 FR 5681, February 6, 2012.

[16] As described above, the self-certification only entails certifying in GOES that the U.S. ABTC applicant is an existing member in good standing in a CBP trusted traveler program or that he or she has submitted an application to a CBP trusted traveler program; that he or she is either a bona fide U.S. business person engaged in business in the APEC region or a U.S. Government official actively engaged in APEC business; and that he or she is not a professional athlete, news correspondent, entertainer, musician, artist, or person engaged in a similar occupation.

[17] 77 FR 5681, February 6, 2012.

Pacific Economic Cooperation [18] estimates.[19] Between the U.S. ABTC IFR's effective date in FY 2014 and December 2015, CBP has received nearly 21,000 initial U.S. ABTC Program applications, exceeding the IFR's projections.[20] Based on worldwide ABTC growth, CBP expects to receive new, initial U.S. ABTC applications past the first three years of the U.S. ABTC's implementation, which contrasts to the U.S. ABTC IFR's assumption that initial applicants would occur in only a three-year period.[21] To project U.S. ABTC application volumes following this final rule's implementation, CBP first uses the latest data available to determine a base value for future applications. During the first three months of FY 2016 (October 2015 to December 2015), CBP received 1,163 U.S. ABTC applications that corresponded to current CBP trusted traveler program members and 2,423 that did not.[22] CBP then extrapolates this partial-year data to the full 2016 fiscal year by multiplying the three-month totals of historical FY 2016 application data according to the applicant type (1,163 for applicants already in a CBP trusted traveler program and 2,423 for applicants not already in a CBP trusted traveler program) and multiplying each of the totals by 4 to account for 12 months, or a full year, of application volumes. Through this estimation method, CBP finds that 4,652 of the projected new, initial U.S. ABTC Program applications in FY 2016, the base year, will correspond to individuals who are already CBP trusted traveler program members, while 9,692 new, initial U.S. ABTC applications will correspond to individuals who are not already CBP trusted traveler program members (*see* Table 2).[23] CBP chose to use extrapolated FY 2016 data rather than the FY 2015 statistics as a base for future U.S. ABTC demand because the partial-year FY 2016 data indicated an increase in the second year of total U.S. ABTC applications, which is consistent with CBP expectations of program growth in this time period.

Given the newness of the U.S. ABTC Program and its subsequently limited historical data available to establish a specific longer term growth rate in U.S. ABTC applications, CBP assumes that the total number of U.S. ABTC applications projected for FY 2016 will remain the same for FY 2017 and FY 2018. Accordingly, CBP estimates that 4,652 new, initial U.S. ABTC Program applications each year from individuals who are already CBP trusted traveler program members and 9,692 new, initial U.S. ABTC applications from individuals who are not already CBP trusted traveler program members (*see* Table 2). In accordance with the U.S. ABTC's authorizing law, CBP does not plan to issue any new U.S. ABTCs or renew any U.S. ABTCs after September 30, 2018, the end of FY 2018. Unless the law is amended to extend the duration of U.S. ABTC issuance, all U.S. ABTCs will expire within a five-year validity period lasting up to September 29, 2023. Therefore, CBP does not forecast any new applications beyond FY 2018 and assumes that no new U.S. ABTCs will be issued thereafter for the purposes of this analysis. Table 2 presents the historical and projected initial applications for the U.S. ABTC Program. As Table 2 shows, CBP estimates that almost 61,000 U.S. citizens will initially apply for the U.S. ABTC Program during the period of analysis spanning from FY 2014 through FY 2018, with 21,000 applicants already possessing a CBP trusted traveler program membership and 40,000 applicants not already CBP trusted traveler program members. CBP assumes that each application signifies a single, unique applicant.

TABLE 2—HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED NUMBERS OF U.S. ABTC APPLICANTS ALREADY AND NOT ALREADY IN A CBP TRUSTED TRAVELER PROGRAM [24]

Fiscal year	Number of initial U.S. ABTC applicants already in a CBP trusted traveler program	Number of initial U.S. ABTC applicants *Not* already in a CBP trusted traveler program	Total initial U.S. ABTC applications
2014 *	2,126	2,477	4,603
2015	4,976	8,138	13,114
2016 **	4,652	9,692	14,344
2017 ***	4,652	9,692	14,344
2018 ***	4,652	9,692	14,344
Total	21,058	39,691	60,749

* Partial year of historical data spanning from the U.S. ABTC Program's effective date of June 12, 2014 to the end of FY 2014.

** Estimate based on historical data spanning from start of October 2015 to December 2015 and data extrapolated for the remaining months of FY 2016.

*** Projection.

[18] The National Center for Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation is a U.S. business association focused on facilitating the private sector input into the APEC process.

[19] *See http://csis.org/publication/why-us-approval-apec-business-travel-card-matters.*

[20] The total U.S. ABTC applications figure represents applications received between the U.S. ABTC Program's interim effective date of June 12, 2014 through December 2015. Source: Email correspondence with CBP's Office of Field Operations on August 12, 2015 and February 10, 2016.

[21] According to APEC, the ABTC ''has experienced significant growth in recent years. The number of active card users in the year to 30 June 2015 increased by more than 15 per cent, to over 190,000, compared to around 164,000 in mid-2014.'' Source: Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. ''APEC Business Travel Card to be Extended to Five Years from 1 September.'' 2015. Available at *http://www.apecsec.org.sg/Press/News-Releases/2015/0728_ABTC.aspx*. Accessed March 3, 2016.

[22] *Source:* Email correspondence with CBP's Office of Field Operations on February 10, 2016.

[23] 1,163 U.S. ABTC applications corresponding to individuals who are already in a trusted traveler program received during first three months of fiscal year 2016 × 4 = 4,652. 2,423 U.S. ABTC applications corresponding to individuals who are not already in a trusted traveler program received during first three months of fiscal year 2016 × 4 = 9,692.

[24] Although the accompanying U.S. ABTC fee study includes CBP's costs related to the processing and printing of 5,000 Canadian ABTCs, CBP excludes these costs from this analysis because Canadian ABTC enrollees are not members of the U.S. ABTC Program and CBP is reimbursed for the costs associated with processing their applications.

Although CBP received nearly 21,000 initial U.S. ABTC applications between June 2014 and December 2015, the agency only processed around 18,000 applications during that time period. Of those applications processed, CBP approved 88 percent on average.[25] During FY 2016, and before the implementation of this final rule and its establishment of a new U.S. ABTC validity period in FY 2017, CBP assumes that the agency will process the backlog of U.S. ABTC Program applications as well as new applications submitted in FY 2016. This would result in the processing of 17,370 initial U.S. ABTC applications in FY 2016. CBP also assumes that the agency will approve 88 percent of these applications, which would bring the total U.S. ABTC Program membership up to 28,303 by the end of FY 2016 (*see* Table 3). For initial U.S. ABTC applications received from FY 2017 to FY 2018, CBP assumes that it would maintain a processing rate equal to its projected application rate, with 14,344 U.S. ABTC applications received and processed each year. Among the projected applications processed between FY 2017 and FY 2018, CBP believes that 88 percent will receive approvals based on the historical U.S. ABTC application approval rate. Thus, about 25,000 new individuals will become members of the U.S. ABTC Program from FY 2017 to FY 2018, as Table 3 illustrates. CBP assumes that these 25,000 individuals will generally receive U.S. ABTCs with five-year validity rates and maintain their program membership for the full validity period.

TABLE 3—PROJECTED NUMBER OF INITIAL U.S. ABTC MEMBERSHIP APPROVALS AND DENIALS

Fiscal year	Number of initial U.S. ABTC applications approved (*i.e.*, new U.S. ABTC program members)	Number of initial U.S. ABTC applications denied	Total initial U.S. ABTC applications processed
2014*	2,619	273	2,892
2015	10,398	1,401	11,799
2016**	15,286	2,084	17,370
2017***	12,623	1,721	14,344
2018***	12,623	1,721	14,344
Total	53,549	7,200	60,749

* Partial year of historical data spanning from the U.S. ABTC Program's effective date of June 12, 2014 to the end of FY 2014.
** Estimate based on historical data spanning from start of October 2015 to December 2015 and data extrapolated for the remaining months of FY 2016.
*** Projection.
Note: Estimates may not sum to total due to rounding.

Without complete data on the number of approved U.S. ABTC applications that corresponded to existing CBP trusted traveler program members, CBP assumes that all of the U.S. ABTC applications submitted between FY 2014 and FY 2018 from individuals already in a CBP trusted traveler program will correspond to an approved application in those respective application years. CBP assumes this because these applicants have already been approved for a trusted traveler program (*see* Table 2). The remaining U.S. ABTC applications approved during the period of analysis will correspond to individuals who concurrently applied, or will concurrently apply, for the U.S. ABTC program and a CBP trusted traveler program. Table 4 summarizes the number of new, initial U.S. ABTC applications approved according to applicants' CBP trusted traveler membership statuses. As illustrated, CBP estimates that 21,000 initial U.S. ABTC members are expected to already be CBP trusted traveler program members prior to applying for a U.S. ABTC between FY 2014 and FY 2018, while 32,000 are not expected to be current members of a CBP trusted traveler program during that period (*see* Table 4).

TABLE 4—PROJECTED NUMBER OF U.S. ABTC APPLICATIONS APPROVED FOR MEMBERS ALREADY AND NOT ALREADY IN A CBP TRUSTED TRAVELER PROGRAM

Fiscal year	Number of initial U.S. ABTC applications approved for members already in a CBP trusted traveler program	Number of initial U.S. ABTC applications approved for members *Not* already in a CBP trusted traveler program	Total initial U.S. ABTC applications approved (*i.e.*, U.S. ABTC program members) (from Table 3)
2014*	2,126	493	2,619
2015	4,976	5,422	10,398
2016**	4,652	10,634	15,286

[25] From June 2014 through December 2015, CBP approved 15,854 U.S. ABTC applications and denied 2,166 U.S. ABTC applications, for an approval rate of 88 percent. Source: Email correspondence with CBP's Office of Field Operations on August 12, 2015 and February 10, 2016.

TABLE 4—PROJECTED NUMBER OF U.S. ABTC APPLICATIONS APPROVED FOR MEMBERS ALREADY AND NOT ALREADY IN A CBP TRUSTED TRAVELER PROGRAM—Continued

Fiscal year	Number of initial U.S. ABTC applications approved for members already in a CBP trusted traveler program	Number of initial U.S. ABTC applications approved for members *Not* already in a CBP trusted traveler program	Total initial U.S. ABTC applications approved (*i.e.*, U.S. ABTC program members) (from Table 3)
2017***	4,652	7,971	12,623
2018***	4,652	7,971	12,623
Total	21,058	32,491	53,549

* Partial year of historical data spanning from the U.S. ABTC Program's effective date of June 12, 2014 to the end of FY 2014.
** Estimate based on historical data spanning from start of October 2015 to December 2015 and data extrapolated for the remaining months of FY 2016.
*** Projection.
Note: Estimates may not sum to total due to rounding.

As previously mentioned, the statute authorizing U.S. ABTC issuance currently expires at the end of FY 2018. Consistent with the U.S. ABTC IFR, CBP estimates that the 2,619 members approved for the U.S. ABTC Program in FY 2014 will renew their memberships in FY 2017 upon the expiration of their three-year validity periods (*see* Table 4). Likewise, CBP estimates that the 10,398 members approved for the U.S. ABTC Program in FY 2015 will renew their memberships in FY 2018 upon the expiration of their three-year validity periods (*see* Table 4). For continued program use after FY 2018, CBP estimates that the 15,286 U.S. ABTC applicants approved in FY 2016 will renew their U.S. ABTC Program memberships in FY 2018 before their initial U.S. ABTC validity periods end (*see* Table 4). As stated in the U.S. ABTC IFR, it is possible that individuals initially approved for the U.S. ABTC Program will change to a job function that does not require conducting APEC business, making them ineligible for a U.S. ABTC. In these cases, CBP assumes that the individual's replacement in that position will enroll in the U.S. ABTC Program, in lieu of the original enrollee, in order to benefit from the expedited immigration process while visiting APEC member economies. Due to the short timeframe between this final rule's implementation and the expiration of the U.S. ABTC Program, CBP does not believe that individuals who enroll in the U.S. ABTC Program between FY 2017 and FY 2018 will renew their memberships during the period of analysis. This is because CBP thinks it is unlikely that these individuals will incur U.S. ABTC application fees and time costs to get less than two years of additional U.S. ABTC use.

Table 5 shows the projected number of U.S. ABTC members who will renew their U.S. ABTC Program memberships during the period of analysis according to their current CBP trusted traveler program membership status. As illustrated, all 28,303 U.S. ABTC applicants approved for memberships prior to FY 2017 will renew their U.S. ABTC memberships by FY 2018's end. In accordance with this rule's extended U.S. ABTC validity period, these members will generally receive U.S. ABTCs that will expire within a five-year validity period lasting up to September 29, 2023. For simplicity of the analysis, CBP counts both the original U.S. ABTC holder who renews and any replacement applicants, if applicable, as a renewal in Table 5. Note that renewals are not forecasted beyond FY 2018 because the statute authorizing the U.S. ABTC expires at the end of that year.

TABLE 5—PROJECTED NUMBER OF U.S. ABTC PROGRAM MEMBERSHIP RENEWALS FOR MEMBERS ALREADY AND NOT ALREADY IN A CBP TRUSTED TRAVELER PROGRAM

Fiscal year	Number of U.S. ABTC renewals from members previously in a CBP trusted traveler program	Number of U.S. ABTC renewals from members *Not* previously in a CBP trusted traveler program	Total U.S. ABTC renewals
2014	.....	.....	.....
2015	.....	.....	.....
2016**	.....	.....	.....
2017***	2,126	493	2,619
2018***	9,628	16,056	25,684
Total	11,754	16,549	28,303

** Estimate based on historical data spanning from start of October 2015 to December 2015 and data extrapolated for the remaining months of FY 2016.
*** Projection.
Note: Estimates may not sum to total due to rounding.

5. Costs

CBP has determined that a $70 fee is necessary to recover its costs associated with the U.S. ABTC Program. These costs include the cost to issue the U.S. ABTCs and the information technology infrastructure costs, initial and recurring, required to run the U.S. ABTC Program.[26] In addition to the U.S. ABTC fee, initial U.S. ABTC applicants will also experience an opportunity cost associated with obtaining a U.S. ABTC. As previously discussed, CBP estimates that new, initial U.S. ABTC applicants who are already members of a CBP trusted traveler program will experience a 1 hour and 10-minute (70-minute) application-related opportunity cost, while U.S. ABTC applicants who are not already members of a CBP trusted traveler program will experience a 1 hour and 40-minute (100-minute) application-related opportunity cost. U.S. ABTC applicants who are not already members of a CBP trusted traveler program are required to pay another fee to join the U.S. ABTC Program—the $100 application fee associated with the Global Entry program.[27] The Department of Transportation's guidance on the valuation of travel time for air passengers estimates a business traveler's value to be $63.16 per hour.[28] Using this estimate as well as the opportunity cost and fees just described, CBP estimates that it will cost a new, initial U.S. ABTC applicant who is already a CBP trusted traveler program member approximately $144 to join the U.S. ABTC Program.[29] For new, initial U.S. ABTC applicants who are not already members of a CBP trusted traveler program, CBP estimates that it will cost approximately $275 to join the U.S. ABTC Program.[30] By applying the U.S. ABTC applicant projections according to CBP trusted traveler program membership statuses (*see* Table 2) to their respective U.S. ABTC application costs ($144 for applicants already in a CBP trusted traveler program and $275 for applicants not already in a CBP trusted traveler program), CBP finds that new, initial U.S. ABTC applicants have incurred or will incur undiscounted costs totaling $13.9 million during this rule's period of analysis (*see* Table 6).

TABLE 6—U.S. ABTC PROGRAM APPLICATION COSTS TO NEW, INITIAL APPLICANTS

[Undiscounted]

Fiscal year	Number of initial U.S. ABTC applicants already in a CBP trusted traveler program (A)	Total application cost for U.S. ABTC applicants already in a CBP trusted traveler program ($144 × A)	Number of initial U.S. ABTC applicants *Not* already in a CBP trusted traveler program (B)	Total application cost for U.S. ABTC applicants *Not* already in a CBP trusted traveler program ($275 × B)
2014	2,126	$306,144	2,477	$681,175
2015	4,976	716,544	8,138	2,237,950
2016	4,652	669,888	9,692	2,665,300
2017	4,652	669,888	9,692	2,665,300
2018	4,652	669,888	9,692	2,665,300
Total	21,058	3,032,352	39,691	10,915,025

As mentioned earlier, CBP estimates that 28,303 U.S. ABTC applicants approved for memberships prior to FY 2017 will successfully renew their U.S. ABTC memberships by FY 2018's end (*see* Table 5). However, these members will incur different renewal costs according to their initial CBP trusted traveler program membership status. U.S. ABTC members already in a CBP trusted traveler program must complete the U.S. ABTC application (*i.e.,* a self-certification) and pay the U.S. ABTC fee using GOES to renew their U.S. ABTC membership. These members will spend an estimated 10 minutes completing such renewal steps, at an opportunity cost of $10.53 per renewal.[31] This contrasts to the IFR's analysis, which assumed that individuals would incur the same time burden when initially

[26] The *Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Fee Study* is posted in the docket for this rulemaking on *www.regulations.gov*.

[27] As previously discussed, CBP anticipates U.S. ABTC applicants who are not already members of a CBP trusted traveler program will join the Global Entry program.

[28] As previously mentioned, this value is based on the U.S. Department of Transportation's (DOT) guidance regarding the valuation of travel time for business travelers in 2013 U.S. dollars, adjusted to 2017 U.S. dollars using the DOT's recommended annual growth rate of one percent. Source: U.S. Department of Transportation, Office of Transportation Policy. *The Value of Travel Time Savings: Departmental Guidance for Conducting Economic Evaluations Revision 2 (2015 Update).* ''Table 4 (Revision 2-corrected): Recommended Hourly Values of Travel Time Savings.'' 2015. Available at *http://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/docs/Revised%20Departmental%20Guidance%20on%20Valuation%20of%20Travel%20Time%20in%20Economic%20Analysis.pdf.* Accessed February 16, 2016.

[29] $63.16 x (70 minutes/60 minutes per hour) = $73.69; $73.69 + $70 U.S. ABTC fee = $143.69, or $144 when rounded to the nearest dollar. CBP estimates that U.S. ABTC applicants who are already in a CBP trusted traveler program will experience an opportunity cost of 10 minutes to complete a self-certification, schedule an appointment at an enrollment center, and have their signature digitally captured. Additionally, CBP estimates these applicants will experience an opportunity cost of 1 hour (60 minutes) to travel to and from an enrollment center and wait to have their signature digitally captured. In total, CBP estimates U.S. ABTC applicants who are already members of a CBP trusted traveler program will experience an opportunity cost of 70 minutes with this rule.

[30] $63.16 x (100 minutes/60 minutes per hour) = $105.27; $105.27 + $100 Global Entry program fee + $70 U.S. ABTC fee = $275.27, or $275 when rounded to the nearest dollar. CBP estimates that U.S. ABTC applicants who are not already in a CBP trusted traveler program will experience an opportunity cost of 40 minutes to complete the Global Entry application and the U.S. ABTC self-certification, schedule their required Global Entry enrollment interview, pay the program application fees, and have their signature digitally captured for the U.S. ABTC Program. Additionally, CBP estimates these applicants will experience an opportunity cost of 1 hour (60 minutes) to travel to and from an enrollment center and complete the interview for Global Entry. In total, CBP estimates U.S. ABTC applicants who are not already members of a CBP trusted traveler program will experience an opportunity cost of 100 minutes with this rule.

[31] $63.16 hourly time for business traveler × (10 minutes/60 minutes per hour) = $10.53.

applying for or renewing a U.S. ABTC. Because the U.S. ABTC Program's initial digital signature capture requirement is generally not necessary for program membership renewal, CBP no longer believes that the time burdens to apply for and renew U.S. ABTC applications are the same. With U.S. ABTC renewals, members will not have to travel to a CBP trusted traveler enrollment center to have their signature digitally captured, thus decreasing their renewal burden assumed in the IFR. Along with the $10.53 renewal opportunity cost, U.S. ABTC applicants who were already members of a CBP trusted traveler program will be required to pay the $70 U.S. ABTC fee upon membership renewal, for a total U.S. ABTC renewal cost of approximately $81.[32] Note that CBP does not consider the costs for current CBP trusted traveler program members to renew their CBP trusted traveler program memberships because they would presumably incur those costs even in the absence of this rule.

Although CBP's trusted traveler program and U.S. ABTC Program validity periods previously differed (five years vs. three years for memberships approved before FY 2017), CBP continues to assume for the simplicity of this analysis that U.S. ABTC applicants who joined a CBP trusted traveler program exclusively for the ability to obtain a U.S. ABTC will concurrently renew their U.S. ABTC and trusted traveler program memberships during the period of analysis. As such, CBP believes that to renew their U.S. ABTC memberships, U.S. ABTC members not previously in a CBP trusted traveler program will concurrently complete the U.S. ABTC application (*i.e.,* a self-certification), Global Entry renewal, and pay the U.S. ABTC and Global Entry fees using GOES. These members will spend an estimated 10 minutes completing such renewal steps, at an opportunity cost of $10.53 per renewal.[33] This burden contrasts to the IFR's analysis, which assumed that individuals would incur the same time burden when initially applying for or renewing a U.S. ABTC. Because the initial CBP trusted traveler program interview and the U.S. ABTC Program's digital signature capture requirements are generally not necessary for program membership renewals, CBP no longer believes that the time burdens to apply for and renew U.S. ABTC applications are the same. With U.S. ABTC renewals, members will not have to travel to a CBP trusted traveler enrollment center to have their signature digitally captured or undergo another interview, thus decreasing their renewal burden assumed in the IFR. Individuals concurrently renewing their U.S. ABTC and Global Entry memberships will also be required to pay the $70 U.S. ABTC fee and the $100 fee associated with the Global Entry program, for a total U.S. ABTC and Global Entry membership renewal cost of about $181.[34]

By applying the U.S. ABTC renewal projections according to CBP trusted traveler program membership statuses (*see* Table 5) to their respective U.S. ABTC membership renewal costs ($81 for applicants already in a CBP trusted traveler program and $181 for applicants not already in a CBP trusted traveler program), CBP finds that U.S. ABTC Program members will incur a total undiscounted cost of $3.9 million to renew their memberships during the period of analysis (*see* Table 7).

TABLE 7—U.S. ABTC PROGRAM RENEWAL COSTS TO MEMBERS

[Undiscounted]

Fiscal year	Number of renewals from members previously in a CBP trusted traveler program (A)	Total renewal cost for members previously in a CBP trusted traveler program ($81 × A)	Number of renewals from members *Not* previously in a CBP trusted traveler program (B)	Total renewal cost from members *Not* previously in a CBP trusted traveler program ($181 × B)
2014	.....	.....	.....	.....
2015	.....	.....	.....	.....
2016	.....	.....	.....	.....
2017	2,126	$172,206	493	$89,233
2018	9,628	779,868	16,056	2,906,136
Total	11,754	952,074	16,549	2,995,369

Accounting for initial application and renewal costs, the total undiscounted cost of this rule is $17.9 million. In present value terms, the overall cost of this rule will range from approximately $18.1 million to $18.3 million from FY 2014 to FY 2018 (*see* Table 8). The total annualized cost of this rule over the period of analysis will equal between $3.4 million and $3.5 million. These estimates vary according to the discount rate applied.

TABLE 8—TOTAL COST OF RULE, FY 2014–FY 2018

[2017 U.S. dollars]

	3% Discount rate	7% Discount rate
Present Value Cost	$18,061,855	$18,319,248

[32] $10.53 opportunity cost to renew U.S. ABTC Program membership + $70 U.S. ABTC fee = $80.53, or $81 when rounded to the nearest dollar.

[33] $63.16 hourly time for business traveler × (10 minutes/60 minutes per hour) = $10.53.

[34] $10.53 opportunity cost to concurrently renew U.S. ABTC and Global Entry Program memberships + $100 Global Entry program fee + $70 U.S. ABTC fee = $180.53, or $181 when rounded to the nearest dollar.

TABLE 8—TOTAL COST OF RULE, FY 2014–FY 2018—Continued

[2017 U.S. dollars]

	3% Discount rate	7% Discount rate
Annualized Cost	3,504,094	3,408,535

6. Benefits

As stated earlier, the U.S. ABTC Program will enable card holders to access fast-track immigration lanes at participating airports in the 20 other APEC member economies. Although the ABTC Program is relatively new for U.S. citizens, it is a well-established program for the other APEC member economies. In an effort to quantify the benefits of the ABTC, APEC commissioned the report ''Reducing Business Travel Costs: The Success of APEC's Business Mobility Initiatives'' (APEC Report).[35] The APEC Report quantified seven key performance indicators, one of which quantifies the time savings an ABTC holder receives by using its fast-track immigration lanes. As shown in Table 9, the time savings each member economy's ABTC holders receive can vary greatly. Like in the U.S. ABTC IFR, CBP believes the weighted average time savings of approximately 43 minutes is an appropriate estimate of the time savings a U.S. ABTC holder will receive when clearing foreign immigration services using the fast-track immigration lanes. To the extent that our estimate understates the time saved by U.S. ABTC holders, the benefits of the rule will be higher. Similarly, to the extent that U.S. ABTC holders are able to catch flights they would have otherwise missed due to lengthy immigration waits, the benefits of this rule will be higher.

TABLE 9—KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR 4—TOTAL TIME SAVINGS CLEARING IMMIGRATION AT THE BORDER BY ABTC HOLDERS

Economy	Average time savings/ABTC holder (minutes)	ABTC holders (2011)	Total time savings by ABTC holders (minutes)
Australia	46.52	24,286	1,129,713
Brunei Darussalam	32.81	43	1,411
Chile	49.33	416	20,520
China	38.74	3,895	150,882
Hong Kong China	26.28	10,659	280,137
Indonesia	60.2	1,495	90,003
Japan	51.49	2,541	130,840
South Korea	43.26	8,422	364,351
Malaysia	66.19	4,140	274,043
Mexico	103.51	185	19,149
New Zealand	48.11	6,538	314,527
Papua New Guinea	27.03	22	595
Peru	40.78	1,277	52,082
Philippines	45.22	476	21,525
Singapore	64.15	8,137	522,013
Thailand	28.94	5,564	161,006
Vietnam	24.29	8,730	212,011
Total	n/a	86,826	3,744,808
Weighted Average	43.13	n/a	n/a

Source: Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. ''Reducing Business Travel Costs: The Success of APEC's Business Mobility Initiatives.'' October 2011. Available at *http://publications.apec.org/publication-detail.php?pub_id=1214*. Accessed May 23, 2012.

As previously discussed, the DOT's guidance regarding the valuation of travel time estimates a business air traveler's value to be $63.16 per hour. Using this hourly time value and the 43 minutes in time savings from the ABTC per trip, CBP estimates each U.S. ABTC holder will save approximately $45 per visit to an APEC member economy.[36] In addition to the time savings per trip to an APEC member economy, CBP estimates a new, initial U.S. ABTC applicant who is not already a CBP trusted traveler member will also save an additional 7 minutes on net, or $7 in opportunity costs, by using a Global Entry kiosk for expedited CBP clearance upon returning to the United States from an APEC economy.[37]

7. Net Benefits

Because participation in the U.S. ABTC Program is voluntary, the perceived benefits of its reduced wait times have to equal or exceed the cost of the program over five years for potential enrollees to determine whether or not the program is worthwhile to join. As previously discussed, CBP estimates that each U.S. ABTC holder will save approximately $45 per trip by using the fast-track immigration lanes in foreign APEC member economies. Although CBP is unable to estimate the number of trips each individual U.S. ABTC holder will

[35] Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. ''Reducing Business Travel Costs: The Success of APEC's Business Mobility Initiatives.'' November 2011. Available at *http://publications.apec.org/publication-detail.php?pub_id=1214*. Accessed May 23, 2012.

[36] $63.16 × (43 minutes/60 minutes per hour) = $45.26, or $45 when rounded to the nearest dollar.

[37] $63.16 × (7 minutes/60 minutes per hour) = $7.37, or $7 when rounded to the nearest dollar. Source: 77 FR 5681, February 6, 2012.

take to an APEC member economy, CBP can estimate the minimum number of trips a U.S. ABTC holder will have to take over the five-year U.S. ABTC validity period for the benefits of initial U.S. ABTC membership to equal or exceed the costs of initially obtaining a U.S. ABTC by using the estimated savings per trip ($45) previously described. CBP estimates that a new, initial U.S ABTC applicant who is already enrolled in a CBP trusted traveler program will need to take a minimum of four trips between the United States and an APEC member economy over five years for the benefits of the U.S. ABTC Program to exceed the costs associated with joining the program.[38] Accounting for the $45 in time savings per trip to an APEC member economy and the $7 in time savings by using a Global Entry kiosk for expedited CBP clearance upon returning to the United States from an APEC economy, CBP estimates that a new, initial U.S. ABTC applicant who is not already a CBP trusted traveler member will need to take a minimum of six trips between the United States and an APEC member economy over five years for the benefits of the U.S. ABTC Program to exceed the costs associated with joining the program and Global Entry.[39] Current U.S. ABTC holders will need to take even fewer trips per year for the benefits of renewing their program memberships to outweigh the costs.

B. The Regulatory Flexibility Act

This section examines the impact of the rule on small entities as required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et. seq.*), as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. A small entity may be a small business (defined as any independently owned and operated business not dominant in its field that qualifies as a small business per the Small Business Act); a small not-for-profit organization; or a small governmental jurisdiction (locality with fewer than 50,000 people). Although this rule regulates people and not businesses, a U.S. citizen is required to be either a bona fide U.S. business person engaged in business in the APEC region or a U.S. Government official actively engaged in APEC business in order to qualify for a U.S. ABTC. Therefore, CBP has considered the impact of this rule on small entities.

The U.S. ABTC Program is voluntary and has an initial application cost of approximately $144 if a U.S. ABTC applicant is a current member of a CBP trusted traveler program or approximately $275 if a U.S. ABTC applicant must concurrently apply for a U.S. ABTC and a CBP trusted traveler program. While the U.S. ABTC applicant will bear the cost associated with obtaining a U.S. ABTC, a business may voluntarily reimburse the applicant for the fee and his or her opportunity cost. CBP cannot estimate the number of small entities that will voluntarily reimburse its employees. CBP recognizes that it is possible that a substantial number of small entities will be impacted by this regulation. However, CBP does not believe an application cost of either $144 or $275, depending on whether a U.S. ABTC applicant is currently enrolled in a CBP trusted traveler program, constitutes a significant economic impact. Moreover, as previously discussed, each U.S. ABTC holder will save approximately 43 minutes, or approximately $45 in opportunity costs, per trip, while new, initial U.S. ABTC applicants who are not already CBP trusted traveler members will also save an additional 7 minutes on net, or $7 in opportunity costs, by using a Global Entry kiosk for expedited CBP clearance upon returning to the United States from an APEC economy. U.S. ABTC Program members can dedicate these time savings to productive, APEC business-related use. After approximately four or six trips to an APEC member economy, the benefits of an ABTC will exceed the full cost of obtaining a U.S. ABTC (fees + opportunity costs). CBP also notes that a one-time expense of $144 or $275, depending on whether the U.S. ABTC applicant is already enrolled in a CBP trusted traveler program, is a fraction of the cost of frequent trans-Pacific travel. Thus, CBP certifies this regulation will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. CBP received no public comments challenging this certification.

C. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions are necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

D. Executive Order 13132

The rule will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the National Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with section 6 of Executive Order 13132, this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a federalism summary impact statement.

E. Paperwork Reduction Act

The collections of information in this document will be submitted for review by OMB in accordance with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3507) under control number 1651–0121. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid control number assigned by OMB. The collections of information in these regulations are contained in Title 8, Part 235 of the CFR. The revisions to OMB clearance 1651–0121 for the U.S. ABTC Program application[40] reflect the following changes:

U.S. ABTC Applications:[41]

[38] (Rounded) $143 U.S. ABTC opportunity cost and fee/$45 savings per trip = 3.2 trips.

[39] (Rounded) $45 fast-track immigration clearance savings + $7 expedited CBP clearance savings from Global Entry = $52 U.S. ABTC holder savings; (Rounded) $274 U.S. ABTC and Global Entry opportunity cost and fees/$52 U.S. ABTC holder savings = 5.3 trips.

[40] Source: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection. Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission: 1651–0121, Trusted Traveler Programs and U.S. APEC Business Travel Card. September 2015. Available at *http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewDocument?ref_nbr=201509-1651-002*. Accessed March 29, 2016.

[41] CBP estimates that a total of 14,344 applicants will initially apply for U.S. ABTC Program membership each year (see ''Executive Order 13563 and Executive Order 12866'' section, Table 2—''Total Initial U.S. ABTC Applications'' in FY 2017). However, as described in the ''Executive Order 13563 and Executive Order 12866'' section above, an estimated 4,652 of these applicants will already be current CBP trusted traveler program members, while 9,692 will not. Because the U.S. ABTC Program application requirements differ according to an applicant's CBP trusted traveler program membership status, the U.S. ABTC application time burdens for individuals will differ. The estimated 4,652 U.S. ABTC applicants who are already CBP trusted traveler program members will incur a time burden of 10 minutes to complete the U.S. ABTC self-certification and have their signature digitally captured at a CBP trusted traveler enrollment center for their U.S. ABTC application. These U.S. ABTC application estimates account for the 4,652 individuals who are already in a CBP trusted traveler program and their related U.S. ABTC application burdens. CBP considers the remaining additional burden to the 9,692 individuals who will concurrently apply for an initial U.S. ABTC and a CBP trusted traveler program membership in the following ''Global Entry Applications'' estimates. Additionally, CBP estimates that a total of 2,619 existing U.S. ABTC Program members will choose to renew their U.S. ABTC memberships and Global Entry memberships (if they were not already in a CBP trusted traveler program at the time of their initial ABTC application) (see ''Executive Order 13563 and Executive Order 12866'' section, Table

Increase in estimated number of annual respondents: 1,643.

Increase in estimated number of annual responses: 1,643.

Estimated average time burden per response: 10 minutes (0.17 hours).

Increase in estimated total annual time burden: 279 hours.

Initial U.S. ABTC applicants who join Global Entry to meet a U.S. ABTC Program membership requirement increased the number of Global Entry applications and burden hours as follows:

Global Entry Applications: [42]

Increase in estimated number of annual respondents: 2,099.

Increase in estimated number of annual responses: 2,099.

Estimated average time burden per response: 40 minutes (0.67 hours).

Increase in estimated total annual time burden: 1,407 hours.

Approved U.S. ABTC members who joined Global Entry for their U.S. ABTC Program membership also increased the Global Entry kiosk usage rate and burden hours through their use of the kiosks for expedited CBP clearance upon returning to the United States from an APEC economy. The additional Global Entry kiosk burden hours directly resulting from the U.S. ABTC Program are as follows:

Global Entry Kiosk Use: [43]

Increase in estimated number of annual respondents: 11,106.

Increase in estimated number of annual responses: 22,212.

Estimated average time burden per response: 1 minute (0.016 hours).

Increase in estimated total annual time burden: 356 hours.

F. Privacy

DHS will ensure that all Privacy Act requirements and policies are adhered to in the implementation of this rule. In this regard, DHS has updated the Privacy Impact Assessment for the Global Enrollment System (GES) on November 1, 2016, which fully outlines processes to ensure compliance with Privacy Act protections relevant to this rule. *See https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/privacy-pia-cbp-ges-november2016.pdf.*

VII. Authority

This regulation is issued under the authority of 5 U.S.C. 301, 6 U.S.C. 112, 203 and 211, 8 U.S.C. 1103 and 19 U.S.C. 2, 66 and 1624, and Public Law 112–54.

List of Subjects in 8 CFR Part 235

Administrative practice and procedure, Aliens, Immigration, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Amendments to Regulations

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, the IFR amending 8 CFR 103.7(b)(1)(ii)(N) and adding a new section 235.13, which was published at 79 FR 27161 on May 13, 2014, is adopted as final with the following changes:

PART 235—INSPECTION OF PERSONS APPLYING FOR ADMISSION

■ 1. The authority citation for part 235 continues to read as follows: 8 U.S.C. 1101 and note, 1103, 1183, 1185 (pursuant to E.O.13323, 69 FR 241, 3 CFR, 2004 Comp., p.278), 1201, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1228, 1365a note, 1365b, 1379, 1731–32; Title VII of Public Law 110–229; 8 U.S.C. 1185 note (section 7209 of Pub. L. 108–458); Public Law 112–54.

§ 235.13 [Amended]

■ 2. Amend § 235.13 as follows:

■ a. In paragraph (c)(6), first sentence, remove the number ''3'' and add in its place the word ''five'' and remove the words ''suspended or'';

■ b. Revise the paragraph (f) subject heading to read ''Denial and removal'';

■ c. In paragraph (f)(2) introductory text, first sentence, remove the words ''suspended or'';

■ d. In paragraph (f)(3), first and second sentences, remove the words ''suspension or'';

■ e. In paragraph (f)(4), remove '', suspended,'';

■ f. In paragraph (g)(1), remove all occurrences of the phrase ''denial, suspension or removal'' and add in its place ''denial or removal'' and remove the words ''date of suspension or removal'' and add in their place ''date of removal'';

■ g. In paragraph (g)(2), remove the phrase ''denial, suspension or removal'' and add in its place ''denial or removal''; and

■ h. In paragraph (h), second sentence, remove the words ''suspended or''.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Jeh Charles Johnson,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28177 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111–14–P

5— ''Total U.S. ABTC Renewals'' in FY 2017). For the purposes of this information collection, CBP includes the renewal figures in the overall U.S. ABTC application estimates because the burden for initial U.S. ABTC Program application and renewal are both assumed to be 10 minutes.

[42] Individuals interested in joining the U.S. ABTC Program who are not already CBP trusted traveler members will need to initially apply for a CBP trusted traveler program membership to meet one of the U.S. ABTC Program's membership requirements. CBP estimates that the 9,692 initial applicants who are not already in a CBP trusted traveler program will concurrently apply for the U.S. ABTC Program and CBP's Global Entry trusted traveler program, incurring a 40-minute time burden to complete the Global Entry application, complete the U.S. ABTC self-certification, schedule their required Global Entry enrollment interview, pay the program application fees, and have their signature digitally captured for the U.S. ABTC Program. These initial Global Entry application estimates account for the 9,692 individuals who are not already in a CBP trusted traveler program and their related U.S. ABTC application burdens.

[43] CBP now estimates that by the end of FY 2017, 24,520 individuals who were not already members of a CBP trusted traveler program will become joint members of the U.S. ABTC Program and Global Entry (see ''Executive Order 13563 and Executive Order 12866'' section, Table 4— ''Number of Initial U.S. ABTC Applications Approved for Members Not Already in a CBP Trusted Traveler Program'' in FY 2014–FY 2017). Due to data limitations, CBP assumes that these 24,520 U.S. ABTC Program members will use Global Entry kiosks twice per year as this is the minimum number of annual trips one of these members would have to take for the benefits of joining the U.S. ABTC Program to outweigh its costs. This translates to an additional 49,040 kiosk responses per year. These Global Entry kiosk use estimates account for the 49,040 kiosk responses and the related burdens.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

12 CFR Part 209

[Regulation I; Docket No. R–1533]

RIN 7100–AE 47

Federal Reserve Bank Capital Stock

AGENCY: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Board of Governors (Board) is adopting, in final form and without change, an interim final rule amending Regulation I. The final rule establishes procedures for payment of dividends by the Federal Reserve Banks (Reserve Banks) to implement the provisions of section 32203 of the ''Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act.'' The final rule sets out the dividend rates applicable to Reserve Bank depository institution stockholders and amends provisions of Regulation I regarding treatment of accrued dividends when a Reserve Bank issues or cancels Federal Reserve Bank capital stock.

DATES: This final rule is effective on January 1, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Evan Winerman, Counsel (202–872–7578), Legal Division; or Kimberly Zaikov, Financial Project Leader (202/452–2256), Reserve Bank Operations and Payments Systems Division. Users of Telecommunication Device for Deaf (TDD) only, call (202) 263–4869.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Overview

Regulation I governs the issuance and cancellation of capital stock by the Reserve Banks. Under section 5 of the Federal Reserve Act [1] and Regulation I,[2] a member bank must subscribe to capital stock of the Reserve Bank of its district in an amount equal to six percent of the member bank's capital and surplus. The member bank must pay for one-half of this subscription on the date that the Reserve Bank approves its application for capital stock, while the remaining half of the subscription shall be subject to call by the Board.[3]

Prior to January 1, 2016, all member banks were entitled to a six percent dividend on their paid-in capital stock. As of January 1, 2016, the ''Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act'' (''FAST Act'') [4] amended section 7(a)(1) of the Federal Reserve Act [5] to provide that stockholders with more than $10 billion in total consolidated assets shall receive a dividend on paid-in capital stock equal to the *lesser* of six percent and ''the rate equal to the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the last auction held prior to the payment of such dividend,'' while stockholders with $10 billion or less in total consolidated assets shall continue to receive a six percent dividend. The FAST Act also provides that the Board must adjust the $10 billion threshold for total consolidated assets annually to reflect the change in the Gross Domestic Product Price Index, published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

On February 24, 2016, the Board published an interim final rule and request for comment in the **Federal Register** (81 FR 9082) that amends Regulation I to implement section 32203 of the FAST Act. The interim final rule allowed the Reserve Banks to continue their practice of making semi-annual dividend payments, although at a new rate for larger institutions.

In addition, Regulation I contains provisions with respect to the treatment of accrued dividends when a Reserve Bank issues new stock or cancels existing stock. These Regulation I provisions implement portions of sections 5, 6, and 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, which were not amended by the FAST Act. Section 5 provides that (1) when a Reserve Bank issues new shares to a stockholder, the stockholder must pay the Reserve Bank for accrued dividends at a monthly rate of one-half of one percent from the last dividend and, correspondingly, (2) when a stockholder reduces or liquidates its holding of Reserve Bank stock, the Reserve Bank must pay the stockholder for accrued dividends at a monthly rate of one-half of one percent from the last dividend. Similarly, sections 6 and 9(10) of the Federal Reserve Act state that, when a member bank becomes insolvent or voluntarily withdraws from Reserve Bank membership, the Reserve Bank shall pay accrued dividends on the bank's cancelled stock at a monthly rate of one-half of one percent. Prior to the amendments published in the interim final rule, Regulation I adopted the approach described in sections 5, 6, and 9(10) of the Federal Reserve Act, providing in §§ 209.4(d) and 209.4(e)(1) that dividends for subscriptions to, and cancellations of, Reserve Bank stock shall accrue at a monthly rate of one-half of one percent. As discussed below, the interim final rule adjusted the accrued dividend rates for larger institutions to be consistent with the rate adopted in the FAST Act.

II. Summary of Comments Received and Final Rule

A. Public Comments

The Board received nine comments on the interim final rule: One from a trade association representing commercial banks; one from a small commercial bank; and seven from individual members of the public. The trade association and the commercial bank expressed concerns regarding Congress's decision to lower the statutory dividend rate for banks with more than $10 billion in total consolidated assets, while other commenters supported Congress's decision. None of the commenters suggested specific changes to the text of the interim final rule.

B. Description of Final Rule

1. Dividend Payment Rate

Like the interim final rule, the final rule amends Regulation I to include a new paragraph, § 209.4(e), addressing the rate for dividend payments by the Reserve Banks. Section 209.4(e)(1)(i) implements the FAST Act provision requiring that banks with more than $10 billion in total consolidated assets receive a dividend on their Reserve Bank capital stock at an annual rate of the lesser of six percent and the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the last auction held prior to the payment of the dividend. Section 209.4(e)(1)(ii) provides that banks with $10 billion or less in total consolidated assets will continue to receive a dividend at an annual rate of six percent. Section 209.4(e)(3) provides that dividends are cumulative, as required by section 7 of the Federal Reserve Act.

Section 209.4(e)(2) provides that each dividend ''will be adjusted to reflect the period from the last dividend payment date to the current dividend payment date according to the dividend proration basis.'' Section 209.1(d)(2) in turn defines ''dividend proration basis'' as ''the use of a 360-day year of 12 30-day months for purposes of computing dividend payments.'' Thus, under the interim final rule, a semi-annual dividend payment to a stockholder with $10 billion or less in total consolidated assets continues to be calculated as three percent of paid-in capital. A semi-annual dividend payment to a stockholder with more than $10 billion in total consolidated assets would be calculated as the lesser of three percent or one-half of the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the last auction held prior to the payment of the dividend.

2. Payment of Accrued Dividends for Subscriptions to Reserve Bank Stock

Section 5 of the Federal Reserve Act requires that member banks subscribe to new stock of the appropriate Reserve Bank whenever the member bank increases its own capital stock, so as to maintain an investment in Federal Reserve Bank stock equal to 3 percent of the member bank's capital and surplus. Banks also become member banks throughout the year.

As discussed above, section 5 of the Federal Reserve Act provides that, when a stockholder subscribes to new capital stock, it must pay for accrued dividends on that new stock at a monthly rate of one-half of one percent from the last dividend (*i.e.,* a monthly rate derived from a six percent annual rate). Prior to the amendments published in the interim final rule, Regulation I adopted the same approach. This requirement ensures that the stockholder will not be overcompensated at the next dividend payment, because the stockholder has paid in advance for the portion of the stockholder's next dividend payment attributable to the period for which the member bank did not own the stock.

Although section 5 of the Federal Reserve Act continues to provide that a stockholder should pay for accrued dividends at a monthly rate of one-half of one percent from the last dividend, section 7 of the Federal Reserve Act now provides that stockholders with more than $10 billion in total

[1] 12 U.S.C. 287.

[2] 12 CFR 209.4(a).

[3] 12 U.S.C. 287 and 12 CFR 209.4(c)(2).

[4] Public Law 114–94, 129 Stat. 1312 (2015). *See https://www.congress.gov/114/bills/hr22/BILLS-114hr22enr.pdf/.*

[5] 12 U.S.C. 289(a)(1).

consolidated assets will receive an annual dividend at the lesser of six percent and the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the last auction held prior to the payment of the dividend. Applying sections 5 and 7 literally could cause a larger stockholder to overpay for accrued dividends if it paid at a rate based on a six percent annual rate but received its next dividend payment at an annual rate *below* six percent (assuming the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note at the applicable auction was below six percent).

Like the interim final rule, the final rule reconciles the conflict between sections 5 and 7 of the Federal Reserve Act by requiring that a stockholder with more than $10 billion in total consolidated assets pay for accrued dividends at an annual rate of the lesser of six percent and the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the last auction held prior to the previous dividend payment date (that is, the rate used for the previous dividend payment to stockholders with more than $10 billion in total consolidated assets), prorated to cover the period between the last dividend payment date and the date of subscription. This approach allows a larger stockholder to pay for accrued dividends at a rate that is generally close to the dividend rate the stockholder will earn at the next dividend payment. This approach also resolves the statutory conflict in favor of giving effect to the most recent Congressional act regarding the payment of dividends as provided in the FAST Act. Conversely, the interim final rule provided that stockholders with $10 billion or less in total consolidated assets will continue to pay for accrued dividends at an annual rate of six percent (prorated to cover the period between the last dividend payment date and the date of subscription), as those stockholders will continue to receive a six percent annual dividend. This approach is adopted in the final rule without change.

The final rule also provides at § 209.4(c)(3) for an adjustment at the next annual dividend if a stockholder pays for accrued dividends at a rate that is different from the annualized rate that the stockholder ultimately receives at the next scheduled dividend payment date. This adjustment equals the difference between the accrued dividends the stockholder paid for the additional subscription and the portion of the next dividend payment attributable to that additional subscription, prorated to cover the period from the last dividend payment date to the subscription date.

3. Payment of Accrued Dividends for Cancellations of Reserve Bank Stock

Section 5 of the Federal Reserve Act requires that a member bank seek redemption of its Federal Reserve Bank stock as the capital of the member bank declines, so as to maintain an investment in Federal Reserve Bank stock equal to 3 percent of the member bank's capital and surplus. Banks also relinquish membership throughout the year.

As discussed above, three provisions of the Federal Reserve Act (sections 5, 6, and 9(10)) state that, when a Reserve Bank cancels stock, the Reserve Bank shall pay the stockholder for accrued dividends at a monthly rate of one-half of one percent from the last dividend (*i.e.,* a monthly rate derived from a six percent annual rate). Prior to the amendments published in the interim final rule, Regulation I adopted the same approach. Sections 5, 6, and 9(10) of the Federal Reserve Act now conflict with section 7 of the Federal Reserve Act, which provides (following passage of the FAST Act) that stockholders with more than $10 billion in total consolidated assets will receive an annual dividend at the lesser of six percent and the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the last auction held prior to the payment of the dividend.

The final rule reconciles sections 5, 6, and 9(10) of the Federal Reserve Act with section 7 of the Federal Reserve Act by requiring the Reserve Banks to pay accrued dividends to stockholders with more than $10 billion of total consolidated assets at an annual rate of the lesser of six percent and the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the last auction held prior to the date of cancellation, prorated to cover the period between the last dividend payment date and the date of cancellation. As noted above, this approach also resolves the statutory conflict between sections 5, 6, and 9(10), on the one hand, and section 7 on the other, in favor of the most recent Congressional act regarding dividends expressed in the FAST Act. Conversely, the final rule provides that, when a Reserve Bank cancels stock of a stockholder with $10 billion or less in total consolidated assets, the Reserve Bank will pay the stockholder for accrued dividends at an annual rate of six percent (prorated to cover the period between the last dividend payment date and the date of cancellation), as those stockholders will continue to receive a six percent annual dividend.

4. Total Consolidated Assets: Definition and Inflation Adjustment

The dividend rate to which a stockholder is entitled under Section 7 of the Federal Reserve Act (as amended by the FAST Act) depends on the stockholder's ''total consolidated assets.'' The final rule amends Regulation I to include a new paragraph, § 209.1(d)(3), that generally defines total consolidated assets by reference to total assets reported on the stockholder's most recent December 31 Consolidated Report of Condition and Income (Call Report).[6] When a bank joins the Federal Reserve System or when a member bank merges with another entity and the surviving bank continues to be a Reserve Bank stockholder, the bank may have never filed a year-end call report, or its most recent year-end call report may not accurately reflect the institution's size. Accordingly, the new member bank or the surviving bank must report whether its total consolidated assets exceed $10 billion in its application for capital stock, which would be shortly after the transaction or the date that the bank becomes a member bank. To that end, the final rule amends § 209.2(a) to require that a bank seeking to join the Federal Reserve System report whether its total consolidated assets exceed $10 billion in its application for capital stock. Similarly, the final rule adds a new paragraph, § 209.3(d)(3), that requires a surviving bank to report whether its total consolidated assets exceed $10 billion when it submits its next application for additional capital stock.

Section 7(a)(1)(C) of the Federal Reserve Act (added by the FAST Act) requires that the Board make an annual inflation adjustment to the total consolidated asset threshold that determines the dividend rate to which a Reserve Bank is entitled. The final rule implements this provision at § 209.4(f). The Board expects to make this adjustment using the final second quarter estimate of the Gross Domestic Product Price Index for each year, published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

III. Regulatory Analysis

A. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

In accordance with section 604 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (''RFA''), 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.,* the Board is publishing a final regulatory flexibility analysis for the final rule. The RFA

[6] The Board has also moved, without revision, the definition of ''capital stock and surplus'' to the definitions in new § 209.1(d).

generally requires an agency to assess the impact a rule is expected to have on small entities. Under size standards established by the Small Business Administration, banks and other depository institutions are considered ''small'' if they have less than $550 million in assets.[7] The RFA requires an agency either to provide a regulatory flexibility analysis or to certify that the final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The final rule implements amendments to the Federal Reserve Act that provide that Reserve Bank stockholders with more than $10 billion in total consolidated assets will receive a dividend at an annual rate equal to the lower of six percent and the high yield of the 10-year Treasury note auctioned at the last auction held prior to the payment of such dividend (with such dividend prorated to cover the period between the last dividend payment date and the current dividend payment date). The final rule also provides that, if a Reserve Bank cancels stock of a stockholder with more than $10 billion in total consolidated assets, the Reserve Bank will pay the stockholder accrued dividends at an annual rate of the lesser of six percent and the high yield of the most recent 10-year Treasury note auction held prior to the date of cancellation, prorated to cover the period between the last dividend payment date and the cancellation date. Finally, the final rule provides that, if a Reserve Bank issues new stock to a stockholder with more than $10 billion in total consolidated assets, the stockholder will pay accrued dividends on such stock at an annual rate of the lesser of six percent and the high yield of the most recent 10-year Treasury note auction held prior to the previous dividend payment date (prorated to cover the period between the last dividend payment date and the subscription date). The next regular dividend payment to that stockholder would be adjusted to account for the difference between the rate at which the stockholder paid for accrued dividends and the rate at which the stockholder receives the regular dividend payment.

Under the final rule, Reserve Bank stockholders with $10 billion or less in total consolidated assets will continue to receive a dividend on their Reserve Bank stock at an annual rate of six percent (prorated to cover the period between the last dividend payment and the current dividend payment). If a Reserve Bank issues new stock to, or cancels existing stock of, a stockholder with $10 billion or less in total consolidated assets, the stockholder or the Reserve Bank would (respectively) continue to pay accrued dividends on such stock at an annual rate of six percent (prorated to cover the period between the last dividend payment date and the subscription date or the cancellation date). Additionally, the final rule continues to allow Reserve Banks to pay dividends semiannually to all stockholders, including banks with $10 billion or less in total consolidated assets. The Board received no public comments in response to the initial regulatory flexibility analysis, nor did it receive comments from the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

The only new requirement that the final rule imposes on stockholders with $10 billion or less in total consolidated assets is that such a stockholder must report whether its total consolidated assets exceed $10 billion when the stockholder applies for (1) new capital stock upon joining the Federal Reserve System or (2) additional capital stock upon merging with another entity. Excluding these two situations, a Reserve Bank will determine the total consolidated assets of all stockholders by reference to the stockholder's most recent December 31 Call Report. The final rule requires the Board to make an annual inflation adjustment to the $10 billion total consolidated asset threshold.

As noted above, a depository institution is ''small'' for purposes of the RFA if it has less than $550 million of assets. The final rule has no effect on small institutions. The Board expects that existing banks and banks that are in the process of organization can readily calculate their total consolidated assets to know if they are a large institution covered by the amendments. The Board currently requires that a bank file an application form with the Reserve Bank in whose district it is located if the bank wishes to join the Federal Reserve System or if the bank must increase or decrease its holding of Reserve Bank stock.[8] The Board is revising these forms to require that, when a bank applies for membership or applies for new stock after merging with another entity, the bank report whether its total consolidated assets exceed $10 billion.

The RFA requires a description of why the agency rejected any significant alternatives that would have affected the impact of the rule on small entities. In this circumstance, there is no feasible alternative to requiring that a bank in the process of organization report whether its total consolidated assets exceed $10 billion when it applies to join the System, because such banks will not have filed a Call Report before applying for membership. With respect to measuring the total consolidated assets of a surviving bank after a merger, the Reserve Banks could alternatively (1) refer to the total assets reported by the surviving bank on its most recent December 31 Call Report or (2) add the total assets of the surviving bank and the nonsurviving bank as reported on each bank's most recent December 31 Call Report. These alternative approaches to measuring total consolidated assets in the merger context would reduce the reporting burden on small entities, but they would not provide timely and accurate notice to a Reserve Bank of whether a merger has caused a surviving bank's total consolidated assets to exceed $10 billion. The Board believes that requiring surviving banks to report whether total consolidated assets exceed $10 billion when they apply for additional capital stock is a minimal reporting burden of an amount that is known by the banks and serves the intent of the FAST Act.

B. Paperwork Reduction Act Analysis

In accordance with section 3512 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3521) (PRA), the Board may not conduct or sponsor, and a respondent is not required to respond to, an information collection unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. The OMB control numbers are 7100–0042 and 7100–0046. The Board reviewed the final rule under the authority delegated to the Board by OMB. The final rule contains requirements subject to the PRA. The reporting requirements are found in §§ 209.2(a) and 209.3(d)(3). The Board received no comments on the PRA analysis in the interim final rule.

The Board has a continuing interest in the public's opinions of collections of information. At any time, comments regarding the burden estimate, or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, may be sent to: Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 20th and C

[7] 13 CFR 121.201.

[8] *See* FR 2030 (application for capital stock for organizing national banks); FR 2030A (application for capital stock for nonmember state banks that are converting to national banks); FR 2083A (application for capital stock by state banks (except mutual savings banks) and national banks that are converting to state banks); FR 2083B (application for capital stock by mutual savings banks); FR 2056 (application for adjustment in holding of Reserve Bank stock).

Streets NW., Washington, DC 20551. A copy of the comments may also be submitted to the OMB desk officer (1) by mail to U.S. Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street NW., 10235, Washington, DC 20503; (2) by facsimile to 202–395–6974; or (3) by email to: *oira_submission@omb.eop.gov,* Attention, Federal Reserve Board Agency Desk Officer.

Proposed Revisions, With Extension for Three Years, of the Following Information Collections

(1) *Title of Information Collection:* Applications for Subscription to, Adjustment in Holding of, and Cancellation of Federal Reserve Bank Stock.

Agency Form Number: FR 2030, FR 2030a, FR 2056, FR 2086, FR 2086a, FR 2087.

OMB Control Number: 7100–0042.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit.

Respondents: National, State Member, and Nonmember banks.

Abstract: These application forms are required by the Federal Reserve Act and Regulation I. These forms must be used by a new or existing member bank (including a national bank) to request the issuance, and adjustment in, or cancellation of Federal Reserve Bank stock. The forms must contain certain certifications by the applicants, as well as certain other financial and shareholder data that is needed by the Federal Reserve to process the request.

Current Actions: The dividend rate to which a Reserve Bank stockholder is entitled under section 7 of the Federal Reserve Act (as amended by the FAST Act) depends on the stockholder's ''total consolidated assets.'' Section 209.2(a) requires a bank to report whether its total consolidated assets exceed $10 billion when it applies for membership in the Federal Reserve System. Section 209.3(d)(3) requires a bank to report whether its total consolidated assets exceed $10 billion when it applies for additional capital stock after merging with another entity. The Board is proposing to revise FR 2030, FR 2030a, and FR 2056 to require that a bank report whether its total consolidated assets exceed $10 billion when it applies to join the Federal Reserve System or applies for additional capital stock after merging with another entity. The proposed revisions would increase the estimated average hours per response for FR 2030 and FR 2030a by half an hour. The proposed revisions would increase the estimated average hours per response for FR 2056 by one quarter of an hour. The Board is not proposing to revise FR 2086, FR 2086A, and FR 2087. The draft reporting forms are available on the Board's public Web site at *http://www.federalreserve.gov/apps/reportforms/review.aspx.*

Estimated annual reporting hours: FR 2030: 4 hours; FR 2030a: 2 hours; FR 2056: 1,000 hours; FR 2086: 5 hours; FR 2086a: 40 hours; FR 2087: 1 hour.

Estimated average hours per response: FR 2030: 1 hour; FR 2030a: 1 hour; FR 2056: 0.75 hours; FR 2086: 0.5 hours; FR 2086a: 0.5 hours; FR 2087: 0.5 hours.

Number of respondents: FR 2030: 4; FR 2030a: 2; FR 2056: 1,333; FR 2086: 10; FR 2086a: 79; FR 2087: 1.

(2) *Title of Information Collection:* Application for Membership in the Federal Reserve System.

Agency Form Number: FR 2083, FR 2083A, FR 2083B, and FR 2083C.

OMB Control Number: 7100–0046.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit.

Respondents: Newly organized banks that seek to become state member banks, or existing banks or savings institutions that seek to convert to state member bank status.

Abstract: The application for membership is a required one-time submission that collects the information necessary for the Federal Reserve to evaluate the statutory criteria for admission of a new or existing state bank into membership in the Federal Reserve System. The application collects managerial, financial, and structural data.

Current Actions: The dividend rate to which a Reserve Bank stockholder is entitled under Section 7 of the Federal Reserve Act (as amended by the FAST Act) depends on the stockholder's ''total consolidated assets.'' Section 209.2(a) requires a bank to report whether its total consolidated assets exceed $10 billion when it applies for membership in the Federal Reserve System. The Board is proposing to revise FR 2083A and FR 2083B to require that a bank report whether its total consolidated assets exceed $10 billion when it applies to join the Federal Reserve System. The proposed revisions would increase the estimated average hours per response by half an hour. The Board is not proposing to revise FR 2083 or FR 2083C. The draft reporting forms are available on the Board's public Web site at *http://www.federalreserve.gov/apps/reportforms/review.aspx.* The estimated annual reporting hours listed below, and the estimated average hours per response, are cumulative totals for FR 2083, FR 2083A, FR 2083B, and FR 2083C.

Estimated annual reporting hours: 207 hours.

Estimated average hours per response: 4.5 hours.

Number of respondents: 46.

List of Subjects in 12 CFR Part 209

Banks and banking, Federal Reserve System, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Securities.

PART 209—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK CAPITAL STOCK (REGULATION I)

Accordingly, the interim final rule amending 12 CFR part 209, which was published at 81 FR 9082 on February 24, 2016, is adopted as a final rule without change.

By order of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, November 18, 2016.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2016–28231 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

15 CFR Part 902

50 CFR Part 660

[Docket No. 140905757–6999–02]

RIN 0648–BE42

Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Commercial Sablefish Fishing Regulations and Electronic Fish Tickets

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule revises fishery monitoring and equipment requirements for all commercial groundfish fisheries. In particular, it establishes a requirement for submitting electronic fish tickets (EFT) in the limited entry fixed gear fisheries and open access fisheries. This final rule also: revises administrative procedures for limited entry permits, providing greater flexibility and efficiencies for limited entry groundfish fishery participants; requires vessels registered to Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) to make an initial declaration report; and makes administrative changes and clarifying edits to improve consistency of the regulations with past Pacific Fishery

Management Council (Council) actions and with the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP). This action improves monitoring and administration of the limited entry sablefish primary fishery, and addresses unforeseen issues arising out of the evolution of commercial sablefish fisheries and subsequent regulations.

DATES: This rule is effective December 23, 2016, except for the amendments to § 660.212(a)(3) through (5) and § 660.312(a)(3) through (5), which will be effective January 1, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Background information and documents are available at the Pacific Fishery Management Council's Web site at *http://www.pcouncil.org/.* NMFS prepared a Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA), which is summarized in the Classification section of this final rule. Copies of the FRFA and the Small Entity Compliance Guide are available from William W. Stelle, Jr., Regional Administrator, West Coast Region, NMFS, 7600 Sand Point Way NE., Seattle, WA 98115–0070; or by phone at 206–526–6150. Copies of the Small Entity Compliance Guide are also available on the West Coast Regional Office Web site at *http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/.*

Written comments regarding the burden-hour estimates or other aspects of the collection-of-information requirements contained in this final rule may be submitted to William W. Stelle, Jr., Regional Administrator, West Coast Region, NMFS, 7600 Sand Point Way NE., Seattle, WA 98115–0070, and to OMB by email to *OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gretchen Hanshew, 206–526–6147, *gretchen.hanshew@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Summary of Major Actions

This final rule improves the timeliness and accuracy of sablefish catch reporting in the limited entry fixed gear fisheries and open access fisheries, provides more flexibility and efficiencies for harvesters in the Shorebased Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) Program and limited entry fixed gear fisheries, and implements several administrative and clarifying changes to monitoring and permitting provisions of regulations for all of the limited entry and open access commercial groundfish fisheries on the West Coast.

This final rule contains eight major actions, along with related minor clarifications and non-substantive changes. The first action is a new requirement for electronic fish tickets to be submitted for all commercial landings of sablefish delivered to Washington, Oregon and California fish buyers. The second action provides qualified vessel owners an opportunity to apply for an exemption to the ownership limitation of three permits in the limited entry sablefish primary fishery. The third action allows a single vessel to be simultaneously (jointly) registered to multiple limited entry permits, one of which may have a trawl gear endorsement. The fourth action prohibits vessels that have been granted an at-sea processing exemption for sablefish in the limited entry fixed gear fishery from processing sablefish at sea when that vessel is participating in the Shorebased IFQ Program. The fifth action clarifies that, consistent with FMP Amendment 6, sablefish catch in incidental open access fisheries is counted against the open access allocation, and is not deducted from the commercial harvest guideline. The sixth action requires any vessel that has a VMS registered with NMFS Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) to submit a declaration report with OLE. The seventh action updates and simplifies equipment requirements for electronic fish tickets. The eighth action clarifies existing regulatory language prohibiting the retention of groundfish species taken in the limited entry fixed gear fishery beyond the allowable quota. In addition, the action includes housekeeping changes that are intended to better align the regulations with defined terms, and to provide clarity and consistency between paragraphs.

Background

The groundfish fisheries in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) off the west coast of the United States are managed under the FMP. The FMP was prepared by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) as amended by the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2004 (Pub. L. 108–199, section 801). Regulations implementing provisions of the FMP are located at 50 CFR part 660, subparts C through G.

This final rule includes several actions that revise regulations for commercial fisheries that harvest sablefish. These regulatory changes apply to the Shorebased IFQ Program, the limited entry fixed gear fishery, which includes the limited entry sablefish primary fishery and the daily trip limit (DTL) fishery, and the open access fishery. A more detailed description of the fisheries affected by this rulemaking, and the major provisions of this action, is contained in the June 1, 2016, proposed rule (81 FR 34947).

1. Electronic Fish Ticket Requirement

This final rule includes a Federal electronic fish ticket submittal requirement for all commercial groundfish deliveries that include sablefish. An electronic fish ticket is a web-based form used to send groundfish landing data to the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC). Electronic fish tickets are used to collect information similar to the information required in state fish receiving tickets or landing receipts (henceforth referred to as paper tickets), but do not replace or change any state requirements. This requirement will improve the timeliness and accuracy of catch data for monitoring harvest relative to applicable tier limits in the limited entry fixed gear sablefish fishery and trip limits in the limited entry fixed gear and open access DTL fisheries. Electronic fish tickets have been required for IFQ species since the start of the Shorebased IFQ Program in 2011, and have allowed vessel owners/operators, buyers and dealers, and fishery managers timely access to catch information. This final rule expands the use of electronic fish tickets to the limited entry fixed gear and open access fisheries, and is expected to have similar benefits regarding timely access to catch data.

2. Exemption to Limited Entry Sablefish Permit Ownership Limitation

Regulations (§ 660.25(b)(3)(iv)(C)) state that no individual person, partnership, or corporation in combination may have ownership interest in or hold more than three permits with sablefish endorsements either simultaneously or cumulatively over the primary season (hereby referred to as ''ownership limitation''). This ownership limitation was intended to prevent concentration of harvest privileges in the Pacific coast sablefish primary fishery. However, this restriction has led to unforeseen complications because many persons, partnerships and corporations have harvest privileges in both the Alaska IFQ sablefish fishery and the Pacific coast sablefish fishery. Under the existing regulations, Alaska IFQ holders are required to have a partial ownership interest in a vessel that fishes for their IFQ. These IFQ holders are deemed to hold any Pacific Coast permits with sablefish endorsements associated with a vessel in which they have an ownership interest. This has resulted in Alaska IFQ holders being ''limited out'' in the Pacific Coast sablefish primary fishery, even though they do not benefit

from the permits associated with the vessels in which they have an interest. The Council recommended, and NMFS is implementing through this final rule, a process by which vessel owners who meet certain qualifying criteria may petition NMFS for a limited exemption to the ownership limitation, as described in detail in the preamble to the proposed rule

3. Joint Registration

Originally, the license limitation program (LLP), implemented through Amendment 6 to the FMP (57 FR 54001, November 16, 1992, see also the EA under **ADDRESSES** for more information on the LLP), allowed vessels to register both a trawl and fixed gear (longline and fishpot) endorsed permit at the same time. Subsequently, regulations were modified and no longer allow vessels to register multiple limited entry permits unless the permits are sablefish-endorsed and stacked for use in the limited entry fixed gear sablefish primary fishery. This restriction was put in place to keep trawl and fixed gear fisheries temporally separated to meet enforcement and monitoring needs. In 2004, a vessel monitoring program was implemented that allowed vessels to identify which fishery they were participating in through a declaration system, which eliminated the need for temporal separation. As part of FMP Amendment 20 trailing actions, in April 2012 the Council recommended that vessels registered to a limited entry trawl permit be allowed to simultaneously register to a limited entry fixed gear permit, also called ''joint registration.'' This final rule implements joint registration and clarifies how fishery-specific regulations still apply to vessels that are jointly registered. Joint registration is permitted in one of two configurations, which are described in additional detail in the June 1, 2016, proposed rule (81 FR 34947):

(1) Configuration A: One trawl permit and one, two, or three sablefish endorsed permits.

(2) Configuration B: One trawl permit and one limited entry fixed gear permit.

Registering a vessel to a limited entry permit with a specific endorsement often triggers certain requirements in the groundfish regulations. Joint registration is not intended to change fishing operations of groundfish fisheries or change requirements that are applicable to vessels because of the type of the endorsement(s) on the limited entry permit to which they are registered, unless otherwise described above and in the June 1, 2016, proposed rule (81 FR 34947).

4. Restrictions on At-Sea Processing of Sablefish

Processing of groundfish at-sea is prohibited for vessels fishing in the Shorebased IFQ Program or limited entry fixed gear fishery, unless exempted from that prohibition. One such exemption applies to certain vessels fishing in the limited entry fixed gear sablefish primary fishery. Those exempted vessels may freeze sablefish at-sea during the limited entry fixed gear sablefish primary fishery.

When trawl rationalization was implemented in 2011, the Council recommended that at-sea processing of groundfish in the Shorebased IFQ Program be prohibited, with limited exemptions. Regulations at § 660.112 (b)(1)(xii) prohibit at-sea processing of groundfish, and also list the exemptions that have been granted to date, including an exemption from the prohibition of at-sea processing that applies in the sablefish primary fishery. As written, those regulations grant vessels with an exemption from the prohibition of at-sea processing in the sablefish primary fishery when fishing in the Shorebased IFQ Program. However, regulations at § 660.25(b)(6)(i) only allow the sablefish at-sea processing exemption when the vessel is registered to a sablefish-endorsed limited entry permit.

Currently, because vessels cannot be registered to a sablefish-endorsed limited entry permit and a trawl-endorsed permit at the same time, Shorebased IFQ vessels cannot take advantage of the sablefish at-sea processing exemption. However, this rule's joint registration provisions would allow a vessel to register to a trawl endorsed and a sablefish endorsed limited entry permit simultaneously. If the exemption at § 660.112(b)(1)(xii)(B) is not removed, joint registration could allow vessels with an exemption from the at-sea processing prohibition for the sablefish primary fishery to also process sablefish at sea in the Shorebased IFQ Program. Consistent with the Council's recommendation, this rule removes the exemption to the prohibition of at-sea processing (at § 660.112(b)(1)(xii)(B)) that extended the limited entry fixed gear exemption in § 660.25(b)(6)(i) to vessels fishing sablefish in the Shorebased IFQ Program. Also, in light of joint registration, a clarifying sentence is added to § 660.25(b)(6)(i), stating that the at-sea processing exemption only applies to at-sea processing of sablefish caught in the limited entry fixed gear sablefish primary fishery.

During development of this rule, NMFS noted that a similar situation as the one described above may occur with the exemption from the processing-at-sea prohibition for non-whiting groundfish. When a vessel with a non-whiting exemption from that prohibition in the Shorebased IFQ Program is jointly registered, it could utilize that exemption when fishing in non-IFQ fisheries. NMFS proposed a clarifying sentence at § 660.25(b)(6)(ii), stating that the exemption only applies to processing non-whiting groundfish caught in the Shorebased IFQ Program, which is consistent with the Council's recommendation under joint registration with regards to the sablefish at-sea processing exemption. NMFS requested public comment on this issue, and received none. Therefore, the clarifying addition to § 660.25(b)(6)(ii) is included in this final rule. This final rule implements joint registration and does not allow at-sea processing of non-whiting groundfish in non-IFQ fisheries, as the exemption was granted to vessels participating in the Shorebased IFQ Program.

5. Sablefish Allocations North of 36° N. lat.

The allocation structure for sablefish north of 36° N. lat. was established in FMP Amendment 6. In April 2009, the Council recommended final preferred intersector allocations for groundfish species under Amendment 21. The Council and NMFS recommended that no change be made to the Amendment 6 allocation structure for sablefish. However, FMP Amendment 21 and its implementing regulations slightly changed the process for allocating sablefish north of 36° N. lat. (75 FR 60868, October 1, 2010). This final rule includes regulations aligning sablefish north of 36° N. lat. allocations with the Amendment 6 allocation structure, as recommended by the Council in 2009, and as described in the June 1, 2016 proposed rule (81 FR 34947).

6. Declaration Reports for Vessels Registered to a VMS Unit

In 2004, the Council and NMFS implemented a vessel monitoring program. Since 2004, all commercial fishing vessels that take and retain groundfish in federal waters, or transit through federal waters with groundfish on board, are required to have a working VMS. The VMS, along with a system of fishing declaration reporting requirements, allows for monitoring and enforcement of areas closed to fishing. With this 2004 program, NMFS type-approved hardware and software, or ''units,'' were installed on vessels in

order to meet these new program requirements for the groundfish fishery. When a VMS unit is installed on a vessel, it is registered with NMFS OLE and catalogued.

There are a number of VMS units that have registered with OLE but those vessels have never made a declaration report. This final rule includes regulation changes at § 660.13(d) that require all vessels registered to a VMS unit to submit a declaration report. Vessels registered to a VMS unit are required to submit a declaration report, regardless of fishing activities. Obtaining a declaration report from these vessels will give OLE the information necessary to monitor the activities of these vessels relative to the applicable regulations. This final rule also revises fisher declarations at § 660.13(d)(5)(iv)(A)(*24*) to include ''other.'' This category will include on-the-water activities that may not be fishing (*e.g.*, scientific research activities). NMFS anticipates vessels may make a declaration of ''other'' if they are not fishing.

7. Equipment Requirements for Electronic Fish Tickets

As described in the proposed rule, a new interface has been developed that uses the internet for both entry and submission of electronic fish ticket data. The changes to regulations at § 660.15(d) in this rule reflect the move to a web-based electronic fish ticket for all first receivers. Note that an internet connection is necessary for all steps for completion of an electronic fish ticket, from creating the new ticket through submission. To reflect these changes, the definition of ''electronic fish ticket'' at § 660.11 is also revised to reflect the web-based form used to send electronic fish ticket information to the PSMFC.

8. Prohibitions Regarding ''Take and Retain''

NMFS is replacing ''taking, retaining'' with ''taking and retaining,'' consistent with the Council's recommendations under PCGFMP Amendment 14 and described in the 2016 proposed rule. With the exception of the sablefish primary fishery, in commercial groundfish fisheries vessels may ''take'' more than a single cumulative trip limit of a species while fishing for other species, but they may not retain any species above its cumulative trip limit. The phrase ''taking, retaining'' in this context is not clear. Therefore, to better align prohibitions for enforcing trip limits with the definition of ''trip limit,'' to improve enforceability of trip limit prohibitions, and to bring consistency to regulations that apply to commercial groundfish fisheries, prohibitions at §§ 660.12(a)(6), 660.212(a)(2), and 660.212(d)(1) and (2) are revised from ''take, retain'' to ''take and retain.''

9. Related Minor Clarifications and Non-Substantive Changes

There are several outdated regulations, mis-specified cross-references, inconsistencies in terminology, and areas in need of clarification throughout the groundfish regulations that pertain to commercial sablefish fishing. For the reasons stated in the proposed rule, this rule implements all of the updates, corrections, clarifications and non-substantive edits described in the proposed rule.

Response to Comments

During the comment period of the proposed rule, NMFS received two comment letters from participants in the fishing industry in support of the proposed regulation changes to allow joint registration of trawl and non-trawl permits and the limited exemption from ownership limitation restrictions. NMFS also received a letter of comment regarding VMS equipment requirements on board fishing vessels, which are not revised in this rule, are outside the scope of this action, and, therefore, are not discussed further here. NMFS addresses other comments below:

Comment 1: Information on an electronic fish ticket will not immediately become available to quota managers because the data will need to be entered by data entry personnel who do not work over the weekend.

Response: This is an automated system, and availability of submitted electronic fish ticket data does not rely on action by system administrators. Upon submission of the electronic fish ticket by first receivers, catch information is immediately available to vessel operators, enforcement, and federal and state fishery managers.

Comment 2: The time requirement for submitting a fish ticket under the new regulation is inconsistent with some California state fish ticket and transport ticket regulations.

Response: California Department of Fish and Wildlife is in the process of developing a monitoring system that incorporates electronic tickets. While the electronic fish tickets required by this provision contain similar information as submitted on state tickets, it does not replace or change the state requirements (§ 660.11). Furthermore, any vessels participating in federal fisheries are subject to federal regulations (§ 660.2).

Comment 3: NMFS should acknowledge that interruption of internet service, equipment failures, etc. may make electronic fish tickets impractical.

Response: NMFS has implemented a system in which a web browser on any electronic device can be used to create and submit electronic fish tickets. Therefore, even allowing for possible, temporary interruptions in service or equipment problems, 24 hours is deemed an appropriate amount of time to complete the fish ticket.

Comment 4: In some situations, the fish have been both landed and transported by the vessel operator, and no paperwork has been completed because the fish buyer has not yet taken possession of them.

Response: The trigger for written documentation of the landing is not the point at which the fish buyer or the first receiver takes possession of the fish. Written documentation of the fish offloaded from a vessel is required once the fish are removed from the vessel. Any fish removed from a vessel is considered a ''landing,'' per the definition at § 660.11. If the fish removed from the vessel will not have an electronic fish ticket submitted prior to transport, the fish must be accompanied by a dock ticket (or a transportation ticket for vessels landing into California) with the information needed to complete the electronic fish ticket, per regulations at §§ 660.213 and 660.313. It is the responsibility of the vessel operator or other person taking possession of the fish upon landing to comply with the requirements to complete the dock ticket or transportation ticket.

Comment 5: Regulations for the landing of fish and requirements of the new rule will unfairly impact first receivers that are not located at a processing plant.

Response: Regulations implemented in this rule were explicitly drafted to address the fact that some first receivers are not located at processing plants, by allowing for use of dock tickets. If the first receiver is taking possession of fish outside of regular business hours, a co-signed dock ticket meets the need for documentation of agreement between the first receiver and vessel operator regarding the specifics of the landing. The dock ticket must include the electronic fish ticket number, which can be generated remotely via any device with a web browser and internet connection (*e.g.*, mobile phone), and the rest of the fish ticket can be completed and submitted from dock ticket data within 24 hours.

Comment 6: The requirement of electronic fish tickets will cause hardship to first receivers that must purchase and maintain the hardware and software needed to submit electronic fish tickets.

Response: The improved timeliness of catch data will increase the ability to manage the fishery to the benefit of all participants, offsetting the cost of equipment needed to complete electronic fish tickets. The electronic ticket portal is web-based, and can be accessed from any electronic device (such as a computer, tablet, or mobile phone) with an internet browser, allowing for increased accessibility with multiple ways to meet reporting requirements. NMFS notes that requirements for electronic fish ticket submission will include the ability of first receivers to request a temporary waiver from these requirements, enabling them to submit paper tickets on a temporary basis. Temporary waivers will be granted on a case-by-case basis by NMFS, per regulations at §§ 660.213 and 660.313.

Comment 7: Those responsible for filling out fish tickets may not have the training and technical knowledge to do so, and may be assisted by fishermen or others as is currently done for paper tickets.

Response: NMFS is providing a written compliance guide, and PSMFC staff will be available to provide training to help ensure that all first receivers are able to perform the duties required in this rule. See **ADDRESSES** for details on where to find these materials. Also, even though the first receiver must sign the fish ticket, regulations implemented in this final rule do not prohibit a first receiver from seeking technical assistance from a third party.

Changes From the Proposed Rule

The electronic fish ticket requirements in the proposed and final rule offer a new, more flexible option that allows for vessels fishing in the sablefish primary fishery to apportion their sablefish from a single landing against multiple tier limits (if the vessel is registered to multiple sablefish endorsed permits), or against their the remainder of their tier limit(s) and applicable daily trip limits. During development of the proposed rule, it was thought that the electronic fish ticket system requirements were such that, in these situations, separate and distinct electronic fish tickets would need to be filled out and submitted for each part of the landing. For example, the first ticket for the delivery would document the sablefish pounds counting toward ''Permit 13, Tier 2'' and a second ticket for the same delivery would document the sablefish pounds counting toward ''Permit 21, Tier 3.'' Therefore, if a vessel operator chose to apportion their sablefish as described above, proposed regulations required multiple fish tickets to be filled out. Each fish ticket is estimated to take approximately 10 minutes to complete and submit.

Since publication of the proposed rule, there has been further exploration of how to document portions of a single sablefish delivery against either multiple tier limits or against both tier limits and DTL limits without having to duplicate some of the information by requiring submittal of multiple electronic fish tickets. A mechanism has been developed that allows catch of sablefish to be apportioned within a single electronic fish ticket when a vessel operator wishes to take advantage of the flexibility to apportion sablefish catch between permits (*i.e.*, among sablefish tiers associated with the permits registered for use with the vessel) or between fisheries (*i.e.*, among sablefish tiers harvested in the sablefish primary fishery and the DTL fishery). Utilizing this updated approach in the electronic fish ticket system, the requirement included in the proposed rule at § 660.213(e)(2)(iii) to submit multiple electronic fish tickets for a single delivery is unnecessary.

Therefore, in this final rule, NMFS is removing the requirement at § 660.213(e)(2)(iii) to submit multiple electronic fish tickets when a vessel operator wishes to take advantage of the flexibility to apportion sablefish catch between permits or between fisheries (as described above). This final rule provides vessel operators with the same flexibilities and gives fishery managers the same permit and landing information as the proposed regulations. However, the regulations at § 660.213(e)(2)(iii) in this final rule are anticipated to relieve first receivers of some of the recordkeeping and reporting burden by slightly reducing the total number of electronic fish tickets required. As noted above, it is unknown how many vessel operators in the sablefish primary fishery will elect to use this new flexibility, therefore it is not possible to estimate exactly how much time may be saved by first receivers. However, this change from the proposed rule relieves a restriction, and is anticipated to benefit vessel operators and first receivers.

The second change from the proposed rule pertains to the definition of ''sablefish landing'' included in that rule at §§ 660.211 and 660.311. The proposed rule would have required electronic fish tickets be submitted by first receivers of all the groundfish on board the vessel if that groundfish included any amount of sablefish. During development of the final rule, it became apparent that given the definition of ''sablefish landing'' the proposed rule language could be interpreted as requiring a first receiver of fish from a landing that included sablefish to submit an electronic fish ticket regardless of whether that first receiver was buying any sablefish. If a scenario arose where the sablefish landing were divided, all of the sablefish were sold to one first receiver, and the rest of the groundfish were sold to a second first receiver, the second first receiver, who did not take possession of any sablefish, would be required to submit an electronic fish ticket for those non-sablefish groundfish species. This would be because as proposed, the electronic fish ticket requirement would have applied to any ''sablefish landing,'' or any landing that includes any amount of sablefish harvested in the limited entry fixed gear fishery. ''Landing'' is defined at § 660.11 and means the transfer or offloading of fish from any vessel. Once transfer of fish begins, all fish aboard the vessel are counted as part of the landing. Therefore, all the fish on board the vessel, even if sold to multiple first receivers, are all counted as part of the same landing. Therefore, a vessel meets the definition of having a ''sablefish landing'' when they have any amount of sablefish on board and begins the transfer of any fish from the vessel. In the above described situation, under proposed electronic fish ticket regulations and the definition of ''sablefish landing,'' both of the first receivers of fish from the sablefish landing would be required to submit an electronic fish ticket, regardless of whether the first receiver is taking possession of any amount of sablefish.

The Council's recommendation was to capture all of the landings of sablefish for more accurate and timely accounting of sablefish harvest against applicable limits in the limited entry fixed gear and open access fisheries. Implementing an electronic fish ticket requirement for first receivers of non-sablefish groundfish deliveries was not intended and does not meet this purpose. Therefore, the proposed definitions of ''sablefish landing'' (as included in the proposed rule at §§ 660.211 and 660.311) are not included in this final rule.

Instead, regulations at §§ 660.212 and 660.312 are revised to clarify that, if the landing is split, only the portion of the landing (or a delivery/offload) that

includes some amount of sablefish must be reported on an electronic fish ticket. With this revision, first receivers of a delivery that includes any amount of sablefish must report that entire delivery (both sablefish and non-sablefish groundfish) on an electronic fish ticket. First receivers of a delivery that does not include any sablefish would not be required to report via electronic fish ticket. These revisions better align with the Council's intent to improve the timeliness of sablefish catch data.

Classification

NMFS has determined that this action is consistent with the FMP, the Magnuson Stevens Conservation and Management Act, and other applicable laws.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has determined that this action is not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

A final regulatory flexibility analysis (FRFA) was prepared and incorporates the initial regulatory flexibility analysis (IRFA). A summary of the significant issues raised by the public comments in response to the IRFA, and NMFS responses to those comments, and a summary of the analyses completed to support the action are included below. NMFS also prepared a Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) for this action. A copy of the RIR/FRFA is available from NMFS (see **ADDRESSES**). A summary of the FRFA, per the requirements of 5 U.S.C. 604(a) follows:

The Small Business Administration (SBA) has established size criteria for all major industry sectors in the US, including fish harvesting and fish processing businesses. A business primarily involved in finfish harvesting is classified as a small business if it is independently owned and operated, is not dominant in its field of operation (including its affiliates), and has combined annual receipts not in excess of $20.5 million for all its affiliated operations worldwide (13 CFR part 121; August 17, 2015). For commercial shellfish harvesters, the other qualifiers apply and the receipts threshold is $5.5 million. For other commercial marine harvesters, for-hire businesses, and marinas, the other qualifiers apply and the receipts threshold is $7.5 million. A business primarily involved in seafood processing is classified as a small business if it is independently owned and operated, is not dominant in its field of operation (including its affiliates), and has combined annual employment not in excess of 500 employees for all its affiliated operations worldwide. For seafood dealers/wholesalers, the other qualifiers apply and the employment threshold is 100 employees. A small organization is any not-for-profit enterprise which is independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field. Small governmental jurisdictions are governments of cities, counties, towns, townships, villages, school districts, or special districts, with populations less than 50,000.

On December 29, 2015, NMFS issued a final rule establishing a small business size standard of $11 million in annual gross receipts for all businesses primarily engaged in the commercial fishing industry (North American Industry Classification System or NAICS 11411) for Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) compliance purposes only (80 FR 81194, December 29, 2015). The $11 million standard became effective on July 1, 2016, and is to be used in all NMFS rules subject to the RFA after July 1, 2016, in place of the U.S. SBA standards (described above) of $20.5 million, $5.5 million, and $7.5 million for the finfish (NAICS 114111), shellfish (NAICS 114112), and other marine fishing (NAICS 114119) sectors of the U.S. commercial fishing industry.

Pursuant to the RFA, and prior to July 1, 2016, an initial regulatory flexibility analysis was developed for this regulatory action using SBA's size standards. NMFS has reviewed the analyses prepared for this regulatory action in light of the new size standard. All of the harvesting entities directly regulated by this regulatory action were considered small under the SBA's size standards, and continue to be considered small under the new NMFS standard. Thus, NMFS has determined that the new size standard does not affect analyses prepared for this regulatory action.

No significant issues were raised during public comment, and no changes were made as a result of public comments.

An estimated 99 entities are potentially impacted by this rule, including 77 receivers and up to 22 vessels/permit holding entities. All of these entities are considered small according to both the SBA guidelines and the new NMFS standards described above. This rule is not anticipated to have a substantial or significant economic impact on small entities, or place small entities at a disadvantage to large entities.

Addition of an exemption to the ownership limitation and joint registration are expected to positively benefit directly impacted small entities.

It is assumed that all first receivers have access to a personal computer or other hardware/device. However, to reduce the potential impacts on first receivers should there be a system failure, a waiver may be granted by NMFS that temporarily exempts a first receiver from the reporting requirements and allow reasonable time to resolve the electronic fish ticket system problem. The duration of the waiver will be determined on a case-by-case basis. First receivers that are granted a temporary waiver from the requirement to submit electronic fish tickets must submit on paper the same data as are required on electronic fish tickets within 24 hours of the date received during the period that the waiver is in effect.

Implementation of an electronic fish ticket improves the accuracy and timeliness of landing data and provides managers with the real time data necessary to do inseason management of the primary and daily trip limit (DTL) fisheries. It also provides enforcement with the permit-specific landings data necessary to monitor overages in the primary (tier) and DTL sablefish fisheries, and could aid in enforcement of the owner-on-board requirement.

There are no significant alternatives to the rule that accomplish the stated objectives of applicable statutes and that minimize any of the significant economic impact of the final rule on small entities. However, Section 212 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 states that, for each rule or group of related rules for which an agency is required to prepare a FRFA, the agency shall publish one or more guides to assist small entities in complying with the rule. The agency shall explain the actions a small entity is required to take to comply with a rule or group of rules. As part of this rulemaking process, a small entity compliance guide will be sent to all limited entry permit owners and holders, and all persons and entities that have requested information on groundfish management actions (*i.e.*, persons and entities on the West Coast groundfish email list serve), and will be posted on the NMFS West Coast Region Web site at *http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/.* With regards to new electronic fish ticket requirements, outreach and compliance guidance will also be available through the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission at *http://pacfin.psmfc.org/.*

Paperwork Reduction Act

This final rule contains the implementation of a Federal requirement for an electronic fish ticket

to capture essential fishery catch data for commercial non-trawl sablefish fisheries (every commercial fishery landing that includes any amount of sablefish) in a timely manner, which is a collection-of-information requirement subject to review and approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA). With regards to electronic fish tickets, this requirement has been approved by OMB as a new OMB collection (OMB collection 0648–0738). The public reporting burden is estimated to average 10 minutes per response. With regards to the ownership limitation exemption, this requirement has been approved by OMB as OMB collection 0648–0737. The public reporting burden is estimated to be 45 minutes per response. Send comments on the burden estimates or any other aspects of the collection of information to West Coast Region at the ADDRESSES above, by email to *OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov,* or by fax to (202) 395–7285.

Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, and no person shall be subject to penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the PRA, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The PRA (44 U.S.C. 3507) requires that agencies inventory and display a current control number assigned by the Director, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), for each agency information collection. § 902.1(b) identifies the location of NOAA regulations for which OMB approval numbers have been issued. Because this final rule adds requirements for scale test report recording and maintenance, § 902.1(b) is revised to reference correctly the section resulting from this final rule.

List of Subjects

15 CFR Part 902

Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

50 CFR Part 660

Fisheries, Fishing, and Indian fisheries.

Dated: November 15, 2016.

Samuel D. Rauch III,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 15 CFR part 902 and 50 CFR part 660 are amended as follows:

Title 15—Commerce and Foreign Trade

PART 902—NOAA INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT: OMB CONTROL NUMBERS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 902 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

■ 2. In § 902.1, in the table in paragraph (b), under the entry ''50 CFR'', revise the entries for ''660.13'', ''660.15'', ''660.17'', ''660.25'', ''660.113'', and ''660.140'' to read as follows:

§ 902.1 OMB control numbers assigned pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

CFR part or section where the information collection requirement is located	Current OMB control No. (all numbers begin with 0648–)
* * * * *	
50 CFR:	
* * * * *	
660.13	–0573, –0619, and –0738.
* * * * *	
660.15	–0619 and –0738.
* * * * *	
660.17	–0619 and –0738.
* * * * *	
660.25	–0203, –0620, and –0737.
* * * * *	
660.113	–0271, –0573, –0618, –0619, and –0737.
* * * * *	
660.140	–0593, –0619, –0620, and –0737.
* * * * *	

Title 50—Wildlife and Fisheries

PART 660—FISHERIES OFF WEST COAST STATES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 660 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.,* 16 U.S.C. 773 *et seq.,* and 16 U.S.C. 7001 *et seq.*

■ 2. In § 660.11:

■ a. Revise the definitions for ''Base permit'' and ''Electronic fish ticket'';

■ b. Add in alphabetical order the definition for ''Joint registration'';

■ c. Remove the definition for ''Stacking''; and

■ d. Add in alphabetical order the definition for ''Stacking or stacked''.

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 660.11 General definitions.

* * * * *

Base permit means a sablefish-endorsed limited entry permit described at § 660.25(b)(3)(i), subpart C, registered for use with a vessel that meets the permit length endorsement requirements appropriate to that vessel, as described at § 660.25(b)(3)(iii), subpart C.

* * * * *

Electronic fish ticket means a web-based form that is used to send landing data to the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. Electronic fish tickets are used to collect information similar to the information required in state fish receiving tickets or landing receipts, but do not replace or change any state requirements.

* * * * *

Joint registration or jointly registered means simultaneously registering both trawl-endorsed and longline or trap/pot-endorsed limited entry permits for use with a single vessel in one of the configurations described at § 660.25(b)(4)(iv).

* * * * *

Stacking or stacked means registering more than one sablefish-endorsed limited entry permit for use with a single vessel (See § 660.25(b)(4)(iii), subpart C).

* * * * *

■ 3. In § 660.12, revise paragraph (a)(6) to read as follows:

§ 660.12 General groundfish prohibitions.

* * * * *

(a) * * *

(6) Take and retain, possess, or land more than a single cumulative limit of a particular species, per vessel, per applicable cumulative limit period, except for sablefish taken in the primary limited entry, fixed gear sablefish season from a vessel authorized to fish in that season, as described at § 660.231, subpart E.

* * * * *

■ 4. In § 660.13, revise paragraph (d) introductory text and paragraphs (d)(5)(ii) and (iii) and (d)(5)(iv)(A)(*24*) to read as follows:

§ 660.13 Recordkeeping and reporting.

* * * * *

(d) *Declaration reporting requirements*—When the operator of a vessel registers a VMS unit with NMFS OLE, the vessel operator must provide NMFS with a declaration report as specified at paragraph (d)(5)(iv) of this section. The operator of any vessel that

has already registered a VMS unit with NMFS OLE but has not yet made a declaration, as specified at paragraph (d)(5)(iv) of this section, must provide NMFS with a declaration report upon request from NMFS OLE.

(5) * * *

(ii) A declaration report will be valid until another declaration report revising the existing gear or fishery declaration is received by NMFS OLE. The vessel operator must send a new declaration report before leaving port on a trip that meets one of the following criteria:

(A) A gear type that is different from the gear type most recently declared for the vessel will be used, or

(B) A vessel will fish in a fishery other than the fishery most recently declared.

(iii) During the period of time that a vessel has a valid declaration report on file with NMFS OLE, it cannot fish with a gear other than a gear type declared by the vessel or fish in a fishery other than the fishery most recently declared.

(iv) * * *

(A) * * *

(*24*) Other, or

* * * * *

■ 5. In § 660.15, revise paragraphs (a) and (d) to read as follows:

§ 660.15 Equipment requirements.

(a) *Applicability.* This section contains the equipment and operational requirements for scales used to weigh catch at sea, scales used to weigh catch at IFQ first receivers, hardware and software for electronic fish tickets, and computer hardware for electronic logbook software. Unless otherwise specified by regulation, the operator or manager must retain, for 3 years, a copy of all records described in this section and make the records available upon request to NMFS staff or an authorized officer.

* * * * *

(d) *Electronic fish tickets.* First receivers are required to meet the hardware and software requirements below.

(1) *Hardware and software requirements.* A personal computer system, tablet, mobile device, or other device that has software (*e.g.* web browser) capable of submitting information over the internet, such that submission to Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission can be executed effectively.

(2) *Internet access.* The first receiver is responsible for maintaining internet access sufficient to access the web-based interface and submit completed electronic fish ticket forms.

(3) *Maintenance.* The first receiver is responsible for ensuring that all hardware and software required under this subsection are fully operational and functional whenever they receive, purchase, or take custody, control, or possession of groundfish species for which an electronic fish ticket is required. ''Functional'' means that the software requirements and minimum hardware requirements described at paragraphs (d)(1) and (2) of this section are met and submission to Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission can be executed effectively by the equipment.

(4) *Improving data quality.* Vessel owners and operators, first receivers, or shoreside processor owners, or managers may contact NMFS to request assistance in improving data quality and resolving issues. Requests may be submitted to: Attn: Electronic Fish Ticket Monitoring, National Marine Fisheries Service, West Coast Region, Sustainable Fisheries Division, 7600 Sand Point Way, NE., Seattle, WA 98115.

■ 6. In § 660.25:

■ a. Revise paragraph (b)(1)(v);

■ b. Remove paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(B);

■ c. Redesignate paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(C) as (b)(3)(iv)(B);

■ d. Revise newly redesignated paragraphs (b)(3)(iv)(B)(*3*) and (*4*);

■ e. Add new paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(C);

■ f. Revise paragraphs (b)(3)(v), (b)(4) introductory text, (b)(4)(i)(D), and (b)(4)(iii);

■ g. Redesignate paragraphs (b)(4)(iv) through (b)(4)(ix) as (b)(4)(v) through (b)(4)(x);

■ h. Add a new paragraph (b)(4)(iv);

■ i. Revise newly redesignated paragraphs (b)(4)(v)(A) and (B), (b)(4)(vi)(A) and (B), and (b)(4)(vii)(A); and

■ j. Revise (b)(6).

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 660.25 Permits.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) * * *

(v) *Initial administrative determination (IAD).* SFD will make a determination regarding permit endorsements, renewal, replacement, change in permit ownership and change in vessel registration. SFD will notify the permit owner in writing with an explanation of any determination to deny a permit endorsement, renewal, replacement, change in permit ownership or change in vessel registration. The SFD will decline to act on an application for permit endorsement, renewal, replacement, or change in registration of a limited entry permit if the permit is subject to sanction provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act at 16 U.S.C. 1858(a) and implementing regulations at 15 CFR part 904, subpart D, apply.

* * * * *

(3) * * *

(iv) * * *

(B) * * *

(*3*) A partnership or corporation will lose the exemptions provided in paragraphs (b)(3)(iv)(B)(*1*) and (*2*) of this section on the effective date of any change in the corporation or partnership from that which existed on November 1, 2000. A ''change'' in the partnership or corporation is defined at § 660.11. A change in the partnership or corporation must be reported to SFD within 15 calendar days of the addition of a new shareholder or partner.

(*4*) Any partnership or corporation with any ownership interest in a limited entry permit with a sablefish endorsement or in the vessel registered to the permit shall document the extent of that ownership interest with NMFS via the Identification of Ownership Interest Form sent to the permit owner through the annual permit renewal process and whenever a change in permit owner, vessel owner, and/or vessel registration occurs as described at paragraph (b)(4)(v) and (vi) of this section. NMFS will not renew a sablefish-endorsed limited entry permit through the annual renewal process described at paragraph (b)(4)(i) of this section, or approve a change in permit owner, vessel owner, and/or vessel registration unless the Identification of Ownership Interest Form has been completed. Further, if NMFS discovers through review of the Identification of Ownership Interest Form that an individual person, partnership, or corporation owns or holds more than 3 permits and is not authorized to do so under paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(B)(*2*) of this section, the individual person, partnership or corporation will be notified and the permits owned or held by that individual person, partnership, or corporation will be void and reissued with the vessel status as ''unidentified'' until the permit owner owns and/or holds a quantity of permits appropriate to the restrictions and requirements described in paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(B)(*2*) of this section. If NMFS discovers through review of the Identification of Ownership Interest Form that a partnership or corporation has had a change in membership since November 1, 2000, as described in paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(B)(*3*) of this section, the partnership or corporation will be notified, NMFS will void any existing permits, and reissue any permits owned and/or held by that partnership or

corporation in ''unidentified'' status with respect to vessel registration until the partnership or corporation is able to register ownership of those permits to persons authorized under this section to own sablefish-endorsed limited entry permits.

* * * * *

(C) *Ownership limitation exemption.* As described in (b)(3)(iv)(B) of this section, no individual person, partnership, or corporation in combination may own and/or hold more than three sablefish-endorsed permits. A vessel owner that meets the qualifying criteria described in paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(C)(*1*) of this section may request an exemption from the ownership limitation.

(*1*) *Qualifying criteria.* The three qualifying criteria for an ownership limitation exemption are: The vessel owner currently has no more than 20 percent ownership interest in a vessel registered to the sablefish endorsed permit, the vessel owner currently has ownership interest in Alaska sablefish individual fishing quota, and the vessel has fished in the past 12-month period in both the West Coast groundfish limited entry fixed gear fishery and the Sablefish IFQ Program in Alaska. The best evidence of a vessel owner having met these qualifying criteria will be state fish tickets or landing receipts from the West Coast states and Alaska. The qualifying vessel owner may seek an ownership limitation exemption for sablefish endorsed permits registered to no more than two vessels.

(*2*) *Application and issuance process for an ownership limitation exemption.* The SFD will make the qualifying criteria and application instructions available online at *www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/fisheries/groundfish/index.html.* A vessel owner who believes that they may qualify for the ownership limitation exemption must submit evidence with their application showing how their vessel has met the qualifying criteria described at paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(C)(*1*) of this section. The vessel owner must also submit a Sablefish Permit Ownership Limitation Exemption Identification of Ownership Interest form that includes disclosure of percentage of ownership in the vessel and disclosure of individual shareholders in any entity. Paragraph (i) of this section sets out the relevant evidentiary standards and burden of proof. Applications may be submitted at any time to NMFS at: NMFS West Coast Region, Sustainable Fisheries Division, ATTN: Fisheries Permit Office—Sablefish Ownership Limitation Exemption, 7600 Sand Point Way NE., Seattle, WA 98115. After receipt of a complete application, the SFD will issue an IAD in writing to the applicant determining whether the applicant qualifies for the exemption. If an applicant chooses to file an appeal of the IAD, the applicant must follow the appeals process outlined at paragraph (g) of this section and, for the timing of the appeals, at paragraph (g)(4)(ii) of this section.

(*3*) *Exemption status.* If at any time a change occurs relative to the qualifying criteria described at paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(C)(*1*), the vessel owner to whom the ownership limitation exemption applies must notify NMFS within 30 calendar days. If such changes mean the vessel owner no longer meets the qualifying criteria, the ownership limitation exemption becomes automatically null and void 30 calendar days after the date the vessel owner no longer meets the qualifying criteria. At any time, NMFS may request that the vessel owner submit a new exemption application. If NMFS at any time finds the vessel owner no longer meets the qualifying criteria described at paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(C)(*1*) of this section NMFS will issue an IAD, which may be appealed, as described at paragraph (g) of this section.

(*v*) *MS/CV endorsement.* An MS/CV endorsement on a trawl limited entry permit conveys a conditional privilege that allows a vessel registered to it to fish in either the coop or non-coop fishery in the MS Coop Program described at § 660.150, subpart D. The provisions for the MS/CV-endorsed limited entry permit, including eligibility, renewal, change of permit ownership, vessel registration, combinations, accumulation limits, fees, and appeals are described at § 660.150. Each MS/CV endorsement has an associated catch history assignment (CHA) that is permanently linked as originally issued by NMFS and which cannot be divided or registered separately to another limited entry trawl permit. Regulations detailing this process and MS/CV-endorsed permit combinations are outlined in § 660.150(g)(2), subpart D.

* * * * *

(4) *Limited entry permit actions*—renewal, combination, stacking, joint registration, change of permit owner or vessel owner, and change in vessel registration—

(i) * * *

(D) Limited entry permits with sablefish endorsements, as described at paragraph (b)(3)(iv) of this section, will not be renewed until SFD has received complete documentation of permit ownership as required under paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(B)(*4*) of this section.

* * * * *

(iii) *Stacking limited entry permits.* ''Stacking'' limited entry permits, as defined at § 660.11, refers to the practice of registering more than one sablefish-endorsed permit for use with a single vessel. Only limited entry permits with sablefish endorsements may be stacked. Up to 3 limited entry permits with sablefish endorsements may be registered for use with a single vessel during the sablefish primary season described at § 660.231, subpart E. Privileges, responsibilities, and restrictions associated with stacking permits to fish in the sablefish primary fishery are described at § 660.231, subpart E and at paragraph (b)(3)(iv) of this section.

(iv) *Joint registration of limited entry permits*—(A) *General.* ''Joint registration'' of limited entry permits, as defined at § 660.11, is the practice of simultaneously registering both trawl-endorsed and longline or trap/pot-endorsed limited entry permits for use with a single vessel.

(B) *Restrictions.* Subject to vessel size endorsements in paragraph (b)(3)(iii), any limited entry permit with a trawl endorsement and any limited entry permit with a longline or trap/pot endorsement may be jointly registered for use with a single vessel but only in one of the following configurations:

(*1*) a single trawl-endorsed limited entry permit and one, two or three sablefish-endorsed fixed gear (longline and/or fishpot endorsed) limited entry permits; or

(*2*) a single trawl-endorsed limited entry permit and one longline-endorsed limited entry permit for use with a single vessel.

(v) * * *

(A) *General.* Change in permit owner and/or vessel owner applications must be submitted to NMFS with the appropriate documentation described at paragraphs (b)(4)(viii) and (ix) of this section. The permit owner may convey the limited entry permit to a different person. The new permit owner will not be authorized to use the permit until the change in permit owner has been registered with and approved by NMFS. NMFS will not approve a change in permit owner for a limited entry permit with a sablefish endorsement that does not meet the ownership requirements for such permit described at paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(B) of this section. NMFS will not approve a change in permit owner for a limited entry permit with an MS/CV endorsement or an MS permit that

does not meet the ownership requirements for such permit described at § 660.150(g)(3), and § 660.150(f)(3), respectively. NMFS considers the following as a change in permit owner that would require registering with and approval by NMFS, including but not limited to: Selling the permit to another individual or entity; adding an individual or entity to the legal name on the permit; or removing an individual or entity from the legal name on the permit. A change in vessel owner includes any changes to the name(s) of any or all vessel owners, as registered with USCG or a state. The new owner(s) of a vessel registered to a limited entry permit must report any change in vessel ownership to NMFS within 30 calendar days after such change has been registered with the USCG or a state licensing agency.

(B) *Effective date.* The change in permit ownership or change in the vessel holding the permit will be effective on the day the change is approved by NMFS, unless there is a concurrent change in the vessel registered to the permit. Requirements for changing the vessel registered to the permit are described at paragraph (b)(4)(vi) of this section.

* * * * *

(vi) * * *

(A) *General.* A permit may not be used with any vessel other than the vessel registered to that permit. For purposes of this section, a permit change in vessel registration occurs when, through SFD, a permit owner registers a limited entry permit for use with a new vessel. Permit change in vessel registration applications must be submitted to SFD with the appropriate documentation described at paragraph (b)(4)(viii) of this section. Upon receipt of a complete application, and following review and approval of the application, the SFD will reissue the permit registered to the new vessel. Applications to change vessel registration on limited entry permits with sablefish endorsements will not be approved until SFD has received complete documentation of permit ownership as described at paragraph (b)(3)(iv)(B)(*4*) and as required under paragraph (b)(4)(viii) of this section. Applications to change vessel registration on limited entry permits with trawl endorsements or MS permits will not be approved until SFD has received complete EDC forms as required under § 660.114, subpart D.

(B) *Application.* Change in vessel registration applications must be submitted to NMFS with the appropriate documentation described at paragraphs (b)(4)(viii) and (ix) of this section. At a minimum, a permit owner seeking to change vessel registration of a limited entry permit shall submit to NMFS a signed application form and his/her current limited entry permit before the first day of the cumulative limit period in which they wish to fish. If a permit owner provides a signed application and current limited entry permit after the first day of a cumulative limit period, the permit will not be effective until the succeeding cumulative limit period. NMFS will not approve a change in vessel registration until it receives a complete application, the existing permit, a current copy of the USCG 1270, and other required documentation.

* * * * *

(vii) * * *

(A) *General.* A permit owner may designate the vessel registration for a permit as ''unidentified,'' meaning that no vessel has been identified as registered for use with that permit. No vessel is authorized to use a permit with the vessel registration designated as ''unidentified.'' A vessel owner who removes a permit from his vessel and registers that permit as ''unidentified'' is not exempt from VMS requirements at § 660.14, unless specifically authorized by that section. When a permit owner requests that the permit's vessel registration be designated as ''unidentified,'' the transaction is not considered a change in vessel registration for purposes of this section. Any subsequent request by a permit owner to change from the ''unidentified'' status of the permit in order to register the permit with a specific vessel will be considered a change in vessel registration and subject to the restriction on frequency and timing of changes in vessel registration.

* * * * *

(6) *At-sea processing exemptions*—(i) *Sablefish at-sea processing exemption.* No new applications for sablefish at-sea processing exemptions will be accepted. As specified at § 660.212(d)(3), subpart E, vessels are prohibited from processing sablefish at sea that were caught in the sablefish primary fishery without a sablefish at-sea processing exemption. Any sablefish at-sea processing exemptions were issued to a particular vessel and that permit and vessel owner who requested the exemption. The exemption is not part of the limited entry permit. The exemption cannot be registered with any other vessel, vessel owner, or permit owner for any reason. The exemption only applies to at-sea processing of sablefish caught in the sablefish primary fishery. The sablefish at-sea processing exemption will expire upon registration of the vessel to a new owner or if the vessel is totally lost, as defined at § 660.11.

(ii) *Non-whiting at-sea processing exemption.* No new applications for non-whiting at-sea processing exemptions will be accepted. As specified at § 660.112(b)(1)(xii), subpart D, vessels are prohibited from processing non-whiting groundfish at sea that were caught in the Shorebased IFQ Program without a non-whiting at-sea processing exemption. Any non-whiting at-sea processing exemptions were issued to a particular vessel and that permit and/or vessel owner who requested the exemption. The exemption is not part of the limited entry permit. The exemption is not transferable to any other vessel, vessel owner, or permit owner for any reason. The exemption only applies to at-sea processing of non-whiting groundfish caught in the Shorebased IFQ Program. The non-whiting at-sea processing exemption will expire upon registration of the vessel to a new owner or if the vessel is totally lost, as defined at § 660.11.

* * * * *

■ 7. In § 660.55, revise paragraph (f) introductory text and paragraphs (h)(1) and (2) to read as follows:

§ 660.55 Allocations.

* * * * *

(f) *Catch accounting.* Catch accounting refers to how the catch in a fishery is monitored against the allocations described in this section. For species with trawl/nontrawl allocations, catch of those species are counted against the trawl/nontrawl allocations as explained in paragraph (f)(1) of this section. For species with limited entry/open access allocations in a given biennial cycle, catch of those species are counted against the limited entry/open access allocations as explained in paragraph (f)(1)(ii) of this section.

* * * * *

(h) * * *

(1) *Tribal/nontribal allocation.* The sablefish allocation to Pacific coast treaty Indian tribes is identified at § 660.50(f)(2). The remainder is available to the nontribal fishery (limited entry, open access (directed and incidental), and research).

(2) *Between the limited entry and open access fisheries.* The allocation of sablefish after tribal deductions is further reduced by the estimated total mortality of sablefish in research and recreational fisheries; the remaining yield (commercial harvest guideline) is

divided between open access and limited entry fisheries. The limited entry fishery allocation is 90.6 percent of the commercial harvest guideline. The open access allocation is 9.4 percent of the commercial harvest guideline and includes incidental catch in non-groundfish fisheries, or incidental open access.

* * * * *

■ 8. In § 660.60:

■ a. Revise paragraphs (h)(7) introductory text, (h)(7)(i) introductory text, (h)(7)(ii)(A), (h)(7)(ii)(B)(*1*) introductory text, and (h)(7)(ii)(B)(*2*); and

■ b. Add paragraphs (h)(7)(ii)(B)(*3*) and (h)(7)(iii).

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 660.60 Specifications and management measures.

* * * * *

(h) * * *

* * * * *

(7) *Crossover provisions.* Crossover provisions apply to three activities: Fishing on different sides of a management line, or fishing in both the limited entry and open access fisheries, or fishing in both the Shorebased IFQ Program and the limited entry fixed gear fishery. NMFS uses different types of management areas for West Coast groundfish management, such as the north-south management areas as defined in § 660.11. Within a management area, a large ocean area with northern and southern boundary lines, trip limits, seasons, and conservation areas follow a single theme. Within each management area, there may be one or more conservation areas, defined at §§ 660.11 and 660.70 through 660.74. The provisions within this paragraph apply to vessels fishing in different management areas. Crossover provisions also apply to vessels that fish in both the limited entry and open access fisheries, or that use open access non-trawl gear while registered to limited entry fixed gear permits. Crossover provisions also apply to vessels that are jointly registered, as defined at § 660.11, fishing in both the Shorebased IFQ Program and the limited entry fixed gear fishery during the same cumulative limit period. Fishery specific crossover provisions can be found in subparts D through F of this part.

(i) *Fishing in management areas with different trip limits.* Trip limits for a species or a species group may differ in different management areas along the coast. The following crossover provisions apply to vessels fishing in different geographical areas that have different cumulative or ''per trip'' trip limits for the same species or species group, with the following exceptions. Such crossover provisions do not apply to: IFQ species (defined at § 660.140(c), subpart D) for vessels that are declared into the Shorebased IFQ Program (see § 660.13(d)(5)(iv)(A), for valid Shorebased IFQ Program declarations); species that are subject only to daily trip limits; or to trip limits for black rockfish off Washington, as described at §§ 660.230(e) and 660.330(e).

* * * * *

(ii) * * *

(A) *Fishing in limited entry and open access fisheries with different trip limits.* Open access trip limits apply to any fishing conducted with open access gear, even if the vessel has a valid limited entry permit with an endorsement for another type of gear. Except such provisions do not apply to IFQ species (defined at § 660.140(c), subpart D) for vessels that are declared into the Shorebased IFQ Program (see § 660.13(d)(5)(iv)(A) for valid Shorebased IFQ Program declarations). A vessel that fishes in both the open access and limited entry fisheries is not entitled to two separate trip limits for the same species. If a vessel has a limited entry permit registered to it at any time during the trip limit period and uses open access gear, but the open access limit is smaller than the limited entry limit, the open access limit may not be exceeded and counts toward the limited entry limit. If a vessel has a limited entry permit registered to it at any time during the trip limit period and uses open access gear, but the open access limit is larger than the limited entry limit, the smaller limited entry limit applies, even if taken entirely with open access gear.

(B) * * *

(*1*) *Vessel registered to a limited entry trawl permit.* To fish with open access gear, defined at § 660.11, a vessel registered to a limited entry trawl permit must make the appropriate fishery declaration, as specified at § 660.14(d)(5)(iv)(A). In addition, a vessel registered to a limit entry trawl permit must remove the permit from their vessel, as specified at § 660.25(b)(4)(vi), unless the vessel will be fishing in the open access fishery under one of the following declarations specified at § 660.13(d):

* * * * *

(*2*) *Vessel registered to a limited entry fixed gear permit(s).* To fish with open access gear, defined at § 660.11, subpart C, a vessel registered to a limit entry fixed gear permit must make the appropriate open access declaration, as specified at § 660.14(d)(5)(iv)(A). Vessels registered to a sablefish-endorsed permit(s) fishing in the sablefish primary season (described at § 660.231, subpart E) may only fish with the gear(s) endorsed on their sablefish-endorsed permit(s) against those limits.

(*3*) *Vessel jointly registered to more than one limited entry permit.* Vessels jointly registered (under the provisions at § 660.25(b)(4)(iv)(B)) may fish with open access gear (defined at § 660.11) if they meet the requirements of both paragraphs (h)(7)(ii)(B)(*1*) and (*2*) of this section.

(iii) *Fishing in both the Shorebased IFQ Program and the limited entry fixed gear fishery for vessels that are jointly registered.*

(A) *Fishing in the Shorebased IFQ Program and limited entry fixed gear fishery with different trip limits.* If a vessel fishes in both the Shorebased IFQ Program and the limited entry fixed gear fishery during a cumulative limit period, they are subject to the most restrictive trip limits for non-IFQ species.

(B) *Fishing in the Shorebased IFQ Program and the limited entry fixed gear sablefish primary fishery with different trip limits.* If a vessel is jointly registered and one or more of the limited entry permits is sablefish endorsed, any sablefish landings made by a vessel declared into the limited entry fixed gear fishery after the start of the sablefish primary fishery count towards the tier limit(s), per regulations at § 660.232(a)(2), subpart E. Any sablefish landings made by a vessel declared into the Shorebased IFQ Program must be covered by quota pounds, per regulations at § 660.112(b), subpart D, and will not count towards the tier limit(s).

■ 9. In § 660.112:

■ a. Revise paragraphs (a)(3)(i) and (ii);

■ b. Remove paragraph (b)(1)(xii)(B); and

■ c. Redesignate paragraph (b)(1)(xii)(C) as (b)(1)(xii)(B).

The revisions read as follows:

§ 660.112 Trawl fishery—prohibitions.

* * * * *

(a) * * *

(3) * * *

(i) Fail to comply with all recordkeeping and reporting requirements at § 660.13, subpart C; including failure to submit information, or submission of inaccurate or false information on any report required at § 660.13(d), subpart C, and § 660.113.

(ii) Falsify or fail to make and/or file, retain or make available any and all reports of groundfish landings,

containing all data, and in the exact manner, required by the regulation at § 660.13, subpart C, or § 660.113.

* * * * *

■ 10. In § 660.113:

■ a. Revise paragraphs (a)(2) and (b)(4)(ii)(A);

■ b. Remove paragraphs (b)(4)(ii)(B) and (C) and redesignate paragraphs (b)(4)(ii)(D) through (F) as (b)(4)(ii)(B) through (D);

■ c. Revise newly redesignated paragraphs (b)(4)(ii)(C)(*5*) introductory text and (b)(4)(ii)(C)(*6*); and

■ d. Revise paragraphs (b)(4)(iii) and (v).

The revisions read as follows:

§ 660.113 Trawl fishery—recordkeeping and reporting.

* * * * *

(a) * * *

(2) All records used in the preparation of records or reports specified in this section or corrections to these reports must be maintained for a period of not less than three years after the date of landing and must be immediately available upon request for inspection by NMFS or authorized officers or others as specifically authorized by NMFS. Records used in the preparation of required reports specified in this section or corrections to these reports that are required to be kept include, but are not limited to, any written, recorded, graphic, electronic, or digital materials as well as other information stored in or accessible through a computer or other information retrieval system; worksheets; weight slips; preliminary, interim, and final tally sheets; receipts; checks; ledgers; notebooks; diaries; spreadsheets; diagrams; graphs; charts; tapes; disks; or computer printouts. All relevant records used in the preparation of electronic fish ticket reports or corrections to these reports, including dock tickets, must be maintained for a period of not less than three years after the date of landing and must be immediately available upon request for inspection by NMFS or authorized officers or others as specifically authorized by NMFS.

(b) * * *

(4) * * *

(ii) * * *

(A) Include, as part of each electronic fish ticket submission, the actual scale weight for each groundfish species as specified by requirements at § 660.15(c), and the vessel identification number. Use, and maintain in good working order, hardware, software, and internet access as specified at § 660.15(d).

* * * * *

(C) * * *

(*5*) Prior to submittal, three copies of the printed, signed, electronic fish ticket must be produced by the IFQ first receiver and a copy provided to each of the following:

* * * * *

(*6*) After review and signature, the electronic fish ticket must be submitted within 24 hours of the completion of the offload, as specified in paragraph (b)(4)(ii)(B) of this section.

* * * * *

(iii) *Revising a submission.* In the event that a data error is found, electronic fish ticket submissions must be revised by resubmitting the revised form electronically. Electronic fish tickets are to be used for the submission of final data. Preliminary data, including estimates of fish weights or species composition, shall not be submitted on electronic fish tickets.

* * * * *

(v) *Reporting requirements when a temporary waiver has been granted.* IFQ first receivers that have been granted a temporary waiver from the requirement to submit electronic fish tickets must submit on paper the same data as is required on electronic fish tickets within 24 hours of the date received during the period that the waiver is in effect. Paper fish tickets must be sent by facsimile to NMFS, West Coast Region, Sustainable Fisheries Division, 206–526–6736 or by delivering it in person to 7600 Sand Point Way NE., Seattle, WA 98115. The requirements for submissions of paper tickets in this paragraph are separate from, and in addition to existing state requirements for landing receipts or fish receiving tickets.

* * * * *

§ 660.114 [Amended]

■ 11. Amend § 660.114(b) by removing the words ''§ 660.25(b)(4)(v)'' wherever they appear and adding in their place the words ''§ 660.25(b)(4)(vi)''.

■ 12. In § 660.212, revise paragraph (a)(2), add paragraphs (a)(3) through (5), and revise paragraphs (b) and (d)(1) and (2) to read as follows:

§ 660.212 Fixed gear fishery—prohibitions.

* * * * *

(a) * * *

(2) Take and retain, possess, or land more than a single cumulative limit of a particular species, per vessel, per applicable cumulative limit period, except for sablefish taken in the limited entry fixed gear sablefish primary season from a vessel authorized to fish in that season, as described at § 660.231 and except for IFQ species taken in the Shorebased IFQ Program from a vessel authorized under gear switching provisions as described at § 660.140(k).

(3) Transport fish, if that fish includes any amount of sablefish, away from the point of landing before being sorted and weighed by federal groundfish species or species group, and recorded for submission on an electronic fish ticket under § 660.213(e). (If fish will be transported to a different location for processing, all sorting and weighing to federal groundfish species groups must occur before transporting the fish away from the point of landing).

(4) Mix fish from more than one landing, where one or more of the landings includes any sablefish, prior to the fish being sorted and weighed for reporting on an electronic fish ticket under § 660.213(e).

(5) Process, sell, or discard any fish, if that fish includes any amount of sablefish, that has not been accounted for on an electronic fish ticket under § 660.213(e).

(b) *Recordkeeping and reporting.* (1) Fail to comply with all recordkeeping and reporting requirements at § 660.13, subpart C; including failure to submit information, or submission of inaccurate or false information on any report required at § 660.13(d), subpart C, and § 660.213.

(2) Falsify or fail to make and/or file, retain or make available any and all reports of groundfish landings that include sablefish, containing all data, and in the exact manner, required by the regulation at § 660.13, subpart C, or § 660.213.

* * * * *

(d) *Sablefish fisheries.* (1) Take and retain, possess or land sablefish under the tier limits provided for the limited entry, fixed gear sablefish primary season, described in § 660.231(b)(3), from a vessel that is not registered to a limited entry permit with a sablefish endorsement.

(2) Take and retain, possess or land sablefish in the sablefish primary season, described at § 660.231(b), unless the owner of the limited entry permit registered for use with that vessel and authorizing the vessel to fish in the sablefish primary season is on board that vessel. Exceptions to this prohibition are provided at § 660.231(b)(4)(i) and (ii).

* * * * *

■ 13. In § 660.213, revise paragraph (d)(1) and add paragraph (e) to read as follows:

§ 660.213 Fixed gear fishery—recordkeeping and reporting.

* * * * *

(d) * * *

(1) Any person landing groundfish must retain on board the vessel from

which groundfish are landed, and provide to an authorized officer upon request, copies of any and all reports of groundfish landings containing all data, and in the exact manner, required by the applicable state law throughout the cumulative limit period during which a landing occurred and for 15 days thereafter. All relevant records used in the preparation of electronic fish ticket reports or corrections to these reports, including dock tickets, must be maintained for a period of not less than three years after the date of landing and must be immediately available upon request for inspection by NMFS or authorized officers or others as specifically authorized by NMFS.

* * * * *

(e) *Electronic fish ticket.* The first receiver, as defined at § 660.11, subpart C, of fish, if that fish includes any amount of sablefish, from a limited entry fixed gear vessel, is responsible for compliance with all reporting requirements described in this paragraph. Per requirements at § 660.212(a), all fish, if that fish includes any amount of sablefish, must be reported via electronic fish ticket. When used in this paragraph, submit means to transmit final electronic fish ticket information via web-based form or, if a waiver is granted, by paper form. When used in this paragraph, record means the action of documenting electronic fish ticket information in any written format.

(1) *Required information.* All first receivers must provide the following types of information: Date of landing, vessel that made the landing, vessel identification number, limited entry permit number(s), name of the vessel operator, gear type used, receiver, actual weights of species landed listed by species or species group including species with no value, condition landed, number of salmon by species, number of Pacific halibut, ex-vessel value of the landing by species, fish caught inside/outside 3 miles or both, and any other information deemed necessary by the Regional Administrator (or designee) as specified on the appropriate electronic fish ticket form.

(2) *Submissions.* The first receiver must:

(i) Include, as part of each electronic fish ticket submission, the actual scale weight for each groundfish species as specified by requirements at § 660.15(c), the vessel identification number, and the limited entry permit number. Use and maintain, for the purposes of submitting electronic fish tickets, equipment as specified at § 660.15(d).

(ii) Submit a completed electronic fish ticket(s) no later than 24 hours after the date of landing, unless a waiver of this requirement has been granted under provisions specified at paragraph (e)(4) of this section.

(iii) Sablefish from a single landing in the limited entry fixed gear sablefish primary fishery may be counted against more than one stacked permit, or against a tier limit(s) and the cumulative trip limit in the DTL fishery. For vessels with stacked limited entry sablefish permits, defined at § 660.12, sablefish may be divided for the purposes of apportioning the sablefish amongst the remaining tier limits associated with each of the stacked permits; in that instance the electronic fish ticket(s) must record all pertinent limited entry permit numbers and apportion sablefish landed against each tier limit. Per regulations at § 660.232(a)(2) a vessel may apportion sablefish catch between the remainder of its tier limit(s) and against the applicable DTL limits; in that instance the electronic fish ticket must be used to apportion sablefish landed against the tier(s) from the sablefish landed against cumulative trip limits of the DTL fishery. If sablefish is apportioned in either of the ways described in this paragraph, the electronic fish ticket must meet the process and submittal requirements specified in paragraphs (e)(iv) and (v) of this section. In addition, the owner-on-board, unless exempted under regulations at § 660.231(a)(4), must review and sign documentation of the landing, as described in paragraphs (e)(2)(iv) and (v) of this section.

(iv) If electronic fish tickets will be submitted prior to processing or transport, follow these process and submittal requirements:

(A) After completing the landing, the electronic fish ticket information must be recorded immediately.

(B) Prior to submittal of the electronic fish ticket, the information recorded for the electronic fish ticket must be reviewed by the vessel operator who delivered the fish and the port sampler, if one is present. If required by regulations at § 660.231(a)(4), the owner-on-board must also review the information recorded on the electronic fish ticket prior to submittal.

(C) After review, the receiver and the vessel operator must sign a printed hard copy of the electronic fish ticket or, if the landing occurs outside of business hours, the original dock ticket. If required by regulations at § 660.231(a)(4), the owner-on-board must also sign a printed copy of the electronic fish ticket or, if the landing occurs outside of business hours, the original dock ticket.

(D) Prior to submittal, three copies of the signed electronic fish ticket must be produced by the receiver and a copy provided to each of the following:

(*1*) The vessel operator and/or the owner-on-board,

(*2*) The state of origin if required by state regulations, and

(*3*) The first receiver.

(E) After review and signature, the electronic fish ticket must be submitted within 24 hours after the date of landing, as specified in paragraph (e)(2)(ii) of this section.

(v) If electronic fish tickets will be submitted after transport, follow these process and submittal requirements:

(A) The vessel name, limited entry permit number, and the electronic fish ticket number must be recorded on each dock ticket related to that landing.

(B) Upon completion of the dock ticket, but prior to transfer of the landing to another location, the dock ticket information that will be used to complete the electronic fish ticket must be reviewed by the vessel operator who delivered the fish. If the electronic fish ticket will report landings of sablefish in the sablefish primary fishery, the owner-on-board, unless exempted under regulations at § 660.231(a)(4), must review the information recorded on the dock ticket prior to transfer of the landing to another location.

(C) After review, the first receiver and the vessel operator must sign the original copy of each dock ticket related to that landing. If a dock ticket includes landings of sablefish in the sablefish primary fishery, the owner-on-board, unless exempted under regulations at § 660.231(a)(4), must sign the original copy of that dock ticket.

(D) Prior to submittal of the electronic fish ticket, three copies of the signed dock ticket must be produced by the first receiver and a copy provided to each of the following:

(*1*) The vessel operator and/or the owner-on-board,

(*2*) The state of origin if required by state regulations, and

(*3*) The first receiver.

(E) Based on the information contained in the signed dock ticket, the electronic fish ticket must be completed and submitted within 24 hours of the completion of the landing, as specified in paragraph (e)(2)(ii) of this section.

(F) Three copies of the electronic fish ticket must be produced by the first receiver and a copy provided to each of the following:

(*1*) The vessel operator and/or the owner-on-board,

(*2*) The state of origin if required by state regulations, and

(*3*) The first receiver.

(3) *Revising a submission.* In the event that a data error is found, electronic fish ticket submissions must be revised by resubmitting the revised form electronically. Electronic fish tickets are to be used for the submission of final data. Preliminary data, including estimates of fish weights or species composition, shall not be submitted on electronic fish tickets.

(4) *Waivers for submission.* On a case-by-case basis, a temporary written waiver of the requirement to submit electronic fish tickets may be granted by the Assistant Regional Administrator or designee if he/she determines that circumstances beyond the control of a receiver would result in inadequate data submissions using the electronic fish ticket system. The duration of the waiver will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

(5) *Reporting requirements when a temporary waiver has been granted.* Receivers that have been granted a temporary waiver from the requirement to submit electronic fish tickets must submit on paper the same data as is required on electronic fish tickets within 24 hours of the date received during the period that the waiver is in effect. Paper fish tickets must be sent by facsimile to NMFS, West Coast Region, Sustainable Fisheries Division, 206–526–6736 or by delivering it in person to 7600 Sand Point Way NE., Seattle, WA 98115. The requirements for submissions of paper tickets in this paragraph are separate from, and in addition to existing state requirements for landing receipts or fish receiving tickets.

■ 14. In § 660.231, revise paragraphs (a), (b)(1) through (3), and (b)(4) introductory text to read as follows:

§ 660.231 Limited entry fixed gear sablefish primary fishery.

* * * * *

(a) *Sablefish endorsement.* In addition to requirements pertaining to fishing in the limited entry fixed gear fishery (described in subparts C and E), a vessel may not fish in the sablefish primary season for the limited entry fixed gear fishery, unless at least one limited entry permit with both a gear endorsement for longline or trap (or pot) gear and a sablefish endorsement is registered for use with that vessel. Permits with sablefish endorsements are assigned to one of three tiers, as described at § 660.25(b)(3)(iv), subpart C.

(b) * * *

(1) *Season dates.* North of 36° N. lat., the sablefish primary season for the limited entry, fixed gear, sablefish-endorsed vessels begins at 12 noon local time on April 1 and closes at 12 noon local time on October 31, or closes for an individual vessel owner when the tier limit for the sablefish endorsed permit(s) registered to the vessel has been reached, whichever is earlier, unless otherwise announced by the Regional Administrator through the routine management measures process described at § 660.60(c).

(2) *Gear type.* During the primary season, when fishing against primary season cumulative limits, each vessel authorized to fish in that season under paragraph (a) of this section may fish for sablefish with any of the gear types, except trawl gear, endorsed on at least one of the sablefish endorsed permits registered for use with that vessel.

(3) *Cumulative limits.* (i) A vessel fishing in the primary season will be constrained by the sablefish cumulative limit associated with each of the sablefish endorsed permits registered for use with that vessel. During the primary season, each vessel authorized to fish in that season under paragraph (a) of this section may take, retain, possess, and land sablefish, up to the cumulative limits for each of the sablefish endorsed permits registered for use with that vessel. If a vessel is stacking permits, that vessel may land up to the total of all cumulative limits announced in this paragraph for the tiers for those permits, except as limited by paragraph (b)(3)(ii) of this section. Up to 3 sablefish endorsed permits may be stacked for use with a single vessel during the primary season; thus, a single vessel may not take and retain, possess or land more than 3 primary season sablefish cumulative limits in any one year. Per regulations at § 660.12(a)(6), subpart C, all other groundfish landings are subject to per vessel trip limits. In 2015, the following annual limits are in effect: Tier 1 at 41,175 (18,677 kg), Tier 2 at 18,716 lb (8,489 kg), and Tier 3 at 10,695 lb (4,851 kg). For 2016 and beyond, the following annual limits are in effect: Tier 1 at 45,053 lb (20,436 kg), Tier 2 at 20,479 lb (9,289 kg), and Tier 3 at 11,702 lb (5,308 kg).

(ii) If a sablefish endorsed permit is registered to more than one vessel during the primary season in a single year, the second vessel may only take the portion of the cumulative limit for that permit that has not been harvested by the first vessel to which the permit was registered. The combined primary season sablefish landings for all vessels registered to that permit may not exceed the cumulative limit for the tier associated with that permit.

(iii) A cumulative trip limit is the maximum amount of sablefish that may be taken and retained, possessed, or landed per vessel in a specified period of time, with no limit on the number of landings or trips.

(iv) *Incidental Pacific halibut retention north of Pt. Chehalis, WA (46°53.30′ N. lat.).* From April 1 through October 31, vessels authorized to participate in the sablefish primary fishery, licensed by the International Pacific Halibut Commission for commercial fishing in Area 2A (waters off Washington, Oregon, California), and fishing with longline gear north of Pt. Chehalis, WA (46°53.30′ N. lat.) may possess and land up to the following cumulative limits: 110 lb (50 kg) dressed weight of Pacific halibut for every 1,000 pounds (454 kg) dressed weight of sablefish landed and up to 2 additional Pacific halibut in excess of the 110-pounds-per-1,000-pound ratio per landing. ''Dressed'' Pacific halibut in this area means halibut landed eviscerated with their heads on. Pacific halibut taken and retained in the sablefish primary fishery north of Pt. Chehalis may only be landed north of Pt. Chehalis and may not be possessed or landed south of Pt. Chehalis.

(4) *Owner-on-board requirement.* Any person who owns or has ownership interest in a limited entry permit with a sablefish endorsement, as described at § 660.25(b)(3), subpart C, must be on board the vessel registered for use with that permit at any time that the vessel has sablefish on board the vessel that count toward that permit's cumulative sablefish landing limit. This person must carry government issued photo identification while aboard the vessel. This person must review and sign a printed copy of the electronic fish ticket(s) or dock ticket, as described at § 660.213(d), unless this person qualified for the owner-on-board exemption. A permit owner is qualified for the owner-on-board exemption and not obligated to be on board the vessel registered for use with the sablefish-endorsed limited entry permit during the sablefish primary season if:

* * * * *

■ 15. Section 660.232 is revised to read as follows:

§ 660.232 Limited entry daily trip limit (DTL) fishery for sablefish.

(a) *Limited entry DTL fisheries both north and south of 36° N. lat.* (1) Before the start of the sablefish primary season, all sablefish landings made by a vessel declared into the limited entry fixed gear fishery and authorized by § 660.231(a) to fish in the sablefish primary season will be subject to the restrictions and limits of the limited entry DTL fishery for sablefish specified in this section and which is governed by

routine management measures imposed under § 660.60(c), subpart C.

(2) Following the start of the primary season, all sablefish landings made by a vessel declared into the limited entry fixed gear fishery and authorized by § 660.231(a) to fish in the primary season will count against the primary season cumulative limit(s) associated with the sablefish-endorsed permit(s) registered for use with that vessel. A vessel that is eligible to fish in the sablefish primary season may fish in the DTL fishery for sablefish once that vessels' primary season sablefish limit(s) have been landed, or after the close of the primary season, whichever occurs earlier (as described at § 660.231(b)(1). If the vessel continues to fish in the limited entry fixed gear fishery for any part of the remaining fishing year, any subsequent sablefish landings by that vessel will be subject to the restrictions and limits of the limited entry DTL fishery for sablefish.

(3) Vessels registered for use with a limited entry fixed gear permit that does not have a sablefish endorsement may fish in the limited entry DTL fishery, consistent with regulations at § 660.230, for as long as that fishery is open during the fishing year, subject to routine management measures imposed under § 660.60(c), Subpart C. DTL limits for the limited entry fishery north and south of 36° N. lat. are provided in Tables 2 (North) and 2 (South) of this subpart.

(b) A vessel that is jointly registered, and has participated or will participate in both the limited entry fixed gear fishery and the Shorebased IFQ Program during the fishing year, is subject to crossover provisions described at § 660.60(h)(7), subpart C.

■ 16. In § 660.312:

■ a. Add paragraphs (a)(3) through (5);

■ b. Redesignate paragraphs (b) and (c) as (c) and (d); and

■ c. Add a new paragraph (b).

The additions read as follows:

§ 660.312 Open access fishery—prohibitions.

* * * * *

(a) * * *

(3) Transport fish, if that fish includes any amount of sablefish, away from the point of landing before being sorted and weighed by federal groundfish species or species group, and recorded for submission on an electronic fish ticket under § 660.313(f). (If fish will be transported to a different location for processing, all sorting and weighing to federal groundfish species groups must occur before transporting the fish away from the point of landing).

(4) Mix fish from more than one landing, where one or more of the landings includes any amount of sablefish, prior to the fish being sorted and weighed for reporting on an electronic fish ticket under § 660.313(f).

(5) Process, sell, or discard any fish if that fish includes any amount of sablefish, that has not been accounted for on an electronic fish ticket under § 660.313(f).

(b) *Recordkeeping and reporting.* (1) Fail to comply with all recordkeeping and reporting requirements at § 660.13, subpart C, including failure to submit information, or submission of inaccurate or false information on any report required at § 660.13(d), subpart C, and § 660.313.

(2) Falsify or fail to make and/or file, retain or make available any and all reports of groundfish landings that include sablefish, containing all data, and in the exact manner, required by the regulation at § 660.13, subpart C, or § 660.313.

* * * * *

■ 17. Section 660.313 is revised to read as follows:

§ 660.313 Open access fishery—recordkeeping and reporting.

(a) *General.* General reporting requirements specified at § 660.13(a) through (c), subpart C, apply to the open access fishery.

(b) *Declaration reports for vessels using nontrawl gear.* Declaration reporting requirements for open access vessels using nontrawl gear (all types of open access gear other than non-groundfish trawl gear) are specified at § 660.13(d), subpart C.

(c) *Declaration reports for vessels using non-groundfish trawl gear.* Declaration reporting requirements for open access vessels using non-groundfish trawl gear are specified at § 660.13(d), subpart C.

(d) *VMS requirements for open access fishery vessels.* VMS requirements for open access fishery vessels are specified at § 660.14, subpart C.

(e) *Retention of records.* Any person landing groundfish must retain on board the vessel from which groundfish is landed, and provide to an authorized officer upon request, copies of any and all reports of groundfish landings containing all data, and in the exact manner, required by the applicable state law throughout the cumulative limit period during which a landing occurred and for 15 days thereafter. All relevant records used in the preparation of electronic fish ticket reports or corrections to these reports, including dock tickets, must be maintained for a period of not less than three years after the date of landing and must be immediately available upon request for inspection by NMFS or authorized officers or others as specifically authorized by NMFS.

(f) *Electronic fish ticket.* The first receiver, as defined at § 660.11, subpart C, of fish, if that fish includes any amount of sablefish, from an open access vessel, is responsible for compliance with all reporting requirements described in this paragraph. Per requirements at § 660.312(a), all fish, if that fish includes any amount of sablefish, must be reported via electronic fish ticket. When used in this paragraph, submit means to transmit final electronic fish ticket information via web-based form or, if a waiver is granted, by paper form. When used in this paragraph, record means the action of documenting electronic fish ticket information in any written format.

(1) *Required information.* All first receivers must provide the following types of information: Date of landing, vessel that made the landing, vessel identification number, name of the vessel operator, gear type used, receiver, actual weights of species landed listed by species or species group including species with no value, condition landed, number of salmon by species, number of Pacific halibut, ex-vessel value of the landing by species, fish caught inside/outside 3 miles or both, and any other information deemed necessary by the Regional Administrator (or designee) as specified on the appropriate electronic fish ticket form.

(2) *Submissions.* The first receiver must:

(i) Include, as part of each electronic fish ticket submission, the actual scale weight for each groundfish species as specified by requirements at § 660.15(c) and the vessel identification number. Use and maintain, for the purposes of submitting electronic fish tickets, equipment as specified at § 660.15(d).

(ii) Submit a completed electronic fish ticket no later than 24 hours after the date of landing, unless a waiver of this requirement has been granted under provisions specified at paragraph (f)(4) of this section.

(iii) If electronic fish tickets will be submitted prior to processing or transport, follow these process and submittal requirements:

(A) After completing the landing, the electronic fish ticket information must be recorded immediately.

(B) Prior to submittal of the electronic fish ticket, the information recorded for the electronic fish ticket must be reviewed by the vessel operator who

delivered the fish and the port sampler, if one is present.

(C) After review, the receiver and the vessel operator must sign a printed hard copy of the electronic fish ticket or, if the landing occurs outside of business hours, the original dock ticket.

(D) Prior to submittal, three copies of the signed electronic fish ticket must be produced by the receiver and a copy provided to each of the following:

(*1*) The vessel operator,

(*2*) The state of origin if required by state regulations, and

(*3*) The first receiver.

(E) After review and signature, the electronic fish ticket must be submitted within 24 hours after the date of landing, as specified in paragraph (f)(2)(ii) of this section.

(iv) If electronic fish tickets will be submitted after transport, follow these process and submittal requirements:

(A) The vessel name and the electronic fish ticket number must be recorded on each dock ticket related to that landing.

(C) Upon completion of the dock ticket, but prior to transfer of the offload to another location, the dock ticket information that will be used to complete the electronic fish ticket must be reviewed by the vessel operator who delivered the fish.

(D) After review, the first receiver and the vessel operator must sign the original copy of each dock ticket related to that landing.

(E) Prior to submittal of the electronic fish ticket, three copies of the signed dock ticket must be produced by the first receiver and a copy provided to each of the following:

(*1*) The vessel operator,

(*2*) The state of origin if required by state regulations, and

(*3*) The first receiver.

(F) Based on the information contained in the signed dock ticket, the electronic fish ticket must be completed and submitted within 24 hours of the date of landing, as specified in paragraph (f)(2)(ii) of this section.

(G) Three copies of the electronic fish ticket must be produced by the first receiver and a copy provided to each of the following:

(*1*) The vessel operator,

(*2*) The state of origin if required by state regulations, and

(*3*) The first receiver.

(3) *Revising a submission.* In the event that a data error is found, electronic fish ticket submissions must be revised by resubmitting the revised form electronically. Electronic fish tickets are to be used for the submission of final data. Preliminary data, including estimates of fish weights or species composition, shall not be submitted on electronic fish tickets.

(4) *Waivers for submission.* On a case-by-case basis, a temporary written waiver of the requirement to submit electronic fish tickets may be granted by the Assistant Regional Administrator or designee if he/she determines that circumstances beyond the control of a receiver would result in inadequate data submissions using the electronic fish ticket system. The duration of the waiver will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

(5) *Reporting requirements when a temporary waiver has been granted.* Receivers that have been granted a temporary waiver from the requirement to submit electronic fish tickets must submit on paper the same data as is required on electronic fish tickets within 24 hours of the date of landing during the period that the waiver is in effect. Paper fish tickets must be sent by facsimile to NMFS, West Coast Region, Sustainable Fisheries Division, 206–526–6736 or by delivering it in person to 7600 Sand Point Way NE., Seattle, WA 98115. The requirements for submissions of paper tickets in this paragraph are separate from, and in addition to existing state requirements for landing receipts or fish receiving tickets.

[FR Doc. 2016–28153 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

15 CFR Part 902

50 CFR Part 679

[Docket No. 151113999–6999–02]

RIN 0648–BF54

Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area; American Fisheries Act; Amendment 113

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: NMFS issues this final rule to implement Amendment 113 to the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (FMP). This final rule modifies the management of Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI) Pacific cod fishery to set aside a portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod total allowable catch for harvest by vessels directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod and delivering their catch for processing to a shoreside processor located on land west of 170° W. longitude in the Aleutian Islands (''Aleutian Islands shoreplant''). The harvest set-aside applies only if specific notification and performance requirements are met, and only during the first few months of the fishing year. This harvest set-aside provides the opportunity for vessels, Aleutian Islands shoreplants, and the communities where Aleutian Islands shoreplants are located to receive benefits from a portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. The notification and performance requirements preserve an opportunity for the complete harvest of the BSAI Pacific cod resource if the set-aside is not fully harvested. This final rule is intended to promote the goals and objectives of Amendment 113, the FMP, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and other applicable laws.

DATES: Effective on November 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Electronic copies of Amendment 113 to the FMP, the Environmental Assessment (EA), Regulatory Impact Review (RIR), Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA), and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) prepared for this action, collectively ''the Analysis,'' and the proposed rule may be obtained from *http://www.regulations.gov* or from the NMFS Alaska Region Web site at *http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov*.

Written comments regarding the burden-hour estimates or other aspects of the collection-of-information requirements contained in this rule may be submitted to NMFS Alaska Region, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802–1668, Attn: Ellen Sebastian, Records Officer; in person at NMFS Alaska Region, 709 West 9th Street, Room 420A, Juneau, AK; by email to *OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov;* or by fax to (202) 395–5806.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Julie Scheurer, 907–586–7228.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

NMFS manages the groundfish and Pacific cod fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone of the BSAI under the FMP. The North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) prepared, and the Secretary of Commerce approved, the FMP pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery

Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) and other applicable laws. Regulations implementing the FMP appear at 50 CFR part 679. General regulations that pertain to U.S. fisheries appear at 50 CFR part 600.

NMFS published the Notice of Availability of Amendment 113 on July 19, 2016 (81 FR 46883), with comments invited through September 19, 2016. NMFS published the proposed rule to implement Amendment 113 on August 1, 2016 (81 FR 50444), with comments invited through August 31, 2016. The Secretary approved Amendment 113 on October 17, 2016. NMFS received 35 unique comments on Amendment 113 and the proposed rule from 16 different commenters. A summary of these comments and the responses by NMFS are provided under the heading ''Responses to Comments'' below. These comments resulted in two minor changes from the proposed rule. One additional change to this final rule is not in response to comments, but is an administrative change that NMFS deemed necessary for timely implementation of this final rule.

A detailed review of the BSAI Pacific cod fishery, provisions of Amendment 113, the proposed regulations to implement Amendment 113, and the rationale for these regulations is provided in the preamble to the proposed rule (81 FR 50444, August 1, 2016) and is not repeated here. The preamble to this final rule briefly reviews the regulatory changes made by this final rule.

This final rule modifies the BSAI Pacific cod fishery to set aside a portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod total allowable catch (TAC) for harvest by vessels directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod and delivering their catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing. The harvest set-aside applies only if specific notification and performance requirements are met, and only during the first few months of the fishing year.

Table 3 in the proposed rule preamble (81 FR 50444, August 1, 2016) describes the Overfishing Levels (OFLs), the Acceptable Biological Catches (ABCs), TACs, the Western Alaska Community Development Quota (CDQ) and non-CDQ fishery sector allocations, and seasonal apportionments of BSAI Pacific cod in 2017, the first year of implementation of this final rule. Each of these terms is described in the preamble to the proposed rule. Table 3 of the proposed rule preamble includes data from Tables 2 and 9 in the 2016 and 2017 final harvest specifications for the BSAI groundfish fisheries (81 FR 14773, March 18, 2016).

Harvesting and Processing of Pacific Cod in the Aleutian Islands

A variety of vessels using a variety of gear types harvest the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC each year. Trawl catcher vessels (CVs) and trawl catcher processors (CPs) have been among the most active participants in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. Hook-and-line CPs have consistently participated in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. Non-trawl CVs have harvested only a very small portion of the Pacific cod from the Aleutian Islands. The proposed rule and Section 2.6.6 of the Analysis provide additional detail on the types of vessels harvesting Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands.

Trawl CVs deliver their catch of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to several types of processors in the Aleutian Islands: CPs acting as motherships (vessels that process Pacific cod delivered by trawl CVs); stationary floating processors anchored in specific locations that receive and process catch on board but do not harvest and process their own catch; and shoreside processing facilities that are physically located on land west of 170° W. longitude in the Aleutian Islands (defined as ''Aleutian Islands shoreplant'' in this final rule).

Currently, Aleutian Islands shoreplants that may be capable of receiving Aleutian Islands Pacific cod from CVs are located in the communities of Adak and Atka. Although the Atka shoreplant has not received and processed Aleutian Islands Pacific cod, the shoreplant in Adak has received and processed relatively large amounts of Pacific cod. The proposed rule and Section 2.7.1 of the Analysis have additional detail on the delivery and processing of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod.

Since 2008, trawl CVs have primarily delivered their catch of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to a small group of CPs that operate as motherships. As deliveries of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod harvest from trawl CVs to CPs operating as motherships have increased in recent years, the amount of trawl CV harvest delivered to Aleutian Islands shoreplants has decreased. Additionally, CPs operating as motherships have demonstrated the capacity to process the entire TAC of Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands in years when no Aleutian Islands shoreplant is in operation. This final rule is intended in part to mitigate the risk that CVs, Aleutian Islands shoreplants, and the communities in which they are located will be preempted from participating in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery by CPs.

The proposed rule and Section 2.6 of the Analysis provide additional description of the factors that have affected the harvesting and processing of Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands.

Need for This Final Rule

A thorough description of the history and need for this action is provided in the proposed rule and the Analysis prepared for this action and is not repeated here. The Council adopted its preferred alternative for Amendment 113 at its October 2015 meeting.

Since 2008, Aleutian Islands fishing communities, and specifically the community of Adak and its shoreplant, have seen a decrease in the amount of Pacific cod being harvested and delivered. The amount of Pacific cod delivered to Aleutian Islands shoreplants has been highly variable, which is not conducive to stable shoreside operations. Several factors have contributed to this instability, and therefore the need for this action, including decreased Pacific cod biomass in the Aleutian Islands subarea; the establishment of separate OFLs, ABCs, and TACs for Pacific cod in the Bering Sea and the Aleutian Islands; changing Steller sea lion protection measures; and changing fishing practices in part resulting from rationalization programs that allocate catch to specific fishery participants.

This rule establishes a harvest set-aside in which a portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC will be available for harvest by vessels directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod and delivering their catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing. This harvest set-aside applies only if specific notification and performance requirements are met, and only during the first few months of the fishing year.

The Council determined and NMFS agrees that a harvest set-aside is needed for several reasons: The TAC for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod has been significantly lower than predicted so that less Pacific cod is available for harvest; the rationalization programs, and particularly the Amendment 80 Program, have allowed an influx of processing capacity into the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery; and the Aleutian Islands communities and shoreplants (Adak) have received almost all of their total first wholesale gross revenue from Aleutian Islands Pacific cod.

This final rule strikes a balance between providing protections for

fishing communities and ensuring that the fishery sectors have a meaningful opportunity to fully harvest their BSAI Pacific cod allocations by including several thresholds to prevent a portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC from being unharvested. This final rule will provide social and economic benefits to, and promote stability in, fishery-dependent fishing communities in the Aleutian Islands and is responsive to changes in management of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery such as rationalization programs, decreasing biomass of Pacific cod, and Steller sea lion protection measures that necessitate putting protections in place to protect other non-rationalized fisheries.

This final rule does not modify existing harvest allocations of BSAI Pacific cod to participants in the CDQ Program. This final rule does not modify existing harvest allocations of BSAI Pacific cod made to the nine non-CDQ fishery sectors defined in § 679.20(a)(7)(ii)(A). Although the nine non-CDQ sectors will continue to receive their existing harvest allocations of BSAI Pacific cod, each sector's ability to harvest a portion of its BSAI Pacific cod allocation in the Aleutian Islands may be affected by this rule.

The Aleutian Islands shoreplants in Adak and Atka currently are not processing Aleutian Islands Pacific cod. However, the protection measures and harvest set-aside in this final rule will minimize the risk of exclusion from, and maintain opportunities for participation in, the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery by Aleutian Islands harvesters, shoreplants, and communities when those Aleutian Islands communities are able to accept deliveries of and process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod.

This final rule revises regulations to provide additional opportunities for harvesters to deliver Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to Aleutian Islands shoreplants. Recent Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TACs have not been sufficient to allow all sectors to prosecute the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery at their historical levels. Without protections, Aleutian Islands harvesters, shoreplants, and fishing communities may be preempted from the fishery by harvests by CPs, or by harvests from CVs delivering their catch to CPs.

Because of their remote location and limited economic alternatives, Aleutian Islands communities rely on harvesting and processing of the nearby fishery resources to support and sustain the social and economic welfare of their communities. This final rule is intended to be directly responsive to National Standard 8 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act that states conservation and management measures shall take into account the importance of fishery resources to fishing communities in order to provide for the sustained participation of such communities, and to the extent practicable, minimize adverse economic impacts on such communities (16 U.S.C. 1851(a)(8)).

Overview of Measures Implemented by This Rule

This final rule modifies several aspects of the BSAI Pacific cod fishery. This final rule sets aside a portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ TAC for harvest by vessels directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod and delivering their catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants. However, the harvest set-aside applies only if specific notification and performance requirements are met, and only during the first few months of the fishing year.

In order to implement Amendment 113, this final rule:

- Defines the term ''Aleutian Islands shoreplant'' in regulation;
- Calculates and defines the amount of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC that will be available as a directed fishing allowance (DFA) and the amount that will be available as an incidental catch allowance (ICA);
- Limits the amount of early season (from January 20 until April 1), also known as A-season, Pacific cod that may be harvested by the trawl CV sector in the Bering Sea prior to March 21 (Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation);
- Sets aside some or all of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ DFA for harvest by vessels directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod and delivering their catch for processing by Aleutian Islands shoreplants from January 1 to March 15 (Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside);
- Requires that either the City of Adak or the City of Atka annually notify NMFS of its intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod during the upcoming fishing year in order for the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation to be effective in the upcoming fishing year; and
- Removes the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside if less than 1,000 metric tons (mt) of the harvest set-aside is delivered to (*i.e.,* landed at) Aleutian Islands shoreplants on or before February 28, or if the harvest set-aside is fully taken before March 15.

The following sections provide further explanation of the regulatory changes made by this rule. Additional detail about the rationale for and effect of the regulatory changes in this rule is provided in the preamble to the proposed rule and in the Analysis for this action.

Summary of Regulatory Changes

Revisions to Definitions at § 679.2

This final rule adds a definition to § 679.2 for ''Aleutian Islands shoreplant'' to mean a processing facility that is physically located on land west of 170° W. longitude within the State of Alaska (State). This definition is needed because the existing term ''shoreside processor'' in § 679.2 can include processing vessels that are moored or otherwise fixed in a location (*i.e.,* stationary floating processors), but not necessarily located on land. This new definition provides a clear and consistent term for referencing the processors located on land within the Aleutian Islands.

Revisions to General Limitations at § 679.20

This final rule adds a new paragraph (viii) to § 679.20(a)(7). This new paragraph includes the primary regulatory provisions of this final rule. The preamble to the proposed rule provides examples to aid the reader in understanding how this final rule will apply using 2017 harvest specifications for BSAI Pacific cod (81 FR 14773, March 18, 2016). For the remainder of this preamble, unless otherwise specified, all references to allocations and apportionments of BSAI Pacific cod refer to non-CDQ allocations and apportionments of BSAI Pacific cod.

Calculation of the Aleutian Islands Pacific Cod ICA and DFA

NMFS will annually specify an ICA and a DFA derived from the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ TAC. Each year, during the annual harvest specifications process described at § 679.20(c), NMFS will specify an amount of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod that NMFS estimates will be taken as incidental catch when directed fishing for non-CDQ groundfish other than Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands. This amount will be the Aleutian Islands ICA and will be deducted from the Aleutian Islands non-CDQ TAC. The amount of the Aleutian Islands non-CDQ TAC remaining after subtraction of the Aleutian Islands ICA will be the Aleutian Islands DFA.

NMFS will specify the Aleutian Islands ICA and DFA so that NMFS can

clearly establish the amount of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod that will be used to determine the amount of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside described in the following sections of this preamble. The specification will also provide the public with notification of the amount of the Aleutian Islands non-CDQ TAC that is available for directed fishing prior to the start of the fishing season to aid in the planning of fishery operations. The Aleutian Islands DFA is the maximum amount of Pacific cod available for directed fishing by all non-CDQ fishery sectors in all seasons in the Aleutian Islands.

Although the amount of the Aleutian Islands ICA may vary from year to year, NMFS specifies an Aleutian Islands ICA of 2,500 mt for 2017. NMFS determined that this amount will be needed to support incidental catch of Pacific cod in other Aleutian Islands non-CDQ directed groundfish fisheries. In future years, NMFS will specify the Aleutian Islands ICA in the annual harvest specifications based on recent and anticipated incidental catch of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod in other Aleutian Islands non-CDQ directed groundfish fisheries.

Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation

This final rule establishes the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation to restrict the amount of the trawl CV sector's A-season allocation that can be harvested in the Bering Sea subarea prior to March 21. The Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation ensures that some of the trawl CV sector's A-season allocation remains available for harvest in the Aleutian Islands subarea by trawl catcher vessels that deliver their catch of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing. On March 21, the restriction on Bering Sea harvest by the trawl CV sector will be lifted and the remainder, if any, of the BSAI trawl CV sector's A-season allocation can be harvested in either the Bering Sea or the Aleutian Islands (if still open to directed fishing for Pacific cod) for delivery to any eligible processor for processing.

The Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation will equal the lesser of either the Aleutian Islands DFA or 5,000 mt. The Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation will be equivalent to the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside, as discussed in the following section of the preamble. The amount of the trawl CV sector's A-season allocation that may be harvested in the Bering Sea prior to March 21 will be the amount of Pacific cod that remains after deducting the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation from the BSAI trawl CV sector A-season allocation listed in the annual harvest specifications (and as determined at § 679.20(a)(7)(iv)(A)(*1*)(*i*)). NMFS will annually specify in the annual harvest specifications the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and the amount of the trawl CV sector's A-season allocation that may be harvested in the Bering Sea prior to March 21.

The preamble to the proposed rule provides additional background on the factors that the Council and NMFS considered when determining the amount and timing of the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and is not repeated here.

Aleutian Islands Catcher Vessel Harvest Set-Aside

This final rule requires that some or all of the Aleutian Islands DFA be set aside for harvest by vessels directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod and delivering their catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing. This Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will be available for harvest by vessels using any authorized gear type and that deliver their directed catch of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing. NMFS will account for harvest and processing of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod under the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside separate from, and in addition to, its accounting of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod catch by the nine non-CDQ fishery sectors established in § 679.20(a)(7)(ii). Because of this separate accounting, the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will not increase or decrease the amount of BSAI Pacific cod allocated to any of the non-CDQ fishery sectors. The Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will apply from January 1 until March 15 of each year if certain notification and performance measures, described in the following section of the preamble, are satisfied.

The amount of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will be calculated as described above for the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation. It will be an amount equal to the lesser of either the Aleutian Islands DFA or 5,000 mt. NMFS will notify the public of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside through the annual harvest specifications process.

When the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is set equal to the Aleutian Islands DFA and the set-aside is in effect, directed fishing for Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands may only be conducted by vessels that deliver their catch of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing. Vessels that do not want to deliver their directed catch of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing will be prohibited from directed fishing for Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands when the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is in effect. These vessels will be permitted to conduct directed fishing for groundfish other than Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands when the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is in effect, and their incidental harvests of Pacific cod will accrue toward the Aleutian Islands ICA. CPs will be permitted to conduct directed fishing for Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands when the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside side is in effect as long as they act only as CVs and deliver their directed catch of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing. CPs also will be permitted to retain and process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod that is caught as incidental catch while directed fishing for groundfish other than Pacific cod, and those incidental harvests of Pacific cod will accrue toward the Aleutian Islands ICA.

When the Aleutian Islands DFA is greater than 5,000 mt, and therefore the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is set equal to 5,000 mt, the difference between the DFA and the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will be available for directed fishing by all non-CDQ fishery sectors with sufficient A-season allocations and may be processed by any eligible processor. This difference is called the ''Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery.'' In years when there is both an Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and an Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery, vessels may conduct directed fishing for Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands and deliver their catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants or to any eligible processor for processing as long as the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery is open to directed fishing. CPs will be permitted to conduct directed fishing for Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands and process that directed catch as long as the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery is open to directed fishing. NMFS will determine whether the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery is sufficient to support a directed fishery and will notify the public through a notice in the **Federal Register**.

While the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is in effect, NMFS will account for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod caught by vessels against the appropriate fishery sector allocation, the ICA or the DFA, and the Aleutian

Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside. Examples illustrating this accounting are provided in the preamble of the proposed rule.

If certain notification and performance measures are met, the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will be in effect from January 1 until March 15 of each year. If the entire set-aside is harvested and delivered prior to March 15, NMFS will lift the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside as soon as possible. The Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will end at noon on March 15 even if the entire set-aside has not been harvested and delivered to Aleutian Islands shoreplants.

When the set-aside ends, any remaining Aleutian Islands DFA may be harvested by any non-CDQ fishery sector with remaining A-season allocation, and the harvest may be delivered to any eligible processor. If a vessel has been directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod, but has not yet delivered that Pacific cod for processing when the harvest set-aside is lifted, that vessel may deliver its Pacific cod to any eligible processor. If a vessel has been directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod, but has not yet delivered that Pacific cod for processing when the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery closes, but the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is still in effect, it will be required to deliver that Pacific cod to an Aleutian Islands shoreplant for processing or be in violation of the directed fishing closure.

The preamble to the proposed rule provides additional background on the factors that the Council and NMFS considered when determining the amount and timing of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and is not repeated here.

Measures To Prevent Stranding of Aleutian Islands Non-CDQ Pacific Cod TAC

Stranding is a term sometimes used to describe TAC that remains unharvested due to regulations. This final rule includes performance measures intended to prevent the stranding of Aleutian Islands non-CDQ Pacific cod TAC if the set-aside is not requested, if limited processing occurs at Aleutian Islands shoreplants, or if the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is taken before March 15.

The first performance measure requires that either the City Manager of the City of Adak or the City Administrator of the City of Atka notify NMFS of the city's intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod in the upcoming fishing year. If neither city notifies NMFS in accordance with regulatory requirements described below, the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will not be in effect for the upcoming fishing year.

This final rule requires annual notification to NMFS in the form of a letter or memorandum signed by the City Manager of Adak or the City Administrator of Atka stating the city's intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod in the upcoming fishing year. This signed letter or memorandum is the official notification of intent. The official notification of intent must be postmarked no later than December 8, 2016, and no later than October 31 for each year after 2016. The official notification of intent must be submitted to the NMFS Alaska Regional Administrator by certified mail through the United States Postal Service. The City Manager of Adak or City Administrator of Atka must also submit an electronic copy of the official notification of intent and the certified mail receipt with postmark via email to NMFS (*nmfs.akr.inseason@noaa.gov*) no later than December 8, 2016, and no later than October 31 for each year after 2016. Email submission of electronic copies of the official notification of intent and the certified mail receipt with postmark will provide NMFS with the timely information it needs to manage the upcoming fisheries. Email notification is in addition to notification via certified U.S. Mail and does not replace the requirement for notification through the U.S. Postal Service.

A city's notification of intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod must contain the following information: Date, name of city, a statement of intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod, statement of calendar year during which the city intends to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod, and the signature of and contact information for the City Manager or City Administrator of the city whose shoreplant is intending to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod.

On or shortly after December 8, 2016, and November 1 for each year after 2016, the Regional Administrator will send a signed and dated letter either confirming receipt of the city's notification of their intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod, or informing the city that notification was not received by the deadline.

While this final rule will make the set-aside available for processing by any shoreplant west of 170° W. longitude in the Aleutian Islands, the notification requirement is required from either Adak or Atka and not another city that might have an Aleutian Islands shoreplant in the future. The Council and NMFS's rationale for this is provided in the preamble of the proposed rule.

The second performance measure removes the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside for the remainder of the A-season if less than 1,000 mt of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is delivered to Aleutian Islands shoreplants by February 28. This performance measure will lift the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and make any remaining amount of the set-aside available to all participants if Aleutian Islands shoreplants are unable to process Pacific cod or if too few or no vessels decide to participate in the set-aside fishery.

The third performance measure suspends the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation for the remainder of the year if the entire Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside (5,000 mt in 2017) is fully harvested and delivered to Aleutian Islands shoreplants before March 15.

The preamble to the proposed rule provides additional background on the factors considered by the Council and NMFS when establishing these performance standards and is not repeated here.

Harvest Specifications Process To Announce BSAI A-Season Pacific Cod Limits Implemented by Amendment 113

During the annual harvest specifications process described in the proposed rule, NMFS will publish in the proposed harvest specifications the amounts for the Aleutian Islands ICA, DFA, CV Harvest Set-Aside, and Unrestricted Fishery, as well as the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation, and the amount available for harvest by trawl CVs in the Bering Sea while the set-aside is in effect. These amounts will be published in a separate table to supplement the table in the harvest specifications that describes the final gear shares and allowances of the BSAI Pacific cod TAC for the upcoming year.

NMFS also will publish a notice in the **Federal Register** shortly after December 8, 2016, and November 1 for each year after 2016, announcing whether the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation will be in effect for the upcoming fishing year, and whether the harvest limits in the supplemental table will apply. If necessary, NMFS will publish in the **Federal Register** an adjustment of the BSAI A-season Pacific cod limits for the

upcoming year after the Council adopts the harvest specifications in December.

Amendment of the 2017 Final Harvest Specifications for the Groundfish Fishery of the BSAI

With this final rule, NMFS amends the 2017 final harvest specifications for the groundfish fishery of the BSAI by adding the following Table 8a, which specifies the Aleutian Islands ICA, DFA, CV Harvest Set-Aside, and Unrestricted Fishery, as well as the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation. If NMFS receives timely notification of intent to process from either Adak or Atka, the harvest limits in Table 8a will be in effect in 2017.

TABLE 8A—2017 BSAI A-SEASON PACIFIC COD LIMITS IF ALEUTIAN ISLANDS SHOREPLANTS INTEND TO PROCESS PACIFIC COD

2017 Allocations under Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside	Amount (mt)
AI non-CDQ TAC	11,465
AI ICA	2,500
AI DFA	8,965
BS non-CDQ TAC	213,141
BSAI Trawl CV A-Season Allocation	36,732
BSAI Trawl CV A-Season Allocation minus Sector Limitation [1]	31,732
BS Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation	5,000
AI CV Harvest Set-Aside	5,000
AI Unrestricted Fishery	3,965

[1] This is the amount of the BSAI trawl CV A-season allocation that may be harvested in the Bering Sea prior to March 21.

Changes From the Proposed Rule

NMFS made three changes to the regulatory text from the proposed rule. Two of these changes are in response to comments received on the proposed rule, and one change is made to address administration of this final rule in 2016.

First, this final rule modifies § 679.20(a)(7)(viii)(E)(*4*) in response to Comment 8. The words ''prior to'' are changed to ''on or before'' to reflect the Council's intent. See the response to Comment 8 for the complete justification for this change.

Second, this final rule modifies § 679.20(a)(7)(viii)(D) and (E) to specify that the City Manager of Adak and the City Administrator of Atka are the individuals responsible for notifying NMFS of their city's intent to process Pacific cod in the upcoming year. See the response to Comment 5 for the complete justification for this change.

Third, this final rule modifies § 679.20(a)(7)(viii) to include a separate notification deadline for 2016 for the City Manager of Adak or the City Administrator of Atka to notify NMFS of the intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod in 2017. This final rule requires that the official notification of intent to process for 2017 be postmarked and emailed no later than December 8, 2016. This final rule clarifies that for all years after 2016, this annual notification must be postmarked and emailed no later than October 31.

This change is required to ensure that NMFS provides an opportunity for the City of Adak and the City of Atka to notify NMFS of their intent to process after this final rule has published. Because this final rule will publish and become effective after October 31, 2016, the City of Adak and the City of Atka could not provide timely notification to NMFS of their intent to process in 2017 without this change in the notification deadline. This change enables the cities of Adak and Atka, and vessels delivering to Aleutian Island shoreplants, to receive the benefits of this final rule in 2017 that would otherwise be foregone without this change. NMFS is providing 15 days after the publication of this rule for the City of Adak or the City of Atka to notify NMFS so that the cities have adequate time after the publication of this final rule to prepare and submit their official notification of intent.

NMFS determined that this change will not affect participants in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery in ways not previously considered and analyzed. The 2016 deadline for submitting notification of intent to process falls between the two dates considered by the Council: Prior to November 1 or prior to December 15. In considering the effect these notification deadlines, the Analysis focuses on the ability of the industry to react if there are no Aleutian Islands shoreplants operating in the upcoming fishing year, stating that selection of the earlier deadline would provide more time for the industry to make the necessary arrangements to harvest and process the non-CDQ Aleutian Islands Pacific cod DFA, and that in general, more notification concerning processing of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod in the upcoming fishing year will help to reduce the risk of unharvested non-CDQ Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC. Even so, the Analysis concludes that both date options would give fishery participants sufficient time to plan and prepare before the A-season begins and that ideally notice of intent to process would be provided to NMFS by a date near the end of the December Council meeting. NMFS continues to agree with the Council that October 31 is the preferred deadline of the two dates considered, and this final rule establishes October 31 as the deadline for submission of notification of intent for each fishing year after 2016. However, NMFS has determined that the notification deadline for 2016 will allow Adak and Atka an opportunity to submit notification prior to the start of the 2017 fishing year, thus providing an opportunity for the set-aside to be effective in 2017, rather than having to wait an additional year. Additionally, the 2016 notification deadline will provide fishery participants with sufficient time to plan and prepare before the A-season begins because NMFS will be able to notify fishery participants as to whether the set-aside will be in effect for 2017 prior to December 15 and prior to the end of the December Council meeting. In addition, this change is applicable only for the first year of implementation of this final rule, and will therefore have a limited and temporary effect.

Responses to Comments

NMFS received 35 unique comments on Amendment 113 and the proposed rule in 18 comment letters from 16 different commenters. The 16 commenters consisted of 2 individuals; 7 companies representing CPs; the

Alaska Department of Fish and Game; 1 fish processing company; 1 CDQ group; 2 community development corporations, 1 Aleutian Islands municipal government; and 1 non-profit conservation organization. Of the 16 commenters, 9 explicitly supported adoption of the proposed harvest set-aside. Opponents were companies representing CPs whose vessels could be restricted by this action.

In responding to these comments, when NMFS refers to Amendment 113, unless otherwise noted, NMFS means Amendment 113 and this final rule implementing Amendment 113.

General Comments

Comment 1: This action is unnecessary. When Adak has an operational plant, it received a significant portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod catch without delivery requirements.

Response 1: In February 2015, the Council identified in a modified problem statement the purpose and need for protections for Aleutian Islands communities as a result of the implementation of rationalization programs, the BSAI Pacific cod TAC split, and relatively low Pacific cod abundance in the Aleutian Islands, among other factors (Section 2.2 of the Analysis). The Council stated that these factors have ''. . . increased the risk that the historical share of BSAI cod of other industry participants and communities that depend on shoreplant processing in the region may be diminished.'' The Council's rationale for its preferred alternative stated that this action ''. . . would provide benefits and stability to fishery dependent communities in the Aleutian Islands and is responsive to changes in management regimes like rationalization programs that necessitate putting protections in place to protect other non-rationalized fisheries'' (Section 2.4.3 of the Analysis). The Council's purpose and need statement, the proposed rule, and the Analysis describe the range of factors that have affected delivery patterns in the Aleutian Islands that could limit opportunities for Aleutian Islands shoreplants, harvesters delivering to Aleutian Islands shoreplants, and the communities in the Aleutian Islands. Thorough descriptions of the factors necessitating this action, and the Council's rationale are provided in the ''Need for This Proposed Rule'' section of the proposed rule and the Analysis and are not repeated here.

In years when the Adak shoreplant was not operational, the offshore processing sector (primarily CPs) was able to process the entire Aleutian Islands TAC (Section 2.7.1.2 of the Analysis), demonstrating that the offshore sector is capable of fully harvesting available catch and preempting the onshore sector's access to the fishery. Table 2–32 of the Analysis shows that prior to 2008, the majority of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod processed by the offshore sector originated from CP harvest, but after 2008, CV deliveries of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to CPs played a more prominent role in the offshore processing of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod. Although Aleutian Islands shoreplants operating in Adak have received Pacific cod without a harvest set-aside in the past, NMFS and the Council determined that this action is necessary to minimize the risk of diminished share of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to Aleutian Islands communities dependent on the fishery and to provide additional stability to promote and sustain Aleutian Islands shoreplants, harvesters delivering to Aleutian Islands shoreplants, and the communities in the Aleutian Islands.

Comment 2: The proposed rule assumes that the increase in offshore processing since the implementation of rationalization programs was a major cause of instability in onshore processing in the Aleutian Islands, but this is not true. There have been long-standing challenges to the viability of shore-based processing in the Aleutian Islands such as ownership changes of Aleutian Islands shoreplants, Steller sea lion protection measures, plant insolvency, energy costs, employment challenges, market conditions, and product transportation difficulties.

Response 2: As explained in the ''Need for This Proposed Rule'' section of the preamble to the proposed rule and in Section 2.2 of the Analysis, the Council and NMFS recognize that several factors have contributed to instability in processing operations in the Aleutian Islands, including decreased Pacific cod biomass in the Aleutian Islands subarea; the establishment of separate OFLs, ABCs, and TACs for Pacific cod in the Bering Sea and the Aleutian Islands (referred to as the ''BSAI TAC split''); changing Steller sea lion protection measures; historical volatility in the Aleutian Islands shoreplant processing sector; and changing fishing practices in part resulting from rationalization programs. The Council, NMFS and this rule do not assume that rationalization programs are the primary cause of this instability, but rather, one of many contributing factors.

Comment 3: This is a wipe-out plan for cod. It will wipe out cod just as this agency did in Maine. Some other system has to be set up for economic sustainability for people in the area. Stop this plan now.

Response 3: NMFS disagrees that Amendment 113 will wipe out Pacific cod. This action will not change the TAC for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod, or conservation and management measures that ensure that harvests of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod do not exceed established OFL, ABC, or TAC limits. Aleutian Islands Pacific cod is managed to a TAC that is set at or below the ABC and the stock is neither overfished nor approaching an overfished condition (see Section 3.3 of the Analysis).

Comment 4: There is no provision in the proposed rule to remove the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside from the FMP and Federal regulations if no on-shore processing activity occurs for a number of years. Does the set-aside continue indefinitely? What would prompt Council re-examination?

Response 4: The commenter is correct; there is no provision in Amendment 113 or this rule that would end, or sunset, the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside if Aleutian Islands shoreplants are not operational for a specified number of years. However, under the performance measures established by this final rule, the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is effective in a fishing year only if timely and complete notification of intent to process from the City of Adak or the City of Atka is received by NMFS. Presumably, if there is not likely to be an operational Aleutian Islands shoreplant in the upcoming fishing year, these cities would not submit a notification to NMFS. Also, in order for the set-aside to continue to be effective after February 28, a minimum of 1,000 mt of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod must be delivered to Aleutian Islands shoreplants on or before February 28. If, in the future, it appears that the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is not being used, or Aleutian Islands shoreplants cannot meet the demand, the Council could consider and, if warranted, initiate an action to revise or remove the provisions of Amendment 113 and its implementing regulations.

Comment 5: The proposed rule grants *de facto* fishery management authority to municipal officials, by requiring them to provide notice to NMFS of the Aleutian Islands shoreplants intent to process Pacific cod in the upcoming year. NMFS is surrendering the determination of whether a shore plant is prepared to process Pacific cod to a community representative who is not a regulated participant in the fishery. This is granting too much power to one

individual. The city manager could use this authority to undermine certain businesses or to grant favors. Additionally, Atka does not have a city manager.

Response 5: The Council specified that the City of Adak or the City of Atka should be the entity to provide official notification to NMFS of the community's intent to process Pacific cod, but it did not specify who from Adak or Atka should provide such notification (Section 2.7.2.4 of the Analysis). The Analysis describes that if the notification requirement is implemented, NMFS could specify the person representing the city who should provide the notification.

The commenter notes that the City of Atka does not have a city manager. Technically, that is accurate: Atka has a city administrator. Title 29 of the Alaska Statutes explains the distinctions between a city manager and a city administrator. In the manager form of municipality, the city manager is the chief executive. In a strong-mayor form of municipality, the mayor is the chief executive and the city administrator can exercise powers or duties only as delegated by the mayor and city council. In either case, the role of the manager or administrator is to represent the interests of the city, city council, and mayor. The language in the final rule has been changed to reflect that the city administrator is the person responsible for providing notification to NMFS for Atka.

This type of designation is not unprecedented. For example, in an action to create Community Quota Entities (CQE) for the Halibut and Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota Program (Amendment 66 to the Gulf of Alaska FMP, 69 FR 23681, April 30, 2004), NMFS specified which governing body would be responsible for proposing a potential CQE to NMFS, depending on the governance structure of the particular community. For communities incorporated as municipalities, the governing body identified was the city council. In communities represented by tribal governments, the governing body was the non-profit entity. In similar fashion, and as described in the proposed rule for this action, NMFS determined that the city manager or administrator would be the appropriate person responsible for submitting the required notification to NMFS.

While ownership and management of fish processing facilities may change, it is likely that there will always be someone performing the role of city manager or administrator for Adak and Atka. As elected or appointed officials, these representatives are bound by oath of office to uphold the wishes of their constituents. Currently, both the City of Adak and the City of Atka execute, in good faith, waivers for the delivery requirement for Western Aleutian Islands golden king crab when sufficient processing capacity does not exist in those communities. These cities issue the waiver knowing that it is not in the communities' best interests to strand the crab resource. The notification requirement under Amendment 113 is similar, and it is not clear how the requirement to notify NMFS of the communities' intent to process Pacific cod grants too much power to the city manager or administrator. NMFS expects that the city manager or administrator will be in communication with the shoreplant manager and local fishing fleet prior to the notification deadline to ensure that the shoreplant will be able to accept deliveries of Pacific cod once the set-aside goes into effect. If, for some reason, the shoreplant does not operate as anticipated, the 1,000 mt minimum processing performance measure would not be met by February 28 and the set-aside would be lifted.

NMFS does not consider the notification requirement to be a *de facto* grant of fishery management authority to the city manager or administrator. The Council and NMFS have established the fishery management policy with regard to Aleutian Islands Pacific cod. The intent of the Council and NMFS with Amendment 113 and this final rule is to have an Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside in place for Aleutian Islands fishing communities, and the harvesters and shoreplants that are part of those communities, to utilize. Recognizing that there may be years when Aleutian Islands shoreplants may not be operational, the notification provision was a fishery management decision by the Council and NMFS to provide for an orderly start to the fishing year and as a way to prevent the set-aside from becoming effective if neither city intends to process in the upcoming fishing year. The city manager or administrator is the person from whom NMFS will expect to receive notification of the city's intent to process Pacific cod and to whom NMFS will confirm that notification has been received. Under this final rule, the city manager or administrator is providing information to NMFS on anticipated processing activities based on knowledge gained from Aleutian Islands shoreplants in their communities. City managers and administrators are not delegated any authority to open or close fisheries, assess catch amounts, or take other actions provided in regulation. Notification is not to be confused with an active role in administering regulations. NMFS is ultimately responsible for taking any management actions once a notification has been received.

Comment 6: If this rule is implemented, NMFS will notify Adak or Atka city managers if they have not received their notifications of intent to process. This seems at odds with other programs that have notification dates, such as submission of annual cooperative notifications to NMFS. There is no regulatory language that provides for NMFS to notify the entity or person that it has not received cooperative information regarding the next year's intent to process.

Response 6: The commenter is referring to the regulatory language at (a)(7)(viii)(D)(*3*) which explains how NMFS will provide confirmation to the City Manager of the City of Adak or the City Administrator of the City of Atka if their notification of intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod has been received or not. This confirmation is to let the city know that the set-aside will or will not be in effect for the upcoming year. Similarly, NMFS will publish a notice in the **Federal Register** to inform the public whether the set-aside will be in effect. NMFS will not offer these cities additional time to provide notification if it was not received by the deadline and according to the requirements stated in regulations.

Comment 7: NMFS received 11 comment letters from 9 different entities in support of Amendment 113 and its implementing regulations. In general, the comments emphasized that three interacting issues have affected the viability of shoreside operations in the Aleutian Islands: the BSAI Pacific cod biomass estimates and TAC split, Steller sea lion protection measures, and rationalization programs. The commenters noted that fish processing is the core economic driver for the communities of Adak and Atka and that these communities have been negatively impacted by prior management actions. They stressed that Aleutian Islands communities, Adak and Atka in particular, need the kind of protections that the Council has provided to communities in the Gulf of Alaska (GOA) and Bering Sea for pollock, and to GOA communities for Pacific cod by limiting the amount that can be delivered either inshore or offshore. These commenters considered stable access to at least 5,000 mt of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod from the Federal

fishery essential for maintaining viable communities in Adak and Atka. These commenters concluded that this final rule provides community protections for shorebased processing in the Aleutian Islands management area that are critical to the survival of Aleutian Islands communities.

Response 7: NMFS acknowledges the comments in support of Amendment 113. The Secretary, through her designee, the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, approved Amendment 113 on October 17, 2016, and implements Amendment 113 with this final rule. The Secretary concluded that the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside in Amendment 113 is consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act, including the National Standards, and other applicable law.

Comment 8: The proposed regulatory language for the minimum Aleutian Islands shoreplant landing requirement at § 679.20(a)(7)(viii)(E)(*4*) states that ''if less than 1,000 mt of the Aleutian Islands Catcher Vessel Harvest Set-Aside is landed at Aleutian Islands shoreplants *prior to* February 28, then paragraphs (a)(7)(viii)(E)(*1*) for the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-season Sector Limitation and (*2*) for the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will not apply for the remainder of the fishing year.'' However, the preamble to the proposed rule and the Council motion clearly state that this performance measure must be met ''by'' February 28. This change in the proposed regulatory language from the Council's motion would give Aleutian Islands shoreplants one less day to fulfill the minimum delivery requirements. This one-day difference is not insignificant to Aleutian Islands shoreplants. An average of 178 mt of Pacific cod was landed at Adak on February 28 from 2002 through 2009. Landings on February 28 represent a substantial portion of the proposed 1,000-mt minimum landing requirement performance measure. The commenters request that the proposed regulatory language at § 679.20(a)(7)(viii)(E)(*4*) be changed so that landings made ''on or before'' February 28 will count toward the performance measure threshold.

Response 8: NMFS agrees. The Council motion, the preamble to the proposed rule, the Analysis, the FMP amendment text, and the notice of availability for the FMP amendment all state that 1,000 mt must be landed ''by,'' not ''prior to,'' February 28. The proposed regulatory language was inadvertently written in a way that contradicts the Council's intent for this performance measure. Inclusion of February 28 in the minimum landings period is important and necessary. As noted in Section 2.7.2.5 of the Analysis, Aleutian Islands Pacific cod tend to aggregate in late February to early March, and these aggregations are optimal for efficient trawl fishing. NMFS has changed § 679.20(a)(7)(viii)(E)(*4*) to clarify that landings made ''on or before'' February 28, rather than ''prior to'' February 28, will be used to determine whether the minimum landings requirement has been met.

Comment 9: As a longtime, small boat, Aleutian Islands fisherman, it is vital to my longline operation and to other small and entry level vessel owners to have a stable shoreside processing facility in the Aleutian Islands. Amendment 113 will create numerous opportunities for small boats and the community of Adak.

Response 9: NMFS acknowledges the support for this action.

Comment 10: We support solutions that optimize and create sustainable social, economic, and conservation outcomes. Amendment 113 and this final rule will help the economic sustainability of Adak and Atka and will help the aspirations of the Aleut people to repopulate some of the islands of the western Aleutians. Amendment 113 and this final rule may also improve the conservation and ecosystem sustainability of the area. Giving the local inhabitants a larger financial stake in the sustainability of the local ecosystem is an important step in a long process leading to better conservation. We firmly believe that where local, and particularly Alaska Natives, have more control over resource extraction, the conservation outcome is likely to be better.

Response 10: NMFS acknowledges the comment and the support for Amendment 113 and this final rule.

Comment 11: Trawl vessels catch large quantities of vulnerable deep sea corals and sponges in the area. Shifting to other gear types in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery may help protect these vulnerable species.

Response 11: NMFS acknowledges the comment but notes that this final rule does not modify the areas or types of gear that can be used to harvest fishery resources in the Aleutian Islands.

Comment 12: There is an error in the fourth row of Table 4 in the preamble of the proposed rule. The fourth row in Table 4 refers to the ''BSAI non-CDQ TAC.'' This row should have read ''BS non-CDQ TAC.''

Response 12: NMFS agrees that the fourth row in Table 4 of the proposed rule preamble should have read ''BS non-CDQ TAC.'' The amount of Pacific cod proposed for the BS non-CDQ TAC in the fourth row of Table 4 was accurate. This final rule modifies the final 2016 and 2017 harvest specifications to add a supplemental table, Table 8a, that provides the 2017 catch limits for Pacific cod under Amendment 113 and this final rule. NMFS will publish a notice in the **Federal Register** in December 2016 if there will be any changes to these amounts. NMFS will also publish a notice in the **Federal Register** to inform the public if the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and Bering Sea Trawl Catcher Vessel Sector Limitation will be in effect in 2017. Table 8a displays the correct name of the allocation and the correct amount. No changes to the regulatory text are necessary in response to this comment.

Comment 13: The agency has not followed the requisite process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). In particular, an environmental impact statement (EIS) should have been completed. The action is clearly controversial, as it has been under consideration for over 8 years in the Council process. A more thorough review might have compelled NMFS to reject this action.

Response 13: According to NEPA and Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations at 40 CFR 1502.3, an EIS is required when a fishery management action may significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Determining whether an action may significantly affect the quality of the human environment requires considerations of both context and intensity, and regulations at 40 CFR 1508.27(b) list several factors that are to be considered in evaluating the intensity of an action. One of these factors is the degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(4)). Before deciding whether to complete an EIS, agencies may prepare an EA to determine whether an EIS must be prepared or a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) can be made (40 CFR 1501.3 and 1508.9). If the EA results in a FONSI, an EIS is not needed.

Courts have held that an action is ''highly controversial'' when there is a substantial dispute about the size, nature, or effect of the action, or when substantial questions are raised as to whether a proposed action may cause significant degradation of some human environmental factor. Courts have also held that the existence of opposition to an action does not raise the level of controversy to the point that an EIS is required. Additionally, as stated in 40

CFR 1508.14 and in Section 3 of the Analysis, economic and social impacts by themselves are not sufficient to require the preparation of an EIS.

In accordance with NEPA and the CEQ regulations, the Council and NMFS appropriately prepared an EA for this action, which analyzes the potential effects of the action on individual resource components, as well as the potential cumulative effects. The EA was prepared using the best available scientific information. Using the information and analysis in the EA, the Council and NMFS reviewed the potential impacts of this action on the human environment as required under NEPA. After reviewing the impacts of this action, the Regional Administrator prepared and signed a FONSI, determining that the action will not result in significant impacts to the quality of the human environment, and further analysis in an EIS is not needed. NMFS determined that the action will make relatively minor changes to the timing and location of fishing for Pacific cod by vessels in the BSAI and that no significant changes in total harvests or when, where, and how fishing occurs are expected with the action.

The commenter implies that the length of time it took the Council to consider and take final action on Aleutian Islands community protection measures makes Amendment 113 and the regulations inherently controversial and therefore requires the preparation of an EIS. NMFS disagrees that the mere length of time this action was under consideration by the Council is indicative of a level of controversy that requires the preparation of an EIS. The implementation of several rationalization programs, Steller sea lion protection measures, the BSAI TAC split, and decreasing biomass of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod, all of which occurred while the Council was considering community protection measures for the Aleutian Islands, considerably changed the way in which the BSAI Pacific cod fishery was managed and conducted by participants. The Council reasonably wanted to examine and understand the effects these changes would have on the BSAI Pacific cod fishery before taking final action. After examining the effects of these changes on Aleutian Islands communities, the Council determined that the community protections that will be implemented by Amendment 113 and this final rule are warranted and necessary. The effects of this action on the quality of the human environment are not in dispute. To the extent that there has been controversy over, or opposition to, the action, the controversy or opposition has been largely related to potential economic and social impacts which do not require the preparation of an EIS.

Comments Related to the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the National Standards

Comment 14: National Standard 4 of the Magnuson-Steven Act states, ''Conservation and management measures shall not discriminate between residents of different states. If it becomes necessary to allocate or assign fishing privileges among various United States fishermen, such allocation shall be (A) fair and equitable to all such fishermen; (B) reasonably calculated to promote conservation; and (C) carried out in such manner that no particular individual, corporation, or other entity acquires an excessive share of such privileges.'' Amendment 113 and this final rule violate National Standard 4. In fact, a 2009 letter from Acting Regional Administrator Mecum to North Pacific Fishery Management Council Chair Olson noted that the proposed set-aside could violate National Standard 4's requirements that allocations be fair and equitable and do not create excessive shares. They are not fair and equitable, do not promote conservation, and would allocate an excessive share to a particular entity. The plant in Atka has never processed cod and has no historical dependency on the Federal non-CDQ Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. Adak is the sole entity that will benefit from this action. Adak would receive an excessive share, *i.e.,* the entire Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside, which is a *de facto* processor share not authorized by the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

Response 14: NMFS has determined that this action is consistent with National Standard 4. Amendment 113 and this final rule do not include any measures that discriminate between residents of different states. While Amendment 113 and this final rule establish the set-aside for vessels that deliver their catch of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing, any properly permitted and licensed vessel, operated by any resident of any community or state, can participate in the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside. Participation in the set-aside or in the Unrestricted Fishery is not premised on residency in a particular state. Participation in the BSAI Pacific cod fishery is governed by regulations that were determined to be consistent with National Standard 4 and neither Amendment 113 nor this final rule change the permitting and licensing requirements currently in place. This final rule does not preclude residents of any state from participation in any fishery in the Aleutian Islands as either a harvester or operator of an Aleutian Islands shoreplant. Appropriately licensed and endorsed vessels will still have the opportunity to prosecute the fishery, and any person wishing to operate a processing facility with the appropriate license in the area may still do so.

Amendment 113 and this final rule establish a set-aside that allocates the Aleutian Islands non-CDQ Pacific cod DFA during a portion of the A-season among those harvesting vessels that conduct directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod and deliver their catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing and those harvesting vessels that conduct directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod and deliver their catch for processing to any eligible processor other than Aleutian Islands shoreplants. Therefore, this allocation must be fair and equitable to all such fishermen, reasonably calculated to promote conservation, and carried out in such manner that no particular individual, corporation, or other entity acquires an excessive share of such privileges, consistent with National Standard 4. For the reasons provided below, NMFS has determined that Amendment 113 and this final rule are consistent with National Standard 4's requirements for allocations.

NMFS has determined that the set-aside is fair and equitable to all participants in the BSAI Pacific cod fishery. Vessels from all non-CDQ sectors can participate in the set-aside and each sector will continue to have access to its entire BSAI Pacific cod allocation. This action also addresses an inequity that has occurred, in part, from the establishment of rationalization programs and minimizes the risk of future inequities in the prosecution of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. The Council and NMFS determined that the protections in Amendment 113 and this final rule are necessary to mitigate the effects of previous Council actions. Offshore processing activity has taken an increasing proportion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery in some recent years due to a variety of factors described in the preamble to the proposed rule and in the Analysis. At the same time, the historical share of the BSAI Pacific cod fishery delivered to Aleutian Islands shoreplants has decreased.

The maximum cap of 5,000 mt for set-aside is representative of the long-term average annual amount of Pacific cod processed by Aleutian Islands shoreplants that includes years both

before and after significant changes in the BSAI Pacific cod fishery occurred. Establishing a maximum amount, rather than a percentage, for the set-aside will protect Aleutian Islands fishing communities during years of relatively low Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC, will ensure the set-aside remains representative of past participation levels by Aleutian Islands fishing communities, and will benefit those who do not participate in the set-aside fishery during years of relatively high Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC by allowing the amount allocated to the Unrestricted Fishery to increase with increases in TAC.

This action is also fair and equitable because the set-aside will be in effect only when the Aleutian Islands fishing communities it is intended to benefit are prepared and actively engaged in participation. When Aleutian Islands communities are unable to accept deliveries of Pacific cod for processing, there are mechanisms built into the final rule that will lift the set-aside and allow others to have access to the remaining harvest.

NMFS also has determined that the set-aside is reasonably calculated to promote conservation. Amendment 113 and this final rule do not modify the process for specifying OFLs, ABCs, or TACs for the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery, the allocation of BSAI Pacific cod to CDQ and non-CDQ fishery participants that is established in existing regulations, or the allocation of BSAI Pacific cod among non-CDQ fishery participants. NMFS will continue to manage the fishery so that harvests stay within specified and allocated amounts. Additionally, Amendment 113 and this final rule continue to promote and do not undermine the conservation measures established under the Steller sea lion protection measures, Amendment 85 allocations, and Amendment 80 rationalization.

Finally, NMFS determined that the set-aside will be carried out in such manner that no particular individual, corporation, or other entity acquires an excessive share of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. NOAA's guidance on National Standard 4 states that ''only those measures that result in direct distributions of fishing privileges will be judged against the allocation requirements of Standard 4'' (§ 600.325(c)(1)). This final rule establishes a set-aside for any otherwise eligible vessel that conducts directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod and delivers its catch to any Aleutian Islands shoreplant for processing. No particular individual, corporation, or other entity participating in either the set-aside or the Unrestricted Fishery will be able to acquire an excessive share of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery under Amendment 113 and this final rule. All vessels will continue to have catch attributed to their sector, and Amendment 113 and this final rule do not create any new allocations to particular individuals, corporations, or other entities fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod. Additionally, Amendment 113 and this final rule do not limit participation in the set-aside to a discreet subset of vessels that meet certain criteria. As explained earlier, any properly permitted and licensed vessel, operated by any resident of any community or state, within any BSAI Pacific cod non-CDQ sector can participate in the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside.

The commenter asserts that Adak will receive an excessive share in violation of National Standard 4 because the shoreplant in Adak is the only processor in the Aleutian Islands that has processed Pacific cod and it therefore will receive the entire Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside. Section 2.6.8 of the Analysis describes the two shoreplants currently in the Aleutian Islands—one in Adak and one in Atka. Although Atka has not processed Pacific cod and Adak has processed Pacific cod, this final rule does not provide a specific allocation of fishing privileges to either of these Aleutian Islands shoreplants. Amendment 113 does not provide Adak or Atka with fishing privileges in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery.

The commenter also asserts that Amendment 113 and this final rule establish a processor share or exclusive processing privilege for Adak which is not authorized by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. This aspect of Comment 14 is also expressed in Comment 18. NMFS refers the reader to its detailed response to this comment in its response to Comment 18.

Finally, the commenter refers to a letter dated January 28, 2009, from Robert D. Mecum, Acting Administrator, Alaska Region, NMFS, to Eric Olsen, then Chairman of the Council. According to the commenter, NMFS noted in this letter that the proposed set-aside could violate National Standard 4's requirement that allocations be fair and equitable and not create excessive shares. While NMFS acknowledges the letter, NMFS disagrees that the letter provides support for the claim that Amendment 113 and this final rule are inconsistent with National Standard 4.

The action under consideration by the Council when NMFS sent the letter was not the set-aside action in Amendment 113 but a different action that would have established processing sideboards on processing vessels eligible under the AFA, BSAI crab rationalization program, and BSAI Amendment 80 program that received deliveries of Pacific cod harvested in the Eastern and Central Aleutian Islands (Areas 541 and 542). Under that action, CPs, floating processors, and motherships in these programs would have been limited in the amount of CV deliveries they could receive of Pacific cod harvested in Area 541 and/or 542 on an annual basis, or prohibited from taking deliveries prior to a specific date. The 2009 letter from NMFS encourages the Council to pay particular attention to National Standard 4's prohibition against allocation of excessive shares of fishing privileges and requirement that allocation actions be reasonably calculated to promote conservation. NMFS advised the Council that if it chose to proceed with the action under consideration at that time, it would need to provide a rationale that clearly demonstrated that the action was consistent with these aspects of National Standard 4. However, NMFS also stated, ''Based on our discussions with NOAA GC, these issues do not appear to preclude the proposed action . . . .''

In developing Amendment 113, the Council considered the advice provided by NMFS and modified the action to address inordinate control concerns by conditioning the set-aside on the achievement of certain performance measures which, if not satisfied, will lift the set-aside; by capping the maximum amount of the set-aside at a level that will provide the protections and stability the Council wanted to create for Aleutian Islands fishing communities, particularly in times of relatively low Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC, and that will allow for the continued participation of the offshore sector; and by allowing any vessel and any Aleutian Islands shoreplant to participate in the set-aside. The Council also designed Amendment 113 and this final rule to promote conservation and to prohibit acquisition of an excessive share of fishing privileges as explained earlier in this response.

Comment 15: This action was reasonably calculated to promote conservation as required under National Standard 4 because it will reduce the amount of halibut prohibited species catch (PSC).

Response 15: NMFS acknowledges the comment. NMFS believes that the

commenter is referring to data that indicate that halibut PSC rates are much lower in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery than in the Bering Sea Pacific cod fishery (Section 2.7.2.2 of the Analysis). The commenter seems to suggest that if more fishing occurs in the Aleutian Islands relative to the Bering Sea because of this final rule, overall halibut PSC usage in the BSAI could potentially decrease. NMFS cannot predict how halibut PSC rates or overall use may change in response to this final rule, if at all. NMFS notes that this final rule will not affect the total maximum permissible amount of halibut PSC established for BSAI groundfish fisheries. As stated in the response to Comment 14, Amendment 113 and this final rule continue to promote and do not undermine the conservation measures established under existing regulations.

Comment 16: The proposed rule will result in TAC being ''stranded'' in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery and it therefore violates National Standard 1 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act because it does not promote achievement of optimal yield. The proposed rule suggests that performance measures, such as the 1,000-mt minimum landings requirement, would prevent the stranding of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod because other sectors would have access to the fishery once the harvest restrictions and delivery requirements are lifted. However, the fleet cannot adjust in the time frames proposed. The midseason announcements intended to prevent stranding a portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC cannot possibly be effective, given that vessels will be fishing at that time and will likely need to interrupt that fishing to prepare gear for the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. These vessels would then need to transit to the area from the Bering Sea or Gulf of Alaska. Additionally, delays between when catch is landed and reported to NMFS, and when NMFS can reopen the fishery may further reduce the amount of time available to harvest the remaining TAC while the desirable aggregations of Pacific cod are still available.

Response 16: The Council and NMFS determined that Amendment 113 and this final rule are consistent with National Standard 1. Optimum yield, as defined in the Magnuson-Stevens Act, is that amount of fish which ''will provide the greatest overall benefit to the Nation, particularly with respect to food production and recreational opportunities, and taking into account the protection of marine ecosystems'' and the amount of fish which ''is prescribed as such on the basis of the maximum sustainable yield from the fishery, as reduced by any relevant economic, social, or ecological factor'' (16 U.S.C. 1802(33)(A) and (B)). Amendment 113 and this final rule do not change the optimum yield of the BSAI groundfish fisheries, which is specified in regulations as a range from 1.4 million to 2.0 million mt (§ 679.20(a)(1)(i)(A)). NMFS notes that optimum yield refers to a broad range of harvest spanning all species within the BSAI groundfish fisheries, not the TAC for a given species and area in a year. Even if the entire Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC were not harvested in a year, optimum yield could still be achieved, consistent with National Standard 1.

The Aleutian Islands Pacific cod OFL, ABC, and TAC, and the process by which NMFS manages the fishery to stay within those limits, will not change as a result of this action. Specifically, this final rule includes several provisions to prevent stranded Pacific cod TAC in the Aleutian Islands and should ensure full harvest of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod DFA, thus promoting the achievement of optimum yield in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands groundfish fisheries. As noted in the response to Comment 14, this final rule does not limit or constrain the proportion of the TAC allocated to CDQ or non-CDQ fishery participants.

NMFS expects that vessel operators will adapt their fishing plans in a variety of ways to accommodate the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside, and expects that sufficient catch monitoring already exists, and notification requirements will be put into effect with this final rule, for vessel operators to predict when and if they should gear up and transit to the Aleutian Islands to fish for Pacific cod. For example, if NMFS has not received notification prior to November 1 of an Aleutian Islands city's intent to process Pacific cod, the A-season Pacific cod fishery will be available to all participants and those participants will have more than two months to prepare. In years with sufficient TAC for an Unrestricted Fishery to commence, vessels may already be fishing in the Aleutian Islands when the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is lifted. In years when the Aleutian Islands TAC is low and an Unrestricted Fishery will not be available, vessel operators may choose to only fish in the Bering Sea. NMFS posts weekly landing reports by fishery to help the agency and fishery participants project when fisheries will open and close.

NMFS disagrees that delays in catch accounting will further shorten the time available for the fleet to harvest the remaining Aleutian Islands TAC if the 1,000-mt performance standard is not met on or before February 28 or if the full Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is harvested allowing the fishery to be opened to all participants. NMFS tracks harvests and projects when catch limits will be reached so that the announcement can be prepared and the fishery can be opened or closed, as applicable, on the appropriate date. NMFS expects to open the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery as soon as necessary. For example, if Aleutian Islands shoreplants have not met the 1,000-mt performance measure by February 28, NMFS would have anticipated that in advance and be prepared to open the fishery to all eligible participants promptly on March 1 (or February 29, if a leap year). Likewise, NMFS would be prepared to lift the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation if the full set-aside were harvested prior to March 15. The Council considered NMFS' Catch Accounting and Inseason Management protocols when selecting dates for the set-aside.

Comment 17: This final rule promotes conservation and should be viewed as a ''trailing amendment'' to the actions to establish separate Aleutian Islands and Bering Sea Pacific cod OFLs, ABCs, and TACs, and to implement new Steller sea lion protection measures. Both of these actions were implemented for conservation purposes and the Council chose to wait to enact community protections until they could determine what the effects of those actions on Aleutian Islands communities would be.

Response 17: NMFS acknowledges the comment. As stated in the response to Comment 14, Amendment 113 and this final rule continue to promote and do not undermine the conservation measures established under existing regulations, such as the BSAI TAC split and Steller sea lion protection measures.

Comment 18: This action is a violation of National Standard 8. National Standard 8 does not constitute a basis for allocating resources to a specific fishing community nor for providing preferential treatment based on residence in a fishing community. National Standard 8 applies to allocation of fishing, not processing, privileges.

Response 18: Because of their remote location and limited economic alternatives, Aleutian Islands communities rely on harvesting and processing of the nearby fishery resources to support and sustain their communities. National Standard 8 requires that conservation and

management measures take into account the importance of fishery resources to fishing communities by utilizing economic and social data that meet the requirements of National Standard 2 in order to provide for the sustained participation of such communities, and to the extent practicable, minimize adverse economic impacts on such communities (16 U.S.C. 1851(a)(8)). National Standard 8 guidelines recommend that ''. . . where two alternatives achieve similar conservation goals, the alternative that provides the greater potential for sustained participation of such communities and minimizes the adverse economic impacts on such communities would be the preferred alternative'' (50 CFR 600.345(b)(1)). The guidelines further state that ''fishing community'' means a community that is substantially dependent on or substantially engaged in the harvest or processing of fishery resources to meet social and economic needs, and includes fishing vessel owners, operators, and crew, and fish processors that are based in such communities. A fishing community is a social or economic group whose members reside in a specific location and share a common dependency on commercial, recreational, or subsistence fishing or on directly related fisheries-dependent services and industries (for example, boatyards, ice suppliers, tackle shops) (50 CFR 600.345(b)(3)). The Council and NMFS considered the importance of fishery resources to Aleutian Islands fishing communities such as Adak and Atka and determined that community protections were necessary to provide for the sustained participation of these communities in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. The Council and NMFS determined that Amendment 113 and this final rule are therefore consistent with National Standard 8.

As discussed in the preamble to the proposed rule and in the Analysis, this final rule does not allocate processing privileges. This final rule allocates fishing privileges for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod through the establishment of a set-aside for a portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC available for harvest by vessels directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod and that deliver their catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for a portion of the year and only if specific notification and performance requirements are met. This final rule does not change any percentage allocations of Pacific cod established under Amendment 85 to the FMP and existing regulations for the CDQ or non-CDQ fishery sectors as described in § 679.20(a)(7). This final rule does not allocate exclusive fishing privileges to a specific harvester, community, processor, or to residents of a specific community.

Under this final rule, any properly permitted and licensed vessel, operated by any resident of any community or state, can harvest the portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC in the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside. Under this final rule, catch harvested from the set-aside can be delivered to any Aleutian Islands shoreplant in any Aleutian Islands community, and no exclusive opportunity to receive any portion of the set-aside is provided to an Aleutian Islands shoreplant or to a person based on residency in an Aleutian Islands community. As explained in the response to Comments 14 and 19, Amendment 113 and this final rule do not create a processing privilege.

As described in the Analysis, the preamble to the proposed rule, and in public testimony provided at Council meetings, Aleutian Islands Pacific cod is an important component of the socioeconomic health of the community of Adak, and may become a more critical piece of the processing in Atka. In Adak, the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery provides income to harvesters, processors, and other businesses providing support services. Section 2.6.8 of the Analysis suggests that without the set-aside, it is very likely that the processing plant in Adak will not be capable of sustained participation in the future (see also Comment 1). Although Atka has not historically participated in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery, the Aleutian Pribilof Islands Community Development Association (APICDA) has been working with investors to make substantial infrastructure improvements to their harbor to enhance the local fishing fleet and to the shoreplant so it may operate year-round. Comments submitted by APICDA indicate that harvesting and processing Aleutian Islands Pacific cod are critical to the success of these developments in this remote community. Additional information about Atka is provided in Section 2.6.8 of the Analysis.

The Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery is a pulse fishery that operates for several weeks in late February and March. This pulse is the most profitable time of the season for Pacific cod in the region. These few weeks of the Federal-waters Pacific cod fishery are a critical part of these remote operations.

This action is consistent with the management objectives in the FMP and the Programmatic Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (available at *https://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/node/33552*). Specifically, NMFS refers the reader to objectives related to potential societal benefits, such as providing socially and economically viable fisheries for the well-being of fishing communities and balancing many competing uses of marine resources and different social and economic goals for sustainable fishery management, including protection of the long-term health of the resource and the optimization of yield.

Comment 19: This action should have been analyzed as a limited access privilege program. The eligibility requirements to grant limited access privileges to communities under the Magnuson-Stevens Act were not followed.

Response 19: Amendment 113 and this final rule do not create a limited access privilege as defined in the Magnuson-Stevens Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(26)). The Magnuson-Stevens Act defines ''limited access privilege'' as a Federal permit, issued as part of a limited access system under section 303A to harvest a quantity of fish expressed by a unit or units representing a portion of the total allowable catch of the fishery that may be received or held for exclusive use by a person, and includes an individual fishing quota, but does not include community development quotas as described in section 305(i). As stated in responses to previous comments, this final rule does not provide any person a portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC that may be received or held for exclusive use. Amendment 113 and this final rule do not assign the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside, in whole or in part, to any one person, Aleutian Islands shoreplant, or community for harvesting or delivery. All harvesters have access to the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside if they are willing to deliver their catch to an Aleutian Islands shoreplant. Any Aleutian Islands shoreplant can accept deliveries from the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside. While the practical effect of Amendment 113 and this final rule may be that harvesters in the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside may have only one Aleutian Islands shoreplant to deliver their catch (Adak), one or more Aleutian Islands shoreplants could become operational at any time and accept deliveries from harvesters in the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside, reducing the amount that Adak could receive. Therefore, Adak is not provided an exclusive processing privilege under Amendment 113 or this final rule (see also response to Comments 14 and 18).

Amendment 113 and this final rule set-aside a portion of the Aleutian Islands DFA during the A-season for vessels that conduct directed fishing for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod and deliver their catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing. Because Amendment 113 and this final rule do not establish a limited access privilege, Amendment 113 and this final rule do not create a limited access privilege program and the eligibility requirements for limited access privilege programs in the Magnuson-Stevens Act at section 303A (16 U.S.C. 1853a) do not apply to Amendment 113 and this final rule.

Comment 20: National Standard 5 states that ''Conservation and management measures shall, where practicable, consider efficiency in the utilization of fishery resources; except that no such measure shall have economic allocation as its sole purpose.'' This action is inconsistent with National Standard 5 because it fosters inefficiency and has no purpose other than economic allocation. The Draft Analysis acknowledged that the set-aside ''could potentially lead to a lower price for catch and reduce efficient utilization,'' and it is uncertain that this action would benefit Aleutian Islands communities. Adak serves as a port of embarkation and provides goods and services to the fleet. By reducing the number of port visits by CPs during a critical part of the year, this action may actually result in lost economic activity for Adak.

Response 20: Amendment 113 and this final rule set aside a portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery for harvest by certain vessels. The primary objective of this action is to provide Aleutian Islands communities with access to and sustained participation in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery, and to minimize the adverse impacts of a range of management actions on those communities. This objective is consistent with the goals of the FMP and with National Standard 8 (see response to Comment 18 for additional explanation of consistency with National Standard 8).

The Council and NMFS have determined that Amendment 113 and this final rule are also consistent with National Standard 5. According to the National Standard 5 guidelines, the term ''utilization'' encompasses harvesting, processing, marketing, and non-consumptive uses of the resource, since management decisions affect all sectors of the industry (§ 600.330(b)(1)). National Standard 5 does not refer exclusively to harvesting. While rationalization programs increased efficiency of harvesting the resource, they did so in part at the expense of Aleutian Islands communities. The Council and NMFS can, and must, implement conservation and management measures that are consistent with all of the National Standards.

Section 2.6.2.2 of the Analysis examines some of the potential gains and losses in efficiency that may result from Amendment 113. The Analysis acknowledges that there may be some losses to communities resulting from fewer port visits by CPs. On the other hand, efficiencies may be gained by having a local fishing fleet that can fish closer to shore. Public comments submitted in support for Amendment 113 and this final rule suggest that the communities believe the benefits of this action to Aleutian Islands outweigh any potential losses (see Comment 7). While the efficiency of utilizing shoreplant processing in remote parts of the Aleutian Islands can be debated, the social and economic benefits the shoreplants provide to the communities in which they are located are tangible.

In this particular case, the Council and NMFS have sought to balance the objectives of efficiency under National Standard 5 with the social and economic considerations of Aleutian Island communities under National Standard 8. This type of balance is contemplated in the National Standard 5 guidelines which note, ''Unless the use of inefficient techniques or the creation of redundant fishing capacity contributes to the attainment of other social or biological objectives, an FMP may not contain management measures that impede the use of cost-effective techniques of harvesting, processing, or marketing, and should avoid creating strong incentives for excessive investment in private sector fishing capital and labor'' (§ 600.330(b)(2)(ii)). In this case, the Council and NMFS considered a range of social factors in addition to efficiency, including providing socially and economically viable fisheries for the well-being of Aleutian Islands fishing communities. Consistent with the National Standard 5 guidelines, the Council and NMFS have prepared an analysis and rulemaking that justify these measures ''in light of the biological, ecological, and social objectives of the FMP, as well as the economic objectives'' (§ 600.330(e)).

Comments on Economic Effects

Comment 21: Reduced competition means lower prices for harvesters. By creating an exclusive processing privilege for Aleutian Islands shoreplants, this action has the potential to cause uncompetitive acts. Creating and enforcing a single market for fish is devastating for harvesters who are not protected by any sort of price arbitration structure. Having only a single plant limits competition for landings and the seller has limited negotiating leverage. This drives down the prices paid to fishermen. Additionally, having only a single processor means that some CVs could be excluded if the lone processor does not want to do business with them.

Response 21: As explained in the response to Comments 14, 18 and 19, Amendment 113 and this final rule do not create an exclusive processing privilege for Aleutian Islands shoreplants. As acknowledged in Section 2.7.2.3 of the Analysis, under Amendment 113, CVs may have less ability to use processor competition for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod landings to leverage higher prices. However, the Analysis also acknowledges several ways that CVs may retain leverage in negotiating fair prices from Aleutian Islands shoreplants. To remain solvent, Aleutian Islands shoreplants will need to offer harvesters competitive prices or CVs could withhold delivery of catch to that shoreplant. CVs could choose not to participate in the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside, wait until the set-aside has ended, or shift fishing operations to the Bering Sea. If Aleutian Islands shoreplants are not competitive, they likely will not be able to operate, and NMFS would not expect to receive notification from the City of Adak or the City of Atka by the annual deadline. If less than 1,000 mt of Aleutians Island Pacific cod have been delivered to Aleutian Islands shoreplants on or before February 28, the set-aside will be lifted and the fishery will be opened to all eligible participants for delivery to any eligible processor. This performance measure serves as an additional incentive for Aleutian Islands shoreplants to offer competitive prices to all interested harvesters so that harvesters do not wait until after February 28 for the opportunity to deliver to offshore processors. In addition, this final rule does not provide for only one Aleutian Islands shoreplant or prevent multiple Aleutian Islands shoreplants from operating at the same time. Even when the set-aside is in place, this final rule does not preclude CPs or stationary floating processors from receiving catch from CVs harvesting from the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery in years when the Aleutian Islands TAC is large enough for the Unrestricted Fishery to occur, or from operating after March 15. CPs and stationary floating processors present in the Aleutian Islands for the Unrestricted

Fishery could be ready to accept deliveries of Pacific cod if the set-aside were lifted early.

Comment 22: The Analysis does not consider the effects of the BSAI TAC split, and assumes the loss of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod can be made up in the Bering Sea, despite the fact that Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands cod are different fisheries with unique products.

Response 22: Sections 2.2 and 2.6 of the Analysis describe some of the effects the BSAI TAC split has had on the amount of Pacific cod available for harvest in the Aleutian Islands. Likewise, the ''Need for This Proposed Rule'' section of the proposed rule identifies the BSAI TAC split and resulting relatively low TAC in the Aleutian Islands as just one of several factors prompting the need for the community protections in this rule. NMFS acknowledges that this action may result in losses to some participants in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. Section 2.7.2 of the Analysis and the response to Comment 23 discuss ways that shifting effort to the Bering Sea may mitigate the effects of Amendment 113 on participants.

Comment 23: The Analysis supposes that the loss of Pacific cod harvest by the hook-and-line CP sector in the Aleutian Islands can be offset by shifting effort to the eastern Bering Sea; however, Aleutian Islands Pacific cod are typically larger and fetch a higher price in international markets than Bering Sea Pacific cod. Bering Sea Pacific cod cannot be substituted for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod.

Response 23: The Council and NMFS recognize that Pacific cod fisheries and products differ between the Bering Sea and the Aleutian Islands. The Analysis does not suggest that the same product harvested and processed in the Aleutian Islands can be substituted by one harvested and processed in the Bering Sea and notes that harvesters generally fetch higher prices for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod because of their typically larger size (Section 2.7.2.2 of the Analysis). The Analysis further notes that moving to the Bering Sea to fish for Pacific cod may not be viable for all vessels because they may participate in other Aleutian Islands fisheries, or are subject to harvest sideboards in other fisheries as a result of their eligibility in rationalization programs. Additionally, vessels that formerly fished for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod that move to the Bering Sea to fish for Pacific cod will compete with vessels that have historically fished in the Bering Sea. The Council recognized these limitations on recuperating losses that may be incurred by some participants as a result of Amendment 113, but determined that CPs are better able to adapt to changing conditions in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery given their ability to move to different locations to fish and process their catch, than Aleutian Islands shoreplants and the vessels that deliver to them, which have less flexibility and adaptability.

The Council and NMFS recognized that CP sectors will not be able to participate in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery unless the set-aside is not in effect for that year, some of the set-aside remains available for harvest after the set-aside ends, or there is sufficient Aleutian Islands DFA for an Unrestricted Fishery during the set-aside period. The Council determined that in years of low TAC, when an Unrestricted Fishery will not occur, it was important to protect Aleutian Islands fishing communities that cannot easily participate in other fisheries or other areas to make up for lost revenue.

The Council and NMFS recognized the participation of hook-and-line CPs in the Aleutians Islands Pacific cod fishery by capping the amount of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod that goes to the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and by providing mechanisms to lift the set-aside if no Aleutian Islands city will be processing in the upcoming year or if deliveries do not meet established thresholds by certain dates. This final rule limits the amount of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside to 5,000 mt, which will allow the participation of all sectors in the Unrestricted Fishery except during years when the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC is extremely low. The Council wanted to provide the Unrestricted Fishery so that vessels not participating in the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside can participate to some extent in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery and get some of the benefits from it. Additionally, because the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is for a specific amount, rather than a percentage of TAC, the set-aside will not increase even if Aleutian Islands TAC increases, which will provide for an even greater amount in the Unrestricted Fishery.

Comment 24: The proposed Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside period is too long and would prevent others from accessing the fishery altogether. If the Adak plant is expected to be capable of processing more than 400 mt of Pacific cod per day, and the proposed Atka plant has a planned capacity of 180 mt per day, Aleutian Islands shoreplants could process the entire proposed set-aside in just 8 to 11 days.

Response 24: If both of the existing Aleutian Islands shoreplants are operational, they may have the combined capacity to process 500 mt to 600 mt per day. However, if the Pacific cod have not yet arrived and aggregated on the fishing grounds, there would be no deliveries for them to process. To be effective, the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation need to be in place long enough for the Pacific cod to aggregate on the fishing grounds, and for the fish to be harvested and delivered to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing. An earlier end date might mean that the peak fishery occurs after the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation have been lifted. Conversely, if the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation did not go into place until later during the A-season, the entire trawl CV allocation could be taken in the Bering Sea before the fishery begins in the Aleutian Islands.

As discussed in the preamble of the proposed rule, the Council determined and NMFS agrees that March 15 is the preferred date for lifting the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside for several reasons. March 15 represents the average date of the peak of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery for CVs. During the period analyzed (2003 through 2015), a significant portion of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod was not delivered shoreside until mid-March (see Table 2–37 of the Analysis). Establishing a date much earlier than March 15 to relieve the set-aside would not meet the Council's goals to provide access to and to sustain participation in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery by Aleutian Islands communities because the protections afforded by the set-aside would be lifted before the Pacific cod aggregated on the fishing grounds.

The Council and NMFS considered earlier dates by which to lift these restrictions, but given historical harvesting and delivery patterns for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod, the longer the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside remains in effect during the A-season each year, the greater the opportunity for complete harvest and delivery of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside. The March 15 date provides greater social and economic stability for Aleutian Islands fishing communities than earlier dates. Limiting the duration of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside to March 15 also would provide an opportunity for CPs to harvest Pacific cod, and for

CVs to harvest and deliver Pacific cod to CPs or stationary floating processors, before the end of the A-season. The proposed March 15 date balances the opportunities for all participants. Additional information is provided in Section 2.7.2.4 of the Analysis.

Comment 25: The proposed threshold of 5,000 mt for the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside exceeds the recent historical average of deliveries made to Aleutian Islands shoreplants. Excluding the years of no processing by Aleutian Islands shoreplants (2010, 2011, and 2015), the 2010 through 2015 average is 3,073 mt and the average proportion of the Federal Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery processed at the Adak and Atka shoreplants from 2003 through 2015 is 32 percent. Applying the historic average to the projected 2017 DFA of 8,965 mt would result in a 2017 set-aside of 2,869 mt. Therefore, a threshold of 3,000 mt would more accurately reflect the ''historical place'' of Aleutian Islands shoreplants in the federal Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery.

Response 25: As discussed in the preamble to the proposed rule and in Section 2.7.1.2 of the Analysis, the Council examined harvest and landings data from 2003 through July 2015 and considered a range of options for the amount of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside (and equivalent Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation). The average amount of non-CDQ Aleutian Islands Pacific cod processed by Aleutian Islands shoreplants during this period was 4,732 mt. The Council considered amounts for the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside ranging from 3,000 to 7,000 mt. The Council determined and NMFS agrees that a maximum of 5,000 mt is the appropriate amount because it represents a large percentage of the total amount of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod available to the non-CDQ fishery sectors in recent years, and is in the range necessary to provide benefits to Aleutian Islands fishing communities, including shoreplant operations, when considered in combination with the State guideline harvest level (State GHL) A-season harvest. Additionally, the Analysis shows that 5,000 mt is the approximate long-term average of the annual amount of Pacific cod processed at Aleutian Islands shoreplants between 2003 and 2015, when Aleutian Islands shoreplants were operational.

The Council considered an option that would have reserved a percentage, rather than a fixed amount, of the Aleutian Islands TAC for the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside (see Section 2.7.2.5 of the Analysis). The Council chose a fixed amount (5,000 mt) so that more of the DFA would be available to Aleutian Islands fishing communities in years of low TAC, and so that more of the DFA would be available to all participants in the Unrestricted Fishery in years when the Aleutian Islands TAC is high, providing more opportunities for other participants. Further explanation for the Council's choice of years to examine in the Analysis is given in the response to Comment 27.

Comment 26: The Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery is important for all hook-and-line CPs. While Amendment 113 will have negative impacts on all CPs with historical participation in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery, the negative effects are more profound on specific hook-and-line CP companies with a higher dependence on the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery.

Response 26: The Council and NMFS examined participation in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery by all sectors over a range of years that included years before major changes in the fishery occurred and years since those changes occurred. The Council recognized that to offer protections to Aleutian Islands communities, there could be some negative effects on other participants in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery, including the hook-and-line CP sector. In years when the TAC is low and the set-aside is in effect, it is likely that CPs will not have access to the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery at all or at levels to which they are accustomed. To minimize those negative effects, the Council included several provisions that lift the restrictions if minimum performance measures are not met and prevent the stranding of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod. For 2017, the hook-and-line CP sector will have access to 3,965 mt through the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery. The annual average targeted Aleutian Islands Pacific cod catch by the hook-and-line CP sector between 2003 and 2015 was 2,399 mt (Table 2–34 of the Analysis). Excluding years that Aleutian Islands shoreplants did not operate, the annual average targeted Pacific cod catch by the hook-and-line CP sector was 2,311 mt (Table 2–34 of the Analysis). Even under current management, there is no guarantee that any sector will have access to the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery because of the ability of one sector to harvest Pacific cod up to the Aleutian Islands TAC before other sectors arrive.

NMFS and the Council acknowledge that the hook-and-line CP sector may have a higher dependence on the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery than some other CP sectors; however, like other offshore sectors, the hook-and-line CP sector has the ability to react to changes in the fishery. The hook-and-line CP sector has formed a voluntary cooperative, which provides many of the benefits and flexibility of a rationalized fishery. In contrast, shoreside processors cannot move their operations in response to changing conditions or a low Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC. As discussed in the response to Comment 14, each sector continues to receive a percentage of the combined BSAI Pacific cod allocation as established in 2008 under Amendment 85, and can fish their allocations in either the Bering Sea or Aleutian Islands (and under this action shift effort to the Bering Sea or access the Aleutian Islands after a specified date). This action does not change the allocation to the hook-and-line CP sector.

This final rule may provide a benefit to the hook-and-line CP sector in years when the Aleutian Islands DFA is large enough for the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery to occur. The A-season for hook-and-line CPs and CVs opens on January 1, whereas the A-season for trawl CPs and CVs does not open until January 20. The hook-and-line CPs and CVs will have earlier access to the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery between January 1 and January 20.

Comment 27: The historical participation of the hook-and-line CP sector in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery is significantly larger and longer than as stated in the proposed rule. The hook-and-line CP sector has historically harvested more than 95 percent of the non-trawl harvest of Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands. The hook-and-line CP sector's proportion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod harvest was much higher before 2002, when Steller sea lion protection measures were first implemented.

Response 27: NMFS acknowledges that the hook-and-line CP sector has consistently participated in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery annually, harvesting 14% of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod on an average annual basis during 2003 through 2015 (Table 2–13 of the Analysis), and that the hook-and-line CP sector participated in the fishery prior to 2003. NMFS also acknowledges that the hook-and-line CP sector harvests a large percentage of the non-trawl harvest of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod, but also notes that the overall non-trawl harvest is a small proportion of the Aleutian Islands TAC. The Council chose to use 2003 as a starting point for the Analysis for this action for several reasons. First, data from years prior to 2003 is not compatible with data from

2003 to the present. NMFS implemented its Catch Accounting System in 2003, which significantly changed the methodologies used to determine catch estimates (Section 2.5 of the Analysis). Second, data before 2003 represent harvests made prior to the implementation of Steller sea lion protection measures, which substantively changed the management of, and the participation patterns in, the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. The Council determined and NMFS agrees that catch data prior to 2003 does not reflect how the fishery has been managed and prosecuted during the last 13 years (2003 through 2015) considered by NMFS and Council in developing Amendment 113 and this final rule. Third, the Council determined and NMFS agrees that it was important to consider data from the largest set of years both before and after the implementation of Steller Sea Lion measures, rationalization programs, and the BSAI TAC split to understand the effects of those actions on the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery.

Comment 28: The proposed action will further concentrate the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod harvest spatially and temporally in the Aleutian Islands with more harvest by the trawl sector. In the proposed rule for the 2014 Steller sea lion protection measures (available at *https://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/sites/default/files/79fr37486.pdf*), NMFS stated that, ''Pacific cod hook-and-line and pot gear harvests occur in much smaller quantities and at slower rates for these gears than trawl gear. This makes it less likely that hook-and-line and pot gear harvests would result in localized depletion of Steller sea lion prey resources.'' The proposed action, combined with the BSAI TAC split, GHL fishery, and consequences of the Steller sea lion protection measures will further limit the hook-and-line CP sector's participation and increase trawl harvests of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod.

Response 28: NMFS acknowledges that the Analysis predicts some spatial concentration of harvest because vessels participating in the set-aside are expected to be trawl CVs that will likely fish closer to shore and nearer to Adak and Atka, the Aleutian Islands communities that are most likely to receive Pacific cod deliveries under the set-aside. The amount of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod harvest that might be caught closer to shore under a maximum set-aside amount of 5,000 mt that is roughly equivalent to the average annual amount of Pacific cod caught by CVs and delivered to Aleutian Islands shoreplants between 2003 and 2015, which reduces the potential for spatial concentration (see Section 3.4 of the Analysis). Fishing closer to shore may increase efficiency in the fishery (Section 2.7.2.2 of the Analysis) by reducing transit times, allowing vessels to make more frequent offloads, and not having to coordinate fishing operations with an offshore processor (Section 2.7.2.2 of the Analysis). Allowing other participants to target the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery when the DFA is greater than 5,000 mt, and the performance measures that remove the set-aside if there is insufficient shoreplant processing will also limit spatial concentration. Finally, the Council and NMFS will continue to use the current harvest specifications process for setting the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC and manage harvest within these limits. Any potential changes in harvest location as a result of the set-aside are not expected to impact Aleutian Islands Pacific cod stock status (see Section 3.3.1 of the Analysis), or have an impact on Steller sea lions in a manner not previously considered in previous consultations (see Section 3.4 of the Analysis).

NMFS disagrees that Amendment 113 and this final rule will cause additional temporal concentration of the fishery. In the years since the BSAI TAC split, the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery has closed on March 16, 2014, February 27, 2015, and June 8, 2016, so as not to exceed the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC. Setting aside a maximum of 5,000 mt of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod until March 21 may actually prolong the season for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod because CPs will not be able to harvest Pacific cod from the set-aside (unless they are delivering their catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing) or process any Aleutian Islands Pacific cod remaining from the set-aside until after the conclusion of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside on March 15.

As examined in the FONSI (Section 3.6 of the Analysis), Amendment 113 and this final rule will not adversely affect endangered or threatened species, marine mammals, or critical habitat of these species in any manner not considered in prior consultations on the BSAI groundfish fisheries. While this action may increase the harvest of Pacific cod nearshore in the Aleutian Islands subarea, the harvest of Pacific cod will continue to occur within the limits established in the annual groundfish harvest specifications by vessels the same as or similar to those currently fishing for Pacific cod in the BSAI.

The vessels affected by this action will continue to be required to comply with all Steller sea lion protection measures including no-transit areas, closed areas, and the requirement to carry vessel monitoring systems (50 CFR part 679). Therefore, Amendment 113 and this rule will result in no substantial change to the actions analyzed in the biological opinion dated April 2, 2014, in which NMFS found that the groundfish fisheries in the BSAI are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the western distinct population segment of Steller sea lions or destroy or adversely modify its designated critical habitat (Section 3.4 of the Analysis).

Comment 29: The hook-and-line CP sector's proportion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod harvest has been reduced since the establishment of the State Pacific cod GHL fishery, which is designed for harvest by CVs that deliver to Aleutian Islands communities. The State GHL fishery sets aside 28 percent of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC for fishing in State waters, which is essentially an allocation to shore-based processors. The State GHL fishery cannot be harvested by CPs and is not prosecutable by the Federal offshore sector. The State GHL fishery has resulted in considerable stranded Pacific cod. A large proportion of the State GHL fishery has remained unharvested and unavailable to the Federal fisheries because there is no rollover provision. Adak and Atka have unique access to processing the State GHL fishery, but have chosen not to participate in this fishery in recent years.

Response 29: The State GHL fishery for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod is managed exclusively by the State within State waters. This final rule does not modify the State GHL fishery. Management of the State GHL fishery is outside of the scope of this final rule. Absent preemption under section 306(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, NMFS does not have authority to determine catch amounts or the types of gear or vessels used in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod State GHL fishery.

The State established two GHL fisheries for Pacific cod in 2006; one in the Bering Sea and one in the Aleutian Islands. The Aleutian Islands State GHL fishery is currently set at a harvest limit equivalent to 27 percent of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod ABC, not 28 percent of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC as stated by the commenter. The harvest limit may be increased (or decreased) in the following fishing year depending on how much of the State GHL fishery is harvested, and the harvest limit can increase to a maximum of 39 percent of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod ABC if

the harvest limit continues to be fully harvested each year. In addition, the Aleutian Islands State GHL fishery is capped at a maximum of 15 million pounds (6,804 mt). Therefore, if 27 percent of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod ABC represents an amount that is greater than 15 million pounds in some future year, the State GHL fishery for that year would be 15 million pounds. The Aleutian Islands State GHL for 2016 is 4,752 mt.

The amount of the Aleutian Islands State GHL fishery is deducted from the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod ABC to calculate the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC. While the establishment of the State GHL fishery in 2006 reduced the Aleutian Islands TAC, it did not change the hook-and-line CP sector's allocation of 48.7 percent of the combined BSAI Pacific cod TAC. The reduction in the Aleutian Islands TAC resulting from the State GHL fishery is distributed proportionately across all sectors, and is not borne by the hook-and-line CP sector alone.

NMFS assumes that the commenter is concluding that setting aside an additional amount of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod for Aleutian Islands communities is not warranted because these communities are not processing the full amount of what has already been allocated to them through the State GHL fishery. The commenter is correct that the full amount of the Aleutian Islands State GHL fishery has not been harvested every year; however, it is incorrect to state that Adak has chosen not to participate in the fishery in recent years. As noted in Table 2–31 in the Analysis, Aleutian Islands shoreplants have processed over 4,000 mt of Pacific cod from Federal and State GHL fisheries each year from 2012 through 2014. On average, Aleutian Islands shoreplants processed 2,046 mt of Pacific cod from the State GHL fishery annually since the inception of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod State GHL fishery in 2006. The Council determined that the State GHL fishery alone was inadequate to sustain Aleutian Islands communities and shoreplants. Based on information received in public testimony, the Council determined that Aleutian Islands communities need about 9,000 mt of Pacific cod annually to support shoreplant operations. The Council selected a set-aside amount that in combination with the State GHL fishery would give Aleutian Islands communities access to at least 9,000 mt of Pacific cod annually. See also the response to Comment 25.

Comment 30: The data presented in the Analysis do not reflect CP participation and dependence in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. Processing by the offshore sector has also declined since rationalization programs were implemented. This rule will cause economic harm to CPs that are invested and have historically participated in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. This rule also harms CVs that cannot make onshore landings and must deliver to CPs.

Response 30: NMFS and the Council recognize, and the Analysis shows, that CPs have a history of participation in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery (Sections 2.6.6.1 through 2.6.6.3 of the Analysis), that the average annual amount of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod processed by the offshore sector has declined since 2011 (coinciding with the BSAI TAC split, Table 2–31 of the Analysis), and that this rule may cause some economic losses to CPs. The Council also recognized that the amount of Pacific cod harvested by trawl CPs, and the number of participating trawl CPs, have declined since 2003 (Table 2–10 in the Analysis). However, Aleutian Islands Pacific cod represents only a small portion of the total landings and revenue by the trawl CP fleet (Table 2–11 in the Analysis). The declining biomass and BSAI TAC split have resulted in reduced Pacific cod catches in the Aleutian Islands for all participants in both the onshore and offshore sectors. The Council and NMFS have chosen to set aside a portion of the harvest for vessels delivering their catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants because these Aleutian Islands fishing communities do not have the flexibility available to offshore sector participants to redeploy into other BSAI or GOA groundfish fisheries, move their operations to the Bering Sea, or participate in rationalization programs that grant greater flexibility (Section 2.7.2.2 of the Analysis). The Council and NMFS have determined that the onshore sector had a greater dependence on the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery than the offshore sector. Section 2.7.2.2 of the Analysis discusses some of the ways trawl CPs, trawl CVs, and hook-and-line CPs may respond to the restrictions imposed by this rule.

The Council and NMFS recognize that some trawl CVs that have historically participated in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery lack the ability to make onshore deliveries. These vessels will likely experience a loss of economic activity from this action (Section 2.7.2.3 of the Analysis), particularly in years of low Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC. The options for mitigating losses incurred by this action on trawl CVs are the same as for other sectors that may be excluded from the fishery during the set-aside: they may fish in the Bering Sea, fish the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery, or wait for the set-aside to be lifted.

Comment 31: The F/V *Katie Ann,* a trawl CP, is one of the earliest and most consistent participants in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. The F/V *Katie Ann* is more dependent on the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery than any other CP. Participation by the F/V *Katie Ann* predates the American Fisheries Act and the first entry of any shorebased processor in the Aleutian Islands. The intermittent entry into the fishery by the Adak shoreplant has harmed the ability of the F/V *Katie Ann* to harvest and process its long-term historical share of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. Amendment 113, if implemented, threatens to destroy one of the only remaining viable fishing operations for the F/V *Katie Ann.*

Response 31: The Council and NMFS recognized the long history of participation in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery by the F/V *Katie Ann* as Amendment 113 was being developed and considered. The Council considered an option that would have allowed CPs that had processed Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands management area in at least 12 years between 2000 and 2014, such as the F/V *Katie Ann,* to be exempt from restrictions on processing for up to 2,000 mt of Pacific cod. Ten CPs that harvested and processed both targeted and incidental catch of Pacific cod during that period would have qualified for this exemption. The F/V *Katie Ann* is the only vessel that operated as a mothership processing targeted Pacific cod during this period.

The Council did not select this option for an exemption for the F/V *Katie Ann* or other qualified CPs. The 2,000-mt exemption would have represented 40 percent of the 5,000-mt set-aside. The Council determined, and NMFS agrees, that this amount would have substantially reduced the amount available to vessels delivering to Aleutian Islands shoreplants and could have undermined the efficacy of Amendment 113. The primary objective of Amendment 113 and this final rule is to provide access to and promote sustained participation in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery by Aleutian Islands fishing communities in this remote area, especially at very low TAC levels. At TACs larger than 5,000 mt, CPs and motherships may participate in the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery. The Council considered historical participation of the offshore sector, including the F/V *Katie Ann,* but determined that the fishery cannot

support historical levels of effort by all sectors (Section 2.7.2.5 of the Analysis). The Council selected a maximum level of 5,000 mt for the set-aside to provide continued access to the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery by the offshore sector when the Aleutian Islands TAC is at a level that can accommodate both the needs of the inshore fishery and Aleutian Islands fishing communities, as well as offshore fishery participants. See also the response to Comment 33.

Comment 32: In any fishery management plan that awards fishing privileges to one group and takes them away from another, there are certain to be winners and losers; however, the benefits to the winners must be balanced against the harm to the losers. Amendment 113 fails to achieve the required balance. There is little to no evidence that the harm that will be suffered by historical participants will be offset by any net benefits to either Adak or Atka. History has shown that it may be impossible to operate a viable shoreplant in Adak, and there is currently no one committed to future operations of the existing plant in Adak.

Response 32: Amendment 113 and this final rule provide access to and sustained participation in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery by Aleutian Islands fishing communities, especially during periods when the Pacific cod TAC in the Aleutian Islands is relatively low. This is an appropriate action for the Council and NMFS to take, in recognition of the dependence on the Pacific cod fishery by Aleutian Islands fishing communities, the lack of protections for Aleutian Island harvesters and communities seeking to establish viable community-based fishing operations under the status quo, and the lack of opportunity for Aleutian Islands shoreplants and CVs to expand to other areas and fisheries.

While it is accurate that the Aleutian Islands shoreplants in Adak or Atka did not process Pacific cod during the 2015 or 2016 fishing years, comments received during public testimony to the Council and the public comment period for the proposed rule state that investors and processors are planning to process Pacific cod in one or both communities if this final rule is implemented. The commenters believe that without the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside, it is doubtful that any operator will have a viable opportunity to process Pacific cod in Adak or Atka, and the inshore sector will continue to be preempted from the fishery. Public comments in favor of the action also state that there will be considerable social and economic benefits to Aleutian Islands communities as a result of this action that offset the expected costs to other participants.

The Council included provisions to mitigate the costs of the set-aside on other participants by providing access to the fishery by other participants if the Aleutian Islands shoreplants do not submit a notification of their intent to process Pacific cod in the upcoming year or if those shoreplants do not meet the minimum processing requirement of 1,000 mt on or before February 28. Additionally, historical participants who cannot participate in the set-aside may participate in the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery, when available, or fish in the Aleutian Islands for Pacific cod when the set-aside is lifted (see also the response to Comment 16).

Comment 33: This action would significantly impact the revenue and operations of Amendment 80 CPs that also have a history of dependence on the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. These CPs take deliveries from CVs that are unable to deliver to shore.

Response 33: Amendment 113 and this rule do not prohibit Amendment 80 CPs and CVs delivering to Amendment 80 CPs from participating in the A-season Pacific cod fishery in the Aleutian Islands; those vessels may participate in the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery, when available, and may harvest any remaining BSAI non-CDQ Pacific cod up to the Aleutian Islands DFA after the set-aside is lifted. In addition, if NMFS does not receive timely notification from the City of Adak or the City of Atka, there will be no Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside, and no additional regulatory harvesting or delivery limitations imposed on these vessels.

When the Aleutian Islands DFA is greater than 5,000 mt, the difference between the DFA and the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside is available as the ''Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery'' for directed fishing by all non-CDQ fishery sectors with sufficient A-season allocation and may be processed by any eligible processor, including Amendment 80 CPs and CVs making deliveries to them. The amount of the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery will be published in the BSAI Harvest Specifications. Given the current 2017 harvest specifications for Aleutian Islands Pacific cod, 3,965 mt of Pacific cod will be available for the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery.

The Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will only be in effect for a portion of the A-season. The set-aside will be lifted if the entire amount of the set-aside has been delivered to Aleutian Islands shoreplants, or on March 15, whichever comes first. Additionally, if Aleutian Islands shoreplants do not meet certain performance requirements, the harvest and delivery restrictions will be lifted and the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod DFA can be harvested by any eligible vessel for delivery to any eligible processor. For example, if Aleutian Islands shoreplants have not processed at least 1,000 mt of Pacific cod by February 28, the set-aside will be lifted. Any amount of the set-aside remaining after that date, plus the remainder of the Aleutian Islands DFA, will be available for harvest by any eligible vessel for delivery to any eligible processor. Likewise, if the entire set-aside is harvested prior to March 15, the harvest and delivery restrictions will be lifted immediately. At the latest, the harvest set-aside will be lifted on March 15, and any amount of the set-aside remaining will be added to the remaining Aleutian Islands DFA for harvest by any eligible vessel for delivery to any eligible processor.

Comment 34: Section 2.7.2 of the Analysis states that the set-aside ''would preclude the future participation of other participants that may benefit or have historically benefitted from the harvesting and processing of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod unless Aleutian Islands shoreplants are unable to process the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod received from catcher vessels.'' The justification for this is presented as the Council having made inshore-offshore allocations previously. This, however, is not an inshore-offshore allocation; this is pre-emption of the offshore sector to the benefit of the onshore sector.

Response 34: The sentence that follows the material quoted by the commenter states, ''The Council and NMFS have allocated fishery resources between inshore and offshore participants in the past, consistent with the purpose and need for the action, the National Standards and other provisions of the MSA [Magnuson-Stevens Act].'' This sentence simply refers to past actions taken by the Council and NMFS that allocate fishery resources between inshore and offshore participants and does not represent the Council's and NMFS' justification for recommending and approving the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod harvest set-aside. The justification and rationale for establishing the set-aside is provided generally in the administrative record for Amendment 113, and specifically in Section 2.4.3 of the Analysis, in the preamble of the proposed rule, and in the preamble of this final rule.

Although the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod set-aside is not identical to other inshore-offshore allocation actions the

Council and NMFS have implemented, the set-aside does allocate Aleutian Islands Pacific cod among an inshore sector (those vessels that deliver their catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing) and an offshore sector (those vessels that process their catch at sea or that deliver their catch to offshore processors for processing), making it a type of inshore-offshore allocation. Another type of inshore-offshore allocation was the Gulf of Alaska (GOA) pollock and Pacific cod inshore-offshore allocations under Amendment 23 to the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the GOA (GOA FMP). Under Amendment 23, 100 percent of the GOA pollock TAC was allocated to vessels delivering their catch of pollock to onshore processors. In the preamble of the final rule implementing Amendment 23, NMFS stated, ''The allocation of 100 percent of the GOA pollock TAC to the inshore sector proposed by the Council and approved by the Secretary slightly exceeds the harvest rates of the inshore sector in recent years and results in a redistribution of the pollock resource from the offshore sector to the inshore sector. The Secretary determined that this redistribution was appropriate based on the social and other benefits that would be derived from implementation of the allocation'' (57 FR 23321, June 3, 1992). In contrast to the inshore-offshore allocation of GOA pollock under Amendment 23 to the GOA FMP, the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod CV Harvest Set-aside will allow the offshore sector to participate in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery in years when the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod DFA provides for the Unrestricted Fishery, and in years when no Aleutian Islands shoreplant is processing Pacific cod or participating vessels fail to deliver 1,000 mt of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to Aleutian Islands shoreplants by February 28.

Comment 35: This action would create an exclusive processing privilege for Adak under the assumption that shore-based processors are entitled to an allocated share of processing privileges. The Council and NMFS have attempted to disguise an exclusive processing allocation to Adak by defining qualifying participants as ''Aleutian Islands shoreplants'' within a specified geographic region. However, the shoreplant in Atka has never processed Pacific cod and has no historical dependence on the fishery and it is unlikely that competing processing will be developed in the region in the foreseeable future. Therefore, this action is an exclusive allocation to Adak, whose shoreplant has a dubious track record for paying fisherman and has had numerous operational difficulties.

The Magnuson-Stevens Act does not allow a fishery management council to allocate fishery privileges to shore-based processors. The express Federal prohibition of creating such a privilege was acknowledged by NOAA General Counsel (GC) in a letter from Lisa Lindeman to the Council Chair in 2009. Section 303A of the Magnuson-Stevens Act specifies that limited access privilege programs authorized under this act pertain to fish harvesting. Had Congress intended to create an individual processor quota, it could have done so, as it did for the crab fisheries in the BSAI. No such congressional grant of authority applies to shore-based processors operating in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery.

Response 35: In a memorandum dated September 30, 2009, from Lisa Lindeman, Regional Counsel for the Alaska Region of NOAA General Counsel, to Eric Olsen (then Chairman) and Chris Oliver (Executive Director) of the Council, NOAA GC provided the Council with legal advice in response to four questions posed by the Council. Questions 1, 2, and 4 of the 2009 memorandum are relevant in responding to this comment. In response to the first question, NOAA GC advised that except for the authority provided at section 313(j) for the Crab Rationalization Program (16 U.S.C. 1862(j)), the Magnuson-Stevens Act does not provide the Council or NMFS with the authority to require fixed linkages between harvesters and shore-based processors. In fixed linkages, a harvester is required to deliver his or her catch to a specific shore-based processor. NOAA GC explained that requiring fixed linkages between harvesters and shore-based processors is similar to issuing processor quota, which is not authorized by the Magnuson-Stevens Act except for the Crab Rationalization Program. Therefore, with the exception of the Crab Rationalization Program, NMFS acknowledges that the Council and NMFS do not have authority under the Magnuson-Stevens Act to require fixed linkages between harvesters and processors or to establish exclusive processing privileges or processor quota.

In response to the second question, NOAA GC advised that the Magnuson-Stevens Act does authorize allocation of harvesting privileges to shore-based processors if other requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act are met. Therefore, NMFS generally disagrees with the commenter's assertion that the Magnuson-Stevens Act does not allow a fishery management council to allocate fishery privileges to shore-based processors. Finally, in response to the fourth question, whether the Magnuson-Stevens Act authorizes the Council to establish an exclusive class of shore-based processors that would be the recipients of all, or a specific portion of all, landings from a fishery, NOAA GC advised that the answer is dependent on the purpose of the action and the record developed by the Council. NOAA GC stated, ''The Magnuson-Stevens Act does not authorize placing a limit on the number of shore-based processing sites if the purpose is to allocate shore-based processing privileges. . . . However, if the Council developed an adequate record demonstrating that an action, which had the practical effect of limiting the number of sites to which deliveries could be made, was necessary for legitimate management or conservation objectives (*e.g.,* . . . protection of fishing communities that depend on the fisheries) and not a disguised limited entry program, then there could be a legal basis for such an action.''

NMFS disagrees that this action creates an exclusive processing privilege for Adak or a disguised processing allocation to Adak. No aspect of this action establishes exclusivity. This final rule does not provide a specific allocation of processing privileges to either Aleutian Islands shoreplant. Nothing in Amendment 113 or this final rule prevents the Atka shoreplant from processing Aleutian Islands Pacific cod and reducing the amount of Pacific cod that is delivered to Adak by vessels participating in the set-aside, prevents other Aleutian Islands shoreplants from processing Aleutian Islands Pacific cod in Adak or Atka, or prevents a shoreplant in any other onshore location west of 170° W. longitude from processing Aleutian Islands Pacific cod. The fact that the set-aside will be lifted if notification of intent to process is not provided, or if less than 1,000 mt of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod is processed by February 28, is directly contrary to exclusive privileges that permit the holder of the privilege exclusive access to the resource without diminishment by other participants or revocation without procedural due process. As explained throughout this final rule, the Council and NMFS have articulated legitimate management and conservation objectives for the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside to protect Aleutian Islands fishing communities that depend on access to and sustained participation in the fisheries for the socioeconomic benefits and stability

provided by that access and participation. Therefore, Amendment 113 and this final rule do not create an exclusive processing privilege for Adak.

OMB Revisions to PRA References in 15 CFR 902.1(b)

Section 3507(c)(B)(i) of the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) requires that agencies inventory and display a current control number assigned by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), for each agency's information collection. Section 902.1(b) identifies the location of NOAA regulations for which OMB approval numbers have been issued. Because this final rule revises and adds data elements within a collection-of-information for recordkeeping and reporting requirements, 15 CFR 902.1(b) is revised to reference correctly the sections resulting from this final rule.

Classification

The NMFS Assistant Administrator, Alaska Region, NMFS, determined that Amendment 113 to the FMP and this rule are necessary for the conservation and management of the groundfish fishery and that they are consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and other applicable laws.

This final rule has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866.

Administrative Procedure Act

The NMFS Assistant Administrator finds good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3) to waive the 30-day delay in effectiveness for this final rule. This finding is based on the need to provide the City of Adak and the City of Atka with sufficient time to submit a notification of intent to process that complies with the regulatory requirements after the notification requirements are effective; to provide NMFS with sufficient time to notify the general public and the affected industry as to whether the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will be in effect for 2017; and to provide the affected industry with sufficient time to adequately prepare for the start of the 2017 fishing year on January 1, 2017.

NMFS has determined that it must give the City of Adak and the City of Atka 15 days after the effective date of the notification of intent to process regulations to take all necessary steps to prepare, sign, and submit a notification of intent to process that complies with the regulatory requirements at § 679.20(a)(7)(viii)(D). Because these cities are aware of this action, have been anticipating its approval, and support its implementation in time for the 2017 fishing year, NMFS has determined that 15 days will provide the cities with enough time to comply with the notification requirements in 2016. Without waiver of the 30-day delay in effectiveness, the deadline for submission of a notification of intent to process would occur 45 days after publication of the final rule in the **Federal Register**, which means the deadline would occur very late in December 2016 or in early January 2017. A deadline in late December would not provide NMFS with adequate time to notify the industry as to whether the set-aside will be in effect on January 1, 2017, or provide the affected industry with sufficient time to prepare for the fishery which begins on January 1 for some participants in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. Because NMFS must receive a notification of intent prior to the start of the fishing year to provide for an orderly start to the fishing year and to ensure the appropriate specifications are in place before fishing occurs on January 1, any notification deadline for 2016 that would occur after December 31, 2016, renders the set-aside meaningless for the 2017 fishing year. For reasons set forth in the Analysis and the preambles of the proposed rule and this final rule, the Council and NMFS have determined that the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will provide important socioeconomic benefits and stability to Aleutian Islands fishing communities that intend to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod in the upcoming fishing year. Waiving the 30-day delay in effectiveness will provide Aleutian Islands fishing communities with an opportunity to realize those benefits starting with the 2017 fishing year; failure to waive the delay in effectiveness will postpone that opportunity for an entire fishing year until 2018. One Aleutian Islands shoreplant has already informally notified NMFS that it intends to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod in 2017.

Additionally, as explained earlier in this final rule, the Analysis determined that the affected fishing industry would have sufficient time to prepare for the upcoming fishing year if notification of intent to process was received from Adak or Atka prior to December 15. Waiving the delay in effectiveness for these regulations provides for a submission deadline that will occur before December 15, thus providing NMFS with sufficient time to notify the public and affected industry as to whether the set-aside will be in effect, and for the affected industry, including vessels that deliver their catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants and those that deliver their catch to at-sea processors, to prepare for the start of the fishing year with that knowledge. As explained above, failure to waive the delay in effectiveness could result in a notification deadline that occurs in late December, which would not provide NMFS or the affected industry with sufficient time to prepare for the upcoming fishery that starts on January 1, 2017.

For these reasons, the NMFS Assistant Administrator finds good cause to waive the 30-day delay in effectiveness for this final rule.

Small Entity Compliance Guide

Section 212 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 states that, for each rule or group of related rules for which an agency is required to prepare a Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, the agency shall publish one or more guides to assist small entities in complying with the rule, and shall designate such publications as ''small entity compliance guides.'' The preambles to the proposed rule and this final rule serve as the small entity compliance guide. This action does not require any additional compliance from small entities that is not described in the preambles. Copies of the proposed rule and this final rule are available from the NMFS Web site at *http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov.*

Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

Section 604 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) requires that, when an agency promulgates a final rule under section 553 of Title 5 of the U.S. Code, after being required by that section or any other law to publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking, the agency shall prepare a FRFA. Section 604 describes the required contents of a FRFA: (1) A statement of the need for and objectives of the rule; (2) a statement of the significant issues raised by the public comments in response to the initial regulatory flexibility analysis, a statement of the assessment of the agency of such issues, and a statement of any changes made in the proposed rule as a result of such comments; (3) the response of the agency to any comments filed by the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) in response to the proposed rule, and a detailed statement of any change made to the proposed rule in the final rule as a result of the comments; (4) a description of and an estimate of the number of small entities to which the rule will apply or an explanation of why

no such estimate is available; (5) a description of the projected reporting, recordkeeping, and other compliance requirements of the rule, including an estimate of the classes of small entities which will be subject to the requirement and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of the report or record; and (6) a description of the steps the agency has taken to minimize the significant economic impact on small entities consistent with the stated objectives of applicable statutes, including a statement of the factual, policy, and legal reasons for selecting the alternative adopted in the final rule and why each one of the other significant alternatives to the rule considered by the agency which affect the impact on small entities was rejected.

(1) Need for and Objectives of This Final Rule

A statement of the need for and objectives of this rule is contained earlier in the preamble and is not repeated here. This FRFA incorporates the IRFA (see **ADDRESSES**) and the summary of the IRFA in the proposed rule (81 FR 50444, August 1, 2016), a summary of the significant issues raised by the public comments, NMFS' responses to those comments, and a summary of the analyses completed to support the action.

(2) Summary of Significant Issues Raised During Public Comment Period

No comments were received that raised significant issues in response to the IRFA specifically; therefore, no changes were made to this rule as a result of comments on the IRFA. However, several comments were received on the economic impacts of Amendment 113 on the Amendment 80 trawl CP and hook-and-line CP sectors. For a summary of the comments received and NMFS' responses, refer to the section above titled ''Responses to Comments.''

(3) Public and Chief Counsel for Advocacy Comments on the IRFA

NMFS published the proposed rule on August 1, 2016 (81 FR 50444), with comments invited through August 31, 2016. An IRFA was prepared and summarized in the ''Classification'' section of the preamble to the proposed rule. NMFS received 18 letters of public comment on the proposed rule and Amendment 113 to the FMP. The Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the SBA did not file any comments on the proposed rule.

(4) Description and Number of Directly Regulated Small Entities

This final rule directly regulates three groups of entities. This final rule will directly regulate trawl CVs harvesting Pacific cod in the BSAI because it limits how much Pacific cod those trawl CVs may harvest in the Bering Sea, and it may prohibit trawl CVs from participating in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery if they do not deliver their Pacific cod catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants. It also directly regulates all non-trawl CVs who are harvesting Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands because it will prohibit those non-trawl CVs from participating in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery if they do not deliver their Pacific cod catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants. Finally, this final will directly regulate all CPs harvesting Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands because it limits how much Pacific cod those CPs can harvest and process in the Aleutian Islands. This rule does not directly regulate the City of Adak or the City of Atka because it does not impose a requirement on those cities. This rule does not directly regulate entities participating in the harvesting and processing of Pacific cod managed under State GHL fisheries in State waters in the Bering Sea or Aleutian Islands.

The SBA has established size standards for all major industry sectors in the United States. For RFA purposes only, NMFS has established a small business size standard for businesses, including their affiliates, whose primary industry is commercial fishing (see 50 CFR 200.2). A business primarily engaged in commercial fishing (NAICS code 114111) is classified as a small business if it is independently owned and operated, is not dominant in its field of operation (including its affiliates), and has combined annual receipts not in excess of $11 million for all its affiliated operations worldwide.

Based on the best available and most recent complete data from 2012 through 2014, between 10 and 16 CPs, and an estimated 43 CVs (trawl and non-trawl) will be directly regulated by this action in the BSAI. Of these, no CP is estimated to be a small entity, while 6 trawl CVs and 26 non-trawl CVs are estimated to be small entities based on the best available data on the gross receipts from these entities and their known affiliates. Therefore, a total of 32 vessels considered to be small entities will be directly regulated by this action. The IRFA assumes that each vessel is a unique entity; therefore, the total number of directly regulated entities may be an overestimate because some vessels are likely affiliated through common ownership. These potential affiliations are not known with the best available data and cannot be predicted.

(5) Recordkeeping, Reporting, and Other Compliance Requirements

This final rule adds a recordkeeping and reporting requirement to notify NMFS of an Aleutian Islands shoreplant's intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod in the upcoming year; therefore, the recordkeeping, reporting, and other compliance requirements are increased slightly under this final rule. This final rule contains a new requirement for the City of Adak or the City of Atka to notify NMFS of its intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod in the upcoming fishing year in order for the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside to go into effect in the upcoming fishing year. The City Manager of Adak or the City Administrator of Atka is required to provide NMFS with an official notification of intent prior to December 8, 2016, and no later than October 31 for each year after 2016, for the harvest set-aside to go into effect in the upcoming year. The professional skills necessary to provide this notice include writing, sending email, and access to a U.S. Post Office.

(6) Description of Significant Alternatives Considered to the Final Action That Minimize Adverse Impacts on Small Entities

The RFA requires identification of any significant alternatives to the final rule that accomplish the stated objectives of the final action, consistent with applicable statutes, and that would minimize any significant economic impact of the final rule on small entities. The Council considered a status quo alternative and one action alternative with several options and suboptions. The combination of options and suboptions under the action alternative effectively provided a broad range of potential alternative approaches to status quo management. Under the status quo, there would have been a continued risk that fishing communities in the Aleutian Islands would not be able to sustainably participate in the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod fishery. The action alternative does not affect any non-CDQ fishery sector's Pacific cod allocation, or the TAC of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod. The action alternative accomplishes the stated objectives of prioritizing a portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC for harvest by vessels that deliver their

catch to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing, while minimizing adverse economic impacts on small entities and the potential for stranding a portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC.

The Council considered a range of dates, varying amounts of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod for the harvest set-aside and Bering Sea sector limitation, and a suite of mechanisms to relieve the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside under the action alternative. The Council recommended the final combination of dates, harvest set-aside amounts, harvest limitations, and provisions to relieve the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside that would give fishery participants sufficient opportunity to harvest and deliver Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to the benefit of Aleutian Islands communities and shoreplants without stranding the trawl CV sector allocation or the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC. The Council recommended and NMFS is implementing selected options in the action alternative such that if specific notification or minimum harvest and processing requirements are not met by a specific date, the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will either not go into effect in the upcoming year, or they will be lifted for the remainder of the year.

The Council considered and rejected two options under the action alternative. One option would have required that if less than 50 percent of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside had been landed at an Aleutian Islands shoreplant by a given date, ranging from February 28 to March 15, the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside would be lifted. Instead, the Council selected an option that requires a minimum weight (1,000 mt) rather than a minimum percentage of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside that must be landed at an Aleutian Islands shoreplant for processing by a given date (February 28) for the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside to remain in place.

The Council also considered and rejected an option that would have exempted certain processing vessels with a history of processing Aleutian Islands Pacific cod in at least 12 out of 15 recent years from the final restrictions on processing and would have allowed them to process up to 2,000 mt of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod while the set-aside was in effect. This option could have allowed up to 10 processing vessels to continue to process Pacific cod during the A-season, limiting the effectiveness of this final rule to minimize the risk of a diminished historical share of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod being delivered to Aleutian Islands shoreplants and the communities where those shoreplants are located.

Federal Rules That May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict With the Final Action

NMFS has not identified any duplication, overlap, or conflict between this final action and existing Federal rules.

Collection-of-Information Requirements

This final rule contains a collection-of-information requirement subject to the PRA and which has been approved by OMB under control number 0648–0743.

Public reporting burden for Notification of Intent to Process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod is estimated to average 30 minutes per individual response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.

Send comments regarding this data collection, or any other aspect of this data collection, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to NMFS Alaska Region (see **ADDRESSES**), and by email to *OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov,* or fax to (202) 395–5806.

Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the PRA, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number. All currently approved NOAA collections of information may be viewed at: *http://www.cio.noaa.gov/services_programs/prasubs.html.*

List of Subjects

15 CFR Part 902

Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

50 CFR Part 679

Alaska, Fisheries, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: November 14, 2016.

Samuel D. Rauch III,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, NMFS amends 15 CFR part 902 and 50 CFR part 679 as follows:

Title 15—Commerce and Foreign Trade

PART 902—NOAA INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT: OMB CONTROL NUMBERS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 902 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

■ 2. In § 902.1, in the table in paragraph (b), under the entry ''50 CFR'', add an entry for ''679.20(a)(7)(viii)'' to read as follows:

§ 902.1 OMB control numbers assigned pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

CFR part or section where the information collection requirement is located	Current OMB control number (all numbers begin with 0648–)
* * * * *	
50 CFR:	
* * * * *	
679.20(a)(7)(viii)	–0743
* * * * *	

* * * * *

Title 50—Wildlife and Fisheries

PART 679—FISHERIES OF THE EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE OFF ALASKA

■ 3. The authority citation for 50 CFR part 679 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 773 *et seq.;* 1801 *et seq.;* 3631 *et seq.;* Pub. L. 108–447; Pub. L. 111–281.

■ 4. In § 679.2, add a definition for ''Aleutian Islands shoreplant'' in alphabetical order to read as follows:

§ 679.2 Definitions.

* * * * *

Aleutian Islands shoreplant means a processing facility that is physically located on land west of 170° W. longitude within the State of Alaska.

* * * * *

■ 5. In § 679.20, add paragraph (a)(7)(viii) to read as follows:

§ 679.20 General limitations.

* * * * *

(a) * * *

(7) * * *

(viii) *Aleutian Islands Pacific Cod Catcher Vessel Harvest Set-Aside Program*—(A) *Calculation of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ ICA and DFA.* Each year, during the annual harvest specifications process set forth at paragraph (c) of this section, NMFS will specify the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ incidental catch allowance and directed fishing allowance from the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ TAC as follows. Shortly after completion of the process set forth in paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(D) of this section, NMFS will announce through notice in the **Federal Register** whether the ICA and DFA will be in effect for the upcoming fishing year.

(*1*) *Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ incidental catch allowance.* Each year, during the annual harvest specifications process set forth at paragraph (c) of this section, NMFS will specify an amount of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod that NMFS estimates will be taken as incidental catch in non-CDQ directed fisheries for groundfish other than Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands. This amount will be the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ incidental catch allowance and will be deducted from the aggregate portion of Pacific cod TAC annually allocated to the non-CDQ sectors identified in paragraph (a)(7)(ii)(A) of this section.

(*2*) *Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ directed fishing allowance.* Each year, during the annual harvest specifications process set forth at paragraph (c) of this section, NMFS will specify the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ directed fishing allowance. The Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ directed fishing allowance will be the amount of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod TAC remaining after subtraction of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod CDQ reserve and the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ incidental catch allowance.

(B) *Calculation of the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery.* Each year, during the annual harvest specifications process set forth at paragraph (c) of this section, NMFS will specify the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery. The Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside will be an amount of Pacific cod equal to the lesser of either the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ directed fishing allowance as determined in paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(A)(*2*) of this section or 5,000 mt. The Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery will be the amount of Pacific cod that remains after deducting the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside from the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ directed fishing allowance as determined in paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(A)(*2*) of this section. Shortly after completion of the process set forth in paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(D) of this section, NMFS will announce through notice in the **Federal Register** whether the Aleutian Islands CV Harvest Set-Aside and the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery will be in effect for the upcoming fishing year.

(C) *Calculation of the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation.* Each year, during the annual harvest specifications process set forth at paragraph (c) of this section, NMFS will specify the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation and the amount of the trawl CV sector's A-season allocation that could be harvested in the Bering Sea subarea prior to March 21. The Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation will be an amount of Pacific cod equal to the lesser of either the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ directed fishing allowance as determined in paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(A)(*2*) of this section or 5,000 mt. The amount of the trawl CV sector's A-season allocation that could be harvested in the Bering Sea subarea prior to March 21 will be the amount of Pacific cod that remains after deducting the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation from the amount of BSAI Pacific cod allocated to the trawl CV sector A-season as determined in paragraph (a)(7)(iv)(A)(*1*)(*i*) of this section. Shortly after completion of the process set forth in paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(D) of this section, NMFS will announce through notice in the **Federal Register** whether the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation will be in effect for the upcoming fishing year.

(D) *Annual notification of intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod*—(*1*) *Submission of notification.* The provisions of paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(E) of this section will apply if the either the City Manager of the City of Adak or the City Administrator of the City of Atka submits to NMFS a timely and complete notification of its intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod during the upcoming fishing year. This notification must be submitted annually to NMFS using the methods described below.

(*2*) *Submittal method.* An official notification of intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod during the upcoming fishing year in the form of a letter or memorandum signed by the City Manager of the City of Adak or the City Administrator of the City of Atka must be submitted by certified mail through the United States Postal Service to: NMFS Alaska Region, Attn: Regional Administrator, P. O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802. The City Manager or City Administrator must also submit an electronic copy of the official notification of intent and the certified mail receipt with postmark via email to *nmfs.akr.inseason@noaa.gov*. Email submission is in addition to submission via U.S. Postal Service; email submission does not replace the requirement to submit an official notification of intent via U.S. Postal Service.

(*3*) *NMFS confirmation.* On or shortly after December 8, 2016, or November 1 for each year after 2016, the Regional Administrator will send a signed and dated letter to the City Manager of the City of Adak or the City Administrator of the City of Atka either confirming NMFS' receipt of its official notification of intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod, or informing the city that NMFS did not receive notification by the deadline.

(*4*) *Deadline.* The official notification of intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod for the upcoming fishing year must be postmarked no later than December 8, 2016, or October 31 for each year after 2016, in order for the provisions of paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(E) of this section to apply during the upcoming fishing year. Notifications of intent postmarked on or after December 9, 2016, or November 1 for each year after 2016, will not be accepted by the Regional Administrator. The electronic copy of the official notification of intent and certified mail receipt with postmark must be submitted to NMFS via email dated no later than December 8, 2016, or no later than October 31 for each year after 2016, in order for the provisions of paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(E) of this section to apply during the upcoming fishing year.

(*5*) *Contents of notification.* A notification of intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod for the upcoming fishing year must contain the following information:

(*i*) Date,

(*ii*) Name of city,

(*iii*) Statement of intent to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod,

(*iv*) Identification of the fishing year during which the city intends to process Aleutian Island Pacific cod, and

(*v*) Signature of and contact information for the City Manager or City Administrator of the city intending to process Aleutian Islands Pacific cod.

(E) *Aleutian Islands community protections for Pacific cod.* If the City Manager of the City of Adak or the City

Administrator of the City of Atka submits a timely and complete notification in accordance with paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(D) of this section, then the following provisions will apply for the fishing year following the submission of the timely and complete notification:

(*1*) *Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation.* Prior to March 21, the harvest of Pacific cod by the trawl CV sector in the Bering Sea subarea is limited to an amount equal to the trawl CV sector A-season allocation as determined in paragraph (a)(7)(iv)(A)(*1*)(*i*) of this section minus the Bering Sea Trawl CV A-Season Sector Limitation as determined in paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(C) of this section. If, after the start of the fishing year, the provisions of paragraphs (a)(7)(viii)(E)(*4*) or (*5*) of this section are met, this paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(E)(*1*) will not apply for the remainder of the fishing year.

(*2*) *Aleutian Islands Catcher Vessel Harvest Set-Aside.* Prior to March 15, only catcher vessels that deliver their catch of Aleutian Islands Pacific cod to Aleutian Islands shoreplants for processing may directed fish for that portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ directed fishing allowance that is specified as the Aleutian Islands Catcher Vessel Harvest Set-Aside in paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(B) of this section. If, after the start of the fishing year, the provisions of paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(E)(*4*) of this section are met, this paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(E)(*2*) will not apply for the remainder of the fishing year.

(*3*) *Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery.* Prior to March 15, vessels otherwise authorized to directed fish for Pacific cod in the Aleutian Islands may directed fish for that portion of the Aleutian Islands Pacific cod non-CDQ directed fishing allowance that is specified as the Aleutian Islands Unrestricted Fishery as determined in paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(B) of this section and may deliver their catch to any eligible processor.

(*4*) *Minimum Aleutian Islands shoreplant landing requirement.* If less than 1,000 mt of the Aleutian Islands Catcher Vessel Harvest Set-Aside is landed at Aleutian Islands shoreplants on or before February 28, then paragraphs (a)(7)(viii)(E)(*1*) and (*2*) of this section will not apply for the remainder of the fishing year.

(*5*) *Harvest of Aleutian Islands Catcher Vessel Harvest Set-Aside.* If the Aleutian Islands Catcher Vessel Harvest Set-Aside is fully harvested prior to March 15, then paragraph (a)(7)(viii)(E)(*1*) of this section will not apply for the remainder of the fishing year.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2016–28152 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

19 CFR Part 12

[CBP Dec. 16–21]

RIN 1515–AE18

Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Archaeological and Ethnological Material From Greece

AGENCY: Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document amends the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) regulations to reflect the extension of import restrictions on certain archaeological and ethnological material from the Hellenic Republic (Greece). The restrictions, which were originally imposed by CBP Decision (CBP Dec.) 11–25, are due to expire on November 21, 2016. The Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, United States Department of State, has determined that factors continue to warrant the imposition of import restrictions and no cause for suspension exists. Accordingly, these import restrictions will remain in effect for an additional five years, and the CBP regulations are being amended to reflect this extension until November 21, 2021. These restrictions are being extended pursuant to determinations of the United States Department of State made under the terms of the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act that implemented the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. CBP Dec. 11–25 contains the Designated List of archaeological and ecclesiastical ethnological material from Greece, to which the restrictions apply.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 21, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For legal aspects, Lisa L. Burley, Chief, Cargo Security, Carriers and Restricted Merchandise Branch, Regulations and Rulings, Office of Trade, (202) 325–0215. For operational aspects, William R. Scopa, Branch Chief, Partner Government Agency Branch, Trade Policy and Programs, Office of Trade, (202) 863–6554, *William.R.Scopa@cbp.dhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Pursuant to the provisions of the 1970 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Convention, implemented by the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act (Pub. L. 97–446, 19 U.S.C. 2601 *et seq.*), the United States made a bilateral agreement with Greece, which entered into force on November 21, 2011, concerning the imposition of import restrictions on archaeological materials representing Greece's cultural heritage from the Upper Paleolithic (beginning approximately 20,000 B.C.) through the 15th century A.D., and ecclesiastical ethnological material representing Greece's Byzantine culture (approximately the 4th century through the 15th century A.D.). On December 1, 2011, CBP published CBP Dec. 11–25 in the **Federal Register** (76 FR 74691), which amended 19 CFR 12.104g(a) to indicate the imposition of these restrictions and included a list designating the types of archaeological and ecclesiastical ethnological material covered by the restrictions.

Import restrictions listed in 19 CFR 12.104g(a) are effective for no more than five years beginning on the date on which the agreement enters into force with respect to the United States. This period can be extended for additional periods not to exceed five years if it is determined that the factors which justified the initial agreement still pertain and no cause for suspension of the agreement exists (19 CFR 12.104g(a)).

On February 5, 2016, the Department of State received a request by the Government of the Hellenic Republic to extend the Agreement. Subsequently, the Department of State proposed to extend the Agreement. After considering the views and recommendation of the Cultural Property Advisory Committee, the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, United States Department of State, determined that the cultural heritage of Greece continues to be in jeopardy from pillage of archaeological materials representing Greece's cultural heritage from the Upper Paleolithic (beginning approximately 20,000 B.C.) through the 15th century A.D., and ecclesiastical

ethnological material representing Greece's Byzantine culture (approximately the 4th century through the 15th century A.D.); and made the necessary determinations to extend the import restrictions for an additional five years. Diplomatic notes have been exchanged, reflecting the extension of those restrictions for an additional five-year period. Accordingly, CBP is amending 19 CFR 12.104g(a) to reflect this extension of the import restrictions.

The Designated List archaeological materials representing Greece's cultural heritage from the Upper Paleolithic (beginning approximately 20,000 B.C.) through the 15th century A.D., and ecclesiastical ethnological material representing Greece's Byzantine culture (approximately the 4th century through the 15th century A.D.) covered by these import restrictions is set forth in CBP Dec. 11–25. The Agreement and Designated List may also be found at the following Internet Web site address: *https://eca.state.gov/cultural-heritage-center/cultural-property-protection/bilateral-agreements/greece.*

The restrictions on the importation of these archaeological and ecclesiastical ethnological materials from Greece are to continue in effect for an additional five years. Importation of such material continues to be restricted unless the conditions set forth in 19 U.S.C. 2606 and 19 CFR 12.104c are met.

Inapplicability of Notice and Delayed Effective Date

This amendment involves a foreign affairs function of the United States and is, therefore, being made without notice or public procedure (5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1)). In addition, CBP has determined that such notice or public procedure would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest because the action being taken is essential to avoid interruption of the application of the existing import restrictions (5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B)). For the same reasons, a delayed effective date is not required under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

Because no notice of proposed rulemaking is required, the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) do not apply.

Executive Order 12866

It has been determined that this rule is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

Signing Authority

This regulation is being issued in accordance with 19 CFR 0.1(a)(1).

List of Subjects in 19 CFR Part 12

Cultural property, Customs duties and inspection, Imports, Prohibited merchandise.

Amendment to CBP Regulations

For the reasons set forth above, part 12 of title 19 of the Code of Federal Regulations (19 CFR part 12), is amended as set forth below:

PART 12—SPECIAL CLASSES OF MERCHANDISE

■ 1. The general authority citation for part 12 and the specific authority citation for § 12.104g continue to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; 19 U.S.C. 66, 1202 (General Note 3(i), Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS)), 1624.

* * * * *

Sections 12.104 through 12.104i also issued under 19 U.S.C. 2612;

* * * * *

§ 12.104g [Amended]

■ 2. In § 12.104g, paragraph (a), the table is amended in the entry for Greece (Hellenic Republic) by adding after the phrase ''CBP Dec. 11–25'' the phrase ''extended by CBP Dec. 16- 21''.

R. Gil Kerlikowske,

Commissioner, U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

Approved: November 21, 2016.

Timothy E. Skud,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

[FR Doc. 2016–28355 Filed 11–21–16; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 9111–14–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 101

Food Labeling

CFR Correction

■ In Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 100 to 169, revised as of April 1, 2016, on page 50, § 101.11 is added to read as follows:

§ 101.11 Nutrition Labeling of Standard Menu Items in Covered Establishments

(a) *Definitions.* The definitions of terms in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act apply to such terms when used in this section. In addition, for purposes of this section:

Authorized official of a restaurant or similar retail food establishment means the owner, operator, agent in charge, or other person authorized by the owner, operator, or agent in charge to register the restaurant or similar retail food establishment, which is not otherwise subject to section 403(q)(5)(H) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with FDA for the purposes of paragraph (d) of this section.

Combination meal means a standard menu item that consists of more than one food item, for example a meal that includes a sandwich, a side dish, and a drink. A combination meal may be represented on the menu or menu board in narrative form, numerically, or pictorially. Some combination meals may include a variable menu item or be a variable menu item as defined in this paragraph where the components may vary. For example, the side dish may vary among several options (*e.g.,* fries, salad, or onion rings) or the drinks may vary (*e.g.,* soft drinks, milk, or juice) and the customer selects which of these items will be included in the meal.

Covered establishment means a restaurant or similar retail food establishment that is a part of a chain with 20 or more locations doing business under the same name (regardless of the type of ownership, *e.g.,* individual franchises) and offering for sale substantially the same menu items, as well as a restaurant or similar retail food establishment that is registered to be covered under paragraph (d) of this section.

Custom order means a food order that is prepared in a specific manner based on an individual customer's request, which requires the covered establishment to deviate from its usual preparation of a standard menu item, *e.g.,* a club sandwich without the bacon if the establishment usually includes bacon in its club sandwich.

Daily special means a menu item that is prepared and offered for sale on a particular day, that is not routinely listed on a menu or menu board or offered by the covered establishment, and that is promoted by the covered establishment as a special menu item for that particular day.

Doing business under the same name means sharing the same name. The term ''name'' refers to either:

(i) The name of the establishment presented to the public; or

(ii) If there is no name of the establishment presented to the public (*e.g.,* an establishment with the generic descriptor ''concession stand''), the name of the parent entity of the establishment. When the term ''name'' refers to the name of the establishment presented to the public under paragraph (i) of this definition, the term ''same'' includes names that are slight variations

of each other, for example, due to the region, location, or size (*e.g.,* ''New York Ave. Burgers'' and ''Pennsylvania Ave. Burgers'' or ''ABC'' and ''ABC Express'').

Food on display means restaurant-type food that is visible to the customer before the customer makes a selection, so long as there is not an ordinary expectation of further preparation by the consumer before consumption.

Food that is part of a customary market test means food that appears on a menu or menu board for less than 90 consecutive days in order to test consumer acceptance of the product.

Location means a fixed position or site.

Menu or menu board means the primary writing of the covered establishment from which a customer makes an order selection, including, but not limited to, breakfast, lunch, and dinner menus; dessert menus; beverage menus; children's menus; other specialty menus; electronic menus; and menus on the Internet. Determining whether a writing is or is part of the primary writing of the covered establishment from which a customer makes an order selection depends on a number of factors, including whether the writing lists the name of a standard menu item (or an image depicting the standard menu item) and the price of the standard menu item, and whether the writing can be used by a customer to make an order selection at the time the customer is viewing the writing. The menus may be in different forms, *e.g.,* booklets, pamphlets, or single sheets of paper. Menu boards include those inside a covered establishment as well as drive-through menu boards at covered establishments.

Offering for sale substantially the same menu items means offering for sale a significant proportion of menu items that use the same general recipe and are prepared in substantially the same way with substantially the same food components, even if the name of the menu item varies, (*e.g.,* ''Bay View Crab Cake'' and ''Ocean View Crab Cake''). ''Menu items'' in this definition refers to food items that are listed on a menu or menu board or that are offered as self-service food or food on display. Restaurants and similar retail food establishments that are part of a chain can still be offering for sale substantially the same menu items if the availability of some menu items varies within the chain. Having the same name may indicate, but does not necessarily guarantee, that menu items are substantially the same.

Restaurant or similar retail food establishment means a retail establishment that offers for sale restaurant-type food, except if it is a school as defined by 7 CFR 210.2 or 220.2.

Restaurant-type food means food that is:

(i) Usually eaten on the premises, while walking away, or soon after arriving at another location; and

(ii) Either:

(A) Served in restaurants or other establishments in which food is served for immediate human consumption or which is sold for sale or use in such establishments; or

(B) Processed and prepared primarily in a retail establishment, ready for human consumption, of the type described in paragraph (ii)(A) of this definition, and offered for sale to consumers but not for immediate human consumption in such establishment and which is not offered for sale outside such establishment.

Self-service food means restaurant-type food that is available at a salad bar, buffet line, cafeteria line, or similar self-service facility and that is served by the customers themselves. Self-service food also includes self-service beverages.

Standard menu item means a restaurant-type food that is routinely included on a menu or menu board or routinely offered as a self-service food or food on display.

Temporary menu item means a food that appears on a menu or menu board for less than a total of 60 days per calendar year. The 60 days includes the total of consecutive and non-consecutive days the item appears on the menu.

Variable menu item means a standard menu item that comes in different flavors, varieties, or combinations, and is listed as a single menu item.

(b) *Requirements for nutrition labeling for food sold in covered establishments*—(1) *Applicability.* (i) The labeling requirements in this paragraph (b) apply to standard menu items offered for sale in covered establishments.

(ii)(A) The labeling requirements in this paragraph (b) do not apply to foods that are not standard menu items, including:

(*1*) Items such as condiments that are for general use, including those placed on the table or on or behind the counter; daily specials; temporary menu items; custom orders; food that is part of a customary market test; and

(*2*) Self-service food and food on display that is offered for sale for less than a total of 60 days per calendar year or fewer than 90 consecutive days in order to test consumer acceptance.

(B) The labeling requirements of paragraph (b)(2)(iii) of this section do not apply to alcoholic beverages that are foods on display and are not self-service foods.

(2) *Nutrition information.* (i) Except as provided by paragraph (b)(2)(i)(A)(*8*) of this section, the following must be provided on menus and menu boards:

(A) The number of calories contained in each standard menu item listed on the menu or menu board, as usually prepared and offered for sale. In the case of multiple-serving standard menu items, this means the calories declared must be for the whole menu item listed on the menu or menu board as usually prepared and offered for sale (*e.g.,* ''pizza pie: 1600 cal''); or per discrete serving unit as long as the discrete serving unit (*e.g.,* pizza slice) and total number of discrete serving units contained in the menu item are declared on the menu or menu board, and the menu item is usually prepared and offered for sale divided in discrete serving units (*e.g.,* ''pizza pie: 200 cal/slice, 8 slices''). The calories must be declared in the following manner:

(*1*) The number of calories must be listed adjacent to the name or the price of the associated standard menu item, in a type size no smaller than the type size of the name or the price of the associated standard menu item, whichever is smaller, in the same color, or a color at least as conspicuous as that used for the name of the associated standard menu item, and with the same contrasting background or a background at least as contrasting as that used for the name of the associated standard menu item.

(*2*) To the nearest 5-calorie increment up to and including 50 calories and to the nearest 10-calorie increment above 50 calories, except that amounts less than 5 calories may be expressed as zero.

(*3*) The term ''Calories'' or ''Cal'' must appear as a heading above a column listing the number of calories for each standard menu item or adjacent to the number of calories for each standard menu item. If the term ''Calories'' or ''Cal'' appears as a heading above a column of calorie declarations, the term must be in a type size no smaller than the smallest type size of the name or price of any menu item on that menu or menu board in the same color or a color at least as conspicuous as that used for that name or price and in the same contrasting background or a background at least as contrasting as that used for that name or price. If the term ''Calories'' or ''Cal'' appears adjacent to the number of calories for the standard menu item, the term ''Calories'' or ''Cal''

must appear in the same type size and in the same color and contrasting background as the number of calories.

(*4*) Additional requirements that apply to each individual variable menu item:

(*i*) When the menu or menu board lists flavors or varieties of an entire individual variable menu item (such as soft drinks, ice cream, doughnuts, dips, and chicken that can be grilled or fried), the calories must be declared separately for each listed flavor or variety. Where flavors or varieties have the same calorie amounts (after rounding in accordance with paragraph (b)(2)(i)(A)(*2*) of this section), the calorie declaration for such flavors or varieties can be listed as a single calorie declaration adjacent to the flavors or varieties, provided that the calorie declaration specifies that the calorie amount listed represents the calorie amounts for each individual flavor or variety.

(*ii*) When the menu or menu board does not list flavors or varieties for an entire individual variable menu item, and only includes a general description of the variable menu item (*e.g.,* ''soft drinks''), the calories must be declared for each option with a slash between the two calorie declarations where only two options are available (*e.g.,* ''150/250 calories'') or as a range in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (b)(2)(i)(A)(7) of this section where more than two options are available (*e.g.,* ''100–250 calories'').

(*iii*) When the menu or menu board describes flavors or varieties for only part of an individual variable menu item (such as different types of cheese offered in a grilled cheese sandwich (*e.g.,* ''Grilled Cheese (Cheddar or Swiss)''), the calories must be declared for each option with a slash between the two calorie declarations where only two options are available (*e.g.,* ''450/500 calories'') or as a range in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (b)(2)(i)(A)(*7*) of this section where more than two options are available (*e.g.,* ''450–550 calories'').

(*5*) Additional requirements that apply to a variable menu item that is offered for sale with the option of adding toppings listed on the menu or menu board. When the menu or menu board lists toppings that can be added to a menu item (such as pizza or ice cream):

(*i*) The calories must be declared for the basic preparation of the menu item as listed (*e.g.,* ''small pizza pie,'' ''single scoop ice cream'').

(*ii*) The calories must be separately declared for each topping listed on the menu or menu board (*e.g.,* pepperoni, sausage, green peppers, onions on pizza; fudge, almonds, sprinkles on ice cream), specifying that the calories are added to the calories contained in the basic preparation of the menu item. Where toppings have the same calorie amounts (after rounding in accordance with paragraph (b)(2)(i)(A)(*2*) of this section), the calorie declaration for such toppings can be listed as a single calorie declaration adjacent to the toppings, provided that the calorie declaration specifies that the calorie amount listed represents the calorie amount for each individual topping.

(*iii*) The calories for the basic preparation of the menu item must be declared for each size of the menu item. The calories for each topping listed on the menu or menu board must be declared for each size of the menu item, or declared using a slash between the two calorie declarations for each topping where only two sizes of the menu item are available (*e.g.,* ''adds 150/250 cal'') or as a range for each topping in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (b)(2)(i)(A)(*7*) of this section where more than two sizes of the menu item are available (*e.g.,* ''adds 100–250 cal''). If a slash between two calorie declarations or a range of calorie declarations is used, the menu or menu board must indicate that the variation in calories for each topping arises from the size of the menu item to which the toppings are added.

(*iv*) If the amount of the topping included on the basic preparation of the menu item decreases based on the total number of toppings ordered for the menu item (such as is sometimes the case with pizza toppings), the calories for each topping must be declared as single values representing the calories for each topping when added to a one-topping menu item, specifying that the calorie declaration is for the topping when added to a one-topping menu item.

(*6*) Additional requirements that apply to a combination meal. Except as provided in paragraph (b)(2)(i)(A)(*6*)(*iv*) of this section:

(*i*) When the menu or menu board lists two options for menu items in a combination meal (*e.g.,* a sandwich with a side salad or chips), the calories must be declared for each option with a slash between the two calorie declarations (*e.g.,* ''350/450 calories'').

(*ii*) When the menu or menu board lists three or more options for menu items in a combination meal (*e.g.,* a sandwich with chips, a side salad, or fruit), the calories must be declared as a range in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (b)(2)(i)(A)(*7*) of this section (*e.g.,* ''350–500 calories'').

(*iii*) When the menu or menu board includes a choice to increase or decrease the size of a combination meal, the calorie difference must be declared for the increased or decreased size with a slash between two calorie declarations (*e.g.,* ''Adds 100/150 calories,'' ''Subtracts 100/150 calories'') if the menu or menu board lists two options for menu items in the combination meal, or as a range in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (b)(2)(i)(A)(*7*) of this section (*e.g.,* ''Adds 100–250 calories,'' ''Subtracts 100–250 calories'') if the menu or menu board lists three or more options for menu items in the combination meal.

(*iv*) Where the menu or menu board describes an opportunity for a consumer to combine standard menu items for a special price (*e.g.,*''Combine Any Sandwich with Any Soup or Any Salad for $8.99''), and the calories for each standard menu item, including each size option as described in paragraph (b)(2)(i)(A)(6)(*iii*) of this section if applicable, available for the consumer to combine are declared elsewhere on the menu or menu board, the requirements of paragraphs (b)(2)(i)(A)(*6*)(*i*), (*ii*), and (*iii*) of this section do not apply.

(*7*) Additional format requirements for declaring calories for an individual variable menu item, a combination meal, and toppings as a range, if applicable. Calories declared as a range must be in the format ''xx–yy,'' where ''xx'' is the caloric content of the lowest calorie variety, flavor, or combination, and ''yy'' is the caloric content of the highest calorie variety, flavor, or combination.

(*8*) Exception for a variable menu item that has no clearly identifiable upper bound to the range of calories: If the variable menu item appears on the menu or menu board and is a self-service food or food on display, and there is no clearly identifiable upper bound to the range, *e.g.,* all-you-can-eat buffet, then the menu or menu board must include a statement, adjacent to the name or price of the item, referring customers to the self-service facility for calorie information, *e.g.,* ''See buffet for calorie declarations.'' This statement must appear in a type size no smaller than the type size of the name or price of the variable menu item, whichever is smaller, and in the same color or a color at least as conspicuous as that used for that name or price, with the same contrasting background or a background at least as contrasting as that used for that name or price.

(*9*) Additional requirements that apply to beverages that are not self-service. For beverages that are not self-service, calories must be declared based

on the full volume of the cup served without ice, unless the covered establishment ordinarily dispenses and offers for sale a standard beverage fill (*i.e.,* a fixed amount that is less than the full volume of the cup per cup size) or dispenses a standard ice fill (*i.e.,* a fixed amount of ice per cup size). If the covered establishment ordinarily dispenses and offers for sale a standard beverage fill or dispenses a standard ice fill, the covered establishment must declare calories based on such standard beverage fill or standard ice fill.

(B) The following statement designed to enable consumers to understand, in the context of a total daily diet, the significance of the calorie information provided on menus and menu boards: ''2,000 calories a day is used for general nutrition advice, but calorie needs vary.'' For menus and menu boards targeted to children, the following options may be used as a substitute for or in addition to the succinct statement: ''1,200 to 1,400 calories a day is used for general nutrition advice for children ages 4 to 8 years, but calorie needs vary.'' or ''1,200 to 1,400 calories a day is used for general nutrition advice for children ages 4 to 8 years and 1,400 to 2,000 calories a day for children ages 9 to 13 years, but calorie needs vary.''

(*1*) This statement must be posted prominently and in a clear and conspicuous manner in a type size no smaller than the smallest type size of any calorie declaration appearing on the same menu or menu board and in the same color or in a color at least as conspicuous as that used for the calorie declarations and with the same contrasting background or a background at least as contrasting as that used for the calorie declarations.

(*2*) For menus, this statement must appear on the bottom of each page of the menu. On menu pages that also bear the statement required by paragraph (b)(2)(i)(C) of this section, this statement must appear immediately above, below, or beside the statement required by paragraph (b)(2)(i)(C) of this section.

(*3*) For menu boards, this statement must appear on the bottom of the menu board, immediately above, below, or beside the statement required by paragraph (b)(2)(i)(C) of this section.

(C) The following statement regarding the availability of the additional written nutrition information required in paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section must be on all forms of the menu or menu board: ''Additional nutrition information available upon request.''

(*1*) This statement must be posted prominently and in a clear and conspicuous manner in a type size no smaller than the smallest type size of any calorie declaration appearing on the same menu or menu board and in the same color or in a color at least as conspicuous as that used for the caloric declarations, and with the same contrasting background or a background at least as contrasting as that used for the caloric declarations.

(*2*) For menus, the statement must appear on the bottom of the first page with menu items immediately above, below, or beside the succinct statement required by paragraph (b)(2)(i)(B) of this section.

(*3*) For menu boards, the statement must appear on the bottom of the menu board immediately above, below, or beside the succinct statement required by paragraph (b)(2)(i)(B) of this section.

(ii) The following nutrition information for a standard menu item must be available in written form on the premises of the covered establishment and provided to the customer upon request. This nutrition information must be presented in the order listed and using the measurements listed, except as provided in paragraph (b)(2)(ii)(B) of this section. Rounding of these nutrients must be in compliance with § 101.9(c). The information must be presented in a clear and conspicuous manner, including using a color, type size, and contrasting background that render the information likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use. Covered establishments may use the abbreviations allowed for Nutrition Facts for certain packaged foods in § 101.9(j)(13)(ii)(B):

(A)(*1*) Total calories (cal);
(*2*) Calories from fat (fat cal);
(*3*) Total fat (g);
(*4*) Saturated fat (g);
(*5*) *Trans* fat (g);
(*6*) Cholesterol (mg);
(*7*) Sodium (mg);
(*8*) Total carbohydrate (g);
(*9*) Dietary fiber (g);
(*10*) Sugars (g); and
(*11*) Protein (g).

(B) If a standard menu item contains insignificant amounts of all the nutrients required to be disclosed in paragraph (b)(2)(ii)(A) of this section, the establishment is not required to include nutrition information regarding the standard menu item in the written form. However, if the covered establishment makes a nutrient content claim or health claim, the establishment is required to provide nutrition information on the nutrient that is the subject of the claim in accordance with § 101.10. For standard menu items that contain insignificant amounts of six or more of the required nutrients, the declaration of nutrition information required by paragraph (b)(2)(ii)(A) of this section may be presented in a simplified format.

(*1*) An insignificant amount is defined as that amount that allows a declaration of zero in nutrition labeling, except that for total carbohydrates, dietary fiber, and protein, it must be an amount that allows a declaration of ''less than one gram.''

(*2*) The simplified format must include information, in a column, list, or table, on the following nutrients:

(*i*) Total calories, total fat, total carbohydrates, protein, and sodium; and

(*ii*) Calories from fat, and any other nutrients identified in paragraph (b)(2)(ii)(A) of this section that are present in more than insignificant amounts.

(*3*) If the simplified format is used, the statement ''Not a significant source of ____'' (with the blank filled in with the names of the nutrients required to be declared in the written nutrient information and calories from fat that are present in insignificant amounts) must be included at the bottom of the list of nutrients.

(C) For variable menu items, the nutrition information listed in paragraph (b)(2)(ii)(A) of this section must be declared as follows for each size offered for sale:

(*1*) The nutrition information required in paragraph (b)(2)(ii)(A) of this section must be declared for the basic preparation of the item and, separately, for each topping, flavor, or variable component.

(*2*) Additional format requirements for toppings if the amount of the topping included on the basic preparation of the menu item decreases based on the total number of toppings ordered for the menu item (such as is sometimes the case with pizza toppings). The nutrients for such topping must be declared as single values representing the nutrients for each topping when added to a one-topping menu item, specifying that the nutrient declaration is for the topping when added to a one-topping menu item.

(*3*) If the calories and other nutrients are the same for different flavors, varieties, and variable components of the combination meal, each variety, flavor, and variable component of the combination meal is not required to be listed separately. All items that have the same nutrient values could be listed together with the nutrient values listed only once.

(D) The written nutrition information required in paragraph (b)(2)(ii)(A) of this section may be provided on a counter card, sign, poster, handout, booklet, loose leaf binder, or electronic device

such as a computer, or in a menu, or in any other form that similarly permits the written declaration of the required nutrient content information for all standard menu items. If the written nutrition information is not in a form that can be given to the customer upon request, it must be readily available in a manner and location on the premises that allows the customer/consumer to review the written nutrition information upon request.

(iii) The following must be provided for a standard menu item that is self-service or on display.

(A) Calories per displayed food item (*e.g.,* a bagel, a slice of pizza, or a muffin), or if the food is not offered for sale in a discrete unit, calories per serving (*e.g.,* scoop, cup), and the serving or discrete unit used to determine the calorie content (*e.g.,* ''per scoop'' or ''per muffin'') on either: A sign adjacent to and clearly associated with the corresponding food; (*e.g.,* ''150 calories per scoop); a sign attached to a sneeze guard with the calorie declaration and the serving or unit used to determine the calorie content above each specific food so that the consumer can clearly associate the calorie declaration with the food, except that if it is not clear to which food the calorie declaration and serving or unit refers, then the sign must also include the name of the food, *e.g.,* ''Broccoli and cheese casserole—200 calories per scoop''; or a single sign or placard listing the calorie declaration for several food items along with the names of the food items, so long as the sign or placard is located where a consumer can view the name, calorie declaration, and serving or unit of a particular item while selecting that item.

(*1*) For purposes of paragraph (b)(2)(iii)(A) of this section, ''per displayed food item''; means per each discrete unit offered for sale, for example, a bagel, a slice of pizza, or a muffin.

(*2*) For purposes of paragraph (b)(2)(iii)(A) of this section, ''per serving'' means, for each food:

(*i*) Per serving instrument used to dispense the food offered for sale, provided that the serving instrument dispenses a uniform amount of the food (*e.g.,* a scoop or ladle);

(*ii*) If a serving instrument that dispenses a uniform amount of food is not used to dispense the food, per each common household measure (*e.g.,* cup or tablespoon) offered for sale or per unit of weight offered for sale, *e.g.,* per quarter pound or per 4 ounces; or

(*iii*) Per total number of fluid ounces in the cup in which a self-service beverage is served and, if applicable, the description of the cup size (*e.g.,* ''140 calories per 12 fluid ounces (small)'').

(*3*) The calories must be declared in the following manner:

(*i*) To the nearest 5-calorie increment up to and including 50 calories and to the nearest 10-calorie increment above 50 calories except that amounts less than 5 calories may be expressed as zero.

(*ii*) If the calorie declaration is provided on a sign with the food's name, price, or both, the calorie declaration, accompanied by the term ''Calories'' or ''Cal'' and the amount of the serving or displayed food item on which the calories declaration is based must be in a type size no smaller than the type size of the name or price of the menu item whichever is smaller, in the same color, or a color that is at least as conspicuous as that used for that name or price, using the same contrasting background or a background at least as contrasting as that used for that name or price. If the calorie declaration is provided on a sign that does not include the food's name, price, or both, the calorie declaration, accompanied by the term ''Calories'' or ''Cal'' and the amount of the serving or displayed food item on which the calorie declaration is based must be clear and conspicuous.

(*iii*) For self-service beverages, calorie declarations must be accompanied by the term ''fluid ounces'' and, if applicable, the description of the cup size (*e.g.,* ''small,'' ''medium'').

(B) For food that is self-service or on display and is identified by an individual sign adjacent to the food itself where such sign meets the definition of a menu or menu board under paragraph (a) of this section, the statement required by paragraph (b)(2)(i)(B) of this section and the statement required by paragraph (b)(2)(i)(C) of this section. These two statements may appear on the sign adjacent to the food itself; on a separate, larger sign, in close proximity to the food that can be easily read as the consumer is making order selections; or on a large menu board that can be easily read as the consumer is viewing the food.

(C) The nutrition information in written form required by paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section, except for packaged food insofar as it bears nutrition labeling information required by and in accordance with paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section and the packaged food, including its label, can be examined by a consumer before purchasing the food.

(c) *Determination of nutrient content.* (1) A covered establishment must have a reasonable basis for its nutrient declarations. Nutrient values may be determined by using nutrient databases (with or without computer software programs), cookbooks, laboratory analyses, or other reasonable means, including the use of Nutrition Facts on labels on packaged foods that comply with the nutrition labeling requirements of section 403(q)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and § 101.9, FDA nutrient values for raw fruits and vegetables in Appendix C of this part, or FDA nutrient values for cooked fish in Appendix D of this part.

(2) Nutrient declarations for standard menu items must be accurate and consistent with the specific basis used to determine nutrient values. A covered establishment must take reasonable steps to ensure that the method of preparation (*e.g.,* types and amounts of ingredients, cooking temperatures) and amount of a standard menu item offered for sale adhere to the factors on which its nutrient values were determined.

(3) A covered establishment must provide to FDA, within a reasonable period of time upon request, information substantiating nutrient values including the method and data used to derive these nutrient values. This information must include the following:

(i) For nutrient databases:

(A) The name and version (including the date of the version) of the database, and, as applicable, the name of the applicable software company and any Web site address for the database. The name and version of a database would include the name and version of the computer software, if applicable;

(B) The recipe or formula used as a basis for the nutrient declarations;

(C)(*1*) Information on:

(*i*) The amount of each nutrient that the specified amount of each ingredient identified in the recipe contributes to the menu item; and

(*ii*) How the database was used including calculations or operations (*e.g.,* worksheets or computer printouts) to determine the nutrient values for the standard menu items;

(*2*) If the information in paragraph (c)(3)(i)(C)(*1*) of this section is not available, certification attesting that the database will provide accurate results when used appropriately and that the database was used in accordance with its instructions;

(D) A detailed listing (*e.g.,* printout) of the nutrient values determined for each standard menu item.

(E) Any other information pertinent to the final nutrient values of the standard menu item (*e.g.,* information about what might cause slight variations in the

nutrient profile such as moisture variations);

(F) A statement signed and dated by a responsible individual, employed at the covered establishment or its corporate headquarters or parent entity, who can certify that the information contained in the nutrient analysis is complete and accurate; and

(G) A statement signed and dated by a responsible individual employed at the covered establishment certifying that the covered establishment has taken reasonable steps to ensure that the method of preparation (*e.g.,* types and amounts of ingredients in the recipe, cooking temperatures) and amount of a standard menu item offered for sale adhere to the factors on which its nutrient values were determined.

(ii) For published cookbooks that contain nutritional information for recipes in the cookbook:

(A) The name, author, and publisher of the cookbook used;

(B) If available, information provided by the cookbook or from the author or publisher about how the nutrition information for the recipes was obtained;

(C) A copy of the recipe used to prepare the standard menu item and a copy of the nutrition information for that standard menu item as provided by the cookbook; and

(D) A statement signed and dated by a responsible individual employed at the covered establishment certifying that that the covered establishment has taken reasonable steps to ensure that the method of preparation (*e.g.,* types and amounts of ingredients in the recipe, cooking temperatures) and amount of a standard menu item offered for sale adhere to the factors on which its nutrient values were determined. (Recipes may be divided as necessary to accommodate differences in the portion size derived from the recipe and that are served as the standard menu item but no changes may be made to the proportion of ingredients used.)

(iii) For laboratory analyses:

(A) A copy of the recipe for the standard menu item used for the nutrient analysis;

(B) The name and address of the laboratory performing the analysis;

(C) Copies of analytical worksheets, including the analytical method, used to determine and verify nutrition information;

(D) A statement signed and dated by a responsible individual, employed at the covered establishment or its corporate headquarters or parent entity, who can certify that the information contained in the nutrient analysis is complete and accurate; and

(E) A statement signed and dated by a responsible individual employed at the covered establishment certifying that the covered establishment has taken reasonable steps to ensure that the method of preparation (*e.g.,* types and amounts of ingredients in the recipe, cooking temperatures) and amount of a standard menu item offered for sale adhere to the factors on which its nutrient values were determined.

(iv) For nutrition information provided by other reasonable means:

(A) A detailed description of the means used to determine the nutrition information;

(B) A recipe or formula used as a basis for the nutrient determination;

(C) Any data derived in determining the nutrient values for the standard menu item, *e.g.,* nutrition information about the ingredients used with the source of the nutrient information;

(D) A statement signed and dated by a responsible individual, employed at the covered establishment or its corporate headquarters or parent entity, who can certify that the information contained in the nutrient analysis is complete and accurate; and

(E) A statement signed and dated by a responsible individual employed at the covered establishment certifying that the covered establishment has taken reasonable steps to ensure that the method of preparation (*e.g.,* types and amounts of ingredients in the recipe, cooking temperatures) and amount of a standard menu item offered for sale adhere to the factors on which its nutrient values were determined.

(d) *Voluntary registration to be subject to the menu labeling requirements*—(1) *Applicability.* A restaurant or similar retail food establishment that is not part of a chain with 20 or more locations doing business under the same name and offering for sale substantially the same menu items may voluntarily register to be subject to the requirements established in this section. Restaurants and similar retail food establishments that voluntarily register will no longer be subject to non-identical State or local nutrition labeling requirements.

(2) *Who may register?* The authorized official of a restaurant or similar retail food establishment as defined in paragraph (a) of this section, which is not otherwise subject to paragraph (b) of this section, may register with FDA.

(3) *What information is required?* Authorized officials for restaurants and similar retail food establishments must provide FDA with the following information on Form FDA 3757:

(i) The contact information (including name, address, phone number, and email address) for the authorized official;

(ii) The contact information (including name, address, phone number, and email address) of each restaurant or similar retail food establishment being registered, as well as the name and contact information for an official onsite, such as the owner or manager, for each specific restaurant or similar retail food establishment;

(iii) All trade names the restaurant or similar retail food establishment uses;

(iv) Preferred mailing address (if different from location address for each establishment) for purposes of receiving correspondence; and

(v) Certification that the information submitted is true and accurate, that the person submitting it is authorized to do so, and that each registered restaurant or similar retail food establishment will be subject to the requirements of section 403(q)(5)(H) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and this section.

(4) *How to register.* Authorized officials of restaurants and similar retail food establishments who elect to be subject to requirements in section 403(q)(5)(H) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act can register by visiting *http://www.fda.gov/food/ingredientspackaginglabeling/labelingnutrition/ucm217762.htm.* FDA has created a form (Form 3757) that contains fields requesting the information in paragraph (d)(3) of this section and made the form available at this Web site. Registrants must use this form to ensure that complete information is submitted.

(i) Information should be submitted by email by typing complete information into the form (PDF), saving it on the registrant's computer, and sending it by email to *menulawregistration@fda.hhs.gov.*

(ii) *If email is not available, the registrant* can either fill in the form (PDF) and print it out (or print out the blank PDF and fill in the information by hand or typewriter), and either fax the completed form to 301–436–2804 or mail it to FDA, CFSAN Menu and Vending Machine Registration, White Oak Building 22, Rm. 0209, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Silver Spring, MD 20993.

(5) *When to renew the registration.* To keep the establishment's registration active, the authorized official of the restaurant or similar retail food establishment must register every other year within 60 days prior to the expiration of the establishment's current registration with FDA. Registration will automatically expire if not renewed.

(e) *Signatures.* Signatures obtained under paragraph (d) of this section that

meet the definition of electronic signatures in § 11.3(b)(7) of this chapter are exempt from the requirements of part 11 of this chapter.

(f) *Misbranding.* A standard menu item offered for sale in a covered establishment shall be deemed misbranded under sections 201(n), 403(a), 403(f) and/or 403(q) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act if its label or labeling is not in conformity with paragraph (b) or (c) of this section.

[79 FR 71253, Dec. 1, 2014]

[FR Doc. 2016–28367 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1301–00–D

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 101

Food Labeling

CFR Correction

■ In Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations, parts 100 to 169, revised as of April 1, 2016, on pages 43 and 44, in § 101.9, paragraphs (j)(1)(i), (2) introductory text, (3) introductory text, and the first sentence of (j)(4) are revised to read as follows. And, on page 50, the effective date note at the end of § 101.9 is removed.

§ 101.9 Nutrition labeling of food.

* * * * *

(j) * * *

(1)(i) Food offered for sale by a person who makes direct sales to consumers (*e.g.,* a retailer) who has annual gross sales made or business done in sales to consumers that is not more than $500,000 or has annual gross sales made or business done in sales of food to consumers of not more than $50,000, *Provided,* That the food bears no nutrition claims or other nutrition information in any context on the label or in labeling or advertising. Claims or other nutrition information subject the food to the provisions of this section, § 101.10, or § 101.11, as applicable.

* * * * *

(2) Except as provided in § 101.11, food products that are:

* * * * *

(3) Except as provided in § 101.11, food products that are:

* * * * *

(4) Except as provided in § 101.11, foods that contain insignificant amounts of all of the nutrients and food components required to be included in the declaration of nutrition information under paragraph (c) of this section, *Provided,* That the food bears no nutrition claims or other nutrition information in any context on the label or in labeling or advertising. * * *

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2016–28363 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1301–00–D

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 101

Food Labeling

CFR Correction

■ In Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations, parts 100 to 169, revised as of April 1, 2016, on page 50, § 101.10 is revised to read as follows:.

§ 101.10 Nutrition labeling of restaurant foods whose labels or labeling bear nutrient content claims or health claims.

Nutrition labeling in accordance with § 101.9 shall be provided upon request for any restaurant food or meal for which a nutrient content claim (as defined in § 101.13 or in subpart D of this part) or a health claim (as defined in § 101.14 and permitted by a regulation in subpart E of this part) is made, except that information on the nutrient amounts that are the basis for the claim (*e.g.,* ''low fat, this meal provides less than 10 grams of fat'') may serve as the functional equivalent of complete nutrition information as described in § 101.9. For the purposes of this section, restaurant food includes two categories of food. It includes food which is served in restaurants or other establishments in which food is served for immediate human consumption or which is sold for sale or use in such establishments. It also includes food which is processed and prepared primarily in a retail establishment, which is ready for human consumption, which is of the type described in the previous sentence, and which is offered for sale to consumers but not for immediate human consumption in such establishment and which is not offered for sale outside such establishment. For standard menu items that are offered for sale in covered establishments (as defined in § 101.11(a)), the information in the written nutrition information required by § 101.11(b)(2)(ii)(A) will serve to meet the requirements of this section. Nutrient levels may be determined by nutrient databases, cookbooks, or analyses or by other reasonable bases that provide assurance that the food or meal meets the nutrient requirements for the claim. Presentation of nutrition labeling may be in various forms, including those provided in § 101.45 and other reasonable means.

[79 FR 71253, Dec. 1, 2014]

[FR Doc. 2016–28364 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1301–00–D

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 330

[Docket No. FDA–2016–N–0543]

RIN 0910–AH30

Food and Drug Administration Review and Action on Over-the-Counter Time and Extent Applications

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or Agency) is amending its nonprescription (over-the-counter or OTC) drug regulations. This final rule supplements the time and extent application (TEA) process for OTC drugs by establishing timelines and performance metrics for FDA's review of non-sunscreen TEAs, as required by the Sunscreen Innovation Act (SIA). It also amends the existing TEA process to include filing determination and withdrawal provisions to make the TEA process more efficient.

DATES: This rule is effective December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: For access to the docket to read background documents or the electronic and written/paper comments received, go to *https://www.regulations.gov* and insert the docket number, found in brackets in the heading of this final rule, into the ''Search'' box and follow the prompts and/or go to the Division of Dockets Management, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristen Hardin, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER), Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Silver Spring, MD 20993, 240–402–4246, *Kristen.Hardin@fda.hhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary

A. Purpose and Coverage of the Final Rule

This final rule implements part of the SIA (Pub. L. 113–195) enacted November 26, 2014, by establishing timelines and related performance metrics for the review of certain submissions under FDA's regulation governing TEAs, which is codified in § 330.14 (21 CFR 330.14). The TEA regulation sets forth criteria and procedures by which OTC drugs initially marketed in the United States after the OTC Drug Review began in 1972 and OTC drugs without any U.S. marketing experience can be considered in the OTC drug monograph system. Section 586F(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act) (21 U.S.C. 360fff–6(b)), which was added by the SIA, requires FDA to issue regulations providing for the timely and efficient review of submissions under the TEA regulation, including establishing: (1) Reasonable timelines for reviewing and acting on such submissions for non-sunscreen OTC active ingredients and other conditions (non-sunscreen TEA conditions) and (2) measurable metrics for tracking the extent to which such timelines are met.

FDA is also amending the TEA regulation to make the TEA process more efficient and predictable for product sponsors, consumers, and FDA by adding filing determination requirements and criteria, and by addressing the withdrawal of consideration of TEAs and safety and effectiveness data submissions.

The timelines and metrics in this final rule apply to non-sunscreen TEA conditions. FDA is addressing timelines for review of sunscreen active ingredients and other related topics regarding sunscreens separately, under other provisions of the SIA.

B. Summary of the Major Provisions of the Final Rule

This final rule implements the SIA requirements for non-sunscreen TEAs by establishing timelines for FDA to review and take action on non-sunscreen TEA conditions. Timelines are provided for each stage of the TEA process and are intended to be reasonable while taking into consideration FDA public health priorities and available resources. The timelines established by this rule provide sponsors, other interested persons, and the public with consistent time frames for expected Agency action.

This rule also implements the SIA requirements for non-sunscreen TEAs by establishing measurable metrics that FDA will use for tracking the extent to which the timelines set forth in the regulations are met. The Agency anticipates that, among other potential benefits, making the metrics publicly available will improve transparency by providing sponsors, other interested persons, and the public with information that will enable them to quickly find out the number of TEAs that have been submitted to FDA. Over time, these measurements may also assist the Agency with resource planning and use.

The applicability of these metric and timeline provisions are generally limited to non-sunscreen TEAs submitted after the enactment of the SIA.

The final rule also amends the existing TEA regulation to provide for FDA to make filing determinations regarding safety and effectiveness data submissions for eligible TEA conditions. This additional procedural step provides early notification on whether submissions are sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review by FDA.

In addition, the rule amends the existing TEA regulation to include a provision regarding the withdrawal of consideration of TEAs, and safety and effectiveness data submissions. The withdrawal provision provides clarity on the status of TEAs, and safety and effectiveness data submissions that are no longer being pursued, so that FDA does not spend resources on these submissions.

Finally, the final rule adds certain definitions, and makes minor conforming and clarifying changes to the existing TEA regulation.

C. Legal Authority

This rule is issued under FDA's authority to regulate OTC drug products under the FD&C Act (see sections 201, 501, 502, 503, 505, 510, 586F, and 701(a) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 321, 351, 352, 353, 355, 360, 360fff–6, and 371(a))). As stated in the **Federal Register** of January 23, 2002 (67 FR3060), in which the final rule establishing the TEA process was published, submission of a new drug application (NDA) has been required before marketing a new drug since passage of the FD&C Act in 1938 (21 U.S.C. 355). To market a new drug, the drug must first be approved under section 505 of the FD&C Act. Section 701(a) of the FD&C Act authorizes FDA to issue regulations for the efficient enforcement of the FD&C Act. FDA's regulations in part 330 describe the conditions for a drug to be considered GRASE and not misbranded. If a drug meets each of the conditions contained in part 330, as well as each of the conditions contained in any applicable OTC drug monograph, and other applicable regulations, it is considered generally recognized as safe and effective (GRASE) and not misbranded, and is not required by FDA to obtain approval under section 505 of the FD&C Act.

In addition, section 586F of the FD&C Act requires FDA to issue regulations providing for the timely and efficient review of certain submissions under the TEA regulation in § 330.14. Section 586F of the FD&C Act specifically requires these regulations to include timelines and metrics associated with the review of those submissions under the TEA regulation. This rule adds timeline and metrics provisions that are intended to implement section 586F of the FD&C Act.

D. Costs and Benefits

We expect that the final rule will make the TEA process more efficient and predictable, and improve communication between FDA, sponsors, and other interested persons. Sponsors and other interested persons may benefit from knowing whether additional data are needed and what optimal steps to take to receive a GRASE determination, and we will be able to bring resolution to TEA conditions. However, we do not know the monetary value of added predictability.

We expect the rule will create a minimal burden on persons that submit

safety and effectiveness data submissions, primarily when they send a letter to request a meeting with us. Thus, we anticipate no increase in annual recurring costs for either small or large sponsors or other interested persons. We expect the six current sponsors of non-sunscreen TEAs covering conditions that have been found eligible to be considered for inclusion in the OTC drug monograph system will incur one-time costs to read and understand the rule.

We also estimate sponsors will submit two additional TEAs annually, and each of these sponsors will also spend time reading and understanding the rule. The present value of the total costs over 10 years ranges from about $17,000 to $35,000 with a 7 percent discount rate and from about $19,000 to $38,000 with a 3 percent discount rate. With a discount rate of 7 percent and 3 percent, we estimate that on average affected sponsors will incur less than $150 of annualized costs per year.

II. Table of Abbreviations and Acronyms Commonly Used in This Document

Abbreviation/ acronym	What it means
ANDA	Abbreviated New Drug Application.
FDA	Food and Drug Administration.
FD&C Act	Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.
GRASE	Generally Recognized as Safe and Effective.
HHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
NDA	New Drug Application.
NOE	Notice of Eligibility.
NPRM	Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
OMB	Office of Management and Budget.
OTC	Over-the-Counter.
PRA	Paperwork Reduction Act.
SIA	Sunscreen Innovation Act of 2014.
TEA	Time and Extent Application.

III. Background

A. Need for the Regulation/History of This Rulemaking

1. Overview of the OTC Drug Monograph System

The OTC drug monograph system was established to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of all OTC drug products marketed in the United States before May 11, 1972, that were not covered by NDAs and all OTC drug products covered by ''safety'' NDAs that were marketed in the United States before enactment of the 1962 drug amendments to the FD&C Act. In 1972, FDA began its OTC Drug Review to evaluate OTC drugs by therapeutic categories or classes (*e.g.,* sunscreens, antacids), rather than on a product-by-product basis, and to develop ''conditions'' under which classes of OTC drugs are GRASE and not misbranded.

FDA publishes these conditions in the **Federal Register** in the form of OTC drug monographs, which consist primarily of active ingredients, labeling, and other general requirements. Final monographs for OTC drugs that are GRASE and not misbranded are codified in part 330. Manufacturers of drugs that meet each of the conditions contained in part 330, including each of the conditions contained in any applicable OTC drug monograph, and other applicable regulations, need not seek FDA clearance before marketing.

2. Overview of the TEA Process Prior to This Rulemaking

Initially, OTC drug conditions not marketed in the United States prior to the inception of the OTC Drug Review were not eligible for review under the OTC drug monograph process. The TEA process, established by regulations finalized in 2002 (§ 330.14), expanded the scope of the OTC Drug Review. A ''condition,'' for purposes of the TEA regulation, is an active ingredient or botanical drug substance (or a combination of active ingredients or botanical drug substances), dosage form, dosage strength, or route of administration marketed for a specific OTC use. The TEA process provides a potential pathway for OTC conditions, including new active ingredients or dosage forms that previously had no U.S. marketing history or that were marketed in the United States after the OTC Drug Review began, to be marketed under an OTC drug monograph.

Active ingredients and other conditions that satisfy the TEA eligibility requirements are subject to the same safety, effectiveness, and labeling standards that apply to other conditions under the OTC monograph process (see § 330.14(g)). The TEA regulation requires multistep, notice-and-comment rulemaking procedures before an active ingredient or other condition is added to an OTC drug monograph.

The TEA process begins with the submission of a TEA containing data documenting the OTC marketing history of the active ingredient, combination of active ingredients, or other condition(s) (*e.g.,* a new dosage strength for an active ingredient already included in an OTC drug monograph). FDA reviews the application and determines whether the sponsor's marketing data establish that the condition or conditions have been marketed to a material extent and for a material time, as set forth in the TEA regulation's eligibility requirements. If the condition is not found eligible, FDA will send a letter to the sponsor explaining why the condition was not found acceptable. If the marketing data satisfy the TEA regulation's eligibility criteria, FDA publishes a notice of eligibility (NOE) in the **Federal Register** announcing that the active ingredient or other condition is being considered for inclusion in an OTC drug monograph and calling for submissions of safety and efficacy data for the proposed OTC use.

We note that although a TEA is the application regarding the time and extent of marketing, which leads to an eligibility determination (resulting in publication of an NOE or a letter of ineligibility), references to TEAs or applications (including in the SIA) sometimes encompass FDA's review of the condition's eligibility and the GRASE determination for the condition. Thus, these references may be used to mean the TEA itself, the safety and effectiveness data submission, FDA's GRASE determination, associated order or rulemaking actions, or all of these. In this rule and preamble, the terms ''TEA'' and ''safety and effectiveness data submission'' are used, where appropriate, to describe the two distinct submissions under the TEA regulation. However, the term ''TEA process'' may be used when referring to one or more actions under the TEA regulation.

If, after FDA reviews the safety and effectiveness data, the Agency initially determines that the active ingredient or other condition is GRASE, it will publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to include the condition in an appropriate OTC drug monograph.

If the condition is initially determined not to be GRASE, FDA will inform the sponsor and other interested persons that submitted data of its decision by letter, and will include the letter in the relevant public docket (§ 330.14(g)(4)). The Agency will also publish a NPRM to include the condition in § 310.502 (21 CFR 310.502). The sponsor and other interested persons will have an opportunity to submit comments and new data on FDA's initial determination and NPRM (§ 330.14(g)(5)). After evaluation of any additional data submitted, FDA will either issue a final rule or a new NPRM, if necessary, in the **Federal Register**.

3. The Sunscreen Innovation Act (SIA)

In November 2014, Congress passed the SIA to supplement the TEA process with regard to both sunscreen and non-sunscreen OTC drug products. Section 586F of the FD&C Act was added by the SIA and only applies to TEAs for drugs other than nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients or combinations of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients (see sections 586 and 586F of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff and 360fff–6) as amended by the SIA). For FDA review of non-sunscreen TEA conditions, section 586F includes two main requirements. The first requirement (see section 586F(a) of the FD&C Act), which is generally outside the scope of this rule, is regarding a framework and timelines for review of certain eligible TEA conditions pending before the date of enactment of the SIA. The second general requirement (see section 586F(b) of the FD&C Act) is that FDA issue a regulation that includes: (1) Timelines for review of new non-sunscreen TEA conditions (with certain exceptions noted in sections 586F(a)(1) and (3)) and (2) measurable metrics for tracking the extent to which the timelines are met. Accordingly, FDA published a proposed rule on April 4, 2016, to address both timelines and metrics, as required by the SIA.

4. Brief Summary of the Proposed Rule

As described in the proposed rule ''Food and Drug Administration Review and Action on Over-the-Counter Time and Extent Applications'' (81 FR 19069, April 4, 2016) (Proposed Rule), FDA had determined that with regard to non-sunscreen TEAs, the best way to both address the statutory requirements of the SIA and to make certain FDA-initiated modifications to the TEA process set forth in § 330.14 was to: (1) Propose a new section (§ 330.15) that is specific to non-sunscreen TEA conditions and establishes the SIA-required timelines and metrics and (2) amend § 330.14 with regard to process improvements for TEAs for all OTC drugs (such as providing format and content criteria for a filing determination and addressing withdrawal of consideration).

We refer readers to the preamble of the Proposed Rule for additional information about the development of the Proposed Rule. The Agency requested public comments on the Proposed Rule, and the comment period closed June 3, 2016.

B. Summary of Comments on the Proposed Rule

We received comments from a trade association and several individual citizens. The comments were generally supportive. In addition to a few general comments, we received comments specific to the proposed timeline provision as well as on the format and content of the safety and effectiveness submissions.

C. General Overview of the Final Rule

This rule finalizes the Proposed Rule. The following subsections give a brief summary of the proposed provisions we are finalizing, including a summary of the key changes between the proposed and final rules.

1. Applicability (§ 330.15(a))

We proposed that a condition in a TEA submitted under § 330.14 would be subject to the timelines for FDA review and action except for: (1) A sunscreen active ingredient or a combination of sunscreen active ingredients, or other conditions for sunscreen ingredients or (2) a non-sunscreen active ingredient or combination of non-sunscreen active ingredients, and other conditions for such ingredients submitted in a TEA under § 330.14 before November 27, 2014, subject to section 586F(a)(1)(C) of the FD&C Act. The exceptions are based on provisions of the SIA, including section 586F(b) of the FD&C Act, which directs the Agency to issue regulations establishing timelines for drugs other than nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients or combinations of nonprescription active ingredients. For additional discussion on the development of this provision see the preamble (81 FR 19069 at 19073) of the Proposed Rule.

We are finalizing this provision without change.

2. Timelines for FDA Review and Action (§ 330.15(c))

In accordance with section 586F(b) of the FD&C Act, FDA proposed timelines for each of the various stages of the TEA process for conditions within the scope of the rule. The proposed timelines for each stage take into consideration factors set forth under the SIA. For additional discussion on the development of this provision, see the preamble (81 FR 19069 at 19073 to 19077) of the Proposed Rule.

We are finalizing this provision with one clarifying change to acknowledge that, with respect to the 90-day timeline for FDA to issue a filing determination, a safety and effectiveness data submission can be submitted by a person other than the sponsor of the TEA.

3. Metrics (§ 330.15(b))

Section 586F(b) of the FD&C Act requires FDA to establish measurable metrics for tracking the extent to which the timelines set forth in the regulations are met. We proposed to maintain a publicly available posting of metrics for the review of TEAs and safety and effectiveness data submissions submitted under § 330.14 that are subject to the timelines, and update the posting annually. The proposed metrics, when publically posted, should provide sponsors and the public with information that will enable them to quickly ascertain the number of TEAs that have been submitted to FDA, and the Agency's performance in meeting the proposed timelines. For additional discussion on the development of this provision, see the preamble (81 FR 19069 at 19077) of the Proposed Rule.

We are finalizing this provision without change.

4. Definitions (§ 330.14(a))

We proposed additional definitions that, in general, are intended to clarify the beginning or ending of the timelines for FDA review and action. We proposed to add these definitions to § 330.14 instead of § 330.15 because § 330.14 describes the TEA process to which these definitions apply. For additional discussion on the development of this provision, see the preamble (81 FR 19069 at 19077 to 19078) of the Proposed Rule.

We are finalizing this provision with clarifying changes to the definition of ''Date of filing'' and ''Safety and effectiveness data submission'' to acknowledge that a safety and effectiveness data submission can be submitted by a person other than the sponsor of the TEA.

5. Filing Determination (§ 330.14(j))

We proposed certain filing determination requirements to help improve the content and format of a safety and effectiveness data submission. We also proposed timelines related to these proposed new requirements and proposed processes that apply whether the submission is accepted for filing, refused, or filed over protest. The proposed requirement and related timelines were developed, in part, to provide a clear pathway for the Agency to indicate when a submission does not contain the information necessary for a complete review and what additional information is needed. For additional discussion on the development of this provision, see the

preamble (81 FR 19069 at 19078 to 19079) of the Proposed Rule.

We are finalizing the provision with several changes to the Proposed Rule for clarification purposes (for additional details on the changes, see section V.E):

- Throughout the provision, we have made clarifying changes to acknowledge that a safety and effectiveness data submission can be submitted by a person other than the sponsor of the TEA.
- With respect to § 330.14(j)(2), we are clarifying in this final rule that data submitted after a submission has been filed will be reviewed as part of the proposed rulemaking if there is adequate time before the NPRM will publish, or if there is not adequate time, the data will be evaluated as comments to the NPRM.
- In § 330.14(j)(3), we are changing the proposed term ''informal conference'' to ''meeting'' to use consistent terminology with the SIA.
- In both § 330.14(j)(2) and (3), we clarify that a copy of the notice will be posted to the docket.
- In § 330.14(j)(3), we originally proposed the process that a person that submitted a safety and effectiveness data submission must follow to request that FDA file a submission over protest. To avoid potential ambiguity, we are modifying § 330.14(j)(3) to clarify that the submitter cannot request to file over protest without first having a meeting with FDA. In addition, this final rule clarifies the status of the submission and the TEA condition once FDA has refused to file a submission.

6. Withdrawal of Consideration of a TEA or Safety and Effectiveness Data Submission (§ 330.14(k))

We proposed to add a withdrawal provision to new § 330.14(k). The proposed provision allowed a sponsor to request withdrawal of consideration of a TEA or safety and effectiveness data submission. In addition, we also proposed (§ 330.14(k)(1)(ii)) that inaction by a sponsor in certain circumstances may be deemed by FDA as a withdrawal of consideration. The proposed § 330.14(k)(2) also included a provision that FDA would give notice to the sponsor before deeming the submission withdrawn from consideration to give the sponsor an opportunity to provide an update and request FDA not withdraw the submission. Another proposed provision, § 330.14(k)(3), provided that the notice of withdrawal of consideration would be posted to the docket. In addition, we proposed in § 330.14(k)(4) that if the TEA or safety and effectiveness data submission is deemed withdrawn, the timelines under § 330.15(c) and the metrics under § 330.15(b) no longer apply. The provisions were proposed in part to enable the Agency to better allocate resources by providing a process for the Agency to suspend work on TEAs or safety and effectiveness data submissions that are no longer being pursued by the sponsor. For additional discussion on the development of these provisions see the preamble (81 FR 19069 at 19079 to 19080) of the Proposed Rule.

We are finalizing the provision with several clarifying changes to the Proposed Rule (for additional details on the changes, see section V.E):

- Throughout the provision, we have made clarifying changes to acknowledge that a safety and effectiveness data submission can be submitted by a person other than the sponsor of the TEA.
- Under § 330.14(k)(1)(ii), we no longer include that a sponsor's failure to act on a submission is a reason for FDA's deeming the submission withdrawn because until the sponsor or other interested person acts and files a TEA submission or safety and effectiveness data submission, there is nothing for FDA to deem withdrawn from consideration. For example, once a notice of eligibility is issued, the TEA is no longer under consideration and the eligible condition is not deemed under consideration until a safety and effectiveness data submission is filed.
- We have revised the proposed § 330.14(k)(2) to extend the time period to make a request that FDA not deem a submission withdrawn from consideration.
- The final rule makes a technical change to proposed § 330.14(k)(3) to account for the situation in which an NOE for a TEA has not been issued and the TEA therefore is not in the public docket.
- The final rule also clarifies in § 330.14(k)(3) that if FDA deems a submission withdrawn from consideration, the condition still remains eligible for consideration if an NOE was issued, and the sponsor or any interested person can pursue consideration of the condition in the future by submitting a new safety and effectiveness data submission.

7. Minor Changes to § 330.14 for Clarity and Consistency

We proposed minor changes to § 330.14 for clarity and consistency purposes. These changes included adding definitions to proposed new paragraph (a). We proposed several minor amendments to § 330.14(f) for clarity and for consistency with the OTC monograph regulations under § 330.10. We also revised § 330.14(f) to use terminology consistent with the new definition in § 330.14(a)(5) for ''safety and effectiveness data submission'' when referring to a data package submitted for an eligible TEA condition. We also proposed to add the word ''feedback'' prior to the word ''letter'' in the first sentence of § 330.14(g)(4) to use terminology consistent with the proposed new definition for ''feedback letter'' in § 330.14(a)(7). For additional discussion on the development of this provision, see the preamble (81 FR 19069 at 19080) of the Proposed Rule.

We are finalizing this provision with changes to § 330.14(f) in order to clarify that a safety and effectiveness data submission can be submitted by a person other than the sponsor of the TEA.

IV. Legal Authority

This rule is issued under FDA's authority to regulate OTC drug products under the FD&C Act (see sections 201, 501, 502, 503, 505, 510, 586F, and 701(a) of the FD&C Act). As stated in the **Federal Register** of January 23, 2002, in which the final rule establishing the original TEA process was published, submission of an NDA has been required before marketing a new drug since passage of the FD&C Act in 1938 (21 U.S.C. 355). To market a new drug, the drug must first be approved under section 505 of the FD&C Act. Section 701(a) of the FD&C Act authorizes FDA to issue regulations for the efficient enforcement of the FD&C Act. FDA's regulations in part 330 describe the conditions for a drug to be considered GRASE and not misbranded. If a drug meets each of the conditions contained in part 330, as well as each of the conditions contained in any applicable OTC drug monograph, and other applicable regulations, it is considered GRASE and not misbranded, and is not required by FDA to obtain approval under section 505 of the FD&C Act.

In addition, section 586F of the FD&C Act requires FDA to issue regulations providing for the timely and efficient review of certain submissions under the TEA regulation in § 330.14. Section 586F of the FD&C Act specifically requires these regulations to include timelines and metrics associated with the review of certain submissions under the TEA regulation. Therefore, § 330.15 adds timeline and metrics provisions that are intended to implement section 586F of the FD&C Act.

V. Comments on the Proposed Rule and FDA Response

A. Introduction

We received three comment letters on the Proposed Rule, each containing one or more comments on one or more issues. The comments were submitted by a trade association and individual consumers. The submissions overall support the objectives of the rule. None of the comments suggested changes to specific provisions of the Proposed Rule.

We describe and respond to the comments in sections V.B. through V.D. We have numbered each comment to help distinguish between different comments. The number assigned to each comment or comment topic is purely for organizational purposes and does not signify the comment's value or importance or the order in which comments were received.

B. Description of General Comments and FDA Response

(Comment 1) The comments generally support the TEA process, the establishment of timelines associated with the general steps in that process, and the proposed revisions to the TEA regulation.

(Response 1) We appreciate the support expressed in the comments received. The TEA process is intended to provide a potential pathway for OTC conditions, including newer active ingredients that previously had no U.S. marketing history or that were marketed in the United States after the OTC Drug Review began, to be marketed under an OTC drug monograph. The associated timelines and revisions to the TEA regulation are intended to implement certain requirements in the SIA and to make the TEA process more efficient and predictable.

C. Specific Comments on Timelines for FDA Review and Action and FDA Response

(Comment 2) One comment stated that the explanation for the proposed timelines was clear. However, the comment suggested that additional changes to the monograph system could further streamline the projected TEA timeline.

(Response 2) This final rule establishes timelines within the context of the general OTC monograph process, which involves rulemaking to establish general recognition of safety and effectiveness for conditions in a monograph. Because this rule is limited to the TEA process and not the overall monograph regulatory framework, changes to the OTC monograph process that in turn could affect the timelines established in this rule are outside the scope of this rulemaking.

(Comment 3) One comment expressed concern that factors such as the format and content of the data submission, the complexity of the data, competing Agency priorities, and available Agency resources and reasonableness could delay TEA reviews and actions many years beyond the established timelines.

(Response 3) As explained in the preamble to the Proposed Rule, section 586F(b) of the FD&C Act provides that the timelines for review of non-sunscreen TEA conditions shall: (1) Reflect FDA public health priorities (including potential public health benefits of including additional drugs in the OTC drug monograph system), (2) take into consideration the resources available for carrying out such public health priorities and the relevant review processes and procedures, and (3) be reasonable, taking into account the required consideration of priorities and resources. We accordingly took these factors into consideration when establishing timelines. Furthermore, we determined that instead of setting multiple timelines for submissions of varying content, complexity, and format, it would be more efficient and sensible, for each stage of the TEA process, to set one general timeline for the review of non-sunscreen TEA conditions that accommodates anticipated variation among submissions. Because anticipated variation is already accounted for, FDA expects the time frames to be achievable in most circumstances.

D. Specific Comments on the Filing Determination and FDA Response

(Comment 4) With respect to the format and content of submissions, one comment seeks FDA guidance on the inclusion of certain information from foreign data sources for non-sunscreen active ingredients. The comment incorporated a comment that was previously submitted to FDA on its draft guidance for industry ''Nonprescription Sunscreen Drug Products—Content and Format of Data Submissions To Support a GRASE Determination Under the Sunscreen Innovation Act'' [1] (nonprescription sunscreen content and format draft guidance) (Ref. 1).

(Response 4) As explained in the preamble to the Proposed Rule, the general advice provided in the nonprescription sunscreen content and format draft guidance (Ref. 1) may also be useful to persons preparing safety and effectiveness data submissions for non-sunscreen TEAs. The comment's request for guidance on the inclusion of certain information from foreign data sources in the safety and effectiveness data submission is outside the scope of this rulemaking. However, the Agency will consider providing additional guidance to address this issue.

E. Technical Amendments

The revised regulatory text includes technical amendments that we have made to the proposed provisions in order to clarify requirements. In the following subsections, we summarize the changes that are intended to clarify amendments to the relevant provisions.

1. Clarifying That the Sponsor or Other Interested Person Can Submit a Safety and Effectiveness Data Submission

We are finalizing §§ 330.14(a), (f), (j), (k), and 330.15(c)(2) with changes to clarify that a safety and effectiveness data submission can be submitted by a person other than the sponsor of the TEA.

In proposed § 330.14(a), we defined the term ''Sponsor'' to mean the person that submitted the TEA, and we defined ''Safety and effectiveness data submission'' to mean, in part, a data package submitted by a sponsor. Generally we expect the person submitting the TEA (*i.e.,* the sponsor) will submit a safety and effectiveness data submission upon issuance of a NOE. However, upon issuance of the NOE, the TEA is no longer under consideration, and the sponsor does not necessarily have to be the person that submits the safety and effectiveness data submission. Therefore, while we are not changing the definition of ''Sponsor,'' we are modifying the definition of ''Safety and effectiveness data submission'' to clarify that the submission can be submitted by a person other than the sponsor.

Correspondingly, we are clarifying the proposed definition of ''Date of filing'' under § 330.14(a) and clarifying the proposed §§ 330.14(f) and 330.15(c)(2) by removing references to the ''sponsor'' in order to acknowledge that the safety and effectiveness data submission can be submitted by a person other than the sponsor. In addition, throughout § 330.14(j) and (k), we have removed references to the ''sponsor'' in the context of a safety and effectiveness data submission and replaced the term with more general terms, such as ''submitter'' or ''person that submitted the safety and effectiveness submission,'' in order to acknowledge that the safety and effectiveness data submission can be

[1] When final, this guidance will represent FDA's current thinking on this topic.

submitted by a person other than the sponsor.

2. Filing Determination (§ 330.14(j))

In addition to the changes noted in the previous subsection, we are finalizing the provision with several additional changes for clarification purposes.

In § 330.14(j)(2), FDA proposed that the date of filing will begin the FDA timelines described in § 330.15(c)(3) and (4). Because FDA needs adequate time to review submitted data and the timeline for FDA to review and develop a NPRM begins as soon as the safety and effectiveness data submission has been filed, we are clarifying that data submitted after a submission has been filed will be reviewed before issuance of the NPRM if there is adequate time; otherwise, the data will be evaluated as comments to the NPRM. We note that although other submitted data submissions may be considered under the rulemaking process, they will not be subject to a filing determination. Furthermore, as with comments submitted after the comment period, any data submitted after the comment period for the NPRM may not be considered before issuance of the final rule.

We are also adding language to both § 330.14(j)(2) and (3) to clarify that when FDA sends a notice to the person that submitted a safety and effectiveness data submission informing that person that the submission is filed or filed over protest, a copy of the corresponding notice will be posted to the docket. The posting to the docket, which is public, provides other interested persons notice that a submission is filed and FDA is beginning its review.

Additionally, in proposed § 330.14(j)(3), we described the process for cases in which FDA refuses to file the safety and effectiveness data submission. The Proposed Rule provided that the sponsor (now submitter) can request an informal conference within 30 days of FDA notifying the sponsor that it refuses to file the submission. We are changing the term ''informal conference'' to ''meeting'' to be consistent with the SIA. In addition, the proposed provision explained that a sponsor's request to file over protest must be within 120 days of the meeting with FDA. To avoid potential ambiguity, we are modifying § 330.14(j)(3) to clarify that a sponsor (now submitter) cannot request to file over protest without first meeting with FDA.

Finally, we are clarifying the status of a safety and effectiveness data submission that FDA has refused to file by including at the end of § 330.14(j)(3) that if FDA refuses to file a safety and effectiveness data submission and the submission is not filed over protest, then the submission is no longer deemed under consideration. If the original submitter or other interested person wishes to pursue consideration of an eligible condition at some point in the future, a new safety and effectiveness data submission must be submitted.

3. Withdrawal of Consideration of a TEA or Safety and Effectiveness Data Submission (§ 330.14(k))

We are finalizing the provision with several clarifying changes.

We no longer include failure to act on a submission as a reason that FDA may deem the submission to be withdrawn from consideration, as was proposed under § 330.14(k)(1)(ii). In the preamble to the Proposed Rule, we explained there have been past instances when a NOE was issued but the sponsor never submitted safety and effectiveness data and the TEA condition remained unresolved. We proposed that a failure to act on a submission, which could include a sponsor's failure to file a safety and effectiveness data submission for a TEA-eligible condition, is one reason for FDA to deem the submission withdrawn from consideration and that, for purposes of the provision, this could include deeming a TEA-eligible condition withdrawn from consideration. However, in such a scenario when a condition is found eligible and there has not been a safety and effectiveness data submission, there is no action for FDA to take. Once a NOE is issued, the TEA is no longer under consideration. Also, since the sponsor or any other interested person is not obligated or under an established deadline for submitting a safety and effectiveness data submission, we do not consider the TEA-eligible condition to be under consideration until such a submission is filed. As a result, a sponsor's failure to act on a submission will not result in the need for FDA to deem a submission or other aspect of the TEA process withdrawn from consideration, and inclusion of this provision is not necessary.

We also proposed in § 330.14(k)(1)(ii) that FDA may deem a submission to be withdrawn from consideration due to the sponsor's failure to respond to communications from FDA. This provision remains, and we note the reference to ''communications'' encompasses the notice of withdrawal under § 330.14(k)(2) and any preceding communication from FDA that the sponsor failed to respond to.

In § 330.14(k)(2), we proposed that FDA will notify the sponsor of a submission that FDA intends to deem withdrawn under § 330.14(k)(1)(ii), and that the sponsor will then have 30 days from the date of the notice to request that FDA not withdraw consideration of the TEA or safety and effectiveness data submission. We are changing the time provided to request that FDA not withdraw consideration from 30 days to 90 days.

We are also further revising proposed § 330.14(k)(3), in which FDA proposed that a notice of withdrawal will be posted to the docket when FDA deems a submission withdrawn from consideration. We are including a clarification that when a condition has been found eligible, even if the safety and effectiveness data submission is withdrawn, not only does the NOE remain in the public docket but the condition remains eligible for consideration, so that the condition can still be considered in the future if a new safety and effectiveness data submission is received. In addition, we are adding an exception to the notice of withdrawal being posted to the docket. Specifically, when a TEA submission is withdrawn from consideration before the issuance of an NOE, the notice of withdrawal will not be posted to the public docket and will only be sent to the sponsor because in such an instance the TEA, itself, is not on public display.

Finally, although not a change to the Proposed Rule, we note as we discussed in the preamble to the Proposed Rule, that if a sponsor requests withdrawal of consideration of its TEA or safety and effectiveness data submission, FDA generally intends to stop its review. However, although FDA may withdraw consideration of a TEA or safety and effectiveness determination, we may determine not to withdraw or not to stop review in some cases. For example, if FDA has already issued a NPRM that tentatively determines that the active ingredient or other condition is GRASE for an OTC use or is not GRASE for an OTC use, FDA may continue the rulemaking and proceed to issue a final rule.

VI. Effective Date

The SIA requires that the final rule be published not less than 30 calendar days before the effective date of the regulation. Consequently, this final rule will become effective 30 calendar days after the date of the rule's publication in the **Federal Register**.

Beginning on that date, the timelines and metrics set forth in this regulation will apply to the review of non-sunscreen TEAs, and safety and

effectiveness data submissions to which this regulation is applicable, and any amended provisions of § 330.14 will apply to the TEA process under that regulation.

VII. Economic Analysis of Impacts

A. Introduction

We have examined the impacts of the final rule under Executive Order 12866, Executive Order 13563, the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), and the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4). Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct us to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, when regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety, and other advantages; distributive impacts; and equity). We have developed a comprehensive Economic Analysis of Impacts that assesses the impacts of the final rule. We believe that this final rule is not a significant regulatory action as defined by Executive Order 12866.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act requires us to analyze regulatory options that would minimize any significant impact of a rule on small entities. Because this final rule does not impose significant new economic burdens on any entity, we certify that the final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (section 202(a)) requires us to prepare a written statement, which includes an assessment of anticipated costs and benefits, before issuing ''any rule that includes any Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100,000,000 or more (adjusted annually for inflation) in any one year.'' The current threshold after adjustment for inflation is $146 million, using the most current (2015) Implicit Price Deflator for the Gross Domestic Product. This final rule would not result in an expenditure in any year that meets or exceeds this amount.

In table 1, we provide the Regulatory Information Service Center/Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs Consolidated Information System accounting information.

Table 1.--Economic Data: Costs and Benefits Statement

Category	Primary Estimate	Low Estimate	High Estimate	Units Year Dollars	Discount Rate	Period Covered	Notes
Benefits							
Annualized					7%		
Monetized					3%		
$ millions/year							
Annualized					7%		
Quantified					3%		
Qualitative	The final rule will improve the TEA review process by establishing timelines and clarifying requirements and will increase the predictability of the process.						
Costs							
Annualized	$0.026	$0.017	$0.035	2015	7%	10 years	
Monetized	$0.029	$0.019	$0.038	2015	3%	10 years	
$ millions/year							
Annualized					7%		
Quantified					3%		
Qualitative							
Transfers							
Federal					7%		
Annualized Monetized					3%		
$ millions/year							
From/To	From:			To:			
Other					7%		
Annualized Monetized					3%		
$ millions/year							
From/To	From:			To:			
Effects							
State, Local, and/or Tribal Government: No effects							
Small Business: No effects							
Wages: No effect							
Growth: No effect							

B. Summary

1. Baseline Conditions

We regulate nonprescription drug products under two primary pathways: (1) The NDA process, described in 21 CFR part 314 or (2) the nonprescription (over-the-counter or OTC) drug monograph process, described in part 330. There are important differences between these two pathways. Under the NDA process, the sponsor of an application must submit to us nonclinical and clinical data that support the safety and effectiveness of its drug product, and we must review and approve the application before the sponsor can market such product. By contrast, OTC drug monographs are regulations describing conditions (§ 330.14 defines ''condition'' as an active ingredient or botanical drug substance (or combination of both), dosage form, dosage strength, or route of administration marketed for a particular specific OTC use) that certain OTC drugs (such as antacids) must meet to be considered GRASE and not misbranded. In contrast with the application pathway, once a sponsor or other interested person submits safety and effectiveness data to amend a monograph (which is posted to a public docket), the data are public. Drug products that comply with an applicable OTC drug monograph and other applicable regulations may be marketed without an NDA.

Initially, active ingredients and other conditions that were not marketed in the United States before the inception of the OTC Drug Review in 1972 were not eligible for review under the OTC drug monograph process. However, the TEA process, established by regulations finalized in 2002 (§ 330.14), expanded the scope of this OTC drug review. The TEA process offers a pathway for OTC conditions to be marketed under an OTC drug monograph. OTC conditions can include newer active ingredients that previously had no U.S. marketing history, or that were marketed in the United States after the OTC drug review began. Active ingredients and other conditions that satisfy the TEA eligibility requirements are subject to the same safety, effectiveness, and labeling standards that apply to other conditions under the OTC monograph process.

The TEA process requires multistep, notice-and-comment rulemaking procedures before a new active ingredient or other condition is added to an OTC drug monograph. After determining that an active ingredient or other condition is eligible for consideration under the OTC monograph process, we issue a notice in the **Federal Register** announcing the TEA determination and requesting safety and effectiveness data for the proposed OTC use. Next, after reviewing data submitted to the docket, we issue a NPRM to either include the condition in the appropriate OTC drug monograph or, if the condition is initially determined not to be GRASE for OTC use, include it in § 310.502, which would require the sponsor to seek approval under the NDA pathway to market the condition. NPRMs regarding GRASE determinations allow for public comments and for sponsors and other interested persons to submit additional data for safety and effectiveness. If a monograph is amended, by publishing a final rule, an OTC condition that complies with the OTC monograph and the general requirements for OTC drugs may be marketed in the United States without an NDA (examples of other general requirements include requirements to comply with Current Good Manufacturing Practice, to register and list products, to use drug facts labeling).

Although our multistep TEA process allows sponsors and other interested persons to learn about the progress of our review of a submission (for example, when an NOE is issued, and if a feedback letter is issued), there are no established timelines to review submissions or for data to be submitted. The lack of timelines can create unpredictability for interested persons because they may lack key information. For example, they may not know: (1) Whether the safety and effectiveness data submitted is sufficient or in the right format for us to conduct a substantive review; (2) when they need to submit new information; or (3) when to expect our determinations regarding eligibility or other feedback. The unpredictability in the process could result in interested persons not performing a required action within reasonable time for our review, performing unnecessary actions (examples of unnecessary actions may include collecting unnecessary or inadequate data, performing tests or studies that do not contribute to data needed by us to make a GRASE determination), or creating unnecessary effort for us and for them. Without specific timelines, persons that submit safety and effectiveness data submissions may not know whether their initial data submissions were insufficient to review, whether their data submissions were sufficient and are under review, or whether we require additional information. In addition, without specific timelines, we don't know whether interested persons intend to submit additional data or whether they do not intend to pursue a TEA condition any further.

2. Purpose of This Rule

This rule complies with certain mandates of the SIA enacted in November 2014. In particular, the final rule establishes timelines and metrics for review of TEAs for non-sunscreen OTC drug products. Specific timelines applicable to non-sunscreen TEA conditions will be added in a new § 330.15. The first timeline is to issue an NOE or post a letter of ineligibility to the TEA docket within 180 days of submission of a TEA. The second timeline is to issue a filing determination within 90 days of receipt of a complete safety and effectiveness data submission once the submitter has confirmed that it considers the submission to be complete. If we initially determine the active ingredient or other condition not to be GRASE, we will inform sponsors and other interested persons who submitted data within 730 days from the date of filing as defined in § 330.14(a). The next timeline is to issue a NPRM within 1,095 days from the date of filing. Lastly, we will issue a final rule regarding GRASE status within 912 days of the closing of the docket of the proposed rulemaking.

The final rule will also amend the existing § 330.14 by: (1) Setting forth clear filing determination requirements with regard to the content and format of safety and effectiveness data submissions for TEAs and (2) addressing withdrawal of consideration of a TEA or safety and effectiveness data submission. These amendments will apply to all TEAs, and their goal is to provide early notification on whether the submissions meet the filing requirements and to provide more clarity regarding withdrawal of TEA-related submissions. The amendments in this final rule are intended to provide us with feedback from sponsors or other interested persons on whether they intend to actively pursue their submissions, and specify that we may withdraw consideration of a TEA or safety and effectiveness data submission in certain circumstances (such as at a submitter's request). Finally, this final rule also adds definitions and makes clarifying changes to the TEA regulation in § 330.14.

The clarifications and establishment of timelines for the TEA process seek to dissipate uncertainties that may have prevented interested persons from submitting all the necessary data for us

to make final GRASE determinations to existing TEA conditions that have been found to be eligible to be considered for inclusion in the OTC drug monograph system. Since the TEA review process became effective in 2002 (67 FR 3060 at 3074), we have received six TEAs for non-sunscreen active ingredients, including applications for dandruff, laxative, gingivitis, and acne products. Of these six, the sponsors for three of the TEAs have subsequently requested that the Agency withdraw consideration of the conditions that were found eligible for consideration.

3. Benefits

We lack data to quantify the potential benefits of this final rule. With this final rule, we expect the timelines and data submission clarifications will make the TEA process, including establishing a new OTC drug monograph, more efficient and predictable, and improve communication between us and sponsors or other interested persons. Sponsors and other interested persons may benefit from knowing whether additional data are needed and what optimal steps to take to receive a GRASE determination, and we will be able to bring resolution to TEA conditions. However, we do not know the monetary value of added predictability.

4. Costs

We expect this final rule will create a minimal burden on sponsors and other interested persons from the possible cost associated with sending a meeting request letter to us in the event that we refuse to file a safety and effectiveness data submission and the submitter wants to meet with us to discuss the decision, or the possible cost of calling or writing us to request that we do not withdraw consideration of a submission under § 330.14(k)(2). Therefore, we anticipate no increase in annual recurring costs for either small or large sponsors or other interested persons.

We expect the six current sponsors will spend time reading and understanding the final rule; we estimate this task will take from about 6.5 hours to 13 hours. With an hourly wage rate of $133 including 100 percent overhead, each sponsor will incur one-time costs ranging from about $865 to $1,730. This cost range is an overestimate because most sponsors are already familiar with the rule if they read the Proposed Rule. We also estimate that we will receive 2 additional TEAs annually, and thus during a 10-year horizon we estimate potentially 20 additional applicants will spend the time to read and understand the final rule. This cost is also an overestimate because we assume that future sponsors will be different from sponsors who already have read and understood the rule. The present value of the total costs over 10 years ranges from about $17,000 to $35,000 with a 7 percent discount rate and from about $19,000 to $38,000 with a 3 percent discount rate. With a discount rate of 7 percent and 3 percent, we estimate that on average, sponsors will incur less than $150 of annualized costs per year.

5. Impact on Small Entities

The Regulatory Flexibility Act requires a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis unless the Agency can certify that the final rule will have no significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The final rule will affect few entities. Moreover, we estimate one-time costs under $2,000 per entity, costs well below 0.01 percent of annual revenues for the smallest entities; thus we certify that the final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This is the full economic analysis.

VIII. Analysis of Environmental Impact

We have determined under 21 CFR 25.31(a) that this action is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required.

IX. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

This final rule contains information collection requirements that are subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (the PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520). The title, description, and respondent description of the information collection provisions are shown below with an estimate of the annual reporting burden. Included in the estimate is the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing each collection of information.

Title: Additional Criteria and Procedures for Classifying Over-the-Counter Drugs as Generally Recognized as Safe and Effective and Not Misbranded—OMB Control No. 0910–0688—Revision.

Description: The final rule amends FDA's TEA regulations to establish timelines and performance metrics for FDA's review of non-sunscreen TEAs and safety and effectiveness data submissions, as required by the SIA. FDA is making other changes to make the TEA process more efficient. Accordingly, FDA is revising the information collection currently approved under OMB control number 0910–0688 consistent with the regulations.

FDA has OMB approval (control number 0910–0688) for the information collection in § 330.14, which specifies additional criteria and procedures by which OTC drugs that were initially marketed in the United States after the OTC Drug Review began and OTC drugs without any U.S. marketing experience may become eligible for consideration in the OTC drug monograph system.

The final rule amends the TEA regulations in § 330.14 to make the process more efficient and to make conforming and clarifying changes. Section 330.14(j) clarifies the requirements on content and format criteria for a safety and effectiveness data submission, and provides procedures for FDA's review of the submissions and determination of whether a submission is sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review. Section 330.14(j)(3) describes the process for cases in which FDA refuses to file the safety and effectiveness data submission. Under § 330.14(j)(3), if FDA refuses to file the submission, the Agency will notify the submitter in writing, state the reason(s) for the refusal, and provide 30 days in which to submit a written request for a meeting with the Agency about whether the Agency should file the submission. A written request for a meeting is not already approved under OMB control number 0910–0688. We estimate that approximately one person that submits a safety and effectiveness data submission (''Number of Respondents'' in table 2, row 1) will annually submit to FDA approximately one request for a meeting (''Total Annual Responses'' in table 2, row 1), and preparing and submitting each request will take approximately 1 hour (''Average Burden per Response'' in table 2, row 1).

Under § 330.14(j)(4)(iii), the safety and effectiveness data submission must contain a signed statement that the submission represents a complete safety and effectiveness data submission and that the submission includes all the safety and effectiveness data and information available to the submitter at the time of the submission, whether positive or negative. A signed statement is not already approved under OMB control number 0910–0688. We estimate that approximately two persons (''Number of Respondents'' in table 2, row 2) will annually submit to FDA approximately two signed statements as

described previously (''Total Annual Responses'' in table 2, row 2), and that preparing and submitting each signed statement will take approximately one hour (''Average Burden per Response'' in table 2, row 2).

Under § 330.14(k)(1), FDA, in response to a written request, may withdraw consideration of a TEA submitted under § 330.14(c) or a safety and effectiveness data submission submitted under § 330.14(f). A request that FDA withdraw consideration of a TEA or safety and effectiveness data submission is not already approved under OMB control number 0910–0688. We estimate that approximately one person that submitted a safety and effectiveness data submission (''Number of Respondents'' in table 2, row 3) will annually submit to FDA approximately one request (''Total Annual Responses'' in table 2, row 3), and that preparing and submitting each request will take approximately 1 hour (Average Burden per Response'' in table 2, row 3).

Under § 330.14(k)(2), a person that submitted the submission may request that FDA not withdraw consideration of a TEA or safety and effectiveness data submission. A request for FDA to not deem its submission withdrawn from consideration is not already approved under OMB control number 0910–0688. We estimate that approximately one person that submitted a TEA or safety and effectiveness data submission (''Number of Respondents'' in table 2, row 4) will annually submit to FDA approximately one request (''Total Annual Responses'' in table 2, row 4), and that preparing and submitting each request will take approximately two hours (''Average Burden per Response'' in table 2, row 4).

FDA estimates the burden of this information collection as follows:

TABLE 2—ESTIMATED ANNUAL REPORTING BURDEN [1]

21 CFR Section	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Total annual responses	Average burden per response	Total hours
330.14(j)(3)—Request for a meeting on FDA's refusal to file	1	1	1	1	1
330.14(j)(4)(iii)—Signed statement that the submission is complete	2	1	2	1	2
330.14(k)(1)—Request for FDA to withdraw consideration of a TEA or safety and effectiveness data submission	1	1	1	1	1
330.14(k)(2)—Request for FDA to not deem its submission withdrawn from consideration	1	1	1	2	2
Total					6

[1] There are no capital costs or operating and maintenance costs associated with this collection of information.

The information collection provisions of this final rule have been submitted to the OMB for review, as required by section 3507(d) of the PRA. FDA will publish a subsequent notice in the **Federal Register** announcing OMB's decision to approve, modify, or disapprove the information collection provisions in this final rule. An Agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

X. Federalism

We have analyzed this final rule in accordance with the principles set forth in Executive Order 13132. Section 4(a) of the Executive order requires agencies to ''construe . . . a Federal statute to preempt State law only where the statute contains an express preemption provision or there is some other clear evidence that the Congress intended preemption of State law, or where the exercise of State authority conflicts with the exercise of Federal authority under the Federal statute.'' The sole statutory provision giving preemptive effect to the final rule is section 751 of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 379r). We have complied with all of the applicable requirements under the Executive order and have determined that the preemptive effects of this rule are consistent with Executive Order 13132.

XI. Reference

The following reference is on display in the Division of Dockets Management (see **ADDRESSES**) and is available for viewing by interested persons between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday; it is also available electronically at *https://www.regulations.gov.* FDA has verified the Web site address, as of the date this document publishes in the **Federal Register**, but Web sites are subject to change over time.

1. FDA, Draft Guidance for Industry, ''Nonprescription Sunscreen Drug Products: Content and Format of Data Submissions To Support a GRASE Determination Under the Sunscreen Innovation Act,'' November 2015, available at *http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM473772.pdf.*

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 330

Over-the-counter drugs.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, 21 CFR part 330 is amended as follows:

PART 330—OVER-THE-COUNTER (OTC) HUMAN DRUGS WHICH ARE GENERALLY RECOGNIZED AS SAFE AND EFFECTIVE AND NOT MISBRANDED

■ 1. The authority citation for part 330 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321, 351, 352, 353, 355, 360, 360fff–6, 371.

■ 2. Section 330.14 is amended as follows:

■ a. Redesignate paragraph (a) as introductory text, revise the newly redesignated introductory text, and add new paragraph (a);

■ b. Revise paragraphs (f) heading and introductory text and (g)(4); and

■ c. Add paragraphs (j) and (k).

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 330.14 Additional criteria and procedures for classifying OTC drugs as generally recognized as safe and effective and not misbranded.

This section sets forth additional criteria and procedures by which over-the-counter (OTC) drugs initially marketed in the United States after the OTC drug review began in 1972 and OTC drugs without any U.S. marketing experience can be considered in the OTC drug monograph system. This

section also addresses conditions regulated as a cosmetic or dietary supplement in a foreign country that would be regulated as OTC drugs in the United States. Section 330.15 sets forth timelines for FDA review and action.

(a) *Definitions.* The definitions and interpretations contained in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the following definitions of terms apply to this section and to § 330.15.

(1) *Botanical drug substance* means a drug substance derived from one or more plants, algae, or macroscopic fungi, but does not include a highly purified or chemically modified substance derived from such a source.

(2) *Condition* means an active ingredient or botanical drug substance (or a combination of active ingredients or botanical drug substances), dosage form, dosage strength, or route of administration, marketed for a specific OTC use, except as excluded in paragraph (b)(2) of this section.

(3) *Date of filing* means the date of the notice from FDA stating that FDA has made a threshold determination that the safety and effectiveness data submission is sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review; or, if the submission is filed over protest in accordance with paragraph (j)(3) of this section, the date of filing is the date of the notice from FDA stating that FDA has filed the submission over protest (this date will be no later than 30 days after the request that FDA file the submission over protest).

(4) *Feedback letter* means a letter issued by the agency in accordance with paragraph (g)(4) of this section that informs the sponsor and other interested persons who have submitted data under paragraph (f) of this section that a condition is initially determined not to be generally recognized as safe and effective (GRASE).

(5) *Safety and effectiveness data submission* means a data package submitted by a sponsor or other interested person that includes safety and effectiveness data and information under paragraph (f) of this section and that is represented by the submitter as being a complete submission.

(6) *Sponsor* means the person that submitted a time and extent application (TEA) under paragraph (c) of this section.

(7) *Time and extent application (TEA)* means a submission by a sponsor under paragraph (c) of this section, which will be evaluated by the agency to determine eligibility of a condition for consideration in the OTC drug monograph system.

* * * * *

(f) *Safety and effectiveness data submission.* The notice of eligibility will request a safety and effectiveness data submission that includes published and unpublished data to demonstrate the safety and effectiveness of the condition for its intended OTC use(s), as well as the submission of any other relevant data and views. These data will be submitted to a docket established in the Division of Dockets Management and will be publicly available for viewing at that office, except data deemed confidential under 18 U.S.C. 1905, 5 U.S.C. 552(b), or 21 U.S.C. 331(j). Data considered confidential under these provisions must be clearly identified. Any proposed compendial standards for the condition will not be considered confidential. The safety and effectiveness data submission must be sufficiently complete to be filed by the agency under paragraph (j)(2) of this section. Safety and effectiveness data and other information submitted under this paragraph are subject to the requirements in § 330.10(c), (e), and (f). The safety and effectiveness data submission must include the following:

* * * * *

(g) * * *

(4) If the condition is initially determined not to be GRASE for OTC use in the United States, the agency will inform the sponsor and other interested persons who have submitted data of its determination by feedback letter, a copy of which will be placed on public display in the docket established in the Division of Dockets Management. The agency will publish a notice of proposed rulemaking to include the condition in § 310.502 of this chapter.

* * * * *

(j) *Filing determination.* (1) After FDA receives a safety and effectiveness data submission, the agency will determine whether the submission may be filed. The filing of a submission means that FDA has made a threshold determination that the submission is sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review.

(2) If FDA finds that none of the reasons in paragraph (j)(4) of this section for refusing to file the safety and effectiveness data submission apply, the agency will file the submission and notify the submitter in writing. FDA will post a copy of the notice to the docket. The date of filing begins the FDA timelines described in § 330.15(c)(3) and (4). Data submitted after the date of filing will be considered before the issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking if there is adequate time for review; otherwise, the data will be considered as comments to the proposed rule after issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking.

(3) If FDA refuses to file the safety and effectiveness data submission, the agency will notify the submitter in writing and state the reason(s) under paragraph (j)(4) of this section for the refusal. The submitter may request in writing, within 30 days of the date of the agency's notification, a meeting with the agency about whether the agency should file the submission, and FDA will convene the meeting within 30 days of the request. If, within 120 days after the meeting, the submitter requests that FDA file the submission (with or without correcting the deficiencies), the agency will file the safety and effectiveness data submission over protest under paragraph (j)(2) of this section, notify the submitter in writing and post a copy to the docket, and review the submission as filed. The submitter must have a meeting before requesting that FDA file the submission over protest but need not resubmit a copy of a safety and effectiveness data submission that is filed over protest. A safety and effectiveness data submission and the corresponding TEA-eligible condition are both not deemed under consideration if FDA refuses to file the safety and effectiveness data submission, and it is not filed over protest; the condition remains eligible for consideration and the sponsor or any interested person can pursue consideration of the condition in the future by submitting a new safety and effectiveness data submission.

(4) FDA may refuse to file a safety and effectiveness data submission if any of the following applies:

(i) The submission is incomplete because it does not contain information required under paragraph (f) of this section. If the submission does not contain required information because such information or data are not relevant to the condition, the submission must clearly identify and provide an explanation for the omission.

(ii) The submission is not organized or formatted in a manner to enable the agency to readily determine whether it is sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review.

(iii) The submission does not contain a signed statement that the submission represents a complete safety and effectiveness data submission and that the submission includes all the safety and effectiveness data and information available to the submitter at the time of the submission, whether positive or negative.

(iv) The submission does not contain an analysis and summary of the data and other supporting information,

organized by clinical or nonclinical area, such as clinical efficacy data, clinical safety data, clinical pharmacology, adverse event reports, animal toxicology, chemistry data, and compendial status.

(v) The submission does not contain a supporting document summarizing the strategy used for literature searches, including search terms, sources, dates accessed, and years reviewed.

(vi) The submission does not contain a reference list of supporting information, such as published literature, unpublished information, abstracts and case reports, and a copy of the supporting information.

(vii) The submission includes data or information relevant for making a GRASE determination marked as confidential without a statement that the information may be released to the public.

(viii) The submission does not contain a complete environmental assessment under § 25.40 of this chapter or fails to provide sufficient information to establish that the requested action is subject to categorical exclusion under § 25.30 or § 25.31 of this chapter.

(ix) The submission does not contain a statement for each nonclinical laboratory study that the study was conducted in compliance with the requirements set forth in part 58 of this chapter, or, if it was not conducted in compliance with part 58 of this chapter, a brief statement of the reason for the noncompliance.

(x) The submission does not contain a statement for each clinical investigation involving human subjects that the investigation was conducted in compliance with the institutional review board regulations in part 56 of this chapter, or was not subject to those regulations, and that the investigation was conducted in compliance with the informed consent regulations in part 50 of this chapter.

(xi) The submission does not include financial certification or disclosure statements, or both, as required by part 54 of this chapter, accompanying any clinical data submitted.

(k) *Withdrawal of consideration.* (1) Notwithstanding paragraph (g) of this section, FDA may withdraw consideration of a TEA submission or a safety and effectiveness data submission if:

(i) The person that submitted the submission requests that its submission be withdrawn from consideration; or

(ii) FDA deems the submission to be withdrawn from consideration due to the submitter's failure to respond to communications from FDA.

(2) Before FDA deems a submission withdrawn under paragraph (k)(1)(ii) of this section, FDA will notify the person that submitted the submission. If, within 90 days from the date of the notice from FDA, the submitter requests that FDA not withdraw consideration of the submission, FDA will not deem the submission to be withdrawn.

(3) If FDA withdraws consideration of a submission under paragraph (k)(1) of this section, FDA will post a notice of withdrawal to the docket, except in the case of a TEA submission that is withdrawn from consideration before issuance of a notice of eligibility, in which case, the notice of withdrawal will only be provided to the sponsor. Information that has been posted to the public docket for the condition at the time of the withdrawal (such as a notice of eligibility or a safety and effectiveness data submission that has been accepted for filing and posted to the docket) will remain in the public docket. If the condition has been found eligible through issuance of a notice of eligibility, the condition remains eligible for consideration and the sponsor or any interested person can pursue consideration of the condition in the future by submitting a new safety and effectiveness data submission.

(4) If FDA withdraws consideration of a submission under paragraph (k)(1) of this section, the timelines under § 330.15(c) will no longer apply as of the date of withdrawal, and the submission will not be included in the metrics under § 330.15(b).

■ 3. Add § 330.15 to subpart B to read as follows:

§ 330.15 Timelines for FDA review and action on time and extent applications and safety and effectiveness data submissions.

(a) *Applicability.* This section applies to the review of a condition in a time and extent application (TEA) submitted under § 330.14 for consideration in the over-the-counter (OTC) drug monograph system. This section does not apply to:

(1) A sunscreen active ingredient or combination of sunscreen active ingredients, and other conditions for such ingredients; or

(2) A non-sunscreen active ingredient or combination of non-sunscreen active ingredients, and other conditions for such ingredients submitted in a TEA under § 330.14 before November 27, 2014, subject to section 586F(a)(1)(C) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

(b) *Metrics.* FDA will maintain and update annually, a publicly available posting of metrics for the review of TEAs and safety and effectiveness data submissions that are subject to the timelines in this section. The posting will contain the following information for tracking the extent to which the timelines set forth in paragraph (c) of this section were met during the previous calendar year.

(1) Number and percent of eligibility notices or ineligibility letters issued within 180 days of submission of a TEA;

(2) Number and percent of filing determinations issued within 90 days of submission of a safety and effectiveness data submission;

(3) If applicable, number and percent of feedback letters issued within 730 days from the date of filing;

(4) Number and percent of notices for proposed rulemaking issued within 1,095 days from the date of filing;

(5) Number and percent of final rules issued within 912 days of closing of the docket of the proposed rulemaking; and

(6) Total number of TEAs submitted under § 330.14.

(c) *Timelines for FDA review and action.* FDA will review and take an action within the following timelines:

(1) Within 180 days of submission of a TEA under § 330.14(c), FDA will issue a notice of eligibility or post to the docket a letter of ineligibility, in accordance with § 330.14(d) and (e).

(2) Within 90 days of submission of a safety and effectiveness data submission, in accordance with § 330.14(j), FDA will issue a filing determination. The date of filing begins the FDA timelines in paragraphs (c)(3) and (4) of this section.

(3) Within 730 days from the date of filing, if the condition is initially determined not to be GRASE for OTC use in the United States, FDA will inform the sponsor and other interested persons who have submitted data of its determination by feedback letter in accordance with § 330.14(g)(4).

(4) Within 1,095 days from the date of filing of a safety and effectiveness data submission, FDA will issue a notice of proposed rulemaking to either:

(i) Include the condition in an appropriate OTC monograph(s), either by amending an existing monograph(s) or establishing a new monograph(s), if necessary; or

(ii) Include the condition in § 310.502 of this chapter.

(5) Within 912 days of the closing of the docket of the proposed rulemaking under paragraph (c)(4) of this section, FDA will issue a final rule.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Leslie Kux,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28120 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Royalty Board

37 CFR Part 381

[Docket No. 16–CRB–0016–PBR–COLA (2017)]

Cost of Living Adjustment for Performance of Musical Compositions by Colleges and Universities

AGENCY: Copyright Royalty Board, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Copyright Royalty Judges announce a cost of living adjustment (COLA) of 2% in the royalty rates that colleges, universities, and other educational institutions not affiliated with National Public Radio pay for the use of published nondramatic musical compositions in the SESAC repertory for the statutory license under the Copyright Act for noncommercial broadcasting.

DATES: *Effective date:* January 1, 2017.

Applicability dates: These rates are applicable to the period January 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kimberly Whittle, Attorney Advisor, by telephone at (202) 707–7658 or by email at *crb@loc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 118 of the Copyright Act, title 17 of the United States Code, creates a statutory license for the use of published nondramatic musical works and published pictorial, graphic, and sculptural works in connection with noncommercial broadcasting.

On November 29, 2012, the Copyright Royalty Judges (Judges) adopted final regulations governing the rates and terms of copyright royalty payments under section 118 of the Copyright Act for the license period 2013–2017. *See* 77 FR 71104. Pursuant to these regulations, on or before December 1 of each year, the Judges shall publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of the change in the cost of living for the rate codified at § 381.5(c)(3) relating to compositions in the repertory of SESAC. The adjustment, fixed to the nearest dollar, shall be the greater of ''the change in the cost of living as determined by the Consumer Price Index (all consumers, all items) [CPI–U] * * * during the period from the most recent index published prior to the previous notice to the most recent index published prior to December 1, of that year,'' or 2%. 37 CFR 381.10.

The change in the cost of living as determined by the CPI–U during the period from the most recent index published before December 1, 2014, to the most recent index published before December 1, 2016, is 1.6%.[1] In accordance with 37 CFR 381.10(b), the Judges announce that the COLA for calendar year 2017 shall be 2%. Application of the 2% COLA to the current rate for the performance of published nondramatic musical compositions in the repertory of SESAC—$149 per station—results in an adjusted rate of $152 per station.

List of Subjects in 37 CFR Part 381

Copyright, Music, Radio, Television, Rates.

Final Regulations

In consideration of the foregoing, the Judges amend part 381 of title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 381—USE OF CERTAIN COPYRIGHTED WORKS IN CONNECTION WITH NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING

■ 1. The authority citation for part 381 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 17 U.S.C. 118, 801(b)(1), and 803.

■ 2. Section 381.5 is amended by revising paragraph (c)(3)(v) to read as follows:

§ 381.5 Performance of musical compositions by public broadcasting entities licensed to colleges and universities.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) * * *

(v) 2017: $152 per station.

* * * * *

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Suzanne M. Barnett,

Chief Copyright Royalty Judge.

[FR Doc. 2016–28178 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410–72–P

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Royalty Board

37 CFR Part 386

[Docket No. 16–CRB–0017–SA–COLA (2017)]

Cost of Living Adjustment to Satellite Carrier Compulsory License Royalty Rates

AGENCY: Copyright Royalty Board, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Copyright Royalty Judges announce a cost of living adjustment (COLA) of 1.6% in the royalty rates satellite carriers pay for a compulsory license under the Copyright Act. The COLA is based on the change in the Consumer Price Index from October 2015 to October 2016.

DATES: *Effective Date:* January 1, 2017.

Applicability Dates: These rates are applicable to the period January 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kimberly Whittle, Attorney Advisor, by telephone at (202) 707–7658 or by email at *crb@loc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The satellite carrier compulsory license establishes a statutory copyright licensing scheme for the retransmission of distant television programming by satellite carriers. 17 U.S.C. 119. Congress created the license in 1988 and has reauthorized the license for additional five-year periods, most recently with the passage of the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014, Public Law 113–200.

On August 31, 2010, the Copyright Royalty Judges (Judges) adopted rates for the section 119 compulsory license for the 2010–2014 term. *See* 75 FR 53198. The rates were proposed by Copyright Owners and Satellite Carriers [1] and were unopposed. *Id.* Section 119(c)(2) of the Copyright Act provides that, effective January 1 of each year, the Judges shall adjust the royalty fee payable under Section 119(b)(1)(B) ''to reflect any changes occurring in the cost of living as determined by the most recent Consumer Price Index (for all consumers and for all items) [CPI–U] published by the Secretary of Labor before December 1 of the preceding year.'' Section 119 also requires that ''[n]otification of the adjusted fees shall be published in the **Federal Register** at least 25 days before January 1.'' 17 U.S.C. 119(c)(2).

The change in the cost of living as determined by the CPI–U during the period from the most recent index published before December 1, 2015, to the most recent index published before December 1, 2016, is 1.6%.[2] Application of the 1.6% COLA to the current rate for the secondary transmission of broadcast stations by satellite carriers for private

[1] On November 17, 2016, the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced that the CPI–U increased 1.6% over the last 12 months.

[1] Program Suppliers and Joint Sports Claimants comprised the Copyright Owners while DIRECTV, Inc., DISH Network, LLC, and National Programming Service, LLC, comprised the Satellite Carriers.

[2] On November 17, 2016, the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced that the CPI–U increased 1.6% over the last 12 months.

home viewing—27 cents per subscriber per month—results in an unchanged rate of 27 cents per subscriber per month (rounded to the nearest cent). *See* 37 CFR 386.2(b)(1). Application of the 1.6% COLA to the current rate for viewing in commercial establishments—56 cents per subscriber per month—results in a rate of 57 cents per subscriber per month (rounded to the nearest cent). *See* 37 CFR 386.2(b)(2).

List of Subjects in 37 CFR Part 386

Copyright, Satellite, Television.

Final Regulations

In consideration of the foregoing, the Judges amend part 386 of title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 386—ADJUSTMENT OF ROYALTY FEES FOR SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS BY SATELLITE CARRIERS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 386 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 17 U.S.C. 119(c), 801(b)(1).

■ 2. Section 386.2 is amended by adding paragraphs (b)(1)(viii) and (b)(2)(viii) as follows:

§ 386.2 Royalty fee for secondary transmission by satellite carriers.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) * * *

(viii) 2017: 27 cents per subscriber per month.

(2) * * *

(viii) 2017: 57 cents per subscriber per month.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Suzanne M. Barnett,

Chief Copyright Royalty Judge.

[FR Doc. 2016–28180 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410–72–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R04–OAR–2014–0507; FRL–9955–49–Region 4]

Air Plan Approval; FL Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 1-hour NO_2 NAAQS

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking final action to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) submission, submitted by the State of Florida, through the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), on January 22, 2013, to demonstrate that the State meets certain infrastructure requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) for the 2010 1-hour nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The CAA requires that each state adopt and submit a SIP for the implementation, maintenance and enforcement of each NAAQS promulgated by EPA, which is commonly referred to as an ''infrastructure'' SIP. FDEP certified that the Florida SIP contains provisions that ensure the 2010 1-hour NO_2 NAAQS is implemented, enforced, and maintained in Florida. EPA has determined that Florida's infrastructure SIP submission, provided to EPA on January 22, 2013, satisfies certain required infrastructure elements for the 2010 1-hour NO_2 NAAQS.

DATES: This rule will be effective December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket Identification No. EPA–R04–OAR–2014–0507. All documents in the docket are listed on the *www.regulations.gov* Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, *i.e.,* Confidential Business Information or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically through *www.regulations.gov* or in hard copy at the Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. EPA requests that if at all possible, you contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to schedule your inspection. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard Wong, Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, Region 4, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. The telephone number is (404) 562–8726. Mr. Richard Wong can also be reached via electronic mail at *wong.richard@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background and Overview

On January 22, 2010 (75 FR 6474, February 9, 2010), EPA promulgated a new 1-hour primary NAAQS for NO_2 at a level of 100 parts per billion, based on a 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the yearly distribution of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations. Pursuant to section 110(a)(1) of the CAA, states are required to submit SIPs meeting the requirements of section 110(a)(2) within three years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS or within such shorter period as EPA may prescribe. Section 110(a)(2) requires states to address basic SIP elements such as requirements for monitoring, basic program requirements and legal authority that are designed to assure attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. States were required to submit such SIPs for the 2010 NO_2 NAAQS to EPA no later than January 22, 2013.

In a proposed rulemaking published on July 20, 2016 (81 FR 47094), EPA proposed to approve Florida's 2010 1-hour NO_2 NAAQS infrastructure SIP submission submitted on January 22, 2013, with the exception of the elements related to the ambient air quality monitoring and data system of section 110(a)(2)(B), and the prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) permitting requirements for major sources of sections 110(a)(2)(C), prong 3 of D(i), and (J). EPA is not acting on Florida's January 22, 2013, infrastructure SIP submission regarding the PSD permitting requirements for major sources of sections 110(a)(2)(C), prong 3 of D(i) and (J) for the 2010 1-hour NO_2 NAAQS because it previously approved these requirements. *See* 80 FR 14019, March 18, 2015. Regarding section 110(a)(2)(B), EPA is not taking any action on this portion of Florida's 2010 1-hour NO_2 NAAQS infrastructure SIP submission in this action and will instead address this requirement in a separate action. Also note that EPA did not propose any action regarding the interstate transport provisions pertaining to the contribution to nonattainment or interference with maintenance in other states of prongs 1 and 2 of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) because Florida's January 22, 2013 SIP submission did not address these requirements. The details of Florida's submission and the rationale for EPA's actions for this final rulemaking are explained in the July 20, 2016, proposed rulemaking. Comments on the proposed rulemaking were due on or before August 19, 2016. EPA received no adverse comments on the proposed action.

II. Final Action

With the exception of the elements related to the ambient air quality monitoring and data system of section 110(a)(2)(B), and the PSD permitting requirements for major sources of sections 110(a)(2)(C), prong 3 of D(i), and (J), EPA is taking final action to approve Florida's infrastructure SIP submission for the 2010 1-hour NO_2 NAAQS submitted on January 22, 2013. EPA is taking final action to approve Florida's infrastructure SIP submission for the 2010 1-hour NO_2 NAAQS because the submission is consistent with section 110 of the CAA.

III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable federal regulations. *See* 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4);
- Does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Is not subject to requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA; and
- Does not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

The SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), nor will it impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.,* as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this action and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register.** A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register.** This action is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by January 23, 2017. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. *See* section 307(b)(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: November 7, 2016.

Heather McTeer Toney,

Regional Administrator, Region 4.

40 CFR part 52 is amended as follows:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart K—Florida

■ 2. In § 52.520, the table in paragraph (e) is amended by adding the entry ''110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 1-hour NO_2 NAAQS'' at the end of the table to read as follows:

§ 52.520 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(e) * * *

EPA-APPROVED FLORIDA NON-REGULATORY PROVISIONS

Provision	State effective date	EPA approval date	**Federal Register** notice	Explanation
*	*	*	*	* * *
110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 1-hour NO_2 NAAQS.	1/22/2013	11/23/2016	[Insert **Federal Register** citation].	With the exception of sections: 110(a)(2)(B) Concerning ambient air quality monitoring and data system; 110(a)(2)(C) and (J) concerning PSD permitting requirements; and 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) and (II) (prongs 1 through 3) concerning interstate transport requirements.

[FR Doc. 2016–28098 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2016–0494; FRL–9955–53–Region 9]

Findings of Failure To Attain the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ Standards; California; San Joaquin Valley

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has determined that the San Joaquin Valley nonattainment area failed to attain the 1997 annual and 24-hour fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) national ambient air quality standards by the December 31, 2015 ''Serious'' area attainment date. As a result of this determination, the State of California is required to submit a revision to the California State Implementation Plan that, among other elements, provides for expeditious attainment of the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ standards and for a five percent annual reduction in the emissions of direct $PM_{2.5}$ or a $PM_{2.5}$ plan precursor pollutant in the San Joaquin Valley.

DATES: This rule is effective December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established docket number EPA–R09–OAR–2016–0494 for this action. Generally, documents in the docket for this action are available electronically at *http://www.regulations.gov* or in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105–3901. While all documents in the docket are listed at *http://www.regulations.gov,* some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (*e.g.,* copyrighted material, large maps, multi-volume reports), and some may not be available in either location (*e.g.,* confidential business information (CBI)). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rory Mays, Air Planning Office (AIR–2), EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3227, *mays.rory@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, ''we'', ''us,'' and ''our'' refer to the EPA.

Table of Contents

I. Background

On October 6, 2016 (81 FR 69448), the EPA proposed to determine that the San Joaquin Valley Serious nonattainment area failed to attain the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS or ''standards'') by the applicable attainment date of December 31, 2015, based on complete, quality-assured and certified ambient air quality data for the 2013 to 2015 monitoring period. The San Joaquin Valley $PM_{2.5}$ nonattainment area (or ''the Valley'') covers San Joaquin County, Stanislaus County, Merced County, Madera County, Fresno County, Tulare County, Kings County, and the valley portion of Kern County (see 40 CFR 81.305 for the precise boundaries of the $PM_{2.5}$ nonattainment area).

As discussed further in our October 6, 2016 proposed rule, in 1997, the EPA established annual and 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standards of 15.0 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu g/m^3$) and 65 $\mu g/m^3$, respectively (*see* 40 CFR 50.7). Since promulgation of the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS, the EPA has established more stringent $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS but, for reasons given in the proposed rule, the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS remain in effect in the San Joaquin Valley and represent the standards for which today's determinations are made. *See* pages 69448–69449 of the proposed rule.

Our proposed rule provided background information on: The effects of exposure to elevated levels of $PM_{2.5}$; the designations and classifications of the San Joaquin Valley under the Clean Air Act (CAA or ''Act'') for the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS; the plans developed by California to address nonattainment area requirements for San Joaquin Valley; the reclassification of the San Joaquin Valley from ''Moderate'' to ''Serious'' for the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS and the related extension of the applicable attainment date to December 31, 2015; the request by California to extend the December 31, 2015 attainment date for San Joaquin Valley under CAA section 188(e); and the denial of that request by the EPA. The EPA published its final denial of the State's attainment date extension request on October 6, 2016 at 81 FR 69396.

In our October 6, 2016 proposed rule, we also described the following: The statutory basis (*i.e.,* CAA sections 179(c)(1) and 188(b)(2)) for the obligation on the EPA to determine whether an area's air quality meets the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS; the EPA regulations establishing the specific methods and procedures to determine whether an area has attained the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS; and the $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring networks operated in the Valley by the California Air Resources Board and the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District and related monitoring network plans. We also documented our previous review of the networks and network plans, the agencies' annual certifications of ambient air monitoring data, and our determination that 15 of the 17 monitoring sites within the Valley produced valid design values for purposes of comparison with the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS.

Under EPA regulations in 40 CFR part 50, section 50.7 and in accordance with Appendix N, the 1997 annual $PM_{2.5}$ standards are met when the design value is less than or equal to 15.0 $\mu g/m^3$, and the 1997 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standards are met when the design value is less than or equal to 65 $\mu g/m^3$. More specifically, the design value for the annual $PM_{2.5}$ standards is the 3-year average of annual mean concentration, and the 1997 annual $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS are met when the design value for the annual $PM_{2.5}$ standards at each eligible monitoring site is less than or equal to 15.0 $\mu g/m^3$. With respect to the 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standards, the design value is the 3-year average of annual 98th percentile 24-hour average values recorded at each eligible monitoring site, and the 1997 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS are met when the design value for the 24-hour standards at each such monitoring site is less than or equal to 65 $\mu g/m^3$.

In our proposed rule, to evaluate whether the San Joaquin Valley attained the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS by the December 31, 2015 attainment date, we determined the 2013–2015 design values at each of the 17 $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring sites for the 1997 annual and 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standards. *See* Tables 1 and 2 of our October 6, 2016 proposed rule. Based on the design values at the various sites, we found that eight sites, all in the central and southern San Joaquin Valley, did not meet the 1997 annual $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS of 15.0 $\mu g/m^3$, and that four sites, all in southwestern San Joaquin Valley, did not meet the 1997 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS of 65 $\mu g/m^3$ by the December 31, 2015 attainment date. The 2015 annual design value site, *i.e.,* the site with the highest design value based on 2013–2015 data, is the Corcoran site with a 2015 annual $PM_{2.5}$ design value of 22.2 $\mu g/m^3$ and a 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ design value of 79 $\mu g/m^3$.

For the San Joaquin Valley to attain the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS by December 31, 2015, the 2015 design value (reflecting data from 2013–2015) at each eligible

monitoring site in the Valley must be equal to or less than 15.0 μg/m^3 for the annual standards and 65 μg/m^3 for the 24-hour standards. Since several sites for each averaging period had 2015 design values greater than those values, based on quality-assured and certified data for 2013–2015, we proposed to determine that the San Joaquin Valley failed to attain the 1997 annual and 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standards by the December 31, 2015 attainment date. With today's action, we finalize this determination.

Finally, in our proposed rule, we described the CAA requirements that would apply if the EPA were to finalize the proposed finding of failure to attain. *See* our October 6, 2016 proposed rule for more information about the topics summarized above.

II. Public Comments and Responses

Our October 6, 2016 proposed rule provided for a 30-day comment period. During this period, we received no comments.

III. Final Action

Under CAA sections 179(c)(1) and 188(b)(2), and based on reasons set forth in our proposed rule and summarized above, the EPA is taking final action to determine that the San Joaquin Valley Serious nonattainment area failed to attain the 1997 annual and 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS by the December 31, 2015 attainment date. This determination is based upon monitored air quality data from 2013 through 2015.

As a result of this final determination, the State of California is required under CAA sections 179(d) and 189(d) to submit, by December 31, 2016, a revision to the SIP for the San Joaquin Valley. The SIP revision must, among other elements, demonstrate expeditious attainment of the standards within the time period provided under CAA section 179(d), provide for annual reduction in the emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ or a $PM_{2.5}$ plan precursor pollutant within the area of not less than five percent until attainment,[1] demonstrate reasonable further progress, and include contingency measures. The requirement for a new attainment demonstration under CAA section 189(d) also triggers the requirement for the SIP revision for quantitative milestones under section 189(c) that are to be achieved every three years until redesignation to attainment.

The new attainment date is set by CAA section 179(d)(3), which relies upon section 172(a)(2) to establish a new attainment date but with a different starting point than provided in section 172(a)(2). Under section 179(d)(3), the new attainment date is the date by which attainment can be achieved as expeditiously as practicable, but no later than five years from the publication date of the final determination of failure to attain. The EPA may extend the attainment date for a period no greater than 10 years from the final determination, considering the severity of nonattainment and the availability and feasibility of pollution control measures.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This final action in and of itself establishes no new requirements; it merely documents that air quality in the San Joaquin Valley did not meet the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ standards by the CAA deadline. For that reason, this final action:

- Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993);
- does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4);
- does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA; and
- does not provide the EPA with the discretionary authority to address disproportionate human health or environmental effects with practical, appropriate, and legally permissible methods under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, this final action does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because the SIP obligations discussed herein do not apply to Indian tribes and thus this action will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law. Nonetheless, the EPA has notified the tribes within the San Joaquin Valley $PM_{2.5}$ nonattainment area of this final action.

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.,* as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. The EPA will submit a report containing this action and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by January 23, 2017. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements (see section 307(b)(2)).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Ammonia, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: November 14, 2016.

Alexis Strauss,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

Chapter I, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

[1] 81 FR 58010 at 58100, 58158 (August 24, 2016). The EPA defines $PM_{2.5}$ plan precursor as those $PM_{2.5}$ precursors required to be regulated in the applicable attainment plan and/or nonattainment new source review program. 81 FR 58010 at 58152.

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for Part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart F—California

■ 2. Section 52.247 is amended by adding paragraph (h) to read as follows:

§ 52.247 Control strategy and regulations: Fine Particle Matter.

* * * * *

(h) *Determination of Failure to Attain:* Effective December 23, 2016, the EPA has determined that the San Joaquin Valley Serious $PM_{2.5}$ nonattainment area failed to attain the 1997 annual and 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS by the applicable attainment date of December 31, 2015. This determination triggers the requirements of CAA sections 179(d) and 189(d) for the State of California to submit a revision to the California SIP for the San Joaquin Valley to the EPA by December 31, 2016. The SIP revision must, among other elements, demonstrate expeditious attainment of the 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS within the time period provided under CAA section 179(d) and that provides for annual reduction in the emissions of direct $PM_{2.5}$ or a $PM_{2.5}$ plan precursor pollutant within the area of not less than five percent until attainment.

[FR Doc. 2016–28100 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

44 CFR Part 62

[Docket ID: FEMA–2016–0012]

RIN 1660–AA86

National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP): Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is issuing this final rule to remove the copy of the Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement (Arrangement) and the summary of the Financial Control Plan from the appendices of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations. It is no longer necessary or appropriate to retain a contract, agreement, or any other arrangement between FEMA and private insurance companies in the Code of Federal Regulations.

DATES: This final rule is effective December 23, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Claudia Murphy, Director, Policyholder Services Division, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 400 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–2775.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background and Regulatory History

The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (NFIA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.*), authorizes the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to establish and carry out a National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) to enable interested persons to purchase insurance against loss resulting from physical damage to or loss of real or personal property arising from flood in the United States. *See* 42 U.S.C. 4011(a). Under the NFIA, FEMA has the authority to undertake arrangements to carry out the NFIP through the facilities of the Federal government, utilizing, for the purposes of providing flood insurance coverage, insurance companies and other insurers, insurance agents and brokers, and insurance adjustment organizations, as fiscal agents of the United States. *See* 42 U.S.C. 4071. To this end, FEMA is authorized to ''enter into any contracts, agreements, or other arrangements'' with private insurance companies to utilize their facilities and services in administering the NFIP, and on such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon. *See* 42 U.S.C. 4081(a).

Pursuant to this authority, FEMA enters into a standard Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement (Arrangement) with private sector property insurers, also known as Write Your Own (WYO) companies, to sell NFIP flood insurance policies under their own names and adjust and pay claims arising under the Standard Flood Insurance Policy (SFIP). Each Arrangement entered into by a WYO company must be in the form and substance of the standard Arrangement, a copy of which is in Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 62, Appendix A. *See* 44 CFR 62.23(a). Since the primary relationship between the Federal government and WYO companies is one of a fiduciary nature (that is, to ensure that any taxpayer funds are appropriately expended), FEMA established ''A Plan to Maintain Financial Control for Business Written Under the Write Your Own Program,'' also known as the ''Financial Control Plan.'' *See* 42 U.S.C. 4071; 44 CFR 62.23(f), Part 62, App. B. To ensure financial and statistical control over the NFIP, as part of the Arrangement, WYO companies agree to adhere to the standards and requirements in the Financial Control Plan.

On May 23, 2016, FEMA published a proposed rule (81 FR 32261) proposing to remove the copy of the Arrangement in 44 CFR part 62, Appendix A, and the summary of the Financial Control Plan in 44 CFR part 62, Appendix B. In addition, FEMA proposed to make conforming amendments to remove citations to these appendices in 44 CFR 62.23.

FEMA proposed to remove the Arrangement from the NFIP regulations because it is no longer necessary to include a copy of the Arrangement in the CFR. FEMA originally included the Arrangement in the CFR to inform the public of the procedural details of the WYO Program. *See* 50 FR 16236 (April 25, 1985). There are now more efficient ways to inform the public of the procedural details of the WYO Program, and after more than 30 years of operation, the public is more familiar with the procedural details of the WYO Program and the flood insurance provided through WYO companies. Further, the NFIA does not require FEMA to include a copy of the Arrangement in the CFR. *See* 42 U.S.C. 4081. Finally, it is inappropriate to codify in regulation a contract, agreement, or other arrangement between FEMA and private insurance companies.

With the removal of the copy of the Arrangement from the NFIP regulations, FEMA and its industry partners can have flexibility to make operational adjustments and corrections to the Arrangement more quickly and efficiently. Although the rulemaking process plays an important role in agency policymaking, when this process is not required or necessary, the requirement to undergo rulemaking can unnecessarily slow down the operation of the NFIP by FEMA and its industry partners and can result in the use of alternate, less than ideal measures that result in business and operational inefficiencies.

FEMA also proposed to remove the summary of the Financial Control Plan in Appendix B, because this information is contained in either FEMA's Financial

Control Plan,[1] or in 44 CFR Section 62.23. Reprinting these requirements elsewhere in the CFR is duplicative and unnecessary.

Finally, FEMA proposed to make conforming amendments to the language in 44 CFR 62.23 where FEMA references Appendix A and Appendix B of 44 CFR part 62, because those appendices will be removed.

II. Public Comments on the Proposed Rule

FEMA received five comments in response to the proposed rule, one from a WYO company (Allstate/FEMA–2016–0012–0003), one from a member of the public, two from organizations representing agents and brokers (Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America, Inc./FEMA–2016–0012–0004; National Association of Professional Insurance Agents/FEMA–2016–0012–0005), and one collective comment from four organizations representing insurance companies (The American Insurance Association (AIA), The Financial Services Roundtable (FSR), The National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies (NAMIC), The Property and Casualty Insurers Association of America (PCIAA)/FEMA–2016–0012–0006). FEMA responds to these comments below.

With this regulatory action, FEMA finalizes the proposed rule, with one revision made in response to the comments received. FEMA is adding a requirement to 44 CFR 62.23 that FEMA must publish the Arrangement in the **Federal Register** at least 6 months prior to the effective date of the Arrangement.

A. Notice to WYO Companies of Changes to the Arrangement

Under the terms of the Arrangement, FEMA must publish in the **Federal Register** each year, and make available to the WYO companies, the terms for subscription or re-subscription to the Arrangement. WYO companies must notify FEMA of their intent to re-subscribe or not re-subscribe within 30 days of the publication of the notice in the **Federal Register**. *See* Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement, Article V(B).

FEMA received two comments requesting FEMA to provide WYO companies sufficient notice prior to the effective date of a revised Arrangement (FEMA–2012–2016–0003/FEMA–2012–2016–0006). The commenters said this would provide time for WYO companies to assess the impact to their business (FEMA–2012–2016–0003), and provide time for the marketplace to assess the impact of changes, thereby allowing WYO companies to determine what, if any, changes would be necessary (FEMA–2012–2016–0006). They stated that this would also provide WYO companies time to decide whether to continue in or withdraw from the NFIP (FEMA–2012–2016–0003; FEMA–2012–2016–0006). One commenter suggested this notice be at least 1 year prior to the effective date of the revised Arrangement (FEMA–2012–2016–0003).

The current Arrangement does not specify how far in advance FEMA must publish the Arrangement in the **Federal Register**. Typically, FEMA publishes the Arrangement in the **Federal Register** in August, and the Arrangement becomes effective October 1.[2] As a result, WYO companies typically have less than a month to decide whether to subscribe, because they must notify FEMA of their intent to re-subscribe or not re-subscribe within 30 days of the publication of the Arrangement in the **Federal Register**. WYO companies commented that they accepted this short timeline because they knew that they would receive notice of substantive changes to the Arrangement as part of the notice-and-comment rulemaking process. (FEMA–2016–0012–0006).

FEMA agrees it should provide sufficient notice to WYO companies prior to the effective date of a revised Arrangement. Therefore, FEMA is adding a requirement to paragraph (a) of Section 63.23 which states that each year, FEMA must publish the Arrangement at least 6 months before the effective date of the Arrangement. FEMA adds this 6-month notice requirement to the NFIP regulations to provide the WYO companies time to assess the impact of any changes to the Arrangement, including whether to re-subscribe. In addition, by placing this requirement in the CFR, FEMA will preserve certainty and protect the ability of WYO companies to adjust to any changes to the Arrangement. FEMA believes the 6-month notice provision is an appropriate balance between the 1-year notice proposed by the commenter, and the language of the current Arrangement, which does not specify how much notice FEMA must provide WYO companies, other than it must publish it each year.

Much like how WYO companies need time to adjust to changes to the Arrangement, FEMA needs time to evaluate the need for changes to the Arrangement. A 6-month notice period will enable FEMA, working with WYO companies, to incorporate lessons learned from the performance of the previous year's Arrangement into the next year's Arrangement. With a 1-year notice period, FEMA would have to publish the Arrangement for the next Arrangement Year the same day the current year's Arrangement takes effect. Accordingly, if stakeholders requested a change to the Arrangement based on experience for the current year, FEMA could not implement the change until nearly two years later. A 1-year notice period would also hinder FEMA's ability, in partnership with WYO companies, to make these operational adjustments and corrections to the Arrangement more quickly and efficiently, which is one of the stated purposes of this rule.

FEMA believes the 6-month notice provision is appropriate because it aligns with the amount of notice FEMA typically provides when it makes changes, for example, through bulletins announcing program changes or changes to the Flood Insurance Manual. Finally, FEMA believes the notice provision provides flexibility to both FEMA and WYO companies, because the 6-month notice is the minimum notice; FEMA may provide more notice than 6 months as necessary.

In addition to providing notice in the **Federal Register** 6 months prior to the effective date of the Arrangement, FEMA will continue to engage WYO companies, as it does currently, before it makes any changes to the Arrangement.

B. Uniformity of the Arrangement After Removal From the CFR

Two commenters stated that removing the copy of the Arrangement from the NFIP regulations might lead to significant variation among agreements executed between FEMA and the various WYO companies, including disparity in the obligations and expectations between entities not party to, but affected by, the Arrangement (FEMA–2016–0012–0003; FEMA–2016–0012–0006). Currently, 44 CFR 62.23(a) requires that arrangements between the NFIP and private insurance companies as part of the WYO Program be in the ''form and substance'' of the copy of the Arrangement found in Appendix A of Part 62. This final rule maintains this requirement. However, the rule no longer requires that the copy of the Arrangement be found in the CFR. As a result, FEMA will continue to enter into the same standard Arrangement with each WYO company or other insurer. Any changes FEMA makes to the Arrangement will be uniformly reflected

[1] *See* National Flood Insurance Program, The Write Your Own Program Financial Control Plan Requirements and Procedures (1999), *http://bsa.nfipstat.fema.gov/manuals/fcp99jc.pdf* (last accessed April 8, 2016).

[2] *See, e.g.,* 81 FR 51460 (Aug. 4, 2016).

in each arrangement entered into by WYO companies in a particular year.

C. Publication in the CFR or the ***Federal Register*** *as a Condition of Participation*

One commenter stated that in 1983, as a condition of private insurance companies returning to the NFIP, FEMA agreed to propose and implement the Arrangement through the **Federal Register** so that it could not be changed quickly (FEMA–2016–0012–0003). The commenter stated that the current regulatory structure creates an incentive for FEMA to work with the WYO companies to avoid surprises, which promotes the sharing of information and helps prevent unintended consequences. A second commenter stated that the condition of the return of the private insurance companies to the NFIP in 1983 was that the Arrangement would be codified in the CFR (FEMA–2016–0012–0006). The second commenter echoed the statement of the first commenter, stating that since 1983, both FEMA and the companies operate in an atmosphere of trust and certainty, as the regulatory process ensures that any issues or proposed changes will be adequately aired before implementation. The second commenter stated that if FEMA removes the Arrangement from the CFR, FEMA must provide a clear, consistently followed, and easily enforced alternative notice requirement.

FEMA is not aware of an agreement between FEMA and WYO companies that, as a condition of the WYO companies returning to the flood program, FEMA agreed to place the Arrangement in the appendices of the NFIP regulations. The WYO Program began in 1983, and FEMA added a copy of the WYO Arrangement to the appendices of the NFIP regulations in 1985 for the stated purpose of informing the public of the procedural details of the WYO Program. *See* 50 FR 16236 (April 25, 1985).

Two commenters mentioned FEMA's past failure to provide sufficient notice of the Arrangement offer prior to the new Arrangement year (FEMA–2016–0012–0003 and FEMA–2016–0012–0006). Article V.B of the Arrangement requires that a WYO company currently subject to the Arrangement inform FEMA of its intent to re-subscribe or not re-subscribe within 30 days of receiving the offer for the upcoming Arrangement Year. The provision is intended to help FEMA determine whether a current WYO company intends to continue participating or if they intend to not participate again, thus triggering the transition process described in Article V.C. No other similar deadlines or other timelines exist in statute, regulation, or in the Arrangement.

In practice, the Article V.B requirement has led FEMA to aim to provide the annual offer more than 30 days prior to the beginning of the next Arrangement Year to ensure clear program continuity. FEMA believes that the addition of the 6-month notice requirement in the **Federal Register** provides a clearer timeline going forward and will give WYO companies much greater notice before deciding whether to subscribe for the upcoming Arrangement Year.

Although FEMA is removing the copy of the Arrangement from the NFIP regulations, FEMA is committed to maintaining an atmosphere of trust and certainty with WYO companies. As discussed, FEMA is adding language to the NFIP regulations in Section 63.23(a) providing that each year, FEMA will publish the Arrangement in the **Federal Register** at least 6 months before the effective date of the Arrangement. However, FEMA intends to work with WYO companies through the NFIP's Industry Management Branch well before publication of the Arrangement in the **Federal Register**. FEMA believes that the 6-month notice requirement and ongoing collaboration efforts will encourage a more responsive Arrangement-modification process than what is possible through the formalities of the notice-and-comment rulemaking process.

D. Applicability of Government Contract Laws to the Arrangement

One commenter asked whether WYO companies would be subject to government contract laws if FEMA takes the Arrangement out of the regulatory process and WYO companies sign individual contracts with FEMA (FEMA–2016–0012–0003).

Since 1983, the first year of the WYO program, FEMA has not utilized contracting to effectuate its arrangement with the WYO companies and it has no intention of doing so in the future.

The NFIA authorizes FEMA to ''enter into any contracts, agreements, *or* other arrangements'' with private insurance companies to utilize their facilities and services in administering the NFIP, and on such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon. 42 U.S.C. 4081(a) (emphasis added). FEMA interprets section 4081(a) as distinguishing ''contracts'' from ''agreements'' and ''other arrangements.'' Accordingly, FEMA has relied upon section 4081(a)'s authority to enter into appropriate arrangements with private insurance companies.

On these grounds, FEMA has never utilized a contracting mechanism for the arrangements entered into between private insurance companies and FEMA as part of the WYO program. As this rule only changes the manner in which the Arrangement is published, FEMA does not intend to alter the Agency's longstanding interpretation of the NFIA and does not foresee any changes to the legal status of arrangements between FEMA and WYO companies.

E. Judicial Deference to FEMA's Interpretation of the Arrangement

One commenter noted that while the NFIA does not require the Arrangement to be codified in the CFR and be subject to public notice and comment, it has been so since the Arrangement's inception, and as a result, FEMA is entitled to the highest *Chevron*[3] deference in any judicial challenges to its interpretations of the NFIA under the Administrative Procedure Act. The commenter stated that once the Arrangement is removed from the CFR, FEMA would be entitled to only weaker *Skidmore*[4] deference, and that undoubtedly future judicial challenges to FEMA's interpretations of the Arrangement will raise the fact that FEMA sponsored the Arrangement's removal from the CFR and understood the negative impact on the deference given to its interpretations (FEMA–2016–0012–0006).

FEMA acknowledges the commenter's concern. However, FEMA believes that the effects of this change will be minimal given that the Arrangement is a largely technical document that does little to interpret or expand upon statute. Rather, the NFIP's regulations, particularly 44 CFR part 62, contain the substantive policies and statutory interpretations relevant to the WYO Program. FEMA does not expect the level of deference owed to these regulations to change due to this rule.

F. Notice to and Involvement of Non-WYO Companies

Three commenters expressed concern that by removing the Arrangement from the rulemaking process, interested persons not a party to the Arrangement will not have an opportunity to comment on proposed changes (FEMA–2016–0012–0003; FEMA–2016–0012–0004; FEMA–2016–0012–0006). One of these commenters stated that the removal of the Arrangement would prejudice third-party stakeholders (FEMA–2016–0012–0006). The

[3] *Chevron U.S.A. Inc.* v. *Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.* 467 U.S. 837 (1984).

[4] *Skidmore* v. *Swift & Co.,* 323 U.S. 134 (1944).

commenter suggested that FEMA establish an alternative mechanism that would allow for meaningful stakeholder and public consultation.

Another commenter stated that the removal of the Arrangement would exclude independent insurance agents from the NFIP purchasing process at an unacceptable detriment to consumers, and that independent insurance agents, through their interactions with consumers, play a pivotal role in educating property owners about their flood insurance purchasing options and providing information vital to the NFIP's current and potential future policy holders (FEMA–2016–2012–0005). This commenter pointed out how the notice of proposed rulemaking stated that removing the Arrangement and the summary of the Financial Control Plan from regulation would keep the Arrangement between FEMA and WYO companies, and thus FEMA's position seemed to be that excluding ''the multitude of others involved in the program would improve the complex NFIP process.'' The commenter noted that in reality, consumers depend on the wisdom, experience, and access to information provided by independent insurance agents in navigating the program. The commenter acknowledged that the Arrangement is technically between FEMA and the WYO companies, but asserted that other stakeholders including independent insurance agents and members of the public, while not technically direct parties to the contract, are equally affected by the terms of the Arrangement and therefore must be included in any discussions about changes to it. The commenter pointed out that while the notice of proposed rulemaking asserts that removing the Arrangement would allow FEMA and its ''industry partners'' to be flexible in negotiating changes to the Arrangement, FEMA should be aware that its ''industry partners'' include more than just the WYO companies.

This commenter expressed ''grave concerns'' about the appearance of a lack of transparency that would be engendered in the removal of the Arrangement and the summary of the Financial Control Plan, and that NFIP stakeholders and members of the public who hope to see the NFIP reauthorized and improved over the next 18 months will be shut out of any changes being made to these documents if they are removed from regulation, and the essential input the stakeholders and public provide in the regulatory process would be lost. The commenter referred to FEMA's statement in the notice of proposed rulemaking that FEMA has carried out the regulatory process 21 times when seeking changes to the Arrangement, and the regulatory process is necessary and vital to the credibility of both FEMA as a Federal agency and the NFIP as a Federal program.

This commenter noted how, although the notice of proposed rulemaking characterized the removal of the Arrangement as nonsubstantive, FEMA's ''description of the benefits of the removal belies FEMA's intent to make substantive changes to the Arrangement upon its removal from regulation.'' The commenter stated that once removed from the CFR, changes to the Arrangement would no longer be subject to the valuable input of many parties affected by the terms of the Arrangement, such as independent agents, consumers, adjusters, State insurance regulators, and others.

A third commenter echoed this commenter's concerns that the flexibility and efficiencies that may be gained by removing the Arrangement from the rulemaking process will compromise the current transparent process where interested persons such as adjusters, consumers, or insurance agents who are not a party to the Arrangement but are impacted by the Arrangement are afforded an opportunity to comment on proposed changes (FEMA–2016–0004). This commenter stated that although the notice of proposed rulemaking stated that FEMA will continue to post the Arrangement online and in the **Federal Register**, it did not provide information on how the Arrangement negotiation process is intended to work, including how interested persons who are not a party to the Arrangement but impacted by it can comment on proposed changes or participate in the negotiation process. The commenter asked that FEMA continue to provide an avenue for interested persons to be informed and involved when changes to the Arrangement are considered.

As discussed, FEMA enters into arrangements with insurance companies to utilize their facilities and services in administering the NFIP, and on such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon. *See* 42 U.S.C. 4081(a). These insurance companies are fiscal agents of the United States, and through the terms of the Arrangement, sell NFIP flood insurance policies under their own names and adjust and pay claims arising under the SFIP. *See* 42 U.S.C. 4071. As discussed in the proposed rule, FEMA is removing the copy of the Arrangement from the NFIP regulations, because the NFIA does not require FEMA to include a copy of the Arrangement in the CFR and it is inappropriate to codify in regulation a contract, agreement, or other arrangement between FEMA and private insurance companies.

While FEMA appreciates the input of other stakeholders such as adjusters, consumers, and insurance agents, FEMA does not believe it is necessary to establish a formal alternative mechanism to allow for stakeholder and public consultation on the Arrangement. All members of the public have opportunities to comment on proposed rulemakings affecting the NFIP. Such regulations reflect the overarching policies and structures of the NFIP.

In addition to comments made as part of a rulemaking, FEMA encourages the public to comment on any other aspect of the NFIP. The NFIP Office of the Flood Insurance Advocate provides an excellent avenue for voicing comments, questions, or concerns. Members of the public can contact the Office via email at *insurance-advocate@fema.dhs.gov.* Members of the public can also send inquiries to Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 400 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472.

G. Consistency Within the NFIP

Two commenters stated the current structure, with the copy of the Arrangement in the NFIP regulations, helps to promote consistent policies, procedures, and claims handling, and helps to shield FEMA from political pressures (FEMA–2016–2012–0003; FEMA–2016–2012–0006). FEMA believes the NFIP regulations, including the SFIP, help to promote consistent policies and claims handling. The copy of the Arrangement in the NFIP regulations is a copy of an arrangement between FEMA and private insurance companies acting as fiscal agents of the United States. As such, FEMA believes removing a copy of the Arrangement from the CFR will not have an impact on NFIP policies, procedures, and claims handling. The public will still have an opportunity to comment on proposed changes to the NFIP, including claims handling, whenever FEMA makes changes to its NFIP regulations.

H. Technical Changes

One commenter asked whether FEMA intended to repeal any portion of 44 CFR Section 63.23(a), which requires the Arrangement to be in the form and substance of the standard arrangement, a copy of which is included in Appendix A (FEMA–2016–2012–0003). In the proposed rule, FEMA proposed to remove reference to Appendix A in paragraph (a) of Section 62.23, because

FEMA was proposing to remove Appendix A. As a result, FEMA will remove reference to Appendix A in the last sentence of paragraph (a) of Section 62.23 which will then read: ''Arrangements entered into by WYO companies or other insurers under this subpart must be in the form and substance of the standard arrangement, titled 'Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement.' ''

I. Comments Outside the Scope of the Rulemaking

FEMA received two comments outside the scope of this rulemaking. One comment was on an individual's observation of a flood event, which is outside the scope of this rulemaking (FEMA–2016–2012–0002). Another comment recommended changes to the existing Arrangement (FEMA–2016–2012–0006). As noted in this final rule, FEMA is adding a requirement to the regulations that FEMA will publish the Arrangement in the **Federal Register** at least 6 months before the effective date of the Arrangement. FEMA will continue to engage WYO companies, as it does currently, before it makes any changes to the Arrangement. In accordance with the process in the current Arrangement, FEMA published notice for the Fiscal Year 2017 Arrangement on August 4, 2016 (81 FR 51460), but FEMA will consider the commenter's recommendations for future possible revisions to the Arrangement.

III. Regulatory Analysis

A. Executive Order 12866, as Amended, Regulatory Planning and Review; Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review

Executive Orders 13563 and 12866 direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This rule has not been designated a ''significant regulatory action'' under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed this rule.

FEMA is issuing a final rule removing Appendix A and B from Part 62 of 44 CFR. These Appendices contain a copy of the WYO Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement (Arrangement) and a summary of the ''Plan to Maintain Financial Control for Business Written Under the Write Your Own Program'' (Financial Control Plan), respectively. In addition, FEMA makes conforming amendments to remove citations to these appendices in 44 CFR 62.23.

Since 1983, FEMA has entered into a standard Arrangement with WYO companies to sell NFIP insurance policies under their own names and adjust and pay SFIP claims.[5] Since 1985, FEMA has included a copy of the Arrangement in the CFR. In order to maintain the Arrangement, FEMA has undertaken rulemaking approximately 21 times to update the copy of the Arrangement in the regulations. The NFIA does not require FEMA to place the Arrangement in the CFR. Accordingly, undergoing such rulemakings is an unnecessary requirement.

FEMA is removing the copy of the Arrangement in 44 CFR part 62, Appendix A, because the NFIA does not require FEMA to include a copy of the Arrangement in the CFR. Therefore, its inclusion is no longer necessary. In 1985, FEMA added a copy of the Arrangement to the regulations to inform the public of the procedural details of the WYO Program. However, since that time, there have been technological advances for disseminating information to the public, and there are now more efficient ways to inform the public of the procedural details of the WYO Program. For example, FEMA now posts a copy of the Arrangement on its Web site. This serves the purpose of promoting awareness and disseminating program information, without needing to go through the rulemaking process. This rulemaking does not impose any changes to the current Arrangement with WYO companies. As such, FEMA believes there will not be any costs imposed on participating WYO companies because of this final rule.

FEMA received a public comment highlighting that ''circumventing'' the rulemaking process could permit FEMA to more easily make changes to the Arrangement. Changes to the Arrangement would not necessarily occur more frequently or be any more impactful in nature than they had been thus far. The pattern of changes seen in the history of the Arrangement, with relatively frequent minor changes and the occasional substantive adjustment, is expected to continue into the future and will not change due to this rule. FEMA will continue to enter into the Arrangement with WYO companies, and make available the Arrangement, as well as the terms for subscription or re-subscription, through **Federal Register** notice. FEMA will also publish the Arrangement at least 6 months prior to it becoming effective.

One of the benefits associated with this final rule is enhanced flexibility for FEMA and WYO companies to make operational adjustments to the Arrangement more quickly and efficiently in order to be more responsive to the needs of WYO companies and the operation of the NFIP. FEMA received two public comments requesting that FEMA provide WYO companies notice prior to the effective date of a revised Arrangement. FEMA agrees it should provide notice to the WYO companies and will publish the Arrangement in the **Federal Register** at least 6 months before the effective date of the Arrangement. This 6-month notice requirement will provide the marketplace time to assess the impact of any changes to the Arrangement, including whether to re-subscribe. FEMA believes that the primary benefits will be reinforced as FEMA, working with WYO companies, is able to make operational adjustments and corrections to the Arrangement more quickly and efficiently incorporating lessons learned from the performance of the previous year's Arrangement into the next year's Arrangement. These revisions, both the removal from the CFR as well as the 6-month advance notice, will preserve certainty, maintain transparency, and protect the ability of WYO companies to adjust to any changes to the Arrangement.

As discussed in the proposed rule, although the rulemaking process plays an important role in agency policymaking, when this process is not required or necessary, the requirement to undergo rulemaking can unnecessarily slow down the operation of the NFIP and can result in the use of alternate, less than ideal measures that result in business and operational inefficiencies. The elimination of the administrative burden that accompanies repeated updates to the CFR and the use of alternative, less than ideal measures are an additional benefit. FEMA believes there will be no economic impact associated with implementing the final rule.

Additionally, FEMA will remove a summary of the Financial Control Plan. FEMA removed the plan itself in 1985

[5] As of August 2016, 73 private property or casualty insurance companies participate in the Write Your Own program. Federal Emergency Management Agency, Write Your Own Flood Insurance Company List, *http://www.fema.gov/wyo_company* (last accessed August 25, 2016).

thus FEMA does not anticipate any economic impacts from removing the summary.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) requires agency review of proposed and final rules to assess their impact on small entities. When an agency promulgates a final rule under 5 U.S.C. 553, after being required by that section or any other law to publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking, the agency must prepare a final regulatory flexibility assessment (FRFA) or have the head of the agency certify pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that the rule will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Having conducted and published an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) for the proposed rule, and having received no public comments on that analysis, FEMA does not believe this final rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

NFIA authorizes FEMA to ''enter into any contracts, agreements, or other arrangements'' with private insurance companies to utilize their facilities and services in administering the NFIP, and on such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon. *See* 42 U.S.C. 4081. Pursuant to this authority, FEMA enters into a standard Arrangement with private sector property insurers, also known as WYO companies, to sell NFIP flood insurance policies under their own names and adjust and pay claims arising under the policy. Since the primary relationship between the Federal government and WYO companies is one of a fiduciary nature, FEMA established the Financial Control Plan. The NFIA does not require FEMA to include a copy of the Arrangement or a summary of the Financial Control Plan in the CFR.

''Small entity'' is defined in 5 U.S.C. 601. The term ''small entity'' can have the same meaning as the terms ''small business'', ''small organization'' and ''small governmental jurisdiction.'' Section 601(3) defines a ''small business'' as having the same meaning as ''small business concern'' under Section 3 of the Small Business Act. This includes any small business concern that is independently owned and operated, and is not dominant in its field of operation. Section 601(4) defines a ''small organization'' as any not-for-profit enterprises that are independently owned and operated, and are not dominant in their field of operation. Section 601(5) defines small governmental jurisdictions as governments of cities, counties, towns, townships, villages, school districts, or special districts with a population of less than 50,000. No small organizations or governmental jurisdictions participate in the WYO Program and therefore will not be affected.

The Small Business Administration (SBA) stipulates in its size standards [6] the largest an insurance firm that is ''for profit'' may be and still be classified as a ''small entity.'' The small business size standards for North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 524126 (direct property and casualty insurance carriers) is 1,500 employees. The size standard for the four remaining applicable codes of 524210 (Insurance Agencies and Brokerages), 524113 (Direct Life Insurance Carriers), 524292 (Third Party Administration of Insurance and Pension Funds) and 524128 (Other Direct Insurance) is $7.0 million in revenue as modified by the SBA, effective February 26, 2016.

This final rule directly affects all WYO companies. There are currently 73 companies participating in the WYO Program; these 73 companies are subject to the terms of the Arrangement and the standards and requirements in the Financial Control Plan. FEMA researched each WYO company to determine the NAICS code, number of employees, and revenue for the individual companies. FEMA used the open-access database, *www.manta.com,* as well as *www.cortera.com* to find this information for the size determination. Of the 73 WYO companies, FEMA found a majority of 50 firms were under code 524210 (Insurance Agencies and Brokerages), of which 19 firms or 38 percent were found to be small (with only one lacking full data but presumed to be small). The second largest contingent of 13 firms were under code 524126 (direct property and casualty insurance carriers), of which 9 firms or 69 percent were found to be small (with only one missing data points but presumed to be small). Of the other three aforementioned industry codes, 524113, 524292 and 524128, there was one firm under each and none were small. Finally, six firms were missing industry classifications, and FEMA believes that all but one are likely to be small. In total, we found that 33 of the 73 companies are below these thresholds, and therefore will be considered small entities. Consequently, small entities comprise 45 percent of participating companies.

FEMA believes that the final rule will impose no direct cost on any participating company because it is removing a *copy* of the Arrangement and a *summary* of the Financial Control Plan from the CFR, and is not making substantive changes to the Arrangement or the Financial Control Plan itself.

During the proposed rule public comment period, FEMA did not receive any comments discussing the IRFA. Pursuant to the RFA (5 U.S.C. 605 (b)), the administrator of FEMA hereby certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Although a substantial number of these small entities will be affected by the final rule, none of these entities will be significantly impacted.

C. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

Pursuant to Section 201 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4, 2 U.S.C. 1531), each Federal agency ''shall, unless otherwise prohibited by law, assess the effects of Federal regulatory actions on State, local, and tribal governments, and the private sector (other than to the extent that such regulations incorporate requirements specifically set forth in law).'' Section 202 of the Act (2 U.S.C. 1532) further requires that ''before promulgating any general notice of proposed rulemaking that is likely to result in the promulgation of any rule that includes any Federal mandate that may result in expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more (adjusted annually for inflation) in any one year, and before promulgating any final rule for which a general notice of proposed rulemaking was published, the agency shall prepare a written statement'' detailing the effect on State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector. The final rule will not result in such an expenditure, and thus preparation of such a statement is not required.

D. National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)

Under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.* an agency must prepare an environmental assessment and environmental impact statement for any rulemaking that significantly affects the quality of the human environment. FEMA has determined that this rulemaking does not significantly affect the quality of the human environment and consequently has not prepared an

[6] U.S. Small Business Administration, Table of Small Business Size Standards, February 26, 2016. *https://www.sba.gov/sites/default/files/files/Size_Standards_Table.pdf.*

environmental assessment or environmental impact statement. Although rulemaking is a major Federal action subject to NEPA, the list of exclusion categories within DHS Instruction 023–01–001–01 includes a categorical exclusion for rules that are of a strictly administrative or procedural nature (A3). This is a rulemaking related to an administrative function. An environmental assessment will not be prepared because a categorical exclusion applies to this rulemaking and no extraordinary circumstances exist.

E. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), as amended, 44 U.S.C. 3501–3520, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the agency obtains approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for the collection and the collection displays a valid OMB control number. *See* 44 U.S.C. 3506, 3507. This final rule does not call for a new collection of information under the PRA. The removal of the Arrangement from the regulation will not impact any existing information collections in that it would not substantively change any of the information collection requirements, because the information collection requirements still exist in the regulations. The existing information collections listed include citations to 44 CFR part 62 Appendices A and B. FEMA will update these citations in the next information collection renewal cycle. FEMA will continue to expect WYO companies to comply with each of the information collection requirements associated with the WYO Program.

The collections associated with this regulation are as follows: (1) OMB Control Number 1660–0038, Write Your Own Company Participation Criteria, 44 CFR 62 Appendix A, which establishes the criteria to return to or participate in the WYO Program; (2) OMB control number 1660–0086, the National Flood Insurance Program—Mortgage Portfolio Protection Program (MPPP), 44 CFR part 62.23 (l)(2) and Appendix B, which is a program lenders can use to bring their mortgage loan portfolios into compliance with flood insurance purchase requirements; and (3) OMB control number 1660–0020, WYO Program, 44 CFR 62.23 (f) and Appendix B, the Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration program that requires each WYO company to submit financial data on a monthly basis into the National Flood Insurance Program's Transaction Record Reporting and Processing Plan (TRRPP) system as referenced in 44 CFR 62.23(h)(4). Part 62 still requires each of these collections. The removal of the Arrangement from the regulation will not impact these information collections because the existing information collections cover requirements in the regulations, not requirements in the Appendices.

F. Privacy Act/E-Government Act

Under the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a, an agency must determine whether implementation of a regulation will result in a system of records. A record is any item, collection, or grouping of information about an individual that is maintained by an agency, including, but not limited to, his/her education, financial transactions, medical history, and criminal or employment history and that contains his/her name, or the identifying number, symbol, or other identifying particular assigned to the individual, such as a finger or voice print or a photograph. *See* 5 U.S.C. 552a(a)(4). A system of records is a group of records under the control of an agency from which information is retrieved by the name of the individual or by some identifying number, symbol, or other identifying particular assigned to the individual. An agency cannot disclose any record which is contained in a system of records except by following specific procedures.

The E-Government Act of 2002, 44 U.S.C. 3501 note, also requires specific procedures when an agency takes action to develop or procure information technology that collects, maintains, or disseminates information that is in an identifiable form. This Act also applies when an agency initiates a new collection of information that will be collected, maintained, or disseminated using information technology if it includes any information in an identifiable form permitting the physical or online contacting of a specific individual. A Privacy Threshold Analysis was completed. This rule does not require a Privacy Impact Analysis or System of Records Notice.

G. Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, 65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000, applies to agency regulations that have Tribal implications, that is, regulations that have substantial direct effects on one or more Indian Tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes. Under this Executive Order, to the extent practicable and permitted by law, no agency shall promulgate any regulation that has Tribal implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs on Indian Tribal governments, and that is not required by statute, unless funds necessary to pay the direct costs incurred by the Indian Tribal government or the Tribe in complying with the regulation are provided by the Federal Government, or the agency consults with Tribal officials.

This rule does not have Tribal implications. Currently, Indian Tribal governments cannot participate in the WYO Program as WYO companies, and thus are not affected by this rule. To participate in the WYO Program, a company must be a licensed property or casualty insurance company and meet the requirements in FEMA regulations at 44 CFR 62.24.

H. Executive Order 13132, Federalism

Executive Order 13132, Federalism, 64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999, sets forth principles and criteria that agencies must adhere to in formulating and implementing policies that have federalism implications, that is, regulations that have ''substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.'' Federal agencies must closely examine the statutory authority supporting any action that would limit the policymaking discretion of the States, and to the extent practicable, must consult with State and local officials before implementing any such action.

As noted in the notice of proposed rulemaking, FEMA has determined that this rulemaking does not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, and therefore does not have federalism implications as defined by the Executive Order. No commenters disagreed with this determination. This rule does not have federalism implications because participation as a WYO company is voluntary and does not affect State policymaking discretion. Moreover, States cannot participate in the WYO Program as WYO companies, and thus are not affected by this regulatory action. To participate in the WYO Program, a company must be a licensed

property or casualty insurance company and must meet the requirements in FEMA regulations at 44 CFR 62.24.

I. Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management

Pursuant to Executive Order 11988, each agency is required to provide leadership and take action to reduce the risk of flood loss, to minimize the impact of floods on human safety, health and welfare, and to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains in carrying out its responsibilities for (1) Acquiring, managing, and disposing of Federal lands and facilities; (2) providing Federally undertaken, financed, or assisted construction and improvements; and (3) conducting Federal activities and programs affecting land use, including but not limited to water and related land resources planning, regulating, and licensing activities. In carrying out these responsibilities, each agency must evaluate the potential effects of any actions it may take in a floodplain; to ensure that its planning programs and budget requests reflect consideration of flood hazards and floodplain management; and to prescribe procedures to implement the policies and requirements of the Executive Order.

Before promulgating any regulation, an agency must determine whether the regulations will affect a floodplain(s), and if so, the agency must consider alternatives to avoid adverse effects and incompatible development in the floodplain(s). If the head of the agency finds that the only practicable alternative consistent with the law and with the policy set forth in Executive Order 11988 is to promulgate a regulation that affects a floodplain(s), the agency must, prior to promulgating the regulation, design or modify the regulation in order to minimize potential harm to or within the floodplain, consistent with the agency's floodplain management regulations and prepare and circulate a notice containing an explanation of why the action is to be located in the floodplain. The changes in this rule would not have an effect on land use, floodplain management, or wetlands.

J. Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands

Pursuant to Executive Order 11990, each agency must provide leadership and take action to minimize the destruction, loss or degradation of wetlands, and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands in carrying out the agency's responsibilities for (1) Acquiring, managing, and disposing of Federal lands and facilities; and (2) providing Federally undertaken, financed, or assisted construction and improvements; and (3) conducting Federal activities and programs affecting land use, including but not limited to water and related land resources planning, regulating, and licensing activities. Each agency, to the extent permitted by law, must avoid undertaking or providing assistance for new construction located in wetlands unless the head of the agency finds (1) that there is no practicable alternative to such construction, and (2) that the action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands which may result from such use. In making this finding the head of the agency may take into account economic, environmental and other pertinent factors.

In carrying out the activities described in the Executive Order, each agency must consider factors relevant to a proposal's effect on the survival and quality of the wetlands. Among these factors are: Public health, safety, and welfare, including water supply, quality, recharge and discharge; pollution; flood and storm hazards; and sediment and erosion; maintenance of natural systems, including conservation and long term productivity of existing flora and fauna, species and habitat diversity and stability, hydrologic utility, fish, wildlife, timber, and food and fiber resources; and other uses of wetlands in the public interest, including recreational, scientific, and cultural uses. The changes in this rule would not have an effect on land use or wetlands.

K. Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice

Pursuant to Executive Order 12898, —Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, 59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994, as amended by Executive Order 12948, 60 FR 6381, February 1, 1995, FEMA incorporates environmental justice into its policies and programs. The Executive Order requires each Federal agency to conduct its programs, policies, and activities that substantially affect human health or the environment in a manner that ensures that those programs, policies, and activities do not have the effect of excluding persons from participation in programs, denying persons the benefits of programs, or subjecting persons to discrimination because of race, color, or national origin.

This rulemaking will not have a disproportionately high or adverse effect on human health or the environment. Therefore, the requirements of Executive Order 12898 do not apply to this rule.

L. Congressional Review of Agency Rulemaking

Under the Congressional Review of Agency Rulemaking Act (CRA), 5 U.S.C. 801–808, before a rule can take effect, the Federal agency promulgating the rule must submit to Congress and to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) a copy of the rule, a concise general statement relating to the rule, including whether it is a major rule, the proposed effective date of the rule, a copy of any cost-benefit analysis, descriptions of the agency's actions under the RFA and the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, and any other information or statements required by relevant executive orders.

FEMA will send this rule to the Congress and to GAO pursuant to the CRA. The rule is not a major rule within the meaning of the CRA. It will not have an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more, it will not result in a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions, and it will not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

List of Subjects in 44 CFR Part 62

Claims, Flood insurance, and Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Federal Emergency Management Agency amends 44 CFR Chapter I as follows:

PART 62—SALE OF INSURANCE AND ADJUSTMENT OF CLAIMS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 62 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.;* Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, 43 FR 41943, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp., p. 329; E.O. 12127 of Mar. 31, 1979, 44 FR 19367, 3 CFR, 1979 Comp., p. 376.

■ 2. Amend § 62.23 by:
■ a. Removing the last sentence of paragraph (a) and adding two sentences in its place;
■ b. Revising the second sentence of paragraph (f);
■ c. Revising paragraph (i)(1); and

■ d. Revising the last sentence of paragraph (l)(2).

The revisions read as follows:

§ 62.23 WYO companies authorized.

(a) * * * Arrangements entered into by WYO companies or other insurers under this subpart must be in the form and substance of the standard arrangement, titled ''Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement.'' Each year, at least six months before the effective date of the ''Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement,'' FEMA must publish in the **Federal Register** and make available to the WYO companies the terms for subscription or re-subscription to the ''Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement.''

* * * * *

(f) * * * In furtherance of this end, the Federal Insurance Administrator has established ''A Plan to Maintain Financial Control for Business Written Under the Write Your Own Program.''

* * * * *

(i) * * *

(1) WYO companies will adjust claims in accordance with general company standards, guided by NFIP Claims manuals. The Arrangement provides that claim adjustments shall be binding upon the FIA.

* * * * *

(l) * * *

(2) * * * Participating WYO companies must also maintain evidence of compliance with paragraph (l)(3) of this section for review during the audits and reviews required by the WYO Financial Control Plan.

* * * * *

Appendix A to Part 62 [Removed]

■ 3. Remove Appendix A to Part 62.

Appendix B to Part 62 [Removed]

■ 4. Remove Appendix B to Part 62.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

W. Craig Fugate,

Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 2016–28224 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 635

[Docket No. 160620545–6999–02]

RIN 0648–XE696

Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2017 Atlantic Shark Commercial Fishing Season

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule; fishing season notification.

SUMMARY: This final rule establishes the opening date for all Atlantic shark fisheries, including the fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean. This final rule also establishes the quotas for the 2017 fishing season based on over- and/or underharvests experienced during 2016 and previous fishing seasons. The large coastal shark (LCS) retention limit for directed shark limited access permit holders will start at 45 LCS other than sandbar sharks per trip in the Gulf of Mexico region and at 25 LCS other than sandbar sharks per trip in the Atlantic region. These retention limits for directed shark limited access permit holders may decrease or increase during the year after considering the specified inseason action regulatory criteria to provide, to the extent practicable, equitable fishing opportunities for commercial shark fishermen in all regions and areas. These actions could affect fishing opportunities for commercial shark fishermen in the northwestern Atlantic Ocean, including the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Sea.

DATES: This rule is effective on January 1, 2017. The 2017 Atlantic commercial shark fishing season opening dates and quotas are provided in Table 1 under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

ADDRESSES: Highly Migratory Species Management Division, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Guý DuBeck or Karyl Brewster-Geisz at 301–427–8503.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Atlantic commercial shark fisheries are managed under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act). The 2006 Consolidated Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Fishery Management Plan (FMP) and its amendments are implemented by regulations at 50 CFR part 635. For the Atlantic commercial shark fisheries, the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments established, among other things, commercial shark retention limits, commercial quotas for species and management groups, accounting measures for under- and overharvests for the shark fisheries, and adaptive management measures such as flexible opening dates for the fishing season and inseason adjustments to shark trip limits, which provide management flexibility in furtherance of equitable fishing opportunities, to the extent practicable, for commercial shark fishermen in all regions and areas.

On August 29, 2016 (81 FR 59167), NMFS published a rule proposing the 2017 opening dates for the Atlantic commercial shark fisheries, commercial shark fishing quotas based on shark landings information reported as of July 15, 2016, and the commercial shark retention limits for each region and sub-region. The August 2016 proposed rule (81 FR 59167; August 29, 2016) for the 2017 season contains details that are not repeated here. The comment period on the proposed rule ended on September 28, 2016.

During the comment period, NMFS received approximately 300 written and oral comments on the proposed rule. Those comments, along with the Agency's responses, are summarized below. As further detailed in the Response to Comments section below, after considering all the comments, NMFS is opening the fishing seasons for all shark management groups except the blacktip, aggregated LCS, and hammerhead shark management groups in the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region on January 1, 2017, as proposed in the August 29, 2016, proposed rule. The blacktip, aggregated LCS, and hammerhead shark management groups in the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region will open on February 1, 2017, which is a change from the proposed rule. For directed shark limited access permit holders, the blacktip, aggregated LCS, and hammerhead management groups in the entire Gulf of Mexico region will start the fishing season with a retention limit of 45 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip. The aggregated LCS and hammerhead shark management groups in the Atlantic region will start the fishing season with a retention limit of 25 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip for directed shark limited access permit holders, which is a change from the proposed rule. The retention limit for incidental shark limited access permit

holders for all regions has not changed from the proposed rule and remains at 3 LCS other than sandbar sharks per trip and a combined total of 16 small coastal sharks (SCS) and pelagic sharks, combined per trip consistent with § 635.24(a)(3) and (4).

This final rule serves as notification of the 2017 opening dates for the Atlantic commercial shark fisheries and 2017 quotas, based on shark landings data updated as of October 14, 2016, and considering the ''opening commercial fishing season'' criteria at § 635.27(b)(3). These criteria consider factors such as the available annual quotas for the current fishing season, estimated season length and average weekly catch rates from previous years, length of the season and fishermen participation in past years, impacts to accomplishing objectives of the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments, temporal variation in behavior or biology target species (*e.g.,* seasonal distribution or abundance), impact of catch rates in one region on another, and effects of delayed season openings. This action does not establish or change the annual base commercial quotas established under the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments for any shark management group. The base quotas were established under previous actions, and any changes to those base quotas would be performed through a separate action. Rather, this action adjusts the annual commercial quotas for 2017 based on over- and/or underharvests that occurred in 2016 and previous fishing seasons, consistent with existing regulations and establishes the opening dates for the fisheries. Only the adjusted blacktip quota in the Gulf of Mexico region has changed since the proposed rule, based on updated landings information as of October 14, 2016; all other quotas remain the same as proposed.

Response to Comments

NMFS received approximately 300 written and oral comments on the proposed rule from fishermen, dealers, and other interested parties. All written comments can be found at *http://www.regulations.gov/* by searching for RIN 0648–XE696. NMFS received approximately 10 oral comments through phone conversations or at the HMS Advisory Panel meeting on September 8, 2016. All of the oral comments are represented with the written comments below.

A. LCS Management Group Comments

Comment 1: NMFS received comments regarding the proposed opening dates for the western Gulf of Mexico LCS fisheries on January 1. Some commenters supported the proposed January 1 opening date for both Gulf of Mexico sub-regions, while other commenters supported a delayed western Gulf of Mexico opening date of February 1 to coincide with the religious holiday of Lent.

Response: After considering public comment, NMFS has determined that changing the opening date to February 1 for the blacktip shark, aggregated LCS, and hammerhead shark management groups in the western Gulf of Mexico region, in combination with the change in retention limit (see discussion in Comment 2), will promote equitable fishing opportunities throughout this region. In reaching this determination, NMFS considered, in particular, the regulatory criterion regarding the length of the season in previous years for the different species and/or management groups and whether fishermen had been able to participate in the fishery in those years (§ 635.27(b)(3)(iii)). In 2016, NMFS opened the season on January 1 and closed it on March 12, 2016 (81 FR 12602; March 10, 2016). The State of Louisiana annually plans a state-water closure from April 1 through June 30. However, once NMFS announced that it was closing the Federal fishery, the State of Louisiana closed its waters as well, 2 weeks before its initially planned closure. Shark fishermen and dealers in the western Gulf of Mexico who were not expecting the closure did not have as much of an opportunity to fish as those few fishermen who fished earlier. Based on 2016 landings data, the majority of the shark landings from the western Gulf of Mexico region did not begin to occur until February, which is when other non-shark fisheries close. If NMFS were to open the fishery on January 1, 2017, it is likely that once again the fishery would need to close earlier than April 1 and a number of fishermen who would otherwise participate in the shark fishery based on traditional expectations would not have the opportunity. Furthermore, based on the review of the landings data, delaying the opening until February 1 will provide more equitable fishing opportunities. Thus, opening the season in February, in combination with the higher retention limit (see change discussion in Comment 2), should give all fishermen in the sub-region an equitable opportunity to harvest the quota before the state-water closure.

Comment 2: NMFS received comments regarding the proposed commercial retention limit for the blacktip, aggregated LCS, and hammerhead management groups in the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region. Specifically, some commenters from the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region preferred a retention limit of 45 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip instead of the proposed 30 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip.

Response: NMFS has determined that the default retention limit of 45 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip at the start of the season will ensure equitable fishing opportunities in the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region. In the proposed rule, NMFS proposed a lower trip limit (30 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip) in order to slow the harvest level due to the potential for a reduced hammerhead shark quota based on the 2016 sub-regional overharvest and given that the Aggregated LCS and hammerhead shark quotas are linked. The lower proposed trip limit was also intended to ensure the management groups remain open until at least April 2017, which is when the State of Louisiana closes state waters to shark fishing and when that State has asked that we close Federal shark fisheries to match state regulations if quotas are limited (see the criteria listed at § 635.27(b)(3)(vii) and 635.24(a)(8)(iii)). With the change in the western Gulf of Mexico LCS fisheries opening date to February 1 (see Comment 1), and because there are no sub-regional blacktip shark, aggregated LCS, and hammerhead shark management group quota adjustments due to overharvest, NMFS no longer believes a lower retention limit is needed to slow the harvest level to ensure the management groups will remain open until at least April 2017. Rather, NMFS will start the commercial retention limit at 45 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip as of February 1, 2017, which is the retention limit preferred in public comments. However, NMFS may utilize the inseason retention limit adjustment during the fishing season if needed to ensure the quotas are not harvested too quickly and the management groups remain open at least until April 2017.

Comment 3: NMFS received several comments regarding the proposed opening date and retention limits for the aggregated LCS and hammerhead management groups in the Atlantic region. Regarding the opening dates, some commenters from the southern and northern part of the Atlantic region supported the proposed opening date of January 1 for the aggregated LCS and hammerhead management groups and retention limits. Some of these commenters requested that NMFS modify the retention limits on an

inseason basis to ensure the majority of the quota remains available later in the year since there are no other fisheries open in Florida at the end of the year. Other commenters suggested that NMFS delay the opening of the Atlantic region fishery until the western Gulf of Mexico LCS fisheries closes to ensure better market prices for the shark products. Additionally, comments from some of the fishermen in the southern part of the region preferred lowering the proposed retention limit of 36 to a lower retention limit of three to five LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip on January 1 with the potential for later inseason retention limit adjustments to ensure the opportunity to fish for sharks in October through December because they participate in other, non-shark fisheries at the beginning of the year and in the shark fisheries later in the year. NMFS also received comments that the LCS retention limit in the Atlantic region should stay at 36 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip all season long and that NMFS should not later consider increasing the retention limit to 45 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip since the aggregated LCS and hammerhead shark management groups quotas have not increased.

Response: After considering the ''opening commercial fishing season'' criteria in light of the comments, which reflected general support of the proposed opening date, NMFS has decided to open the fisheries in the Atlantic region on January 1, 2017, as proposed, but with a lower retention limit than proposed. Specifically, on January 1, 2017, the LCS fisheries in the Atlantic region will open with a retention limit of 25 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip for directed shark limited access permit holders. NMFS has determined that a lower retention limit at the start of the season will allow NMFS to more easily and closely monitor the quota and catch rates in the beginning of the year to help ensure equitable fishing opportunities later in the year, while still allowing the majority of quota to be harvested later in the year (see the criteria listed at § 635.24(a)(8)(iii)). NMFS chose 25 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip because that is the commercial retention limit for the fishery from October 19, 2016, through the rest of the 2016 fishing season (81 FR 72007; October 19, 2016), and would not cause additional changes in fishing practices, thus minimizing any economic or compliance issues within the fishery. Also, this change seemed a reasonable amount between that of an incidental level (3 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip) and maximum retention levels (between 36 and 55 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip). The January 1 opening date, in combination with this reduced retention limit, should allow fishermen in the southern and northern portions of the Atlantic region the opportunity to fish at the beginning of the year, while providing all fishermen in the Atlantic region fishing opportunities later in the year, when the majority of fishing occurs, as the majority of the quota should still be available.

The proposed rule stated that, if it appears that the quota is being harvested too quickly to allow fishermen throughout the entire region an opportunity to fish, NMFS will consider reducing the commercial retention limit after a portion of the quota is harvested (*e.g.,* 20 percent) and later consider raising the commercial retention limit to 45 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip around July 15 to allow greater fishing opportunities later in the year. After considering public comment, NMFS anticipates that it would consider increasing the commercial retention limit around July 15, 2017, as this was the date used for prior season opening dates and was the date NMFS increased the retention limit in 2016 (81 FR 44798; July 11, 2016).

Regarding the request to delay the fishery in the Atlantic region until the shark fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico close, NMFS decided to not delay the LCS fisheries opening date in the Atlantic region until the western Gulf of Mexico fisheries are closed since this would not promote equitable fishing opportunities throughout the Atlantic region. In past fishing seasons, the LCS fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico have closed as early as March 17 or as late as July 17, and never on the same date year to year. Without knowing when the western or eastern Gulf of Mexico LCS fisheries will close, NMFS could not evaluate the ''opening commercial fishing season'' criteria (§ 635.27(b)(3)) when choosing an opening date for the Atlantic region based on the commenters' request. Thus, NMFS is not making a change in response to this comment and will open the Atlantic LCS fisheries on January 1. NMFS will consider adjusting the commercial retention limit during the season as appropriate to ensure equitable fishing opportunities.

Regarding the comments that having the LCS fisheries in the Atlantic and western Gulf of Mexico regions open at the same time will impact the market prices, while NMFS considers economic impacts as required, market prices are not one of the criteria NMFS evaluates when choosing an opening date. However, in the past, the LCS fisheries in the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico regions have been open at the same time, and during those times, NMFS has noticed impacts on the ex-vessel prices in either region. For example, in 2016, when both regional LCS fisheries were open in January, the ex-vessel price for Atlantic aggregated LCS was at its lowest when compared to the rest of the year, but was higher than the western Gulf of Mexico aggregated LCS ex-vessel prices.

Comment 4: NMFS received comments regarding the overharvest of the western Gulf of Mexico sub-regional hammerhead shark quota. Some commenters were concerned that NMFS did not propose to adjust the western Gulf of Mexico sub-regional hammerhead shark quota even though the quota was overharvested by 41 percent in 2016.

Response: Based on landings through October 14, 2016, NMFS is not adjusting the western Gulf of Mexico sub-regional hammerhead shark quota in this final rule. As stated in the proposed rule, even though the reported landings in the western Gulf of Mexico exceeded the 2016 sub-regional quota, the total regional Gulf of Mexico reported landings have not exceeded the 2016 regional quota as of October 14, 2016. The regulations implemented through Amendment 6 to the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP (80 FR 50073; August 18, 2015), provide that sub-regional quota overages (*e.g.,* western Gulf of Mexico sub-region) are only deducted from the next year's quota if the total regional quota (*e.g.,* Gulf of Mexico region) is exceeded. Thus, at this time, because the overall regional quota has not been overharvested, NMFS is not adjusting the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region quota to account for the overharvest. However, because the eastern Gulf of Mexico sub-region remains open at the time of this final rulemaking and quota is still available in that sub-region, NMFS expects that landings will continue to occur. If landings in the eastern Gulf of Mexico sub-region exceed 8.5 mt dw (18,594 lb dw) (*i.e.,* the remainder of the total regional Gulf of Mexico quota), then NMFS will take additional action to reduce the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region quota to account for overharvests in 2018.

B. General Comments

Comment 5: NMFS received some comments in support of the proposed rule regulating commercial shark fishing, while other commenters

opposed the regulations that allow for increased adjusted quotas as a result of underharvest. Specifically, those in opposition were concerned with the accuracy and the potential for under reporting of shark landings.

Response: As discussed in the proposed rule, shark stocks or management groups that are not overfished and have no overfishing occurring may have any underharvest carried over in the following year, up to 50 percent of the base quota (81 FR 59167; August 29, 2016). Since the Gulf of Mexico blacktip shark management group and smoothhound shark management groups in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic regions have been determined not to be overfished and to have no overfishing occurring, available underharvest from the 2016 fishing season for these management groups may be applied to the respective 2017 quotas to the extent allowable, and NMFS is doing so in this final rule.

All commercial shark landings and quotas are monitored with the HMS electronic dealer reporting system, which has been in use since January 1, 2013. This improvement in commercial quota monitoring technology and the weekly, as opposed to biweekly, reporting on paper provides more information on each dealer transaction, including a requirement of reporting all shark landings to the species level, and ensures that quotas are not exceeded. Overall, this improvement helps with monitoring of commercial landings of all shark species and with closing management groups in a more efficient and timely manner.

Comment 6: NMFS received approximately 280 comments in support of more conservative shark management measures by, for example, implementing lower commercial shark fishing quotas or prohibiting all commercial shark fishing to stop shark finning.

Response: These comments are outside the scope of this rulemaking because the purpose of this rulemaking is to adjust quotas for the 2017 shark seasons based on over- and underharvests from the previous years and set opening dates and commercial retention limits for the 2017 shark seasons. The quotas and general management measures were established in previous rulemakings, which were the final rules to implement Amendment 2 to the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP (73 FR 35778, June 24, 2008; corrected on 73 FR 40658; July 15, 2008), Amendment 5a to the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP (78 FR 40318; July 3, 2013), Amendment 6 to the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP (80 FR 50073; August 18, 2015), and Amendment 9 to the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP (80 FR 73128; November 24, 2015). Management of the Atlantic shark fisheries is based on the best available science to achieve optimum yield while also rebuilding overfished shark stocks and preventing overfishing. NMFS currently is considering conservation and management to rebuild the dusky shark stock and prevent overfishing in Amendment 5b to the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP (81 FR 71672; October 18, 2016). The comment period for that rulemaking ends on December 22, 2016.

Comment 7: NMFS received a comment suggesting that we change the start of the fishing year for all shark species from January to September.

Response: This comment is outside the scope of this rulemaking because the fishing year is defined in the regulations as January 1 to December 31. The rule did not reanalyze the overall start date of the shark fishing year, which was established in the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP.

Comment 8: NMFS received a comment suggesting that we not implement these regulations until such time that adequate shark research can be accomplished.

Response: Management of the Atlantic shark fisheries is based on the best available science to achieve optimum yield while preventing overfishing and to rebuild overfished shark stocks. Domestic shark stock assessments are generally conducted through the Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR) process, in which NMFS participates. This process is also used by the South Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, and Caribbean Fishery Management Councils and is designed to provide transparency throughout the stock assessment process. Generally, SEDAR stock assessments have three stages (data availability, assessment models, and peer review). Meetings in these stages may be face-to-face or by webinar or conference call. All meetings are open to the public. All reports from all stages of the process are available online at *http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/*. The SEDAR process can take several months to over a year depending on whether the species has been assessed before, if a species needs a full review of a previous assessment, or if the assessment is more of an update to previous assessments. Because the process takes so long and because of the large number of shark stocks that need to be assessed, there are times where we have reviewed stock assessments that were completed and peer reviewed outside of the SEDAR process and have determined the assessment to be appropriate for management. We have done that for both porbeagle and scalloped hammerhead sharks. Additionally, there are some shark stocks that are assessed internationally via the process established by ICCAT. In all cases, we ensure the data and models used are appropriate, all sources of mortality are considered, and that the end result constitutes the best available science, consistent with National Standard 2 and other requirements.

Comment 9: NMFS received comments asserting that sharks are worth more to eco-tourism than commercial fishermen.

Response: In adjusting quotas for the 2017 shark seasons based on over- and underharvests from the previous years and setting opening dates and commercial retention limits for the 2017 shark seasons, NMFS considers specific regulatory criteria, including the available annual quotas for the current fishing season, estimated season length and average weekly catch rates from previous years, length of the season and fishermen participation in past years, impacts to accomplishing objectives of the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments, temporal variation in behavior or biology target species (*e.g.,* seasonal distribution or abundance), impact of catch rates in one region on another, and effects of delayed season openings. NMFS does not consider the economic impacts of sharks to eco-tourism compared to commercial shark fishing. Such impacts are appropriately considered when establishing the base quotas.

Comment 10: NMFS received a comment expressing concern about the high mercury levels in shark meat. Specifically, the commenter is concerned that NMFS still allows fishing for sharks even though the health impacts are well known about high levels of mercury in shark meat.

Response: This comment is outside the scope of this rulemaking because the purpose of this rulemaking is to adjust quotas for the 2017 shark seasons based on over- and underharvests from the previous years and set opening dates and commercial retention limits for the 2017 shark seasons.

Comment 11: NMFS received comments regarding the stock status of hammerhead shark and other shark species. Some commenters requested more protective management for hammerhead sharks and other shark species due to their threatened or endangered stock status listing by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

Response: This comment is outside the scope of this rulemaking, because

the purpose of this rulemaking is to adjust quotas for the 2017 shark seasons based on over- and underharvests from the previous years and set opening dates and commercial retention limits for the 2017 shark seasons. NMFS published Amendment 5a on July 3, 2013 (78 FR 40318) which implemented quotas for the hammerhead shark complex, including scalloped hammerhead sharks, linked the hammerhead shark quota to the aggregated LCS quota, and established a hammerhead shark recreational minimum size limit to reduce fishing mortality and rebuild the scalloped hammerhead stock. That rulemaking addressed this issue and it is not further addressed in this rulemaking.

Comment 12: NMFS received a comment requesting that NMFS implement individual fishing quotas for each of the three species of hammerhead sharks within the hammerhead shark management group.

Response: This comment is outside the scope of this rulemaking, because the purpose of this rulemaking is to adjust quotas for the 2017 shark seasons based on over- and underharvests from the previous years and set opening dates and commercial retention limits for the 2017 shark seasons. The current hammerhead shark quota was established in Amendment 5a to the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP based on the best available science (78 FR 40318; July 3, 2013). In that rulemaking, NMFS decided to include all hammerhead shark landings in one quota because the three hammerhead sharks are difficult to differentiate, with the most evident differences being small differences in the shape of the front of the head. Once the head has been removed and the carcass has been dressed, species identification becomes more difficult. NMFS intends to conduct stock assessments on scalloped, smooth, and great hammerhead sharks in the future, as soon as practicable given timing, resource limits, and data availability and NMFS could consider individual fishing quotas for each of the three species of hammerhead sharks in the future if warranted and supportable.

Comment 13: NMFS received comments regarding state-water landings and discards of sharks with no observer coverage and fewer requirements and training than Federal fishermen. The commenters supported the need to have consistency between state, Council, and Federal regulations.

Response: This comment is outside the scope of this rulemaking, because the purpose of this rulemaking is to adjust quotas for the 2017 shark seasons based on over- and underharvests from the previous years and set opening dates and commercial retention limits for the 2017 shark seasons. Many states allow landings of sharks by state-permitted fishermen. However, these fishermen must comply with the state fishing regulations, which in some cases are the same as Federal regulations or, in other cases, are more restrictive. NMFS will continue to work closely with the states to ensure consistent regulations for shark fishing, to the extent practicable.

Comment 14: NMFS received comments that all quota linkages should be removed since it has contributed to underfishing for the past several years.

Response: This comment is outside the scope of this rulemaking, because the purpose of this rulemaking is to adjust quotas for the 2017 shark seasons based on over- and underharvests from the previous years and set opening dates and commercial retention limits for the 2017 shark seasons. The current LCS and SCS quota linkages were implemented in the final rules for Amendment 5a and Amendment 6 to the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and NMFS is citing the rationale provided in the previous rulemakings. The issue of removing quota linkages is not being re-considered or re-addressed in this rulemaking now.

As explained in those rulemakings, quota linkages were created for shark species that are in separate management groups, but that have the potential to be caught together on the same shark fishing trip (*e.g.* aggregated LCS and hammerhead sharks). If the quota for one management group has been harvested and the management group is closed, that species could still be caught as bycatch by fishermen targeting other shark species, possibly resulting in excess mortality and negating some of the conservation benefit of management group closures. In addition, shark quota linkages were put into place as part of the rebuilding plans for shark species that are overfished in order to reduce excess mortality of the overfished species during commercial fishing for other shark species. Thus, NMFS closes the linked shark management groups together.

Comment 15: NMFS received comments requesting that we consider increasing the Federal fishery closure trigger for the shark management groups from 80 percent to greater than 90 percent to prevent quota underharvests and to promote harvesting quotas fully for the greater profitability for fishermen and for increased access to shark products for consumers.

Response: This comment is outside the scope of this rulemaking, because the purpose of this rulemaking is to adjust quotas for the 2017 shark seasons based on over- and underharvests from the previous years and set opening dates and commercial retention limits for the 2017 shark seasons. The 80-percent Federal fishery closure trigger for the shark management groups was implemented in the final rule for Amendment 2 to the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and NMFS is citing the rationale provided in the previous rulemakings. The issue of changing this closure trigger is not being re-considered or re-addressed in this rulemaking now.

As explained in Amendment 2, NMFS' goal is to allow shark fishermen to harvest the full quota without exceeding it in order to maximize economic benefits to stakeholders while achieving conservation goals, including preventing overfishing and rebuilding overfished stocks. Based on past experiences with monitoring quotas for HMS species, the 80-percent threshold works well, allowing for all or almost all of the quota to be harvested without exceeding the quota. As such, NMFS expects that, in general, the quotas would be harvested between the time that the 80-percent threshold is reached and the time that the season actually closes. In addition, NMFS must also account for late reporting by shark dealers even with the improved electronic dealer system. Closing shark fisheries when 80 percent of quotas have been harvested provides a buffer to include landings received after the reporting deadline in an attempt to avoid overharvests.

Comment 16: NMFS received a comment to present all shark landings by species in addition to management group, particularly for hammerhead sharks given the listing of hammerhead sharks on Appendix II of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES).

Response: This comment is outside the scope of this rulemaking, because the purpose of this rulemaking is to adjust quotas for the 2017 shark seasons based on over- and underharvests from the previous years and set opening dates and commercial retention limits for the 2017 shark seasons. NMFS presents the shark landings by species and region in the annual Stock Assessment and Fisheries Evaluation (SAFE) Report that is released in December of each year, consistent with confidentiality requirements.

CITES is an international treaty designed to control and regulate international trade of certain animal and plant species that are now or potentially may be threatened with extinction and are affected by trade. Some shark

species (*e.g.,* oceanic whitetip sharks, great, scalloped, and smooth hammerhead sharks, and porbeagle sharks) are now listed on Appendix II, which imposes strict trade monitoring and could impact the ability of dealers to sell these species to international costumers. Additionally, starting in October 2017, silky and thresher sharks will be listed on Appendix II. Due to this listing, any U.S. fishermen or dealer who wishes to export these shark products will have to obtain a CITES permit in order to export or re-export these products.

Changes From the Proposed Rule

NMFS made four changes to the proposed rule, as described below.

1. NMFS changed the final blacktip shark quota in the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region from the 331.8 mt dw (730,803 lb dw) in the proposed rule to 331.6 mt dw (730,425 lb dw), a difference of 378 lb dw, based on updated landings through October 14, 2016. The 2017 shark season proposed rule (81 FR 59167; August 29, 2016) was based on dealer reports available through July 15, 2016. NMFS explained in the proposed rule that it would adjust the proposed quotas based on dealer reports as of mid-October or mid-November 2015. Based on updated landings data through October 14, 2016, the overall available adjustment amount for the blacktip shark management group in the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region was 100.1 mt dw (220,164 lb dw), resulting in a small reduction in the amount of quota that could be carried over to 2017. Landings information beyond October 14, 2016, was not available while NMFS was writing this rule. Any landings between October 14 and December 31, 2016, will be accounted for in the 2018 shark fisheries quotas, as appropriate.

2. NMFS changed the retention limit for directed shark limited access permit holders at the start of the commercial shark fishing season for the aggregated LCS and hammerhead shark management groups in the Atlantic region from 36 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip to 25 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip. As explained above, NMFS changed the retention limit after considering the ''opening commercial fishing season'' criteria (§ 635.27(b)(3)), public comment, and the 2016 landings data in order to promote equitable fishing opportunities throughout the Atlantic region.

3. NMFS changed the retention limit for directed shark limited access permit holders for the aggregated LCS, blacktip shark, and hammerhead shark management groups in the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region from 30 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip to 45 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip. As explained above, NMFS changed the retention limit after considering the ''opening commercial fishing season'' criteria (§ 635.27(b)(3)), public comment, and the 2016 landings data in order to promote equitable fishing opportunities throughout the Gulf of Mexico region.

4. NMFS changed the fishing season opening date for the western Gulf of Mexico from January 1, to February 1, 2017. NMFS changed the opening date based upon public comments that indicated a preference for a delayed opening when market conditions would be more optimal in that sub-region.

2017 Annual Quotas

This final rule adjusts the 2017 commercial quotas due to over- and/or underharvests in 2016 and previous fishing seasons, based on landings data through October 14, 2016. Based on overharvest in 2012 and 2015, NMFS had previously reduced the Atlantic blacknose shark base annual quota by 1.5 mt dw (3,268 lb dw) in 2016, 2017, and 2018. However, in 2016, the Atlantic blacknose shark quota was underharvested by 3.5 mt dw (7,725 lb dw). In the proposed rule for this action, NMFS noted that preliminary reported landings of blacknose sharks were at 78 percent (12.2 mt dw) of their 2016 quota levels (15.7 mt dw) in the Atlantic region. Given this large underharvest, NMFS notified the public that rather than spread out the previous years' overharvests over several years, it proposed to use the 2016 underharvest to cover the remaining 2012 and 2015 overharvest. Since NMFS received no comments on this proposal, 3.0 mt dw of the 2016 quota will be used to account for the past years' overharvests. An underharvest of 0.5 mt dw occurs in 2016 after this accounting but, pursuant to § 635.27(b)(2), NMFS cannot carry forward underharvest because blacknose sharks have been declared to be overfished with overfishing occurring in the Atlantic region. Therefore, the 2017 Atlantic blacknose shark quota is equal to the annual base quota without adjustment.

The 2017 annual quotas by species and management group are summarized in Table 1. Any dealer reports that are received by NMFS after October 14, 2016, will be used to adjust the 2018 quotas, if necessary. A description of the quota calculations is provided in the proposed rule and is not repeated here. Any changes are described in the ''Changes from the Proposed Rule'' section.

TABLE 1—ANNUAL QUOTAS FOR THE ATLANTIC SHARK FISHERIES

[All quotas and landings are dressed weight (dw), in metric tons (mt), unless specified otherwise. 1 mt dw = 2,204.6 lb dw]

Region or sub-region	Management group	2016 annual quota (A)	Preliminary 2016 landings [1] (B)	Adjustments [2] (C)	2017 Base annual quota (D)	2017 Final annual quota (D+C)
Eastern Gulf of Mexico.	Blacktip Sharks ...	28.9 mt dw (63,189 lb dw).	18.7 mt dw (41,116 lb dw).	10.9 mt dw (23,920 lb dw) [3].	25.1 mt dw (55,439 lb dw).	36.0 mt dw (79,359 lb dw)
	Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks.	85.5 mt dw (188,593 lb dw).	54.2 mt dw (119,592 lb dw).	.....	85.5 mt dw (188,593 lb dw).	85.5 mt dw (188,593 lb dw)
	Hammerhead Sharks.	13.4 mt dw (29,421 lb dw).	6.8 mt dw (14,955 lb dw).	.....	13.4 mt dw (29,421 lb dw).	13.4 mt dw (29,421 lb dw)
Western Gulf of Mexico.	Blacktip Sharks ...	266.5 mt dw (587,396 lb dw).	165.7 mt dw (365,385 lb dw).	100.1 mt dw (220,164 lb dw) [3].	231.5 mt dw (510,261 lb dw).	331.6 mt dw (730,425 lb dw)
	Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks.	72.0 mt dw (158,724 lb dw).	66.1 mt dw (145,791 lb dw).	.....	72.0 mt dw (158,724 lb dw).	72.0 mt dw (158,724 lb dw)
	Hammerhead Sharks.	11.9 mt dw (26,301 lb dw).	16.8 mt dw (37,128 lb dw).	.....	11.9 mt dw (23,301 lb dw).	11.9 mt dw (23,301 lb dw)

TABLE 1—ANNUAL QUOTAS FOR THE ATLANTIC SHARK FISHERIES—Continued

[All quotas and landings are dressed weight (dw), in metric tons (mt), unless specified otherwise. 1 mt dw = 2,204.6 lb dw]

Region or sub-region	Management group	2016 annual quota (A)	Preliminary 2016 landings [1] (B)	Adjustments [2] (C)	2017 Base annual quota (D)	2017 Final annual quota (D+C)
Gulf of Mexico	Non-Blacknose Small Coastal Sharks.	107.3 mt dw (236,603 lb dw).	60.6 mt dw (133,648 lb dw).	.....	112.6 mt dw (248,215 lb dw).	112.6 mt dw (248,215 lb dw)
	Smoothhound Sharks.	336.4 mt dw (741,627).	0 mt dw (0 lb dw)	168.2 mt dw (370,814 lb dw).	336.4 mt dw (741,627).	504.6 mt dw (1,112,441 lb dw)
Atlantic	Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks.	168.9 mt dw (372,552 lb dw).	113.2 mt dw (249,661 lb dw).	.....	168.9 mt dw (372,552 lb dw).	168.9 mt dw (372,552 lb dw)
	Hammerhead Sharks.	27.1 mt dw (59,736 lb dw).	12.5 mt dw (27,542 lb dw).	.....	27.1 mt dw (59,736 lb dw).	27.1 mt dw (59,736 lb dw)
	Non-Blacknose Small Coastal Sharks.	264.1 mt dw (582,333 lb dw).	50.7 mt dw (111,793 lb dw).	.....	264.1 mt dw (582,333 lb dw).	264.1 mt dw (582,333 lb dw)
	Blacknose Sharks (South of 34° N. lat. only).	15.7 mt dw (34,653 lb dw).	12.2 mt dw (26,928 lb dw).	.....	17.2 mt dw (37,921 lb dw).	17.2 mt dw (37,921 lb dw) [4]
	Smoothhound Sharks.	1,201.7 mt dw (2,647,725 lb dw).	287.4 mt dw (633,605 lb dw).	600.9 mt dw (1,323,862 lb dw).	1,201.7 mt dw (2,647,725 lb dw).	1,802.6 mt dw (3,971,587 lb dw)
No regional quotas	Non-Sandbar LCS Research.	50.0 mt dw (110,230 lb dw).	14.6 mt dw (32,167 lb dw).	.....	50.0 mt dw (110,230 lb dw).	50.0 mt dw (110,230 lb dw)
	Sandbar Shark Research.	90.7 mt dw (199,943 lb dw).	41.5 mt dw (91,568 lb dw).	.....	90.7 mt dw (199,943 lb dw).	90.7 mt dw (199,943 lb dw)
	Blue Sharks	273.0 mt dw (601,856 lb dw).	< 1.0 mt dw (< 2,000 lb dw).	.....	273.0 mt dw (601,856 lb dw).	273.0 mt dw (601,856 lb dw)
	Porbeagle Sharks	0 mt dw (0 lb dw)	0 mt dw (0 lb dw)	.....	1.7 mt dw (3,748 lb dw).	1.7 mt dw (3,748 lb dw)
	Pelagic Sharks Other Than Porbeagle or Blue.	488.0 mt dw (1,075,856 lb dw).	77.4 mt dw (170,675 lb dw).	.....	488.0 mt dw (1,075,856 lb dw).	488.0 mt dw (1,075,856 lb dw)

[1] Landings are from January 1, 2016, through October 14, 2016, and are subject to change.

[2] Underharvest adjustments can only be applied to stocks or management groups that are not overfished and have no overfishing occurring. Also, the underharvest adjustments cannot exceed 50 percent of the base quota.

[3] This adjustment accounts for underharvest in 2016. This final rule would increase the overall Gulf of Mexico blacktip shark quota by 111.0 mt dw (244,084 lb dw). Since any underharvest would be divided based on the sub-regional quota percentage split, 10.9 mt dw (9.8 percent of the overall regional quota adjustment) is being added to the eastern Gulf of Mexico blacktip shark base quota, and 100.1 mt dw (90.2 percent of the overall regional quota adjustment) is being added to the western Gulf of Mexico blacktip shark base quota.

[4] Based on overharvest in 2012 and 2015, NMFS had previously reduced the Atlantic blacknose shark base annual quota by 1.5 mt dw (3,268 lb dw) in 2016, 2017, and 2018. However, in 2016, the Atlantic blacknose shark quota was underharvested by 3.5 mt dw (7,725 lb dw). NMFS will use the 2016 underharvest to cover the remaining overharvest amount of 3.0 mt dw (6,536 lb dw). Thus the 2017 Atlantic blacknose shark quota will be equal to base annual quota.

Fishing Season Notification for the 2017 Atlantic Commercial Shark Fishing Seasons

Based on the seven ''opening commercial fishing season'' criteria listed in § 635.27(b)(3), NMFS is opening the 2016 Atlantic commercial shark fishing seasons on January 1, 2017, except for the aggregated LCS, blacktip shark, and hammerhead shark management groups in the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region which will open on February 1, 2017 (Table 2).

Regarding the LCS retention limit, as shown in Table 2, for directed shark limited access permit holders, the Gulf of Mexico blacktip shark, aggregated LCS, and hammerhead shark management groups will start the commercial fishing season at 45 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip, and the Atlantic aggregated LCS and hammerhead shark management groups will start the commercial fishing season at 25 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip. In the Atlantic region, as described above, NMFS will closely monitor the quota at the beginning of the year. If it appears that the quota is being harvested too quickly to allow fishermen throughout the entire region an opportunity to fish (*e.g.,* if approximately 20 percent of the quota is caught at the beginning of the year), NMFS will consider reducing the commercial retention limit, then consider raising it later in the season. Based on prior years' fishing activity, to allow greater fishing opportunities later in the year, NMFS anticipates considering raising the commercial retention limit to the default limit of 36 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip around July 15, 2017. Any retention limit reductions and increases will be based on consideration of the trip limit adjustment criteria at 50 CFR 635.24(a)(8).

All of the shark management groups will remain open until December 31, 2017, or until NMFS determines that the fishing season landings for any shark management group has reached, or is projected to reach, 80 percent of the available quota; however, consistent with § 635.28(b)(5), NMFS may close the Gulf of Mexico blacktip shark management group before landings reach, or are expected to reach, 80 percent of the quota. Additionally,

NMFS has previously established non-linked and linked quotas; linked quotas are explicitly designed to concurrently close multiple shark management groups that are caught together to prevent incidental catch mortality from exceeding the total allowable catch. The linked and non-linked quotas are shown in Table 2. NMFS will file for publication with the Office of the Federal Register a notice of closure for that shark species, shark management group including any linked quotas, and/or region that will be effective no fewer than 5 days from date of filing. From the effective date and time of the closure until NMFS announces, via the publication of a notice in the **Federal Register**, that additional quota is available and the season is reopened, the fisheries for the shark species or management group are closed, even across fishing years.

TABLE 2—QUOTA LINKAGES, SEASON OPENING DATES, AND COMMERCIAL RETENTION LIMIT BY REGIONAL OR SUB-REGIONAL SHARK MANAGEMENT GROUP

Region or sub-region	Management group	Quota linkages	Season opening dates	Commercial retention limits for directed shark limited access permit holders (inseason adjustments are available)
Eastern Gulf of Mexico.	Blacktip Sharks	Not Linked	January 1, 2017	45 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip
	Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks.	Linked.		
	Hammerhead Sharks.			
Western Gulf of Mexico.	Blacktip Sharks	Not Linked	February 1, 2017	45 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip
	Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks.	Linked.		
	Hammerhead Sharks.			
Gulf of Mexico	Non-Blacknose Small Coastal Sharks.	Not Linked	January 1, 2017	N/A
Atlantic	Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks.	Linked	January 1, 2017	25 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip. [If quota is landed quickly (*e.g.,* if approximately 20 percent of quota is caught at the beginning of the year), NMFS anticipates considering an inseason reduction (*e.g.,* to 3 or fewer LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip), and later considering an inseason increase to 36 LCS other than sandbar sharks per vessel per trip around July 15, 2017]
	Hammerhead Sharks.			
	Non-Blacknose Small Coastal Sharks.	Linked (South of 34 °N. lat. only).	January 1, 2017	N/A
	Blacknose Sharks (South of 34 °N. lat. only).			
No regional quotas	Non-Sandbar LCS Research.	Linked	January 1, 2017	N/A
	Sandbar Shark Research.			
	Blue Sharks	Not Linked	January 1, 2017	N/A
	Porbeagle Sharks.			
	Pelagic Sharks Other Than Porbeagle or Blue.			

Classification

The NMFS Assistant Administrator has determined that the final rule is consistent with the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments, other provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and other applicable law.

This final rule is exempt from review under Executive Order 12866.

In compliance with section 604 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), NMFS prepared a Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA) for this final rule, which analyzed the adjustments to the Gulf of Mexico blacktip shark, Gulf of Mexico smoothhound shark, and Atlantic smoothhound shark management group quotas based on underharvests from the previous fishing season(s). The FRFA analyzes the anticipated economic impacts of the final actions and any significant economic impacts on small entities. The FRFA is below.

Section 604(a)(1) of the RFA requires an explanation of the purpose of the rulemaking. The purpose of this final rulemaking is, consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments, to establish the 2017 Atlantic commercial shark fishing quotas, retention limits, and fishing seasons. Without this rule, the Atlantic commercial shark fisheries would close on December 31, 2016, and would not reopen until another action was taken. This final rule will be implemented according to the regulations implementing the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments. Thus, NMFS expects few, if any, economic impacts to fishermen other than those already analyzed in the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments. While there may be some direct negative economic impacts associated with the opening dates for fishermen in certain areas, there could also be positive effects for other fishermen in the region. The opening

dates were chosen to allow for an equitable distribution of the available quotas among all fishermen across regions and states, to the extent practicable.

Section 604(a)(2) of the RFA requires NMFS to summarize significant issues raised by the public in response to the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA), provide a summary of NMFS' assessment of such issues, and provide a statement of any changes made as a result of the comments. The IRFA was done as part of the proposed rule for the 2017 Atlantic Commercial Shark Season Specifications. NMFS did not receive any comments specific to the IRFA. However, NMFS received comments related to the overall economic impacts of the proposed rule, and those comments and NMFS' assessment of and response to them are summarized above (see Comments 3 and 9 above). As described in the responses to those comments relating to the season opening dates, consistent with § 635.27(b)(3), the opening date for the all of the commercial shark fisheries will be implemented as proposed (January 1, 2017), except for the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region, which will open on February 1, 2017.

Section 604(a)(4) of the RFA requires NMFS to provide an estimate of the number of small entities to which the rule would apply. The Small Business Administration (SBA) has established size criteria for all major industry sectors in the United States, including fish harvesters. Provision is made under SBA's regulations for an agency to develop its own industry-specific size standards after consultation with Advocacy and an opportunity for public comment (see 13 CFR 121.903(c)). Under this provision, NMFS may establish size standards that differ from those established by the SBA Office of Size Standards, but only for use by NMFS and only for the purpose of conducting an analysis of economic effects in fulfillment of the agency's obligations under the RFA. To utilize this provision, NMFS must publish such size standards in the **Federal Register** (FR), which NMFS did on December 29, 2015 (80 FR 81194, December 29, 2015). In this final rule effective on July 1, 2016, NMFS established a small business size standard of $11 million in annual gross receipts for all businesses in the commercial fishing industry (NAICS 11411) for RFA compliance purposes (80 FR 81194, December 29, 2015). NMFS considers all HMS permit holders to be small entities because they had average annual receipts of less than $11 million for commercial fishing.

As of October 2016, the proposed rule would apply to the approximately 223 directed commercial shark permit holders, 271 incidental commercial shark permit holders, 103 smoothhound shark permit holders, and 111 commercial shark dealers. Not all permit holders are active in the fishery in any given year. Active directed commercial shark permit holders are defined as those with valid permits that landed one shark based on HMS electronic dealer reports. Of the 494 directed and incidental commercial shark permit holders, only 40 permit holders landed sharks in the Gulf of Mexico region and only 99 landed sharks in the Atlantic region. Of the 103 smoothhound shark permit holders, only 59 permit holders landed smoothhound sharks in the Atlantic region and none landed smoothhound sharks in the Gulf of Mexico region. NMFS has determined that the proposed rule would not likely affect any small governmental jurisdictions.

Section 604(a)(5) of the RFA requires NMFS to describe the projected reporting, recordkeeping, and other compliance requirements of the final rule, including an estimate of the classes of small entities which would be subject to the requirements of the report or record. None of the actions in this final rule would result in additional reporting, recordkeeping, or compliance requirements beyond those already analyzed in the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments.

Section 604(a)(6) of the RFA requires NMFS to describe the steps taken to minimize the economic impact on small entities, consistent with the stated objectives of applicable statutes. Additionally, the RFA (5 U.S.C. 603(c)(1)–(4)) lists four general categories of ''significant'' alternatives that would assist an agency in the development of significant alternatives that would accomplish the stated objectives of applicable statutes and minimize any significant economic impact of the rule on small entities. These categories of alternatives are: (1) Establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities; (2) clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance and reporting requirements under the rule for such small entities; (3) use of performance rather than design standards; and (4) exemptions from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for small entities.

In order to meet the objectives of this rule, consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act, NMFS cannot exempt small entities or change the reporting requirements only for small entities because all the entities affected are small entities. Thus, there are no alternatives discussed that fall under the first, second, and fourth categories described above. NMFS does not know of any performance or design standards that would satisfy the aforementioned objectives of this rulemaking while, concurrently, complying with the Magnuson-Stevens Act; therefore, there are no alternatives considered under the third category.

This rulemaking does not establish management measures to be implemented, but rather implements previously adopted and analyzed measures as adjustments, as specified in the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments and the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the 2011 shark quota specifications rule (75 FR 76302; December 8, 2010). Thus, in this rulemaking, NMFS adjusted the base quotas established and analyzed in the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments by subtracting the underharvest or adding the overharvest, as specified and allowable in existing regulations. Under current regulations (§ 635.27(b)(2)), all shark fisheries close on December 31 of each year, or when NMFS determines that the fishing season landings for any shark management group has reached, or is projected to reach, 80 percent of the available quota, and do not open until NMFS takes action, such as this rulemaking to re-open the fisheries. Thus, not implementing these management measures would negatively affect shark fishermen and related small entities, such as dealers, and also would not provide management flexibility in furtherance of equitable fishing opportunities, to the extent practicable, for commercial shark fishermen in all regions and areas.

Based on the 2015 ex-vessel price, fully harvesting the unadjusted 2017 Atlantic shark commercial baseline quotas could result in total fleet revenues of $8,265,467 (see Table 3). For the Gulf of Mexico blacktip shark management group, NMFS will increase the baseline sub-regional quotas due to the underharvests in 2016. The increase for the eastern Gulf of Mexico blacktip shark management group would result in a $24,099 gain in total revenues for fishermen in that sub-region, while the increase for the western Gulf of Mexico blacktip shark management group would result in a $221,815 gain in total revenues for fishermen in that sub-region. For the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic smoothhound shark management groups, NMFS will

increase the baseline quotas due to the underharvest in 2016. This would cause a potential gain in revenue of $270,323 for the fleet in the Gulf of Mexico region and a potential gain in revenue of $965,095 for the fleet in the Atlantic region.

All of these changes in gross revenues are similar to the changes in gross revenues analyzed in the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments. The FRFAs for those amendments concluded that the economic impacts on these small entities are expected to be minimal. In the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments and the EA for the 2011 shark quota specifications rule, NMFS stated it would be conducting annual rulemakings and considering the potential economic impacts of adjusting the quotas for under- and overharvests at that time.

TABLE 3—AVERAGE EX-VESSEL PRICES PER LB DW FOR EACH SHARK MANAGEMENT GROUP, 2015

Region	Species	Average ex-vessel meat price	Average ex-vessel fin price
Gulf of Mexico	Blacktip Shark	$0.51	$9.95
	Aggregated LCS	0.55	9.96
	Hammerhead Shark	0.61	11.98
	Non-Blacknose SCS	0.35	6.72
	Smoothhound Shark*	0.65	1.58
Atlantic	Aggregated LCS	0.80	4.73
	Hammerhead Shark	0.65	10.25
	Non-Blacknose SCS	0.73	4.36
	Blacknose Shark	0.97	4.00
	Smoothhound Shark*	0.65	1.58
No Region	Shark Research Fishery (Aggregated LCS)	0.68	9.24
	Shark Research Fishery (Sandbar only)	0.76	10.62
	Blue shark	0.60	2.93
	Porbeagle shark	1.50	2.93
	Other Pelagic sharks	1.50	2.93

* Ex-vessel prices for smoothhound sharks come from HMS dealers who submitted landings data voluntarily before it was a requirement on March 15, 2016.

For this final rule, NMFS reviewed the ''opening commercial fishing season'' criteria at § 635.27(b)(3)(i) through (vii) to determine when opening each fishery will provide equitable opportunities for fishermen while also considering the ecological needs of the different species. Over- and/or underharvests of 2016 and previous fishing season quotas were examined for the different species/complexes to determine the effects of the 2017 final quotas on fishermen across regional fishing areas. The potential season lengths and previous catch rates were examined to ensure that equitable fishing opportunities would be provided to fishermen. Lastly, NMFS examined the seasonal variation of the different species/complexes and the effects on fishing opportunities. In addition to these criteria, NMFS also considered other relevant factors, such as recent landings data and public comments, before arriving at the final opening dates for the 2017 Atlantic shark management groups. For the 2017 fishing season, NMFS is opening the shark management groups on January 1, 2017, except for the aggregated LCS, blacktip shark, and hammerhead shark management groups in the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region, which will open on February 1, 2017. The direct and indirect economic impacts will be neutral on a short- and long-term basis for the eastern Gulf of Mexico blacktip shark, eastern Gulf of Mexico aggregated LCS, eastern Gulf of Mexico hammerhead shark, Gulf of Mexico non-blacknose shark SCS, Atlantic non-blacknose shark SCS, Atlantic blacknose shark, sandbar shark, blue shark, porbeagle shark, and pelagic shark (other than porbeagle or blue sharks) management groups, because NMFS did not change the opening dates of these fisheries from the status quo. For the aggregated LCS, blacktip shark, and hammerhead shark management groups in the western Gulf of Mexico sub-region, the delayed opening to February 1, 2017, anticipates minor positive short- and long-term economic impacts, because, according to public comments, ex-vessel prices for sharks are expected to be higher at that time in that sub-region.

Opening the aggregated LCS and hammerhead shark management groups in the Atlantic region on January 1 will result in short-term, direct, moderate, beneficial economic impacts, as fishermen and dealers in the southern portion of the Atlantic region will be able to fish for and sell aggregated LCS and hammerhead sharks starting in January. These fishermen will be able to fish earlier in the 2017 fishing season compared to the 2010, 2011, 2012, 2014, and 2015 fishing seasons, which did not start until June or July. Based on public comment, some Atlantic fishermen in the southern and northern part of the region prefer a January 1 opening for the fishery as long as the majority of the quota is available later in the year. With the implementation of the HMS electronic reporting system in 2013, NMFS now monitors the quota on a more real-time basis compared to the paper reporting system that was in place before 2013. This ability, along with the inseason retention limit adjustment criteria in § 635.24(a)(8), should allow NMFS the flexibility to further provide equitable fishing opportunities for fishermen across all regions, to the extent practicable. Depending on how quickly the quota is being harvested, NMFS will consider reducing the commercial retention limit, then consider raising it later in the season to ensure that fishermen farther north have sufficient quota for a fishery later in the 2017 fishing season. The direct impacts to shark fishermen in the Atlantic region of reducing the trip limit depend on the needed reduction in the trip limit and the timing of such a reduction. Therefore, such a reduction in the trip limit for directed shark limited access permit holders is only anticipated to have minor adverse direct economic impacts to fishermen in the short-term; long-term impacts are not anticipated as these reductions would not be permanent.

In the northern portion of the Atlantic region, a January 1 opening for the aggregated LCS and hammerhead shark management groups, with inseason trip limit adjustments to ensure quota is available later in the season, will have direct, minor, beneficial economic impacts in the short-term for fishermen as they will potentially have access to the aggregated LCS and hammerhead shark quotas earlier than in past seasons. Fishermen in this area have stated that, depending on the weather, some aggregated LCS species might be available to retain in January. Thus, fishermen will be able to target or retain aggregated LCS while targeting non-blacknose SCS. There will be indirect, minor, beneficial economic impacts in the short- and long-term for shark dealers and other entities that deal with shark products in this region as they will also have access to aggregated LCS products earlier than in past seasons. Thus, opening the aggregated LCS and hammerhead shark management groups in January and using inseason trip limit adjustments to ensure the fishery is open later in the year in 2017 will cause beneficial cumulative economic impacts, because it allows for a more equitable distribution of the quotas among constituents in this region, consistent with the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments.

Section 212 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 states that, for each rule or group of related rules for which an agency is required to prepare a FRFA, the agency shall publish one or more guides to assist small entities in complying with the rule, and shall designate such publications as ''small entity compliance guides.'' The agency shall explain the actions a small entity is required to take to comply with a rule or group of rules. As part of this rulemaking process, NMFS has prepared a listserv summarizing fishery information and regulations for Atlantic shark fisheries for 2017. This listserv also serves as the small entity compliance guide. Copies of the compliance guide are available from NMFS (see **ADDRESSES**).

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 971 *et seq.;* 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Samuel D. Rauch III,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–28154 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 635

[Docket No. 160531477–6999–02]

RIN 0648–BG10

Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Removal of Vessel Upgrade Restrictions for Swordfish Directed Limited Access and Atlantic Tunas Longline Category Permits

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule removes vessel upgrading restrictions for vessels issued swordfish directed and Atlantic tunas Longline category limited access permits (LAPs). Currently, regulations allow for upgrading vessels or transferring permits to another vessel only if the vessel upgrade or permit transfer results in an increase of no more than 35 percent in length overall, gross registered tonnage, and net tonnage, as measured relative to the baseline vessel specifications (*i.e.,* the specifications of the vessel first issued a Highly Migratory Species (HMS) LAP). This final rule eliminates these restrictions on upgrades and permit transfers. This action affects vessel owners issued swordfish directed and Atlantic tunas Longline category LAPs and fishing in the Atlantic Ocean, including the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Sea.

DATES: This rule is effective on December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Other documents relevant to this final rule are available from the Atlantic HMS Management Division Web site at *http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/hms/* or by contacting Steve Durkee by phone at 202–670–6637 or Rick Pearson by phone at 727–824–5399.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Durkee by phone at 202–670–6637 or Rick Pearson by phone at 727–824–5399.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The U.S. Atlantic swordfish and tuna fisheries are managed under the 2006 Consolidated HMS Fishery Management Plan (FMP) and its amendments. Implementing regulations at 50 CFR part 635 are issued under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act), 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.,* and the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act (ATCA), 16 U.S.C. 971 *et seq.* ATCA authorizes the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) to promulgate regulations, as may be necessary and appropriate, to implement recommendations of the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT).

Background

This final rule removes vessel upgrading restrictions for vessels issued swordfish directed and Atlantic tunas Longline category LAPs. A brief summary of the background of this final rule is provided below. The details were described in the proposed rule for this action (81 FR 48731, July 26, 2016) and are not repeated here. Additional information regarding Atlantic HMS management can be found in the 2006 Consolidated Atlantic HMS FMP and its amendments, the annual HMS Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation (SAFE) Reports, and online at *http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/hms/*. The comments received on the proposed rule for this action, and NMFS' responses to those comments, are summarized below in the section labeled ''Response to Comments.''

In 1999, NMFS issued initial LAPs in the Atlantic swordfish and shark fisheries (64 FR 29090, March 28, 1999). To be eligible to fish with pelagic longline gear, a vessel had to be issued a swordfish directed or incidental LAP, a shark directed or incidental LAP, and an Atlantic tunas Longline category permit. After initial issuance of these permits, no new permits were issued by NMFS, but permits could be transferred to other vessels. Swordfish and shark directed LAPs included restrictions on vessel upgrading and permit transfers. Vessel upgrades and permit transfers were allowed only if the upgrade or permit transfer to another vessel did not result in an increase in horsepower of more than 20 percent or an increase of more than 10 percent in length overall, gross registered tonnage, or net tonnage relative to the respective specifications of the first vessel issued the initial LAP (the baseline vessel). Additionally, vessels could only be upgraded one time. These vessel upgrading restrictions were put into place to limit capacity in the swordfish fishery. Incidental LAPs for these species did not have vessel upgrading restrictions. Upgrading restrictions for Atlantic tunas Longline category LAPs were not explicitly implemented in the 1999 rule. However, as a practical effect, Atlantic tunas Longline category LAPs were limited by the same upgrading restrictions as the swordfish and shark

directed permits due to the requirement to hold all three permits when fishing with pelagic longline gear.

On June 7, 2007 (72 FR 31688), NMFS issued a final rule amending the HMS fishery regulations to provide additional opportunities for U.S. vessels to more fully utilize the North Atlantic swordfish quota, recognizing the improved status of the species. The 2007 action modified limited access vessel upgrading and permit transfer restrictions for vessels that were concurrently issued, or were eligible to renew, directed or incidental swordfish, directed or incidental shark, and Atlantic tunas Longline category LAPs (*i.e.,* vessels that were eligible to fish with pelagic longline gear). The rule also clarified that Atlantic tunas Longline category LAPs were subject to the same vessel upgrade restrictions as swordfish and shark directed LAPs. These measures allowed eligible vessel owners to upgrade their vessels by 35 percent in size (length overall, gross registered tonnage, and net tonnage) relative to the specifications of the baseline vessel, and removed upgrade limits on horsepower. Additionally, these permits could be upgraded more than once, provided that the new maximum upgrade limits were not exceeded.

Since implementing the vessel upgrade requirements in 1999 and modifying them in 2007, several important things have changed in the Atlantic HMS pelagic longline fishery. As described in the proposed rule for this action, NMFS was concerned about ensuring that pelagic longline fishing effort and fleet capacity were commensurate with the available swordfish quota in 1999. The vessel upgrading restrictions were part of NMFS' management strategy to reduce fleet capacity. Since then, fleet capacity has been reduced through the successful application of the initial LAP qualification criteria and attrition over time. In 1998, prior to the implementation of upgrade restrictions, 233 pelagic longline vessels among the 2,000 permit holders landed swordfish and thus were considered ''active.'' The number of such vessels dropped to a low of 102 in 2006 and has since remained between 109 and 122 vessels. Similarly, as of December 30, 1999, approximately 451 directed and incidental swordfish LAPs had been issued. By 2015, permit numbers had been reduced to 260 directed and incidental swordfish LAPs. Permit numbers are expected to remain at approximately these levels because no new LAPs are being issued.

Other requirements implemented since 1999, such as those designed to reduce bycatch in the pelagic longline fishery (*e.g.,* closed areas, bait requirements, individual bluefin tuna quotas, and gear restrictions), have also limited fishing effort. The directed North Atlantic swordfish quota has not been exceeded in almost 20 years and, in fact, has been underharvested for a number of years.

During this same time period, the stock status of North Atlantic swordfish has significantly improved. In 2009, ICCAT declared that the stock had been fully rebuilt. Using domestic stock status thresholds, NMFS has also declared that the North Atlantic swordfish stock is not overfished and that overfishing is not occurring.

In addition to limiting capacity in the HMS pelagic longline fishery, a secondary goal for implementing the specific swordfish directed and Atlantic tunas Longline vessel upgrade limits adopted in 1999 was to be consistent with similar regulations previously established by the New England and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Councils (Councils). In August 2015, the Councils removed gross registered and net tonnage limits (80 FR 51754) so that only length and horsepower limits remain in effect. Because this HMS action will remove all upgrade restrictions for vessels issued swordfish directed and Atlantic tunas Longline category LAPs, only the Council regulations will limit vessel upgrading for vessels issued LAPs for both Council-managed species and HMS. Thus, there will be no conflict between Council and HMS vessel upgrade restrictions. This action will simplify compliance for dually permitted vessels and provide greater flexibility for HMS permitted vessels.

Because the overall reduction in pelagic longline fleet capacity, in combination with the totality of effort controls implemented since 1999, has sufficiently limited the Atlantic HMS pelagic longline fishery's capacity, vessel upgrading and related permit transfer restrictions are no longer necessary at this time. Therefore, this final rule removes all upgrading restrictions for vessels issued swordfish directed and Atlantic tunas Longline category LAPs. Although limited in scope, this action eases a barrier to entry in the pelagic longline fishery, facilitates LAP transfers, provides increased business flexibility, and helps vessel owners address safety issues. Eliminating vessel upgrading restrictions will have short- and long-term minor beneficial socioeconomic impacts, since it will allow fishermen to buy, sell, or transfer swordfish directed and Atlantic tunas Longline category LAPs without concerns about exceeding the maximum upgrade limit for the permits. It will also allow vessel owners to transfer their permits to newer vessels, which could have greater capacity, and address safety issues that exist with older vessels.

Removing the upgrading restrictions is not expected to affect the overall number of swordfish and tunas being landed by vessels, as these amounts are determined by established quotas and effort controls (including, for example, individual vessel quotas for bluefin tuna), not the size of the vessel. Thus, this action is expected to have no ecological impacts beyond those previously analyzed regarding the quotas and existing conservation and management measures, and will not result in additional interactions with protected resources, given the other restrictions on the Atlantic HMS pelagic longline fishery.

Response to Comments

The comment period for the proposed rule closed on September 26, 2016. NMFS received three written comments, which can be found at *https://www.regulations.gov/* by searching for NOAA–NMFS–2016–0087. Comments were also received from the Atlantic HMS Advisory Panel during its meeting on September 7, 2016. No comments were received during a conference call/webinar held on August 23, 2016. NMFS received comments in support of, and one opposed to, removing vessel upgrade restrictions for vessels issued Atlantic tunas Longline category and swordfish directed permits. A summary of the comments received during the public comment period is provided below along with NMFS's responses.

Comment 1: A commenter opposed to removing HMS pelagic longline vessel upgrade restrictions stated that the proposal will enable permits to be transferred to larger vessels that could catch more fish. The commenter also wrote that there should be a complete ban on catching swordfish because the species is virtually extinct.

Response: North Atlantic swordfish are not virtually extinct. In 2009, ICCAT declared that the stock was fully rebuilt, and it has remained so ever since. Using domestic stock status thresholds, NMFS has also declared that the north Atlantic swordfish stock is not overfished and that overfishing is not occurring. The most recent stock assessment, conducted in 2013, indicates that the stock is not overfished (B_{2011}/B_{MSY} = 1.14) and overfishing is not occurring (F_{2011}/F_{MSY} = 0.82). North Atlantic

swordfish quotas are set by ICCAT considering the stock's status and to ensure that the stock is sustainably harvested and to prevent overfishing from occurring. The United States adheres to its ICCAT-designated quota and, in fact, has underharvested the quota for the past several years. Numerous conservation and management measures remain in place in addition to the quota limitations to ensure that the stock is protected. The vessel upgrading restriction removal does not affect the amount of fish caught, nor does it relieve other restrictions that ensure effective conservation and management of this rebuilt fishery. Thus, the commenter's concerns about the stock being ''virtually extinct'' are unfounded and do not warrant modification of the proposed action.

While removing the upgrade restrictions for vessels issued swordfish directed and Atlantic tunas Longline category permits could facilitate the transfer of permits to larger vessels which could catch more swordfish, overall compliance with the quota in this fishery ensures that the stock is not negatively affected by fishing effort. North Atlantic swordfish landings are regulated by semi-annual quotas, and the fishery can be adjusted or closed as those quotas are approached. Similarly, landings of most tunas and pelagic sharks are regulated by quotas which can be adjusted, as necessary, to remain within the quotas.

Comment 2: A supporter of the proposal to remove upgrade restrictions for vessels issued Atlantic tunas Longline category and swordfish directed permits stated that when the upgrade restrictions were first implemented, the commercial swordfish industry was at a peak in terms of both participation and landings. The commenter stated that the swordfish fleet is currently in decline due to increased operating costs, competition from foreign product, and regulatory restrictions, despite a fully recovered north Atlantic swordfish stock; that NMFS should pursue management measures to allow new entrants into the fishery and to expand the production capabilities of the existing fleet; and that eliminating vessel upgrading restrictions is a small step toward encouraging new entrants in the pelagic longline fishery to keep the fleet operative.

Response: Although this final action is limited in scope, it will ease a barrier to entry in the pelagic longline fishery, facilitate LAP transfers, and provide increased business flexibility. As discussed above, both the North Atlantic swordfish stock status and the pelagic longline fishery have changed significantly since 1999. The vessel upgrading restrictions were part of NMFS' initial management strategy to reduce fleet capacity. Since then, capacity has been reduced through the successful application of the initial LAP qualification criteria and attrition over time. Both the number of swordfish LAPs and the number of pelagic longline vessels actively landing swordfish have declined by approximately 50 percent since 1999. As a result of these and other management measures, swordfish are no longer overfished and overfishing is not occurring. The overall reduction in fleet capacity, in combination with the totality of effort controls implemented since 1999, has sufficiently limited the Atlantic HMS pelagic longline fishery's capacity. Thus, vessel upgrading and related permit transfer restrictions are no longer necessary or relevant at this time. Adverse impacts on stock status can be avoided because swordfish landings are regulated by semi-annual quotas, and the fishery can be adjusted or closed as those quotas are approached. Similarly, landings of most tunas and pelagic sharks are regulated by quotas which can be adjusted, as necessary, to remain within the quotas.

Comment 3: When the upgrade restrictions were first implemented, vessel observers were not considered. The requirement to carry observers requires more space onboard a vessel, thus there is sometimes a need to increase the size of vessels more than might be allowed by the existing upgrade restrictions.

Response: Pelagic longline vessels are required to carry observers if selected by NMFS. Removing the upgrade restrictions for vessels issued swordfish directed and Atlantic tunas Longline category permits could allow owners to modify their vessels or purchase newer, larger vessels that would better accommodate these observers.

Comment 4: A commenter in support of the proposed action indicated that fishing vessels and fishing equipment needs improvement from time to time and that vessel upgrading restrictions have sometimes restricted that ability.

Response: NMFS agrees. Removing upgrade restrictions for vessels issued swordfish directed and Atlantic tunas Longline category vessels could facilitate improvements in safety, working conditions, and overall living conditions for both crew members and fishery observers while onboard. This final rule will allow pelagic longline vessel owners to make necessary modifications to their vessels without restrictions on vessel length and tonnage.

Comment 5: A commenter indicated that it has been almost impossible to replace their older engine with a similar engine due to the horsepower upgrade limits.

Response: Horsepower upgrade limits for most HMS pelagic longline vessels were removed in a final rule that published on June 7, 2007 (72 FR 31688).

Comment 6: NMFS should remove vessel upgrade restrictions on swordfish handgear LAPs in order to convert permits that are currently useless due to low horsepower upgrade limits and allow them to be used because handgear vessel owners often prefer high horsepower ratings.

Response: NMFS has previously considered this request in a final rule that published on June 7, 2007 (72 FR 31688) and will continue to do so. The swordfish handgear LAP authorizes the deployment of buoy gear, and buoy gear may be deployed in areas including the East Florida Coast pelagic longline closed area. This area contains oceanographic features that make it biologically unique. It provides important juvenile swordfish habitat, and is essentially a narrow migratory corridor containing high concentrations of swordfish located in close proximity to high concentrations of people who may fish for them. As stated in 2007, horsepower upgrade restrictions can limit the number of swordfish handgear LAPs that are issued because newer handgear vessels have very high horsepower ratings. Public comment indicated a concern that removing vessel upgrade restrictions on swordfish handgear LAPs could result in increased numbers of fishermen in the area, and the potential for crowding of fishermen, which could lead to potential fishing gear and user conflicts. Those concerns remain valid and NMFS decided not to pursue similar adjustments in the swordfish handgear fishery at this time.

Comment 7: Some fishermen might obtain swordfish directed permits because those permits could be used to fish with handgear (including buoy gear). This final action could provide a preliminary preview of lifting the vessel upgrade restrictions on swordfish handgear permits.

Response: Vessels in the swordfish buoy gear fishery are generally small. NMFS believes that the current vessel size restrictions (for maximum length and tonnage) applicable to pelagic longline vessels issued swordfish directed and Atlantic tunas Longline category LAPs have not been a limiting factor in the number of vessels that use

buoy gear. Rather, commenters indicated that buoy gear vessel owners are primarily limited by horsepower upgrade restrictions. Because the horsepower upgrade restrictions have already been removed from most swordfish directed limited access and Atlantic tunas Longline category LAPs (72 FR 31688) and because vessels owners who wish to enter the buoy gear fishery and whose vessels have large horsepower engines have already obtained permits and entered the fishery, it is unlikely that this action will result in significant increases in persons obtaining swordfish directed and Atlantic tunas Longline category LAPs to fish with buoy gear.

Comment 8: NMFS should remove vessel upgrade restrictions on swordfish and shark incidental LAPs, and shark directed LAPs.

Response: Swordfish and shark incidental LAPs and shark directed LAPs do not have vessel upgrade restrictions.

Changes From the Proposed Rule

There are no changes from the proposed rule.

Classification

The NMFS Assistant Administrator has determined that this final action is necessary for the conservation and management of the Atlantic HMS fisheries, and that it is consistent with the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP and its amendments, other provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, ATCA, and other applicable laws.

This final action has been determined to be categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an environmental assessment in accordance with NOAA Administrative Order 216–6. A memorandum for the file has been prepared that sets forth the decision to use a categorical exclusion because the rule would implement minor changes to the regulations whose effects have already been analyzed, and additional effects are not expected. This action will have no additional effects that were not already analyzed, and the action is not precedent-setting or controversial. It would not have a significant effect, individually or cumulatively, on the human environment.

This final rule has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866.

The Chief Counsel for Regulation of the Department of Commerce certified to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration during the proposed rule stage that this action would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The factual basis for the certification was published in the proposed rule and is not repeated here. No comments were received regarding this certification. As a result, a regulatory flexibility analysis was not required and none was prepared.

NMFS has determined that this final rule will have no effects on any coastal use or resource, and a negative determination pursuant to 15 CFR 930.35 is not required. Therefore, pursuant to 15 CFR 930.33(a)(2), coordination with appropriate state agencies under section 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act is not required. No changes to the human environment are anticipated because removing the vessel upgrading restrictions would not affect the number of swordfish and tunas being landed by vessels, as these amounts are determined by the established quotas and effort controls, not the size of the vessel.

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 635

Fisheries, Fishing, Fishing vessels, Foreign relations, Imports, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Treaties.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Samuel D. Rauch III,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service.

For reasons set out in the preamble, 50 CFR part 635 is amended as follows:

PART 635—ATLANTIC HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 635 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 971 *et seq.;* 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

■ 2. In § 635.4, revise paragraphs (l)(2)(i), (l)(2)(ii) introductory text, (l)(2)(ii)(B), and (l)(2)(ii)(C) to read as follows:

§ 635.4 Permits and fees.

* * * * *

(l) * * *

(2) * * *

(i) Subject to the restrictions on upgrading the harvesting capacity of permitted vessels in paragraph (l)(2)(ii) of this section, as applicable, and to the limitations on ownership of permitted vessels in paragraph (l)(2)(iii) of this section, an owner may transfer a shark or swordfish LAP or an Atlantic Tunas Longline category permit to another vessel that he or she owns or to another person. Directed handgear LAPs for swordfish may be transferred to another vessel or to another person but only for use with handgear and subject to the upgrading restrictions in paragraph (l)(2)(ii) of this section and the limitations on ownership of permitted vessels in paragraph (l)(2)(iii) of this section. Shark directed and incidental LAPs, swordfish directed and incidental LAPs, and Atlantic Tunas Longline category permits are not subject to the upgrading requirements specified in paragraph (l)(2)(ii) of this section. Shark and swordfish incidental LAPs are not subject to the ownership requirements specified in paragraph (l)(2)(iii) of this section.

(ii) An owner may upgrade a vessel with a swordfish handgear LAP, or transfer such permit to another vessel or to another person, and be eligible to retain or renew such permit only if the upgrade or transfer does not result in an increase in horsepower of more than 20 percent or an increase of more than 10 percent in length overall, gross registered tonnage, or net tonnage from the vessel baseline specifications.

* * * * *

(B) Subsequent to the issuance of a swordfish handgear limited access permit, the vessel's horsepower may be increased, relative to the baseline specifications of the vessel initially issued the LAP, through refitting, replacement, or transfer. Such an increase may not exceed 20 percent of the baseline specifications of the vessel initially issued the LAP.

(C) Subsequent to the issuance of a swordfish handgear limited access permit, the vessel's length overall, gross registered tonnage, and net tonnage may be increased, relative to the baseline specifications of the vessel initially issued the LAP, through refitting, replacement, or transfer. An increase in any of these three specifications of vessel size may not exceed 10 percent of the baseline specifications of the vessel initially issued the LAP. This type of upgrade may be done separately from an engine horsepower upgrade.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2016–28171 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 648

[Docket No. 160929900–6900–01]

RIN 0648–XE927

Revisions to Framework Adjustment 55 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule; adjustment to specifications.

SUMMARY: We are reducing the 2016 fishing year Georges Bank haddock catch cap for the herring midwater trawl fishery. The reduction in the 2016 midwater trawl catch cap is necessary to account for an overage that occurred in fishing year 2015. This reduction is formulaic and is required as an accountability measure to help mitigate the 2015 overage.

DATES: Effective November 23, 2016, through April 30, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Liz Sullivan, Fishery Management Specialist, (978) 282–8493.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Framework Adjustment 55 to the Northeast (NE) Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (FMP) (May 2, 2016, 81 FR 26412) set annual catch limits for groundfish stocks for the 2016 fishing year, including allocations for the groundfish fishery and other fisheries with incidental catch of groundfish. The midwater trawl herring fishery is allocated 1 percent of the U.S. acceptable biological catch of Gulf of Maine (GOM) and Georges Bank (GB) haddock. If the herring midwater trawl fishery exceeds its GOM or GB haddock catch cap, we are required to reduce the respective catch cap by the amount of the overage in the following fishing year.

In fishing year 2015, the midwater trawl fishery exceeded its GB haddock catch cap by 8.54 mt. Therefore, this rule reduces the fishing year 2016 GB haddock catch cap by 8.54 mt to account for this overage. Table 1 provides the midwater trawl adjustment for GB haddock that this rule implements.

TABLE 1—FISHING YEAR 2016 MIDWATER TRAWL OVERAGE ADJUSTMENT (mt)

Stock	2015 Overage	Initial 2016 midwater trawl fishery catch cap	Adjusted 2016 midwater trawl fishery catch cap
GB haddock	8.54	521	512.46

Classification

The NMFS Assistant Administrator has determined that this final rule is consistent with the FMP, other provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and other applicable law.

This action is exempt from the procedures of E.O. 12866 because this action contains no implementing regulations.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B), we find good cause to waive prior public notice and opportunity for public comment on the catch cap adjustment because allowing time for notice and comment is impracticable, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest. We also find good cause to waive the 30-day delay in effectiveness pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), so that this final rule may become effective upon publication.

Prior notice and comment are impracticable and contrary to the public interest, because this is a non-discretionary action required by provisions of Framework 46 to the NE Multispecies FMP, which was subject to public comment. The proposed rule to implement Framework 46 requested public comment on these measures, including the specific accountability measure implemented by this rule, with the understanding that a catch cap adjustment would be required if an overage occurred. As a result, the public and industry are expecting this adjustment.

Final 2015 catch data only recently became available in September 2016. This information allows us to determine the amount of an overage, if any, and it was not possible to finalize this information sooner. If this rule is not effective immediately, the midwater trawl fishery will be operating under an incorrect 2016 catch cap for GB haddock. This could increase the likelihood of a subsequent overage and uncertainty on when to trigger an inseason accountability measure, which in turn could cause confusion and negative economic impacts to the midwater trawl fishery. Therefore, it is important to implement the reduced catch limit as soon as possible. For these reasons, we are waiving the public comment period and delay in effectiveness for this rule, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B) and (d), respectively.

A final regulatory flexibility analysis (FRFA) was previously prepared as part of the regulatory impact review of Framework 55. This minor adjustment does not change the conclusions drawn from that FRFA. The FRFA is contained in the Framework 55 final rule.

Each item in section 604(a)(1) through (5) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 604(a)(1) through (5)) was addressed in the Classification section of the Framework 55 final rule.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Samuel D. Rauch III,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–28175 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

Proposed Rules

Federal Register
Vol. 81, No. 226
Wednesday, November 23, 2016

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 52

[Document Number AMS–FV–08–0076; SC–16–334]

United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Onions

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) of the Department of Agriculture (USDA) is soliciting comments on its proposal to create new United States Standards for Grades of Frozen Onions. The American Frozen Food Institute (AFFI) petitioned AMS to develop new grade standards for frozen onions. AMS has received additional industry comments on several discussion drafts of the proposed standards. The grade standards would provide a common language for trade, a means of measuring value in the marketing of frozen onions, and guidance on the effective use of frozen onions.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before January 23, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be submitted via the Internet to *http://www.regulations.gov*; by email to *Brian.Griffin@ams.usda.gov*; by mail to Brian E. Griffin, Standardization Branch, Specialty Crops Inspection Division, Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., Room 1536, South Building; STOP 0247, Washington, DC 20250; or by fax to (202) 690–1527. All comments should reference the document number, date, and page number of this issue of the **Federal Register**. All comments will be posted without change, including any personal information provided. All comments submitted in response to this notice will be included in the public record and will be made available to the public on the Internet via *http://www.regulations.gov.* Comments will be made available for public inspection at the above address during regular business hours or can be viewed at: *http://www.regulations.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian E. Griffin, Agricultural Marketing Specialist, Specialty Crops Inspection Division, Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., Room 1536, South Building; STOP 0247, Washington, DC 20250; telephone (202) 720–5021; fax (202) 690–1527; or, email *Brian.Griffin@ams.usda.gov*. Copies of the proposed revised grade standards are published with this notice and can be viewed at *http://www.regulations.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 203(c) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (Act) (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627), as amended, directs and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture ''to develop and improve standards of quality, condition, quantity, grade, and packaging, and recommend and demonstrate such standards in order to encourage uniformity and consistency in commercial practices.''

AMS is committed to carrying out this authority in a manner that facilitates the marketing of agricultural commodities and makes copies of official grade standards available upon request. The United States Standards for Grades of Fruits and Vegetables unrelated to Federal Marketing Orders or U.S. Import Requirements no longer appear in the Code of Federal Regulations, but are maintained by USDA, AMS, Specialty Crops Program, and are available on the Internet at *http://www.ams.usda.gov/scihome.*

AMS is proposing to establish U.S. Standards for Grades of Frozen Onions using the procedures in part 36, Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (7 CFR part 36).

Background: The American Frozen Food Institute (AFFI) petitioned AMS to develop new grade standards for frozen onions. AFFI is a national trade association representing the interests of U.S. frozen food processors and their suppliers in all frozen food sectors, including processors and packers of frozen onions. AFFI's more than 500 member companies represent approximately 90 percent of all frozen food processed annually in the United States. The AFFI petition provided information on product styles, sample sizes, and a product description for use in the grade standards.

AMS asked the petitioner for various styles of samples in order to determine grades of frozen onions. AMS distributed several discussion drafts of proposed standards to AFFI, instituted changes to the drafts once agreement was reached, then published several **Federal Register** notices in order to receive comments from all interested parties (see 66 FR 21116, 68 FR 11801, 68 FR 27010, and 76 FR 31575).

Comments

AMS responded to comments received in response to the drafts as follows:

1. AMS agreed to include stem material, sprout material, and root material as defects in the ''core material'' defect category for strips, diced, and other styles.

2. AMS agreed to include an AFFI proposal to add and define dark green units with dark green stripes across 50 percent or more of the onion unit as a defect.

3. AMS agreed to include onion units from ⅜ inch (10mm) to ⅞ inch (22mm) under the whole styles category as Type II (Pearl).

4. In response to AFFI comments, AMS agreed to classify the style ''minced'' in the category of ''other'' styles.

5. AFFI expressed concern that defects, as defined in the proposed section on Acceptable Quality Levels (AQLs) for quality defects, were defined by count and not by weight, and that larger units would be allowed a smaller number of defects, and that smaller units would be allowed a large number of defects. AMS agreed, and after reevaluation, based the sample size for quality defects in whole units by count (50 count), and for the styles ''diced,'' ''strips,'' and ''other'' by weight (450 grams). AFFI agreed with the adjusted sample sizes and AQLs.

6. AFFI also expressed concern that the proposed AQLs allowed many more defects than current industry practices, and submitted examples of current buyers specifications to demonstrate this. AMS then modified the AQLs by reducing the number of defects allowed

per hundred units to align it with current industry practices, based on the AFFI request.

7. AMS did not modify use of 450 gram samples in response to AFFI questioning why we used 450 grams for the individual sample sizes for styles other than whole instead of 454 grams, which equals one pound. AMS responded that AQLs are based on increments of 50 units so rounding to the nearest AQL results in using 450 grams per sample unit or approximately one pound. AFFI concurred with use of 450 gram samples.

8. In response to a request to revise the definitions of ''good appearance'' and ''reasonably good appearance'' because they were too similar, AMS added flowability, brightness, and overall appearance to the description of ''reasonably good appearance,'' and also added the classification and definition for ''poor appearance.'' AFFI agreed to the new terminology and additional classification.

9. In response to a comment received, AMS did not include a requirement for heat treatment but added that option in the product description, by means of blanching. The revised statement is: ''have been properly prepared, washed, blanched or unblanched, and then frozen in accordance with good commercial practice and maintained at temperatures necessary to preserve the product.'' AFFI concurred with the revised product description.

10. In response to AFFI comments, AMS agreed to limit the product description to ''individually quick frozen'' onions.

11. In accordance with AMS' policy requiring commodities covered by U.S. grade standards to comply with all federal, state, and local laws, AMS did not include microbiological requirements, storage temperatures, shelf life requirements, and limits for chemical and pesticide residues to the proposed frozen onion grade standards. Such requirements are not typically included in the voluntary U.S. grade standards. AFFI concurred.

12. In response to a request from AFFI members, AMS changed the proposed size descriptions for ''whole'' styles as follows:

Type I from ¾ inch (19mm) to 1⅞ inch (48mm) changed to ⅞ inch (22mm) to 1⅞ inch (48mm).

Type II (Pearl) from ¼ inch (6mm) to ⅞ inch (22mm) changed to ⅜ inch (10mm) to ⅞ inch (22mm).

13. In reponse to an AFFI member's comment to the AMS' **Federal Register** notice published on June 1, 2011 (76 FR 31575), AMS revised the Defect Tables and Definitions of the proposed standards. The AFFI member, a major processor and distributor of strips and diced styles of frozen onions, agreed with most of the proposal, but provided additional suggestions concerning whole, strips, diced, and other styles containing crown material defects in its comments. The member also suggested additional provisions for defects, such as core material, sprouts, seed stems, and root material; and, suggested that portions of root crown exceeding ⅜ inch (10 mm) in diameter be listed in a separate category. AMS agreed and revised Defect Tables I (whole style) and II (strips, diced, and other styles) of the proposed grade standards and definitions to include major and minor defects in core material, to include root crown, with dimensions listed accordingly.

AMS sent a discussion draft of the proposed standards to AFFI members for concurrence. AMS received confirmation in November 2015 that AFFI members agreed with the changes, and had no additional comments.

Conclusions

These proposed standards would establish the grade levels ''A,'' ''B,'' and ''Substandard,'' as well as proposed AQL tolerances and acceptance numbers for each quality factor as defined for each grade level.

AMS used the standard format for U.S. standards for grades using ''individual attributes.'' Specifically, the proposed grade standards would provide for tolerance limits for defects; acceptance numbers of allowable defects with single letter grade designation based on a specified number or weight of sample units; a product description for frozen onions; and, style designations for ''whole,'' ''strips,'' ''diced,'' and ''other'' styles. The proposal also would define quality factors, AQLs, and tolerances for defects in frozen onions, and determine sample unit sizes for this commodity. The grade of a sample unit of frozen onions would be ascertained considering the factors of varietal characteristics, color, flavor and odor, appearance, absence of grit or dirt, defects, and character.

These voluntary grade standards would provide a common language for trade, a means of measuring value in marketing, and guidance in the effective use of frozen onions.

The official grade of a lot of frozen onions covered by these standards would be determined by the procedures set forth in the Regulations Governing Inspection and Certification of Processed Fruits and Vegetables, Processed Products Thereof, and Certain Other Processed Food Products (7 CFR 52.1 to 52.83).

AMS is publishing this notice with a 60-day comment period that will provide a sufficient amount of time for interested persons to comment on the proposed new grade standards for frozen onions.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1621–1627

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Elanor Starmer,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–28255 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 966

[Doc. No. AMS–SC–16–0088; SC16–966–1 PR]

Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Increased Assessment Rate

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule would implement a recommendation from the Florida Tomato Committee (Committee) to increase the assessment rate established for the 2016–17 and subsequent fiscal periods from $0.03 to $0.035 per 25-pound carton of tomatoes handled under the marketing order (order). The Committee locally administers the order and is comprised of producers of tomatoes operating within the area of production. Assessments upon Florida tomato handlers are used by the Committee to fund reasonable and necessary expenses of the program. The fiscal period begins August 1 and ends July 31. The assessment rate would remain in effect indefinitely unless modified, suspended, or terminated.

DATES: Comments must be received by December 8, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning this proposed rule. Comments must be sent to the Docket Clerk, Marketing Order and Agreement Division, Specialty Crops Program, AMS, USDA, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., STOP 0237, Washington, DC 20250–0237; Fax: (202) 720–8938; or Internet: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Comments should reference the document number and the date and page number of this issue of the **Federal Register** and will be available for public

inspection in the Office of the Docket Clerk during regular business hours, or can be viewed at: *http://www.regulations.gov.* All comments submitted in response to this proposed rule will be included in the record and will be made available to the public. Please be advised that the identity of the individuals or entities submitting the comments will be made public on the Internet at the address provided above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven W. Kauffman, Marketing Specialist, or Christian D. Nissen, Regional Director, Southeast Marketing Field Office, Marketing Order and Agreement Division, Specialty Crops Program, AMS, USDA; Telephone: (863) 324–3375, Fax: (863) 291–8614, or Email: *Steven.Kauffman@ams.usda.gov* or *Christian.Nissen@ams.usda.gov*.

Small businesses may request information on complying with this regulation by contacting Richard Lower, Marketing Order and Agreement Division, Specialty Crops Program, AMS, USDA, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., STOP 0237, Washington, DC 20250–0237; Telephone: (202) 720–2491, Fax: (202)720–8938, or Email: *Richard.Lower@ams.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This proposed rule is issued under Marketing Agreement No. 125 and Order No. 966, both as amended (7 CFR part 966), regulating the handling of tomatoes grown in Florida, hereinafter referred to as the ''order.'' The order is effective under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674), hereinafter referred to as the ''Act.''

The Department of Agriculture (USDA) is issuing this proposed rule in conformance with Executive Orders 12866, 13563, and 13175.

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. Under the marketing order now in effect, Florida tomato handlers are subject to assessments. Funds to administer the order are derived from such assessments. It is intended that the assessment rate as proposed herein would be applicable to all assessable Florida tomatoes beginning on August 1, 2016, and continue until amended, suspended, or terminated.

The Act provides that administrative proceedings must be exhausted before parties may file suit in court. Under section 608c(15)(A) of the Act, any handler subject to an order may file with USDA a petition stating that the order, any provision of the order, or any obligation imposed in connection with the order is not in accordance with law and request a modification of the order or to be exempted therefrom. Such handler is afforded the opportunity for a hearing on the petition. After the hearing, USDA would rule on the petition. The Act provides that the district court of the United States in any district in which the handler is an inhabitant, or has his or her principal place of business, has jurisdiction to review USDA's ruling on the petition, provided an action is filed not later than 20 days after the date of the entry of the ruling.

This proposed rule would increase the assessment rate established for the Committee for the 2016–17 and subsequent fiscal periods from $0.03 to $0.035 per 25-pound carton of tomatoes.

The Florida tomato marketing order provides authority for the Committee, with the approval of USDA, to formulate an annual budget of expenses and collect assessments from handlers to administer the program. The members of the Committee are producers of Florida tomatoes. They are familiar with the Committee's needs and with the costs of goods and services in their local area and are thus in a position to formulate an appropriate budget and assessment rate. The assessment rate is formulated and discussed in a public meeting. Thus, all directly affected persons have an opportunity to participate and provide input.

For the 2015–16 and subsequent fiscal periods, the Committee recommended, and USDA approved, an assessment rate of $0.03 per 25-pound carton of tomatoes that would continue in effect from fiscal period to fiscal period unless modified, suspended, or terminated by USDA upon recommendation and information submitted by the Committee or other information available to USDA.

The Committee met on August 16, 2016, and unanimously recommended 2016–17 expenditures of $1,494,600 and an assessment rate of $0.035 per 25-pound carton of tomatoes. In comparison, last year's budgeted expenditures were $1,513,177. The assessment rate of $0.035 is $0.005 higher than the rate currently in effect. At the current assessment rate, assessment income would equal only $990,000, an amount insufficient to cover the Committee's anticipated expenditures of $1,494,600. The Committee considered the proposed expenses and recommended increasing the assessment rate.

The major expenditures recommended by the Committee for the 2016–17 year include $450,000 for salaries, $400,000 for research, and $400,000 for education and promotion. Budgeted expenses for these items in 2015–16 were $435,377, $400,000, and $400,000, respectively.

The assessment rate recommended by the Committee was derived by dividing anticipated expenses by expected shipments of Florida tomatoes. Florida tomato shipments for the 2016–17 year are estimated at 33 million 25-pound cartons, which should provide $1,155,000 in assessment income. Income derived from handler assessments, along with interest income, block grants, and funds from the Committee's authorized reserve, would be adequate to cover budgeted expenses. Funds in the reserve (approximately $999,361) would be kept within the maximum permitted by the order of no more than approximately one fiscal period's expenses as stated in § 966.44.

The proposed assessment rate would continue in effect indefinitely unless modified, suspended, or terminated by USDA upon recommendation and information submitted by the Committee or other available information.

Although this assessment rate would be in effect for an indefinite period, the Committee would continue to meet prior to or during each fiscal period to recommend a budget of expenses and consider recommendations for modification of the assessment rate. The dates and times of Committee meetings are available from the Committee or USDA. Committee meetings are open to the public, and interested persons may express their views at these meetings. USDA would evaluate Committee recommendations and other available information to determine whether modification of the assessment rate is needed. Further rulemaking would be undertaken as necessary. The Committee's 2016–17 budget and those for subsequent fiscal periods would be reviewed and, as appropriate, approved by USDA.

Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

Pursuant to requirements set forth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601–612), the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) has considered the economic impact of this proposed rule on small entities. Accordingly, AMS has prepared this initial regulatory flexibility analysis.

The purpose of the RFA is to fit regulatory actions to the scale of businesses subject to such actions in order that small businesses will not be unduly or disproportionately burdened. Marketing orders issued pursuant to the Act, and the rules issued thereunder, are unique in that they are brought about through group action of essentially

small entities acting on their own behalf.

There are approximately 100 producers of tomatoes in the production area and approximately 80 handlers subject to regulation under the marketing order. Small agricultural producers are defined by the Small Business Administration (SBA) as those having annual receipts less than $750,000, and small agricultural service firms are defined as those whose annual receipts are less than $7,500,000 (13 CFR 121.201).

Based on industry and Committee data, the average annual price for fresh Florida tomatoes during the 2015–16 season was approximately $11.27 per 25-pound carton, and total fresh shipments were approximately 28.2 million cartons. Using the average price and shipment information, number of handlers, and assuming a normal distribution, the majority of handlers have average annual receipts below $7,500,000. In addition, based on production data, an estimated grower price of $6.25, and the total number of Florida tomato growers, the average annual grower revenue is above $750,000. Thus, a majority of the handlers of Florida tomatoes may be classified as small entities while a majority of the producers may be classified as large entities.

This proposal would increase the assessment rate established for the Committee and collected from handlers for the 2016–17 and subsequent fiscal periods from $0.03 to $0.035 per 25-pound carton of tomatoes. The Committee unanimously recommended 2016–17 expenditures of $1,494,600 and an assessment rate of $0.035 per 25-pound carton handled. The proposed assessment rate of $0.035 is $.005 higher than the 2015–16 rate. The quantity of assessable tomatoes for the 2016–17 season is estimated at 33 million 25-pound cartons. Thus, the $0.035 rate should provide $1,155,000 in assessment income. Income derived from handler assessments, along with funds from interest income, MAP funds, and block grants, should provide sufficient funds to meet this year's anticipated expenses.

The major expenditures recommended by the Committee for the 2016–17 year include $450,000 for salaries, $400,000 for research, and $400,000 for education and promotion. Budgeted expenses for these items in 2015–16 were $435,377, $400,000, and $400,000, respectively.

At the current assessment rate, assessment income would equal only $990,000, an amount insufficient to cover the Committee's anticipated expenditures of $1,494,600. The Committee considered the proposed expenses and recommended increasing the assessment rate.

Prior to arriving at this budget and assessment rate, the Committee considered information from various sources, such as the Committee's Executive Subcommittee, Research Subcommittee, and Education and Promotion Subcommittee. Alternative expenditure levels were discussed by these groups, based upon the relative value of various activities to the tomato industry. The Committee determined that 2016–17 expenditures of $1,494,600 were appropriate, and the recommended assessment rate, along with funds from interest income, block grants, and funds from reserves, would be adequate to cover budgeted expenses.

A review of historical information and preliminary information pertaining to the upcoming crop year indicates that the average grower price for the 2016–17 season could be approximately $6.50 per 25-pound carton of tomatoes. Therefore, the estimated assessment revenue for the 2016–17 crop year as a percentage of total grower revenue would be approximately 0.5 percent.

This action would increase the assessment obligation imposed on handlers. While assessments impose some additional costs on handlers, the costs are minimal and uniform on all handlers. Some of the additional costs may be passed on to producers. However, these costs would be offset by the benefits derived by the operation of the marketing order.

The Committee's meeting was widely publicized throughout the Florida tomato industry, and all interested persons were invited to attend the meeting and participate in Committee deliberations on all issues. Like all Committee meetings, the August 16, 2016, meeting was a public meeting, and all entities, both large and small, were able to express views on this issue. Finally, interested persons are invited to submit comments on this proposed rule, including the regulatory and informational impacts of this action on small businesses.

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the order's information collection requirements have been previously approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and assigned OMB No. 0581–0178 Vegetable and Specialty Crops. No changes in those requirements are necessary as a result of this action. Should any changes become necessary, they would be submitted to OMB for approval.

This proposed rule would impose no additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either small or large Florida tomato handlers. As with all Federal marketing order programs, reports and forms are periodically reviewed to reduce information requirements and duplication by industry and public sector agencies.

AMS is committed to complying with the E-Government Act, to promote the use of the Internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

USDA has not identified any relevant Federal rules that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with this action.

A small business guide on complying with fruit, vegetable, and specialty crop marketing agreements and orders may be viewed at: *http://www.ams.usda.gov/rules-regulations/moa/small-businesses*. Any questions about the compliance guide should be sent to Richard Lower at the previously mentioned address in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

A 15-day comment period is provided to allow interested persons to respond to this proposed rule. Fifteen days is deemed appropriate because: (1) The 2016–17 fiscal period began on August 1, 2016, and the marketing order requires that the rate of assessment for each fiscal period apply to all assessable Florida tomatoes handled during such fiscal period; (2) the Committee needs to have sufficient funds to pay its expenses, which are incurred on a continuous basis; and (3) handlers are aware of this action, which was unanimously recommended by the Committee at a public meeting and is similar to other assessment rate actions issued in past years.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 966

Marketing agreements, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Tomatoes.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR part 966 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 966—TOMATOES GROWN IN FLORIDA

■ 1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 966 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

■ 2. Section 966.234 is revised to read as follows:

§ 966.234 Assessment rate.

On and after August 1, 2016, an assessment rate of $0.035 per 25-pound carton is established for Florida tomatoes.

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Elanor Starmer,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–28259 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Parts 1150, 1160, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1212, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1222, 1230, 1250, and 1260

[Document Number AMS–DA–16–0101]

Provisions for Removing Commodity Research and Promotion Board Members and Staff

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposal would amend the research and promotion orders—or the regulations under the orders—overseen by the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) to provide uniform authority for the removal of board members and staff who fail to perform their duties or who engage in dishonest actions or willful misconduct. The removal provisions in 13 of the orders would be modified to allow the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to take action necessary to ensure the boards can continue to fulfill their intended purposes with minimal disruption. Removal provisions would be added to the six orders that do not currently provide for such action.

DATES: Comments must be received by December 8, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning this proposed rule. Comments may be submitted on the internet at: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Written comments may also be sent to Laurel L. May, Senior Marketing Specialist, Order Formulation and Enforcement Division, USDA/AMS/Dairy Program, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., Room 2967–S—Stop 0231, Washington, DC 20250–0231; facsimile: 202–690–0552. All comments should reference the document number and the date and page number of this issue of the **Federal Register**, and will be made available for public inspection in the above office during regular business hours, or may be viewed at: *http://www.regluations.gov.* Please be advised that the identity of the individuals or entities submitting the comments will be made public on the internet at the address provided above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laurel L. May, Senior Marketing Specialist, USDA/AMS/Dairy Program, telephone 202–690–1366, or email *Laurel.May@ams.usda.gov;* or Whitney Rick, Director; Promotion, Research, and Planning Division; USDA/AMS/Dairy Program; telephone 202–720–6961; or email *Whitney.Rick@ams.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This proposed rule is issued under 19 of the commodity research and promotion orders established under the following acts: Beef Promotion and Research Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 2901–2911); Commodity Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7411–7425); Cotton Research and Promotion Act of 1966 (7 U.S.C. 2101–2118); Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 4501–4514); Egg Research and Consumer Information Act of 1974 (7 U.S.C. 2701–2718); Fluid Milk Promotion Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6401–6417); Hass Avocado Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 2000 (U.S.C. 7801–7813); Mushroom Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6101–6112); Popcorn Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7481–7491); Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 4801–4819); Potato Research and Promotion Act of 1971 (7 U.S.C. 2611–2627); and Watermelon Research and Promotion Act (7 U.S.C. 4901–4916). These acts are collectively referred to as ''commodity research and promotion laws'' or ''acts.''

The preceding acts provide that administrative proceedings must be exhausted before parties may file suit in court. Under those acts, any person subject to an order may file a petition with the Secretary of Agriculture (Secretary) stating that the order, any provision of the order, or any obligation imposed in connection with the order is not in accordance with laws and request a modification of the order or to be exempted therefrom. The petitioner is afforded the opportunity for a hearing on the petition. After the hearing, the Secretary will make a ruling on the petition. The acts provide that the district courts of the United States in any district in which the person is an inhabitant, or has his or her principal place of business, has the jurisdiction to review the Secretary's rule, provided a complaint is filed within 20 days from the date of the entry of the ruling. There are no administrative proceedings that must be exhausted prior to any judicial challenge to the provision of the Beef Promotion and Research Act of 1985.

Executive Order 12866 and Executive Order 13563

USDA is issuing this proposed rule in conformance with Executive Orders 12866 and 13563. Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health, and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, reducing costs, harmonizing rules, and promoting flexibility. This action has been designated as a ''non-significant regulatory action'' under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the Office of Management and Budget has waived the review process.

Executive Order 13175

This proposed rule has been reviewed in accordance with the requirements of Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments. The review reveals that this regulation would not have substantial and direct effects on Tribal governments and would not have significant Tribal implications.

Executive Order 12988

Beef Promotion and Research Act of 1985

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. It is not intended to have retroactive effect. Section 11 of the Beef Promotion and Research Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 2910) provides that it shall not preempt or supersede any other program relating to beef promotion organized and operated under the laws of the United States or any State.

Commodity Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1996

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. It is not intended to have retroactive effect. Section 524 of the Commodity Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7423) provides that it shall not affect or preempt any other Federal or State law authorizing promotion or research relating to an agricultural commodity.

Cotton Research and Promotion Act of 1966

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. The proposed rule is not intended to have retroactive effect.

Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. The proposed rule is not intended to have retroactive effect. Section 1221 of the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 provides that nothing in this Act may be construed to preempt or superseded any other program relating to dairy product promotion organized and operated under the laws of the United States or any State.

Egg Research and Consumer Information Act of 1974

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. The proposed rule is not intended to have retroactive effect.

Fluid Milk Promotion Act of 1990

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. The proposed rule is not intended to have retroactive effect.

Hass Avocado Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 2000

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. It is not intended to have retroactive effect. Section 1212(c) of the Hass Avocado Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 7811) provides that nothing in this Act may be construed to preempt or supersede any program relating to Hass avocado promotion, research, industry information, and consumer information organized and operated under the laws of the United States or of a State.

Mushroom Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act of 1990

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. It is not intended to have retroactive effect. Section 1930 of the Mushroom Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6109) provides that nothing in this Act may be construed to preempt or supersede any program relating to mushroom promotion, research, industry information, and consumer information organized and operated under the laws of the United States or of a State.

Popcorn Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act of 1996

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. It is not intended to have retroactive effect. Section 580 of the Popcorn Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7489) provides that nothing in this Act may be construed to preempt or supersede any program relating to popcorn promotion organized and operated under the laws of the United States or of a State.

Potato Research and Promotion Act of 1971

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. It is not intended to have retroactive effect.

Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act of 1985

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. It is not intended to have retroactive effect. Section 1628 of the Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 4817) states that the statute is intended to occupy the field of promotion and consumer education involving pork and pork products and of obtaining funds thereof from pork producers. The regulation of such activity (other than a regulation or requirements relating to a matter of public health or the provision of State or local funds for such activity) that is in addition to or different from the Pork Act may not be imposed by a State.

Watermelon Research and Promotion Act

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. It is not intended to have retroactive effect.

Proposed Rule

USDA is proposing amendments to the orders and/or rules and regulations for 19 of the 22 national commodity research and promotion programs overseen by AMS. Each of the programs is administered by a board or council comprised of industry stakeholders, who are appointed by the Secretary to chart the course of the promotion and research activities undertaken by each commodity research and promotion program. The boards and councils hire staffs to carry out the day-to-day business operations of the programs. The proposed amendments would establish uniform provisions across all the programs for removing board and council members and their employees as necessary to preserve program integrity.

Currently, 16 of AMS's 22 research and promotion programs specify provisions for removing board and council members or their staff employees when they are unwilling or unable to perform their duties properly or when they engage in prohibited or illegal activities or other willful misconduct. Some of the programs require the board or council to first make a recommendation for removal to the Secretary, who then determines whether such action is appropriate. Six of the programs include no removal provisions.

The need to remove board and council members and staff from service is infrequent; but situations do arise that require immediate AMS action to ensure program integrity is maintained and to mitigate damage from illegal or inappropriate behavior. Examples of such situations include, but are not limited to, those occasions when board or council members find that they cannot commit enough time to board or council business and are unable to consistently attend meetings or fulfill program assignments. In such cases, it may be difficult for the board or council to meet quorum requirements or make urgent business decisions. In other situations, board or council members or their employees might violate program policies regarding lobbying and influencing government action or policy or violate anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, or anti-trust laws, all of which impede program integrity and the ability to conduct normal business. Board or council members or their employees might mishandle program funds or commit other dishonest acts injurious to all program participants. In each case, the Secretary must have the ability to initiate removal actions, applying consistent criteria and procedures across all programs. Improved AMS oversight would ensure these industry boards and councils can continue to fulfill their appointed purposes.

Currently, three of AMS's research and promotion orders (for soybeans, sorghum, and lamb) contain identical language related to removing board and council members and staff that would be appropriate for use in the other 19 programs. The language authorizes the Secretary to initiate removal action against any person (board or council member or employee) for failure or refusal to perform his or her duties properly or for engaging in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct. The Secretary is authorized to remove that person if the he or she determines that

person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the act under which the program is established.

This proposed rule would amend 11 of the orders by replacing current provisions with the language used in the soybean, sorghum, and lamb orders, to provide identical authority for the Secretary to take appropriate removal action when necessary to preserve program integrity. Specifically, the following sections in each order would be amended:

Mango Promotion, Research, and Information Order	§ 1206.33(b).
Processed Raspberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order	§ 1208.43(b).
Mushroom Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Order	§ 1209.35(c).
Honey Packers and Importers Research, Promotion, Education and Information Order	§ 1212.43(b).
Christmas Tree Promotion, Research, and Information Order	§ 1214.43(b).
Popcorn Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Order	§ 1215.26.
Softwood Lumber Research, Promotion, Consumer Education, and Industry Information Order	§ 1217.43(b).
Blueberry Promotion, Research and Information Order	§ 1218.43(b).
Paper and Paper-Based Packaging Promotion, Research, and Information Order	§ 1222.43(a).
Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Order	§§ 1230.35 and 1230.55.
Beef Promotion and Research Order	§ 1260.213.

Additionally, this proposed rule would suspend the current removal authority under two orders. The language proposed for use in all the other orders, as currently provided in the orders for soybeans, sorghum, and lamb, would be added to the rules and regulations under the three orders to provide identical authority for the Secretary to take appropriate removal action when necessary to preserve program integrity. Specifically, new regulations would be added to replace language suspended in the following sections:

Watermelon Research and Promotion Plan	§ 1210.324(b)
Hass Avocado Promotion, Research and Information Order	§ 1219.36(b)

Finally, this proposed rule would add removal authority to the six orders or the rules and regulations under the orders that do not currently specify such provisions. The language proposed for use in all the other orders, as currently provided in the orders for soybeans, sorghum, and lamb, would be added to provide identical authority for the Secretary to take appropriate removal action when necessary to preserve program integrity. Specifically, removal language would be added to each of the following:

Dairy Promotion and Research Order	§ 1150.136.
National Fluid Milk Processor Promotion Order	§ 1160.25.
Cotton Research and Promotion—Cotton Board Rules and Regulations	§ 1205.506 (new).
Potato Research and Promotion Plan	§ 1207.324.
Peanut Promotion, Research, and Information Order	§ 1216.44.
Egg Research and Promotion Order	§ 1250.331.

This proposed rule is intended to strengthen AMS's oversight of the commodity research and promotion programs to protect the interests of the regulated industries. The proposed removal language to be applied to all of the orders would not preclude the ability of the boards or councils to initiate action to remove members if they become aware of situations requiring such action. Nevertheless, board or council recommendations regarding removals would not be required for AMS to take action, as they currently are under some of the orders. AMS would be able to take immediate action to investigate possible violations of order provisions, policies, and laws without waiting for a formal request to do so from the board or council. AMS would also be able to apply consistent criteria for board or council member removal across all the programs as necessary to ensure program integrity.

Initial Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

In accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601–612), AMS is required to examine the impact of this proposed rule on small entities. The purpose of the RFA is to fit regulatory actions to the scale of businesses subject to such actions in order that small businesses will not be unduly or disproportionately burdened. Accordingly, AMS has considered the economic impact of this action on small entities and has prepared this initial regulatory flexibility analysis.

Small agricultural service firms are defined by the Small Business Administration (SBA) as those having annual receipts of less than $7,000,000, and small agricultural producers are defined as those having annual receipts of less than $750,000 (13 CFR 121.201).

Research and promotion programs established under the various commodity research and promotion acts, and the rules and regulations issued thereunder, are uniquely brought about through group action of essentially small entities acting on their own behalf. The boards and councils that administer the programs are largely comprised of producers, handlers, processors, manufacturers, and importers of the regulated commodities, who are nominated by their industries and selected by the Secretary to recommend, plan, and conduct generic promotion and research projects that will benefit all industry members, regardless of size.

In most cases, board and council members are nominated by their peers in specific regions or states where the commodity is produced to represent those areas. Some programs may provide for board or council representation according to the member's production volume. Every effort is made to ensure that boards and councils are composed of diverse members of all business sizes in order to assure proper representation of all

segments of the regulated industries. Thus, across the 19 boards and councils that would be affected by this proposed rule, there are any number of large or small entities serving as members at any one time.

This rule is intended to facilitate the removal of individual board and council members, or employees of the boards and councils, who are no longer able to perform their duties or who have engaged in dishonest acts or other willful misconduct. The proposed removal criteria and procedures would pertain to the removal of any board or council member, regardless of the size of the business entity they represent, or any employee of the boards or councils, whose continued service would be detrimental to the programs.

No negative or disproportionate impacts on large or small entities are anticipated in connection with this proposed rule. The positive impacts, which are expected to accrue to all industry members, both large and small, are improved AMS oversight of the commodity research and promotion programs and the improved integrity and effectiveness of those programs, which are designed to benefit all commodity producers, handlers, importers, and consumers, regardless of size.

AMS considered alternatives to this proposed rule, including variations to the removal provision language to be applied to all the orders, or doing nothing at all. After consideration, AMS opted to propose the provision language that would give the boards, councils, and the Secretary the ability to initiate and carry out removal proceedings when necessary. The proposal would also allow AMS to apply uniform oversight across all programs. In this way, AMS would be able to provide more effective oversight of the 22 commodity research and promotion programs.

This proposed rule would not impose any additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either small or large entities. In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the information collection requirements of the 19 affected commodity research and promotion programs (7 CFR parts 1150, 1160, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1212, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1222, 1230, 1250, and 1260) have previously been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under those orders. All reports and forms used in the AMS research and promotion programs are periodically reviewed to reduce information requirements and duplication by industry and public sector agencies. In addition, USDA has not identified any relevant Federal rules that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with this rule.

AMS is committed to complying with the E-Government act, to promote the use of the internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on this proposed rule, including the regulatory and informational impacts of this action on small businesses.

While this proposed rule has not received the approval of USDA, it has been determined that it is consistent with and would effectuate the purposes of the Commodity Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1996, for the programs to which the Act is applicable.

A 15-day comment period for the proposed rule is provided to allow interested persons to submit written comments on the proposed changes to the provisions for removing research and promotion board and council members, or board and council employees, from service. All comments timely received will be considered before a final determination is made on this matter.

List of Subjects

7 CFR Part 1150

Administrative practice and procedure, Dairy products, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Research.

7 CFR Part 1160

Administrative practice and procedure, Fluid milk products, Promotion, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1205

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Agricultural research, Cotton, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1206

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Agricultural research, Mango, Marketing agreements, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1207

Advertising, Agricultural research, Imports, Potatoes, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1208

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Consumer information, Marketing agreements, Raspberry promotion, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CRF Part 1209

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Agricultural research, Imports, Mushrooms, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CRF Part 1210

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Agricultural research, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Watermelons.

7 CFR Part 1212

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Consumer education, Honey and honey products, Marketing agreements, Promotion, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1214

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Christmas trees, promotion, Consumer information, Marketing agreements, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1215

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Agricultural research, Popcorn, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1216

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Agricultural research, Peanuts, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1217

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Consumer Information, Marketing agreements, Promotion, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Softwood lumber.

7 CFR Part 1218

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Agricultural research, Blueberries, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1219

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Agricultural research, Hass avocados, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1222

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Consumer

information, Marketing agreements, Paper and paper-based packaging promotion, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1230

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Agricultural research, Marketing agreements, Pork and pork products, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1250

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Agricultural research, Eggs and egg products, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

7 CFR Part 1260

Administrative practice and procedure, Advertising, Agricultural research, Imports, Marketing agreements, Meat and meat products, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR parts 1150, 1160, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1212, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1222, 1230, 1250, and 1260 are proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 1150—DAIRY PROMOTION PROGRAM

■ 1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1150 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 4501–4514 and 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 2. In § 1150.136, redesignate the introductory text as paragraph (a), and add a new paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 1150.136 Vacancies.

* * * * *

(b) If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

PART 1160—FLUID MILK PROMOTION PROGRAM

■ 3. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1160 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 6401–6417 and 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 4. In § 1160.205, redesignate the introductory text as paragraph (a), and add a new paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 1160.205 Vacancies.

* * * * *

(b) If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

PART 1205—COTTON RESEARCH AND PROMOTION

■ 5. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1205 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 2101–2118.

■ 6. Add § 1205.506 under the undesignated center heading ''General'' in the Subpart—Cotton Board Rules and Regulations to read as follows:

§ 1205.506 Removal.

If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

PART 1206—MANGO PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION

■ 7. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1206 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7411–7425 and 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 8. In § 1206.33, revise paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 1206.33 Vacancies.

* * * * *

(b) If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

* * * * *

PART 1207—POTATO RESEARCH AND PROMOTION PLAN

■ 9. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1207 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 2611–2627 and 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 10. In § 1207.324, redesignate the introductory text as paragraph (a), and add a new paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 1207.324 Vacancies.

* * * * *

(b) If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

PART 1208—PROCESSED RASPBERRY PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION ORDER

■ 11. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1208 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7411–7425; 7 U.S.C. 7404.

■ 12. In § 1208.43, revise paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 1208.43 Vacancies.

* * * * *

(b) If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Council may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

* * * * *

PART 1209—MUSHROOM PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND CONSUMER INFORMATION ORDER

■ 13. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1209 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 6101–6112 and 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 14. In § 1209.35, revise paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 1209.35 Vacancies.

* * * * *

(c) If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Council may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

PART 1210—WATERMELON RESEARCH AND PROMOTION PLAN

■ 15. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1210 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 4901–4916 and 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 16. In § 1210.324, suspend paragraph (b) indefinitely.

■ 17. Add § 1210.503 under the undesignated center heading ''General'' in Subpart C—Rules and Regulations to read as follows:

§ 1210.503 Removal.

If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

PART 1212—HONEY PACKERS AND IMPORTER RESEARCH, PROMOTION, CONSUMER EDUCATION AND INDUSTRY INFORMATION ORDER

■ 18. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1212 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7411–7425; 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 19. In § 1212.43, revise paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 1212.43 Removal and Vacancies.

* * * * *

(b) If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

* * * * *

PART 1214—CHRISTMAS TREE PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION ORDER

■ 20. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1214 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7411—7425; 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 21. In § 1214.43, revise paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 1214.43 Vacancies.

* * * * *

(b) If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

PART 1215—POPCORN PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND CONSUMER INFORMATION

■ 22. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1215 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7481–7491 and 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 23. Revise § 1215.26 to read as follows:

§ 1215.26 Removal.

If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

PART 1216—PEANUT PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION ORDER

■ 24. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1216 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7411–7425 and 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 25. In § 1216.44, redesignate the introductory text as paragraph (a), and add paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 1216.44 Vacancies.

* * * * *

(b) If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

PART 1217—SOFTWOOD LUMBER RESEARCH, PROMOTION, CONSUMER EDUCATION, AND INDUSTRY INFORMATION ORDER

■ 26. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1217 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7411–7425; 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 27. In § 1217.43, revise paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 1217.43 Removal and Vacancies.

* * * * *

(b) If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

* * * * *

PART 1218—BLUEBERRY PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION ORDER

■ 28. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1218 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7411–7425 and 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 28. In § 1218.43, revise paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 1218.43 Vacancies.

* * * * *

(b) If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Council may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

* * * * *

PART 1219—HASS AVOCADO PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION

■ 29. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1219 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7801–7813 and U.S.C. 7401.

■ 30. In § 1219.36, suspend paragraph (b) indefinitely.

■ 31. Add § 1219.204 under Subpart C—Rules and Regulations to read as follows:

§ 1219.204 Removal.

If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

PART 1222—PAPER AND PAPER-BASED PACKAGING PROMOTION, RESEARCH AND INFORMATION ORDER

■ 32. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1222 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 7411–7425; 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 33. In § 1222.43, revise paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 1222.43 Removal and vacancies.

(a) If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

* * * * *

PART 1230—PORK PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND CONSUMER INFORMATION

■ 34. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1230 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 4801–4819 and 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 35. Add § 1230.40, to read as follows:

§ 1230.40 Removal.

If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

■ 36. Add § 1230.59, to read as follows:

§ 1230.59 Removal.

If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

PART 1250—EGG RESEARCH AND PROMOTION

■ 37. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1250 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 2701–2718 and 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 38. Add § 1250.511 under the undesignated section heading ''General'' in Subpart—Rules and Regulations to read as follows:

§ 1250.511 Removal.

If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

PART 1260—BEEF PROMOTION AND RESEARCH

■ 39. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 1260 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 2901–2911 and 7 U.S.C. 7401.

■ 40. Revise § 1260.213 to read as follows:

§ 1260.213 Removal.

If the Secretary determines that any person appointed under this part fails or refuses to perform his or her duties properly or engages in acts of dishonesty or willful misconduct, the Secretary shall remove the person from office. A person appointed under this part or any employee of the Board or Committee may be removed by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that the person's continued service would be detrimental to the purposes of the Act.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Elanor Starmer,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–28050 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 101

[Docket No. FDA–2016–D–3401]

Scientific Evaluation of the Evidence on the Beneficial Physiological Effects of Isolated or Synthetic Non-Digestible Carbohydrates Submitted as a Citizen Petition; Draft Guidance for Industry; Availability

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notification of availability.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or we) is announcing the availability of a draft guidance entitled ''Scientific Evaluation of the Evidence on the Beneficial Physiological Effects of Isolated or Synthetic Non-digestible Carbohydrates Submitted as a Citizen Petition (21 CFR 10.30).'' The draft guidance, when finalized, will describe our views on the scientific evidence needed and the approach to evaluating the scientific evidence on the physiological effects of isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrates that are added to foods that are beneficial to human health.

DATES: Although you can comment on any guidance at any time (see 21 CFR 10.115(g)(5)), to ensure that the Agency considers your comment on the draft guidance before it begins work on the final version of the guidance, submit either electronic or written comments on this document by January 23, 2017.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments as follows:

Electronic Submissions

Submit electronic comments in the following way:

• *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments. Comments submitted electronically, including attachments, to *http://www.regulations.gov* will be posted to the docket unchanged. Because your comment will be made public, you are solely responsible for ensuring that your comment does not include any confidential information that you or a

third party may not wish to be posted, such as medical information, your or anyone else's Social Security number, or confidential business information, such as a manufacturing process. Please note that if you include your name, contact information, or other information that identifies you in the body of your comments, that information will be posted on *http://www.regulations.gov.*

• If you want to submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made available to the public, submit the comment as a written/paper submission and in the manner detailed (see ''Written/Paper Submissions'' and ''Instructions'').

Written/Paper Submissions

Submit written/paper submissions as follows:

• *Mail/Hand delivery/Courier (for written/paper submissions):* Division of Dockets Management (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

• For written/paper comments submitted to the Division of Dockets Management, FDA will post your comment, as well as any attachments, except for information submitted, marked and identified, as confidential, if submitted as detailed in ''Instructions.''

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket No. FDA–2016–D–3401 for ''Scientific Evaluation of the Evidence on the Beneficial Physiological Effects of Isolated or Synthetic Non-digestible Carbohydrates Submitted as a Citizen Petition (21 CFR 10.30).'' Received comments will be placed in the docket and, except for those submitted as ''Confidential Submissions,'' publicly viewable at *http://www.regulations.gov* or at the Division of Dockets Management between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

• *Confidential Submissions*—To submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made publicly available, submit your comments only as a written/paper submission. You should submit two copies total. One copy will include the information you claim to be confidential with a heading or cover note that states ''THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.'' The Agency will review this copy, including the claimed confidential information, in its consideration of comments. The second copy, which will have the claimed confidential information redacted/blacked out, will be available for public viewing and posted on *http://www.regulations.gov.* Submit both copies to the Division of Dockets Management. If you do not wish your name and contact information to be made publicly available, you can provide this information on the cover sheet and not in the body of your comments and you must identify this information as ''confidential.'' Any information marked as ''confidential'' will not be disclosed except in accordance with 21 CFR 10.20 and other applicable disclosure law. For more information about FDA's posting of comments to public dockets, see 80 FR 56469, September 18, 2015, or access the information at: *http://www.fda.gov/regulatoryinformation/dockets/default.htm.*

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or the electronic and written/paper comments received, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and insert the docket number, found in brackets in the heading of this document, into the ''Search'' box and follow the prompts and/or go to the Division of Dockets Management, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

Submit written requests for single copies of the draft guidance to the Office of Nutrition and Food Labeling, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–830), Food and Drug Administration, 5001 Campus Dr., College Park, MD 20740. Send two self-addressed adhesive labels to assist that office in processing your request. See the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for electronic access to the draft guidance.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paula R. Trumbo, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–830), Food and Drug Administration, 5001 Campus Dr., College Park, MD 20740, 240–402–2579.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

We are announcing the availability of a draft guidance for industry entitled ''Scientific Evaluation of the Evidence on the Beneficial Physiological Effects of Isolated or Synthetic Non-digestible Carbohydrates Submitted as a Citizen Petition (21 CFR 10.30).'' We are issuing the draft guidance consistent with our good guidance practices regulation (21 CFR 10.115). The draft guidance, when finalized, will represent the current thinking of FDA on this topic. It does not establish any rights for any person and is not binding on FDA or the public. You can use an alternate approach if it satisfies the requirements of the applicable statutes and regulations.

In the **Federal Register** of May 27, 2016 (81 FR 33741), we published a final rule amending our Nutrition and Supplement Facts label regulations. The final rule provides a definition of dietary fiber as non-digestible soluble and insoluble carbohydrates (with 3 or more monomeric units), and lignin that are intrinsic and intact in plants; isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrates (with 3 or more monomeric units) determined by FDA to have physiological effects that are beneficial to human health § 101.9(c)(6)(i)) (21 CFR 101.9 (c)(6)(i)). One mechanism by which a manufacturer could request an amendment to the dietary fiber definition is by using the citizen petition process in § 10.30. If an isolated or synthetic nondigestible carbohydrate meets the dietary fiber definition, then it would be added to the list of dietary fibers in the definition in § 101.9(c)(6)(i)).

The draft guidance document represents our current thinking regarding the type of scientific evidence on which we will rely and the scientific evaluation process we plan to use in determining the strength of the evidence for the relationship between an isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrate that is added to food and a physiological effect that is beneficial to human health.

II. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

The draft guidance refers to previously approved collections of information found in FDA regulations. These collections of information are subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520). The collections of information in § 101.9 have been approved under OMB control number 0910–0813.

III. Electronic Access

Persons with access to the Internet may obtain the draft guidance at either *http://www.fda.gov/FoodGuidances* or *http://www.regulations.gov.* Use the FDA Web site listed in the previous sentence to find the most current version of the guidance.

Dated: November 14, 2016.

Leslie Kux,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–27949 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

26 CFR Part 1

[REG–136978–12]

RIN 1545–BL22

Fractions Rule

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document contains proposed regulations relating to the application of section 514(c)(9)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code (Code) to partnerships that hold debt-financed real property and have one or more (but not all) qualified tax-exempt organization partners within the meaning of section 514(c)(9)(C). The proposed regulations amend the current regulations under section 514(c)(9)(E) to allow certain allocations resulting from specified common business practices to comply with the rules under section 514(c)(9)(E). These regulations affect partnerships with qualified tax-exempt organization partners and their partners.

DATES: Written and electronic comments and requests for a public hearing must be received by February 21, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Send submissions to: CC:PA:LPD:PR (REG–136978–12), room 5203, Internal Revenue Service, P.O. Box 7604, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044. Submissions may be hand-delivered Monday through Friday between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. to: CC:PA:LPD:PR (REG–136978–12), Courier's Desk, Internal Revenue Service, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC, or sent electronically, via the Federal eRulemaking Portal site at *http://www.regulations.gov* (indicate IRS and REG–136978–12).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Concerning the proposed regulations, Caroline E. Hay at (202) 317–5279; concerning the submissions of comments and requests for a public hearing, Regina L. Johnson at (202) 317–6901 (not toll-free numbers).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

This document proposes amendments to the Income Tax Regulations (26 CFR part 1) under section 514(c)(9)(E) regarding the application of the fractions rule (as defined in the Background section of this preamble) to partnerships that hold debt-financed real property and have one or more (but not all) qualified tax-exempt organization partners.

In general, section 511 imposes a tax on the unrelated business taxable income (UBTI) of tax-exempt organizations. Section 514(a) defines UBTI to include a specified percentage of the gross income derived from debt-financed property described in section 514(b). Section 514(c)(9)(A) generally excepts from UBTI income derived from debt-financed real property acquired or improved by certain qualified organizations (QOs) described in section 514(c)(9)(C). Under section 514(c)(9)(C), a QO includes an educational organization described in section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii) and its affiliated support organizations described in section 509(a)(3), any trust which constitutes a qualified trust under section 401, an organization described in section 501(c)(25), and a retirement income account described in section 403(b)(9).

Section 514(c)(9)(B)(vi) provides that the exception from UBTI in section 514(c)(9)(A) does not apply if a QO owns an interest in a partnership that holds debt-financed real property (the partnership limitation), unless the partnership meets one of the following requirements: (1) all of the partners of the partnership are QOs, (2) each allocation to a QO is a qualified allocation (within the meaning of section 168(h)(6)), or (3) each partnership allocation has substantial economic effect under section 704(b)(2) and satisfies section 514(c)(9)(E)(i)(I) (the fractions rule).

A partnership allocation satisfies the fractions rule if the allocation of items to any partner that is a QO does not result in that partner having a share of overall partnership income for any taxable year greater than that partner's fractions rule percentage (the partner's share of overall partnership loss for the taxable year for which the partner's loss share is the smallest). Section 1.514(c)–2(c)(1) describes overall partnership income as the amount by which the aggregate items of partnership income and gain for the taxable year exceed the aggregate items of partnership loss and deduction for the year. Overall partnership loss is the amount by which the aggregate items of partnership loss and deduction for the taxable year exceed the aggregate items of partnership income and gain for the year.

Generally, under § 1.514(c)–2(b)(2)(i), a partnership must satisfy the fractions rule both on a prospective basis and on an actual basis for each taxable year of the partnership, beginning with the first taxable year of the partnership in which the partnership holds debt-financed real property and has a QO partner. However, certain allocations are taken into account for purposes of determining overall partnership income or loss only when actually made, and do not create an immediate violation of the fractions rule. See § 1.514(c)–2(b)(2)(i). Certain other allocations are disregarded for purposes of making fractions rule calculations. See, for example, § 1.514(c)–2(d) (reasonable preferred returns and reasonable guaranteed payments), § 1.514(c)–2(e) (certain chargebacks and offsets), § 1.514(c)–2(f) (reasonable partner-specific items of deduction and loss), § 1.514(c)–2(g) (unlikely losses and deductions), and § 1.514(c)–2(k)(3) (certain de minimis allocations of losses and deductions). In addition, § 1.514(c)–2(k)(1) provides that changes in partnership allocations that result from transfers or shifts of partnership interests (other than transfers from a QO to another QO) will be closely scrutinized, but generally will be taken into account only in determining whether the partnership satisfies the fractions rule in the taxable year of the change and subsequent taxable years. Section 1.514(c)–2(m) provides special rules for applying the fractions rule to tiered partnerships.

The Treasury Department and the IRS have received comments requesting targeted changes to the existing regulations under section 514(c)(9)(E) to allow certain allocations resulting from specified common business practices to comply with the rules under section 514(c)(9)(E). Section 514(c)(9)(E)(iii) grants the Secretary authority to prescribe regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 514(c)(9)(E), including regulations that may provide for the exclusion or segregation of items. In response to comments and under the regulatory authority in section 514(c)(9)(E), these proposed regulations provide guidance in determining a partner's share of overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule, including allowing allocations consistent with common arrangements involving preferred returns, partner-specific expenditures, unlikely losses, and chargebacks of partner-specific expenditures and unlikely losses. The proposed regulations also simplify one of the examples involving tiered partnerships and provide rules regarding changes to partnership allocations as a result of capital commitment defaults and later acquisitions of partnership interests. These proposed regulations except from applying the fractions rule certain partnerships in which all partners other than QOs own five percent or less of the capital or profits interests in the

partnership. Finally, these proposed regulations increase the threshold for de minimis allocations away from QO partners.

Explanation of Provisions

1. Preferred Returns

Section 1.514(c)–2(d)(1) and (2) of the existing regulations disregard in computing overall partnership income for purposes of the fractions rule items of income (including gross income) and gain that may be allocated to a partner with respect to a current or cumulative reasonable preferred return for capital (including allocations of minimum gain attributable to nonrecourse liability (or partner nonrecourse debt) proceeds distributed to the partner as a reasonable preferred return) if that preferred return is set forth in a binding, written partnership agreement. Section 1.514(c)–2(d)(2) of the existing regulations also provides that if a partnership agreement provides for a reasonable preferred return with an allocation of what would otherwise be overall partnership income, items comprising that allocation are disregarded in computing overall partnership income for purposes of the fractions rule.

Section 1.514(c)–2(d)(6)(i) of the existing regulations limits the amount of income and gain allocated with respect to a preferred return that can be disregarded for purposes of the fractions rule to: (A) The aggregate of the amount that has been distributed to the partner as a reasonable preferred return for the taxable year of the allocation and prior taxable years, on or before the due date (not including extensions) for filing the partnership's return for the taxable year of the allocation; minus (B) the aggregate amount of corresponding income and gain (and what would otherwise be overall partnership income) allocated to the partner in all prior years. Thus, this rule requires a current distribution of preferred returns for the allocations of income with respect to those preferred returns to be disregarded.

The Treasury Department and the IRS have received comments requesting that the current distribution requirement be eliminated from the regulations because it interferes with normal market practice, creates unnecessary complication, and, in some cases, causes economic distortions for partnerships with QO partners. The preamble to the existing final regulations under section 514(c)(9)(E) responded to objections regarding the current distribution requirement by explaining that if the requirement were eliminated, partnerships might attempt to optimize their overall economics by allocating significant amounts of partnership income and gain to QOs in the form of preferred returns. The preamble explained that these allocations ''would be a departure from the normal commercial practice followed by partnerships in which the money partners are generally subject to income tax.'' TD 8539, 59 FR 24924. A recent commenter explained that the vast majority of partnerships holding debt-financed real property (real estate partnerships) with preferred returns to investing partners (either the QO or the taxable partner) make allocations that match the preferred return as it accrues, without regard to whether cash has been distributed with respect to the preferred return. Instead of requiring distributions equal to the full amount of their preferred returns, taxable partners generally negotiate for tax distributions to pay any tax liabilities associated with their partnership interest.

The Treasury Department and the IRS have reconsidered the necessity of the current distribution requirement to prevent abuses of the fractions rule. So long as the preferred return is required to be distributed prior to other distributions (with an exception for certain distributions intended to facilitate the payment of taxes) and any undistributed amount compounds, the likelihood of abuse is minimized. Therefore, the proposed regulations remove the current distribution requirement and instead disregard allocations of items of income and gain with respect to a preferred return for purposes of the fractions rule, but only if the partnership agreement requires that the partnership make distributions first to pay any accrued, cumulative, and compounding unpaid preferred return to the extent such accrued but unpaid preferred return has not otherwise been reversed by an allocation of loss prior to such distribution (preferred return distribution requirement). The preferred return distribution requirement, however, is subject to an exception under the proposed regulations that allows distributions intended to facilitate partner payment of taxes imposed on the partner's allocable share of partnership income or gain, if the distributions are made pursuant to a provision in the partnership agreement, are treated as an advance against distributions to which the distributee partner would otherwise be entitled under the partnership agreement, and do not exceed the distributee partner's allocable share of net partnership income and gain multiplied by the sum of the highest statutory federal, state, and local tax rates applicable to that partner.

2. Partner-Specific Expenditures and Management Fees

Section 1.514(c)–2(f) of the existing regulations provides a list of certain partner- specific expenditures that are disregarded in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule. These expenditures include expenditures attributable to a partner for additional record-keeping and accounting costs including in connection with the transfer of a partnership interest, additional administrative costs from having a foreign partner, and state and local taxes. The Treasury Department and the IRS are aware that some real estate partnerships allow investing partners to negotiate for management and similar fees paid to the general partner that differ from fees paid with respect to investments by other partners. These fees include the general partner's fees for managing the partnership and may include fees paid in connection with the acquisition, disposition, or refinancing of an investment. Compliance with the fractions rule may preclude a real estate partnership with QO partners from allocating deductions attributable to these management expenses in a manner that follows the economic fee arrangement because the fractions rule limits the ability of the partnership to make disproportionate allocations.

The Treasury Department and the IRS have determined that real estate partnerships with QO partners should be permitted to allocate management and similar fees among partners to reflect the manner in which the partners agreed to bear the expense without causing a fractions rule violation. Accordingly, the proposed regulations add management (and similar) fees to the current list of excluded partner-specific expenditures in § 1.514(c)–2(f) of the existing regulations to the extent such fees do not, in the aggregate, exceed two percent of the partner's aggregate committed capital.

It has been suggested to the Treasury Department and the IRS that similar partner-specific expenditure issues may arise under the new partnership audit rules in section 1101 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, Public Law 114–74 (the BBA), which was enacted into law on November 2, 2015. Section 1101 of the BBA repeals the current rules governing partnership audits and replaces them with a new centralized partnership audit regime that, in general, assesses and collects tax at the

partnership level as an imputed underpayment. Some have suggested that the manner in which an imputed underpayment is borne by partners potentially could implicate similar concerns as special allocations of partner-specific items. As the Treasury Department and the IRS continue to consider how to implement the BBA, the Treasury Department and the IRS request comments regarding whether an imputed underpayment should be included among the list of partner-specific expenditures.

3. Unlikely Losses

Similar to § 1.514(c)–2(f), § 1.514(c)–2(g) of the existing regulations generally disregards specially allocated unlikely losses or deductions (other than items of nonrecourse deduction) in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule. To be disregarded under § 1.514(c)–2(g), a loss or deduction must have a low likelihood of occurring, taking into account all relevant facts, circumstances, and information available to the partners (including bona fide financial projections). Section 1.514(c)–2(g) describes types of events that give rise to unlikely losses or deductions.

The Treasury Department and the IRS have received comments suggesting that a ''more likely than not'' standard is appropriate for determining when a loss or deduction is unlikely to occur. Notice 90–41 (1990–1 CB 350) (see § 601.601(d)(2)(ii)(*b*)), which preceded the initial proposed regulations under section 514(c)(9)(E), outlined this standard. The commenter explained that the ''low likelihood of occurring'' standard in the existing regulations is vague and gives little comfort to QOs and their taxable partners when drafting allocations to reflect legitimate business arrangements (such as, drafting allocations to account for cost overruns). The Treasury Department and the IRS are considering changing the standard in § 1.514(c)–2(g) and request further comments explaining why ''more likely than not'' is a more appropriate standard than the standard contained in the existing regulations, or whether another standard turning upon a level of risk that is between ''more likely than not'' and ''low likelihood of occurring'' might be more appropriate and what such other standard could be.

4. Chargebacks of Partner-Specific Expenditures and Unlikely Losses

Because allocations of partner-specific expenditures in § 1.514(c)–2(f) and unlikely losses in § 1.514(c)–2(g) are disregarded in computing overall partnership income or loss, allocations of items of income or gain or net income to reverse the prior partner-specific expenditure or unlikely loss could cause a violation of the fractions rule. For example, a QO may contribute capital to a partnership to pay a specific expenditure with the understanding that it will receive a special allocation of income to reverse the prior expenditure once the partnership earns certain profits. If the allocation of income is greater than the QO's fractions rule percentage, the allocation will cause a fractions rule violation.

Section 1.514(c)–2(e)(1) of the existing regulations generally disregards certain allocations of income or loss made to chargeback previous allocations of income or loss in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule. Specifically, § 1.514(c)–2(e)(1)(i) disregards allocations of what would otherwise be overall partnership income that chargeback (that is, reverse) prior disproportionately large allocations of overall partnership loss (or part of the overall partnership loss) to a QO (the chargeback exception). The chargeback exception applies to a chargeback of an allocation of part of the overall partnership income or loss only if that part consists of a pro rata portion of each item of partnership income, gain, loss, and deduction (other than nonrecourse deductions, as well as partner nonrecourse deductions and compensating allocations) that is included in computing overall partnership income or loss.

The Treasury Department and the IRS understand that often a real estate partnership with QO partners may seek to reverse a special allocation of unlikely losses or partner-specific items with net profits of the partnership, which could result in allocations that would violate the fractions rule. Such allocations of net income to reverse special allocations of unlikely losses or partner-specific items that were disregarded in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule under § 1.514(c)–2(f) or (g), respectively, do not violate the purpose of the fractions rule. Accordingly, the proposed regulations modify the chargeback exception to disregard in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule an allocation of what would otherwise have been an allocation of overall partnership income to chargeback (that is, reverse) a special allocation of a partner-specific expenditure under § 1.514(c)–2(f) or a special allocation of an unlikely loss under § 1.514(c)–2(g). Notwithstanding the rule in the proposed regulations, an allocation of an unlikely loss or a partner-specific expenditure that is disregarded when allocated, but is taken into account for purposes of determining the partners' economic entitlement to a chargeback of such loss or expense may, in certain circumstances, give rise to complexities in determining applicable percentages for purposes of fractions rule compliance. Accordingly, the Treasury Department and the IRS request comments regarding the interaction of disregarded partner-specific expenditures and unlikely losses with chargebacks of such items with overall partnership income.

5. Acquisition of Partnership Interests After Initial Formation of Partnership

Section 1.514(c)–2(k)(1) of the existing regulations provides special rules regarding changes in partnership allocations arising from a change in partners' interests. Specifically, § 1.514(c)–2(k)(1) provides that changes in partnership allocations that result from transfers or shifts of partnership interests (other than transfers from a QO to another QO) will be closely scrutinized (to determine whether the transfer or shift stems from a prior agreement, understanding, or plan or could otherwise be expected given the structure of the transaction), but generally will be taken into account only in determining whether the partnership satisfies the fractions rule in the taxable year of the change and subsequent taxable years. Section 1.514(c)–2(k)(4) of the existing regulations provides that § 1.514(c)–2 may not be applied in a manner inconsistent with the purpose of the fractions rule, which is to prevent tax avoidance by limiting the permanent or temporary transfer of tax benefits from tax-exempt partners to taxable partners.

The Treasury Department and the IRS have received comments requesting guidance in applying the fractions rule when additional partners are admitted to a partnership after the initial formation of the partnership. The commenter explained that many real estate partnerships with QO partners admit new partners in a number of rounds of closings, but treat the partners as having entered at the same time for purposes of sharing in profits and losses (staged closings). A number of commercial arrangements are used to effect staged closings. For example, the initial operations of the partnership may be funded entirely through debt financing, with all partners contributing their committed capital at a later date. Alternatively, later entering partners may contribute capital and an interest

factor, some or both of which is then distributed to the earlier admitted partners to compensate them for the time value of their earlier contributions.

Under existing regulations, staged closings could cause violations of the fractions rule in two ways. First, when new partners are admitted to a partnership, shifts of partnership interests occur. Changes in allocations that result from shifts of partnership interests are closely scrutinized under § 1.514(c)–2(k)(1) of the existing regulations if pursuant to a prior agreement and could be determined to violate the fractions rule. Second, after admitting new partners, partnerships may disproportionately allocate income or loss to the partners to adjust the partners' capital accounts as a result of the staged closings. These disproportionate allocations could cause fractions rule violations if one of the partners is a QO.

The Treasury Department and the IRS have determined that changes in allocations and disproportionate allocations resulting from common commercial staged closings should not violate the fractions rule if they are not inconsistent with the purpose of the fractions rule under § 1.514(c)–2(k)(4) and certain conditions are satisfied. The conditions include the following: (A) The new partner acquires the partnership interest no later than 18 months following the formation of the partnership (applicable period); (B) the partnership agreement and other relevant documents anticipate the new partners acquiring the partnership interests during the applicable period, set forth the time frame in which the new partners will acquire the partnership interests, and provide for the amount of capital the partnership intends to raise; (C) the partnership agreement and any other relevant documents specifically set forth the method of determining any applicable interest factor and for allocating income, loss, or deduction to the partners to adjust partners' capital accounts after the new partner acquires the partnership interest; and (D) the interest rate for any applicable interest factor is not greater than 150 percent of the highest applicable Federal rate, at the appropriate compounding period or periods, at the time the partnership was formed.

Under the proposed regulations, if those conditions are satisfied, the IRS will not closely scrutinize changes in allocations resulting from staged closings under § 1.514(c)–2(k)(1) and will disregard in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule disproportionate allocations of income, loss, or deduction made to adjust the capital accounts when a new partner acquires its partnership interest after the partnership's formation.

6. Capital Commitment Defaults or Reductions

The Treasury Department and the IRS received comments requesting guidance with respect to calculations of overall partnership income and loss when allocations change as a result of capital commitment defaults or reductions. The commenter indicated that, in the typical real estate partnership, a limited partner generally will not contribute its entire investment upon being admitted as a partner. Rather, that limited partner will commit to contribute a certain dollar amount over a fixed period of time, and the general partner will then ''call'' on that committed, but uncontributed, capital as needed. These calls will be made in proportion to the partners' commitments to the partnership.

The commenter identified certain remedies that partnership agreements provide if a partner fails to contribute a portion (or all) of its committed capital. These remedies commonly include: (i) Allowing the non-defaulting partner(s) to contribute additional capital in return for a preferred return on that additional capital; (ii) causing the defaulting partner to forfeit all or a portion of its interest in the partnership; (iii) forcing the defaulting partner to sell its interest in the partnership, or (iv) excluding the defaulting partner from making future capital contributions. Alternatively, the agreement may allow partners to reduce their commitment amounts, reducing allocations of income and loss as well. The commenter noted that, depending on the facts, any of these partnership agreement provisions could raise fractions rule concerns.

There is little guidance in the existing regulations regarding changes to allocations of a partner's share of income and losses from defaulted capital calls and reductions in capital commitments. Section 1.514(c)–2(k)(1) applies to changes in allocations resulting from a default if there is a ''transfer or shift'' of partnership interests. The Treasury Department and the IRS have determined that changes in allocations resulting from unanticipated defaults or reductions do not run afoul of the purpose of the fractions rule if such changes are provided for in the partnership agreement. Therefore, the proposed regulations provide that, if the partnership agreement provides for changes to allocations due to an unanticipated partner default on a capital contribution commitment or an unanticipated reduction in a partner's capital contribution commitment, and those changes in allocations are not inconsistent with the purpose of the fractions rule under § 1.514(c)–2(k)(4), then: (A) Changes to partnership allocations provided in the agreement will not be closely scrutinized under § 1.514(c)–2(k)(1) and (B) partnership allocations of income, loss, or deduction (including allocations to adjust partners' capital accounts to be consistent with the partners' adjusted capital commitments) to partners to adjust the partners' capital accounts as a result of unanticipated capital contribution defaults or reductions will be disregarded in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule.

7. Applying the Fractions Rule to Tiered Partnerships

Section 1.514(c)–2(m)(1) of the existing regulations provides that if a QO holds an indirect interest in real property through one or more tiers of partnerships (a chain), the fractions rule is satisfied if: (i) The avoidance of tax is not a principal purpose for using the tiered-ownership structure; and (ii) the relevant partnerships can demonstrate under ''any reasonable method'' that the relevant chains satisfy the requirements of § 1.514(c)–2(b)(2) through (k). Section 1.514(c)–2(m)(2) of the existing regulations provides examples that illustrate three different ''reasonable methods:'' the collapsing approach, the entity-by-entity approach, and the independent chain approach.

The Treasury Department and the IRS have received comments requesting guidance with respect to tiered partnerships and the application of the independent chain approach. Under the independent chain approach in § 1.514(c)–2(m)(2) *Example 3* of the existing regulations, different lower-tiered partnership chains (one or more tiers of partnerships) are examined independently of each other, even if these lower-tiered partnerships are owned by a common upper-tier partnership. The example provides, however, that chains are examined independently only if the upper-tier partnership allocates the items of each lower-tier partnership separately from the items of another lower-tier partnership.

The comment noted that in practice, a real estate partnership generally invests in a significant number of properties, often through joint ventures with other partners. A typical real estate partnership will not make separate allocations to its partners of lower-tier partnership items. Accordingly, the

proposed regulations amend § 1.514(c)–2(m)(2) *Example 3* to remove the requirement that a partnership allocate items from lower-tier partnerships separately from one another. Partnership provisions require that partnership items such as items that would give rise to UBTI be separately stated. *See* § 1.702–1(a)(8)(ii). That requirement suffices to separate the tiers of partnerships, and, thus, the proposed regulations do not require the upper-tier partnership to separately allocate partnership items from separate lower-tier partnerships. The proposed regulations also revise § 1.514(c)–2(m)(1)(ii) to remove the discussion of minimum gain chargebacks that refers to language that has been deleted from the example.

8. De Minimis Exceptions From Application of the Fractions Rule

Section 1.514(c)–2(k)(2) of the existing regulations provides that the partnership limitation in section 514(c)(9)(B)(vi) does not apply to a partnership if all QOs hold a de minimis interest in the partnership, defined as no more than five percent in the capital or profits of the partnership, and taxable partners own substantial interests in the partnership through which they participate in the partnership on substantially the same terms as the QO partners. If the partnership limitation in section 514(c)(9)(B)(vi) does not apply to the partnership, the fractions rule does not apply to the partnership. Because the fractions rule does not apply to a partnership if all QOs are de minimis interest holders in the partnership, the Treasury Department and the IRS considered whether the inverse fact pattern, in which all non-QO partners are de minimis partners, implicates the purpose of the fractions rule. *See* § 1.514(c)–2(k)(4) (providing that the purpose of the fractions rule is to ''prevent tax avoidance by limiting the permanent or temporary transfer of tax benefits from tax-exempt partners to taxable partners, whether by directing income or gain to tax-exempt partners, by directing losses, deductions or credits to taxable partners, or by some similar manner.'').

The Treasury Department and the IRS have determined that the purpose of the fractions rule is similarly not violated if all non-QO partners hold a de minimis interest. Therefore, the proposed regulations provide that the fractions rule does not apply to a partnership in which non-QO partners do not hold (directly or indirectly through a partnership), in the aggregate, interests of greater than five percent in the capital or profits of the partnership, so long as the partnership's allocations have substantial economic effect. For purposes of the proposed rule, the determination of whether an allocation has substantial economic effect is made without application of the special rules in § 1.704–1(b)(2)(iii)(*c*)(*2*) (regarding the presumption that there is a reasonable possibility that allocations will affect substantially the dollar amounts to be received by the partners from the partnership if there is a strong likelihood that offsetting allocations will not be made in five years, and the presumption that the adjusted tax basis (or book value) of partnership property is equal to the fair market value of such property).

The existing regulations also provide for a de minimis exception for allocations away from QO partners. Section 1.514(c)–2(k)(3) of the existing regulations provides that a QO's fractions rule percentage of the partnership's items of loss and deduction, other than nonrecourse and partner nonrecourse deductions, that are allocated away from the QO and to other partners in any taxable year, are treated as having been allocated to the QO for purposes of the fractions rule if: (i) The allocation was neither planned nor motivated by tax avoidance; and (ii) the total amount of those items of partnership loss or deduction is less than both one percent of the partnership's aggregate items of gross loss and deduction for the taxable year and $50,000. The preamble to the existing final regulations under section 514(c)(9)(E) explained that the de minimis allocation exception was ''to provide relief for what would otherwise be minor inadvertent violations of the fractions rule.'' TD 8539, 59 FR 24924. The exception was ''not intended . . . [to] be used routinely by partnerships to allocate some of the partnership's losses and deductions.'' *Id.* To that end, the final regulations limited the exception to $50,000. As an example of a de minimis allocation intended to meet this exception, the preamble described a scenario in which a plumber's bill is paid by the partnership but overlooked until after the partner's allocations have been computed and then is allocated entirely to the taxable partner. *Id.*

In current business practices, a $50,000 threshold does not provide sufficient relief for de minimis allocations away from the QO partner. The proposed regulations still require that allocations not exceed one percent of the partnership's aggregate items of gross loss and deduction for the taxable year, but raise the threshold from $50,000 to $1,000,000.

Proposed Applicability Date

The regulations under section 514(c)(9)(E) are proposed to apply to taxable years ending on or after the date these regulations are published as final regulations in the **Federal Register**. However, a partnership and its partners may apply all the rules in these proposed regulations for taxable years ending on or after November 23, 2016.

Special Analyses

Certain IRS regulations, including this one, are exempt from the requirements of Executive Order 12866, as supplemented and reaffirmed by Executive Order 13563. Therefore, a regulatory impact assessment is not required. It also has been determined that section 553(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. chapter 5) does not apply to these regulations. Because these proposed regulations do not impose a collection of information on small entities, the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. chapter 6) does not apply. Pursuant to section 7805(f) of the Code, this notice of proposed rulemaking has been submitted to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration for comment on its impact on small business.

Comments and Requests for a Public Hearing

Before these proposed regulations are adopted as final regulations, consideration will be given to any comments that are submitted timely to the IRS as prescribed in this preamble under the ''Addresses'' heading. The Treasury Department and the IRS request comments on all aspects of the proposed rules. All comments will be available at *www.regulations.gov* or upon request. A public hearing will be scheduled if requested in writing by any person that timely submits written comments. If a public hearing is scheduled, notice of the date, time, and place for the public hearing will be published in the **Federal Register**.

Drafting Information

The principal author of these proposed regulations is Caroline E. Hay, Office of the Associate Chief Counsel (Passthroughs and Special Industries). However, other personnel from the Treasury Department and the IRS participated in their development.

List of Subjects in 26 CFR Part 1

Income Taxes, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Proposed Amendments to the Regulations

Accordingly, 26 CFR part 1 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 1—INCOME TAXES

■ **Paragraph 1.** The authority citation for part 1 continues to read in part as follows:

Authority: 26 U.S.C. 7805 * * *

Section 1.514(c)–2 also issued under 26 U.S.C. 514(c)(9)(E)(iii).

■ **Par. 2.** Section 1.514(c)–2 is amended by:

■ 1. In paragraph (a), adding entries for (d)(2)(i) through (iii), adding entries for (d)(3)(i) and (ii), revising the entry for (d)(6), removing entries for (d)(6)(i) and (ii), and (d)(7), adding entries for (k)(1)(i) through (iv), revising the entries for (k)(2)(i) and (ii), adding an entry for (k)(2)(iii), and revising the entry for (n).

■ 2. Revising paragraphs (d)(2) and (3).

■ 3. Removing paragraph (d)(6).

■ 4. Redesignating paragraph (d)(7) as paragraph (d)(6).

■ 5. Revising newly redesignated paragraph (d)(6) *Example 1* paragraph (i) and adding paragraph (iv).

■ 6. Removing the language ''(*i.e.,* reverse)'' in paragraph (e)(1)(i) and adding the language ''(that is, reverse)'' in its place.

■ 7. Removing the language ''other partners; and'' at the end of paragraph (e)(1)(iii) and adding the language ''other partners;'' in its place.

■ 8. Removing the language ''of § 1.704–1(b)(2)(ii)(*d*).'' at the end of paragraph (e)(1)(iv) and adding the language ''of § 1.704–1(b)(2)(ii)(*d*);'' in its place.

■ 9. Removing the language ''the regulations thereunder.'' at the end of paragraph (e)(1)(v) and adding the language ''the regulations thereunder;'' in its place.

■ 10. Adding new paragraphs (e)(1)(vi) and (vii).

■ 11. Adding *Example 5* to paragraph (e)(5).

■ 12. Removing the word ''and'' at the end of paragraph (f)(3).

■ 13. Redesignating paragraph (f)(4) as paragraph (f)(5) and adding new paragraph (f)(4).

■ 14. Revising paragraph (k)(1).

■ 15. Revising the subject heading for paragraph (k)(2)(i).

■ 16. Revising paragraph (k)(2)(i)(A).

■ 17. Redesignating paragraph (k)(2)(ii) as paragraph (k)(2)(iii) and adding new paragraph (k)(2)(ii).

■ 18. Revising paragraph (k)(3)(ii)(B).

■ 19. Removing the second sentence in paragraph (m)(1)(ii).

■ 20. Revising *Example 3*(ii) of paragraph (m)(2).

■ 21. Revising the subject heading for paragraph (n).

■ 22. Adding a sentence to the end of paragraph (n)(2).

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 1.514(c)–2. Permitted allocations under section 514(c)(9)(E).

(a) *Table of contents.* * * *

(d) * * *

(2) * * *

(i) In general.

(ii) Limitation.

(iii) Distributions disregarded.

(3) * * *

(i) In general.

(ii) Reasonable guaranteed payments may be deducted only when paid in cash.

* * * * *

(6) Examples.

* * * * *

(k) * * *

(1) * * *

(i) In general.

(ii) Acquisition of partnership interests after initial formation of partnership.

(iii) Capital commitment defaults or reductions.

(iv) Examples.

(2) * * *

(i) Qualified organizations.

(ii) Non-qualified organizations.

(iii) Example.

* * * * *

(n) Effective/applicability dates.

* * * * *

(d) * * *

(2) *Preferred returns*—(i) *In general.* Items of income (including gross income) and gain that may be allocated to a partner with respect to a current or cumulative reasonable preferred return for capital (including allocations of minimum gain attributable to nonrecourse liability (or partner nonrecourse debt) proceeds distributed to the partner as a reasonable preferred return) are disregarded in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule. Similarly, if a partnership agreement effects a reasonable preferred return with an allocation of what would otherwise be overall partnership income, those items comprising that allocation are disregarded in computing overall partnership income for purposes of the fractions rule.

(ii) *Limitation.* Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (d)(2)(iii) of this section, items of income and gain (or part of what would otherwise be overall partnership income) that may be allocated to a partner in a taxable year with respect to a reasonable preferred return for capital are disregarded under paragraph (d)(2)(i) of this section for purposes of the fractions rule only if the partnership agreement requires the partnership to make distributions first to pay any accrued, cumulative, and compounding unpaid preferred return to the extent such accrued but unpaid preferred return has not otherwise been reversed by an allocation of loss prior to such distribution.

(iii) *Distributions disregarded.* A distribution is disregarded for purposes of paragraph (d)(2)(ii) of this section if the distribution—

(A) Is made pursuant to a provision in the partnership agreement intended to facilitate the partners' payment of taxes imposed on their allocable shares of partnership income or gain;

(B) Is treated as an advance against distributions to which the distributee partner would otherwise be entitled under the partnership agreement; and

(C) Does not exceed the distributee partner's allocable share of net partnership income and gain multiplied by the sum of the highest statutory federal, state, and local tax rates applicable to such partner.

(3) *Guaranteed payments*—(i) *In general.* A current or cumulative reasonable guaranteed payment to a qualified organization for capital or services is treated as an item of deduction in computing overall partnership income or loss, and the income that the qualified organization may receive or accrue from the current or cumulative reasonable guaranteed payment is not treated as an allocable share of overall partnership income or loss. The treatment of a guaranteed payment as reasonable for purposes of section 514(c)(9)(E) does not affect its possible characterization as unrelated business taxable income under other provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

(ii) *Reasonable guaranteed payments may be deducted only when paid in cash.* If a partnership that avails itself of paragraph (d)(3)(i) of this section would otherwise be required (by virtue of its method of accounting) to deduct a reasonable guaranteed payment to a qualified organization earlier than the taxable year in which it is paid in cash, the partnership must delay the deduction of the guaranteed payment until the taxable year it is paid in cash. For purposes of this paragraph (d)(3)(ii), a guaranteed payment that is paid in cash on or before the due date (not including extensions) for filing the partnership's return for a taxable year may be treated as paid in that prior taxable year.

* * * * *

(6) * * *

Example 1. * * *

(i) The partnership agreement provides QO a 10 percent preferred return on its

unreturned capital. The partnership agreement provides that the preferred return may be compounded (at 10 percent) and may be paid in future years and requires that when distributions are made, they must be made first to pay any accrued, cumulative, and compounding unpaid preferred return not previously reversed by a loss allocation. The partnership agreement also allows distributions to be made to facilitate a partner's payment of federal, state, and local taxes. Under the partnership agreement, any such distribution is treated as an advance against distributions to which the distributee partner would otherwise be entitled and must not exceed the partner's allocable share of net partnership income or gain for that taxable year multiplied by the sum of the highest statutory federal, state, and local tax rates applicable to the partner. The partnership agreement first allocates gross income and gain 100 percent to QO, to the extent of the preferred return. All remaining income or loss is allocated 50 percent to QO and 50 percent to TP.

* * * * *

(iv) The facts are the same as in paragraph (i) of this *Example 1,* except the partnership makes a distribution to TP of an amount computed by a formula in the partnership agreement equal to TP's allocable share of net income and gain multiplied by the sum of the highest statutory federal, state, and local tax rates applicable to TP. The partnership satisfies the fractions rule. The distribution to TP is disregarded for purposes of paragraph (d)(2)(ii) of this section because the distribution is made pursuant to a provision in the partnership agreement that provides that the distribution is treated as an advance against distributions to which TP would otherwise be entitled and the distribution did not exceed TP's allocable share of net partnership income or gain for that taxable year multiplied by the sum of the highest statutory federal, state, and local tax rates applicable to TP. The income and gain that is specially allocated to QO with respect to its preferred return is disregarded in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule because the requirements of paragraph (d) of this section are satisfied. After disregarding those allocations, QO's fractions rule percentage is 50 percent (see paragraph (c)(2) of this section), and, under the partnership agreement, QO may not be allocated more than 50 percent of overall partnership income in any taxable year.

(e) * * *

(1) * * *

(vi) Allocations of what would otherwise be overall partnership income that may be made to chargeback (that is, reverse) prior allocations of partner-specific expenditures that were disregarded in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule under paragraph (f) of this section; and

(vii) Allocations of what would otherwise be overall partnership income that may be made to chargeback (that is, reverse) prior allocations of unlikely losses and deductions that were disregarded in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule under paragraph (g) of this section.

* * * * *

(5) * * *

Example 5. Chargeback of prior allocations of unlikely losses and deductions. (i) Qualified organization (QO) and taxable corporation (TP) are equal partners in a partnership that holds encumbered real property. The partnership agreement generally provides that QO and TP share partnership income and deductions equally. QO contributes land to the partnership, and the partnership agreement provides that QO bears the burden of any environmental remediation required for that land, and, as such, the partnership will allocate 100 percent of the expense attributable to the environmental remediation to QO. In the unlikely event of the discovery of environmental conditions that require remediation, the partnership agreement provides that, to the extent its cumulative net income (without regard to the remediation expense) for the taxable year the partnership incurs the remediation expense and for subsequent taxable years exceeds $500x, after allocation of the $500x of cumulative net income, net income will first be allocated to QO to offset any prior allocation of the environmental remediation expense deduction. On January 1 of Year 3, the partnership incurs a $100x expense for the environmental remediation of the land. In that year, the partnership had gross income of $60x and other expenses of $30x for total net income of $30x without regard to the expense associated with the environmental remediation. The partnership allocated $15x of income to each of QO and TP and $100x of remediation expense to QO.

(ii) The partnership satisfies the fractions rule. The allocation of the expense attributable to the remediation of the land is disregarded under paragraph (g) of this section. QO's share of overall partnership income is 50 percent, which equals QO's share of overall partnership loss.

(iii) In Year 8, when the partnership's cumulative net income (without regard to the remediation expense) for the taxable year the partnership incurred the remediation expense and subsequent taxable years is $480x (the $30x from Year 3, plus $450x of cumulative net income for Years 4–7), the partnership has gross income of $170x and expenses of $50x, for total net income of $120x. The partnership's cumulative net income for all years from Year 3 to Year 8 is $600x ($480x for Years 3–7 and $120x for Year 8). Pursuant to the partnership agreement, the first $20x of net income for Year 8 is allocated equally between QO and TP because the partnership must first earn cumulative net income in excess of $500x before making the offset allocation to QO. The remaining $100x of net income for Year 8 is allocated to QO to offset the environmental remediation expense allocated to QO in Year 3.

(iv) Pursuant to paragraph (e)(1)(vii) of this section, the partnership's allocation of $100x of net income to QO in Year 8 to offset the prior environmental remediation expense is disregarded in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule. The allocation does not cause the partnership to violate the fractions rule.

(f) * * *

(4) Expenditures for management and similar fees, if such fees in the aggregate for the taxable year are not more than 2 percent of the partner's capital commitments; and * * *

* * * * *

(k) *Special rules*—(1) *Changes in partnership allocations arising from a change in the partners' interests*—(i) *In general.* A qualified organization that acquires a partnership interest from another qualified organization is treated as a continuation of the prior qualified organization partner (to the extent of that acquired interest) for purposes of applying the fractions rule. Changes in partnership allocations that result from other transfers or shifts of partnership interests will be closely scrutinized (to determine whether the transfer or shift stems from a prior agreement, understanding, or plan or could otherwise be expected given the structure of the transaction), but generally will be taken into account only in determining whether the partnership satisfies the fractions rule in the taxable year of the change and subsequent taxable years.

(ii) *Acquisition of partnership interests after initial formation of partnership.* Changes in partnership allocations due to an acquisition of a partnership interest by a partner (new partner) after the initial formation of a partnership will not be closely scrutinized under paragraph (k)(1)(i) of this section, but will be taken into account only in determining whether the partnership satisfies the fractions rule in the taxable year of the change and subsequent taxable years, and disproportionate allocations of income, loss, or deduction to the partners to adjust the partners' capital accounts as a result of, and to reflect, the new partner acquiring the partnership interest and the resulting changes to the other partners' interests will be disregarded in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule if such changes and disproportionate allocations are not inconsistent with the purpose of the fractions rule under paragraph (k)(4) of this section and—

(A) The new partner acquires the partnership interest no later than 18 months following the formation of the partnership (applicable period);

(B) The partnership agreement and other relevant documents anticipate the

new partners acquiring the partnership interest during the applicable period, set forth the time frame in which the new partners will acquire the partnership interests, and provide for the amount of capital the partnership intends to raise;

(C) The partnership agreement and other relevant documents specifically set forth the method for determining any applicable interest factor and for allocating income, loss, or deduction to the partners to account for the economics of the arrangement in the partners' capital accounts after the new partner acquires the partnership interest; and

(D) The interest rate for any applicable interest factor is not greater than 150 percent of the highest applicable Federal rate, at the appropriate compounding period or periods, at the time the partnership was formed.

(iii) *Capital commitment defaults or reductions.* Changes in partnership allocations that result from an unanticipated partner default on a capital contribution commitment or an unanticipated reduction in a partner's capital contribution commitment, that are effected pursuant to provisions prescribing the treatment of such events in the partnership agreement, and that are not inconsistent with the purpose of the fractions rule under paragraph (k)(4) of this section, will not be closely scrutinized under paragraph (k)(1)(i) of this section, but will be taken into account only in determining whether the partnership satisfies the fractions rule in the taxable year of the change and subsequent taxable years. In addition, partnership allocations of income, loss, or deduction to partners made pursuant to the partnership agreement to adjust partners' capital accounts as a result of unanticipated capital contribution defaults or reductions will be disregarded in computing overall partnership income or loss for purposes of the fractions rule. The adjustments may include allocations to adjust partners' capital accounts to be consistent with the partners' adjusted capital commitments.

(iv) *Examples.* The following examples illustrate the provisions of paragraph (k)(1) of this section.

Example 1. Staged closing. (i) On July 1 of Year 1, two taxable partners (TP1 and TP2) form a partnership that will invest in debt-financed real property. The partnership agreement provides that, within an 18-month period, partners will be added so that an additional $1000x of capital can be raised. The partnership agreement sets forth the method for determining the applicable interest factor that complies with paragraph (k)(1)(ii)(D) of this section and for allocating income, loss, or deduction to the partners to account for the economics of the arrangement in the partners' capital accounts. During the partnership's Year 1 taxable year, partnership had $150x of net income. TP1 and TP2, each, is allocated $75x of net income.

(ii) On January 1 of Year 2, qualified organization (QO) joins the partnership. The partnership agreement provides that TP1, TP2, and QO will be treated as if they had been equal partners from July 1 of Year 1. Assume that the interest factor is treated as a reasonable guaranteed payment to TP1 and TP2, the expense from which is taken into account in the partnership's net income of $150x for Year 2. To balance capital accounts, the partnership allocates $100x of the income to QO ($50x, or the amount of one-third of Year 1 income that QO was not allocated during the partnership's first taxable year, plus $50x, or one-third of the partnership's income for Year 2) and the remaining income equally to TP1 and TP2. Thus, the partnership allocates $100x to QO and $25x to TP1 and TP2, each.

(iii) The partnership's allocation to QO would violate the fractions rule because QO's overall percentage of partnership income for Year 2 of 66.7 percent is greater than QO's fractions rule percentage of 33.3 percent. However, the special allocation of $100x to QO for Year 2 is disregarded in determining QO's percentage of overall partnership income for purposes of the fractions rule because the requirements in paragraph (k)(1)(ii) of this section are satisfied.

Example 2. Capital call default. (i) On January 1 of Year 1, two taxable partners, (TP1 and TP2) and a qualified organization (QO) form a partnership that will hold encumbered real property and agree to share partnership profits and losses, 60 percent, 10 percent, and 30 percent, respectively. TP1 agreed to a capital commitment of $120x, TP2 agreed to a capital commitment of $20x, and QO agreed to a capital commitment of $60x. The partners met half of their commitments upon formation of the partnership. The partnership agreement requires a partner's interest to be reduced if the partner defaults on a capital call. The agreement also allows the non-defaulting partners to make the contribution and to increase their own interests in the partnership. Following a capital call default, the partnership agreement requires allocations to adjust capital accounts to reflect the change in partnership interests as though the funded commitments represented the partner's interests from the partnership's inception.

(ii) In Year 1, partnership had income of $100x, which was allocated to the partners $60x to TP1, $10x to TP2, and $30x to QO.

(iii) In Year 2, partnership required each partner to contribute the remainder of its capital commitment, $60x from TP1, $10x from TP2, and $30x from QO. TP1 could not make its required capital contribution, and QO contributed $90x, its own capital commitment, in addition to TP1's. TP1's default was not anticipated. As a result and pursuant to the partnership agreement, TP1's interest was reduced to 30 percent and QO's interest was increased to 60 percent. Partnership had income of $60x and losses of $120x in Year 2, for a net loss of $60x. Partnership allocated to TP1 $48x of loss (special allocation of $30x of gross items of loss to adjust capital accounts and $18x of net loss (30 percent of $60x net loss)), TP2 $6x of net loss (10 percent of $60x net loss), and QO $6x of loss (special allocation of $30x of gross items of income to adjust capital accounts—$36x of net loss (60 percent of $60x net loss)). At the end of Year 2, TP1's capital account equals $72x (capital contribution of $60x + $60x income from Year 1—$48x loss from Year 2); TP2's capital account equals $24x (capital contributions of $20x + $10x income from Year 1—$6x loss from Year 2); and QO's capital account equals $144x (capital contributions of $120x ($30x + $90x) + $30x income from Year 1—$6x loss from Year 2).

(iv) The changes in partnership allocations to TP1 and QO due to TP1's unanticipated default on its capital contribution commitment were effected pursuant to provisions prescribing the treatment of such events in the partnership agreement. Therefore these changes in allocations will not be closely scrutinized under paragraph (k)(1)(i) of this section, but will be taken into account only in determining whether the partnership satisfies the fractions rule in the taxable year of the change and subsequent taxable years. In addition, pursuant to paragraph (k)(1)(iii) of this section, the special allocations of $30x additional loss to TP1 and $30x additional income to QO to adjust their capital accounts to reflect their new interests in the partnership are disregarded when calculating QO's percentage of overall partnership income and loss for purposes of the fractions rule.

(2) * * *

(i) *Qualified organizations.* * * *

(A) Qualified organizations do not hold (directly or indirectly through a partnership), in the aggregate, interests of greater than five percent in the capital or profits of the partnership; and

* * * * *

(ii) *Non-qualified organizations.* Section 514(c)(9)(B)(vi) does not apply to a partnership otherwise subject to that section if—

(A) All partners other than qualified organizations do not hold (directly or indirectly through a partnership), in the aggregate, interests of greater than five percent in the capital or profits of the partnership; and

(B) Allocations have substantial economic effect without application of the special rules in § 1.704–1(b)(2)(iii)(*c*) (regarding the presumption that there is a reasonable possibility that allocations will affect substantially the dollar amounts to be received by the partners from the partnership if there is a strong likelihood that offsetting allocations will not be made in five years, and the presumption that the adjusted tax basis (or book value) of partnership property

is equal to the fair market value of such property).

* * * * *

(3) * * *

(ii) * * *

(B) $1,000,000.

* * * * *

(m) * * *

(2) * * *

Example 3. * * *

(ii) P2 satisfies the fractions rule with respect to the P2/P1A chain. See § 1.702–1(a)(8)(ii) (for rules regarding separately stating partnership items). P2 does not satisfy the fractions rule with respect to the P2/P1B chain.

(n) *Effective/applicability dates.*

* * *

(2) * * * However, paragraphs (d)(2)(ii) and (iii), (d)(6) *Example 1* (i) and (iv), (e)(1)(vi) and (vii), (e)(5) *Example 5,* (f)(4), (k)(1)(ii) through (iv), (k)(2)(i)(A), (k)(2)(ii), (k)(3)(ii)(B), (m)(1)(ii), and (m)(2) *Example 3* (ii) of this section apply to taxable years ending on or after the date these regulations are published as final regulations in the **Federal Register**.

* * * * *

John Dalrymple,

Deputy Commissioner for Services and Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2016–27105 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Royalty Board

37 CFR Parts 301, 350 and 351

[Docket No. 16–CRB–0015–RM]

Electronic Filing of Documents

AGENCY: Copyright Royalty Board, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Copyright Royalty Judges propose to amend procedural regulations governing the filing and delivery of documents to allow for electronic filing of documents. The Judges solicit comments on the proposed rule.

DATES: Comments are due no later than December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Submit electronic comments via email to *crb@loc.gov*. Those who choose not to submit comments electronically should see ''How to Submit Comments'' in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for physical addresses and further instructions. The proposed rule is also posted on the agency's Web site (*www.loc.gov/crb*).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kimberly Whittle, Attorney Advisor, by telephone at (202) 707–7658 or email at *crb@loc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 23, 2016, the Library of Congress awarded a contract for the design and implementation of an electronic filing and case management system for the Copyright Royalty Board (''Board''). The Copyright Royalty Judges (''Judges'') anticipate that the new system will be available for use by claims filers, participants in proceedings before the Judges, and other members of the public having business with the Board (*e.g.,* persons wishing to comment on proposed regulations) by May 2017. The Judges intend to make use of the system mandatory for claimants and participants in proceedings after a six-month transition period.

As part of the Judges' continuing oversight of the Board's procedural regulations, the Judges propose to amend the regulations to accommodate electronic filing of documents and to specify the required format of both electronic and paper documents. In addition, the Judges propose to amend the regulations to remove references to obsolete technologies and to eliminate redundant provisions.

I. Part 301—Organization

The Judges propose to amend Part 301 to specify that (1) the official addresses for the Board are to be used only for documents that are not filed using the electronic filing system; (2) general correspondence, but not pleadings or claims, may be sent by electronic mail; and (3) fax is no longer an acceptable means of transmitting any document or correspondence to the Board.

II. Part 350—General Administrative Provisions

The Judges propose rules concerning the required format and permitted length of documents, whether filed electronically or otherwise. Electronically-filed documents would be subject to additional requirements, similar to the guidelines that the Judges issued in November 2014.[1]

The proposed regulations include rules on obtaining and using a password for filing documents electronically. The use of a password to file a document would constitute the filer's signature. Electronic filing of a document would effect delivery of the document to all parties to a proceeding who have been issued a password or are represented by counsel who has been issued a password.

The Judges also propose to gather in this Part the various provisions that establish whether a document (including a claim) is timely filed. For documents that are not filed using the electronic filing system, the rules concerning timeliness would be unchanged. Documents that are filed electronically are considered timely if they are received and time-stamped by the system by 11:59:59 p.m. (ET) on the due date.

III. Part 351—Proceedings

The Judges propose to amend paragraph 351.1(b)(4) to clarify that the filing fee that must accompany a petition to participate may be remitted by check or money order, or through the electronic filing system's payment portal.

IV. Part 360—Filing of Claims to Royalty Fees Collected Under Compulsory License

The Judges will propose revisions to Part 360 in order to accommodate filing of claims through the new electronic filing system at a later date.

How To Submit Comments

Interested members of the public must submit comments to only one of the following addresses. If not commenting by email or online, commenters must submit an original of their comments, five paper copies, and an electronic version on a CD.

Email: crb@loc.gov; or

U.S. mail: Copyright Royalty Board, P.O. Box 70977, Washington, DC 20024–0977; or

Overnight service (only USPS Express Mail is acceptable): Copyright Royalty Board, P.O. Box 70977, Washington, DC 20024–0977; or

Commercial courier: Address package to: Copyright Royalty Board, Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, LM–403, 101 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20559–6000. Deliver to: Congressional Courier Acceptance Site, 2nd Street NE. and D Street NE., Washington, DC; or

Hand delivery: Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, LM–401, 101 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20559–6000.

List of Subjects

37 CFR Part 301

Copyright, Organization and functions (government agencies).

[1] The guidelines are on the CRB Web site at *www.loc.gov/crb/docs/Guidelines_for_Electronic_Documents.pdf.*

37 CFR Part 350

Administrative practice and procedure, Copyright, Lawyers.

37 CFR Part 351

Administrative practice and procedure, Copyright.

Proposed Regulations

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, and under the authority of chapter 8, title 17, United States Code, the Copyright Royalty Judges propose to amend parts 301, 350, and 351 of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

SUBCHAPTER A—GENERAL PROVISIONS

PART 301—ORGANIZATION

■ 1. The authority citation for part 301 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 17 U.S.C. 801.

§ 301.2 [Amended]

■ 2. Revise § 301.2 to read as follows:

§ 301.2 Official addresses.

All claims, pleadings, and general correspondence intended for the Copyright Royalty Board and not submitted by electronic means through the electronic filing system (''eCRB'') must be addressed as follows:

(a) If sent by mail (including overnight delivery using United States Postal Service Express Mail), the envelope should be addressed to: Copyright Royalty Board, P.O. Box 70977, Southwest Station, Washington, DC 20024–0977.

(b) If hand-delivered by a private party, the envelope must be brought to the Copyright Office Public Information Office, Room LM–401 in the James Madison Memorial Building, and be addressed as follows: Copyright Royalty Board, Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, 101 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20559–6000.

(c) If hand-delivered by a commercial courier (excluding Federal Express, United Parcel Service and similar courier services), the envelope must be delivered to the Congressional Courier Acceptance Site (CCAS) located at Second and D Street NE., Washington, DC.

(d) Subject to paragraph (f), if sent by electronic mail, to *crb@loc.gov.*

(e) Correspondence and filings for the Copyright Royalty Board may not be delivered by means of:

(1) Overnight delivery services such as Federal Express, United Parcel Service, etc.; or

(2) Fax.

(f) General correspondence for the Copyright Royalty Board may be sent by electronic mail. Claimants or Parties must not send any claims, pleadings, or other filings to the Copyright Royalty Board by electronic mail without specific, advance authorization of the Copyright Royalty Judges.

SUBCHAPTER B—COPYRIGHT ROYALTY JUDGES' RULES AND PROCEDURES

PART 350—GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

■ 3. Revise part 350 to read as follows:

Sec.
350.1 Scope.
350.2 Representation.
350.3 Documents: Format and length.
350.4 Form of motions and responsive pleadings.
350.5 Electronic filing system (eCRB).
350.6 Filing and delivery.
350.7 Time.
350.8 Construction and waiver.

Authority: 17 U.S.C. 803.

PART 350—GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

§ 350.1 Scope.

This subchapter governs procedures generally applicable to proceedings before the Copyright Royalty Judges in making determinations and adjustments pursuant to the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. 801(b).

§ 350.2 Representation.

Individual parties in proceedings before the Judges may represent themselves or be represented by an attorney. All other parties must be represented by an attorney. Cf. Rule 49(c)(11) of the Rules of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. The appearance of an attorney on behalf of any party constitutes a representation that the attorney is a member of the bar, in one or more states, in good standing.

§ 350.3 Documents Format and Length.

(a) *Format*—(1) *Caption and description.* Parties filing pleadings and documents in a proceeding before the Copyright Royalty Judges must include on the first page of each filing a caption that identifies the proceeding by proceeding type and docket number, and a heading under the caption describing the nature of the document. In addition, Parties must include a footer on each page that includes the name and posture of the filing party, *e.g.,* [Party's] Motion, [Party's] Response in Opposition, *etc.*

(2) *Page Layout.* Parties must submit documents that are typed (double spaced) using a serif typeface (*e.g.,* Times New Roman) no smaller than 12 points for text or 10 points for footnotes and formatted for 8½ by 11 inch pages with no less than 1 inch margins. Parties must assure that any exhibit or attachment to documents reflects the docket number of the proceeding in which it is filed and that all pages are numbered appropriately. Any party submitting a document to the Copyright Royalty Board in paper format must submit it unfolded and produced on opaque 8½ by 11 inch white paper using a clear black image.

(3) *Binding or securing.* Parties submitting any paper document to the Copyright Royalty Board must bind or secure the document in a manner that will prevent pages from becoming separated from the document. For example, acceptable forms of binding or securing include: Ring binders; spiral binding; comb binding; and for documents of fifty pages or fewer, a binder clip or single staple in the top left corner of the document. Rubber bands and paper clips are not acceptable means of securing a document.

(b) *Additional format requirements for electronic documents*—(1) *In general.* Parties filing documents electronically through eCRB must follow the requirements of § 350.3(a)(1) and (2) and the additional requirements in paragraphs (b)(2) through (8) of this section.

(2) *File type.* Parties must file all pleadings and documents in Portable Document Format (PDF), with the exception of proposed orders. In addition, participants may provide the Copyright Royalty Board with copies of Excel workbooks, audio files, and video files in their native electronic formats. Participants may also provide the Copyright Royalty Board with copies of PowerPoint presentations or image files in their native electronic formats if conversion to PDF format would render the files difficult to read or view.

(3) *Proposed Orders; file type.* Parties filing or responding to motions must provide a proposed order, drafted as if the Copyright Royalty Judges were granting the party's requested relief. The party must prepare the proposed order as a separate Word document and submit it as an attachment to the main pleading.

(4) *No scanned pleadings.* Parties must convert every filed document directly to PDF format (using ''print to pdf'' or ''save to pdf''), rather than submitting a scanned PDF image. The Copyright Royalty Board will NOT accept scanned documents, except in the case of specific exhibits or attachments that are available to the filing party only in paper form.

(5) *Scanned exhibits.* Parties must scan exhibits or other documents that are only available in paper form at no less than 300 dpi. All exhibits must be searchable. Parties must scan in color any exhibit that uses color to convey information or enhance readability.

(6) *Bookmarks.* Parties must include in all electronic documents appropriate electronic bookmarks to designate the tabs and/or tables of contents that would appear in a paper version of the same document.

(7) *Page rotation.* Parties must ensure that all pages in electronic documents are right side up, regardless of whether they are formatted for portrait or landscape printing.

(8) *Signature.* The signature line of an electronic pleading must contain ''/s/'' followed by the signer's typed name. The name on the signature line must match the name of the user logged into eCRB to file the document. Parties with the capability may also sign documents with a verifiable electronic signature.

(c) *Length of submissions.* Whether filing in paper or electronically, parties must adhere to the following space limitations or such other space limitations as the Copyright Royalty Judges may direct by order. Any party seeking an enlargement of the applicable page limit must make the request by a motion to the Copyright Royalty Judges filed no fewer than three days prior to the applicable filing deadline.

(1) *Motions.* Motions must not exceed 20 pages or 5000 words (exclusive of exhibits, proof of delivery, and the like).

(2) *Responses.* Responses in support of or opposition to motions must not exceed 20 pages or 5000 words (exclusive of exhibits, proof of delivery, and the like).

(3) *Replies.* Replies in support of motions must not exceed 10 pages or 2500 words (exclusive of exhibits, proof of delivery, and the like).

§ 350.4 Form of Motion and Responsive Pleadings.

A motion, responsive pleading, or reply must include the following content and conform to the following format:

(a) *Relief requested.* The pleading must state specific relief the party seeks from the Copyright Royalty Judges.

(b) *Statement of facts.* The pleading must include a succinct statement of material facts.

(c) *Statement of issues.* The pleading must include a concise statement of the issues of law presented to the Copyright Royalty Judges for ruling.

(d) *Evidence relied upon.* The pleading must state with particularity the evidence on which it is based, and must include any relevant, admissible documentary evidence as attachment(s).

(e) *Legal authority.* Parties must cite any legal authority upon which they rely for the relief they seek.

§ 350.5 Electronic Filing System (eCRB).

(a) *Documents to be filed by electronic means*—(1) *Transition period.* For a period of up to six months following the initial deployment of the Copyright Royalty Board's electronic filing and case management system (eCRB), all parties having the technological capability must file all documents with the Copyright Royalty Board through eCRB in addition to filing paper documents in conformity with applicable Copyright Royalty Board rules. The Copyright Royalty Board will announce the date of the initial deployment of eCRB on the Copyright Royalty Board Web site (*www.loc.gov/crb*), as well as the conclusion of the dual-system transition period.

(2) *Subsequent to transition period.* Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, all attorneys must file documents with the Copyright Royalty Board through eCRB. *Pro se* parties may file documents with the Copyright Royalty Board through eCRB, subject to § 350.4(c)(2).

(b) *Official record.* The electronic version of a document filed through and stored in eCRB will be the official record of the Copyright Royalty Board.

(c) *Obtaining an electronic filing password*—(1) *Attorneys.* An attorney must obtain an eCRB password from the Copyright Royalty Board in order to file documents or to receive copies of orders and determinations of the Copyright Royalty Judges. The Copyright Royalty Board will issue an eCRB password after the attorney applicant completes the application form available on the CRB Web site and completes eCRB training.

(2) Pro se *parties.* A party not represented by an attorney (a *pro se* party) may obtain an eCRB password from the Copyright Royalty Board with permission from the Copyright Royalty Judges, in their discretion. To obtain permission, the *pro se* party must submit an application on the form available on the CRB Web site, describing the party's access to the Internet and confirming the party's ability and capacity to file documents and receive electronically the filings of other parties on a regular basis. If the Copyright Royalty Judges grant permission, the *pro se* party must complete the eCRB training provided by the Copyright Royalty Board to all electronic filers before receiving an eCRB password. Once the Copyright Royalty Board has issued an eCRB password to a *pro se* party, that party must make all subsequent filings by electronic means through eCRB.

(3) *Claimants.* Any person desiring to file a claim with the Copyright Royalty Board for copyright royalties may obtain an eCRB password for the limited purpose of filing claims by completing the application form available on the CRB Web site.

(d) *Use of an eCRB password.* An eCRB password may be used only by the person to whom it is assigned, or, in the case of an attorney, by that attorney or an authorized employee or agent of that attorney's law office or organization. The person to whom an eCRB password is assigned is responsible for any document filed using that password.

(e) *Signature.* The use of an eCRB password to login and submit documents creates an electronic record. The password operates and serves as the signature of the person to whom the password is assigned for all purposes under this chapter III.

(f) *Originals of sworn documents.* The electronic filing of a document that contains a sworn declaration, verification, certificate, statement, oath, or affidavit certifies that the original signed document is in the possession of the attorney or *pro se* party responsible for the filing and that it is available for review upon request by a party or by the Copyright Royalty Judges. The filer must file through eCRB a scanned copy of the signature page of the sworn document together with the document itself.

(g) *Consent to delivery by electronic means.* An attorney or *pro se* party who obtains an eCRB password consents to electronic delivery of all documents, subsequent to the petition to participate, that are filed by electronic means through eCRB. Counsel and *pro se* parties are responsible for monitoring their email accounts and, upon receipt of notice of an electronic filing, for retrieving the noticed filing. Parties and their counsel bear the responsibility to keep the contact information in their eCRB profiles current.

(h) *Accuracy of docket entry.* A person filing a document by electronic means is responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the official docket entry generated by the eCRB system, including proper identification of the proceeding, the filing party, and the description of the document. The Copyright Royalty Board will maintain on its Web site (*www.loc.gov/crb*) appropriate guidance regarding naming protocols for eCRB filers.

(i) *Documents subject to a protective order.* A person filing a document by electronic means is responsible for

ensuring, at the time of filing, that any documents subject to a protective order are identified to the eCRB system as ''restricted'' documents. This requirement is in addition to any requirements detailed in the applicable protective order. Failure to identify documents as ''restricted'' to the eCRB system may result in inadvertent publication of sensitive, protected material.

(j) *Exceptions to requirement of electronic filing*—(1) *Certain exhibits or attachments.* Parties may file in paper form any exhibits or attachments that are not in a format that readily permits electronic filing, such as oversized documents; or are illegible when scanned into electronic format. Parties filing paper documents or things pursuant to this paragraph must deliver legible or usable copies of the documents or things in accordance with paragraph 350.5(a)(2) and must file electronically a notice of filing that includes a certificate of delivery.

(2) Pro se *parties.* A *pro se* party must file documents in paper form and must deliver and accept delivery of documents in paper form, unless the *pro se* party has obtained an eCRB password.

(k) *Privacy Requirements.* Unless otherwise instructed by the Copyright Royalty Judges, parties must exclude or redact from all electronically filed documents, whether designated ''restricted'' or not:

(1) *Social Security Numbers.* If an individual's Social Security number must be included in a filed document for evidentiary reasons, the filer must use only the last four digits of that number.

(2) *Names of minor children.* If a minor child must be mentioned in a document for evidentiary reasons, the filer must use only the initials of that child.

(3) *Dates of birth.* If an individual's date of birth must be included in a pleading for evidentiary reasons, the filer must use only the year of birth.

(4) *Financial account numbers.* If a financial account number is relevant evidence in the proceeding, the filer must use only the last four digits of the account identifier.

(*l*) *Incorrectly filed documents and technical difficulties.* (1) The Copyright Royalty Board may direct an eCRB filer to re-file a document that has been incorrectly filed, or to correct an erroneous or inaccurate docket entry.

(2) After the transition period, if an attorney or a *pro se* party who has been issued an eCRB password inadvertently presents a document for filing in paper form, the Copyright Royalty Board may direct the attorney or *pro se* party to file the document electronically. The document will be deemed filed on the date it was first presented for filing if, no later than the next business day after being so directed by the Copyright Royalty Board, the attorney or *pro se* participant files the document electronically. If the party fails to make the electronic filing on the next business day, the document will be deemed filed on the date of the electronic filing.

(3) The inability to complete an electronic filing because of technical problems arising in the eCRB system may constitute ''good cause'' (as used in § 350.6(b)(4)) for an order enlarging time or excusable neglect for the failure to act within the specified time. A filer encountering technical problems with an eCRB filing must immediately notify the Copyright Royalty Board of the problem either by email or by telephone, followed promptly by written confirmation. This rule does not provide authority to extend statutory time limits.

§ 350.6 Filing and delivery.

(a) *Filing of pleadings*—(1) *Electronic filing through eCRB.* Except as described in § 350.5(*l*)(2), any document filed by electronic means through eCRB in accordance with § 350.5 constitutes filing for all purposes under this chapter, effective as of the date and time the document is received and timestamped by eCRB.

(2) *All other filings.* For all filings not submitted by electronic means through eCRB, the submitting party must deliver an original, five paper copies, and one electronic copy in Portable Document Format (PDF) on an optical data storage medium such as a CD or DVD, a flash memory device, or an external hard disk drive to the Copyright Royalty Board in accordance with the provisions described in § 301.2 of this chapter. In no case will the Copyright Royalty Board accept any document by facsimile transmission or electronic mail, except with prior express authorization of the Copyright Royalty Judges.

(b) *Exhibits.* Filers must include all exhibits with the pleadings they support. In the case of exhibits not submitted by electronic means through eCRB, whose bulk or whose cost of reproduction would unnecessarily encumber the record or burden the party, the Copyright Royalty Judges will consider a motion, made in advance of the filing, to reduce the number of required copies. *See* § 350.5(j).

(c) *English language translations.* Filers must accompany each submission that is in a language other than English with an English-language translation, duly verified under oath to be a true translation. Any other party to the proceeding may, in response, submit its own English-language translation, similarly verified, so long as the responding party's translation proves a substantive, relevant difference in the document.

(d) *Affidavits.* The testimony of each witness must be accompanied by an affidavit or a declaration made pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1746 supporting the testimony. *See* § 350.5(f).

(e) *Subscription*—(1) *Parties represented by counsel.* Subject to § 350.5(e), all documents filed electronically by counsel must be signed by at least one attorney of record and must list the attorney's full name, mailing address, email address (if any), telephone number, and a state bar identification number. *See* § 350.5(e). Submissions signed by an attorney for a party need not be verified or accompanied by an affidavit. The signature of an attorney constitutes certification that the contents of the document are true and correct, to the best of the signer's knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances and:

(i) The document is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation;

(ii) The claims, defenses, and other legal contentions therein are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law;

(iii) The allegations and other factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and

(iv) The denials of factual contentions are warranted by the evidence or, if specifically so identified, are reasonably based on a lack of information or belief.

(2) *Parties representing themselves.* The original of all paper documents filed by a party not represented by counsel must be signed by that party and list that party's full name, mailing address, email address (if any), and telephone number. The party's signature will constitute the party's certification that, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, there is good ground to support the document, and that it has not been interposed for purposes of delay.

(f) *Responses and replies.* Responses in support of or opposition to motions must be filed within five days of the

filing of the motion. Replies to responses must be filed within four days of the filing of the response.

(g) *Participant list.* The Copyright Royalty Judges will compile and distribute to those parties who have filed a valid petition to participate the official participant list for each proceeding. For all paper filings, a party must deliver a copy of the document to counsel for all other parties identified in the participant list, or, if the party is unrepresented by counsel, to the party itself. Parties must notify the Copyright Royalty Judges and all parties of any change in the name or address at which they will accept delivery and must update their eCRB profiles accordingly.

(h) *Delivery method and proof of delivery*—(1) *Electronic filings through eCRB.* Electronic filing of any document through eCRB operates to effect delivery of the document to counsel or *pro se* participants who have obtained eCRB passwords, and the automatic notice of filing sent by eCRB to the filer constitutes proof of delivery. Counsel or parties who have not yet obtained eCRB passwords must deliver and receive delivery as provided in paragraph (h)(2). Parties making electronic filings are responsible for assuring delivery of all filed documents to parties that do not use the eCRB system.

(2) *Paper filings.* During the course of a proceeding, each party must deliver all documents, including motions, responses and replies that they have not filed through eCRB to the other parties or their counsel by means no slower than overnight express mail on the same day they file the pleading, or by such other means as the parties may agree in writing among themselves. Parties must include a proof of delivery with any document delivered in accordance with this paragraph.

§ 350.7 Time.

(a) *Computation.* To compute the due date for filing and delivering any document or performing any other act directed by an order of the Copyright Royalty Judges or the rules of the Copyright Royalty Board:

(1) Exclude the day of the act, event, or default that begins the period.

(2) Exclude intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays when the period is less than 11 days, unless computation of the due date is stated in calendar days.

(3) Include the last day of the period, unless it is a Saturday, Sunday, legal holiday, or a day on which the weather or other conditions render the Copyright Royalty Board's office inaccessible.

(4) As used in this rule, ''legal holiday'' means the date designated for the observance of New Year's Day, Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Birthday, Presidents' Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Columbus Day, Veterans' Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, and any other day declared a federal holiday by the President or the Congress.

(5) Except as otherwise described in this Chapter or in an order by the Copyright Royalty Judges, the Copyright Royalty Board will consider documents to be timely filed only if:

(i) They are filed electronically through eCRB and time-stamped by 11:59:59 p.m. Eastern time on the due date;

(ii) They are sent by U.S. mail, are addressed in accordance with paragraph 301.2(a), have sufficient postage, and bear a USPS postmark on or before the due date;

(iii) They are hand-delivered by private party to the Copyright Office Public Information Office in accordance with § 301.2(b) of this chapter and received by 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the due date; or

(iv) They are hand-delivered by commercial courier to the Congressional Courier Acceptance Site in accordance with paragraph 301.2(c) and received by 4:00 p.m. Eastern time on the due date.

(6) Any document sent by mail and dated only with a business postal meter will be considered filed on the date it is actually received by the Library of Congress.

(b) *Extensions.* A party seeking an extension must do so by written motion. Prior to filing such a motion, a party must attempt to obtain consent from the other parties to the proceeding. An extension motion must state:

(1) The date on which the action or submission is due;

(2) The length of the extension sought;

(3) The date on which the action or submission would be due if the extension were allowed;

(4) The reason or reasons why there is good cause for the delay;

(5) The justification for the amount of additional time being sought; and

(6) The attempts that have been made to obtain consent from the other parties to the proceeding and the position of the other parties on the motion.

§ 350.8 Construction and waiver.

The regulations of the Copyright Royalty Judges are intended to provide efficient and just administrative proceedings and will be construed to advance these purposes. For purposes of an individual proceeding, the provisions of this subchapter may be suspended or waived, in whole or in part, upon a showing of good cause, to the extent allowable by law.

PART 351—PROCEEDINGS

■ 4. The authority citation for part 351 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 17 U.S.C. 803.

■ 5. In § 351.1 revise paragraph (b)(4) to read as follows:

§ 351.1 Initiation of proceedings.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(4) *Filing fee.* A petition to participate must be accompanied with a filing fee of $150 or the petition will be rejected. For petitions filed electronically through eCRB, payment must be made to the Copyright Royalty Board through the payment portal designated on eCRB. For petitions filed by other means, payment must be made to the Copyright Royalty Board by check or by money order. If a check is subsequently dishonored, the petition will be rejected. If the petitioner believes that the contested amount of that petitioner's claim will be $1,000 or less, the petitioner must so state in the petition to participate and should not include payment of the $150 filing fee. If it becomes apparent during the course of the proceedings that the contested amount of the claim is more than $1,000, the Copyright Royalty Judges will require payment of the filing fee at that time.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Suzanne M. Barnett,

Chief Copyright Royalty Judge.

[FR Doc. 2016–27932 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410–72–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 51 and 63

[PS Docket No. 14–74, GN Docket No. 13–5, WC Docket Nos. 05–25 and 13–3, RM–11358 and RM–10593; Report No. 3055]

Petitions for Reconsideration and Clarification of Action in Rulemaking Proceeding

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Petitions for reconsideration and clarification.

SUMMARY: Petitions for Reconsideration and Clarification (Petitions) have been filed in the Commission's rulemaking proceeding by David Springe and David C. Bergmann, on behalf of NASUCA, and Kathy D. Smith, on behalf of NTIA.

DATES: Oppositions to the Petition must be filed on or before December 8, 2016.

Replies to an opposition must be filed on or before December 19, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alex Johns, Wireline Competition Bureau, Competition Policy Division, (202) 418–1167, or send an email to *Alexis.Johns@fcc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's document, Report No. 3055, released November 9, 2016. The full text of the Petitions is available for viewing and copying at the FCC Reference Information Center, 445 12th Street SW., Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554 or may be accessed online via the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System at *http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/.* The Commission will not send a copy of this *document* pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A), because this *document* does not have an impact on any rules of particular applicability.

Subject: Technology Transitions; USTelecom Petition for Declaratory Ruling that Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers are Non-Dominant in the Provision of Switched Access Services; Policies and Rules Governing Retirement of Copper Loops by Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, FCC 16–90, published at 81 FR 62632, September 12, 2016, in WC Docket No. 13–5; RM–11358. This document is being published pursuant to 47 CFR 1.429(e). *See also* 47 CFR 1.4(b)(1) and 1.429(f), (g).

Number of Petitions Filed: 2.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28199 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

49 CFR Part 701

Revision of the Freedom of Information Act Regulations of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation

AGENCY: National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth proposed revisions of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) regulations of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (''Amtrak''). The regulations are being revised in part to incorporate the changes brought about by the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, which requires all agencies to review and update their FOIA regulations in accordance with its provisions. Amtrak has also taken this opportunity to update, clarify, and streamline the language of its regulations in order to make the FOIA process easier for the public to navigate.

DATES: Comments on the rulemaking must be submitted on or before December 23, 2016. Comments received by mail will be considered timely if they are postmarked on or before that date.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on the rulemaking by either of the methods listed below.

1. *Email: foiarequests@amtrak.com.* Please include ''Comments on FOIA Rule'' in the subject line.

2. *U.S. mail, courier, or hand delivery:* The Freedom of Information Office; National Railroad Passenger Corporation; 60 Massachusetts Avenue, NE.; Washington, DC 20002. To ensure proper handling, please write ''Comments on FOIA Rule'' on the correspondence.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sharron H. Hawkins, Lead FOIA Specialist, 202–906–3741 or *foiarequests@amtrak.com.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Amtrak's FOIA regulations were last revised on February 13, 1998. Since that time, there have been several major changes to the FOIA, including the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 (Pub. L. 114–185) signed into law on June 30, 2016. The Act contains several substantive and procedural amendments to the FOIA, which include requirements that agencies establish a minimum of 90 days for requesters to file an administrative appeal and that they provide dispute resolution services at various times throughout the FOIA process.

Based on the amendments to the FOIA and the practical experience of the FOIA staff, Amtrak has made several changes to its regulations and is republishing them in their entirety. These revisions incorporate the necessary changes under the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 and update, clarify, and streamline the language of the regulations in order to make the FOIA process easier for the public to navigate.

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 701

Freedom of Information.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, Amtrak proposes to amend 49 CFR part 701 as follows:

■ 1. Revise Part 701 to read as follows:

PART 701—AMTRAK FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT PROGRAM

Sec.

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552; 49 U.S.C. 24301(e).

§ 701.1. General provisions.

This part contains the rules that the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (''Amtrak'') follows in processing requests for records under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), Title 5 of the United States Code, section 552. Information routinely provided to the public (*i.e.,* train timetables, press releases) may be obtained at Amtrak's Web site *www.amtrak.com* without following Amtrak's FOIA procedures. As a matter of policy, Amtrak will only withhold information under the FOIA if Amtrak reasonably foresees that disclosure would harm an interest protected by a FOIA exemption or when disclosure is prohibited by law.

§ 701.2. Definitions.

Unless the context requires otherwise in this part, masculine pronouns include the feminine gender and ''includes'' means ''includes but is not limited to.''

(a) *Amtrak or Corporation* means the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

(b) *Appeal* means a request submitted to the President of Amtrak or designee for review of an adverse initial determination.

(c) *Business days* means working days; Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays are excluded in computing response time for processing FOIA requests.

(d) *Disclose or disclosure* means making records available for examination or copying, or furnishing a copy of nonexempt responsive records.

(e) *Electronic data* means records and information (including email) that are created, stored, and retrievable by electronic means.

(f) *Exempt information* means information that is exempt from disclosure as permitted by 5 U.S.C. 552.

(g) *Final determination* means a decision by the President of Amtrak or designee concerning a request for

review of an adverse initial determination received in response to an FOIA request.

(h) *Freedom of Information Act or* ''*FOIA*'' means the statute as codified in section 552 of Title 5 of the United States Code as amended.

(i) *FOIA Officer* means the Amtrak official designated to fulfill the responsibilities of implementing and administering the Freedom of Information Act as specifically designated under this part.

(j) *Initial determination* means a decision by the Amtrak FOIA Officer in response to a request for information under the FOIA.

(k) *Pages* means paper copies of standard office size or the cost equivalent in other media.

(l) *President* means the President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) or designee.

(m) *Record* means any writing, drawing, map, recording, tape, film, photograph, or other documentary material by which information is preserved in any format, including electronic format. A record must exist and be in the possession and control of Amtrak at the time of the request to be subject to this part and the FOIA. The following are not included within the definition of the word ''record'':

(1) Library materials compiled for reference purposes or objects of substantial intrinsic value.

(2) Routing and transmittal sheets, notes, and filing notes which do not also include information, comments, or statements of substance.

(3) Anything that is not a tangible or documentary record such as an individual's memory or oral communication.

(4) Objects or articles, whatever their historical or value as evidence.

(n) *Request* means any request for records made pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552.

(o) *Requester or requesting party* means any person who has submitted a request to Amtrak.

(p) *Responsive records* means documents or electronic records determined to be within the scope of a FOIA request.

§ 701.3. Policy.

(a) Amtrak will make records of the Corporation available to the public to the greatest practicable extent in keeping with the spirit of the law. Therefore, records of the Corporation are available electronically, which can be accessed at the Amtrak FOIA Web site *http://www.amtrak.com/foia* and *www.amtrak.com,* as provided in this part with the exception of those that the Corporation specifically determines should not be disclosed either in the public interest, for the protection of private rights, or for the efficient conduct of public or corporate business, but only to the extent withholding is permitted by law.

(b) A record of the Corporation, or parts thereof, may be withheld from disclosure if the Corporation reasonably foresees that disclosure would harm an interest protected by a FOIA exemption or when disclosure is prohibited by law. Disclosure to a properly constituted advisory committee, to Congress, or to federal agencies does not waive the exemption.

(c) In the event full disclosure of a requested record is not possible, any reasonably segregable portion of the record will be made available to the requesting person after deletion of the exempt portions. The entire record may be withheld if a determination is made that nonexempt material is so inextricably intertwined that disclosure would leave only essentially meaningless words or phrases, or when it can be reasonably assumed that a skillful and knowledgeable person could reconstruct the deleted information.

(d) The procedures in this part apply only to records in existence at the time of a request. The Corporation has no obligation to create a record solely for the purpose of making it available under the FOIA or to provide a record that will be created in the future.

(e) Each officer and employee of the Corporation dealing with FOIA requests is directed to cooperate in making records available for disclosure under the Act in a prompt manner consistent with this part.

(f) The FOIA time limits will not begin to run until a request has been identified as being made under the Act and deemed received by the FOIA Office.

(g) Generally, when a member of the public complies with the procedures established in this part for obtaining records under the FOIA, the request shall receive prompt attention, and a response shall be made within twenty business days.

§ 701.4. Amtrak public information.

(a) *Amtrak FOIA Web site.* Amtrak will make available electronically records created by the Corporation that are required under the FOIA to be made available for public inspection which can be accessed at the Amtrak FOIA Web site *http://www.amtrak.com/foia* and *www.amtrak.com.*

(b) *Frequently requested information.* The FOIA requires that copies of records, regardless of form or format, that have been released pursuant to a FOIA request under 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(3) be made publicly available in an electronic format if (1) because of the nature of their subject matter they have become or are likely to become the subject of subsequent requests for substantially the same records or (2) they have been requested three or more times.

(1) Amtrak shall decide on a case-by-case basis whether records fall into the first category of ''frequently requested FOIA records'' based on the following factors:

(i) Previous experience with similar records;

(ii) The nature and type of information contained in the records;

(iii) The identity and number of requesters and whether there is widespread media or commercial interest in the records.

(2) The provision in this paragraph is intended for situations where public access in a timely manner is important. It is not intended to apply where there may be a limited number of requests over a short period of time from a few requesters. Amtrak may remove the records when it is determined that access is no longer necessary.

(c) *Guide for making requests.* A guide on how to use the FOIA for requesting records from Amtrak shall be made available to the public upon request. Amtrak's major information systems will be described in the guide.

§ 701.5. Requirements for making requests.

(a) *General requirements.*

(1) A FOIA request can be made by ''any person'' as defined in 5 U.S.C. 551(2), which encompasses individuals (including foreign citizens; partnerships; corporations; associations; and local, state, tribal, and foreign governments). A FOIA request may not be made by a federal agency.

(2) A request must be in writing, indicate that it is being made under the FOIA, and provide an adequate description of the records sought. The request should also include applicable information regarding fees as specified in paragraphs (d) and (e) of this section.

(b) *How to submit a request.*

(1) A request must clearly state on the envelope and in the letter that it is a Freedom of Information Act or ''FOIA'' request.

(2) The request must be addressed to the Freedom of Information Office; National Railroad Passenger Corporation; 60 Massachusetts Avenue, NE.; Washington, DC 20002. Requests will also be accepted by facsimile at

(202) 906–2004 or via email at *foiarequests@amtrak.com.* Amtrak cannot assure that a timely or satisfactory response under this part will be given to written requests addressed to Amtrak offices, officers, or employees other than the FOIA Office. Amtrak employees receiving a communication in the nature of a FOIA request shall forward it to the FOIA Office expeditiously. Amtrak shall advise the requesting party of the date that an improperly addressed request is received by the FOIA Office.

(c) *Content of the request—*

(1) *Description of records.* Identification of records sought under the FOIA is the responsibility of the requester. The records sought should be described in sufficient detail so that Amtrak personnel can locate them with a reasonable amount of effort. When possible, the request should include specific information such as dates, title or name, author, recipient, subject matter of the record, file designation or number, or other pertinent details for each record or category of records sought. Requesters may contact Amtrak's FOIA Public Liaison to discuss the records they seek and to receive assistance in describing the records.

(2) *Reformulation of a request.* Amtrak is not obligated to act on a request until the requester provides sufficient information to locate the record. Amtrak may offer assistance in identifying records and reformulating a request where: The description is considered insufficient, the production of voluminous records is required, or a considerable number of work hours would be required that would interfere with the business of the Corporation. The FOIA Office shall notify the requester within ten business days of the type of information that will facilitate the search. The requesting party shall be given an opportunity to supply additional information and may submit a revised request, which will be treated as a new request. Requesters may contact Amtrak's FOIA Public Liaison to receive assistance in reformulating or modifying their request.

(d) *Payment of fees.* The submission of a FOIA request constitutes an agreement to pay applicable fees accessed up to $25.00 unless the requesting party specifies a willingness to pay a greater or lesser amount or seeks a fee waiver or reduction in fees.

(1) *Fees in excess of $25.00.* When Amtrak determines or estimates that applicable fees are likely to exceed $25.00, the requesting party shall be notified of estimated or actual fees, unless a commitment has been made in advance to pay all fees. If only a portion of the fee can be estimated readily, Amtrak shall advise the requester that the estimated fee may be a portion of the total fee.

(i) In order to protect requesters from large and/or unexpected fees, Amtrak will request a specific commitment when it estimates or determines that fees will exceed $100.00.

(ii) A request shall not be considered received and further processing shall not be carried out until the requesting party agrees to pay the anticipated total fee. Any such agreement must be memorialized in writing. A notice under this paragraph will offer the requesting party an opportunity to discuss the matter in order to reformulate the request to meet the requester's needs at a lower cost.

(iii) Amtrak will hold in abeyance for ten business days requests requiring agreement to pay fees and will thereafter deem the request closed. This action will not prevent the requesting party from refiling the FOIA request with a fee commitment at a subsequent date.

(2) *Fees in excess of $250.* When Amtrak estimates or determines that allowable charges are likely to exceed $250, an advance deposit of the entire fee may be required before continuing to process the request.

(e) *Information regarding fee category.* In order to determine the appropriate fee category, a request should indicate whether the information sought is intended for commercial use or whether the requesting party is a member of the staff of an educational or noncommercial scientific institution or a representative of the news media.

(f) *Records concerning other individuals.* If the request is for records concerning another individual, either of the following may be required in order to process the request: (1) A notarized written authorization signed by that individual permitting disclosure of those records to the requesting party, together with a copy of a photo ID of that individual; or (2) proof that the individual is deceased (*i.e.,* a copy of a death certificate or an obituary). A form of identification from the requesting party may also be required. Such records are also subject to any applicable FOIA exemptions.

§ 701.6. Release and processing procedures.

(a) *General provisions.* In determining records that are responsive to a request, Amtrak will ordinarily include only records that exist and are in the possession and control of the Corporation as of the date that the search is begun. If any other date is used, the requesting party will be informed of that date.

(b) *Authority to grant or deny requests.* Amtrak's FOIA Officer is authorized to grant or deny any request for records.

(c) *Notice of referral.* If Amtrak refers all or any part of the responsibility for responding to a request to another organization, the requesting party will be notified. A referral shall not be considered a denial of access within the meaning of this part. All consultations and referrals of requests will be handled according to the date that the FOIA request was initially received.

(d) *Creating a record.* There is no obligation on the part of Amtrak to create, compile, or obtain a record to satisfy a FOIA request. The FOIA also does not require that a new computer program be developed to extract the records requested. Amtrak may compile or create a new record, however, when doing so would result in a more useful response to the requesting party or would be less burdensome to Amtrak than providing existing records. The cost of creating or compiling such a record may not be charged to the requester unless the fee for creating the record is equal to or less than the fee that would be charged for providing the existing record.

(e) *Incomplete records.* If the records requested are not complete at the time of a request, Amtrak may, at its discretion, inform the requester that complete nonexempt records will be provided when available without having to submit an additional request.

(f) *Electronic records.* Amtrak is not obligated to process a request for electronic records where creation of a record, programming, or a particular format would result in a significant expenditure of resources or interfere with the corporation's operations.

§ 701.7. Timing of responses to requests.

(a) *General.*

(1) The time limits prescribed in the FOIA will begin only after the requirements for submitting a request as established in § 701.5 have been met, and the request is deemed received by the FOIA Office.

(2) A request for records shall be considered to have been received on the later of the following dates:

(i) The requester has agreed in writing to pay applicable fees in accordance with § 701.5(d), or

(ii) The fees have been waived in accordance with § 701.11(k), or

(iii) Payment in advance has been received from the requester when required in accordance with § 701.11(i).

(3) The time for responding to requests set forth in paragraph (b) of this section may be delayed if:

(i)The request does not sufficiently identify the fee category applicable to the request;

(ii) The request does not state a willingness to pay all fees;

(iii) A request seeking a fee waiver does not address the criteria for fee waivers set forth in § 701.11(k);

(iv) A fee waiver request is denied, and the request does not include an alternative statement indicating that the requesting party is willing to pay all fees.

(b) *Initial determination.* Whenever possible, an initial determination to release or deny a record shall be made within twenty business days after receipt of the request. In ''unusual circumstances'' as described in paragraph (d) of this section, the time for an initial determination may be extended for ten business days.

(c) *Multitrack processing.*

(1) Amtrak may use two or more processing tracks by distinguishing between simple, complex, and expedited requests based on the amount of work and/or time needed to process a request or the number of pages involved.

(2) In general, when requests are received, Amtrak's FOIA Office will review and categorize them for tracking purposes. Requests within each track will be processed according to date of receipt.

(3) The FOIA Office may contact a requester when a request does not appear to qualify for fast track processing to provide an opportunity to limit the scope of the request and qualify for a faster track. Such notification shall be at the discretion of the FOIA Office and will depend largely on whether it is believed that a narrowing of the request could place the request on a faster track.

(d) *Unusual circumstances.*

(1) The requesting party shall be notified in writing if the time limits for processing a request cannot be met because of unusual circumstances, and it will be necessary to extend the time limits for processing the request. The notification shall set forth the unusual circumstances for such extension and shall include the date by which the request can be expected to be completed. Where the extension is for more than ten business days, the requesting party will be afforded an opportunity to either modify the request so that it may be processed within the time limits or to arrange an alternative time period for processing the initial request or modified request. In such a case, the requesting party has the right to seek assistance from Amtrak's FOIA Public Liaison and to seek dispute resolution services from the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS). If Amtrak fails to comply with the extended time limit, no search fees (or, in the case of requesters described in § 701.11(d)(2), no duplication fees) may be charged unless more than 5,000 pages are necessary to respond to the request, timely written notice has been sent out, and Amtrak has discussed with the requesting party via written mail, email, or telephone (or made not less than three good-faith attempts to do so) how the requesting party could effectively limit the scope of the request.

(2) If Amtrak believes that multiple requests submitted by a requester or by a group of requesters acting in concert constitute a single request that would otherwise involve unusual circumstances and the requests involve clearly related matters, the requests may be aggregated. Multiple requests concerning unrelated matters may not be aggregated.

(3) Unusual circumstances that may justify delay include:

(i) The need to search for and collect the requested records from other facilities that are separate from Amtrak's headquarters offices.

(ii) The need to search for, collect, and examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct records sought in a single request.

(iii) The need for consultation, which shall be conducted with all practicable speed, with agencies having a substantial interest in the determination of the request, or among two or more Amtrak components having a substantial subject-matter interest in the request.

(e) *Expedited processing.*

(1) Requests and appeals may be taken out of order and given expedited treatment whenever it is determined that they involve a compelling need, which means:

(i) Circumstances in which the lack of expedited treatment could reasonably be expected to pose an imminent threat to the life or physical safety of an individual; and

(ii) An urgency to inform the public about an actual or alleged Amtrak activity, if made by a person primarily engaged in disseminating information.

(2) A request for expedited processing may be made at the time of the initial request for records or at a later date.

(3) A requester seeking expedited processing must submit a statement, certified to be true and correct to the best of that person's knowledge and belief, explaining in detail the basis for requesting expedited processing. This statement must accompany the request in order to be considered and responded to within the ten calendar days required for decisions on expedited access.

(4) A requester who is not a full-time member of the news media must establish that he is a person whose main professional activity or occupation is information dissemination, though it need not be his sole occupation. A requester must establish a particular urgency to inform the public about the Amtrak activity involved in the request.

(5) Within ten business days of receipt of a request for expedited processing, Amtrak shall determine whether to grant such a request and notify the requester of the decision. If a request for expedited treatment is granted, the request shall be given priority and shall be processed as soon as practicable.

(6) Amtrak shall provide prompt consideration of appeals of decisions denying expedited processing.

§ 701.8. Responses to requests.

(a) *Granting of requests.* When an initial determination is made to grant a request in whole or in part, the requesting party shall be notified in writing and advised of any fees charged under § 701.11(e). The records shall be disclosed to the requesting party promptly upon payment of applicable fees. The requesting party has the right to seek assistance from Amtrak's FOIA Public Liaison.

(b) *Adverse determination of requests—*

(1) *Types of denials.* The requesting party shall be notified in writing of a determination to deny a request in any respect. Adverse determinations or denials of records consist of:

(i) A determination to withhold any requested record in whole or in part;

(ii) A determination that a requested record does not exist or cannot be located;

(iii) A denial of a request for expedited treatment; and

(iv) A determination on any disputed fee matter including a denial of a request for a fee waiver.

(2) *Deletions.* Records disclosed in part shall be marked clearly to show both the amount of the information deleted and the exemption under which the deletion was made unless doing so would harm an interest protected by an applicable exemption. If technically feasible, the amount of the information deleted and the exemption under which the deletion is made shall be indicated at the place in the record where such deletion is made.

(3) *Content of denial letter.* The denial letter shall be signed by the FOIA Officer or designee and shall include:

(i) A brief statement of the reason(s) for the adverse determination including any FOIA exemptions applied in denying the request;

(ii) An estimate of the volume of information withheld (number of pages or some other reasonable form of estimation). An estimate does not need to be provided if the volume is indicated through deletions on records disclosed in part, or if providing an estimate would harm an interest protected by an applicable exemption;

(iii) A statement that an appeal may be filed under § 701.10 and a description of the requirements of that section and of the right of the requesting party to seek dispute resolution services from either Amtrak's FOIA Public Liaison or the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS); and

(iv) The name and title or position of the person responsible for the denial.

(4) *Engaging in dispute resolution services provided by OGIS.* Mediation is a voluntary process. If Amtrak agrees to participate in the mediation services provided by OGIS, it will actively engage as a partner to the process in an attempt to resolve the dispute.

§ 701.9. Business information.

(a) *General.* Business information held by Amtrak will be disclosed under the FOIA only under this section.

(b) *Definitions.* For purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) *Business information* means commercial or financial information held by Amtrak that may be protected from disclosure under Exemption 4 of the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4).

(2) *Submitter* means any person or entity including partnerships; corporations; associations; and local, state, tribal, and foreign governments.

(c) *Designation of business information.* A submitter of business information will use good faith efforts to designate, by appropriate markings, either at the time of submission or at a reasonable time thereafter, any portions of its submission that it considers to be protected from disclosure under Exemption 4. These designations will expire ten years after the date of the submission unless the submitter requests and provides justification for a longer designation period.

(d) *Notice to submitters.* Amtrak shall provide a submitter with prompt written notice of an FOIA request or an appeal that seeks its business information when required under paragraph (e) of this section, except as provided in paragraph (h), in order to give the submitter an opportunity to object to disclosure of any specified portion of the information under paragraph (f). The notice shall either describe the business information requested or include copies of the requested records or portions of records containing the information.

(e) *When notice is required.* Notice shall be given to a submitter when:

(1) The information has been designated in good faith by the submitter as information considered protected from disclosure under Exemption 4; or

(2) Amtrak has reason to believe that the information may be protected from disclosure under Exemption 4.

(f) *Opportunity to object to disclosure.* Amtrak will allow a submitter a reasonable amount of time, as determined by Amtrak in its sole discretion, to respond to the notice described in paragraph (d) of this section.

(1) A detailed written statement must be submitted to Amtrak if the submitter has any objection to disclosure. The statement must specify all grounds for withholding any specified portion of the information sought under the FOIA. In the case of Exemption 4, it must show why the information is a trade secret or commercial or financial information that is privileged or confidential.

(2) Unless otherwise specified, in the event that a submitter fails to respond within the time specified in the notice, the submitter may, in Amtrak's discretion, be considered to have no objection to disclosure of the information sought under the FOIA.

(3) Information provided by a submitter in response to the notice may be subject to disclosure under the FOIA.

(g) *Notice of intent to disclose.* Amtrak shall consider a submitter's objections and specific grounds for disclosure in making a determination whether to disclose the information. In any instance, when a decision is made to disclose information over the objection of a submitter, Amtrak shall give the submitter written notice which shall include:

(1) A statement of the reason(s) why each of the submitter's objections to disclosure was not sustained;

(2) A description of the information to be disclosed; and

(3) A specified disclosure date, which shall be a reasonable time subsequent to the notice as determined by Amtrak in its sole discretion.

(h) *Exceptions to notice requirements.* The notice requirements of this section shall not apply if:

(1) Amtrak determines that the information should not be disclosed;

(2) The information has been published or has been officially made available to the public;

(3) Disclosure of the information is required by law (other than the FOIA);

(4) The designation made by the submitter under paragraph (c) of this section appears obviously frivolous. In such a case, Amtrak shall, prior to a specified disclosure date, give the submitter written notice of the final decision to disclose the information; or

(5) The information requested is not designated by the submitter as exempt from disclosure in accordance with this part, unless Amtrak has substantial reason to believe that disclosure of the information would result in competitive harm.

(i) *Notice of a FOIA lawsuit.* Whenever a FOIA requester files a lawsuit seeking to compel disclosure of business information, Amtrak shall promptly notify the submitter.

(j) *Notice to requesters.*

(1) When Amtrak provides a submitter with notice and an opportunity to object to disclosure under paragraph (f) of this section, the FOIA Office shall also notify the requester(s).

(2) When Amtrak notifies a submitter of its intent to disclose requested information under paragraph (g) of this section, Amtrak shall also notify the requester(s).

(3) When a submitter files a lawsuit seeking to prevent the disclosure of business information, Amtrak shall notify the requester(s).

§ 701.10. Appeals.

(a) *Appeals of adverse determinations.*

(1) The requesting party may appeal:

(i) A decision to withhold any requested record in whole or in part;

(ii) A determination that a requested record does not exist or cannot be located;

(iii) A denial of a request for expedited treatment; or

(iv) Any disputed fee matter or the denial of a request for a fee waiver.

(2) The appeal must be addressed to the President and Chief Executive Officer, in care of the Chief Legal Officer and General Counsel; National Railroad Passenger Corporation; 60 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, DC 20002.

(3) The appeal must be in writing and specify the relevant facts and the basis for the appeal. The appeal letter and envelope must be marked prominently ''Freedom of Information Act Appeal'' to ensure that it is properly routed.

(4) The appeal must be received by the President's Office within ninety days of the date of denial.

(5) An appeal will not be acted upon if the request becomes a matter of FOIA litigation.

(b) *Responses to appeals.* The decision on any appeal shall be made in writing.

(1) A decision upholding an adverse determination in whole or in part shall contain a statement of the reason(s) for such action, including any FOIA exemption(s) applied. The requesting party shall also be advised of the provision for judicial review of the decision contained in 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(4)(B).

(2) If the adverse determination is reversed or modified on appeal in whole or in part, the requesting party shall be notified, and the request shall be reprocessed in accordance with the decision.

(c) *When appeal is required.* The requesting party must timely appeal any adverse determination prior to seeking judicial review.

§ 701.11. Fees.

(a) *General.* Amtrak shall charge for processing requests under the FOIA in accordance with this section. A fee of $38 per hour shall be charged for search and review. For information concerning other processing fees, refer to paragraph (e) of this section. Amtrak shall collect all applicable fees before releasing copies of requested records to the requesting party. Payment of fees shall be made by check or money order payable to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

(b) *Definitions.* For purposes of this section:

(1) *Search* means the process of looking for and retrieving records or information responsive to a request. It includes page-by-page or line-by-line identification of information within records and also includes reasonable efforts to locate and retrieve information from records maintained in electronic form or format.

(2) *Review* means the process of examining a record located in response to a request to determine whether one or more of the statutory exemptions of the FOIA apply. Processing any record for disclosure includes doing all that is necessary to redact the record and prepare it for release. Review time includes time spent considering formal objection to disclosure by a commercial submitter under § 701.9 but does not include time spent resolving general legal or policy issues regarding the application of exemptions. Review costs are recoverable even if a record ultimately is not disclosed.

(3) *Reproduction* means the making of a copy of a record or the information contained in it in order to respond to a FOIA request. Copies can take the form of paper, microform, audiovisual materials, or electronic records (*i.e.,* magnetic tape or disk) among others. Amtrak shall honor a requester's specified preference for the form or format of disclosure if the record is readily reproducible with reasonable effort in the requested form or format by the office responding to the request.

(4) *Direct costs* means those expenses actually incurred in searching for and reproducing (and, in the case of commercial use requests, reviewing) records to respond to a FOIA request. Direct costs include such costs as the salary of the employee performing the work (the basic rate of pay for the employee plus applicable benefits and the cost of operating reproduction equipment). Direct costs do not include overhead expenses such as the costs of space and heating or lighting of the facility.

(c) *Fee categories.* There are four categories of FOIA requesters for fee purposes: ''commercial use requesters,'' ''representatives of the news media,'' ''educational and non-commercial scientific institution requesters,'' and ''all other requesters.'' The categories are defined in paragraphs (c)(1) through (5), and applicable fees, which are the same for two of the categories, will be assessed as specified in paragraph (d) of this section.

(1) *Commercial requesters.* The term ''commercial use'' request refers to a request from or on behalf of a person who seeks information for a use or purpose that furthers his commercial, trade, or profit interests, including furthering those interests through litigation. Amtrak shall determine, whenever reasonably possible, the use to which a requester will put the records sought by the request. When it appears that the requesting party will put the records to a commercial use, either because of the nature of the request itself or because Amtrak has reasonable cause to doubt the stated intended use, Amtrak shall provide the requesting party with an opportunity to submit further clarification. Where a requester does not explain the use or where explanation is insufficient, Amtrak may draw reasonable inferences from the requester's identity and charge accordingly.

(2) *Representative of the news media or news media requester* refers to any person actively gathering news for an entity that is organized and operated to publish or broadcast news to the public. The term ''news'' means information that is about current events or that would be of current interest to the public. Examples of news media entities include television or radio stations broadcasting to the public at large and publishers of periodicals (but only in those instances where they can qualify as disseminators of news). For ''freelance'' journalists to be regarded as working for a news organization, they must demonstrate a solid basis for expecting publication through an organization. A publication contract would be the clearest proof, but Amtrak shall also look to the past publication record of a requester in making this determination. A request for records supporting the news dissemination function of the requester shall not be considered to be for commercial use.

(3) *Educational institution* refers to a preschool, a public or private elementary or secondary school, an institution of undergraduate higher education, an institution of graduate higher education, an institution of professional education, or an institution of vocational education that operates a program of scholarly research. To be in this category, a requester must show that the request is authorized by and is made under the auspices of a qualifying institution and that the records are not sought for commercial use but to further scholarly research.

(4) *Noncommercial scientific institution* refers to an institution that is not operated on a ''commercial'' basis, as that term is defined in paragraph (c)(1) of this section, and that is operated solely for the purpose of conducting scientific research, the results of which are not intended to promote any particular product or industry. To be in this category, the requesting party must show that the request is authorized by and is made under the auspices of a qualifying institution and that the records are not sought for commercial use but to further scientific research.

(5) *Other requesters* refers to requesters who do not come under the purview of paragraphs (c)(1) through (4) of this section.

(d) *Assessing fees.* In responding to FOIA requests, Amtrak shall charge the following fees unless a waiver or a reduction in fees has been granted under paragraph (k) of this section:

(1) ''*Commercial use*'' *requesters:* The full allowable direct costs for search, review, and duplication of records.

(2) ''*Representatives of the news media*'' *and* ''*educational and non-commercial scientific institution*'' *requesters:* Duplication charges only, excluding charges for the first 100 pages.

(3) ''*All other*'' *requesters:* The direct costs of search and duplication of

records. The first 100 pages of duplication and the first two hours of search time shall be provided without charge.

(e) *Schedule of fees—*

(1) *Manual searches.* Personnel search time includes time expended in either manual searches for paper records, searches using indices, review of computer search results for relevant records, and personal computer system searches.

(2) *Computer searches.* The direct costs of conducting a computer search will be charged. These direct costs will include the cost of operating a central processing unit for that portion of the operating time that is directly attributable to searching for responsive records as well as the costs of operator/programmer salary apportionable to the search.

(3) *Duplication fees.* Duplication fees will be charged all requesters subject to limitations specified in paragraph (d) of this section. Amtrak shall charge 25 cents per page for a paper photocopy of a record. For copies produced by computer (such as tapes or printouts), Amtrak will charge the direct costs, including the operator time in producing the copy. For other forms of duplication, Amtrak will charge the direct costs of that duplication.

(4) *Review fees.* Review fees will be assessed for commercial use requests. Such fees will be assessed for review conducted in making an initial determination, or upon appeal, when review is conducted to determine whether an exemption not previously considered is applicable.

(5) *Charges for other services.* The actual cost or amount shall be charged for all other types of output, production, and duplication (*e.g.,* photographs, maps, or printed materials). Determinations of actual cost shall include the commercial cost of the media, the personnel time expended in making the item available for release, and an allocated cost for the equipment used in producing the item. The requesting party will be charged actual production costs when a commercial service is required. Items published and available through Amtrak will be made available at the publication price.

(6) *Charges for special services.* Apart from the other provisions of this section, when Amtrak chooses as a matter of discretion to provide a special service such as sending records by other than ordinary mail, the direct costs of providing such services shall be charged.

(f) *Commitment to pay fees.* When Amtrak determines or estimates that applicable fees will likely exceed $25.00, the requesting party will be notified of the actual or estimated amount unless a written statement has been received indicating a willingness to pay all fees. To protect requesters from large and/or unexpected fees, Amtrak will request a specific commitment when it is estimated or determined that fees will exceed $100.00. See § 701.5(d) for additional information.

(g) *Restrictions in accessing fees—*

(1) *General.* Fees for search and review will not be charged for a quarter-hour period unless more than half of that period is required.

(2) *Minimum fee.* No fees will be charged if the cost of collecting the fee is equal to or greater than the fee itself. That cost includes the costs to Amtrak for billing, receiving, recording, and processing the fee for deposit, which has been deemed to be $10.00.

(3) *Computer searches.* With the exception of requesters seeking documents for commercial use, Amtrak shall not charge fees for a computer search until the cost of search equals the equivalent dollar amount of two hours of the salary of the operator performing the search.

(h) *Nonproductive searches.* Amtrak may charge for time spent for search and review even if responsive records are not located or if the records located are determined to be entirely exempt from disclosure.

(i) *Advance payments.*

(1) When Amtrak estimates or determines that charges are likely to exceed $250, an advance payment of the entire fee may be required before continuing to process the request.

(2) Where a requester has previously failed to pay a properly charged FOIA fee within thirty (30) days of the date of billing, Amtrak may require the full amount due plus applicable interest and an advance payment of the full amount of anticipated fees before beginning to process a new request or continuing to process a pending request. The time limits of the FOIA will begin only after Amtrak has received such payment.

(3) Amtrak will hold in abeyance for thirty days requests where deposits are due.

(4) Monies owed for work already completed (*i.e.,* before copies are sent to a requester) shall not be considered an advance payment.

(5) Amtrak shall not deem a request as being received in cases in which an advance deposit or payment is due, and further work will not be done until the required payment is received.

(j) *Charging interest.* Amtrak may charge interest on any unpaid bill for processing charges starting on the 31st day following the date of billing the requester. Interest charges will be assessed at the rate that Amtrak pays for short-term borrowing.

(k) *Waiver or reduction of fees—*

(1) *Automatic waiver of fees.* When the costs for a FOIA request total $10.00 or less, fees shall be waived automatically for all requesters regardless of category.

(2) *Other fee waivers.* Decisions to waive or reduce fees that exceed the automatic waiver threshold shall be made on a case-by-case basis. Records responsive to a request will be furnished without charge or at below the established charge where Amtrak determines, based on all available information, that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because:

(i) It is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of Amtrak, and

(ii) It is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requesting party.

(3) To determine whether the fee waiver requirement in paragraph (k)(2)(i) of this section is met, Amtrak will consider the following factors:

(i) *The subject of the request—whether the subject of the requested records concerns the operations or activities of Amtrak.* The subject of the requested records must concern identifiable operations or activities of Amtrak with a connection that is direct and clear, not remote or attenuated.

(ii) *The informative value of the information to be disclosed—whether the disclosure is likely to contribute to an understanding of Amtrak operations or activities.* The disclosable portions of the requested records must be meaningfully informative about Amtrak's operations or activities in order to be found to be likely to contribute to an increased public understanding of those operations or activities. The disclosure of information that already is in the public domain, in either a duplicative or a substantially identical form, would not be as likely to contribute to such understanding where nothing new would be added to the public's understanding.

(iii) *The contribution to an understanding of the subject by the public likely to result from disclosure—whether disclosure of the requested information will contribute to public understanding.* The disclosure must contribute to the understanding of a reasonably broad audience of persons interested in the subject as opposed to the individual understanding of the requester. A requester's ability and

expertise in the subject area as well as the requester's intention to effectively convey information to the public shall be considered. It shall be presumed that a representative of the news media will satisfy this consideration.

(iv) *The significance of the contribution to public understanding—whether the disclosure is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of Amtrak operations or activities.* The public's understanding of the subject in question, as compared to the level of public understanding existing prior to the disclosure, must be enhanced by the disclosure to a significant extent.

(4) To determine whether the fee waiver requirement in paragraph (k)(2)(ii) of this section is met, Amtrak will consider the following factors:

(i) *The existence and magnitude of a commercial interest—whether the requesting party has a commercial interest that would be furthered by the requested disclosure.* Amtrak shall consider any commercial interest of the requesting party (with reference to the definition of ''commercial use'' in paragraph (c)(1) of this section) or any person on whose behalf the requesting party may be acting that would be furthered by the requested disclosure. Requesters shall be given an opportunity to provide explanatory information regarding this consideration.

(ii) *The primary interest in disclosure—whether the magnitude of the identified commercial interest of the requester is sufficiently large in comparison with the public interest in disclosure, that disclosure is ''primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.''* A fee waiver or reduction is justified where the public interest standard is satisfied and public interest is greater in magnitude than any identified commercial interest in disclosure.

(5) Requests for a fee waiver will be considered on a case-by-case basis, based upon the merits of the information provided. Where it is difficult to determine whether the request is commercial in nature, Amtrak may draw inference from the requester's identity and the circumstances of the request.

(6) Requests for a waiver or reduction of fees must address the factors listed in paragraphs (k) (3) and (4) of this section. In all cases, the burden shall be on the requesting party to present evidence of information in support of a request for a waiver of fees.

(l) *Aggregating requests.* A requester may not file multiple requests at the same time in order to avoid payment of fees. Where Amtrak reasonably believes that a requester or a group of requesters acting in concert is attempting to divide a request into a series of requests for the purpose of avoiding fees, Amtrak may aggregate those requests and charge accordingly. Amtrak may presume that multiple requests of this type made within a thirty-day period have been made in order to avoid fees. Where requests are separated by a longer period, Amtrak may aggregate them only when there exists a reasonable basis for determining that aggregation is warranted in view of all the circumstances involved. Multiple requests involving unrelated matters may not be aggregated.

§ 701.12. Other rights and services.

Nothing in this part shall be construed as entitling any person, as of right, to any service or the disclosure of any record to which such person is not entitled under the FOIA.

Dated: November 10, 2016.

Eleanor D. Acheson,

Executive Vice President, Chief Legal Officer, General Counsel & Corporate Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–27620 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9600–51–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 622

[Docket No. 160630574–6574–01]

RIN 0648–BG18

Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Hogfish Management Measures

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS proposes to implement management measures described in Amendment 43 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf)(FMP), as prepared by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Gulf Council)(Amendment 43). This proposed rule would revise the geographic range of the fishery management unit (FMU) for Gulf hogfish (the West Florida stock) consistent with the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's (South Atlantic Council) proposed boundary between the Florida Keys/East Florida and West Florida stocks, set the annual catch limit (ACL) for the West Florida stock, increase the minimum size limit for the proposed West Florida stock, and remove the powerhead exception for harvest of hogfish in the Gulf reef fish stressed area. This proposed rule would also correct a reference in the regulatory definition for charter vessel. The purpose of this proposed rule is to manage hogfish using the best scientific information available.

DATES: Written comments must be received by December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on the proposed rule identified by ''NOAA–NMFS–2016–0126'' by either of the following methods:

- *Electronic Submission:* Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Go to *www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=NOAA-NMFS-2016-0126,* click the ''Comment Now!'' icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach your comments.
- *Mail:* Submit all written comments to Peter Hood, NMFS Southeast Regional Office, 263 13th Avenue South, St. Petersburg, FL 33701.

Instructions: Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period, may not be considered by NMFS. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on *www.regulations.gov* without change. All personal identifying information (*e.g.,* name, address, etc.), confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive information submitted voluntarily by the sender will be publicly accessible. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter ''N/A'' in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous).

Electronic copies of Amendment 43, which includes an environmental assessment, a fishery impact statement, a Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) analysis, and a regulatory impact review, may be obtained from the Southeast Regional Office Web site at *http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sustainable_fisheries/gulf_fisheries/reef_fish/2016/am43/index.html.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Hood, NMFS Southeast Regional Office, telephone: 727–824–5305, email: *peter.hood@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NMFS and the Council manage the Gulf reef fish fishery, which includes hogfish, under the FMP. The Council prepared the FMP and NMFS implements the FMP

through regulations at 50 CFR part 622 under the authority of the Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*).

Background

The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires NMFS and regional fishery management councils to prevent overfishing and achieve, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from federally managed fish stocks. These mandates are intended to ensure fishery resources are managed for the greatest overall benefit to the nation, particularly with respect to providing food production and recreational opportunities, and protecting marine ecosystems.

Hogfish occur throughout the Gulf but are caught primarily off the Florida west coast. Hogfish are managed with a stock ACL and no allocation between the commercial and recreational sectors. Generally, the fishing season for both sectors is open year-round, January 1 through December 31. However, accountability measures (AMs) for hogfish specify that if commercial and recreational landings exceed the stock ACL in a fishing year, then during the following fishing year, if the stock ACL is reached or is projected to be reached, the commercial and recreational sectors will be closed for the remainder of the fishing year. The hogfish ACL and AMs were implemented in 2012 (76 FR 82044, December 29, 2011). The AMs were triggered when the hogfish ACL was exceeded in 2012, and the 2013 season was closed on December 2 because NMFS determined that the 2013 hogfish stock ACL had been harvested (78 FR 72583, December 3, 2013). The stock ACL was exceeded again in 2013. However, there was no closure in 2014 and the stock ACL was not exceeded in the 2014 or 2015 fishing years.

In 2014, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) completed the most recent stock assessment for hogfish through the Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review process (SEDAR 37). SEDAR 37 divided the hogfish stock into three stocks based upon genetic analysis as follows: the West Florida stock, the Florida Keys/East Florida stock, and the Georgia through North Carolina stock. The West Florida stock is completely within the jurisdiction of the Gulf Council and the Georgia through North Carolina stock is completely within the jurisdiction of the South Atlantic Council. The Florida Keys/East Florida stock crosses the two Councils' jurisdictional boundary, with a small portion of the stock extending into the Gulf Council's jurisdiction off the west coast of Florida. Based on SEDAR 37 and the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils' Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) recommendations, NMFS determined that the West Florida stock is not overfished or undergoing overfishing, the Florida Keys/East Florida stock is overfished and experiencing overfishing, and the status of the Georgia through North Carolina stock is unknown. NMFS notified the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils of these stock status determinations via letter on February 17, 2015.

Because only a small portion of the Florida Keys/East Florida stock extends into the Gulf Council's jurisdiction off south Florida, the Gulf Council's SSC recommended that the South Atlantic Council's SSC take the lead in setting the overfishing limit (OFL) and acceptable biological catch (ABC) for the Florida Keys/East Florida stock. The Gulf Council's SSC reviewed and provided recommendations on the west Florida shelf (Gulf) portion of the stock assessment.

Management Measures Contained in This Proposed Rule

If implemented, this proposed rule would: Revise the hogfish FMU managed by the FMP to the West Florida hogfish stock, which includes hogfish in the Gulf exclusive economic zone (EEZ), except south of a line extending due west from 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida; specify the ACL for the West Florida hogfish stock; increase the minimum size limit for the West Florida stock; and remove the powerhead exception for harvest of hogfish in the Gulf reef fish stressed area.

Fishery Management Unit

The South Atlantic Council developed and submitted for review by the Secretary of Commerce a rebuilding plan for the Florida Keys/East Florida stock through Amendment 37 to the FMP for the Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region (Amendment 37). A small portion of the Florida Keys/East Florida stock, as defined by the SEDAR 37, extends into Gulf waters in the Gulf Council's jurisdiction in south Florida. Therefore, in Amendment 43 and this proposed rule, the Gulf Council would revise the hogfish FMU in the Gulf to be the West Florida stock, and would define the geographic range of this stock consistent with the South Atlantic Council's proposed boundary between the Florida Keys/East Florida and West Florida hogfish stocks in Amendment 37. This boundary would be a line extending west along 25°09′ N. lat. to the outer boundary of the EEZ, which is just south of Cape Sable, Florida, on the west coast of Florida. The Gulf Council would manage hogfish (the West Florida stock) in the Gulf EEZ except south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida. The South Atlantic Council would manage hogfish (the Florida Keys/East Florida stock) in the Gulf EEZ south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida, and in the South Atlantic EEZ to the state border of Florida and Georgia. This boundary is south of the line used in SEDAR 37, which defined the West Florida stock as north of the Monroe and Collier County, Florida, boundary line. Therefore, it is possible that some fish that are part of the Florida Keys/East Florida stock will be harvested under the regulations set by the Gulf Council. However, the majority of hogfish landings in Monroe County occur in the Florida Keys, and the proposed boundary is far enough north of the Florida Keys that fishing trips originating in the Florida Keys rarely travel north of the boundary, and far enough south of Naples and Marco Island, Florida, that fishing trips originating from these locations rarely travel south of the boundary. In addition, the boundary line proposed by the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils is currently used by the FWC as a regulatory boundary for certain state-managed species. Using a pre-existing management boundary will increase enforceability and help fishermen by simplifying regulations across adjacent management jurisdictions.

In accordance with section 304(f) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the Gulf Council requested that the Secretary of Commerce designate the South Atlantic Council as the responsible Council for management of the Florida Keys/East Florida hogfish stock in Gulf Federal waters south of 25°09′ N. lat. near Cape Sable on the west coast of Florida. If the Gulf Council's request is approved, the Gulf Council would continue to manage hogfish in Federal waters in the Gulf, except in Federal waters south of this boundary. Therefore, the South Atlantic Council, and not the Gulf Council, would establish the management measures for the entire range of the Florida Keys/East Florida hogfish stock, including in Federal waters south of 25°09′ N. lat. near Cape Sable in the Gulf. Commercial and recreational for-hire vessels fishing for hogfish in Gulf Federal waters, *i.e.,* north and west of the jurisdictional boundary between the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils (approximately at the Florida Keys), as defined at 50 CFR 600.105(c), would still be required to have the appropriate Federal Gulf reef fish permits, and

vessels fishing for hogfish in South Atlantic Federal waters, *i.e.,* south and east of the jurisdictional boundary, would still be required to have the appropriate Federal South Atlantic snapper-grouper permits. Those permit holders would still be required to follow the sale and reporting requirements associated with the respective permits.

NMFS specifically seeks public comment regarding the revised stock boundaries and the manner in which the Councils would have jurisdiction over these stocks if both Amendment 37 for the South Atlantic Council and Amendment 43 for the Gulf Council are approved and implemented. NMFS published notices of availability, seeking comments on Amendment 37 and Amendment 43, on October 7, 2016, and November 4, 2016, respectively (81 FR 69774 and 81 FR 76908).

Annual Catch Limit

The current stock ACL and annual catch target (ACT) for Gulf hogfish were established based on 1999–2008 landings. The ACL and ACT were set using the Gulf Council's ABC control rule for stocks that have not been assessed, but are stable over time, or are unlikely to undergo overfishing at current average levels. The SEDAR 37 projections produced annual yields for OFL and ABC for the West Florida hogfish stock for the 2016 through 2026 fishing years are based on an overfishing threshold of the fishing morality rate (F) at 30 percent spawning potential ratio ($F_{30\%SPR}$). However, because of increasing uncertainty with long-range projections, the Gulf Council's SSC only provided OFL and ABC recommendations for the West Florida hogfish stock for the first 3 years, 2016 through 2018. The 2016–2018 OFLs were 257,100 lb (116,619 kg), 229,400 lb (104,054 kg), and 211,000 lb (95,708 kg), round weight, respectively, and the 2016–2018 ABCs were 240,400 lb (109,044 kg), 216,800 lb (98,339 kg), and 200,800 lb (91,081 kg), round weight, respectively. The Gulf Council's SSC also made constant catch OFL and ABC recommendations based on the averages of the 2016–2018 OFLs and ABCs of 232,000 lb (105,233 kg), and 219,000 lb (99,337 kg), round weight, respectively. For 2019, and subsequent years, the SSC recommended an OFL and ABC set at the equilibrium yield of 161,900 lb (73,028 kg), and 159,300 lb (72,257 kg), round weight, respectively.

The proposed rule would set the ACL for the West Florida hogfish stock at 219,000 lb (99,337 kg), round weight, for the 2017 and 2018 fishing years and is based on the Gulf Council's SSC ABC recommendations that averaged the 2016 through 2018 ABC yield streams. In 2019, and subsequent fishing years, the stock ACL would be set at the equilibrium ABC of 159,300 lb (72,257 kg), round weight. The Council decided to discontinue the designation of an ACT, because it is not used in the current AMs or for other management purposes.

Minimum Size Limit

Although the West Florida hogfish stock is not overfished or undergoing overfishing, the stock could be subject to seasonal closures if landings exceed the stock ACL and AMs are triggered. The Gulf Council's Reef Fish Advisory Panel recommended increasing the minimum size limit in Federal waters from 12 inches (30.5 cm), fork length (FL), to 14 inches (35.6 cm), FL, to reduce the directed harvest rate and reduce the probability of exceeding the ACL. This minimum size limit increase was also supported in public testimony by fishermen. The minimum size limit increase is projected to reduce the recreational harvest rate by 10 to 35 percent and reduce the commercial harvest rate by 6 to 28 percent, depending upon time of year and type of fishing. This action has an additional benefit of allowing hogfish to grow larger and have an additional spawning opportunity before being susceptible to harvest.

Powerhead Exemption

Currently, as described at 50 CFR 622.35(a), a regulatory exemption allows for the harvest of hogfish using powerheads in the reef fish stressed area. The powerhead exemption is a regulatory holdover from when hogfish were listed in the regulations as a ''species in the fishery but not in the reef fish fishery management unit.'' Amendment 15 to the FMP (62 FR 67714, December 30, 1997) removed 25 reef fish species and left 4 species (hogfish, queen triggerfish, sand perch, and dwarf sand perch) in the category of ''species in the fishery but not the management unit.'' Amendment 15 to the FMP also included a provision that reinstated the allowance of powerheads in the reef fish stressed area to harvest these four reef fish species. In 1999, Amendment 16B to the FMP (64 FR 57403, October 10, 1999) removed the distinction between reef fish species in the management unit and those in the fishery but not in the management unit and also removed queen triggerfish from the FMU. Even though the ''species in the fishery but not the management unit'' category no longer existed, the other three species from this category continued to be listed as exempt from powerhead prohibition. Sand perch and dwarf sand perch were removed from the FMP in 2011, through the Gulf Council's Generic ACL/AM Amendment (76 FR 82043, December 29, 2011), leaving only hogfish subject to the powerhead exemption.

This proposed rule would remove the provision that exempts hogfish from the prohibition on the use of powerheads to take Gulf reef fish in the Gulf reef fish stressed area. By removing the powerhead exemption for hogfish, hogfish would be subject to the same regulations for Gulf reef fish in the stressed area as other species in the reef fish FMU. The stressed area begins at the shoreward boundary of Federal waters and generally follows the 10-fathom contour from the Dry Tortugas to Sanibel Island, Florida; the 20-fathom contour to Tarpon Springs, Florida; the 10-fathom contour to Cape San Blas, Florida; the 25-fathom contour to south of Mobile Bay, Alabama; the 13-fathom contour to Ship Island, Mississippi; the 10-fathom contour off Louisiana; and the 30-fathom contour off Texas. The original FMP established the stressed area for purposes of preventing the localized depletion of reef fish stocks in nearshore waters, and to reduce the potential for gear conflicts (49 FR 39548, October 9, 1984). The coordinates for the reef fish stressed area are provided in 50 CFR part 622, Table 2 in Appendix B.

Management Measures Contained in Amendment 43 But Not Codified Through This Proposed Rule

Amendment 43 would also specify hogfish status determination criteria (SDC) for the hogfish West Florida stock. The minimum stock size threshold (MSST) and maximum fishing mortality threshold (MFMT) are used to determine if a stock is overfished or undergoing overfishing, respectively. If the stock biomass falls below the MSST, then the stock is considered overfished and the Gulf Council would then need to develop a rebuilding plan capable of returning the stock to a level that allows the stock to produce maximum sustainable yield (MSY) on a continuing basis. If fishing mortality exceeds the MFMT, a stock is considered to be undergoing overfishing because this level of fishing mortality, if continued, would reduce the stock biomass to an overfished condition.

Currently, the only SDC implemented for Gulf hogfish is the overfishing threshold, or MFMT. This threshold was approved by NMFS through the Gulf Council's Sustainable Fisheries Act Generic Amendment on November 17, 1999. The overfished threshold, or

MSST, and MSY in the Sustainable Fisheries Act Generic Amendment were disapproved because these values were not biomass based.

In setting SDC in Amendment 43, the Council selected the spawning potential ratio (SPR) as the basis for an MSY proxy. The SPR is calculated as the average number of eggs per fish over its lifetime when the stock is fished compared to the average number of eggs per fish over its lifetime when the stock is not fished. The SPR assumes that a certain amount of fish must survive and spawn in order to replenish the stock. Analyses of stocks with various life histories suggest that, in general, SPR levels of 30 to 40 percent are most commonly associated with MSY. Amendment 43 proposes to use the equilibrium yield from fishing at $FF_{30\%SPR}$ as a proxy for MSY. This proxy is consistent to that used in SEDAR 37 and is consistent with the MSY proxy commonly used for reef fish species.

Both the proposed hogfish MFMT and MSST are based on this MSY proxy. The current MFMT value of $FF_{30\%SPR}$ for hogfish is already consistent with the MSY proxy and is not being changed in Amendment 43. To be consistent with the MSY proxy, the MSST needs to be equal to or reduced from the spawning stock biomass (SSB) capable of producing an equilibrium yield when fished at $FF_{30\%SPR}$ ($SSBF_{30\%SPR}$). The closer the MSST value is to $SSBF_{30\%SPR}$, the more likely a stock could be mistakenly declared overfished due to year-to-year fluctuations in SSB resulting in an unneeded rebuilding plan. However, if MSST is set too low, then rebuilding the stock equilibrium levels could take longer because the difference between $SSBF_{30\%SPR}$ and MSST is larger. Therefore, in Amendment 43, the Gulf Council determined that setting the MSST at 75 percent of $SSBF_{30\%SPR}$ balanced the likelihood of declaring the stock as overfished as a result of natural variations in stock size with being able to allow the stock to recover quickly from an overfished state.

Additional Proposed Changes to Codified Text Not in Amendment 43

In 2013, NMFS reorganized the regulations in 50 CFR part 622 to improve the organization of the regulations and make them easier to use (78 FR 57534, September 19, 2013). However, during that reorganization, a regulatory reference in the definition of ''charter vessel'' in § 622.2, was inadvertently not updated as needed. The current charter vessel definition includes a reference to § 622.4(a)(2) as the provision that specifies the required commercial permits under the various fishery management plans. Although § 622.4(a)(2) addressed all of the required commercial permits before the 2013 reorganization, that provision now refers to operator permits. The reorganization of the regulations removed the various commercial permit provisions from § 622.4 and placed them in the appropriate subparts throughout part 622. This proposed rule would update the regulatory reference in the definition of charter vessel in § 622.2 to refer to commercial permits ''as required under this part''. This update in language would make the regulatory reference in the definition of charter vessel consistent with the current regulatory definition for headboat in § 622.2.

Classification

Pursuant to section 304(b)(1)(A) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the NMFS Assistant Administrator has determined that this proposed rule is consistent with Amendment 43, other provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and other applicable laws, subject to further consideration after public comment.

This proposed rule has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866.

NMFS prepared an initial regulatory flexibility analysis (IRFA) for this proposed rule, as required by section 603 of the RFA, 5 U.S.C. 603. The IRFA describes the economic impact this proposed rule, if adopted, would have on small entities. A description of the action, why it is being considered, the objectives of, and legal basis for this action are contained at the beginning of this section in the preamble and in the **SUMMARY** section of the preamble. A copy of the full analysis is available from NMFS (see **ADDRESSES**). A summary of the IRFA follows.

The Magnuson-Stevens Act provides the statutory basis for this proposed rule. No duplicative, overlapping, or conflicting Federal rules have been identified. In addition, no new reporting or record-keeping requirements are introduced by this proposed rule.

This proposed rule would directly affect all vessels with a Gulf Federal commercial reef fish permit that harvest hogfish. A Federal commercial reef fish permit is required for commercial vessels to harvest reef fish species, including hogfish, in the Gulf EEZ. Over the period 2010 through 2014, the number of vessels with recorded commercial harvests of hogfish in the Gulf EEZ ranged from 55 in 2010 to 75 in 2014, or an average of 61 vessels per year, based on mandatory Federal logbook data. The average annual revenue per vessel from the harvest of all finfish species during this period by these vessels was approximately $35,600 (this estimate and all subsequent monetary estimates in this analysis are in 2014 dollars), of which approximately $2,200 was derived from the harvest of hogfish.

NMFS has not identified any other small entities that might be directly affected by this proposed rule. Although recreational anglers would be directly affected by the actions in this proposed rule, recreational anglers are not small entities under the RFA. The actions in this proposed rule would not directly apply to or change the operation of the charter vessel and headboat (for-hire) component of the recreational sector or the service this component provides, which is providing a platform to fish for and retain those fish which are caught and within legal allowances. Although angler demand for for-hire services could be affected by the management changes in this proposed rule, the resultant effects on for-hire businesses would be indirect consequences of this proposed rule.

For RFA purposes only, NMFS has established a small business size standard for businesses, including their affiliates, whose primary industry is commercial fishing. A business primarily engaged in commercial fishing (NAICS code 11411) is classified as a small business if it is independently owned and operated, is not dominant in its field of operation (including its affiliates), and has combined annual receipts not in excess of $11 million for all its affiliated operations worldwide. All commercial fishing vessels expected to be directly affected by this proposed rule are believed to be small business entities.

This proposed rule contains four actions pertaining to the management of the West Florida hogfish stock in the Gulf: Defining the hogfish FMU, establishing the stock ACL, setting the minimum size limit, and prohibiting the harvest of hogfish with powerheads in the reef fish stressed area. Two of these actions, defining the FMU and prohibiting the use of powerheads, would not be expected to have any direct economic effects on any small entities.

Defining the FMU is an administrative action that forms the platform from which subsequent harvest regulations, such as the ACL and minimum size limit, are based. Although direct economic effects may accrue due to the imposition and change of these harvest regulations, these effects would be indirect consequences of defining the

FMU. Indirect effects are outside the scope of the RFA.

Prohibiting the use of powerheads would not be expected to directly affect any small entities because powerheads are not expected to be a gear used to harvest hogfish. The use of powerheads for the harvest of other reef fish species in these areas is currently prohibited and, because of the small size of hogfish, powerheads would be expected to result in excessive damage to the fish and adversely affect its market quality. Thus, it is not expected that any hogfish in the reef fish stressed area are commercially harvested using powerheads, and the proposed prohibition would not be expected to reduce revenue to any commercial fishermen.

The proposed changes in the West Florida hogfish stock ACL and minimum size limit have independent and interactive effects. The proposed West Florida hogfish stock ACL would be expected to result in an increase in total (all vessels) commercial fishing revenue for 2016 through 2018 fishing years by approximately $8,900 per year, followed by a decrease in revenue of approximately $39,300 in 2019, and thereafter until the stock ACL (or other management aspect) is changed. The proposed minimum size limit would be expected to reduce commercial harvest by 17 percent, resulting in a decrease in commercial revenue each year if vessels are unable to compensate for the increased minimum size limit. Independent of the proposed West Florida hogfish stock ACL, the proposed minimum size limit would be expected to result in a decrease in total (all vessels) commercial revenue of approximately $28,500 per year.

In combination, the proposed revisions to the West Florida hogfish stock ACL and minimum size limit would be expected to result in a decrease in total (all vessels) commercial revenue of approximately $21,100 per year for 2016 through 2018 and approximately $61,100 in 2019 and each year thereafter until the stock ACL (or other management aspect) is changed. As previously stated, these projected reductions assume an inability of fishermen to benefit from the full proposed increase in the ACL due to the proposed increase in the minimum size limit, as well as compensate for the effects of the larger minimum size limit on their normal harvests (*i.e.,* pre-ACL increase). Averaged across the number of small business entities expected to be directly affected by this proposed action (55–75 entities, or an average of 61 entities per year), the expected reduction in revenue each year for 2016 through 2018 would range from $282 (75 entities) to $384 (55 entities) per year, or an average of $347 (61 entities). For 2019, and thereafter, the expected average reduction would range from $814 (75 entities) to $1,111 (55 entities) per year, or an average of $1,001 (61 entities).

Compared to the average annual revenue per vessel from all commercial fishing (approximately $35,600), the expected reduction in revenue per year as a result of the proposed West Florida hogfish stock ACL and minimum size limit would average approximately one percent of average annual total revenue for 2016 through 2018. For 2019, and thereafter, the average expected reduction in annual revenue would be approximately three percent of average annual total revenue.

In conjunction with the proposed ACL for the West Florida stock, this proposed rule would eliminate the ACT (*i.e.,* an ACT would not be defined). Although this would eliminate the current West Florida hogfish ACT, the hogfish ACT is not currently used as a fishing restraint and does not affect the harvest of hogfish, or associated revenue, in the Gulf. As a result, not defining an ACT would not be expected to have any economic effects on any small entities.

In addition to the four actions that pertain to the management of hogfish in the Gulf, this proposed rule would make a minor revision to the definition of a charter vessel. A regulatory reference within the definition of charter vessel was inadvertently not updated when the regulations at 50 CFR part 622 were reorganized in 2013 (78 FR 57534, September 19, 2013). This revision would be editorial in nature and would not be expected to have any direct effect on any small entities.

Because the proposed actions to define the Gulf hogfish FMU, specify the SDC for the West Florida hogfish stock, prohibit the use of powerheads to harvest hogfish in the reef fish stressed area, and revise the definition of charter vessel would not be expected to have any direct adverse economic effects on any small entities, the issue of significant alternatives is not relevant.

Four alternatives, including no action, were considered for the action to set the West Florida hogfish stock ACL. Each of these alternatives included options to set the West Florida hogfish ACT, and the option selected by the Gulf Council was to not define an ACT. As previously discussed, the current ACT does not restrict harvest. Thus, not defining an ACT would not be expected to have any direct economic effects, and the issue of significant alternatives (or options) is not relevant.

The first alternative (no action) to the proposed ACL for the West Florida hogfish stock would have resulted in less revenue to commercial fishermen in 2016 through 2018, and more revenue in 2019, and thereafter than the proposed change. Cumulatively (2016 through 2019 and thereafter), this alternative would have resulted in more commercial fishing revenue than the proposed ACL. However, this alternative was not selected by the Gulf Council because it would not enable the increase in stock ACL for the West Florida hogfish stock resulting from SEDAR 37. Under the proposed rule, the ACL in 2019 will be substantially reduced from the 2017 and 2018 ACL if a new hogfish assessment is not completed. This may suggest the ''no action'' ACL would be preferable to the proposed ACL. However, retaining the ''no action'' ACL in 2019 and beyond would have been inconsistent with the ABC recommendations provided by the Council's SSC. In addition, the Council expects a new assessment to be completed in sufficient time to avoid the scheduled reduction to the ACL beginning in the 2019 fishing year.

The second alternative to the proposed ACL for the West Florida hogfish stock would set the ACL higher in 2016 and reduce it thereafter, until it reached the lowest level in 2019. This alternative would be expected to result in increased commercial fishing revenue in 2016, decreased revenue in 2017 and 2018, and the same revenue in 2019, and thereafter compared to the proposed ACL. This alternative was not adopted by the Gulf Council because it would require successive reductions in the ACL in 2017 and 2018 (after the initial increase in 2016), in addition to the reduction in 2019, common to both this alternative and the proposed ACL. The Gulf Council determined that employing a constant ACL for the 2016 through 2018 fishing years would result in greater economic stability for affected fishermen and associated businesses.

Finally, the fourth alternative to the proposed ACL for the West Florida hogfish stock would set the ACL at the lowest level, resulting in less revenue in 2016 through 2018, and the same revenue in 2019, and thereafter compared to the proposed ACL. This alternative was not selected because it would unnecessarily limit hogfish harvest and cause greater economic losses than the proposed ACL.

Four alternatives, including no action, were considered for the action to change the hogfish minimum size limit. The Gulf Council determined that slowing

the hogfish directed harvest rate was prudent to reduce the likelihood that the ACL is exceeded, thus triggering AMs. Exceeding the ACL may require an AM closure in the following year, and the Gulf Council determined that a closure is more economically harmful than reducing the harvest rate to help ensure a longer open season. Therefore, to reduce the harvest rate, the Gulf Council is proposing to increase the hogfish minimum size limit.

The first alternative (no action) to the proposed minimum size limit would not change the minimum size limit, would not reduce the harvest rate, and would not achieve the Gulf Council's objective. Two other minimum size limits were considered in Amendment 43, each of which are higher than the current and proposed size limits. Because these alternatives would result in a higher minimum size limit than the Council's preferred alternative, each would be expected to result in greater reductions in hogfish harvest and associated revenue. These alternatives were not adopted because the Gulf Council concluded that the resultant reductions in the hogfish harvest rate would be greater than necessary, and would result in excessive adverse economic effects on fishermen and associated businesses.

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 622

Commercial, Fisheries, Fishing, Gulf of Mexico, Hogfish, Recreational, South Atlantic.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Samuel D. Rauch III,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 50 CFR part 622 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 622—FISHERIES OF THE CARIBBEAN, GULF OF MEXICO, AND SOUTH ATLANTIC

■ 1. The authority citation for part 622 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

■ 2. In § 622.1, revise the Table 1 entry for ''FMP for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico'', and add footnote 7 to Table 1 to read as follows:

§ 622.1 Purpose and scope.

* * * * *

TABLE 1 TO § 622.1—FMPS IMPLEMENTED UNDER PART 622

FMP title	Responsible fishery management council(s)	Geographic area
* * * * * * *		
FMP for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico	GMFMC	Gulf.[1 3 4 7]
* * * * * * *		

[1] Regulated area includes adjoining state waters for purposes of data collection and quota monitoring.

* * * * * * * * *

[3] Regulated area includes adjoining state waters for Gulf red snapper harvested or possessed by a person aboard a vessel for which a Gulf red snapper IFQ vessel account has been established or possessed by a dealer with a Gulf IFQ dealer endorsement.

[4] Regulated area includes adjoining state waters for Gulf groupers and tilefishes harvested or possessed by a person aboard a vessel for which an IFQ vessel account for Gulf groupers and tilefishes has been established or possessed by a dealer with a Gulf IFQ dealer endorsement.

* * * * * * * * *

[7] Hogfish are managed by the FMP in the Gulf EEZ except south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida. Hogfish in the remainder of the Gulf EEZ south of 25°09' N. lat. off the west coast of Florida are managed under the FMP for the Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region.

■ 3. In § 622.2, revise the first two sentences in the definition of *Charter vessel* to read as follows:

§ 622.2 Definitions and acronyms.

* * * * *

Charter vessel means a vessel less than 100 gross tons (90.8 mt) that is subject to the requirements of the USCG to carry six or fewer passengers for hire and that engages in charter fishing at any time during the calendar year. A charter vessel with a commercial permit, as required under this part, is considered to be operating as a charter vessel when it carries a passenger who pays a fee or when there are more than three persons aboard, including operator and crew, except for a charter vessel with a commercial vessel permit for Gulf reef fish or South Atlantic snapper-grouper. * * *

* * * * *

■ 4. In § 622.34, add paragraph (g) to read as follows:

§ 622.34 Seasonal and area closures designed to protect Gulf reef fish.

* * * * *

(g) *Recreational sector for hogfish in the Gulf EEZ south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida.* See § 622.183(b)(4) for the applicable seasonal closures.

■ 5. In § 622.35, revise paragraph (a)(1) to read as follows:

§ 622.35 Gear restricted areas.

(a) * * *

(1) A powerhead may not be used in the stressed area to take Gulf reef fish. Possession of a powerhead and a mutilated Gulf reef fish in the stressed area or after having fished in the stressed area constitutes *prima facie* evidence that such reef fish was taken with a powerhead in the stressed area.

* * * * *

■ 6. In § 622.37, revise paragraph (c)(2) to read as follows:

§ 622.37 Size limits.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(2) *Hogfish in the Gulf EEZ except south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida*—14 inches (40.6 cm), fork length. See § 622.185(c)(3)(ii) for the hogfish size limit in the Gulf EEZ south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida.

* * * * *

■ 7. In § 622.38, revise paragraph (b)(7) to read as follows:

§ 622.38 Bag and possession limits.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(7) *Hogfish in the Gulf EEZ except south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida*—5. See § 622.187(b)(3)(ii) for the hogfish bag and possession limits in the Gulf EEZ south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida.

* * * * *

■ 8. In § 622.41, revise paragraph (p) to read as follows:

§ 622.41 Annual catch limits (ACLs), annual catch targets (ACTs), and accountability measures (AMs).

* * * * *

(p) *Hogfish in the Gulf EEZ except south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida.* If the sum of the commercial and recreational landings, as estimated by the SRD, exceeds the stock ACL, then during the following fishing year, if the sum of commercial and recreational landings reaches or is projected to reach the stock ACL, the AA will file a notification with the Office of the Federal Register to close the commercial and recreational sectors for the remainder of that fishing year. For the 2016 through 2018 fishing years, the stock ACL for hogfish in the Gulf EEZ except south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida is 219,000 lb (99,337 kg), round weight. For the 2019 and subsequent fishing years, the stock ACL for hogfish in the Gulf EEZ except south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida is 159,300 lb (72,257 kg), round weight. See § 622.193(u)(2) for the ACLs, ACT, and AMs for hogfish in the Gulf EEZ south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida.

* * * * *

■ 9. In § 622.43, add paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 622.43 Commercial trip limits.

* * * * *

(c) *Hogfish in the Gulf EEZ south of 25°09′ N. lat. off the west coast of Florida*—see § 622.191(a)(12) for the applicable commercial trip limit.

[FR Doc. 2016–28173 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 648

[Docket No. 160816746–6746–01]

RIN 0648–XE819

Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery; Proposed 2017–2018 Fishing Quotas

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS proposes status quo commercial quotas for the Atlantic surfclam and ocean quahog fisheries for 2017 and projected status quo quotas for 2018. This action is necessary to establish allowable harvest levels of Atlantic surfclams and ocean quahogs that will prevent overfishing and allow harvesting of optimum yield. This action would also continue to suspend the minimum shell size for Atlantic surfclams for the 2017 fishing year. It is expected that the industry and dealers will benefit from the proposed status quo quotas, as they will be able to maintain a consistent market.

DATES: Comments must be received by December 8, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by NOAA–NMFS–2016–0122, by any of the following methods:

- *Electronic Submissions:* Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Go to *www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=NOAA-NMFS-2016-0122,* click the ''Comment Now!'' icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach your comments.
- *Mail:* Submit written comments to John K. Bullard, Regional Administrator, NMFS, Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office, 55 Great Republic Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930. Mark the outside of the envelope: ''Comments on the 2017–2018 Surfclam/Ocean Quahog Specifications.''

Instructions: Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period, may not be considered by NMFS. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on *www.regulations.gov* without change. All personal identifying information (*e.g.,* name, address, etc.), confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive information submitted voluntarily by the commenter may be publicly accessible. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter ''N/A'' in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous). Attachments to electronic comments will be accepted in Microsoft Word, Excel, or Adobe PDF file formats only.

Copies of the Environmental Assessment (EA), Supplemental Information Report (SIR), and other supporting documents for these proposed specifications are available from the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 800 North State Street, Suite 201, Dover, DE 19901. The EA and SIR are also accessible via the internet at: *www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Douglas Potts, Fishery Policy Analyst, 978–281–9341.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery Management Plan (FMP) requires that NMFS, in consultation with the Mid-Atlantic Council, specify quotas for surfclam and ocean quahog for up to a 3-year period, with an annual review. It is the policy of the Council that the catch limits selected allow sustainable fishing to continue at that level for at least 10 years for surfclams, and 30 years for ocean quahogs. In addition to this, the Council policy also considers the economic impacts of the quotas. Regulations implementing Amendment 10 to the FMP (63 FR 27481; May 19, 1998) added Maine ocean quahogs (locally known as Maine mahogany quahogs) to the management unit, and provided for a small artisanal fishery for ocean quahogs in the waters north of 43°50′ N. lat., with an annual quota within a range of 17,000 to 100,000 Maine bu (0.6 to 3.524 million L). As specified in Amendment 10, the Maine ocean quahog quota is allocated separately from the quota specified for the ocean quahog fishery. Regulations implementing Amendment 13 to the FMP (68 FR 69970; December 16, 2003) established the ability to propose multi-year quotas with an annual quota review to be conducted by the Council to determine if the multi-year quota specifications remain appropriate for each year. NMFS then publishes the annual final quotas in the **Federal Register**. The fishing quotas must ensure overfishing will not occur. In recommending these quotas, the Council considered the most recent stock assessments and other relevant scientific information.

In June 2016, the Council voted to recommend maintaining the status quo quota levels of 5.33 million bu (284 million L) for the ocean quahog fishery, 3.40 million bu (181 million L) for the Atlantic surfclam fishery, and 100,000 Maine bu (3.52 million L) for the Maine ocean quahog fishery for 2017 and projected status quo quotas would be maintained in 2018.

Tables 1 and 2 show proposed quotas for the 2017 Atlantic surfclam and ocean quahog fishery along with projected quotas for 2018. By providing projected quotas for 2018, NMFS hopes to assist fishery participants in planning ahead. NMFS plans to reassess the status of the Atlantic surfclam and ocean quahog fishery in 2017. Final 2018 quotas will be published in the **Federal Register** before the start of the 2018 fishing year (January 1, 2018) based on the 2017 review.

TABLE 1—PROPOSED ATLANTIC SURFCLAM MEASURES

Year	Acceptable biological catch (ABC) (mt)	Annual catch limit (ACL) (mt)	Annual catch target (ACT) (mt)	Commercial quota
2017	44,469	44,469	29,364	3.40 million bu (181 million L).
2018 (projected)	45,524	45,524	29,364	3.4 million bu (181 million L).

TABLE 2—PROPOSED OCEAN QUAHOG MEASURES

Year	ABC (mt)	ACL (mt)	ACT (mt)	Commercial quota
2017; 2018 (projected)	26,100	26,100	26,035	Non-Maine Quota: 5.33 million bu (284 million L) Maine ACT: 100,000 Maine bu (3.52 million L)

The Atlantic surfclam and ocean quahog quotas are specified in ''industry'' bushels of 1.88 ft^3 (53.24 L) per bushel, while the Maine ocean quahog quota is specified in Maine bushels of 1.24 ft^3 (35.24 L) per bushel. Because Maine ocean quahogs are the same species as ocean quahogs, both fisheries are assessed under the same overfishing definition. When the two quota amounts (ocean quahog and Maine ocean quahog) are added, the total allowable harvest is below the level that would result in overfishing for the entire stock.

Surfclams

The proposed 2017 status quo surfclam quota was developed after reviewing the results of the Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Workshop (SAW) 56 for Atlantic surfclam, released to the public in 2013. The surfclam quota recommendation is consistent with the SAW 56 finding that the Atlantic surfclam stock is not overfished, nor is overfishing occurring. Based on this information, the Council is recommending, and NMFS is proposing, to maintain the status quo surfclam quota of 3.40 million bu (181 million L) for 2017 (See Table 1).

Ocean Quahogs

The proposed 2017 non-Maine quota for ocean quahogs also reflects the status quo quota of 5.33 million bu (284 million L). In April 2013, the ocean quahog stock assessment was updated and found that the ocean quahog stock is not overfished, nor is overfishing occurring. After several decades of relatively low fishing mortality, the ocean quahog stock is still above the biomass target reference points.

The 2017 proposed quota for Maine ocean quahogs is the status quo level of 100,000 Maine bu (3.52 million L). The proposed quota represents the maximum allowable quota under the FMP.

This proposed rule also announces projected quotas for 2018. However, new stock assessments for both Atlantic surfclam and ocean quahog are pending and the results are expected to be available to the Council when it next reviews quotas for this fishery in June 2017. It is expected that the Council will use these assessment results to update the 2018 specifications as needed and recommend specifications for both fisheries for 2018 through 2020.

Surfclam Minimum Size

At its June 2016 meeting, the Council voted to recommend that the Regional Administrator suspend the minimum size limit for Atlantic surfclams for the 2017 fishing year. This action may be taken unless discard, catch, and biological sampling data indicate that 30 percent or more of the Atlantic surfclam resource have a shell length less than 4.75 inches (120 mm), and the overall reduced size is not attributable to harvest from beds where growth of the individual clams has been reduced because of density-dependent factors.

Commercial surfclam data for 2016 were analyzed to determine the percentage of surfclams that were smaller than the minimum size requirement. The analysis indicated that 14.4 percent of the overall commercial landings were composed of surfclams that were less than the 4.75-in (120-mm) default minimum size. This percentage of small clams is higher than in most previous years; however, it is still below the 30-percent trigger. Based on the information available, the Regional Administrator concurs with the Council's recommendation, and is proposing to suspend the minimum size limit for Atlantic surfclams in the upcoming fishing year (January 1 through December 31, 2017).

Classification

Pursuant to section 304(b)(1)(A) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NOAA, has determined that this proposed rule is consistent with the Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog FMP, other provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and other applicable law, subject to further consideration after public comment.

This action does not introduce any new reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance requirements. This proposed rule does not duplicate, overlap, or conflict with other Federal rules.

This proposed rule is exempt from the requirements of E.O. 12866.

The Chief Counsel for Regulation of the Department of Commerce certified to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration that this proposed rule, if adopted, would not

have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The factual basis for this certification is as follows:

For RFA purposes only, NMFS has established a small business size standard for businesses, including their affiliates, whose primary industry is commercial fishing (see 50 CFR 200.2). A business primarily engaged in commercial fishing (NAICS code 11411) is classified as a small business if it is independently owned and operated, is not dominant in its field of operation (including its affiliates), and has combined annual receipts not in excess of $11 million for all its affiliated operations worldwide. In 2015, there were 358 fishing firms that held at least one surfclam or ocean quahog permit. Using the $11.0 million cutoff for firms, there are 348 entities that are small and 10 that are large. In order to provide a more accurate count and description of the small directly regulated entities, landings data were evaluated to select only firms that were active in either the surfclam or ocean quahog fishery. There are 29 active fishing firms, of which 26 are small entities and 3 are large entities.

Because the proposed quotas are identical to those implemented for 2014–2016, the proposed action would have no impact on the way the fishery operates. These measures are expected to provide similar fishing opportunities in 2017 and 2018 when compared to 2015 (proxy for base year 2016). As such, revenue changes are not expected in 2017 and 2018 when compared to landings and revenues in 2015. Therefore, adoption of the proposed specifications would have no impacts on entities participating in the fishery if landings are similar to those that occurred in 2015.

Maintaining the suspension of the surfclam minimum shell length requirement would result in no change when compared to 2014–2016. The minimum shell length requirement has been suspended each year since 2005. The proposed action would have no impact on the way the fishery operates, and is not expected to disproportionately affect small entities.

As a result, an initial regulatory flexibility analysis is not required and none has been prepared.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Samuel D. Rauch III,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–28174 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 660

[Docket No. 160728670–6904–01]

RIN 0648–BG23

Fisheries off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Drift Gillnet Fishery; Protected Species Hard Caps for the California/Oregon Large-Mesh Drift Gillnet Fishery; Extension of Public Comment Period

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of public comment period.

SUMMARY: On October 13, 2016, NMFS published a proposed rule to establish protected species hard caps for the California/Oregon large-mesh drift gillnet fishery, with comments due by November 28, 2016. However, in response to a request to extend the public comment period, NMFS has decided to extend the public comment period by an additional 30 calendar days.

DATES: The deadline for receipt of comments on the proposed rule published on October 13, 2016 (81 FR 70660) is extended to December 28, 2016. NMFS must receive written comments and information on or before December 28, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on the proposed rule, draft Environmental Assessment (EA), draft Regulatory Impact Review (RIR), and Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA), identified by NOAA–NMFS–2016–0123, by any of the following methods:

- *Electronic Submission:* Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Go to *http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=NOAA-NMFS-2016-0123,* click the ''Comment Now!'' icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach your comments.
- *Mail:* Submit written comments to Lyle Enriquez, NMFS West Coast Region, 501 W. Ocean Blvd., Suite 4200, Long Beach, CA 90802. Include the identifier ''NOAA–NMFS–2016–0123'' in the comments.

Instructions: Comments must be submitted by one of the above methods to ensure they are received, documented, and considered by NMFS. Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period, may not be considered. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on *www.regulations.gov* without change. All personal identifying information (*e.g.,* name, address, etc.) submitted voluntarily by the sender will be publicly accessible. Do not submit confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive or protected information. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter ''N/A'' in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous).

Copies of the draft EA, draft RIR, IRFA, and other supporting documents are available via the Federal eRulemaking Portal: *http://www.regulations.gov,* docket NOAA–NMFS–2016–0123 or by contacting the Regional Administrator, Barry Thom, NMFS West Coast Region, 1201 NE Lloyd Blvd., Portland, OR 97232–2182, or *RegionalAdministrator.WCRHMS@noaa.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lyle Enriquez, NMFS, West Coast Region, 562–980–4025, or *Lyle.Enriquez@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 13, 2016, NMFS published a proposed rule in the **Federal Register** (81 FR 70660) announcing proposed issuance of regulations to establish protected species hard caps for the California/Oregon large-mesh drift gillnet fishery. The 45-day public comment period on the proposed rule ends on November 28, 2016.

On October 21, 2016, representatives of potentially affected parties requested an extension of the public comment period to aid in their review of the proposed rulemaking. NMFS has considered the request and will extend the comment period to December 28, 2016. This extension provides a total of 75 days for public input and continuing Federal agency reviews to inform NMFS' final decision to issue or deny the regulations.

NMFS refers the reader to the October 13, 2016, proposed rule (81 FR 70660) for background information concerning the proposed rulemaking as this notice does not repeat the information here.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: November 15, 2016.

Samuel D. Rauch III,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–28179 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

Notices

Federal Register
Vol. 81, No. 226
Wednesday, November 23, 2016

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

[Doc. No. AMS–LPS–16–0089]

Request for Approval of a New Information Collection for the Processed Egg and Egg Products Verification Program

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice and Request for Comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), this notice announces the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Agricultural Marketing Service's (AMS) intention to request approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), for a new information collection for the Processed Egg and Egg Products Verification Program. One new form is introduced in this information collection.

DATES: Submit comments on or before January 23, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments concerning this notice by using the electronic process available at *www.regulations.gov.* Written comments may also be submitted to Quality Assessment Division; Livestock, Poultry, and Seed Program; Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA; 1400 Independence Avenue SW; Room 3932–S, Stop 0258; Washington, DC 20250–0258; or by facsimile to (202) 690–2746. All comments should reference the docket number AMS–LPS–16–0089, the date of submission, and the page number of this issue of the **Federal Register**. All comments received will be posted without change, including any personal information provided, at *www.regulations.gov* and will be included in the record and made available to the public.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeff Waite, Branch Chief, Auditing Services Branch, Quality Assessment Division (QAD); (202) 720–4411; or email *Jeffrey.Waite@ams.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Agency:* USDA, AMS.

(2) *Title:* Processed Egg and Egg Products Verification Program.

(3) *OMB Number:* 0581–NEW.

(4) *Type of Request:* New Information Collection.

(5) *Abstract:*

The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (AMA) (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627) directs and authorizes the USDA to develop and improve standards of quality, grades, grading programs, and certification services which facilitate the marketing of agricultural products. The regulation in 7 CFR part 62—Livestock, Meat, and Other Agricultural Commodities (Quality Systems Verification Programs (QSVP)) provides for voluntary, audit-based, user-fee funded programs that allow applicants to have program documentation and program processes assessed by AMS auditors and other USDA officials. AMS also provides other types of voluntary services under these regulations, including contract and specification acceptance services and export verification services. The Processed Egg and Egg Products Export Verification Program is a voluntary export verification program that aids domestic food manufacturers in exporting processed food products containing egg to other countries. It is a voluntary program, and respondents request or apply for the specific service. Once the verification service is performed, the respondent is provided documentation that their product meets export requirements, in the form of an export certificate. AMS intends to create an export certificate specifically for this program, namely the USDA Processed Egg and Egg Products Export Certificate, Form LPS–234. In order to complete the export certificate, AMS must gather information from the respondent, including (but not limited to): Name and address of product manufacturer; exporter and importer information; country of destination; point of entry; product origin (state and/or county); place of loading; means of transport; dates of pack; type of packing material; name(s) of product(s); number of package(s); net weight; and any other import information requested by the importing country.

The information collection requirements in this request are essential to carry out the intent of AMA, to provide the respondents the type of service they request, and to administer the program.

Upon Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval of the new Form LPS–234 and the information collection package, AMS will request OMB approval to merge the new form and this information collection into the currently approved information collection OMB control number 0581–0128 approved on July 8, 2014.

(6) *Estimate of Burden:* Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 12 minutes per response.

(7) *Respondents:* Exporters of processed egg and egg products.

(8) *Estimated Number of Respondents:* 43.

(9) *Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent:* 15.

(10) *Estimated Number of Responses:* 645.

(11) *Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 129 hours.

Comments are invited on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

All responses to this document will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All responses will become a matter of public record, including any personal information provided.

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Elanor Starmer,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–28250 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS–2016–0086]

Notice of Request for Extension of Approval of an Information Collection; Spring Viremia of Carp; Import Restrictions on Certain Live Fish, Fertilized Eggs, and Gametes

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Extension of approval of an information collection; comment request.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's intention to request an extension of approval of an information collection associated with the regulations for the importation of live fish, fertilized eggs, and gametes to prevent the introduction of spring viremia of carp into the United States.

DATES: We will consider all comments that we receive on or before January 23, 2017.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by either of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=APHIS-2016-0086.*
- *Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery:* Send your comment to Docket No. APHIS–2016–0086, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3A–03.8, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737–1238.

Supporting documents and any comments we receive on this docket may be viewed at *http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=APHIS-2016-0086* or in our reading room, which is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 799–7039 before coming.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information on the regulations for the importation of live fish, fertilized eggs, and gametes, contact Dr. Christa Speekmann, Import-Export Specialist-Aquaculture, NIES, VS, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 39, Riverdale, MD 20737; (301) 851–3365. For copies of more detailed information on the information collection, contact Ms. Kimberly Hardy, APHIS' Information Collection Coordinator, at (301) 851–2483.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Spring Viremia of Carp; Import Restrictions on Certain Live Fish, Fertilized Eggs, and Gametes.

OMB Control Number: 0579–0301.

Type of Request: Extension of approval of an information collection.

Abstract: Under the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8301 *et seq.*), the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is authorized, among other things, to prohibit or restrict the importation and interstate movement of animals and animal products to prevent the introduction into and dissemination within the United States of livestock diseases and pests. To carry out this mission, APHIS regulates the importation of animals and animal products into the United States. These regulations are contained in 9 CFR parts 92 through 98. Sections 93.900 through 93.906 contain requirements to prevent the introduction of spring viremia of carp (SVC) into the United States. SVC is a disease of certain species of finfish that is caused by an eponymous rhabdovirus. The disease is considered extremely contagious, and there are currently no U.S.-approved vaccines or treatments for the virus.

In accordance with the regulations, APHIS restricts the importation of live fish, fertilized eggs, and gametes of SVC-susceptible species and the importation of diagnostic specimens or research materials containing viable SVC virus. The regulations involve information collection activities, including a fish import permit application, application for import or in-transit permit, diagnostic specimen import application, refusal of entry and order to dispose of fish, health certificate, cleaning and disinfection certificate, recordkeeping, and 72-hour notification to APHIS before arrival of a shipment in the United States.

We are asking the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to approve our use of these information collection activities for an additional 3 years.

The purpose of this notice is to solicit comments from the public (as well as affected agencies) concerning our information collection. These comments will help us:

(1) Evaluate whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through use, as appropriate, of automated, electronic, mechanical, and other collection technologies; *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

Estimate of burden: The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.333 hours per response.

Respondents: Fish farmers, brokers, personnel at aquatic pathogen detection laboratories, salaried veterinary officers of the national government of the exporting region or designated certifying officials, and importers of SVC-susceptible live fish, fertilized eggs, and gametes.

Estimated annual number of respondents: 40.

Estimated annual number of responses per respondent: 120.3.

Estimated annual number of responses: 4,811.

Estimated total annual burden on respondents: 1,603 hours. (Due to averaging, the total annual burden hours may not equal the product of the annual number of responses multiplied by the reporting burden per response.)

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Done in Washington, DC, this 18th day of November 2016.

Kevin Shea,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–28230 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food Safety and Inspection Service

[Docket No. FSIS–2016–0037]

National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection; Nominations for Membership

AGENCY: Food Safety and Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice soliciting nominations for membership.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is soliciting nominations for membership for the National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection (NACMPI). The full Committee consists of 20 members, and each person selected is expected to serve a 2-year term. The current Committee consists of 17 members, with 4 members retiring. USDA is soliciting nominations for seven available positions.

DATES: Nominations, including a cover letter to the Secretary, the nominee's typed resume or curriculum vitae, and a completed USDA Advisory Committee Membership Background Information form AD–755, must be received within December 23, 2016. Self-nominations are welcome.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Natasha Williams, Program Specialist, Designated Federal Officer, Office of Outreach, Employee Education and Training, Outreach and Partnership Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Telephone: 202–690–6531, Fax: (202) 690–6519, Email: *Natasha.Williams@fsis.usda.gov,* regarding specific questions about the Committee or this solicitation. General information about the Committee can also be found at: *http://www.fsis.usda.gov/nacmpi.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. 2, USDA is seeking nominees for membership on the National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection (NACMPI). The Committee provides advice and recommendations to the Secretary on meat and poultry inspection programs, pursuant to sections 7(c), 24, 301(a)(3), and 301(c) of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 607(c), 624, 645, 661(a)(3), and 661(c)) and to sections 5(a)(3), 5(c), 8(b), and 11(e) of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 454(a)(3), 454(c), 457(b), and 460(e)). Nominations for membership are being sought from persons representing industry; academia; State and local government officials; public health organizations; and consumers and consumer organizations. NACMPI is seeking members with knowledge and interest in meat and poultry food safety and other FSIS policies. Appointments to the Committee will be made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

To ensure that recommendations of the Committee take into account the needs of the diverse groups served by the Department, membership will include, to the extent practicable, individuals with demonstrated ability to represent minorities, women, and persons with disabilities. It is anticipated that the Committee will meet at least once annually.

Please note that federally registered lobbyists cannot be considered for USDA advisory committee membership. Members can only serve on one advisory committee at a time. All nominees will undergo a USDA background check.

How To Apply

To receive consideration for service on the NACMPI, a nominee must submit a resume and the USDA Advisory Committee Membership Background Information form AD–755. The resume or curriculum vitae must be limited to five one-sided pages and should include nominee's educational background and expertise. For submissions received that are more than five one-sided pages in length, only the first five pages will be reviewed. The USDA Advisory Committee Membership Background Information form AD–755 is available online at *http://www.fsis.usda.gov/wps/portal/fsis/forms.* The AD–755 will only be considered if it is complete.

Nomination packages should be accompanied by a resume and AD–755 form and can be sent by mail to: Natasha Williams, Designated Federal Officer; Office of Outreach, Employee Education and Training, Food Safety and Inspection Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; 1400 Independence Avenue SW., Mail Stop 3778, Patriots Plaza III, Room 9–265A, Washington, DC 20250, Attention: National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection.

Regarding Nominees Who Are Selected

All members who are associated with colleges and universities will be designated as Special Government Employees (SGE) and must complete the Office of Government (OGE) 450 Confidential Financial Disclosure Report electronically through the USDA online system before rendering any advice or before their first meeting. SGEs are required to update financial forms yearly. An invitation to fill out the 450 form will be sent via email before the NACMPI meeting.

All members will be reviewed for conflict of interest pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 208 in relation to specific NACMPI work charges. Advisory Committee members serve a two-year term, renewable for two consecutive terms.

Additional Public Notification

Public awareness of all segments of rulemaking and policy development is important. Consequently, FSIS will announce this **Federal Register** publication on-line through the FSIS Web page located at: *http://www.fsis.usda.gov/federal-register.*

FSIS also will make copies of this publication available through the FSIS Constituent Update, which is used to provide information regarding FSIS policies, procedures, regulations, **Federal Register** notices, FSIS public meetings, and other types of information that could affect or would be of interest to our constituents and stakeholders. The Update is available on the FSIS Web page. Through the Web page, FSIS is able to provide information to a much broader, more diverse audience. In addition, FSIS offers an email subscription service which provides automatic and customized access to selected food safety news and information. This service is available at: *http://www.fsis.usda.gov/subscribe.* Options range from recalls to export information, regulations, directives, and notices. Customers can add or delete subscriptions themselves, and have the option to password protect their accounts.

USDA Non-Discrimination Statement

No agency, officer, or employee of the USDA shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, or political beliefs, exclude from participation in, deny the benefits of, or subject to discrimination any person in the United States under any program or activity conducted by the USDA.

How to File a Complaint of Discrimination

To file a complaint of discrimination, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, which may be accessed online at *http://www.ocio.usda.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2012/Complain_combined_6_8_12.pdf,* or write a letter signed by you or your authorized representative.

Send your completed complaint form or letter to USDA by mail, fax, or email:

Mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Director, Office of Adjudication, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20250–9410.

Fax: (202) 690–7442.

Email: program.intake@usda.gov.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.),

should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720–2600 (voice and TDD).

Alfred V. Almanza,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2016–28237 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–DM–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Happy Camp/Oak Knoll Ranger District; California; Horse Creek Community Protection and Forest Restoration Project

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The purpose of the Horse Creek Community Protection and Forest Restoration Project (Horse Creek Project) is to reduce fuels along egress and ingress roads, on strategic ridges, and adjacent to private property; to reduce safety hazards along roads and in concentrated stands in and around the community of Horse Creek, California; to restore previously stocked units; and treat the riparian areas within the Horse Creek Botanical Special Interest Area. The Horse Creek Project includes 103 miles of roadside hazard treatment and 7,325 acres of other treatments within the 40,834-acre project boundary.

DATES: Comments concerning the scope of the analysis must be received by December 23, 2016. The draft environmental impact statement is expected March 2017 and the final environmental impact statement is expected July 2017.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to C. Christine Frisbee ATTN: Lisa Bousfield 1711 S. Main Street, Yreka, California 96097–9549. Comments may also be sent via email to *lbousfield@fs.fed.us,* or via facsimile to (530) 493–1796.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa Bousfield, (530) 493–1766, *lbousfield@fs.fed.us* or Jeff Marszal, (530) 493–2243, *jmarszal@fs.fed.us.*

Individuals who use telecommunication devices for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose and Need for Action

Purpose and need is drive by the desired conditions for the landscape or management area in the Forest Plan. Where the forest is in the desired condition described in the Forest Plan, there is no need to act—meaning the existing condition is consistent with the Forest Plan. Where the existing condition of the landscape does not represent the desired conditions described in the Forest Plan, there is a need to act to accomplish the goals and objectives or purposes described in the Forest Plan.

- All Land Allocations—There is a need for public safety because the Gap Fire created unsafe conditions for the public and for adjacent private landowners. There is a need for safe conditions for forest workers, firefighters, tree planters, and recreationists.
- General Forest—There is a need for recovered timber volume from fire killed trees in the General Forest Management Area because these areas contribute to the timber base of the Forest. There is a need for reduced fuel loads to reduce the probability and extent of future high-severity fire. There is a need for fire-resilient coniferous forests in severely burned areas to meet Forest Plan Objectives.
- Partial Retention Visual Quality Objective—There is a need for recovered timber volume from fire killed trees on Partial Retention lands because these areas contribute to the timber base of the Forest. There is a need for reduced fuel loads to reduce the probability and extent of future high severity fire. There is a need for fire-resilient coniferous forests in severely burned areas to meet Forest Plan Objectives for partial retention.
- Late Successional Reserves—There is a need for reduced fuels to reduce the risk of future large-scale high severity fire losses of late successional habitat. There is a need for a fire resilient coniferous forest in severely burned areas to meet the desired conditions for late successional reserves.
- Riparian Reserves—There is a need to reduce fuels to reduce the risk of future high severity fire.
- Special Interest Area—There is a need to restore ecological functions to reflect the unique characteristics for which the Horse Creek Botanical area was designated.

Proposed Action

The proposed action was designed to meet the purpose and need of the project. The proposed action would treat roadside hazard trees adjacent to approximately 103 miles of roads and 7,325 acres of other treatments within the 40,834-acre project boundary. Acres by treatment type are described below and do not account for the overlap in treatment types. Treatment acreages are approximate at this point, riparian reserves have not been field validated, and may be adjusted and refined following scoping.

This project includes the following seven types of treatments: (1) Roadside hazard tree removal; (2) roadside fuels treatments; (3) fuels reduction adjacent to private property; (4) developing and maintaining fuels management zones; (5) salvage harvest with site preparation and planting; (6) site preparation and planting (without salvage); and (7) Horse Creek SIA.

(1) Roadside Hazard Tree Removal (103 miles)—Trees adjacent to National Forest System roads or along county roads adjacent to National Forest System lands within the project area will be evaluated for hazard tree removal.

(2) Roadside Fuels Treatment (1,243 acres)—The National Forest System Roads 12, 46N60, and 46N50 would receive treatment within 150 feet on either side of the road. To maintain strategic ingress and egress roads and to decrease the amount of activity-generated fuels in hazard tree removal areas, we propose to remove dead vegetation and live understory vegetation along with live conifer trees less than 12 inches at breast height.

(3) Fuels Reduction Adjacent to Private Property (1,684 acres)—Fuels reduction treatments are proposed within the 500 feet of National Forest System lands adjacent to private property with an existing structure or that had a structure that was affected by the fire. Treatment would include removing dead vegetation and live understory vegetation including conifer trees less than 12 inches in diameter at breast height to reduce fire behavior activity, specifically reduced flame length, crown fire potential and intensity to meet desired conditions.

(4) Developing and Maintaining Fuels Management Zones (1,499 acres)—During the Gap Fire, strategic dozer lines built during the Beaver Fire in 2014 or from past wildfires were re-opened. Strategic ridge systems, many containing historic firelines already in place, would be maintained by removing dead vegetation and live understory vegetation along with live conifer trees less than 12 inches at breast height.

(5) Salvage Harvest with Site Preparation and Planting (Ground-based 1,262 acres and Skyline (Cable) 995 acres)—Standing dead trees 14 inches in diameter at breast height or greater would be considered for salvage. Fire-killed and fire-injured trees with a 70 percent or greater chance of dying within the next three to five years

would be considered for salvage harvest. Salvage logging treatments would be accomplished by a combination of ground-based and skyline logging systems. All salvage units would be reforested as described in the site-preparation and planting section.

(6) Site Preparation and Planting (without salvage) (458 acres)—Forest stands selected for site preparation and tree planting are predominately plantations composed of standing dead trees generally under 16 inches in diameter at breast height. Both manual and mechanical methods would be used to cut or masticate standing dead trees depending on slope steepness, accessibility and feasibility. Activity-generated fuels would be treated using a variety of methods including piling and burning, underburning, or lop and scattering. Reforestation would be accomplished by directly planting nursery-grown seedlings or by allowing natural regeneration.

(7) Horse Creek SIA (184 acres)—Treatment within the Horse Creek SIA includes, hazard tree removal, placing trees with rootwads into the riparian reserve, and planting hardwood and conifers within the riparian reserves.

Connected Actions

- Road Access—Access for this project would be mainly accomplished by use of roads on National Forest Transportation System. Temporary roads are estimated at this time and will be finalized to comply with standards and guidelines as designated within the forest plan.
- Landings—Existing landings will be used where possible. Landing size will be commensurate with operation safety. Skyline landings will use roads where possible. Skyline landings off the road system and ground-based landings will average one acres in size but will not exceed 1.5 acres in size. Both new and existing landings will be hydrologically stabilized at the end of the project.

Responsible Official

C. Christine Frisbee, Klamath National Forest Acting Forest Supervisor, 1711 South Main Street, Yreka, California 96097, will prepare and sign the Record of Decision at the conclusion of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review.

Nature of Decision To Be Made

The Forest Service is lead agency for the project. Based on the result of the NEPA analysis, the Forest Supervisor's Record of Decision regarding the Horse Creek Project will recommend implementation of one of the following: (1) The proposed action and mitigation necessary to minimize or avoid adverse impacts; (2) An alternative to the proposed action and mitigation necessary to minimize or avoid adverse impacts; or (3) The no-action alternative. The Record of Decision will also document the consistency of the proposed action or one of the alternatives with the Klamath National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

Scoping Process

This notice of intent initiates the scoping process, which guides the development of the environmental impact statement.

It is important that reviewers provide their comments at such times and in such manner that they are useful to the agency's preparation of the environmental impact statement. Therefore, comments should be provided prior to the close of the comment period and should clearly articulate the reviewer's concerns and contentions.

Comments received in response to this solicitation, including names and addresses of those who comment, will be part of the public record for this proposed action. Comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered, however.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Ted O. Mcarthur,

Acting Deputy Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 2016–28209 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3411–15–P

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Notice of Public Meeting of the South Carolina Advisory Committee To Discuss Future Civil Rights Projects

AGENCY: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

ACTION: Announcement of meeting.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Commission) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act that the South Carolina (State) Advisory Committee will hold a meeting on Wednesday, January 18, 2017, for the purpose of discussing potential projects.

DATES: The meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 18, 2017 12:00 p.m. EST.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be by teleconference. Toll-free call-in number: 888–505–4378, conference ID: 2302391.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeff Hinton, DFO, at *jhinton@usccr.gov* or 404–562–7006.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Members of the public can listen to the discussion. This meeting is available to the public through the following toll-free call-in number: 888–505–4378, conference ID: 2302391. Any interested member of the public may call this number and listen to the meeting. Callers can expect to incur charges for calls they initiate over wireless lines, and the Commission will not refund any incurred charges. Callers will incur no charge for calls they initiate over land-line connections to the toll-free telephone number. Persons with hearing impairments may also follow the proceedings by first calling the Federal Relay Service at 1–800–977–8339 and providing the Service with the conference call number and conference ID number.

Members of the public are also entitled to submit written comments; the comments must be received in the regional office by January 13, 2017. Written comments may be mailed to the Southern Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 61 Forsyth Street, Suite 16T126, Atlanta, GA 30303. They may also be faxed to the Commission at (404) 562–7005, or emailed to Regional Director, Jeffrey Hinton at *jhinton@usccr.gov.* Persons who desire additional information may contact the Southern Regional Office at (404) 562–7000.

Records generated from this meeting may be inspected and reproduced at the Southern Regional Office, as they become available, both before and after the meeting. Records of the meeting will be available via *www.facadatabase.gov* under the Commission on Civil Rights, South Carolina Advisory Committee link. Persons interested in the work of this Committee are directed to the Commission's Web site, *http://www.usccr.gov,* or may contact the Southern Regional Office at the above email or street address.

Agenda

Welcome and Call to Order

Walter Caudle, South Carolina SAC Chairman

Jeff Hinton, Regional Director

Regional Update—Jeff Hinton

Open Comment—Walter Caudle, South Carolina SAC Chairman Staff/Advisory Committee

Public Participation

Adjournment

Dated: November 18, 2016.

David Mussatt,

Supervisory Chief, Regional Programs Unit.

[FR Doc. 2016–28234 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Notice of Public Meeting of the Georgia Advisory Committee for an Orientation Meeting To Welcome the New Committee

AGENCY: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

ACTION: Announcement of meeting.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Commission) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act that the Georgia (State) Advisory Committee will hold a meeting on Thursday, December 15, 2016, for the purpose of orientation and discussing potential project topics.

DATES: The meeting will be held on Thursday December 15, 2016 10:00 p.m. EST.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be by teleconference. Toll-free call-in number: 877–545–1409, conference ID: 9961239.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeff Hinton, DFO, at *jhinton@usccr.gov* or 404–562–7006.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Members of the public can listen to the discussion. This meeting is available to the public through the following toll-free call-in number: 877–545–1409, conference ID: 9961239. Any interested member of the public may call this number and listen to the meeting. Callers can expect to incur charges for calls they initiate over wireless lines, and the Commission will not refund any incurred charges. Callers will incur no charge for calls they initiate over land-line connections to the toll-free telephone number. Persons with hearing impairments may also follow the proceedings by first calling the Federal Relay Service at 1–800–977–8339 and providing the Service with the conference call number and conference ID number.

Members of the public are also entitled to submit written comments; the comments must be received in the regional office by December 13, 2016. Written comments may be mailed to the Southern Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 61 Forsyth Street, Suite 16T126, Atlanta, GA 30303. They may also be faxed to the Commission at (404) 562–7005, or emailed to Regional Director, Jeffrey Hinton at *jhinton@usccr.gov.* Persons who desire additional information may contact the Southern Regional Office at (404) 562–7000.

Records generated from this meeting may be inspected and reproduced at the Southern Regional Office, as they become available, both before and after the meeting. Records of the meeting will be available via *www.facadatabase.gov* under the Commission on Civil Rights, North Carolina Advisory Committee link. Persons interested in the work of this Committee are directed to the Commission's Web site, *http://www.usccr.gov,* or may contact the Southern Regional Office at the above email or street address.

Agenda

Welcome and Introductions
Jeff Hinton, Regional Director; Jerry Gonzalez, Chair Georgia SAC
Regional Updatee—Jeff Hinton
Discussion on topics for potential projects—Jerry Gonzalez, Chair Georgia SAC/Staff/Advisory Committee
Public comments
Adjournment

Dated: November 18, 2016.

David Mussatt,

Supervisory Chief, Regional Programs Unit.

[FR Doc. 2016–28232 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Notice of Public Meeting of the North Carolina Advisory Committee for a Meeting To Discuss Potential Project Topics

AGENCY: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Commission) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act that the North Carolina (State) Advisory Committee will hold a meeting on Tuesday, December 13, 2016, for the purpose of welcoming new members and discussing potential projects.

DATES: The meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 13, 2016 12:00 p.m. EST.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be by teleconference. Toll-free call-in number: 877–741–4240, conference ID: 4742958.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeff Hinton, DFO, at *jhinton@usccr.gov* or 404–562–7006.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Members of the public can listen to the discussion. This meeting is available to the public through the following toll-free call-in number: 877–741–4240, conference ID: 4742958. Any interested member of the public may call this number and listen to the meeting. Callers can expect to incur charges for calls they initiate over wireless lines, and the Commission will not refund any incurred charges. Callers will incur no charge for calls they initiate over land-line connections to the toll-free telephone number. Persons with hearing impairments may also follow the proceedings by first calling the Federal Relay Service at 1–800–977–8339 and providing the Service with the conference call number and conference ID number.

Members of the public are also entitled to submit written comments; the comments must be received in the regional office by December 10, 2016. Written comments may be mailed to the Southern Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 61 Forsyth Street, Suite 16T126, Atlanta, GA 30303. They may also be faxed to the Commission at (404) 562–7005, or emailed to Regional Director, Jeffrey Hinton at *jhinton@usccr.gov.* Persons who desire additional information may contact the Southern Regional Office at (404) 562–7000.

Records generated from this meeting may be inspected and reproduced at the Southern Regional Office, as they become available, both before and after the meeting. Records of the meeting will be available via *www.facadatabase.gov* under the Commission on Civil Rights, North Carolina Advisory Committee link. Persons interested in the work of this Committee are directed to the Commission's Web site, *http://www.usccr.gov,* or may contact the Southern Regional Office at the above email or street address.

Agenda

- Welcome/Member participation roll call
  Jeff Hinton, Regional Director; Matty Lazo—Chadderton, Chairman—NC SAC
- North Carolina Advisory Committee discussion on potential projects
  Matty Lazo—Chadderton, Chair/Staff/Advisory Committee
- Public Participation
- Adjournment

Dated: November 18, 2016.

David Mussatt,

Supervisory Chief, Regional Programs Unit.

[FR Doc. 2016–28233 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Economic Development Administration

Notice of National Advisory Council on Innovation and Entrepreneurship Meeting

AGENCY: Economic Development Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of an open meeting.

SUMMARY: The National Advisory Council on Innovation and Entrepreneurship (NACIE) will hold a public meeting via teleconfrerence on Wednesday, December 7, 2016. During this time, members will discuss initial ideas and efforts underway and determine its focus on projects and potential recommendations leading up to NACIE's next quarterly meeting in early 2017.

DATES: Wednesday, December 7, 2016.

Time: 2:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m. Eastern Time (ET).

ADDRESSES: This meeting will be held by teleconference; a physical address is therefore not applicable.

Teleconference Information

Toll-Free: +1 877 950 4778.
Passcode: 4423486.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Council was chartered on November 10, 2009, to advise the Secretary of Commerce on matters related to innovation and entrepreneurship in the United States. NACIE's overarching focus is recommending transformational policies to the Secretary that will help U.S. communities, businesses, and the workforce become more globally competitive. The Council operates as an independent entity within the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship (OIE), which is housed within the U.S. Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration. NACIE members are a diverse and dynamic group of successful entrepreneurs, innovators, and investors, as well as leaders from nonprofit organizations and academia.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the Council's planned work initiatives in three focus areas: workforce/talent, entrepreneurship, and innovation. The final agenda will be posted on the NACIE Web site at *http://www.eda.gov/oie/nacie/* prior to the meeting. Any member of the public may submit pertinent questions and comments concerning the Council's affairs at any time before or after the meeting. Comments may be submitted to the Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship at the contact information below. Copies of the meeting minutes will be available by request within 90 days of the meeting date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Craig Buerstatte, Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Room 78018, 1401 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20230; email: *nacie@doc.gov;* telephone: +1 202 482 8001; facsimile: +1 202 273 4781. Please reference ''NACIE December 7, 2016'' in the subject line of your correspondence.

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Craig Buerstatte,

Deputy Director, Office of Innovation and Entrepreneurship.

[FR Doc. 2016–28247 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–WH–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau Of Industry And Security

Emerging Technology And Research Advisory Committee; Notice of Open Meeting

The Emerging Technology and Research Advisory Committee (ETRAC) will meet on December 15, 2016, 8:30 a.m., Room 3884, at the Herbert C. Hoover Building, 14th Street between Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues NW., Washington, DC. The Committee advises the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration on emerging technology and research activities, including those related to deemed exports.

Agenda

Open Session

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks.
2. Update on Export Control Reform, Bureau of Industry and Security.
3. Review: Emerging Technologies in the News: ''Industrial Firms Embrace 3–D'' Wall Street Journal—Nov. 12, 2016; ''Basic Research Key to Invigorating Innovation''—National Defense August 2016; ''Emerging Capability''—Forward-looking infrared technology (FLIR) published in C4ISRNET—October 2016; ''Hyperloop Preliminary Design Study-Technical Section''; Boost basic research in China'' Nature—June 2016; 'Encourage governments to need scientific advice'' Nature September 29, 2016; and New Frequently Asked Questions on Deemed Exports Effective September 1, 2016
4. Issues for Discussion/Developments from October 2016 meeting-Priority Technologies: Electronics & Graphene Circuits; Graphene metamaterials; Robotics and Big Data; Optoelectronics & Photonics; Additive Manufacturing; Advanced materials; Hypersonics—''Hypersonic Weapons and US National Security: A 21st. Century Breakthrough'' Mitchell Institute for Aerospace Studies—Air Force Association and Biomedical Engineering Materials and Applications ''Digital DNA'' Nature September 2016.
5. Comments from the Public.
6. Introduction and Demonstration to the new Deemed Interactive Tool.
7. Further Discussion—Toxicological Agents Final Rule.
8. ''Disruptive Technologies: Advances that will transform life, business and the global economy'' McKinsey Global Institute.

The open sessions will be accessible via teleconference to 25 participants on a first come, first serve basis. To join the conference, submit inquiries to Ms. Yvette Springer at *Yvette.Springer@bis.doc.gov* no later than, December 8, 2016.

A limited number of seats will be available for the public session. Reservations are not accepted. To the extent that time permits, members of the public may present oral statements to the Committee. The public may submit written statements at any time before or after the meeting. However, to facilitate the distribution of public presentation materials to the Committee members, the Committee suggests that presenters forward the public presentation materials prior to the meeting to Ms. Springer via email.

For more information, call Yvette Springer at (202) 482–2813.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Yvette Springer,

Committee Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–28127 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–JT–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Regulations and Procedures Technical Advisory Committee; Notice of Partially Closed Meeting

The Regulations and Procedures Technical Advisory Committee (RPTAC) will meet December 13, 2016, 9:00 a.m., Room 3884, in the Herbert C. Hoover Building, 14th Street between Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues NW., Washington, DC. The Committee advises the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration on implementation of the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) and provides for continuing review to update the EAR as needed.

Agenda

Public Session

1. Opening remarks by the Chairman
2. Opening remarks by the Bureau of Industry and Security
3. Presentation of papers or comments by the Public
4. Export Enforcement update
5. Regulations update
6. Working group reports
7. Automated Export System update

Closed Session

8. Discussion of matters determined to be exempt from the provisions relating to public meetings found in 5 U.S.C. app. 2 §§ 10(a)(1) and 10(a)(3).

The open session will be accessible via teleconference to 25 participants on a first come, first serve basis. To join the conference, submit inquiries to Ms. Yvette Springer at *Yvette.Springer@bis.doc.gov* no later than December 6, 2016.

A limited number of seats will be available for the public session. Reservations are not accepted. To the extent that time permits, members of the public may present oral statements to the Committee. The public may submit written statements at any time before or after the meeting. However, to facilitate the distribution of public presentation materials to the Committee members, the Committee suggests that presenters forward the public presentation materials prior to the meeting to Ms. Springer via email.

The Assistant Secretary for Administration, with the concurrence of the delegate of the General Counsel, formally determined on November 4, 2016, pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. app. 2 § 10(d)), that the portion of the meeting dealing with pre-decisional changes to the Commerce Control List and the U.S. export control policies shall be exempt from the provisions relating to public meetings found in 5 U.S.C. app. 2 § § 10(a)(1) and 10(a)(3). The remaining portions of the meeting will be open to the public.

For more information, call Yvette Springer at (202) 482–2813.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Yvette Springer,

Committee Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–28138 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–JT–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–871, A–475–835, A–469–815]

Finished Carbon Steel Flanges From India, Italy, Spain: Postponement of Preliminary Determinations of the Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigations

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: Effective November 23, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Baker at (202) 482–2924 (India), Edythe Artman at (202) 482–3931 (Italy), and Mark Flessner at (202) 482–6312 (Spain), AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 20, 2016, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated antidumping duty investigations concerning imports of finished carbon steel flanges from India, Italy and Spain.[1] The notice of initiation stated that the Department, in accordance with section 733(b)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), would issue its preliminary determinations no later than 140 days after the date of the initiation, unless postponed.[2] The current deadline for the preliminary determinations of these investigations is no later than December 7, 2016.

Postponement of Preliminary Determinations

On October 31, 2016, Weldbend Corporation and Boltex Manufacturing Co., L.P. (collectively, the petitioners), made timely requests pursuant to section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(e), for a 50-day postponement of the preliminary determinations in these investigations in order to provide the Department with sufficient time to review submissions and request supplemental information, in order to arrive at the most accurate results possible.[3] No other parties commented.

For the reasons stated above, and because there are no compelling reasons to deny the petitioners' request, the Department is postponing the deadline for the preliminary determinations by 50 days, until January 26, 2017, in accordance with section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(2).

In accordance with section 735(a)(1) of the Act, the deadline for the final determinations of these investigations will continue to be 75 days after the date of the preliminary determinations, unless postponed at a later date.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 733(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(f)(1).

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2016–28240 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[1] *See Finished Carbon Steel Flanges From India, Italy, and Spain: Initiation of Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigations,* 81 FR 49619 (July 28, 2016).

[2] *Id.,* at 49622.

[3] *See* the letters from the petitioners to the Secretary of Commerce entitled, ''Finished Carbon Steel Flanges from India: Request to Postpone Preliminary Determination,'' dated October 31, 2016; ''Finished Carbon Steel Flanges from Italy: Request to Postpone Preliminary Determination,'' dated October 31, 2016; ''Finished Carbon Steel Flanges from Spain: Request to Postpone Preliminary Determination,'' dated October 31, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–049]

Ammonium Sulfate From the People's Republic of China: Correction to the Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maliha Khan or Thomas Martin, AD/CVD Operations, Office IV, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0895 or (202) 482–3936, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 9, 2016, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published the preliminary results of the investigation of sales at less than fair value for ammonium sulfate from the People's Republic of China (''PRC'').[1]

The Department is issuing this notice to correct an inadvertent error in the **Federal Register** notice for the *Preliminary Determination.* Specifically, the Department stated an incorrect

[1] *See Ammonium Sulfate from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value;* 81 FR 78776 (November 9, 2016) (''*Preliminary Determination*'').

deadline for submitting case briefs or other written comments in the ''Disclosure and Public Comment'' section of the *Preliminary Determination* notice. The notice states that ''{c}ase briefs or other written comments may be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance no later than seven days after the date on which the final verification report is issued in this proceeding . . .'' [2] However, the correct deadline, as stated in the preliminary determination memorandum accompanying the *Preliminary Determination* notice is ''no later than 30 days after the publication of this preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**.'' [3] Accordingly, the deadline for filing case briefs is December 9, 2016.

This correction to the preliminary determination of sales at less than fair value is issued and published in accordance with sections 733(f) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2016–28226 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–471–807]

Certain Uncoated Paper From Portugal: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On October 18, 2016, The Department of Commerce (the ''Department'') published its initiation and preliminary results of a changed circumstances review of the antidumping duty (''AD'') order on certain uncoated paper from Portugal. The Department preliminarily determined that The Navigator Company, S.A. and Navigator Fine Paper, S.A. (collectively ''Navigator'') is the successor in interest to Portucel, S.A. and Portucel Soporcel Fine Paper, S.A. (collectively ''Portucel'') for purposes of the AD order and, as such, is entitled to Portucel's cash deposit rate with respect to entries of subject merchandise. We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results. As no parties submitted comments, and there is no additional information or evidence on the record, the Department is making no changes to the *Preliminary Results.*

DATES: Effective November 23, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carrie Bethea, AD/CVD Operations, Office V, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1491.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 18, 2016, the Department initiated a changed circumstances review and made a preliminary finding that Navigator is the successor-in-interest to Portucel and is entitled to Portucel's cash deposit rate with respect to entries of subject merchandise.[1] We also provided interested parties 14 days from the date of publication of the *Preliminary Results* to submit case briefs in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(ii). No interested parties submitted case briefs or requested a hearing. On October 12, 2016, the Department issued draft customs instructions to interested parties and solicited comments.[2] None were received.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to the order is certain uncoated paper. The product is currently classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) categories 4802.56.1000, 4802.56.2000, 4802.56.3000, 4802.56.4000, 4802.56.6000, 4802.56.7020, 4802.56.7040, 4802.57.1000, 4802.57.2000, 4802.57.3000, and 4802.57.4000. Some imports of subject merchandise may also be classified under 4802.62.1000, 4802.62.2000, 4802.62.3000, 4802.62.5000, 4802.62.6020, 4802.62.6040, 4802.69.1000, 4802.69.2000, 4802.69.3000, 4811.90.8050 and 4811.90.9080. While HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of the investigation is dispositive.[3]

Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review

Because no party submitted a case brief in response to the Department's *Preliminary Results,* and because the record contains no other information or evidence that calls into question the *Preliminary Results,* the Department continues to find that Navigator is the successor-in-interest to Portucel, and is entitled to Portucel's cash deposit rate with respect to entries of merchandise subject to the AD order on uncoated paper from Portugal.[4]

Instructions to U.S. and Border Protection

Based on these final results, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to collect estimated ADs for all shipments of subject merchandise exported by Navigator and entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of this notice in the **Federal Register** at the current AD cash deposit rate for Portucel (*i.e.,* 7.80 percent). This cash deposit requirement shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice serves as a final reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (''APO'') of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing this final results notice in accordance with sections 751(b) and 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.216.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2016–28239 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[2] *Id.,* at 78776–78777.

[3] *See* Memorandum from Christian Marsh to Paul Piquado, ''Decision Memorandum for the Preliminary Determination of the Less Than Fair Value Investigation of Ammonium Sulfate from the People's Republic of China,'' dated November 1, 2016, at 11.

[1] *Certain Uncoated Paper from Portugal: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review,* 81 FR 71703 (October 18, 2016) (*Preliminary Results*).

[2] *See* Memo to the File from Carrie Bethea, regarding, Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Uncoated Paper from Portugal, Draft U.S. Customs and Border Protection (''CBP'') Instructions, dated October 12, 2016.

[3] For a complete description of the Scope of the Order, *see* (*Preliminary Results*).

[4] For a complete discussion of the Department's findings, which remain unchanged in these final results and which are herein incorporated by reference and adopted by this notice, *see generally* (*Preliminary Results*).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Environmental Technologies Trade Advisory Committee (ETTAC) Public Meeting

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Federal Advisory Committee meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of a meeting of the Environmental Technologies Trade Advisory Committee (ETTAC).

DATES: The teleconference meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 7, 2016, at 2:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST). Please register by 5:00 p.m. EST on Friday, December 2, 2016 to listen in on the teleconference meeting.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will take place via teleconference. For logistical reasons, all participants are required to register in advance by the date specified above. Please contact Ms. Maureen Hinman at the contact information below to register and obtain call-in information.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting will take place from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST). This meeting is open to the public. Written comments concerning ETTAC affairs are welcome any time before or after the meeting. Minutes will be available within 30 days of this meeting.

Topic to be considered: The agenda for the December 7, 2016 meeting includes providing the newly chartered committee with an overview of committee operations and a briefing on Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) requirements. The committee will also deliberate on composition of subcommittees.

Background: The ETTAC is mandated by Section 2313(c) of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 4728(c), to advise the Environmental Trade Working Group of the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee, through the Secretary of Commerce, on the development and administration of programs to expand U.S. exports of environmental technologies, goods, services, and products. The ETTAC was originally chartered in May of 1994. It was most recently re-chartered until August 2016.

The teleconference will be accessible to people with disabilities. Please specify any requests for reasonable accommodation when registering to participate in the teleconference. Last minute requests will be accepted, but may be impossible to fulfill.

No time will be available for oral comments from members of the public during this meeting. As noted above, any member of the public may submit pertinent written comments concerning the Committee's affairs at any time before or after the meeting. Comments may be submitted to Ms. Maureen Hinman at the contact information indicated above. To be considered during the meeting, comments must be received no later than 5:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on Friday, December 2, 2016, to ensure transmission to the Committee prior to the meeting. Comments received after that date will be distributed to the members but may not be considered at the meeting.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Maureen Hinman, Office of Energy & Environmental Industries (OEEI), International Trade Administration, Room 4053, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230. (Phone: 202–482–0627; Fax: 202–482–5665; email: *maureen.hinman@trade.gov*).

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Man Cho,

Deputy Director, Office of Energy and Environmental Industries.

[FR Doc. 2016–28205 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648–XF013

Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Application for an Exempted Fishing Permit

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice; receipt of application for exempted fishing permit.

SUMMARY: This notice announces receipt of an exempted fishing permit (EFP) application from the Alaska Seafood Cooperative (AKSC). If granted, this permit would allow up to ten vessels to participate in the EFP—up to five AKSC-member Amendment 80 vessels would be allowed to conduct experimental fishing in two subareas of the Bering Sea that are closed to fishing with trawl gear, and five additional AKSC-member Amendment 80 vessels would conduct experimental fishing adjacent to the closed areas. Under the permit, experimental fishing with non-pelagic trawl gear would be authorized in Reporting Area 516 of Zone 1 that is otherwise closed to all trawl gear and the Red King Crab Savings Area (RKCSA) that is otherwise closed to non-pelagic trawl gear. The AKSC would collect data on crab prohibited species catch (PSC) rates during commercial groundfish fishing operations inside the Area 516 seasonal closure, the RKCSA, and adjacent areas that are currently open to non-pelagic trawling. The objective of the EFP is to evaluate PSC rates and overall catch of target species in the above-mentioned closed areas compared with the areas currently open to fishing with trawl gear. This experiment has the potential to promote the objectives of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

DATES: Submit comments on this EFP application on or before December 15, 2016. The North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) will consider the EFP application at its meeting to be held December 6, 2016, through December 14, 2016, in Anchorage, Alaska.

ADDRESSES: The Council meeting will be held at the Anchorage Hilton Hotel, 500 W. 3rd Avenue, Anchorage, AK, 99501. The agenda for the Council meeting is available at *http://legistar2.granicus.com/npfmc/meetings/2016/12/950_A_North_Pacific_Council_16-12-06_Meeting_Agenda.pdf.*

You may submit comments on this document, identified by NOAA–NMFS–2016–0142, by any of the following methods:

- *Electronic Submission:* Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Go to *www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=NOAA-NMFS-2016-0142* click the ''Comment Now!'' icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach your comments.
- *Mail:* Address written comments to Glenn Merrill, Assistant Regional Administrator, Sustainable Fisheries Division, Alaska Region NMFS, Attn: Ellen Sebastian. Mail comments to P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802–1668.

Instructions: Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period, may not be considered by NMFS. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on *www.regulations.gov* without change. All personal identifying information (*e.g.,* name, address), confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive information submitted voluntarily by the sender will

be publicly accessible. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter ''N/A'' in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous).

Electronic copies of the EFP application and the categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act are available from the Alaska Region, NMFS Web site at *http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brandee Gerke, 907–586–7228.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NMFS manages the domestic groundfish fisheries in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands management area (BSAI) under the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (FMP), which the Council prepared under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Regulations governing the BSAI groundfish fisheries appear at 50 CFR parts 600 and 679. The FMP and the implementing regulations, § 600.745(b) and § 679.6, allow the NMFS Regional Administrator to authorize, for limited experimental purposes, fishing that would otherwise be prohibited. Procedures for issuing EFPs are contained in the implementing regulations.

Background

BSAI groundfish harvests are subject to annual limits on groundfish and PSC. Pacific halibut, Pacific herring, Pacific salmon and steelhead, king crab (including red king crab), and Tanner crab are prohibited species under the FMP. Participants in the BSAI non-pelagic trawl fisheries catch PSC incidentally—primarily crab and halibut.

The directed red king crab pot fishery is one of the most important shellfish fisheries in the Bering Sea. Current regulations for harvesting red king crab in the crab pot fishery may be found in 50 CFR part 680. Red king crab is also caught incidentally as PSC in Bering Sea groundfish non-pelagic trawl fisheries. PSC (including red king crab) in the non-pelagic trawl fisheries must be minimized to the extent practicable and if caught, immediately returned to the ocean with a minimum of injury.

The Council and NMFS have implemented FMP amendments, dating back to the 1980s and 1990s, to reduce the amount of red king crab PSC in trawl fisheries, including the BSAI non-pelagic trawl fishery. For example, the Area 516 red king crab seasonal closure for all trawl gear (FMP Amendment 10) was implemented in 1987 (52 FR 8592, March 19, 1987). FMP Amendment 37, (61 FR 65985, December 16, 1996) was implemented in 1997 to create the RKCSA along with other measures to conserve concentrations of Bristol Bay red king crab.

The management and structure of the non-pelagic trawl fisheries in the Bering Sea have changed since these red king crab closure areas were implemented. In 2008, NMFS implemented Amendment 80 to the FMP (72 FR 52668, September 14, 2007). Amendment 80 established a catch share program to allocate specific non-pelagic groundfish species among specific defined participants (the Amendment 80 sector) and facilitate the formation of Amendment 80 cooperatives among those participants. Nineteen vessels were active in the Amendment 80 sector in 2016—this sector is the largest component of the non-pelagic trawl fishery. With the implementation of Amendment 80 to the FMP in 2008, vessels operating in Amendment 80 cooperatives were able to develop tools to reduce incidental catch of crab PSC.

Participants in Amendment 80 cooperatives have reduced the amount of red king crab PSC through improved fishing practices that are possible now that participants in the Amendment 80 cooperative receive an allocation of specific groundfish species. These exclusive allocations provide opportunities for Amendment 80 cooperative participants to slow down or otherwise change their fishing operations to avoid red king crab. These modified fishing practices are not practicable when vessels are not provided an exclusive harvest allocation, participate in derby-style fisheries, and are competing with other vessels to harvest their groundfish as soon as possible.

Although Amendment 80 cooperatives have undoubtedly helped to reduce red king crab bycatch in the sector's target fisheries, a combination of closed areas and PSC limits currently regulate red king crab PSC in trawl fisheries, including the Amendment 80 sector. For example, Area 516 of Zone 1 in the Bering Sea subarea closes annually to all trawl gear, including Amendment 80 vessels, from March 15 through June 15, § 679.22(a)(2).

Regulations for groundfish fishing in the RKCSA, found at § 679.22(a)(3), close directed fishing for non-pelagic trawl gear in a portion of the Bering Sea subarea defined in Figure 11 to 50 CFR part 679. Non-pelagic trawl gear is used by all Amendment 80 vessels in the Bering Sea.

PSC limits for red king crab, found at § 679.21(e)(1)(i), specify the annual PSC allowance of red king crab for all trawl vessels while engaged in directed fishing for groundfish in Zone 1. Approximately 50 percent of the Zone 1 red king crab PSC limit is apportioned to the Amendment 80 sector, and distributed as an allowance of crab to each Amendment 80 cooperative. In 2016, the Zone 1 PSC allowance for the AKSC is 30,834 red king crab.

The Zone 1 red king crab PSC allowance, allowed the Amendment 80 cooperatives to assign voluntary, vessel-level apportionments of PSC to vessels fishing in Zone 1. With these voluntary apportionments, vessel owners and operators in the sector began to share information about individual vessel PSC rates and avoid areas with high PSC rates for red king crab.

The primary result of the improved crab avoidance and management tools is that AKSC and the remaining Amendment 80 sector participants have consistently stayed well under the Zone 1 red king crab PSC allowance. While the potential exists for crab PSC allowances and closure areas to constrain allocated catch in some Amendment 80 target fisheries, the Amendment 80 sector continues to actively explore how to further reduce crab PSC while preserving target fishery harvest opportunities.

Exempted Fishing Permit Application

On August 25, 2016, the AKSC, an Amendment 80 cooperative, submitted an application for an EFP. We note that the AKSC submitted an application for similar EFP on October 2, 2015 (80 FR 72049, November 18, 2015). That EFP application was subsequently withdrawn by the applicant to provide additional time for the applicants to address comments received on the experimental design during review at the December 2015 Council meeting. The application submitted by the AFSC on August 25, 2016, includes the additional information requested at the December 2015 Council meeting and a few modifications to the experimental design relative to the October 2, 2015, application.

The EFP would allow up to five AKSC-member Amendment 80 vessels to conduct field tests in two subareas of the Bering Sea that are closed to trawl directed fisheries. Those two subareas are Reporting Area 516 of Zone 1, which is closed to all trawl gear under § 679.22(a)(2), and the RKCSA, which is closed to non-pelagic trawl gear under § 679.22(a)(3). The EFP would also allow up to five additional AKSC-member Amendment 80 vessels to conduct simultaneous, paired field tests adjacent to the two closed subareas. If granted, this EFP would allow AKSC to

collect data on crab bycatch rates during commercial fishing operations on ten groundfish fishing vessels (targeting mostly flatfish) inside the Area 516 seasonal closure, the RKCSA, and adjacent areas that are currently open to non-pelagic trawl gear. The principle objective of the EFP is to compare red king crab bycatch rates and target flatfish catch rates inside and outside of the closed areas. Data collected under this EFP would inform whether a systematic survey of crab abundance in the closed area is warranted.

AKSC proposes to conduct EFP fishing from January 20, 2017, through the end of April 2017. EFP fishing would begin again in late January 2018 and end by April 30, 2018. Conducting EFP fishing over two winter/spring seasons would increase the chance that data are collected over a wider range of environmental conditions that are expected to affect crab and flatfish abundance and location.

To ensure data are available for valid comparisons of catch rates inside and outside the closed areas, participating vessels would fish both inside the closed areas and in adjacent areas outside the closed areas (as proportionally as possible) over the course of their Zone 1 rock sole and yellowfin sole fishing each year of the EFP. The adjacent areas outside of the closed areas would be selected based on similarities in general depth and substrate type with areas fished in the RKCSA and Area 516 closed areas. To help ensure differences in bycatch rates reflect differences in relative abundance rather than the attributes of trawl gear used, the vessels participating in the EFP would keep their ground gear configuration (*e.g.,* size of trawl net and width of footropes) as consistent as possible inside and outside of the closed areas.

Under the EFP, sea samplers would be required for monitoring and data collection. Sea samplers are NMFS-certified observers that conduct activities under an EFP rather than normal observer activities on an Amendment 80 vessel.

The sea samplers would conduct a census of all crab for all EFP tows inside the red king crab closed areas and in adjacent areas outside the red king crab closed areas. The census data would include a record of size and sex of each individual. Temperature and depth data will be collected by sea samplers for each tow. Sea samplers will also collect fishing operational information such as tow speed and tow length. AKSC will compare catch rates on different EFP vessels when fishing in similar areas to evaluate the degree to which individual vessels are impacting catch rates.

To ensure observer sampling duties are undisturbed, expanded crab data collection under the census would be conducted in a manner that is completely separate from current observer sampling protocols. To accomplish this, the crab census would occur after all the catch passes over the vessel's flow scale and the observer has completed all sampling of unsorted catch for all Bering Sea EFP hauls.

The ten vessels authorized to participate in this EFP would be required to comply with all the aggregate target species allocations that apply to the rest of the Amendment 80 sector, and would operate under the Amendment 80 crab and halibut PSC allowances available through membership in the AKSC. These allowances would apply to all EFP and non-EFP fishing during the year.

Under the EFP, the AKSC and the member EFP vessels would be limited to the amount of aggregate groundfish allocations currently in regulation at 50 CFR part 679. Further, the amount of red king crab PSC accrued by the AKSC and under the EFP would not exceed the AKSC's 2017 or 2018 red king crab allowance. All other crab limits and halibut mortality limits will continue to apply to the EFP activities, and are subject to review and approval by NMFS.

At the end of EFP fishing in 2017, AKSC would be required to submit to NMFS a preliminary report of the EFP results on PSC use inside and outside of the closed areas and by target fishery. At the end of EFP fishing in 2018, a final, comprehensive EFP report would be submitted.

The proposed action would exempt participating AKSC vessels from selected 50 CFR part 679 closed areas and PSC handling requirements. Should the Regional Administrator issue a permit based on this EFP application, the conditions of the permit would be designed to minimize PSC, and any potential for EFP participants to bias estimates of groundfish or PSC. Vessels participating in EFP fishing would be exempt from, at minimum, the following regulations:

1. Closure to directed fishing by trawl gear in Reporting Area 516 of Zone 1 in the Bering Sea subarea from March 15 through June 15, at § 679.22(a)(2).

2. Closure to directed fishing by non-pelagic trawl gear in the RKCSA, at § 679.22(a)(3).

3. The operator of each vessel, after allowing for sampling by an observer, return all prohibited species, or parts thereof, to the sea immediately, with a minimum of injury, regardless of its condition, at § 679.21(a)(2)(ii).

The EFP would be valid upon issuance in 2017 until either the end of designated EFP fishing in 2018 or until the AKSC Zone 1 red king crab PSC allowance is reached in areas of the BSAI open to directed fishing by the Amendment 80 cooperatives. EFP-authorized fishing activities would not be expected to change the nature or duration of the groundfish fishery, gear used, or the amount or species of fish caught by the Amendment 80 cooperatives.

The fieldwork that would be conducted under this EFP is not expected to have a significant impact on the human environment as detailed in the categorical exclusion prepared for this action (see **ADDRESSES**).

In accordance with § 679.6, NMFS has determined that the application warrants further consideration and has forwarded the application to the Council to initiate consultation. The Council is scheduled to consider the EFP application during its December 2016 meeting, which will be held at the Anchorage Hilton Hotel, Anchorage, AK. The EFP application will also be provided to the Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee for review at the December Council meeting. The applicant has been invited to appear in support of the application.

Public Comments

Interested persons may comment on the EFP application at the December 2016 Council meeting during public testimony. Information regarding the meeting is available at the Council's Web site at *http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/npfmc/council.htm.* Comments also may be submitted directly to NMFS (see **ADDRESSES**) by the end of the comment period (see **DATES**). Copies of the application and categorical exclusion are available for review from NMFS (see **ADDRESSES**).

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Emily H. Menashes,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2016–28274 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Title: Analysis of and Participation in Ocean Exploration Video Products.

OMB Control Number: 0648–xxxx.

Form Number(s): None.

Type of Request: Regular (request for a new information collection).

Number of Respondents: 2,000.

Average Hours per Response: 15 minutes or less.

Burden Hours: 563.

Needs and Uses: This request is for a new information collection. Telepresence uses satellite communication from ship to shore to bring the unknown ocean to the screens of scientists and the general public in their homes, schools or offices. With technology constantly evolving it is important to address the needs of the shore-based scientists and public to maintain a high level of participation. We will use voluntary surveys to identify the needs of users of data, best approaches to leverage expertise of shore based participants and to create a ''Citizen Science'' web portal for meaningful public engagement focused on ocean exploration.

Affected Public: Not-for-profit institutions; individuals or households.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

This information collection request may be viewed at *reginfo.gov*. Follow the instructions to view Department of Commerce collections currently under review by OMB.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to *OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov* or fax to (202) 395–5806.

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Sarah Brabson,

NOAA PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–28258 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–KD–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Submission for OMB Review; Proposed Revised Information Collection Comment Request; Limited Access Death Master File Subscriber Certification Form

The Department of Commerce will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Agency: National Technical Information Service, Commerce.

Title: Limited Access Death Master File Subscriber Certification Form (Certification Form).

OMB Control Number: 0692–0013.

Form Number(s): NTIS FM161.

Type of Request: Revised information collection.

Number of Respondents: NTIS expects to receive approximately 560 applications for certification or renewal of certification every year for access to the Limited Access Death Master File.

Average Hours per Response: 2.5 hours.

Burden Hours: 1400 (560 applications × 2.5 hours = 1400 hours).

Needs and Uses: NTIS issued a final rule establishing a program through which persons may become eligible to obtain access to Death Master File (DMF) information about an individual within three years of that individual's death. The final rule was promulgated under Section 203 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, Public Law 113–67 (Act). The Act prohibits the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) from disclosing DMF information during the three-year period following an individual's death (Limited Access DMF), unless the person requesting the information has been certified to access the Limited Access DMF pursuant to certain criteria in a program that the Secretary establishes. The Secretary delegated the authority to carry out Section 203 to the Director of NTIS. Initially, on March 26, 2014, NTIS promulgated an interim final rule, establishing a temporary certification program (79 FR 16668) for persons who seek access to the Limited Access DMF. Subsequently, on December 30, 2014, NTIS issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (79 FR 78314). NTIS adjudicated the comments received, and, on June 1, 2016, published a final rule (81 FR 34822).

NTIS created the Certification Form used with the interim final rule for Persons and Certified Persons to provide information to NTIS describing the basis upon which they are seeking certification. In the notice of proposed rulemaking, NTIS discussed proposed revisions to the Certification Form (79 FR 78314 at 78320–21). The final rule requires that Persons and Certified Persons provide additional information to improve NTIS's ability to determine whether a Person or Certified Person meets the requirements of the Act (81 FR 34882).

Affected Public: Members of the public seeking certification or renewal of certification for access to the Limited Access Death Master File under the final rule for the ''Certification Program for Access to the Death Master File.''

Frequency: Once a year.

Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory for any Person seeking certification or renewal of certification for access to the Limited Access DMF.

This information collection request may be viewed at *reginfo.gov*. Follow the instructions to view Department of Commerce collections currently under review by OMB.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to *OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov* or fax to (202) 395–5806.

Sheleen Dumas,

PRA Departmental Lead, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–28243 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Civil Penalties; Notice of Adjusted Maximum Amounts

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission

ACTION: Notice of adjusted maximum civil penalty amounts.

SUMMARY: In 1990, Congress enacted statutory amendments that provided for periodic adjustments to the maximum civil penalty amounts authorized under the Consumer Product Safety Act, the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, and the Flammable Fabrics Act. On August 14, 2009, the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (CPSIA) increased the maximum civil penalty amounts to $100,000 for each violation and $15,000,000 for any related series of violations. The CPSIA also revised the starting date, from December 1, 1994 to December 1, 2011, and December 1 of each fifth calendar year thereafter, on which the Commission must prescribe

and publish in the **Federal Register**, the schedule of maximum authorized penalties. As calculated in accordance with the amendments, the new amounts are $110,000 for each violation, and $16,025,000 for any related series of violations.

DATES: The new amounts will become effective on January 1, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dennis C. Kacoyanis, Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504–7587; email *dkacoyanis@cpsc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 1990 (Improvement Act), Public Law 101–608, 104 Stat. 3110 (November 16, 1990), and the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (CPSIA), Public Law 110–314, 122 Stat. 3016 (August 14, 2008), amended the Consumer Product Safety Act (CPSA), the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (FHSA), and the Flammable Fabrics Act (FFA). The Improvement Act added civil penalty authority to the FHSA and FFA, which previously contained only criminal penalties. 15 U.S.C. 1264(c) and 1194(e). The Improvement Act also increased the maximum civil penalty amounts applicable to civil penalties under the CPSA and set the same maximum amounts for the newly created FHSA and FFA civil penalties. 15 U.S.C. 2069(a)(1), 1264(c)(1) and 1194(e)(1).

The Improvement Act directed the Commission to adjust the maximum civil penalty amounts periodically for inflation:

(A) The maximum penalty amounts authorized in paragraph (1) shall be adjusted for inflation as provided in this paragraph.

(B) Not later than December 1, 1994, and December 1 of each fifth calendar year thereafter, the Commission shall prescribe and publish in the **Federal Register** a schedule of maximum authorized penalties that shall apply for violations that occur after January 1 of the year immediately following such publication.

(C) The schedule of maximum authorized penalties shall be prescribed by increasing each of the amounts referred to in paragraph (1) by the cost-of-living adjustment for the preceding 5 years. Any increase determined under the preceding sentence shall be rounded to—

(i) in the case of penalties greater than $1,000 but less than or equal to $10,000, the nearest multiple of $1,000;

(ii) in the case of penalties greater than $10,000 but less than or equal to $100,000, the nearest multiple of $5,000;

(iii) in the case of penalties greater than $100,000 but less than or equal to $200,000, the nearest multiple of $10,000; and

(iv) in the case of penalties greater than $200,000, the nearest multiple of $25,000.

(D) For purposes of this subsection:

(i) The term ''Consumer Price Index'' means the Consumer Price Index for all-urban consumers published by the Department of Labor.

(ii) The term ''cost-of-living adjustment for the preceding five years'' means the percentage by which—

(I) the Consumer Price Index for the month of June of the calendar year preceding the adjustment; exceeds

(II) the Consumer Price Index for the month of June preceding the date on which the maximum authorized penalty was last adjusted. 15 U.S.C. 2069(a)(3), 1264(c)(6), and 1194(e)(5).

The CPSIA amended the CPSA, FHSA, and FFA to increase the maximum civil penalty amounts to $100,000 for each violation, and $15,000,000 for any related series of violations. 15 U.S.C. 2069(a)(1), 1264(c)(1), and 1194(e)(1). The CPSIA also revised the starting date from December 1, 1994, and every fifth year thereafter, to no later than December 1, 2011, and every fifth year thereafter, as the date on which ''the Commission shall prescribe and publish in the **Federal Register** a schedule of maximum authorized penalties that shall apply for violations that occur after January 1 of the year immediately following such publication.''

The Commission's Directorate for Economics has calculated that the cost-of-living adjustment increases the maximum civil penalty amounts to $105,722 for each violation, and to $16,016,580 for any related series of violations. Rounding off these numbers in accordance with the statutory directions, the adjusted maximum amounts are $110,000 for each violation, and $16,025,000 for any related series of violations. These new amounts will apply to violations that occur after January 1, 2017.

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Todd A. Stevenson,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016–28242 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Conclusion of Consumer Product Safety Commission International Trade Data System Initial Test Concerning the Electronic Filing of Targeting/Enforcement Data

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (Commission or CPSC) in consultation with U.S. Customs & Border Protection (CBP) previously announced a test to assess the electronic filing of certain data via the Partner Government Agency (PGA) Message Set to the CBP-authorized Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) system known as the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE). Test participants collaborated with CBP and CPSC in examining the effectiveness of the ''single window'' capability and assessing the concept of a data registry (the Product Registry), maintained by CPSC. CBP and CPSC have determined that the test, which the CPSC refers to as the ''eFiling Alpha Pilot,'' was successful, in that participating firms were able to file CPSC's PGA Message Set data as part of an ACE entry, CPSC was able to receive the PGA Message Set data from CBP, and CPSC was able to accept the data into CPSC's system for risk analysis. Accordingly, this document announces that the initial test, the eFiling Alpha Pilot, will conclude on December 31, 2016.

DATES: The CPSC test will conclude on December 31, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the test or concerning this notice should be submitted through electronic mail to: *efilingpilot@cpsc.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions regarding the test should be directed to Jim Joholske, Deputy Director, Office of Import Surveillance, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, (301) 504–7527, *efilingpilot@cpsc.gov.* Questions sent by electronic mail should contain the subject heading ''Question re PGA Message Set Test.'' For technical questions regarding ACE or ABI transmissions, or the PGA message set data transmission, please contact your assigned CBP client representative. Interested parties without an assigned client representative should submit an email to Steven Zaccaro at *steven.j.zaccaro@cbp.dhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

A. The Automated Commercial Environment

ACE is an automated and electronic system for commercial trade processing that is intended to streamline business processes, facilitate growth in trade, ensure cargo security, and foster participation in global commerce, while ensuring compliance with U.S. laws and regulations, and reducing costs for CBP and all of its communities of interest. The Automated Broker Interface (ABI) is a software interface to ACE. Commercial trade participants who want to file entries in ACE use ABI to electronically file required import data with CBP. ABI transfers trade-submitted data into ACE. CBP has developed ACE as the ''single window'' for the trade community to comply with the International Trade Data System (ITDS) requirement established by the SAFE Port Act of 2006. The PGA Message Set enables additional trade-related data specified by PGAs to be entered in one location.

B. ITDS Goals and CBP's Authority To Conduct National Customs Automation Program Tests

The ITDS is an electronic data interchange system whose goals include eliminating redundant information requirements, efficiently regulating the flow of commerce, and effectively enforcing laws and regulations relating to international trade by establishing a single portal system, operated by CBP, for the collection and distribution of standard electronic import and export data required by participating federal agencies. All federal agencies that require documentation for clearance or licensing the importation of cargo are required to participate in ITDS. The Customs Modernization provisions in the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act provide the Commissioner of CBP with authority to conduct limited test programs or procedures designed to evaluate planned components of the National Customs Automation Program (NCAP), which includes ACE.

C. Test Purpose and Goal

CPSC's PGA Message Set test, described in an August 21, 2015 **Federal Register** Notice, was developed to further ITDS and NCAP goals. 80 FR 50827 (Aug. 21, 2015) (August 2015 Test Notice). Information and feedback from the test will be used to evaluate electronic filing capability and inform the Commission in striving to improve and streamline the import process going forward. The goal of electronic filing of targeting/enforcement data is to facilitate compliant trade as well as sharpen CPSC's focus on noncompliant trade. CPSC intends to use targeting/enforcement data to review consumer product entry requirements and allow for earlier risk-based admissibility decisions by CPSC staff. Additionally, because it is electronic, the PGA Message Set could eliminate the necessity for submission and subsequent handling of paper documents. Piloting electronic filing as a means to transition away from paper-based filing is a priority initiative of the PGAs to meet the stated ''single window'' implementation timeline.

II. CPSC's PGA Message Set Test

A. Description of the Test

CPSC focused this initial test on electronic filing of five targeting/enforcement data elements (CPSC data), using the PGA Message Set. The test evaluated participant's ability to electronically file targeting/enforcement data for regulated finished consumer products under CPSC's jurisdiction and three specified finished products included on the Substantial Product Hazard List established under section 15(j) of the CPSA, and CPSC's ability to accept targeting/enforcement data into CPSC's risk assessment methodology program (the RAM).

Pilot participants had a choice between two different methods to file targeting/enforcement data for products using the PGA Message Set. Participants could either: (1) File the targeting/enforcement data elements with each product at the time of entry (Full PGA Message Set), or (2) file only a reference to targeting/enforcement data stored in a Product Registry maintained by CPSC (Product Registry and Reference PGA Message Set). Participants primarily chose to file data using the Product Registry and Reference PGA Message Set, although we anticipate that several participants will file using the Full PGA Message Set before the pilot concludes. Through their broker, pilot participants submitted targeting/enforcement data through CPSC's PGA Message Set as part of an ACE entry, or ACE entry summary if both entry and entry summary were filed together. Participants filed PGA Message Set data with each applicable entry filed with CBP. To file CPSC PGA Message Set data through ACE, associated brokers successfully implemented application software updates.

Once filed in ACE, CBP made the PGA Message Set data, along with entry data, available to CPSC for validation. CPSC was able to receive PGA Message Set data from CBP, where applicable, match a reference number with previously-filed targeting/enforcement data in the Product Registry, and to accept the enforcement/targeting data elements into CPSC's RAM. Moreover, participants that chose to use the Product Registry were able to file the requisite targeting/enforcement data into the Product Registry for specific products, and were able to successfully provide a reference number to this data using the PGA Message Set during the entry process, rather than entering all such data elements each time the product was imported.

B. Conclusion of the Test

As stated in the August 2015 Test Notice, once operational, the test was expected to run for approximately six months or until concluded or extended by the issuance of a **Federal Register** notice announcing the extension or conclusion of this test. This notice announces that CPSC and CBP have determined that ACE is capable of accepting electronic targeting/enforcement data, and electronic Product Registry reference information, through CPSC's PGA Message Set. CPSC is capable of receiving PGA Message Set data, matching reference data to previously-filed targeting/enforcement data in the Product Registry, and accepting targeting/enforcement data and entry data into CPSC's RAM program for further risk evaluation. CPSC also determined that participants are able to enter the requisite targeting/enforcement data elements for each product into a Product Registry, receive a reference number, and file such reference number in CPSC's PGA Message Set each time the product is referenced in an ACE entry. Having found the eFiling Alpha Pilot to be successful, CPSC and CBP are concluding the test effective December 31, 2016.

Upon the date the test concludes, trade members will no longer be authorized to file CPSC data in ACE. CBP will undertake efforts to reject or prevent the filing of CPSC data in ACE.

III. Next Steps for CPSC's PGA Message Set Testing

After the conclusion of the test, CPSC will provide a forum to consider what CPSC staff and participants learned from the eFiling Alpha Pilot and how best to structure a more robust ''beta'' test of electronic filing. Based on the review of the eFiling Alpha Pilot, CPSC staff will provide options regarding a ''beta'' testing phase for Commission consideration.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Todd A. Stevenson,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016–28172 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

Notice of Intent To Grant a Partially Exclusive Patent License

AGENCY: Air Force Materiel Command.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Bayh-Dole Act and implementing regulations, the Department of the Air Force hereby gives notice of its intent to grant a partially exclusive (exclusive with respect to the field of fluid separation and filtration) patent license agreement to InfiniPure LLC., a corporation of the State of Ohio, having a place of business at 714 Monument Ave, Dayton, OH 45402.

DATES: Written objections must be filed no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the date of publication of this Notice.

ADDRESSES: Submit written objections to the Air Force Materiel Command Law Office, AFMCLO/JAZ, 2240 B Street, Room 260, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433–7109; Facsimile: (937) 255–3733; or Email: *afmclo.jaz.tech@us.af.mil.* Include Docket No. ARQ–161114B–PL in the subject line of the message.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Air Force Materiel Command Law Office, AFMCLO/JAZ, 2240 B Street, Rm 260, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433–7109; Facsimile: (937) 255–3733; Email: *afmclo.jaz.tech@us.af.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of the Air Force intends to grant the partially exclusive patent license agreement for the invention described in:

U.S. Patent No. 8,293,107, entitled, ''Fibers With Axial Capillary Slit That Enhances Adsorption, Absorption and Separation,'' filed 11 January 2010, and issued 23 October 2012.

Authority: 35 U.S.C. 209; 37 CFR 404.

The Department of the Air Force may grant the prospective license unless a timely objection is received that sufficiently shows the grant of the license would be inconsistent with the Bayh-Dole Act or implementing regulations. A competing application for a patent license agreement, completed in compliance with 37 CFR 404.8 and received by the Air Force within the period for timely objections, will be treated as an objection and may be considered as an alternative to the proposed license.

Henry Williams,

Acting Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–28202 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–10–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy Notice of Meeting

AGENCY: U.S. Air Force Academy Board of Visitors, Department of Defense.

ACTION: Meeting notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with 10 U.S.C. Section 9355, the U.S. Air Force Academy (USAFA) Board of Visitors (BoV) will hold a meeting on the Senate Side, Capitol Visitor Center, Room 212–10, Washington, DC on Thursday, December 8, 2016. The meeting will begin at 0830 and conclude at 1515. The purpose of this meeting is to review morale and discipline, social climate, curriculum, instruction, infrastructure, fiscal affairs, academic methods, strategic communication, and other matters relating to the Academy. Specific topics for this meeting include a Superintendent's Update; Dean's Update; Athletic Department Update; BoV update. Public attendance at this USAFA BoV meeting shall be accommodated on a first-come, first-served basis up to the reasonable and safe capacity of the meeting room. In addition, any member of the public wishing to provide input to the USAFA BoV should submit a written statement in accordance with 41 CFR Section 102–3.140(c) and section 10(a)(3) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and the procedures described in this paragraph. Written statements must address the following details: The issue, discussion, and a recommended course of action. Supporting documentation may also be included as needed to establish the appropriate historical context and provide any necessary background information. Written statements can be submitted to the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) at the Air Force address detailed below at any time. However, if a written statement is not received at least 10 calendar days before the first day of the meeting which is the subject of this notice, then it may not be provided to or considered by the BoV until its next open meeting. The DFO will review all timely submissions with the BoV Chairman and ensure they are provided to members of the BoV before the meeting that is the subject of this notice. If after review of timely submitted written comments and the BoV Chairman and DFO deem appropriate, they may choose to invite the submitter of the written comments to orally present the issue during an open portion of the BoV meeting that is the subject of this notice. Members of the BoV may also petition the Chairman to allow specific personnel to make oral presentations before the BoV. In accordance with 41 CFR Section 102–3.140(d), any oral presentations before the BoV shall be in accordance with agency guidelines provided pursuant to a written invitation and this paragraph. Direct questioning of BoV members or meeting participants by the public is not permitted except with the approval of the DFO and Chairman. For the benefit of the public, rosters that list the names of BoV members and any releasable materials presented during the open portions of this BoV meeting shall be made available upon request.

Contact Information: For additional information or to attend this BoV meeting, contact Major James Kuchta, Accessions and Training Division, AF/A1PT, 1040 Air Force Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330, (703) 695–4066, *James.L.Kuchta.mil@mail.mil.*

Henry Williams,

Acting Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–28201 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–10–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Modification of the Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche-Jump Waterway, Louisiana, Navigation Channel Project in Lafourche Parish

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District will be the lead agency for a draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), to be integrated with a Feasibility Report (FR), for the Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche-Jump Waterway, Louisiana Project, in Lafourche Parish. The FR and DEIS will investigate channel modification to the Bayou

Lafourche Waterway up to as much as 50 feet deep. The integrated document will be prepared by the Greater Lafourche Port Commission (GLPC).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions about the project and the DEIS should be addressed to: Mr. Sean Mickal, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Planning and Environment Division South, Planning Branch, Room 141, 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, LA 70118–3651, by email at *sean.p.mickal@usace.army.mil,* or by telephone at (504) 862–2319.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. *Authority.* The DEIS is being prepared by the GLPC under authority granted by Section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986, as amended by Section 1014(b) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) of 2014.

2. *Proposed Action.* The proposed action is to increase the controlling depth of the Bayou Lafourche Waterway federal navigation channel. Economic analyses will be performed to determine the current and future needs for the channel by various draft vessels, and the costs and benefits of maintaining channels of various sizes.

3. *Alternatives.* An array of alternatives will be analyzed and the most feasible of the alternatives will be recommended. Alternatives range from the 'No Action' Alternative to enlarging and extending the access channel to the natural contour of the Gulf at approximately -50 ft. Mean Lower Low Water. The selected contour is to be optimized in the process of preparing the Integrated FR and DEIS. All feasible and reasonable alternatives will be considered, including alternatives with varying depths and lengths, for detailed analysis.

4. *Scoping.* Scoping is the process for determining the scope of alternatives and significant issues to be addressed in the DEIS. For this study, a letter will be sent to all parties believed to have an interest in the study, requesting their input on alternatives and issues to be evaluated. The letter will also notify interested parties of a public scoping meeting that will be held in the local area. Notices will also be sent to local news media. All interested parties are invited to comment at this time, and anyone interested in this study should request to be included in the study mailing list. A public scoping meeting or meetings will be announced in the near future.

5. *Purpose of and Need for the Project.* The project will enlarge the existing authorized channel at Port Fourchon, Louisiana, to an engineering, economic and environmentally feasible depth and extend the main access channel to the natural contour of the Gulf of Mexico at the optimum depth. The project would include the construction of a turning basin or wider slip(s) within the port complex to accommodate larger vessels. The action is being proposed to provide adequate depth to accommodate deeper drafts of larger oil and gas exploration and service vessels plying the Gulf in deep waters; to provide depths required to move large oil and gas exploration and production rigs constructed and fabricated at the port to open water; to allow large oil and gas platforms to move from the Gulf to Port Fourchon for repair and refurbishment; and to provide adequate depth for other ongoing construction projects at the port.

6. *Significant Issues.* The tentative list of resources and issues, not exclusive, to be evaluated in the DEIS includes tidal wetlands, barrier shoreline habitat, aquatic resources, wildlife resources, essential fish habitat, water quality, air quality, threatened and endangered species, recreational resources, and cultural resources. Additional resources might include geological issues (including dredging and stabilization of fill areas) and impacts on visual resources. Socioeconomic items to be evaluated in the DEIS include navigation, business and industrial activity, employment, land use, property values, public/community facilities and services, tax revenues, population, community and regional growth, vehicular transportation, and noise.

7. *Consultation, Coordination, and Review.* The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) will be assisting in the documentation of existing conditions and assessment of effects of project alternatives through Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act consultation procedures. The USFWS will also provide a Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act report. Endangered Species Act, Section 7 consultation, will also be conducted in close coordination with the USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service concerning threatened and endangered species. Consultation will also be done with the State Historic Preservation Office and federally recognized Indian Tribes. The proposed action will involve evaluation for compliance with guidelines established by Section 404(b) of the Clean Water Act; application (to the State of Louisiana) for Water Quality Certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act; certification of state lands, easements, and rights of way; and determination of Coastal Zone Management Act consistency. The DEIS will be distributed for review to all interested agencies, organizations, and individuals.

8. *Estimated Date of Availability.* It is estimated that this DEIS will be available to the public in November 2017. At least one public meeting will be held at that time, during which the public will be provided the opportunity to comment on the DEIS before it becomes final.

Dated: November 10, 2016.

Michael N. Clancy,

Colonel, U.S. Army, District Commander.

[FR Doc. 2016–28218 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3720–35–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[Docket No.: ED–2016–ICCD–0100]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget for Review and Approval; Comment Request; Gainful Employment Disclosure Template

AGENCY: Federal Student Aid (FSA), Department of Education (ED).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, ED is proposing a revision of an existing information collection.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: To access and review all the documents related to the information collection listed in this notice, please use *http://www.regulations.gov* by searching the Docket ID number ED–2016–ICCD–0100. Comments submitted in response to this notice should be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov* by selecting the Docket ID number or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. *Please note that comments submitted by fax or email and those submitted after the comment period will not be accepted.* Written requests for information or comments submitted by postal mail or delivery should be addressed to the Director of the Information Collection Clearance Division, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., LBJ, Room 2E–347, Washington, DC 20202–4537.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For specific questions related to collection activities, please contact Beth Grebeldinger, 202–377–4018.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Education (ED), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the public's reporting burden. It also helps the public understand the Department's information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. ED is soliciting comments on the proposed information collection request (ICR) that is described below. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

Title of Collection: Gainful Employment Disclosure Template.

OMB Control Number: 1845–0107.

Type of Review: A revision of an existing information collection.

Respondents/Affected Public: State, Local, and Tribal Governments; Individuals or Households; Private Sector.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 27,944,411.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours: 3,118,160.

Abstract: Under the new disclosure requirements, an institution must provide current and prospective students with information about each of its programs that prepares students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation (GE programs) using a disclosure template provided by the Secretary. The Secretary must specify the information to be included on the disclosure template in a notice published in the **Federal Register**. In accordance with the requirements of § 668.412 of the Gainful Employment (GE) final regulations published in the **Federal Register** on October 31, 2014 (79 FR 64890), as corrected on December 4, 2014 (79 FR 71957), this collection describes the items that must be disclosed on the GE disclosure template. This request revises the current information collection for the disclosure template to reflect the new disclosure requirements and provides notice of the information that institutions must disclose. The Department is further requesting that burden currently calculated for 1845–0107 be discharged and transfer the burden already calculated for § 668.412 regarding the GE disclosure requirements from 1845–0123 to this information collection.

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Kate Mullan,

Acting Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Office of the Chief Privacy Officer, Office of Management.

[FR Doc. 2016–28200 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[Docket No.: ED–2016–ICCD–0132]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget for Review and Approval; Comment Request; 2018 Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS 2018) Main Study Recruitment and Field Test—Questionnaires Change Request

AGENCY: National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Department of Education (ED).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, ED is proposing a reinstatement of a previously approved information collection.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: To access and review all the documents related to the information collection listed in this notice, please use *http://www.regulations.gov* by searching the Docket ID number ED–2016–ICCD–0132. Comments submitted in response to this notice should be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov* by selecting the Docket ID number or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. *Please note that comments submitted by fax or email and those submitted after the comment period will not be accepted.* Written requests for information or comments submitted by postal mail or delivery should be addressed to the Director of the Information Collection Clearance Division, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., LBJ, Room 2E–347, Washington, DC 20202–4537.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For specific questions related to collection activities, please contact NCES Information Collections at *NCES.Information.Collections@ed.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Education (ED), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the public's reporting burden. It also helps the public understand the Department's information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. ED is soliciting comments on the proposed information collection request (ICR) that is described below. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

Title of Collection: 2018 Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS 2018) Main Study Recruitment and Field Test—Questionnaires Change Request.

OMB Control Number: 1850–0888.

Type of Review: A reinstatement of a previously approved information collection.

Respondents/Affected Public: Individuals or Households.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 1,228.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours: 1,949.

Abstract: The Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) is an international survey of teachers and principals that focuses on the working conditions of teachers and the teaching and learning practices in schools. TALIS was first administered in 2008 and is conducted every five years. Having participated in 2013 but not in 2008, the United States will administer TALIS for

the second time in 2018. TALIS is sponsored by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). In the United States, TALIS is conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), of the Institute of Education Sciences within the U.S. Department of Education. TALIS 2018 will address teacher training and professional development, teachers' appraisal, school climate, school leadership, teachers' instructional approaches, and teachers' pedagogical practices. In February 2017, TALIS 2018 field test will be conducted to evaluate newly developed teacher and school questionnaire items and test the survey operations. NCES's request to recruit and conduct pre-survey activities for the 2017 field test sample, administer the field test, and recruit schools for the 2018 main study sample was approved in September 2016 (1850–0888 v.5). This request amends the TALIS 2018 Recruitment and Field Test record with the final versions of the adapted U.S. versions of the TALIS 2018 field trial questionnaires. We are announcing a second 30-day comment period for the TALIS 2018 Field Test to include additional survey items in the field test questionnaires, as recently stipulated by OECD.

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Kate Mullan,

Acting Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Office of the Chief Privacy Officer, Office of Management.

[FR Doc. 2016–28204 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

The SunShot Prize: Solar in Your Community Challenge

AGENCY: Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice; Release of prize competition rules and process to participate.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE) gives notice of the official release of rules for the SunShot Prize: Solar in Your Community Challenge. The Solar in your Community Challenge is a $5 million prize competition to expand solar access to underserved segments, specifically low-and-moderate-income (LMI) communities; non-federal governments (*i.e.* state, local, and tribal), and non-profit organizations. The Challenge supports the creation, demonstration, and scaling of innovative, replicable, and sustainable business and financial models that can successfully unlock solar access to these underserved segments. A $500,000 Grand Prize will be awarded to the best team that can most successfully demonstrate a model and plan to scale solar to low and moderate income market segments. Other top teams will compete to receive four final prizes totaling $500,000 based on their achievements and potential to scale up. In addition to competing for final prizes, DOE will award selected teams a total of $2 million in seed awards and $2 million in technical assistance throughout an 18-month performance period starting in April 2017 based on successful milestone completion. The rules for the Challenge can be found at *www.solarinyourcommunity.org.*

DATES: Submission to participate in the Solar in Your Community Challenge started on November 18, 2016 and ends on March 17, 2017. The 18-month performance period starts in April 2017 and ends in October 2018. Final prizes are expected to be announced in January 2019. All dates are subject to change.

ADDRESSES: To apply, parties interested in participating should visit *www.solarinyourcommunity.org* and fill out an application.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Odette Mucha, U.S. Department of Energy, Mailstop EE–4S, 1000 Independence Ave. SW., Washington, DC 20585–0001. Telephone: (202) 287–1862, Email: *solar.community@ee.doe.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (America COMPETES), Public Law 111–358, enacted January 4, 2011, authorizes Federal agencies to issue competitions to stimulate innovations in technology, education, and science.

Subject of the Competition

The Solar in Your Community Challenge is a $5 million competition sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) SunShot Initiative and administered by State University of New York Polytechnic Institute. The goal is to expand solar access to underserved segments, specifically low-and-moderate-income (LMI) communities, non-federal governments (*i.e.* state, local, and tribal), and non-profit organizations. The Challenge supports the creation, demonstration, and scaling of innovative, replicable, and sustainable business and financial models that can successfully unlock solar access to these underserved segments.

A $500,000 Grand Prize will be awarded to the best team that can most successfully demonstrate a model and plan to scale solar to low and moderate income markets. Top teams will also compete to receive four additional final prizes totaling $500,000 based on their achievements and potential to scale up. In addition to competing for final prizes, DOE will award selected teams a total of $2 million in seed awards and $2 million in technical assistance. Seed awards will be granted incrementally based on milestones during the 18-month performance period.

Two types of teams can participate in the Challenge: Project-focused and program-focused teams. Both types of teams will pursue solar efforts that benefit LMI communities (*e.g.,* residents of public housing), municipal governments (*e.g.,* schools), or non-profits (*e.g.,* foodbanks) that aggregate to 25kW–5MW in size.

Project teams will pursue a portfolio of new solar projects, while program-teams will establish new initiatives that support and enable these types of projects. Any entity can lead the project teams, but the teams should include a wide range of partners (*e.g.,* solar developers, utilities, cities, financial institutions, and community groups). State, local, and/or tribal governments; financial institutions; or utilities should lead the program-focused teams.

The Rules for Being Eligible To Participate in the Competition

The Challenge is open only to: (a) Citizens or permanent residents of the United States; and (b) private or non-federal public entities, such as townships, tribes, corporations, or other organizations that are incorporated in and maintain a primary place of business in the United States. DOE employees, employees of sponsoring organizations, members of their immediate families (spouses, children, siblings, parents), and persons living in the same household as such persons, whether or not related, are not eligible to participate in this competition. Federal entities and federal employees, acting within the scope of their employment, are also not eligible to participate in any portion of this competition.

Applicants Planning To Participate as Part of a Team Must Meet the Following Qualifying Requirements

A team must have a single legal entity representing the entire team. This entity shall be designated the Team Lead. The Team Lead is responsible for complying

with all rules of this competition including coordinating with its team members, resolving any conflicts, working with DOE and its prize administrator, participating according to the governing guidelines of the Marketplace, responsibly allocating resources, submitting all required materials throughout the competition, and complying with all guidance and restrictions, including restrictions around intellectual property.

For program-focused teams only, the Team Lead should be an electric utility, an electric co-operative, municipal power company, a financial institution, or a state, local or tribal government entity.

Each team member must be either: (a) Citizens or permanent residents of the United States; or (b) private or non-federal public entities, such as townships, tribes, corporations, or other organizations that are incorporated in and maintain a primary place of business in the United States. A subsidiary of a foreign entity that is incorporated in the United States and that maintains a primary place of business in the United States is also eligible.

To apply, parties interested in participating should visit *www.solarinyourcommunity.org* and fill out an application.

Technical Assistance

DOE and the Prize Administrator will provide a total of $2 million in technical assistance to selected teams.

Prizes

Select Teams will receive seed prizes based on criteria assessing the team's potential impact (40%), innovation (30%), and the team itself (30%).

Final prizes will be determined through evaluation of teams' progress over the 18-month period of performance, their overall ability to create replicable, scalable, economically-sustainable business and financial models, and the innovativeness of their approach. The decisions of the judges are final and may not be challenged by participating teams.

Issued in Washington, DC on November 17, 2016.

Roland Risser,

Deputy Assistant Secretary Renewable Power, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, U.S. Department of Energy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28235 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER17–357–000]

MPower Energy; Supplemental Notice That Initial Market-Based Rate Filing Includes Request for Blanket Section 204 Authorization

This is a supplemental notice in the above-referenced proceeding MPower Energy's application for market-based rate authority, with an accompanying rate tariff, noting that such application includes a request for blanket authorization, under 18 CFR part 34, of future issuances of securities and assumptions of liability.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest should file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). Anyone filing a motion to intervene or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Applicant.

Notice is hereby given that the deadline for filing protests with regard to the applicant's request for blanket authorization, under 18 CFR part 34, of future issuances of securities and assumptions of liability, is December 6, 2016.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper, using the FERC Online links at *http://www.ferc.gov.* To facilitate electronic service, persons with Internet access who will eFile a document and/or be listed as a contact for an intervenor must create and validate an eRegistration account using the eRegistration link. Select the eFiling link to log on and submit the intervention or protests.

Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 5 copies of the intervention or protest to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

The filings in the above-referenced proceeding are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the appropriate link in the above list. They are also available for electronic review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an eSubscription link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive email notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please email *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov.* or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28164 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice of Application

Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC ..... Columbia Natural Resources, LLC. Core Appalachia Midstream, LLC.	Docket No. CP17–13–000

Take notice that on November 9, 2016, Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC (Chesapeake), Columbia Natural Resources, LLC (CNR), (collectively CNR/Chesapeake), 6100 N. Western Avenue, Oklahoma City, OK 73118, filed an application for authority under section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations to abandon by sale a Limited Jurisdiction Certificate granted in Docket No. CP04–101–000.

The Commission has previously determined that CNR/Chesapeake is not a natural gas company, as defined in Section 2(6) of the NGA. CNR/Chesapeake states that it entered into a Purchase and Sale Agreement on September 19, 2016, in which CNR/Chesapeake agreed to sell to TCFII Core LLC (Core) the non-jurisdictional Devonian Gas Gathering System located in Kanawha, Lincoln, Logan, Mingo, Raleigh, Roane, Wayne, and Wyoming Counties in West Virginia, and Floyd, Knott, Letcher, Magoffin, Martin, and Pike Counties in Kentucky. CNR/Chesapeake required the Limited Jurisdiction Certificate to provide limited service to Mountaineer Gas Company d/b/a Allegheny Power (Mountaineer).

Pursuant to Section 7(c) of the NGA and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations Core Appalachia Midstream, LLC (Core Midstream) 200 Crescent Court, Suite 1040, Dallas, Texas 75201, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Core, requests a Limited Jurisdiction Certificate authorizing continuation of the service authorized in the Certificate for which CNR/Chesapeake requests abandonment authorization. Core Midstream states that the Limited Jurisdiction Certificate would enable it to transport gas on the Devonian Gas Gathering System to provide service to

Mountaineer, thus there will be no gap in service.

Core Midstream states that it will continue to provide firm service to Mountaineer pursuant to the rate schedule already on file with the Commission, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. The filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site web at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the ''eLibrary'' link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, contact FERC at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or call toll-free, (886) 208–3676 or TYY, (202) 502–8659.

Any questions for CNR/Chesapeake regarding this application may be directed to Katherine B. Edwards, Edwards & Floom, LLP, 1409 King Street, Alexandria, VA 22314, by telephone at (703) 549–0888, by facsimile at (703) 549–8608, or by email to *kbe@kbelaw.com.*

Any questions for Core Midstream regarding this application may be directed to William F. Demarest, Jr., Hush Blackwell, LP, 750 17th St NW., Suite 900, Washington, DC 20002, by telephone at (202) 378–2310, or by email to *william.demarest@huschblackwell.com.*

Pursuant to section 157.9 of the Commission's rules, 18 CFR 157.9, within 90 days of this Notice, the Commission staff will either: Complete its environmental assessment (EA) and place it into the Commission's public record (eLibrary) for this proceeding; or issue a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review. If a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review is issued, it will indicate, among other milestones, the anticipated date for the Commission staff's issuance of the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) or EA for this proposal. The filing of the EA in the Commission's public record for this proceeding or the issuance of a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review will serve to notify federal and state agencies of the timing for the completion of all necessary reviews, and the subsequent need to complete all federal authorizations within 90 days of the date of issuance of the Commission staff's FEIS or EA.

There are two ways to become involved in the Commission's review of this project. First, any person wishing to obtain legal status by becoming a party to the proceedings for this project should, on or before the comment date stated below file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.10). A person obtaining party status will be placed on the service list maintained by the Secretary of the Commission and will receive copies of all documents filed by the applicant and by all other parties. A party must submit five copies of filings made in the proceeding with the Commission and must mail a copy to the applicant and to every other party. Only parties to the proceeding can ask for court review of Commission orders in the proceeding.

However, a person does not have to intervene in order to have comments considered. The second way to participate is by filing with the Secretary of the Commission, as soon as possible, an original and two copies of comments in support of or in opposition to this project. The Commission will consider these comments in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but the filing of a comment alone will not serve to make the filer a party to the proceeding. The Commission's rules require that persons filing comments in opposition to the project provide copies of their protests only to the party or parties directly involved in the protest.

Persons who wish to comment only on the environmental review of this project should submit an original and two copies of their comments to the Secretary of the Commission. Environmental commenters will be placed on the Commission's environmental mailing list, will receive copies of the environmental documents, and will be notified of meetings associated with the Commission's environmental review process. Environmental commenters will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, the non-party commenters will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission (except for the mailing of environmental documents issued by the Commission) and will not have the right to seek court review of the Commission's final order.

The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings of comments, protests and interventions in lieu of paper using the ''eFiling'' link at *http://www.ferc.gov.* Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and five copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

Comment Date: 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on December 7, 2016.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28160 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER17–252–000]

2016 ESA Project Company, LLC; Supplemental Notice That Initial Market-Based Rate Filing Includes Request for Blanket Section 204 Authorization

This is a supplemental notice in the above-referenced proceeding 2016 ESA Project Company, LLC's application for market-based rate authority, with an accompanying rate tariff, noting that such application includes a request for blanket authorization, under 18 CFR part 34, of future issuances of securities and assumptions of liability.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest should file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). Anyone filing a motion to intervene or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Applicant.

Notice is hereby given that the deadline for filing protests with regard to the applicant's request for blanket authorization, under 18 CFR part 34, of future issuances of securities and assumptions of liability, is December 5, 2016.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper, using the FERC Online links at *http://www.ferc.gov.* To facilitate electronic service, persons with Internet access who will eFile a document and/or be listed as a contact for an intervenor must create and validate an eRegistration account using the eRegistration link. Select the eFiling link to log on and submit the intervention or protests.

Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 5 copies of the intervention or protest to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

The filings in the above-referenced proceeding are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the appropriate link in the above list. They are also available for electronic review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an eSubscription link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive email notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please email *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov.* or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: November 15, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28159 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER17–351–000]

American Falls Solar, LLC; Supplemental Notice That Initial Market-Based Rate Filing Includes Request for Blanket Section 204 Authorization

This is a supplemental notice in the above-referenced proceeding American Falls Solar, LLC's application for market-based rate authority, with an accompanying rate tariff, noting that such application includes a request for blanket authorization, under 18 CFR part 34, of future issuances of securities and assumptions of liability.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest should file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). Anyone filing a motion to intervene or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Applicant.

Notice is hereby given that the deadline for filing protests with regard to the applicant's request for blanket authorization, under 18 CFR part 34, of future issuances of securities and assumptions of liability, is December 6, 2016.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper, using the FERC Online links at *http://www.ferc.gov.* To facilitate electronic service, persons with Internet access who will eFile a document and/or be listed as a contact for an intervenor must create and validate an eRegistration account using the eRegistration link. Select the eFiling link to log on and submit the intervention or protests.

Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 5 copies of the intervention or protest to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

The filings in the above-referenced proceeding are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the appropriate link in the above list. They are also available for electronic review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an eSubscription link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive email notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please email *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov.* or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28161 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER17–339–000]

96WI 8ME, LLC; Supplemental Notice That Initial Market-Based Rate Filing Includes Request for Blanket Section 204 Authorization

This is a supplemental notice in the above-referenced proceeding 96WI 8ME, LLC's application for market-based rate authority, with an accompanying rate tariff, noting that such application includes a request for blanket authorization, under 18 CFR part 34, of future issuances of securities and assumptions of liability.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest should file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). Anyone filing a motion to intervene or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Applicant.

Notice is hereby given that the deadline for filing protests with regard to the applicant's request for blanket authorization, under 18 CFR part 34, of future issuances of securities and assumptions of liability, is December 5, 2016.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper, using the FERC Online links at *http://www.ferc.gov.* To facilitate electronic service, persons with Internet access who will eFile a document and/or be listed as a contact for an intervenor must create and validate an eRegistration account using the eRegistration link. Select the eFiling link to log on and submit the intervention or protests.

Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 5 copies of the intervention or protest to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

The filings in the above-referenced proceeding are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the appropriate link in the above list. They are also available for electronic review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an eSubscription link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive email notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please email *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov.* or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: November 15, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28167 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP07–427–001]

Boardwalk Storage Company, LLC; Notice of Application

Take notice that on November 10, 2016, Boardwalk Storage Company, LLC (Boardwalk Storage), having its principal place of business at 9 Greenway Plaza, Suite 2800, Houston, TX 77046 filed in the above referenced docket an application pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations requesting authorization to amend its certificate for a natural gas storage cavern, Cavern No. 25, located in Iberville Parish,

Louisiana, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. The filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site web at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the ''eLibrary'' link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, contact FERC at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or call toll-free, (886) 208–3676 or TYY, (202) 502–8659.

Any questions concerning this application may be directed to J. Kyle Stephens, Vice President of Regulatory Affairs, 9 Greenway Plaza, Suite 2800, Houston, TX 77046; by calling (713) 479–8033; by faxing (713) 479–1846; or by emailing *kyle.stephens@bwpmlp.com.*

The Commission issued a certificate of public convenience and necessity on March 3, 2008 (March 3 Order) in Docket No. CP07–427–000 to PetroLogistics Natural Gas Storage, LLC (PetroLogistics).[1] Boardwalk Storage is the successor-in-interest to PetroLogistics. Specifically, the applicant proposes to amend the requirements of Engineering Condition No. 5 related to periodic sonar survey found in Appendix A of the March 3 Order by replacing periodic sonar surveys with the alternative proposed Well and Cavern Integrity Monitoring Program.

Pursuant to section 157.9 of the Commission's rules (18 CFR 157.9), within 90 days of this Notice, the Commission staff will either: Complete its environmental assessment (EA) and place it into the Commission's public record (eLibrary) for this proceeding; or issue a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review. If a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review is issued, it will indicate, among other milestones, the anticipated date for the Commission staff's issuance of the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) or EA for this proposal. The filing of the EA in the Commission's public record for this proceeding or the issuance of a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review will serve to notify federal and state agencies of the timing for the completion of all necessary reviews, and the subsequent need to complete all federal authorizations within 90 days of the date of issuance of the Commission staff's FEIS or EA.

There are two ways to become involved in the Commission's review of this project. First, any person wishing to obtain legal status by becoming a party to the proceedings for this project should, on or before the comment date stated below file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.10). A person obtaining party status will be placed on the service list maintained by the Secretary of the Commission and will receive copies of all documents filed by the applicant and by all other parties. A party must submit seven copies of filings made in the proceeding with the Commission and must mail a copy to the applicant and to every other party. Only parties to the proceeding can ask for court review of Commission orders in the proceeding.

However, a person does not have to intervene in order to have comments considered. The second way to participate is by filing with the Secretary of the Commission, as soon as possible, an original and two copies of comments in support of or in opposition to this project. The Commission will consider these comments in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but the filing of a comment alone will not serve to make the filer a party to the proceeding. The Commission's rules require that persons filing comments in opposition to the project provide copies of their protests only to the party or parties directly involved in the protest.

Persons who wish to comment only on the environmental review of this project should submit an original and two copies of their comments to the Secretary of the Commission. Environmental commentors will be placed on the Commission's environmental mailing list, will receive copies of the environmental documents, and will be notified of meetings associated with the Commission's environmental review process. Environmental commentors will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, the non-party commentors will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission (except for the mailing of environmental documents issued by the Commission) and will not have the right to seek court review of the Commission's final order.

The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings of comments, protests and interventions in lieu of paper using the ''eFiling'' link at *http://www.ferc.gov.* Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 7 copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

Comment Date: 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on December 7, 2016.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28156 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[1] *PetroLogistics Natural Gas Storage, LLC,* 122 FERC 61,193 (2008).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RM98–1–000]

Records Governing Off-the-Record Communications; Public Notice

This constitutes notice, in accordance with 18 CFR 385.2201(b), of the receipt of prohibited and exempt off-the-record communications.

Order No. 607 (64 FR 51222, September 22, 1999) requires Commission decisional employees, who make or receive a prohibited or exempt off-the-record communication relevant to the merits of a contested proceeding, to deliver to the Secretary of the Commission, a copy of the communication, if written, or a summary of the substance of any oral communication.

Prohibited communications are included in a public, non-decisional file associated with, but not a part of, the decisional record of the proceeding. Unless the Commission determines that the prohibited communication and any responses thereto should become a part of the decisional record, the prohibited off-the-record communication will not be considered by the Commission in reaching its decision. Parties to a proceeding may seek the opportunity to respond to any facts or contentions made in a prohibited off-the-record communication, and may request that the Commission place the prohibited communication and responses thereto in the decisional record. The Commission will grant such a request only when it determines that fairness so requires. Any person identified below as having made a prohibited off-the-record communication shall serve the document on all parties listed on the official service list for the applicable proceeding in accordance with Rule 2010, 18 CFR 385.2010.

Exempt off-the-record communications are included in the

decisional record of the proceeding, unless the communication was with a cooperating agency as described by 40 CFR 1501.6, made under 18 CFR 385.2201(e)(1)(v).

The following is a list of off-the-record communications recently received by the Secretary of the Commission. The communications listed are grouped by docket numbers in ascending order. These filings are available for electronic review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the eLibrary link. Enter the docket number, excluding the last three digits, in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll free at (866) 208–3676, or for TTY, contact (202)502–8659.

Docket No.	File date	Presenter or requester
Prohibited:		
1. CP15–558–000	11–2–2016	Andre Nurkin.
2. CP15–138–000, PF14–8–000	11–4–2016	Jonathan and Jill Kloppmann.
3. CP15–138–000, PF14–8–000	11–4–2016	Abner B. Esh.
4. CP13–483–001, CP13–492–001	11–8–2016	Grand Junction Economic Partnership.
5. CP16–10–010	11–9–2016	Judy and Barry Sink.
Exempt:		
1. CP15–138–000	10–31–2016	State of Pennsylvania House Representative, Bryan Cutler.
2. CP14–96–000	11–3–2016	U.S. House Representative Stephen F. Lynch.
3. CP13–483–001, CP13–492–001	11–7–2016	City of Rifle, Colorado.
4. CP13–483–001, CP13–492–001	11–8–2016	Rio Blanco County, Colorado, Board of County Commissioners.
5. CP13–483–001, CP13–492–001	11–8–2016	Delta County, Colorado, Board of County Commissioners.
6. CP13–483–001, CP13–492–001	11–9–2016	Town of Parachute, Colorodo, Mayor Roy B. McClung.
7. CP13–483–001, CP13–492–001	11–9–2016	City of Grand Junction, Colorodo, Mayor Phyllis Norris.
8. CP16–357–000	11–10–2016	FERC Staff.[1]

[1] Conference Call Summary for October 19, 2016 call with Burns & McDonnell and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Dated: November 15, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28168 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP17–9–000]

ANR Pipeline Company; Notice of Application

Take notice that on November 3, 2016, ANR Pipeline Company (ANR), having its principal place of business at 700 Louisiana Street, Suite 700, Houston, TX 77002–2700, filed an application in the above referenced docket pursuant to section 7(c) and 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations requesting authorization to implement its Wisconsin South Expansion Project (Project) in Illinois and Wisconsin. Specifically, ANR proposes modifications at its existing Sandwich Compressor Station, Hampshire Meter Station, Tiffany East Meter Station, Kewaskum Compressor Station and replacement of an approximate 0.54 mile associated lateral, as well as related appurtenant facilities. Upon completion, ANR states that it will be able to deliver an additional 230,950 Dekatherm per day (Dth/d) from its Sandwich Compressor Station area into the Northern Illinois and Wisconsin markets to meet growing natural gas demand in these areas. ANR estimates the total cost of the Project to be $57.7 million, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. The filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site web at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the ''eLibrary'' link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, contact FERC at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or call toll-free, (886) 208–3676 or TYY, (202) 502–8659.

Any questions concerning this application may be directed to Robert Jackson, Manager, Certificates and Regulatory Administration, ANR Pipeline Company, 700 Louisiana Street, Suite 700, Houston, Texas 77002–2700; by calling (832) 320–5487; by faxing (832) 320–6487; or by emailing *robert_jackson@transcanada.com.*

Pursuant to section 157.9 of the Commission's rules (18 CFR 157.9), within 90 days of this Notice, the Commission staff will either: complete its environmental assessment (EA) and place it into the Commission's public record (eLibrary) for this proceeding; or issue a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review. If a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review is issued, it will indicate, among other milestones, the anticipated date for the Commission staff's issuance of the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) or EA for this proposal. The filing of the EA in the Commission's public record for this proceeding or the issuance of a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review will serve to notify federal and state agencies of the timing for the completion of all necessary reviews, and the subsequent need to complete all federal authorizations within 90 days of the date of issuance of the Commission staff's FEIS or EA.

There are two ways to become involved in the Commission's review of this project. First, any person wishing to obtain legal status by becoming a party to the proceedings for this project should, on or before the comment date stated below file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.10). A person obtaining party status will be placed on the service list maintained by the Secretary of the Commission and will receive copies of all documents filed by the applicant and by all other parties. A party must submit seven copies of filings made in the proceeding with the Commission and must mail a copy to the applicant and

to every other party. Only parties to the proceeding can ask for court review of Commission orders in the proceeding.

However, a person does not have to intervene in order to have comments considered. The second way to participate is by filing with the Secretary of the Commission, as soon as possible, an original and two copies of comments in support of or in opposition to this project. The Commission will consider these comments in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but the filing of a comment alone will not serve to make the filer a party to the proceeding. The Commission's rules require that persons filing comments in opposition to the project provide copies of their protests only to the party or parties directly involved in the protest.

Persons who wish to comment only on the environmental review of this project should submit an original and two copies of their comments to the Secretary of the Commission. Environmental commentors will be placed on the Commission's environmental mailing list, will receive copies of the environmental documents, and will be notified of meetings associated with the Commission's environmental review process. Environmental commentors will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, the non-party commentors will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission (except for the mailing of environmental documents issued by the Commission) and will not have the right to seek court review of the Commission's final order.

The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings of comments, protests and interventions in lieu of paper using the ''eFiling'' link at *http://www.ferc.gov.* Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 5 copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

Comment Date: 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on December 7, 2016.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28169 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER17–354–000]

American Falls Solar II, LLC; Supplemental Notice That Initial Market-Based Rate Filing Includes Request For Blanket Section 204 Authorization

This is a supplemental notice in the above-referenced proceeding American Falls Solar II, LLC's application for market-based rate authority, with an accompanying rate tariff, noting that such application includes a request for blanket authorization, under 18 CFR part 34, of future issuances of securities and assumptions of liability.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest should file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). Anyone filing a motion to intervene or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Applicant.

Notice is hereby given that the deadline for filing protests with regard to the applicant's request for blanket authorization, under 18 CFR part 34, of future issuances of securities and assumptions of liability, is December 6, 2016.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper, using the FERC Online links at *http://www.ferc.gov.* To facilitate electronic service, persons with Internet access who will eFile a document and/or be listed as a contact for an intervenor must create and validate an eRegistration account using the eRegistration link. Select the eFiling link to log on and submit the intervention or protests.

Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 5 copies of the intervention or protest to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

The filings in the above-referenced proceeding are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the appropriate link in the above list. They are also available for electronic review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an eSubscription link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive email notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please email *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov.* or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28162 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 3442–026]

Mine Falls Limited Partnership; City of Nashua; Notice of Application for Transfer of License and Soliciting Comments, Motions To Intervene, and Protests

On November 4, 2016, Mine Falls Limited Partnership, co-licensee (transferor) and City of Nashua, co-licensee (transferor) filed an application to partially transfer the license for the Mine Falls Project No. 3442. The project is located on the Nashua River in Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. The project does not occupy Federal lands.

The applicants seek Commission approval to transfer the license for the Mine Falls Project from Mine Falls Limited Partnership and City of Nashua as co-licensees to City of Nashua as the sole licensee.

Applicants Contact: For transferor: Mr. Bernard H. Cherry, Mine Falls Limited Partnership, c/o Eagle Creek Renewable Energy, LLC, 65 Madison Avenue, Morristown, NJ 07960, Phone: 973–998–8400, Email: *bud.cherry@eaglecreekre.com* and Mr. Donald H. Clarke and Mr. Joshua E. Adrian, Duncan, Weinberg, Genzer & Pembroke, P.C., 1615 M Street NW., Suite 800, Washington, DC 20036, Phone: 202–467–6370, Emails: *dhc@dwgp.com* and *jea@dwgp.com.* For transferor/transferee: Mr. James Donchess, Mayor, City of Nashua, 229 Main Street, Nashua, NH 03060, Phone: 603–589–3260, Email: *NashuaMayor@NashuaNH.gov* and Ms. Madeleine Mineau, Waterways Manager, City of Nashua, 229 Main Street, P.O. Box 2019, Nashua, NH 03060, Phone: 603–589–3092, Email: *mineaum@nashuanh.gov.*

FERC Contact: Patricia W. Gillis, (202) 502–8735, *patricia.gillis@ferc.gov.*

Deadline for filing comments, motions to intervene, and protests: 30 days from the date that the Commission issues this notice. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filing. Please file

comments, motions to intervene, and protests using the Commission's eFiling system at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling.asp.* Commenters can submit brief comments up to 6,000 characters, without prior registration, using the eComment system at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/ecomment.asp.* You must include your name and contact information at the end of your comments. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov,* (866) 208–3676 (toll free), or (202) 502–8659 (TTY). In lieu of electronic filing, please send a paper copy to: Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426. The first page of any filing should include docket number P–3442–026.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28166 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER17–356–000]

MPower Energy NJ LLC; Supplemental Notice That Initial Market-Based Rate Filing Includes Request for Blanket Section 204 Authorization

This is a supplemental notice in the above-referenced proceeding MPower Energy NJ LLC's application for market-based rate authority, with an accompanying rate tariff, noting that such application includes a request for blanket authorization, under 18 CFR part 34, of future issuances of securities and assumptions of liability.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest should file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). Anyone filing a motion to intervene or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Applicant.

Notice is hereby given that the deadline for filing protests with regard to the applicant's request for blanket authorization, under 18 CFR part 34, of future issuances of securities and assumptions of liability, is December 6, 2016.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper, using the FERC Online links at *http://www.ferc.gov.* To facilitate electronic service, persons with Internet access who will eFile a document and/or be listed as a contact for an intervenor must create and validate an eRegistration account using the eRegistration link. Select the eFiling link to log on and submit the intervention or protests.

Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 5 copies of the intervention or protest to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426.

The filings in the above-referenced proceeding are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the appropriate link in the above list. They are also available for electronic review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an eSubscription link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive email notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please email *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov.* or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28163 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. OR17–2–000]

Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P.; Notice of Petition for Declaratory Order

Take notice that on November 14, 2016, pursuant to Rule 207(a)(2) of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.207(a)(2) (2016), Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P. (''Magellan''), filed a petition for a declaratory order seeking confirmation that certain proposed marketing affiliate transactions are permissible under the Interstate Commerce act (ICA) and Elkins Act, as more fully explained in the petition.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest this filing must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a notice of intervention or motion to intervene, as appropriate. Such notices, motions, or protests must be filed on or before the comment date. Anyone filing a motion to intervene or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Petitioner.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper using the ''eFiling'' link at *http://www.ferc.gov.* Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 5 copies of the protest or intervention to theFederal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street N.E., Washington, DC 20426.

This filing is accessible on-line at *http://www.ferc.gov,* using the ''eLibrary'' link and is available for review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an ''eSubscription'' link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive email notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please email *ERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov,* or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Comment Date: 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on December 14, 2016.

DATED: November 16, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28165 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP17–10–000]

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC; Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC; Notice of Application

Take notice that on November 7, 2016, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC (Transco), P.O. Box 1396, Houston, Texas 77251, and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (Tennessee) 1001 Louisiana Street, Suite 1000, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP17–10–000 an application pursuant to section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Part 157 of the Commission's Regulations, requesting authorization to abandon certain wholly-owned offshore gathering lateral facilities extending from

Galveston Block 391 to Brazos Block 538, Offshore, Texas, and related metering facilities, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

The filing may also be viewed on the Web at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the ''eLibrary'' link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll free at (866) 208–3676, or TTY, contact (202) 502–8659.

Any questions concerning this application may be directed to Marg Camardello, Regulatory Analyst, Lead, (713) 215–3380, P.O. Box 1396, Houston, Texas 77251; and Ben Carranza, Manager, Rates & Regulatory, (713) 420–5535, 1001 Louisiana Street, Suite 1000, Houston Texas 77002.

Specifically, Transco and Tennessee propose to abandon four pipeline segments on Transco's Central Texas Gathering System, offshore Texas: Three 20-inch-diameter segments with a combined length of 40.45-miles connecting Transco Platform BA538 to Platform GA393, and 16-inch-diameter 5.87-mile-long segment immediately downstream of Transco Platform GA393. Transco states that due to the minimal flow on the Laterals, it would not be operationally feasible to pig these facilities in order to maintain their integrity. The requested order date is March 1, 2017. The project cost is estimated at $2.28 million.

Pursuant to section 157.9 of the Commission's rules, 18 CFR 157.9, within 90 days of this Notice the Commission staff will either: Complete its environmental assessment (EA) and place it into the Commission's public record (eLibrary) for this proceeding; or issue a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review. If a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review is issued, it will indicate, among other milestones, the anticipated date for the Commission staff's issuance of the EA for this proposal. The filing of the EA in the Commission's public record for this proceeding or the issuance of a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review will serve to notify federal and state agencies of the timing for the completion of all necessary reviews, and the subsequent need to complete all federal authorizations within 90 days of the date of issuance of the Commission staff's EA.

There are two ways to become involved in the Commission's review of this project. First, any person wishing to obtain legal status by becoming a party to the proceedings for this project should, on or before the comment date stated below, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.10). A person obtaining party status will be placed on the service list maintained by the Secretary of the Commission and will receive copies of all documents filed by the applicant and by all other parties. A party must submit five copies of filings made with the Commission and must mail a copy to the applicant and to every other party in the proceeding. Only parties to the proceeding can ask for court review of Commission orders in the proceeding.

However, a person does not have to intervene in order to have comments considered. The second way to participate is by filing with the Secretary of the Commission, as soon as possible, an original and two copies of comments in support of or in opposition to this project. The Commission will consider these comments in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but the filing of a comment alone will not serve to make the filer a party to the proceeding. The Commission's rules require that persons filing comments in opposition to the project provide copies of their protests only to the party or parties directly involved in the protest.

Persons who wish to comment only on the environmental review of this project should submit an original and two copies of their comments to the Secretary of the Commission. Environmental commentors will be placed on the Commission's environmental mailing list, will receive copies of the environmental documents, and will be notified of meetings associated with the Commission's environmental review process. Environmental commentors will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, the non-party commentors will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission (except for the mailing of environmental documents issued by the Commission) and will not have the right to seek court review of the Commission's final order.

The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings of comments, protests and interventions in lieu of paper using the ''eFiling'' link at *http://www.ferc.gov.* Persons unable to file electronically should submit original and five copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

Comment Date: 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on December 7, 2016.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28157 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP17–12–000]

Dominion Carolina Gas Transmission, LLC; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

Take notice that on November 9, 2016, Dominion Carolina Gas Transmission, LLC (DCG), 121 Moore Hopkins Lane, Columbia, South Carolina 29210, filed in Docket No. CP17–12–000, a prior notice request pursuant to sections 157.205 and 157.216 of the Commission's regulations under the Natural Gas Act (NGA). DCG seeks authorization to abandon in place and disconnect an 11.01 mile segment of its Line L in Kershaw County, South Carolina.

DCG proposes to perform these activities under its blanket certificate authority issued in Docket No. CP06–72–000, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

The filing may be viewed on the web at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the ''eLibrary'' link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, contact FERC at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or call toll-free, (886) 208–3676 or TYY, (202) 502–8659.

Any questions regarding this application should be directed to Richard D. Jessee, Gas Transmission Certificates Program Manager, Dominion Carolina Gas Transmission, LLC, 707 East Main Street, Richmond, VA 23219, or by calling (804) 771–3704. (telephone), *Richard.Jessee@dom.com,*

Any person or the Commission's Staff may, within 60 days after the issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and, pursuant to section 157.205 of the Commission's

Regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefore, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to section 7 of the NGA.

Pursuant to Section 157.9 of the Commission's rules, 18 CFR 157.9, within 90 days of this Notice the Commission staff will either: Complete its environmental assessment (EA) and place it into the Commission's public record (eLibrary) for this proceeding, or issue a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review. If a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review is issued, it will indicate, among other milestones, the anticipated date for the Commission staff's issuance of the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) or EA for this proposal. The filing of the EA in the Commission's public record for this proceeding or the issuance of a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review will serve to notify federal and state agencies of the timing for the completion of all necessary reviews, and the subsequent need to complete all federal authorizations within 90 days of the date of issuance of the Commission staff's FEIS or EA.

Persons who wish to comment only on the environmental review of this project should submit an original and two copies of their comments to the Secretary of the Commission. Environmental commenters will be placed on the Commission's environmental mailing list, will receive copies of the environmental documents, and will be notified of meetings associated with the Commission's environmental review process. Environmental commenters will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, the non-party commenters will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission (except for the mailing of environmental documents issued by the Commission) and will not have the right to seek court review of the Commission's final order.

The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings of comments, protests, and interventions via the internet in lieu of paper. See 18 CFR 385.2001(a) (1) (iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site (*www.ferc.gov*) under the ''e-Filing'' link. Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 5 copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28158 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings #1

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric corporate filings:

Docket Numbers: EC17–34–000.

Applicants: Great Western Wind Energy, LLC.

Description: Application for Authorization under Section 203 of the Federal Power Act and Request for Expedited Consideration and Confidential Treatment of Great Western Wind Energy, LLC.

Filed Date: 11/16/16.

Accession Number: 20161116–5159.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/7/16.

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric rate filings:

Docket Numbers: ER10–2881–014; ER10–2641–014; ER10–2663–014; ER10–2882–014; ER10–2883–014; ER10–2884–014; ER10–2885–014; ER13–1101–009; ER13–1541–008; ER14–787–002; EL15–39–000.

Applicants: Alabama Power Company; Southern Power Company; Mississippi Power Company; Georgia Power Company; Gulf Power Company; Oleander Power Project, Limited Partnership; Southern Company—Florida LLC; Southern Turner Cimarron I, LLC; Spectrum Nevada Solar, LLC; Campo Verde Solar, LLC; Macho Springs Solar, LLC.

Description: Comments of Southern Companies on the EQR Analysis of Hour-Ahead Transactions in accordance to the August 9, 2016 and October 13, 2016 Orders.

Filed Date: 10/28/16.

Accession Number: 20161028–5192.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/18/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–272–000.

Applicants: Startrans IO, LLC.

Description: Errata to November 1, 2016 Startrans IO, LLC tariff filing (Exhibit ST–03).

Filed Date: 11/16/16.

Accession Number: 20161116–5149.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/7/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–366–000.

Applicants: Southwest Power Pool, Inc.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Revisions to Prospectively Require All VERs to Register as DVERs to be effective 1/15/2017.

Filed Date: 11/16/16.

Accession Number: 20161116–5132.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/7/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–367–000.

Applicants: PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Revisions to the OATT and RAA RE: Enhanced Aggregation and Seasonal Capacity to be effective 1/19/2017.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5003.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–368–000.

Applicants: Southwest Power Pool, Inc.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: 3114R1 Resale Power Group of Iowa NITSA NOA to be effective 11/1/2016.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5021.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

The filings are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the links or querying the docket number.

Any person desiring to intervene or protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date. Protests may be considered, but intervention is necessary to become a party to the proceeding.

eFiling is encouraged. More detailed information relating to filing requirements, interventions, protests, service, and qualifying facilities filings can be found at: *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling/filing-req.pdf.* For other information, call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28196 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings

Take notice that the Commission has received the following Natural Gas Pipeline Rate and Refund Report filings:

Filings Instituting Proceedings

Docket Numbers: RP17–178–000.

Applicants: Discovery Gas Transmission LLC.

Description: § 4(d) Rate Filing: 2017 HMRE Surcharge Filing to be effective 1/1/2017.

Filed Date: 11/15/16.

Accession Number: 20161115–5107.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/28/16.

Docket Numbers: RP17–179–000.

Applicants: Northwest Pipeline LLC.

Description: § 4(d) Rate Filing: Non-Conforming Contracts—Citadel (3 Releases from WPX) to be effective 12/16/2016.

Filed Date: 11/15/16.

Accession Number: 20161115–5112.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/28/16.

Docket Numbers: RP17–180–000.

Applicants: Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC.

Description: § 4(d) Rate Filing: Negotiated Rate Agreement—W. Roxbury Lateral Boston Gas K510807 to be effective 12/1/2016.

Filed Date: 11/15/16.

Accession Number: 20161115–5145.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/28/16.

Any person desiring to intervene or protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 385.211 and § 385.214) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date. Protests may be considered, but intervention is necessary to become a party to the proceeding.

Filings in Existing Proceedings

Docket Numbers: RP15–65–006.

Applicants: Gulf South Pipeline Company, LP.

Description: Compliance filing Rate Case Settlement Compliance Filing to be effective 12/1/2016.

Filed Date: 11/15/16.

Accession Number: 20161115–5034.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/28/16.

Any person desiring to protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rule 211 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 385.211) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date.

The filings are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the links or querying the docket number.

eFiling is encouraged. More detailed information relating to filing requirements, interventions, protests, service, and qualifying facilities filings can be found at: *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling/filing-req.pdf.* For other information, call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated November 16, 2016.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28192 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings #2

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric rate filings:

Docket Numbers: ER17–184–001.

Applicants: SociVolta Inc.

Description: Tariff Amendment: Amendment to 1 to be effective 1/1/2017; also filed was SociVolta Inc. tariff filing Amendment (Asset Appendix).

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5119, 20161117–5122.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–369–000.

Applicants: Benson Power, LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Revised Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 1/17/2017.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5035.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–370–000.

Applicants: CPV Biomass Holdings, LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Revised Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 1/17/2017.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5037.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–371–000.

Applicants: CPV Keenan II Renewable Energy Company.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Revised Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 1/17/2017.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5039.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–372–000.

Applicants: CPV Maryland, LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Revised Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 1/17/2017.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5042.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–373–000.

Applicants: CPV Shore, LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Revised Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 1/17/2017.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5043.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–374–000.

Applicants: CPV Towantic, LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Revised Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 1/17/2017.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5044.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–375–000.

Applicants: CPV Valley, LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Revised Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 1/17/2017.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5045.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–376–000.

Applicants: Public Service Company of New Hampshire.

Description: Tariff Cancellation: Cancellation of PSNH Rate Schedule No. IA–PSNH–08 Springfield Power, LLC to be effective 10/25/2016.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5051.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–377–000.

Applicants: NorthWestern Corporation.

Description: Tariff Cancellation: Notice of Cancellation and Termination—Service Agreements to be effective 11/18/2016.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5052.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–378–000.

Applicants: NorthWestern Corporation.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: SA 794—Agreement with Phillips County re Malta Bridge Project to be effective 11/18/2016.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5072.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–379–000.

Applicants: PacifiCorp.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: BPA NITSA (CEC Load) Rev 1 to be effective 11/30/2016.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5103.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER17–380–000.

Applicants: Stored Solar J&WE, LLC.

Description: Baseline eTariff Filing: Baseline new to be effective 12/1/2016.

Filed Date: 11/17/16.

Accession Number: 20161117–5120.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/8/16.

The filings are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the links or querying the docket number.

Any person desiring to intervene or protest in any of the above proceedings

must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date. Protests may be considered, but intervention is necessary to become a party to the proceeding.

eFiling is encouraged. More detailed information relating to filing requirements, interventions, protests, service, and qualifying facilities filings can be found at: *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling/filing-req.pdf.* For other information, call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

DATED: November 17, 2016.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28191 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA–HQ–OW–2015–0714; FRL–9955–59–OW]

Notice of a Public Meeting of the National Drinking Water Advisory Council

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of a public meeting and location.

SUMMARY: On November 17, 2016, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced a meeting of the National Drinking Water Advisory Council (NDWAC) in the **Federal Register**, as authorized under the Safe Drinking Water Act. This notice announces the location of the meeting (see the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice). The meeting is scheduled for December 6 and 7, 2016. During this meeting, the NDWAC will focus discussions on developing recommendations for the EPA Administrator on the Lead and Copper National Primary Drinking Water Regulation—Long Term Revisions.

DATES: The meeting on December 6, will be held from 9:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m.; and December 7, from 8:30 a.m. to noon, eastern time.

ADDRESSES: The public meeting will be held at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, William Jefferson Clinton (WJC), 1201 Constitution Avenue NW., Room 1117A & B, Washington, DC 20004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For more information about this meeting or to request written materials, contact Tracey Ward of the Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, by phone at 202–564–3796 or by email at *ward.tracey@epa.gov.* For additional information about the NDWAC meeting, please visit *http://water.epa.gov/drink/ndwac/* or *www.regulations.gov* (search for Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OW–2015–0714).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Details about Participating in the Meeting: Teleconferencing will be available during the meeting. The number of teleconference connections available for the meeting is limited and will be offered on a first-come, first-served basis. The teleconference number is (1) 866–299–3188; when prompted, enter conference code 202 564–7347.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Peter Grevatt,

Director, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water.

[FR Doc. 2016–28263 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–9955–56–Region 3]

Notice of Administrative Settlement Agreement for Recovery of Past Response Costs Pursuant to Section 122(H) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as Amended

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice; Request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (''CERCLA''), as amended, notice is hereby given that a proposed administrative settlement agreement for recovery of past response costs (''Proposed Agreement'') associated with Operable Unit Two of the Sharon Steel Corporation (Farrell Works Disposal Area) Superfund Site, Mercer County, Pennsylvania, was executed by the Environmental Protection Agency (''EPA'') and is now subject to public comment, after which EPA may modify or withdraw its consent if comments received disclose facts or considerations that indicate that the Proposed Agreement is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate. The Proposed Agreement would resolve potential EPA claims under Section 107(a) of CERCLA, against Daniel Williams, d/b/a Williams Brothers Trucking (''Settling Party''). The Proposed Agreement would require Settling Party to reimburse EPA $12,000.00 for past response costs incurred by EPA for the Site.

For 30 days following the date of publication of this notice, EPA will receive written comments relating to the Proposed Agreement. EPA's response to any comments received will be available for public inspection at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

DATES: Comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the date of publication of this notice.

ADDRESSES: The Proposed Agreement and additional background information relating to it are available for public inspection at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103. A copy of the Proposed Agreement may be obtained from Robert S. Hasson (3RC41), Senior Assistant Regional Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103. Comments should reference the ''Sharon Steel Corporation (Farrell Works Disposal Area) Superfund Site, Proposed Administrative Settlement Agreement for Recovery of Past Response Costs'' and ''EPA Docket No. CERC–03–2017–0057CR,'' and should be forwarded to Robert S. Hasson at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert S. Hasson (3RC41), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103, Phone: (215) 814–2672; *hasson.robert@epa.gov.*

Dated: November 15, 2016.

Karen Melvin,

Director, Hazardous Site Cleanup Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III.

[FR Doc. 2016–28262 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[Petition VI–2014–10; FRL–9955–61–Region 9]

Clean Air Act Operating Permit Program; Petition for Objection to State Operating Permit for Hu Honua Bioenergy Facility, LLC; Pepeekeo, Hawaii

AGENCY: United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of final order on petition to object to a state operating permit.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Clean Air Act (CAA or Act), the EPA Administrator signed an Order, dated September 14, 2016, denying a petition to object to a CAA title V operating permit proposed by the Clean Air Branch, Environmental Management Division, Hawaii Department of Health (HDOH) for the Hu Honua Bioenergy Facility, LLC (Hu Honua) in Pepeekeo, Hawaii. The Order constitutes a final action on the petition submitted by the Law Office of Marc Chytilo, on behalf of Preserve Pepeekeo Health & Environment (Petitioner), on September 15, 2014 (Petition). A petitioner may seek judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit of those portions of the petition which EPA denied. Any petition for review shall be filed within 60 days from the date this notice appears in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the Order, the Petition, and all pertinent information relating thereto are on file at the following location: EPA Region 9; Air Division; 75 Hawthorne Street; San Francisco, California 94105.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gerardo Rios, Section Chief, Air Permits Office, EPA Region 9, at (415) 972–3974 or *rios.gerardo@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The CAA affords the EPA a 45-day period to review and, as appropriate, the authority to object to operating permits proposed by state permitting authorities under title V of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7661–7661f. Section 505(b)(2) of the CAA and 40 CFR 70.8(d) authorize any person to petition the EPA Administrator to object to a title V operating permit within 60 days after the expiration of the EPA's 45-day review period if the EPA has not objected on its own initiative. Petitions must be based only on objections to the permit that were raised with reasonable specificity during the public comment period provided by the state, unless the petitioner demonstrates that it was impracticable to raise these issues during the comment period or the grounds for the issues arose after this period.

On September 15, 2014, the EPA received a Petition dated September 13, 2014, pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7661d(b)(2), and 40 CFR 70.8(d). The Petition requested that the EPA object to the title V operating permit proposed on March 14, 2014 by HDOH, for the Hu Honua Bioenergy Facility, which is an electricity generating facility that consists primarily of a single biomass-fired steam boiler. On February 18, 2016, HDOH issued a final permit for Hu Honua, identified as Amendment of Covered Source Permit Number 0724–01–C, pursuant to Hawaii's Administrative Rules at Title 11, Chapter 60.1, Air Pollution Control.

The Petitioner requested that EPA object to the above referenced permit based on the following ten claims: (1) HDOH has failed to satisfy the public participation requirements of the Act, title V regulations, and state law; (2) permit limitations for criteria pollutants are not practically enforceable; (3) emissions limitations for hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) are not federally or practically enforceable; (4) emissions factors for HAPs are unacceptable; (5) the permit does not explicitly preclude affirmative defenses; (6) the monitoring report requirements are not practically enforceable; (7) there is no requirement for monitoring, recording, and reporting flow meter data; (8) special condition E6 concerning semi-annual reporting is ambiguous; (9) the permit fails to address greenhouse gas emissions; and (10) HDOH failed to estimate emissions from malfunction or upset conditions.

On September 14, 2016, the Administrator issued an Order denying each of the claims raised in the Petition. The Order explains the EPA's rationale for denying the petition. No modification or replacement of the above referenced permit is required as a result of this Order.

Dated: November 3, 2016.

Elizabeth Adams,

Acting Director, Air Division, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2016–28268 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2016–0385; FRL–9955–44]

FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel; Notice of Rescheduled Public Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Agency is issuing this notice to reschedule the 4-day meeting of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act Scientific Advisory Panel (FIFRA SAP) to consider and review a set of scientific issues being evaluated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regarding EPA's evaluation of the carcinogenic potential of glyphosate, a non-selective, phosphonomethyl amino acid herbicide registered to control weeds in various agricultural and non-agricultural settings.

DATES: The meeting will be held on December 13–16, 2016, from approximately 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Environmental Protection Agency, Conference Center, Lobby Level, One Potomac Yard (South Bldg.), 2777 S. Crystal Dr., Arlington, VA 22202.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven M. Knott, DFO, Office of Science Coordination and Policy (7201M), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; telephone number: (202) 564–0103; email address: *knott.steven@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Agency is issuing this notice to reschedule the 4-day meeting of the FIFRA SAP to consider and review a set of scientific issues being evaluated by EPA regarding EPA's evaluation of the carcinogenic potential of glyphosate, a non-selective, phosphonomethyl amino acid herbicide registered to control weeds in various agricultural and non-agricultural settings. The meeting was originally scheduled for October 18–21, 2016 as announced in the **Federal Register** on July 26, 2016 (81 FR 48794) (FRL 9949–22). The new meeting dates are December 13–16, 2016. For additional information, please visit the public docket for this meeting at *http://www.regulations.gov* (Docket number EPA–HQ–OPP–2016–0385), the FIFRA SAP Web site at *http://www.epa.gov/sap* or contact the Designated Federal Official (DFO) listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 136 *et. seq.;* 21 U.S.C. 301 *et seq.*

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Laura Bailey,

Acting Director, Office of Science Coordination and Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28270 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA–HQ–OAR–2006–0745; FRL–9955–55–OAR]

Proposed Information Collection Request; Comment Request; Reformulated Gasoline Commingling Provisions (Renewal)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is planning to submit an

information collection request (ICR), ''Reformulated Gasoline Commingling Provisions'' (EPA ICR No 2228.05, OMB Control No. 2060–0587 to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*). Before doing so, EPA is soliciting public comments on specific aspects of the proposed information collection as described below. This is a renewal of the ICR, which is currently approved through December 31, 2016. An Agency may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before January 23, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, referencing Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2006–0745, online using *www.regulations.gov* (our preferred method), or by mail to: EPA Docket Center, Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Code 28221T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460.

EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes profanity, threats, information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Geanetta Heard, Fuels Compliance Center, 6406J, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: 202–343–9017; fax number: 202–565–2085; email address: *heard.geanetta@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Supporting documents which explain in detail the information that the EPA will be collecting are available in the public docket for this ICR. The docket can be viewed online at *www.regulations.gov* or in person at the EPA Docket Center, WJC West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC. The telephone number for the Docket Center is 202–566–1744. For additional information about EPA's public docket, visit *http://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

Pursuant to section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA, EPA is soliciting comments and information to enable it to: (i) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (ii) evaluate the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (iii) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (iv) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses. EPA will consider the comments received and amend the ICR as appropriate. The final ICR package will then be submitted to OMB for review and approval. At that time, EPA will issue another **Federal Register** notice to announce the submission of the ICR to OMB and the opportunity to submit additional comments to OMB.

Abstract: With this information collection request (ICR), the Office of Air and Radiation (OAR) is seeking permission to accept notifications from gasoline retailers and wholesale purchaser-consumers related to commingling of ethanol blended and non-ethanol-blended reformulated gasoline (RFG) under § 1513 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct) and 40 CFR 80.78(a)(8)(ii)(B); and to provide for a compliance option whereby a retailer or wholesale purchaser-consumer may demonstrate compliance via test results under

§ 80.78(a)(8)(iii)(A). These provisions are designed to grant compliance flexibility. Parties were first subject to this recordkeeping and reporting on June 1, 2006.

Section 1513 of the EPAct addresses the combining of ethanol-blended RFG with non-ethanol-blended RFG. This provision amended the Clean Air Act (CAA) to add a new § 211(s) providing retail outlets two ten-day opportunities during a single VOC-control season to blend batches of ethanol-blended and non-ethanol- blended RFG. Under this new section, retail outlets are allowed to sell non-ethanol-blended RFG which has been combined with ethanol blended RFG under certain conditions.

Form Numbers: No.

Respondents/Affected Entities: Gasoline Stations, Gasoline stations with convenience stores, Gasoline stations without convenience stores

Respondent's Obligation to Respond: mandatory Section 114 and 208 of the Clean Air Act (CAA), 42 U.S.C. 7414 and 7542

Estimated Number of Respondents: 39,165 (total).

Frequency of Response: Annually

Total Estimated Burden: 19,116 hours (per year). Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.03(b)

Total Estimated Cost: $344,093 (per year), includes $0 annualized capital or operation & maintenance costs.

Changes in Estimates: The change in burden from the prior ICR is due in part to better numbers extracted from business and industry economic statistics that assisted in calculating the numbers of respondents. These better numbers reduced the party size by 5,750 members. The number of responses also declined from 84,050 to 76,465, a difference of 7,585 reports, which reduced the industry burden hours from 21,013 hours to 19,116 hours, a difference of 1,897 hours. With the decline of respondents, burden hours and responses, the cost associated with this ICR is $344,093 a difference of $13,128 calculated from the prior collection approved by OMB.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Byron Bunker,

Director, Compliance Division, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Office of Air and Radiation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

[FR Doc. 2016–28260 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL9955–57–ORD]

Federal Interagency Steering Committee on Multimedia Environmental Modeling

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: The annual public meeting of the Federal Interagency Steering Committee on Multimedia Environmental Modeling (ISCMEM) will convene to discuss developments in environmental modeling applications, tools and frameworks, as well as new operational initiatives among the participating agencies. The meeting this year will emphasize collaboration.

DATES: December 14, 2016, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Arlington, VA.

ADDRESSES: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Inquiries and notice of intent to attend the meeting may be emailed to: Brenda Rashleigh, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 27 Tarzwell Drive, Narragansett, RI 02881, 401–782–3014, *Rashleigh.brenda@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background: Federal agencies have been cooperating since 2001 under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the research and development of multimedia environmental models. The MOU, which was revised in 2016, establishes a framework for facilitating cooperation and coordination among the six following agencies (the specific research organization within the agency is in parentheses): National Science Foundation; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Engineer Research and Development Center); U.S. Department of Energy (Office of Biological and Environmental Research); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Office of Research and Development); U.S. Geological Survey; and U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research). These agencies are cooperating and coordinating in the research and development of multimedia environmental models, software and related databases, including development, enhancements, applications and assessments of site specific, generic, and process-oriented multimedia environmental models. Multimedia model development and simulation supports interagency interests in human and environmental health risk assessment, uncertainty analyses, water supply issues and contaminant transport.

Purpose of the Public Meeting: The public meeting provides an opportunity for other Federal and State agencies, the scientific community, and the public to be briefed on ISCMEM activities and initiatives, and to discuss technological advancements in multimedia environmental modeling.

Proposed Agenda: The ISCMEM Chair will open the meeting with an overview of the goals of the MOU and current activities of ISCMEM, followed by a series of presentations on modeling efforts in the Agencies in the morning, and Workgroup discussions on the afternoon.

Meeting Access: The meeting will be available through Web Meeting Services. To obtain web access, all interested attendees must pre-register by emailing Brenda Rashleigh (*Rashleigh.Brenda@epa.gov*) or Bill Cooper (*WJCOOPER@nsf.gov*), indicating their intent to participate in the meeting and providing their full contact information and affiliation.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Brenda Rashleigh,

Chair, Federal Interagency Steering Committee on Multimedia Environmental Modeling.

[FR Doc. 2016–28261 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Notice of Agreements Filed

The Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the following agreements under the Shipping Act of 1984. Interested parties may submit comments on the agreements to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573, within twelve days of the date this notice appears in the **Federal Register**. Copies of the agreements are available through the Commission's Web site (*www.fmc.gov*) or by contacting the Office of Agreements at (202) 523–5793 or *tradeanalysis@fmc.gov.*

Agreement No.: 011117–057.

Title: United States/Australasia Discussion Agreement.

Parties: ANL Singapore Pte Ltd.; CMA–CGM.; Hamburg-Süd; Mediterranean Shipping Company S.A.; and Pacific International Lines (PTE) LTD.

Filing Party: Wayne R. Rohde, Esq.; Cozen O'Connor; 1200 Nineteenth Street NW.; Washington, DC 20036.

Synopsis: The amendment would add Compagnie Maritime Marfret S.A. as a party to the Agreement.

Agreement No.: 011574–020.

Title: Pacific Islands Discussion Agreement.

Parties: Hamburg Sudamerikanische Dampfschifffahrts-Gesellschaft KG doing business under its own name and the name Fesco Australia/New Zealand Liner Services (FANZL); and Polynesia Line Ltd.

Filing Party: Wayne R. Rohde, Esq.; Cozen O'Conner; 1200 Nineteenth Street NW.; Washington, DC 20036.

Synopsis: The amendment would add Compagnie Maritime Marfret S.A. as a party to the Agreement.

Agreement No.: 011223–054.

Title: Transpacific Stabilization Agreement.

Parties: American President Lines, Ltd. and APL Co. PTE Ltd.; (operating as a single carrier); Maersk Line A/S; CMA CGM, S.A.; COSCO Container Lines Company Ltd; Evergreen Line Joint Service Agreement; Hanjin Shipping Co., Ltd.; Hapag-Lloyd AG; Hyundai Merchant Marine Co., Ltd.; Mediterranean Shipping Company; Orient Overseas Container Line Limited; Yangming Marine Transport Corp.; and Zim Integrated Shipping Services, Ltd.

Filing Party: David F. Smith, Esq.; Cozen O'Conner; 1200 Nineteenth Street NW.; Washington, DC 20036.

Synopsis: The amendment revises Appendix A of the TSA Agreement to remove Nippon Yusen Kaisha Line as a party to the Agreement, effective November 16, 2016.

Agreement No.: 012441.

Title: HLUSA/ARC Cooperative Working Agreement.

Parties: American Roll-On Roll-Off Carrier, LLC and Hapag-Lloyd USA, LLC.

Filing Party: Wayne Rohde; Cozen O'Connor; 1200 Nineteenth Street NW.; Washington, DC 20036.

Synopsis: The Agreement authorizes HLUSA and ARC to engage in ad hoc space chartering in the trades between ports on the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts of the United States on the one hand and ports in North Europe and on the Baltic, Mediterranean and Red Seas and on the Persian Gulf on the other hand. It also authorizes the parties to discuss possible operational cooperation in those trades.

Agreement No.: 012442.

Title: Miami Marine Terminal Conference Agreement.

Parties: Port of Miami Terminal Operating Company, L.C.; and South Florida Container Terminal, LLC.

Filing Party: David F. Smith, Esq.; Cozen O'Conner; 1200 Nineteenth Street NW.; Washington, DC 20036.

Synopsis: The Agreement would permit the parties to (a) establish and maintain terminal rates, charges, classifications, rules, regulations, and practices at terminals owned and/or operated by them at the Port of Miami, and (b) meet, discuss, and agree on issues regarding their respective operations, facilities, and services at the Port, in order to improve services, reduce costs, increase efficiency, and otherwise optimize conditions in order to better service the interests of the shipping public at the Port.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Rachel E. Dickon,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28241 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–P

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission (FTC).

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, the FTC is seeking public comments on its request to OMB for a three-year extension of the current PRA clearance for the information collection requirements contained in the Consumer Product Warranty Rule. That clearance expires on December 31, 2016.

DATES: Comments must be received by December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties may file a comment online or on paper, by following the instructions in the Request for Comment part of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below. Write ''Warranty Rules: Paperwork Comment, FTC File No. P044403'' on your comment, and file your comment online at *https://ftcpublic.commentworks.com/ftc/consumerwarrantypra2* by following the instructions on the web-based form. If you prefer to file your comment on paper, mail or deliver your comment to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite CC–5610 (Annex J), Washington, DC 20580, or deliver your comment to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, Constitution Center, 400 7th Street SW., 5th Floor, Suite 5610 (Annex J), Washington, DC 20024.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the proposed information requirements should be addressed to Gary Ivens, Attorney, Division of Marketing Practices, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, Room CC–8528, 600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20580, (202) 326–2330.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Rule Concerning Disclosure of Written Consumer Product Warranty Terms and Conditions (the Consumer Product Warranty Rule or Warranty Rule), 16 CFR 701.

OMB Control Number: 3084–0111.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Abstract: The Warranty Rule is one of three rules [1] that the FTC implemented pursuant to requirements of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. 2301 *et seq.* (Warranty Act or Act). The Warranty Rule specifies the information that must appear in a written warranty on a consumer product costing more than $15. The Rule tracks Section 102(a) of the Warranty Act, specifying information that must appear in the written warranty and, for certain disclosures, mandates the exact language that must be used. Neither the Warranty Rule nor the Act requires that a manufacturer or retailer warrant a consumer product in writing, but if they choose to do so, the warranty must comply with the Rule.

On August 24, 2016, the Commission sought comment on the Rule's information collection requirements.[2] The Commission did not receive any comments.

As required by OMB regulations, 5 CFR part 1320, the FTC is providing this second opportunity for public comment.

Likely Respondents: Manufacturers of consumer products.

Estimated Annual Hours Burden: 140,280 hours (derived from estimated 17,535 manufacturers x 8 hours of burden per year).

Estimated Annual Cost Burden: $19,011,798 ($17,535,000 for legal professionals + $883,413 for legal support + $593,384 for clerical workers).[3]

- Legal Professionals: (0.5) (140,280 hours) ($250/hour) = $17,535,000
- Legal Support: (0.25) (140,280 hours) ($25.19/hour) = $883,413
- Clerical Workers: (0.25) (140,280 hours) ($16.92/hour) = $593,384.

Request for Comment

You can file a comment online or on paper. For the Commission to consider your comment, we must receive it on or before December 23, 2016. Write ''Warranty Rules: Paperwork Comment, FTC File No. P044403'' on your comment. Your comment—including your name and your state—will be placed on the public record of this proceeding, including, to the extent practicable, on the public Commission Web site, at *http://www.ftc.gov/os/publiccomments.shtm.* As a matter of discretion, the Commission tries to remove individuals' home contact information from comments before placing them on the Commission Web site.

Because your comment will be made public, you are solely responsible for making sure that your comment does not include any sensitive personal information, such as anyone's Social Security number, date of birth, driver's license number or other state identification number or foreign country equivalent, passport number, financial account number, or credit or debit card number. You are also solely responsible for making sure that your comment does not include any sensitive health information, like medical records or other individually identifiable health information. In addition, do not include any ''[t]rade secret or any commercial or financial information which is . . . privileged or confidential,'' as discussed in Section 6(f) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. 46(f), and FTC Rule 4.10(a)(2), 16 CFR 4.10(a)(2). In particular, do not include competitively sensitive information such as costs, sales statistics, inventories, formulas, patterns, devices, manufacturing processes, or customer names.

If you want the Commission to give your comment confidential treatment, you must file it in paper form, with a request for confidential treatment, and you are required to follow the procedure explained in FTC Rule 4.9(c), 16 CFR 4.9(c). Your comment will be kept confidential only if the FTC General Counsel grants your request in accordance with the law and the public interest.

Postal mail addressed to the Commission is subject to delay due to heightened security screening. As a result, we encourage you to submit your comment online, or to send it to the Commission by courier or overnight service. To make sure that the Commission considers your online comment, you must file it at *https://ftcpublic.commentworks.com/ftc/consumerwarrantypra2,* by following the instructions on the web-based form. If this Notice appears at *http://www.regulations.gov,* you also may file a comment through that Web site.

If you file your comment on paper, write ''Warranty Rules: Paperwork Comment, FTC File No. P044403'' on your comment and on the envelope, and mail or deliver it to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, Room H–113 (Annex J), 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20580. If possible,

[1] The other two rules relate to the pre-sale availability of warranty terms and minimum standards for informal dispute settlement mechanisms that are incorporated into a written warranty.

[2] *See* 81 FR 57910 (60-Day **Federal Register** Notice).

[3] Staff has derived an hourly wage rate ($250/hour) for legal professionals based upon industry knowledge. The wage rates for legal support workers ($25.19) and for clerical support ($16.92) used in this Notice are based on recent data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment and Wages—May 2015, table 1 (''National employment and wage data from the Occupational Employment Statistics survey by occupation''), released Mar. 30, 2016, available at *http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/ocwage.pdf.*

submit your paper comment to the Commission by courier or overnight service.

Visit the Commission Web site at *http://www.ftc.gov* to read this Notice. The FTC Act and other laws that the Commission administers permit the collection of public comments to consider and use in this proceeding as appropriate. The Commission will consider all timely and responsive public comments that it receives on or before December 23, 2016. You can find more information, including routine uses permitted by the Privacy Act, in the Commission's privacy policy, at *http://www.ftc.gov/ftc/privacy.shtm.*

Comments on the information collection requirements subject to review under the PRA should also be submitted to OMB. If sent by U.S. mail, address comments to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for the Federal Trade Commission, New Executive Office Building, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503. Comments sent to OMB by U.S. postal mail, however, are subject to delays due to heightened security precautions. Thus, comments instead should be sent by facsimile to (202) 395–5167.

David C. Shonka,

Principal Deputy General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2016–28208 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–P

GULF COAST ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION COUNCIL

Notice of Proposed Subaward Under a Council-Selected Restoration Component Award

AGENCY: Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council (Council) publishes notice of a proposed subaward from the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) to the Nature Conservancy (TNC), a nonprofit organization, for the purpose of acquiring three properties in the Bahia Grande Coastal Corridor in accordance with the Bahia Grande Coastal Corridor Implementation Award as approved in the Initial Funded Priority List.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Please send questions by email to *raams_pgmsupport@restorethegulf.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 1321(t)(2)(E)(ii)(III) of the RESTORE Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(t)(2)(E)(ii)(III)) and Treasury's implementing regulation at 31 CFR 34.401(b) require that, for purposes of awards made under the Council-Selected Restoration Component, a State or Federal award recipient may make a grant or subaward to or enter into a cooperative agreement with a nongovernmental entity that equals or exceeds 10 percent of the total amount of the award provided to the State or Federal award recipient only if certain notice requirements are met. Specifically, at least 30 days before the State or Federal award recipient enters into such an agreement, the Council must publish in the **Federal Register** and deliver to specified Congressional Committees the name of the recipient and subrecipient; a brief description of the activity, including its purpose; and the amount of the award. This notice accomplishes the **Federal Register** requirement.

Description of Proposed Action

As specified in the Initial Funded Priority List, which is available on the Council's Web site at *https://www.restorethegulf.gov/council-selected-restoration-component/funded-priorities-list,* RESTORE Act funds will support the Bahia Grande Coastal Corridor Implementation Award (Bahia Grande Award) to TCEQ. Through this Award of $4,378,500, approximately 1,852 acres of land will be conserved through fee title acquisition from willing sellers and added to a 105,000 acre corridor of conservation lands that includes the Laguna Atascosa National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), Boca Chica State Park, and the Lower Rio Grande Valley NWR. Property acquisitions under the Bahia Grande Award will be accomplished through a subaward in the amount of $4,363,391 from TCEQ to TNC. Through the subaward, TNC will acquire three properties in the Bahia Grande Coastal Corridor, which are expected to ultimately become part of the Laguna Atascosa NWR. These properties will connect Laguna Atascosa NWR, Lower Rio Grande Valley NWR, and Boca Chica State Park, as well as over 2 million acres of intact habitat on private ranchland with the 1.3 million acre Rio Bravo Protected Area. The connection provided by these properties will provide additional protection for, and could prevent future listing of State-threatened species like the reddish egret, Botteri's sparrow, white-tailed hawk, white-faced ibis, Texas tortoise, Texas indigo snake and Texas horned lizard. Conserving additional portions of the Bahia Grande wetland system and portions of its watershed will secure valuable freshwater inflows and allow partners to complete hydrological restoration needed to increase tidal flows and divert freshwater inflows needed to fully restore this system.

Will D. Spoon,

Program Analyst, Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council.

[FR Doc. 2016–28316 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–58–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the intention of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) to request that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approve the proposed information collection project: ''*The Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS) Patient-Centered Medical Home (PCMH) Items Demonstration Study.*'' In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, AHRQ invites the public to comment on this proposed information collection.

This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on August 3rd, 2016 and allowed 60 days for public comment. AHRQ did not receive any substantive comments. The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comment.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received by December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be submitted to: AHRQ's OMB Desk Officer by fax at (202) 395–6974 (attention: AHRQ's desk officer) or by email at *OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov* (attention: AHRQ's desk officer).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Doris Lefkowitz, AHRQ Reports Clearance Officer, (301) 427–1477, or by email at *doris.lefkowitz@AHRQ.hhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Proposed Project

''*The Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS) Patient-Centered Medical Home (PCMH) Items Demonstration Study.*''

This study is being conducted by AHRQ through its contractor, RAND, pursuant to AHRQ's statutory authority to conduct and support research on healthcare and on systems for the delivery of such care, including activities with respect to the quality, effectiveness, efficiency, appropriateness and value of healthcare services and with respect to quality measurement and improvement. 42 U.S.C. 299a(a)(1) and (2).

Method of Collection

The patient-centered medical home (PCMH) is a model for delivering primary care that is patient-centered, comprehensive, coordinated, accessible, and continuously improved through a systems-based approach to quality and safety.

As primary care practices across the United States seek National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA) recognition as patient-centered medical homes (PCMH), they can choose to administer the Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS®) Clinician and Group (CG–CAHPS) survey with or without the PCMH supplemental item set (AHRQ, 2010; Hays et al., 2014; Ng et al., 2016; Scholle et al., 2012). NCQA offers a special patient experience distinction to practices that opt to use the CAHPS PCMH items set in their CG–CAHPS survey tool. While over 11,000 practices, representing an estimated 15–18% of primary care physicians, are currently recognized for PCMH by NCQA (NCQA, 2015), fewer than 3% of them submit patient experience surveys to NCQA when applying for recognition under NCQA's PCMH recognition program.

Despite the rapid movement toward PCMH primary care transformation and the increasing use of CAHPS PCMH items, little is known about the ways in which practices are using these CAHPS data and the PCMH supplemental item information (about access, comprehensiveness, self-management, shared decision making, coordination of care, and information about care and appointments) to understand and improve their patients' experiences during PCMH transformation. The PCMH Items Demonstration Study will investigate:

- How practices across the U.S. use CAHPS and the PCMH item set during PCMH transformation,
- How practices assemble and select items for inclusion in their patient experience surveys (*e.g.* core, PCMH, supplemental, and custom items),
- Primary care practice leaders' perspectives on NCQA PCMH Recognition and CAHPS Patient Experience Distinction,
- Effects of changes made during PCMH transformation on patient experiences reported on CAHPS surveys and any PCMH items, and
- Associations between PCMH transformation and patient experience scores.

To achieve the goals of this project the following data collections will be implemented:

(1) Office Manager Questions administered via phone about the participating practice's characteristics to describe the type of practices in the study and to understand how practice characteristics influence PCMH transformation and patient experience.

(2) Physician Interviews administered via phone with the lead PCMH clinical expert about the details, decisions and processes of PCMH transformation, NCQA PCMH Recognition and CAHPS Patient Experience Distinction and their use of patient experience data during the transformation process.

(3) PCMH–A Assessment Tool to be completed by the lead PCMH clinical expert (before or after the interview on the standardized form via fax or email) to collect validated metrics on the ''PCMH-ness'' of the practice.

(4) CAHPS Patient Experience Data Files, which are patient-level de-identified CAHPS patient experience data covering the period of PCMH transformation for the participating practice. These data are collected independently of this study by the practice (or network) via their current vendor. We will work with the PCMH clinical expert (or a person they designate who handles their data) in each of the participating practices to submit these CAHPS data files securely to RAND to understand practices' CAHPS patient experience trends and associations with PCMH implementation during practices' PCMH journey.

Characterizing primary care practices' use of CAHPS and PCMH items will provide important insight into the activities practices conduct during PCMH transformation to improve patient experience scores. This information may be useful in supporting practices that lag behind their peers, learning from practices with outstanding records of patient experience, and providing recommendations that may be used to refine the content of the CAHPS survey items.

Estimated Annual Respondent Burden

Table 1 shows the estimated annualized burden and cost for the respondents' time to participate in this data collection. These burden estimates are based on tests of data collection conducted on nine or fewer entities. As indicated below, the annual total burden hours are estimated to be 179 hours. The annual total cost associated with the annual total burden hours is estimated to be $16,899.

Table 1 shows the estimated annualized burden for the respondents' time to participate in this data collection. The PCMH Items Demonstration Study will recruit 150 practices including the participating practices' office managers and one physician/lead PCMH clinical expert. We will recruit and administer the Office Manager Questions by phone to 150 office managers, recruit all sampled physicians by sending them a recruitment packet that includes a cover letter, an AHRQ endorsement letter and an info sheet, and then administer the Physician Interview protocol questions by phone to 150 physicians, and 150 physicians will self-administer the PCMH–A Assessment Tool.

We have calculated our burden estimate for Office Manager Questions asked during physician recruitment using an estimate of 3–5 questions a minute as the Office Manager Questions are closed-ended survey questions. The Office Manager Questions contains 17 questions and is estimated to require an average of 5 minutes; this estimate is supported by the information gathered during a pilot of these questions. For the Physician Interview, we have calculated the burden estimate to require an average of 40 minutes per interview. For the PCMH–A Assessment Tool, we calculated our burden using a conservative estimate of 4.5 items per minute. Prior work suggests that 3–5 items on an assessment tool can typically be completed per minute, depending on item complexity and respondent characteristics (Berry, 2009; Hays & Reeve, 2010). The PCMH–A Assessment tool contains 36 items and is estimated to require an average completion time of 8–10 minutes.

Participating practices will be asked to submit any available CAHPS Patient Experience data files (*e.g.* submission of de-identified data including a data dictionary via encrypted transfer) for the period of time covering their NCQA

PCMH Recognition history. Each practice will have an average estimate of 3 CAHPS Patient Experience data files to submit per one submission, which we based on the average number of years of PCMH history of the sample. In addition, we conservatively estimate that half of the control practices (25/50) administer CG–CAHPS data, as this percentage is unknown; while 90% of the participating current and past CAHPS practices (90/100) will submit CAHPS data, yielding 115 submissions of CAHPS patient experience data files. As indicated below, the annual total burden is estimated to be 179 hours.

EXHIBIT 1—ESTIMATED ANNUALIZED BURDEN HOURS

Data collection task	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Hours per response	Total burden hours
Office Manager Questions	150	1	5/60	12.5
Physician Interview	150	1	40/60	100
PCMH–A Assessment Tool	150 (Same Physicians as above).	1 (same person as above).	15/60	37.5
CAHPS Patient Experience Data Files	115	1 per practice	15/60	28.75
Total	415	1	75/60	178.75

+ The same respondent completes the Physician Interview and PCMH–A Assessment Tool and submits the CAHPS Patient Experience Data Files.

EXHIBIT 2—ESTIMATED ANNUALIZED COST BURDEN

Data collection task	Number of requests	Total burden hours	Average hourly wage rate *	Total cost burden
Office Manager Questions	150	12.5	$57.44 [a]	$718.00
Physician Interview	150	100	97.33 [b]	9,733.00
PCMH–A Assessment Tool	150	37.5	97.33 [b]	3,649.88
CAHPS Patient Experience Data Files	115	28.75	97.33 [b]	2,798.24
Total	300	178.75	55.48	16,899.12

+ The same respondent completes the Physician Interview and PCMH–A Assessment Tool and submits the CAHPS Patient Experience Data Files.

* Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2015 National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates United States, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. *http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm*

[a] Based on the mean wages for *General and Operations Managers, 11–1021 within Healthcare Support Occupations,* the occupational group most likely tasked with completing the Office Manager Questions.

[a] Based on the mean wages for *Physicians and Surgeons, 29–1060,* the occupational group most likely tasked with completing the Physician Interview, PCMH–A Assessment Tool, and submitting the CAHPS Patient Experience Data Files.

Request for Comments

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, comments on AHRQ's information collection are requested with regard to any of the following: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of AHRQ health care research and health care information dissemination functions, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of AHRQ's estimate of burden (including hours and costs) of the proposed collection(s) of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information upon the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and included in the Agency's subsequent request for OMB approval of the proposed information collection. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Sharon B. Arnold,

Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. 2016–28155 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–90–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Statement of Organization, Functions, and Delegations of Authority

Part C (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) of the Statement of Organization, Functions, and Delegations of Authority of the Department of Health and Human Services (45 FR 67772–76, dated October 14, 1980, and corrected at 45 FR 69296, October 20, 1980, as amended most recently at 81 FR 66284–66285, dated September 27, 2016) is amended to reflect the reorganization of the Human Resources Office, Office of the Chief Operating Officer, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Section C–B, Organization and Functions, is hereby amended as follows:

Delete in its entirety the title and the mission and function statements for the *Human Resources Office (CAJQ)* and insert the following:

Human Resources Office (CAJQ). (1) Provides leadership, policy formation, oversight, guidance, service, and advisory support and assistance to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR); (2) collaborates as appropriate, with the CDC Office of the Director (OD), Centers/Institute/Offices (CIOs), domestic and international agencies and organizations; and provides a focus for short- and long-term planning within the Human Resource Office (HRO); (3) develops and administers human capital and human resource management policies; (4) serves as the business steward for all CDC developed human capital and human resources management systems and applications; (5) develops,

maintains, and supports information systems to conduct personnel activities and provide timely information and analyses of personnel and staffing to management and employees; (6) conducts and coordinates human resources management for civil service and Commissioned Corps personnel; (7) manages the administration of fellowship programs; (8) conducts recruitment, special emphasis, staffing, position classification, position management, pay and leave administration, work-life programs, performance management, employee training and development, and employee and labor relations programs; (9) maintains personnel records and reports, and processes personnel actions and documents; (10) administers the federal life and health insurance programs; (11) administers employee recognition, suggestion, and incentive awards programs; (12) furnishes advice and assistance in the processing of workers compensation claims; (13) interprets standards of conduct regulations, reviews financial disclosure reports, and offers ethics training and counseling services to CDC/ATSDR employees; (14) maintains liaison with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) on human resources management, policy, compliance and execution of the Human Capital Assessment and Accountability Framework; (15) conducts organizational assessments to determine compliance with human capital policies, guidance, regulatory and statutory requirements of federal human capital and resource management programs and initiatives; (16) plans, directs, and manages CDC/ATSDR-wide training programs, monitors compliance with mandatory training requirements, and maximizes economies of scale through systematic planning and evaluation of agency-wide training initiatives to assist employees in achieving required competencies; (17) assists in the definition and analysis of training needs and develops and evaluates instructional products designed to meet those needs; (18) develops, designs, and implements a comprehensive leadership and career management program for all occupational series throughout CDC/ATSDR; (19) provides technical assistance in organizational development, career management, employee development, and training; (20) collaborates and works with partners, internally and externally, to develop workforce goals and a strategic vision for the public health workforce; (21) provides support for succession planning, forecasting services, and environmental scanning to ascertain both current and future public health workforce needs; and (22) administers and maintains the customer service help desk.

Office of the Director (CAJQ1). (1) Provides leadership and overall direction for HRO; (2) develops goals and objectives, and provides leadership, policy formation, oversight, and guidance in program planning and development; (3) plans, coordinates, and develops strategic plans for HRO; (4) develops and administers human capital and human resource management policies and procedures; (5) coordinates all program reviews; (6) provides technical assistance and consultation in the development of proposed legislation, Congressional testimony, and briefing materials; (7) establishes performance metrics and coordinates quarterly reviews to ascertain status on meeting of the metrics; (8) coordinates budget formulation, negotiation, and execution of financial resources; (9) identifies relevant scanning/benchmarking on workforce and career development processes, services and products; (10) provides leadership and guidance on new developments and national trends for the public health workforce; (11) establishes and oversees policies governing human capital and human resources management, and works collaboratively within CDC/ATSDR and other components in planning, developing and implementing policies; (12) develops strategic plans for information technology and information systems required to support human capital and human resources management information requirements; (13) serves as the business steward for CDC/ATSDR-wide human capital and human resources administrative systems and advocates and supports the commitment of resources to application development; (14) coordinates HR information resource management activities with the Management Information Systems Office and the related governance groups; (15) coordinates management information systems and analyses of data for improved utilization of resources; (16) serves as a liaison with HHS on the utilization and deployment of centralized HHS human capital and human resource management systems and applications; (17) applies standards of conduct regulations, reviews financial disclosure reports, and offers ethics training and counseling services to CDC/ATSDR employees; and (18) conducts demographic analysis of the CDC/ATSDR work force and publishes results in management reports.

Ethics and Compliance Activity (CAJQ12). (1) Oversees the CDC/ATSDR ethics and compliance program to ensure that processes and procedures are in place to ensure compliance with government-wide ethics statutes, regulations, and standards; (2) identifies and corrects weaknesses in policy, training, and monitoring to prevent CDC/ATSDR non-compliance of HHS supplemental ethics regulations; (3) serves as a liaison between the Office of Government Ethics and HHS on ethics matters; (4) applies standards of conduct regulations; (5) reviews financial disclosure reports for potential conflicts of interest; (6) provides continuing ethics training and counseling services; and (7) reviews and approve ethics-related requests for employees.

Commissioned Corps Activity (CAJQ14). (1) Serves as the primary contact for CDC/ATSDR management and employees in obtaining the full range of personnel assistance and management services for Commissioned Corps personnel; (2) provides leadership, technical assistance, guidance, and consultation in benefits, entitlements, and obligations of the Commissioned Corps to commissioned officers; (3) plans, directs, and manages the Department of Defense's Defense Eligibility Enrollment Report System identification card program for all active duty officers, retirees, and eligible dependents; (4) implements and evaluates Commissioned Corps policies and systems such as salary/benefits, performance management, assignments, health benefits, training, travel, relocation, and retirement; (5) manages the CDC/ATSDR's Commissioned Corps promotion and awards programs; (6) maintains liaison and coordinates personnel services for Commissioned Corps personnel with the Office of Commissioned Corps Operations and the Office of Surgeon General; (7) coordinates the agency deployment status of commissioned officers assigned to CDC and manages the Emergency Operation Center (EOC) Commissioned Corps deployment desk during activation of the CDC EOC; and (8) establishes and maintains personnel and payroll records and files.

Policy and Communications Activity (CAJQ15). (1) Provides leadership, oversight, guidance and support for policy and communication activities supporting HRO; (2) develops, administers and monitors the implementation of human capital and human resources management policies and operational procedures as directed

by OPM, HHS, CDC/ATSDR or other pertinent federal agencies to ensure consistent application across CDC/ATSDR; (3) serves as the focal point for the analysis, development, technical review and clearance of controlled correspondence and non-scientific policy documents that require approval/signature from the HRO Director or other senior CDC/ATSDR leadership; (4) responds to and coordinates requests from the OD for issues management information to ensure efficient responses to the Director's priority issues; (5) provides and manages a wide range of communication services in support of HRO; (6) facilitates open and transparent employee communication; (7) develops and implements internal and external public relations strategies to communicate upward and outward to customers, partners, and other stakeholders; and (8) utilizes multiple channels and methods to communicate and disseminate HR policies, announcements, procedures, information, and other relevant messages.

Operations Management Activity (CAJQ17). (1) Provides leadership, oversight, and guidance in the management and operations of HRO programs; (2) provides and oversees the delivery of HRO-wide administrative management and support services in the areas of fiscal management, personnel, travel, records management, internal controls, and other administrative services; (3) prepares annual budget formulation and budget justifications; (4) coordinates HRO requirements relating to contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, and reimbursable agreements; (5) develops and implements administrative policies, procedures, and operations, as appropriate, for HRO, and prepares special reports and studies, as required, in the administrative management areas; and (6) maintains liaison with related staff offices and other officials of CDC/ATSDR.

Customer Service Help Desk Activity (CAJQ18). (1) Provides technical assistance, guidance, and consultation on employee and labor relations, employee services, pay, leave and benefits administration, staffing and recruitment, position classification; (2) Provide issues management and resolution support to HRO as well as internal and external customers; (3) manage workload assessment and customer based training; (4) monitor customer satisfaction, (5) track and assess key performance indicators and other reporting requirements; and (6) administers and maintains the customer service help desk.

Strategic Programs Office (CAJQB). (1) Provides a broad array of strategic programs, workforce support, and development services; (2) develops and implements methodologies to measure, evaluate, and improve human capital results to ensure mission alignment; (3) assesses and evaluates the overall effectiveness and compliance of human resources programs and policies related to merit-based decision-making and compliance with laws and regulations; (4) works with the OPM, HHS, and CDC Governance Boards and agency managers to carry out human capital management planning and development activities; and (5) establishes, coordinates, develops, and monitors implementation of human capital initiatives and the agency Strategic Human Capital Management Plan.

Office of the Director (CAJQB1). (1) Provides leadership and overall direction for the Strategic Program Office (SPO); (2) develops goals and objectives, and provides leadership, policy formation, oversight, and guidance in program planning and development; (3) plans, coordinates, and develops strategic plans for the SPO; (4) develops and administers human capital and human resource management policies and procedures; (5) coordinates all program reviews; (6) provides technical assistance and consultation to the activities within the SPO; (7) establishes performance metrics and coordinates reviews to ascertain status on meeting of the metrics; and (8) coordinates, develops, and monitors implementation of human capital initiatives and the agency Strategic Human Capital Management Plan.

Human Capital Effectiveness and Accountability Activity (CAJQB2). (1) Operates as an internal audit function to maintain the operational integrity of human resources and human capital areas and safeguards legal and regulatory requirements; (2) ensures that human capital goals and programs are aligned with and support CDC/ATSDR missions; (3) ensures that human capital planning is guided by a data driven, results-oriented process toward goal achievement; (4) ensures that managers and HR practitioners are held accountable for their human capital decisions; (5) assesses the effectiveness and efficiency of the HR function; (6) ensures human capital programs and policies adhere to merit system principles and other pertinent laws and regulations; (7) conducts recurring delegated examining audits and periodic human capital management reviews to verify and validate the level of compliance and performance; and (8) implements a plan for addressing issues or problems identified during accountability audits and related activities.

Workforce Planning Activity (CAJQB3). (1) Advises and facilitates strategic workforce planning and development for CDC/ATSDR; (2) supports HRO and CIO program officials in the development, implementation and evaluation of workforce plans, policies, and initiatives; (3) serves as a liaison with HHS and entities within and outside the Agency to develop CDC/ATSDR's human capital management direction and strategies; (4) coordinates the development and implementation of an agency-wide strategic human capital plan; (5) identifies mission-critical occupations and associated competencies to assess potential gaps in occupations and competencies that are essential to CDC/ATSDR achieving its strategic goals; (6) reports on CDC/ATSDR's progress in meeting human capital management improvement objectives associated with HHS-wide and government-wide human capital management improvement; (7) develops and executes a strategic hiring plan to facilitate the recruitment and retention of members of under-represented groups and for closing occupational series and/or competency gaps in the workforce; (8) provides recruitment, retention, consultation and support to customers; and (9) supports CIO-specific, mission-critical work by managing various training programs designed to provide students, postgraduates, and university faculty with opportunities to participate in projects and assignments in support of CDC/ATSDR's missions.

Information Systems and Data Analytics Activity (CAJQB4). (1) Oversees all human resources information technology CDC/ATSDR systems and serves as the liaison to HHS in the development, maintenance, and support of Department-wide human resource information systems and applications; (2) manages capital planning and investment control activities related to all CDC/ATSDR developed human capital and human resources management systems and applications; (3) serves as liaison and provides support in the development and maintenance of HHS enterprise human resources systems; (4) facilitates the administration, analysis and reporting of, and provides recommendations for, business process improvements in regards to survey data or other business process reengineering efforts; (5) supports periodic reporting requirements from CDC/ATSDR, HHS, OPM, and Office of Management and Budget (OMB); (6) provides business

strategy, data analytics, and reporting services; (7) performs analysis, forecasting, and modeling to interpret quantitative and qualitative data; (8) reports and evaluates organizational performance outcomes on key measures and metrics; (9) oversees the human resources governance structure and change control board activities; (10) develops strategic plans for information technology and information systems required to support human capital and human resources management information requirements; (11) coordinates HR information resource management activities with the Management Information Systems Office and the related governance groups; and (12) coordinates management information systems and analyses of data for improved utilization of resources;

CDC University Office (CAJQC). (1) Provides agency-wide leadership and guidance in all functional areas related to training and career development; (2) designs, develops, implements and evaluates a comprehensive strategic human resource leadership and career training and development program for all occupational series throughout CDC; (3) develops and implements training strategies and activities that contribute to the agency's mission, goals and objectives; (4) maximizes economies of scale through systematic planning, administration, delivery, and evaluation of agency-wide training initiatives to assist CDC employees in achieving required competencies; (5) development of retraining activities for CDC managers/employees affected by organizational changes (*e.g.* major reorganizations, outsourcing initiatives, etc.); (6) maintains employee training records; (7) develops and validates occupational and functional competencies and develops related training plans and career maps; (8) develops and administers professional development programs; (9) administers and monitors the Training and Learning Management System for compliance with the Government Employees Training Act; (10) conducts training needs assessment of employees, provides analysis and data to correlate individual training with strategic plans; (11) develops and maintains assessment tools to identify core competency requirements for each occupational series throughout the agency; (12) provides consultation, guidance, and technical assistance to managers and employees in organizational development, career management, employee development, and training; (13) develops and delivers education and training programs to meet the identified needs of the workforce; (14) promotes, develops, and implements training needs assessment methodology to establish priorities for training interventions; (15) collaborates, as appropriate, with the CDC/OD, CIOs, HHS, OPM and other domestic and international agencies and organizations; and (16) develops and implements policies related to employee training.

Office of the Director (CAJQC1). (1) Provides leadership and overall direction for the CDC University Office; (2) develops goals and objectives, and provides leadership, policy formation, oversight, and guidance in program planning and development; (3) plans, coordinates, and develops strategic plans for the CDC University Offices; (4) coordinates all program reviews; (5) provides technical assistance and consultation to the activities within the CDC University Office; (6) establishes performance metrics and coordinates reviews to ascertain status on meeting of the metrics; and (7) coordinates, develops, and monitors implementation of training initiatives for the agency.

Career Development Activity (CAJQC2). (1) Designs, develops, implements and evaluates training activities to increase competency in the area of career development strategies; (2) maximizes economies of scale through systematic planning, administration, delivery, and evaluation of agency-wide training initiatives to assist CDC/ATSDR employees in achieving required competencies; (3) develops retraining activities for CDC/ATSDR managers/employees affected by organizational changes (*e.g.* major reorganizations, outsourcing initiatives, etc.); (4) maintains employee training records; (5) develops and validates occupational and functional competencies and develops related training plans and career maps; (6) develops and administers professional development programs to include mentoring and coaching for enhanced performance; (7) conducts training needs assessment of employees, provides analysis and data to correlate individual training with strategic plans; (8) develops and maintains assessment tools to identify core competency requirements for each occupational series throughout the agency; (9) provides consultation, guidance, and technical assistance to managers and employees in organizational development, career management, employee development, and training; (10) promotes, develops, and implements training needs assessment methodology to establish priorities for training interventions; (11) collaborates, as appropriate, with the CDC/ATSDR/OD, CIOs, HHS, OPM and other domestic and international agencies and organizations; (12) implements procedural components in compliance to the long term education training policy; and (13) conducts New Employee Orientation for the agency.

Leadership Development Activity (CAJQC3). (1) Designs, develops, implements and evaluates a comprehensive leadership development curriculum for leaders at all levels throughout CDC/ATSDR; (2) develops and implements leadership training strategies and activities that contribute to the agency's mission, goals and objectives; (3) maximizes economies of scale through systematic planning, administration, delivery, and evaluation of agency-wide training initiatives to assist CDC/ATSDR employees in achieving required competencies; (4) maintains employee training records; (5) develops and administers professional development programs such as executive coaching; (6) provides consultation, guidance, and technical assistance to managers and employees around leadership training and development activities; (7) develops and delivers education and training programs to meet the identified needs of the workforce; (8) collaborates, as appropriate, with the CDC/ATSDR/OD, CIOs, HHS, OPM and other domestic and international agencies and organizations; and (9) implements procedural components in compliance to the mandatory supervisory training requirements policy.

Public Health Training Activity (CAJQC4). (1) Designs, develops, implements and evaluates a comprehensive public health training curriculum for employees engaged in public health activities throughout CDC/ATSDR; (2) develops and implements public health, science, research and medicine and preparedness and emergency response training strategies and activities that contribute to the agency's mission, goals and objectives; (3) maximizes economies of scale through systematic planning, administration, delivery, and evaluation of agency-wide training initiatives to assist CDC employees in achieving required competencies; (4) maintains employee training records; (5) provides consultation, guidance, and technical assistance to managers and employees associated within curriculum scope; (6) develops and delivers education and training programs to meet the identified needs of the workforce; and (7) collaborates, as appropriate, with the CDC/ATSDR/OD, CIOs, HHS, OPM and

other domestic and international agencies and organizations.

Business and Technology Training Activity (CAJQC5). (1) Designs, develops, implements and evaluates a comprehensive business and technology training curriculum for employees throughout CDC/ATSDR; (2) develops and implements financial, acquisition and project management, communication and office skills and information technology training strategies and activities that contribute to the agency's mission, goals and objectives; (3) maximizes economies of scale through systematic planning, administration, delivery, and evaluation of agency-wide training initiatives to assist CDC/ATSDR employees in achieving required competencies; (4) maintains employee training records; (5) provides consultation, guidance, and technical assistance to managers and employees associated within curriculum scope; (6) develops and delivers education and training programs to meet the identified needs of the workforce; and (7) collaborates, as appropriate, with the CDC/ATSDR/OD, CIOs, HHS, OPM and other domestic and international agencies and organizations.

Workforce Relations Office (CAJQD). (1) Provides leadership, technical assistance, guidance, and consultation on employee and labor relations, employee services and assistance, work-life programs, performance management, incentive awards, pay, leave and benefits administration, on-the-job injuries and exposures to infectious diseases, debt complaints and other job-related issues; (2) develops and administers labor-management and employee relations program including: Disciplinary actions, grievances and appeals, labor negotiations, collective bargaining, management representation before third parties, and partnership activities; (3) serves as liaison with the Office of Safety, Security and Asset Management (OSSAM) and other CDC/ATSDR staff for personnel matters relating to substance abuse and other employee assistance programs; (4) coordinates and processes garnishment, child support, and other collection actions for CDC/ATSDR employees; (5) plans, directs, coordinates, and conducts contract negotiations on behalf of agency management with labor organizations holding exclusive recognition; (6) represents management in third party proceedings involving labor and employee relations issues; (7) serves as the authority to ensure validity, consistency, and legality of employee relations matters concerning grievances (both negotiated and agency procedures), disciplinary actions, adverse actions, and resultant third party hearings; (8) plans and coordinates all programmatic activities to include preparation of disciplinary and adverse action letters and all final agency decisions in grievances and appeals; (9) provides technical advice, consultation, and training on matters of employee conduct and performance; (10) provides consultation, guidance, and technical advice to human resources specialists, managers, and employees on the development, coordination and implementation of all work-life program initiatives; (11) provides personnel services relating to on-the-job injuries and exposures to infectious diseases; (12) facilitates the development and implementation of an agency-wide strategic approach to monitoring, evaluating, aligning, and improving performance management policies and practices for all CDC performance management systems (Title 5, Title 42, Senior Executive Service (SES), Senior Biomedical Research Service (SBRS), and the Commissioned Officer Effectiveness Report (COER); (13) coordinates performance management, strategic rewards and recognition programs and systems; (14) provides human resources services and assistance on domestic and international employee benefits and leave administration; (15) serves as liaison between CDC/ATSDR and the HHS payroll office resolving discrepancies with pay and leave; (16) administers the leave donor program and processes time and attendance amendments; (17) administers the federal life and health insurance programs; (18) provides policy guidance and technical advice and assistance on retirement, the Thrift Savings Plan, health/life insurance, and savings bonds; and (19) furnishes advice and assistance in the processing of Office of Workers' Compensation Program claims and the Voluntary Leave Donation Program;

Office of the Director (CAJQD1). (1) Provides leadership and overall direction for the Workforce Relations Office; (2) develops goals and objectives, and provides leadership, policy formation, oversight, and guidance in program planning and development; (3) plans, coordinates, and develops strategic plans for the Workforce Relations Offices; (4) coordinates all program reviews; (5) provides technical assistance and consultation to the activities within the Workforce Relations Office; and (6) coordinates, develops, and monitors implementation of program initiatives.

Employee and Labor Relations Activity (CAJQD2). (1) Provides leadership, technical assistance, guidance, and consultation on employee and labor relations, employee services; (2) develops and administers labor-management and employee relations program including: disciplinary actions, grievances and appeals, labor negotiations, collective bargaining, management representation before third parties, and partnership activities; (3) serves as liaison with OSSAM and other CDC/ATSDR staff for personnel matters relating to substance abuse and other employee assistance programs; (4) coordinates and processes garnishment, child support, and other collection actions for CDC/ATSDR employees; (5) plans, directs, coordinates, and conducts contract negotiations on behalf of agency management with labor organizations holding exclusive recognition; (6) represents management in third party proceedings involving labor and employee relations issues; (7) serves as the authority to ensure validity, consistency, and legality of employee relations matters concerning grievances (both negotiated and agency procedures), disciplinary actions, adverse actions, and resultant third party hearings; (8) plans and coordinates all programmatic activities to include preparation of disciplinary and adverse action letters and all final agency decisions in grievances and appeals; (9) provides technical advice, consultation, and training on matters of employee conduct and performance; and (10) provides consultation, guidance, and technical advice to human resources specialists, managers, and employees on the development.

Employee Benefits, WorkLife Programs and Payroll Activity (CAJQD3). (1) Provides consultation, guidance, and technical advice to human resources specialists, managers, and employees on the development, coordination and implementation of all WorkLife program initiatives; (2) provides personnel services relating to on-the-job injuries and exposures to infectious diseases; (3) provides human resources services and assistance on domestic and international employee benefits and leave administration; (4) serves as liaison between CDC/ATSDR and the HHS payroll office resolving discrepancies with pay and leave; (5) administers the leave donor program and processes time and attendance amendments; (6) administers the federal life and health insurance programs; (7) provides policy guidance and technical advice and assistance on retirement, the Thrift Savings Plan, health/life

insurance, and savings bonds; and (8) furnishes advice and assistance in the processing of Office of Workers' Compensation Program claims and the Voluntary Leave Donation Program.

Performance Management, Strategic Rewards and Recognitions Activity (CAJQD4). (1) Facilitates the development and implementation of an agency-wide strategic approach to monitoring, evaluating, aligning, and improving performance management policies and practices for all CDC/ATSDR performance management systems (Title 5, Title 42, SES, SBRS, and the COER); and (2) coordinates performance management, strategic rewards and recognition programs and systems.

Client Services Office (CAJQE). (1) Serves as the primary contact for CDC/ATSDR management and employees in obtaining the full range of personnel assistance and management services for civil service personnel; (2) provides leadership, technical assistance, guidance, and consultation in human resource utilization, position management, classification and pay administration, recruitment, staffing, placement, reorganizations, program evaluation, and personnel records and files management; (3) maintains liaison with HHS and OPM in the area of human resources management; (4) provides leadership in identifying the CIOs recruiting needs, and assesses, analyzes, and assists CDC/ATSDR programs in developing and executing short- and long-range hiring plans to meet these needs; (5) provides guidance to CDC/ATSDR organizations in the development of staffing plans and job analyses, evaluating/classifying position descriptions, conducting position management studies, and responding to desk audit requests; (6) processes personnel actions by determining position classification, issuing vacancy announcements, assisting in development of selection criteria, conducting examining under delegated examining authority, conducting candidate rating and ranking under CDC Merit Promotion Plan, making qualification determinations, determining pay, conducting reductions-in-force, effecting appointments and processing other actions; (7) codes and finalizes all personnel actions in the automated personnel data system, personnel action processing, data quality control/assessment, and files/records management; (8) plans, develops, implements, and evaluates systems to ensure consistently high quality human resources services; (9) establishes objectives, standards, and internal controls; (10) evaluates, analyzes, and makes recommendations to improve personnel authorities, policies, systems, operations, and procedures; (11) manages various staffing programs such as the CDC summer program, Priority Placement Program, Priority Consideration Program, the Interagency Career Transition Assistance Program, and the Career Transition Assistance Program and other special emphasis programs; (12) provides consultation, guidance, and technical advice on recruitment and special emphasis policies, practices, and procedures, including search committees, strategizes on the best approach to recruitment at specific events, and designs and develops recruitment materials for events; (13) establishes and maintains personnel records, files, and controls; (14) establishes and maintains the official personnel files system and administers personnel records storage and disposal program; (15) collaborates with Personnel Security in initiating suitability background checks and fingerprints for all CDC/ATSDR personnel; (16) responds to employment verification inquiries; and (17) administers the Special Emphasis Programs and Student Intern/Fellowship Programs.

Office of the Director (CAJQE1). (1) Provides leadership and overall direction for the Client Services Office; (2) develops goals and objectives, and provides leadership, policy formation, oversight, and guidance in program planning and development; (3) plans, coordinates, and develops strategic plans for the Client Services Offices; (4) coordinates all program reviews; (5) provides technical assistance and consultation to the Activities within the Client Services Office; and (6) coordinates, develops, and monitors implementation of program initiatives.

Customer Staffing Activity 1 (CAJQE2). (1) Supports the CDC, OD, Business Services Offices, Staff Offices, Office of Public Health Scientific Services, Office of State, Tribal, Local and Territorial Support; (2) provides leadership in identifying CIOs recruiting needs, and assesses, analyzes, and assists CDC programs in developing and executing short- and long-range hiring plans to meet these needs; (3) provides guidance to CDC organizations in the development of staffing plans and job analyses; (4) processes personnel actions by issuing vacancy announcements, assisting in development of selection criteria, conducting examinations under delegated examining authority, conducting candidate rating and ranking under CDC Merit Promotion Plan, making qualification determinations, determining pay, conducting reductions-in-force, effecting appointments and processing other actions; (5) plans, develops, implements, and evaluates systems to ensure consistently high quality human resources services; (6) establishes objectives, standards, and internal controls; (7) evaluates, analyzes, and makes recommendations to improve personnel authorities, policies, systems, operations, and procedures; (8) provides consultation, guidance, and technical advice on recruitment and special emphasis policies, practices, and procedures, including search committees, strategizes on the best approach to recruitment at specific events, and designs and develops recruitment materials for events; (9) provides leadership, technical assistance, guidance, and consultation in human resource utilization, position management, classification and pay administration; and (10) codes and finalizes all personnel actions in the automated personnel data system; data quality control/assessment, and files/records management.

Customer Staffing Activity 2 (CAJQE3). (1) Supports the Office of Non-communicable Diseases, Injury and Environmental Health and subordinate Centers, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, and the National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities; (2) provides leadership in identifying CIOs recruiting needs, and assesses, analyzes, and assists CDC/ATSDR programs in developing and executing short- and long-range hiring plans to meet these needs; (3) provides guidance to CDC/ATSDR organizations in the development of staffing plans and job analyses; (4) processes personnel actions by issuing vacancy announcements, assisting in development of selection criteria, conducting examinations under delegated examining authority, conducting candidate rating and ranking under CDC Merit Promotion Plan, making qualification determinations, determining pay, conducting reductions-in-force, effecting appointments and processing other actions; (5) plans, develops, implements, and evaluates systems to ensure consistently high quality human resources services; (6) establishes objectives, standards, and internal controls; (7) evaluates, analyzes, and makes recommendations to improve personnel authorities, policies, systems,

operations, and procedures; (8) provides consultation, guidance, and technical advice on recruitment and special emphasis policies, practices, and procedures, including search committees; strategizes on the best approach to recruitment at specific events, and designs and develops recruitment materials for events; (9) provides leadership, technical assistance, guidance, and consultation in human resource utilization, position management, classification and pay administration; and (10) codes and finalizes all personnel actions in the automated personnel data system and ensures data quality control/assessment, and files/records management.

Customer Staffing Activity 3 (CAJQE4). (1) Supports the National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases, National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, and the Office of Infectious Diseases; (2) provides leadership in identifying CIOs recruiting needs, and assesses, analyzes, and assists CDC/ATSDR programs in developing and executing short- and long-range hiring plans to meet these needs; (3) provides guidance to CDC organizations in the development of staffing plans and job analyses; (4) processes personnel actions by issuing vacancy announcements, assisting in development of selection criteria, conducting examinations under delegated examining authority, conducting candidate rating and ranking under CDC Merit Promotion Plan, making qualification determinations, determining pay, conducting reductions-in-force, effecting appointments and processing other actions; (5) plans, develops, implements, and evaluates systems to ensure consistently high quality human resources services; (6) establishes objectives, standards, and internal controls; (7) evaluates, analyzes, and makes recommendations to improve personnel authorities, policies, systems, operations, and procedures; (8) provides consultation, guidance, and technical advice on recruitment and special emphasis policies, practices, and procedures, including search committees; strategizes on the best approach to recruitment at specific events, and designs and develops recruitment materials for events; (9) provides leadership, technical assistance, guidance, and consultation in human resource utilization, position management, classification and pay administration; and (10) codes and finalizes all personnel actions in the automated personnel data system and ensures data quality control/assessment, and files/records management.

Classification and Advisory Activity (CAJQE5). (1) provides guidance to CDC/ATSDR organizations in the development of staffing plans and job analyses, evaluating/classifying position descriptions, conducting position management studies, and responding to desk audit requests; (2) provides leadership, technical assistance, guidance, and consultation in human resource utilization, position management, classification and pay administration; (3) provides leadership in identifying CIOs classification and position management needs; (4) provides guidance to CDC organizations in the development, evaluation/classification of position descriptions; (5) conducts position management studies and responds to desk audit requests; (6) reviews reorganization proposals and provides advice on proposed staffing plans and organizational structures; (7) plans, develops, implements, and evaluates systems to ensure consistently high quality human resources services; (8) establishes objectives, standards, and internal controls; and (9) evaluates, analyzes, and makes recommendations to improve personnel authorities, policies, systems, operations, and procedures.

Technical Services Activity (CAJQE6). (1) Processes personnel actions by determining pay, conducting reductions-in-force, effecting appointments and processing other actions; (2) codes and finalizes all personnel actions in the automated personnel data system, personnel action processing, data quality control/assessment, and files/records management; (3) establishes objectives, standards, and internal controls; (4) evaluates, analyzes, and makes recommendations to improve personnel authorities, policies, systems, operations, and procedures; (5) establishes and maintains personnel records, files, and controls; (6) establishes and maintains the official personnel files system and administers personnel records storage and disposal program; (7) collaborates with Personnel Security in initiating suitability background checks and fingerprints for all CDC/ATSDR personnel; and (8) responds to employment verification inquiries.

Customer Staffing Activity 4 (CAJQE7). (1) Supports the recruitment and staffing services for CDC/ATSDR's international workforce; (2) provides leadership in identifying the CDC/ATSDR international workforce recruiting needs, and assesses, analyzes, and assists programs in developing and executing short- and long-range hiring plans to meet these needs; (3) provides guidance to CDC/ATSDR in the development of staffing plans and job analyses; (4) processes personnel actions by issuing vacancy announcements, assisting in development of selection criteria, conducting examinations under delegated examining authority, conducting candidate rating and ranking under CDC Merit Promotion Plan, making qualification determinations, determining pay, conducting reductions-in-force, effecting appointments and processing other actions; (5) plans, develops, implements, and evaluates systems to ensure consistently high quality human resources services; (6) establishes objectives, standards, and internal controls; (7) evaluates, analyzes, and makes recommendations to improve personnel authorities, policies, systems, operations, and procedures; (8) provides consultation, guidance, and technical advice on recruitment and special emphasis policies, practices, and procedures, including search committees; strategizes on the best approach to recruitment at specific events, and designs and develops recruitment materials for events; (9) coordinates the provision of benefits, allowances, special pay requirements, labor and employee relations support services; (10) consults with the Department of State on utilization of State Department authorities to hire locally employed staff and coordination of records management requirements (11) provides leadership in identifying CIO's classification and position management needs; (12) provides guidance to CDC/ATSDR organizations in the development, evaluation/classification of position descriptions; (13) conducts position management studies and responds to desk audit requests; (14) codes and finalizes all personnel actions in the automated personnel data system and ensures data quality control/assessment, and files/records management; and (15) reviews all reorganization proposals and provides advice on proposed staffing plans and organizational structures.

Customer Staffing Activity 5 (CAJQE8). (1) Supports the Office of Public Health Preparedness and Response, and the National Center for HIV/AIDS, Virus Hepatitis, STD, and Tuberculosis Prevention; (2) provides leadership in identifying CIOs recruiting needs, and assesses, analyzes, and assists CDC programs in developing and executing short- and long-range hiring

plans to meet these needs; (3) provides guidance to CDC organizations in the development of staffing plans and job analyses; (4) processes personnel actions by issuing vacancy announcements, assisting in development of selection criteria, conducting examinations under delegated examining authority, conducting candidate rating and ranking under CDC Merit Promotion Plan, making qualification determinations, determining pay, conducting reductions-in-force, effecting appointments and processing other actions; (5) plans, develops, implements, and evaluates systems to ensure consistently high quality human resources services; (6) establishes objectives, standards, and internal controls; (7) evaluates, analyzes, and makes recommendations to improve personnel authorities, policies, systems, operations, and procedures; (8) provides consultation, guidance, and technical advice on recruitment and special emphasis policies, practices, and procedures, including search committees; strategizes on the best approach to recruitment at specific events, and designs and develops recruitment materials for events; (9) provides leadership, technical assistance, guidance, and consultation in human resource utilization, position management, classification and pay administration; and (10) codes and finalizes all personnel actions in the automated personnel data system and ensures data quality control/assessment, and files/records management.

Customer Staffing Activity 6 (CAJQE9). (1) Supports the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, the Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry, National Center for Environmental Health, and the Office of Public Health Scientific Services/Center for Surveillance, Epidemiology, and Laboratory Services; (2) provides leadership in identifying CIOs recruiting needs, and assesses, analyzes, and assists CDC programs in developing and executing short- and long-range hiring plans to meet these needs; (3) provides guidance to CDC organizations in the development of staffing plans and job analyses; (4) processes personnel actions by issuing vacancy announcements, assisting in development of selection criteria, conducting examinations under delegated examining authority, conducting candidate rating and ranking under CDC Merit Promotion Plan, making qualification determinations, determining pay, conducting reductions-in-force, effecting appointments and processing other actions; (5) plans, develops, implements, and evaluates systems to ensure consistently high quality human resources services; (6) establishes objectives, standards, and internal controls; (7) evaluates, analyzes, and makes recommendations to improve personnel authorities, policies, systems, operations, and procedures; (8) provides consultation, guidance, and technical advice on recruitment and special emphasis policies, practices, and procedures, including search committees; strategizes on the best approach to recruitment at specific events, and designs and develops recruitment materials for events; (9) provides leadership, technical assistance, guidance, and consultation in human resource utilization, position management, classification and pay administration; and (10) codes and finalizes all personnel actions in the automated personnel data system and ensures data quality control/assessment, and files/records management.

Special Emphasis Activity (CAJQE10). (1) Serves as the primary contact for CDC/ATSDR management and employees in obtaining the full range of personnel assistance and management services for excepted service personnel; (2) manages various staffing programs such as the CDC summer program, Priority Placement Program, Priority Consideration Program, the Interagency Career Transition Assistance Program, and the Career Transition Assistance Program, Pathways Program, Public Health Associates Program, and other special emphasis programs; (3) provides consultation, guidance, and technical advice on recruitment and special emphasis policies, practices, and procedures, including search committees, strategizes on the best approach to recruitment at specific events, and designs and develops recruitment materials for events; (4) establishes and maintains personnel records, files, and controls; (5) administers the Special Emphasis Programs and Student Intern/Fellowship Programs; (6) plans, develops, implements, and evaluates systems to ensure consistently high quality human resources services; (7) establishes objectives, standards, and internal controls; (8) evaluates, analyzes, and makes recommendations to improve personnel authorities, policies, systems, operations, and procedures; and (9) process the agency's Intergovernmental Personnel Act Employees.

Executive and Scientific Resources Office (CAJQG). (1) Provides leadership, technical assistance, guidance, and consultation in the administration of policies and procedures for appointment of individuals through the SBRS, SES, distinguished consultants, experts, consultants, and fellows under Title 42 appointment authorities;

(2) provides advisory services and technical assistance on pay and compensation guidelines in accordance with OPM rules and regulations, HHS and CDC/ATSDR established pay and compensation recommendation policies, and procedures; (3) provides expert human resources advisory services and technical assistance support to the CDC/ATSDR performance review boards and compensation committees; (4) reviews actions for statutory and regulatory compliance; (5) manages strategic recruitment, relocation, and retention incentives to facilitate attraction of a quality, diverse workforce to ensure accomplishment of the CDC/ATSDR missions; (6) provides performance management training for all SES and Title 42 executives with emphasis on performance systems, timelines, supervisory and employee responsibilities; (7) provides guidance on establishing performance plans, conducting mid-year reviews, and conducting final performance rating discussions and closing performance plans; (8) develops and maintains a standard Department-wide performance management system and forms for executives;(9) conducts reviews of SES performance plans and appraisals and provide feedback; (10) prepares and submits SES performance system certification request to OPM and OMB; (11) processes performance awards and performance-based pay adjustments; (12) provides advice, assistance, templates and training workshops on performance award and Presidential Rank Award requirements; (13) manages the HHS Executive Development Program, including developmental activities, rotational assignments, and the Candidate Development Program; (14) advises on development of executive succession planning activities; and (15) provides program guidance, administration, and oversight of CDC/ATSDR immigration and visa programs.

Office of the Director (CAJQG1). (1) Provides leadership and overall direction for the Executive and Scientific Resources Office (ESRO); (2) develops goals and objectives, and provides leadership, policy formation, oversight, and guidance in program planning and development; (3) plans, coordinates, and develops strategic plans for the Executive and Scientific Resources Office; (4) coordinates all program reviews; (5) provides technical

assistance and consultation to the activities within ESRO; and (6) coordinates, develops, and monitors implementation of program initiatives.

Senior Executive Compensation and Performance Activity (CAJQG2). (1) Provides advisory services, and technical assistance on pay and compensation guidelines in accordance with OPM rules and regulations, HHS and CDC/ATSDR established pay and compensation recommendation policies, and procedures; (2) provides expert human resources advisory services and technical assistance support to the CDC performance review boards and compensation committees; (3) reviews actions for statutory and regulatory compliance; (4) manages strategic recruitment, relocation, and retention incentives to facilitate attraction of a quality, diverse workforce to ensure accomplishment of the CDC/ATSDR missions; (5) provides performance management training for all SES and Title 42 executives with emphasis on performance systems, timelines, supervisory and employee responsibilities; (6) provides guidance on establishing performance plans, conducting mid-year reviews, and conducting final performance rating discussions and closing performance plans; (7) develops and maintains a standard Department-wide performance management system and forms for executives; (8) conducts reviews of SES performance plans and appraisals and provides feedback; (9) prepares and submits SES performance system certification request to OPM and OMB; (10) processes performance awards and performance-based pay adjustments; (11) provides advice, assistance, templates and training workshops on performance award and Presidential Rank Award requirements; (12) manages the HHS Executive Development Program, including developmental activities, rotational assignments, and the Candidate Development Program; and (13) advises on development of executive succession planning activities.

Title 42 Staffing and Recruitment Activity (CAJQG3). (1) Provides leadership, technical assistance, guidance, and consultation in the administration of policies and procedures for appointment of individuals through the distinguished consultants, experts, consultants, and fellows under Title 42 appointment authorities; and (2) administers and manages the Guest Researcher and Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education Program.

Immigration Activity (CAJQG4). (1) provides technical guidance and visa-assistance for employment based, CDC-sponsored visas; (2) administers and Manages the Exchange Visitor Program; (3) works closely with the US Office of Exchange and Cultural Affairs, US Citizenship and Immigration Services, US Department of Homeland Security, US Department of State, Office of the Secretary/DHHS, and US Department of Labor) to facilitate immigration procedures; (4) reviews, processes and files H–1B, O–1, and Green Card (I–140) Petitions with the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services; (5) provides advisory services and guidance on employment based green card petitions in the Alien of Extraordinary Ability category; (6) issues Certificate of Eligibility for J–1 Exchange Visitor Status through the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System to non US citizens seeking CDC J–1 visa sponsorship; (7) coordinates and provides consultations and guidance on Interested Government Agency Waivers; (8) provides Immigration Training Workshops to CDC/ATSDR Administrative Staff; and (9) determines the appointment mechanism, legal status, and work authorizations for non U.S. citizens through the Visitors Management System.

Sherri A. Berger,

Chief Operating Officer, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[FR Doc. 2016–28225 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Request for Nominations of Potential Reviewers To Serve on the Disease, Disability, and Injury Prevention and Control Special Emphasis Panel (SEP)

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) is soliciting nominations for possible membership on the Disease, Disability, and Injury Prevention and Control Special Emphasis Panel (SEP) in the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC).

The Disease, Disability, and Injury Prevention and Control Special Emphasis Panel provides advice and guidance to the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services (HHS); the Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and the Administrator, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) regarding the concept review, scientific and technical merit of grant and cooperative agreement assistance applications, and contract proposals relating to the causes, prevention, and control of diseases, disabilities, injuries, and impairments of public health significance; exposure to hazardous substances in the environment; health promotion and education; and other related activities that promote health and well-being.

Nominations are being sought for individuals who have expertise and qualifications necessary to contribute to the accomplishment of NCIPC SEP objectives. Reviewers with expertise in the following research fields for injury and violence prevention are sought to serve on the NCIPC SEPs, for research and evaluation related, but not limited to: Child abuse and neglect, prescription drug overdose, intimate partner violence, motor vehicle injury, older adult falls, self-directed violence, sexual violence, traumatic brain injury, youth sports concussion, and youth violence. Reviewers with expertise in the following methodological fields for injury and violence prevention are also sought to serve on the CDC SEP for NCIPC programs: economic evaluation, etiology, implementation and translation, intervention research, policy evaluation, program evaluation, qualitative research design, quantitative research design, statistics, and surveillance.

Members and Chairs shall be selected by the Secretary, HHS, or other official to whom the authority has been delegated, on an ''as needed'' basis in response to specific applications being reviewed with expertise to provide advice. Members will be selected from authorities in the various fields of prevention and control of diseases, disabilities, and injuries. Members of other chartered HHS advisory committees may serve on the panel if their expertise is required. Consideration is given to professional training and background, points of view represented, and upcoming applications to be reviewed by the committee.

Information about nominated potential reviewers will be maintained in the NCIPC Reviewer and Advisor Database. The work of reviewers' appointed to NCIPC SEPS includes the initial review, discussion, and written critique and evaluation of applications. This work will enable the CDC/NCIPC to fulfill its mission of funding meritorious research that provides vital knowledge about underlying risk and protective factors and strategies for violence and injury prevention *http://www.cdc.gov/injury/index.html.*

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services policy stipulates that

committee membership be balanced in terms of points of view represented and the committee's function. Appointments shall be made without discrimination on the basis of age, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, HIV status, disability, and cultural, religious, or socioeconomic status. Nominees must be U.S. citizens appointed to serve on a CDC SEP and can be full-time employees of the U.S. Government. Current participation on CDC federal workgroups or prior experience serving on another federal advisory committee does not disqualify a reviewer, except for service on the Board of Scientific Counselors, NCIPC. However, HHS policy is to avoid excessive individual service on advisory committees and multiple committee memberships. Reviewers appointed to the SEP, CDC are not considered Special Government Employees, and will not be required to file financial disclosure reports.

Nominees interested in serving as a potential reviewer on a SEP, CDC for NCIPC programs should submit the following items:

• Current *curriculum vitae,* including complete contact information (name, affiliation, mailing address, telephone number, and email address).

Nomination materials must be postmarked by March 31, 2017 and sent by U.S. mail to: NCIPC Extramural Research Program Office (ERPO): Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road NE., Mailstop F–63, Atlanta, Georgia 30329 or to the ERPO Mailbox *NCIPC_ERPO@cdc.gov.*

The Director, Management Analysis and Services Office, has been delegated the authority to sign **Federal Register** notices pertaining to announcements of meetings and other committee management activities for both the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

Elaine L. Baker,

Director, Management Analysis and Services Office, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[FR Doc. 2016–28207 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Advisory Committee on Breast Cancer in Young Women, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Notice of Charter Renewal

This gives notice under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463) of October 6, 1972, that the Advisory Committee on Breast Cancer in Young Women, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), has been renewed for a 2-year period through June 17, 2018.

For information, contact Temeika L. Fairley, Ph.D., Designated Federal Officer, Advisory Committee on Breast Cancer in Young Women, HHS, CDC, 4770 Buford Highway NE., Mailstop K52, Atlanta, Georgia 30341, telephone 770/488–4518, fax 770/488–4760.

The Director, Management Analysis and Services Office, has been delegated the authority to sign **Federal Register** notices pertaining to announcements of meetings and other committee management activities, for both the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

Elaine L. Baker,

Director, Management Analysis and Services Office, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[FR Doc. 2016–28206 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

[Docket No. FDA–2015–D–4033]

Nonprescription Sunscreen Drug Products—Format and Content of Data Submissions; Guidance for Industry; Availability

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or Agency) is announcing the availability of a guidance for industry entitled ''Nonprescription Sunscreen Drug Products—Format and Content of Data Submissions.'' This guidance addresses FDA's current thinking on the format and content of information provided to support a request for a determination whether a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient is generally recognized as safe and effective (GRASE), as provided under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the FD&C Act), as amended by the Sunscreen Innovation Act (SIA).

DATES: Submit either electronic or written comments on Agency guidances at any time.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments as follows:

Electronic Submissions

Submit electronic comments in the following way:

• *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments. Comments submitted electronically, including attachments, to *http://www.regulations.gov* will be posted to the docket unchanged. Because your comment will be made public, you are solely responsible for ensuring that your comment does not include any confidential information that you or a third party may not wish to be posted, such as medical information, your or anyone else's Social Security number, or confidential business information, such as a manufacturing process. Please note that if you include your name, contact information, or other information that identifies you in the body of your comments, that information will be posted on *http://www.regulations.gov.*

• If you want to submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made available to the public submit the comment as a written/paper submission and in the manner detailed (see ''Written/Paper Submissions'' and ''Instructions'').

Written/Paper Submissions

Submit written/paper submissions as follows:

• *Mail/Hand delivery/Courier (for written/paper submissions):* Division of Dockets Management (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

• For written/paper comments submitted to the Division of Dockets Management, FDA will post your comment, as well as any attachments, except for information submitted, marked and identified, as confidential, if submitted as detailed in ''Instructions.''

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket No. FDA–2015–D–4033 for ''Nonprescription Sunscreen Drug Products—Format and Content of Data Submissions; Guidance for Industry; Availability.'' Received comments will be placed in the docket

and, except for those submitted as ''Confidential Submissions,'' publicly viewable at *http://www.regulations.gov* or at the Division of Dockets Management between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

- *Confidential Submissions*—To submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made publicly available submit your comments only as a written/paper submission. You should submit two copies total. One copy will include the information you claim to be confidential with a heading or cover note that states ''THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.'' The Agency will review this copy, including the claimed confidential information, in its consideration of comments. The second copy, which will have the claimed confidential information redacted/blacked out, will be available for public viewing and posted on *http://www.regulations.gov.* Submit both copies to the Division of Dockets Management. If you do not wish your name and contact information to be made publicly available, you can provide this information on the cover sheet and not in the body of your comments and you must identify this information as ''confidential.'' Any information marked as ''confidential'' will not be disclosed except in accordance with 21 CFR 10.20 and other applicable disclosure law. For more information about FDA's posting of comments to public dockets, see 80 FR 56469, September 18, 2015, or access the information at: *http://www.fda.gov/regulatoryinformation/dockets/default.htm.*

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or the electronic and written/paper comments received, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and insert the docket number, found in brackets in the heading of this document, into the ''Search'' box and follow the prompts and/or go to the Division of Dockets Management, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

Submit written requests for single copies of the guidance to the Division of Drug Information, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10001 New Hampshire Ave., Hillandale Building, 4th Floor, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002. Send one self-addressed adhesive label to assist that office in processing your requests. See the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for electronic access to the guidance document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristen Hardin, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 22, Rm. 5443, Silver Spring, MD 20993, 240–402–4246.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

FDA is announcing the availability of a guidance for industry entitled ''Nonprescription Sunscreen Drug Products—Format and Content of Data Submissions.'' This guidance replaces a draft guidance that was issued on November 23, 2015, under the title ''Nonprescription Sunscreen Drug Products—Content and Format of Data Submissions to Support a GRASE Determination Under the Sunscreen Innovation Act'' (see 80 FR 72973), and incorporates editorial changes and clarifying language based on FDA's consideration of comments received on that draft guidance. The draft guidance and related public comments are available at *http://www.regulations.gov* by searching Docket No. FDA–2015–D–4033.

This guidance addresses FDA's current thinking on the format and content of information provided to support a request submitted under section 586A (586A request) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff–1), as amended by the Sunscreen Innovation Act (SIA) (21 U.S.C. Ch. 9 Sub. 5 Part I, enacted November 26, 2014), or in support of a pending request, as defined under section 586(6) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff(6)).[1] The requests addressed in this guidance seek a determination from FDA of whether an over-the-counter (nonprescription) sunscreen active ingredient,[2] or a combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, is GRASE for use under specified conditions and should be included in the over-the-counter sunscreen drug monograph.[3] The GRASE determination is primarily based on FDA's review of safety and effectiveness data and other information submitted by the request's sponsor (GRASE data submission) but also on information and comments submitted to the public docket by other interested parties.[4] Before that review may begin, however, FDA must review the GRASE data submission for completeness and determine accordingly whether to file or refuse to file it for substantive review. If the submission is not sufficiently complete to enable the Agency to conduct a substantive GRASE review, including being formatted in a manner that will enable the Agency to evaluate the submission's completeness, FDA will refuse to file the submission (section 586B(b)(2) of the FD&C Act).

FDA is issuing this guidance in partial implementation of the SIA, which, among other things, added section 586D(a)(1)(B) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff–4(a)(1)(B)) and directed FDA to finalize guidance on the implementation of and compliance with the SIA requirements for nonprescription sunscreens, including the Agency's guidance on the format and content of information submitted by a sponsor in support of a 586A request or a pending request. The information in this guidance is intended to provide recommendations to help sponsors prepare a GRASE data submission that is sufficiently complete (including being formatted in a manner that enables FDA to determine its completeness) to enable FDA to conduct a substantive GRASE review, as required by section 586B(b)(2) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff–2(b)(2)).

This guidance is being issued consistent with FDA's good guidance practices regulation (21 CFR 10.115). The guidance represents the current thinking of FDA on the format and content of GRASE data submissions under the SIA. It does not establish any rights for any person and is not binding on FDA or the public. A sponsor or member of the public can use an alternative approach if it satisfies the requirements of the applicable statutes and regulations.

[1] The SIA defines a *pending request* to mean a request for a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient to be included in the over-the-counter monograph that was originally submitted as a time and extent application under 21 CFR 330.14 and that was determined to be eligible for review and for which safety and effectiveness data were submitted prior to the enactment of the SIA (section 586(6) of the FD&C Act).

[2] As defined in the SIA, *sunscreen* means a drug containing one or more sunscreen active ingredients (section 586(9) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff(9)), and the term *sunscreen active ingredient* means an active ingredient that is intended for application to the skin of humans for purposes of absorbing, reflecting, or scattering ultraviolet radiation (section 586(10) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff(10)).

[3] See section 586(4) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff(4) (definition of ''GRASE determination''). Under the SIA, FDA must also make an initial determination on whether a nonprescription sunscreen ingredient or combination of sunscreen ingredients that is the subject of a 586A request has been marketed for a material time and to a material extent and thus whether that ingredient or combination of sunscreen ingredients is eligible for review under the SIA (section 586B(a) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff–2(a))).

[4] Section 586B(b)(1) of the FD&C Act. An SIA *sponsor* is a person who has submitted a 586A request, a pending request, or any other application subject to the SIA (section 586(8) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff(8)).

II. The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

This guidance contains collections of information that are exempt from the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (the PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520). Section 586D(a)(1)(C) of the FD&C Act, as amended by the SIA, states that the PRA shall not apply to collections of information for purposes of guidance under that subsection.

III. Electronic Access

Persons with access to the Internet may obtain the document at either *http://www.fda.gov/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/default.htm* or *http://www.regulations.gov.*

Dated: *November 17, 2016.*

Leslie Kux,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28121 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

[Docket No. FDA–2015–D–4021]

Nonprescription Sunscreen Drug Products—Safety and Effectiveness Data; Guidance for Industry; Availability

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or Agency) is announcing the availability of a guidance for industry entitled ''Nonprescription Sunscreen Drug Products—Safety and Effectiveness Data.'' This guidance addresses FDA's current thinking on the safety and effectiveness data needed to determine whether a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of active ingredients evaluated under the Sunscreen Innovation Act (SIA) is generally recognized as safe and effective (GRASE) and not misbranded when used under specified conditions. The guidance also addresses FDA's current thinking about an approach to safety-related final formulation testing that the Agency anticipates adopting in the future.

DATES: Submit either electronic or written comments on Agency guidances at any time.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments as follows:

Electronic Submissions

Submit electronic comments in the following way:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments. Comments submitted electronically, including attachments, to *http://www.regulations.gov* will be posted to the docket unchanged. Because your comment will be made public, you are solely responsible for ensuring that your comment does not include any confidential information that you or a third party may not wish to be posted, such as medical information, your or anyone else's Social Security number, or confidential business information, such as a manufacturing process. Please note that if you include your name, contact information, or other information that identifies you in the body of your comments, that information will be posted on *http://www.regulations.gov.*
- If you want to submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made available to the public, submit the comment as a written/paper submission and in the manner detailed (see ''Written/Paper Submissions'' and ''Instructions'').

Written/Paper Submissions

Submit written/paper submissions as follows:

- *Mail/Hand delivery/Courier (for written/paper submissions):* Division of Dockets Management (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.
- For written/paper comments submitted to the Division of Dockets Management, FDA will post your comment, as well as any attachments, except for information submitted, marked and identified, as confidential, if submitted as detailed in ''Instructions.''

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket No. FDA–2015–D–4021 for ''Nonprescription Sunscreen Drug Products—Safety and Effectiveness Data; Guidance for Industry; Availability.'' Received comments will be placed in the docket and, except for those submitted as ''Confidential Submissions,'' publicly viewable at *http://www.regulations.gov* or at the Division of Dockets Management between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

- Confidential Submissions—To submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made publicly available, submit your comments only as a written/paper submission. You should submit two copies total. One copy will include the information you claim to be confidential with a heading or cover note that states ''THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.'' The Agency will review this copy, including the claimed confidential information, in its consideration of comments. The second copy, which will have the claimed confidential information redacted/blacked out, will be available for public viewing and posted on *http://www.regulations.gov.* Submit both copies to the Division of Dockets Management. If you do not wish your name and contact information to be made publicly available, you can provide this information on the cover sheet and not in the body of your comments and you must identify this information as ''confidential.'' Any information marked as ''confidential'' will not be disclosed except in accordance with 21 CFR 10.20 and other applicable disclosure law. For more information about FDA's posting of comments to public dockets, see 80 FR 56469, September 18, 2015, or access the information at: *http://www.fda.gov/regulatory&information/dockets/default.htm.*

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or the electronic and written/paper comments received, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and insert the docket number, found in brackets in the heading of this document, into the ''Search'' box and follow the prompts and/or go to the Division of Dockets Management, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

Submit written requests for single copies of the guidance to the Division of Drug Information, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10001 New Hampshire Ave., Hillandale Building, 4th Floor, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002. Send one self-addressed adhesive label to assist that office in processing your requests. See the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for electronic access to the guidance document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristen Hardin, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 22, rm. 5443, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002, 240–402–4246.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

FDA is announcing the availability of a guidance for industry entitled ''Nonprescription Sunscreen Drug Products—Safety and Effectiveness Data.'' This guidance replaces a draft

guidance entitled ''Over-the-Counter Sunscreens: Safety and Effectiveness Data'' that was issued on November 23, 2015 (see 80 FR 72975) and incorporates editorial changes and clarifying language based on FDA's consideration of comments received on that draft guidance. The draft guidance and related public comments are available at *http://www.regulations.gov* by searching Docket No. FDA–2015–D–4021.

This guidance addresses the current thinking of FDA about the safety and effectiveness data needed to determine whether a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of active ingredients evaluated under the SIA (Pub. L. 113–195), enacted November 26, 2014, which amended the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the FD&C Act) (21 U.S.C. 351 *et seq.*), is GRASE and not misbranded when used under specified conditions. The guidance also addresses FDA's current thinking about an approach to safety-related final formulation testing that it anticipates adopting in the future. FDA is issuing this guidance in partial implementation of the SIA which, among other things, established new procedures and review timelines for FDA to determine whether a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of active ingredients is GRASE and not misbranded when used under the conditions specified in a final sunscreen order, in accordance with sections 586A, 586B, and 586C of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360fff–1, 360fff–2, and 360fff–3). The SIA directed FDA to issue guidance on four topics, including guidance regarding safety and effectiveness data in accordance with section 586D of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360ffff–4). Many of the safety topics addressed in this guidance were discussed at a public Nonprescription Drug Advisory Committee meeting held on September 4 and 5, 2014, *http://www.fda.gov/AdvisoryCommittees/CommitteesMeetingMaterials/Drugs/NonprescriptionDrugsAdvisoryCommittee/ucm380890.htm.*

This guidance is being issued consistent with FDA's good guidance practices regulation (21 CFR 10.115). The guidance represents FDA's current thinking on the topics it addresses. This guidance does not establish any rights for any person and is not binding on FDA or the public. You can use an alternative approach if it satisfies the requirements of the applicable statutes and regulations.

II. The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

This guidance contains collections of information that are exempt from the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (the PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520). Section 586D(a)(1)(C) of the FD&C Act, as amended by the SIA, states that the PRA shall not apply to collections of information made for purposes of guidance under that subsection.

III. Electronic Access

Persons with access to the Internet may obtain the guidance at either *http://www.fda.gov/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/default.htm* or *http://www.regulations.gov.*

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Leslie Kux,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28124 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

[Docket No. FDA–2016–N–3389]

Evaluation of the Beneficial Physiological Effects of Isolated or Synthetic Non-Digestible Carbohydrates; Request for Scientific Data, Information, and Comments

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice; request for scientific data, information, and comments.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or we) is requesting scientific data, information, and comments that would help us evaluate the beneficial physiological effects to human health of isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrates that are added to foods. We are requesting such scientific data, information, and comments to help us determine whether a particular isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrate should be added to our definition of ''dietary fiber'' for purposes of being declared as dietary fiber on a Nutrition Facts or Supplement Facts label.

DATES: Submit either electronic or written scientific data, information, and comments by January 9, 2017.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments as follows:

Electronic Submissions

Submit electronic scientific data, information, and comments in the following way:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments. Comments submitted electronically, including attachments, to *http://www.regulations.gov* will be posted to the docket unchanged. Because your comments will be made public, you are solely responsible for ensuring that your comment does not include any confidential information that you or a third party may not wish to be posted, such as medical information, your or anyone else's Social Security number, or confidential business information, such as a manufacturing process. Please note that if you include your name, contact information, or other information that identifies you in the body of your comments, that information will be posted on *http://www.regulations.gov.*
- If you want to submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made available to the public, submit the comment as a written/paper submission and in the manner detailed (see ''Written/Paper Submissions'' and ''Instructions'').

Written/Paper Submissions

Submit written/paper submissions as follows:

- *Mail/Hand delivery/Courier (for written/paper submissions):* Division of Dockets Management (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.
- For written/paper comments submitted to the Division of Dockets Management, FDA will post your comment, as well as any attachments, except for information submitted, marked and identified, as confidential, if submitted as detailed in ''Instructions.''

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket No. FDA–2016–N–3389 for ''Evaluation of the Beneficial Physiological Effects of Isolated or Synthetic Non-Digestible Carbohydrates; Request for Scientific Data, Information, and Comments.'' Received comments will be placed in the docket and, except for those submitted as ''Confidential Submissions,'' publicly viewable at *http://www.regulations.gov* or at the Division of Dockets Management between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

- Confidential Submissions—To submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made publicly available, submit your

comments only as a written/paper submission. You should submit two copies total. One copy will include the information you claim to be confidential with a heading or cover note that states ''THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.'' The Agency will review this copy, including the claimed confidential information, in its consideration of comments. The second copy, which will have the claimed confidential information redacted/blacked out, will be available for public viewing and posted on *http://www.regulations.gov*. Submit both copies to the Division of Dockets Management. If you do not wish your name and contact information to be made publicly available, you can provide this information on the cover sheet and not in the body of your comments and you must identify this information as ''confidential.'' Any information marked as ''confidential'' will not be disclosed except in accordance with 21 CFR 10.20 and other applicable disclosure law. For more information about FDA's posting of comments to public dockets, see 80 FR 56469, September 18, 2015, or access the information at: *http://www.fda.gov/regulatoryinformation/dockets/default.htm*.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or the electronic and written/paper comments received, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and insert the docket number, found in brackets in the heading of this document, into the ''Search'' box and follow the prompts and/or go to the Division of Dockets Management, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paula R. Trumbo, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–830), Food and Drug Administration, 5001 Campus Dr., College Park, MD 20740, 240–402–2579.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

FDA regulations did not define the term ''dietary fiber'' before 2016. In the **Federal Register** of May 27, 2016 (81 FR 33742), we published a final rule amending our Nutrition and Supplement Facts label regulation. The final rule, among other things, defines dietary fiber as non-digestible soluble and insoluble carbohydrates (with three or more monomeric units), and lignin that are intrinsic and intact in plants; isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrates (with three or more monomeric units) determined by FDA to have physiological effects that are beneficial to human health (21 CFR 101.9(c)(6)(i)). The final rule also identifies seven isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrates that we determined to have beneficial effects for human health when added to foods (§ 101.9(c)(6)(i)). The seven isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrates are: [beta]-glucan soluble fiber (as described in 21 CFR 101.81(c)(2)(ii)); psyllium husk (as described in § 101.81(c)(2)(ii)); cellulose, guar gum, pectin, locust bean gum; and hydroxypropyl methylcellulose. Foods and dietary supplements that contain any of these seven isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrates must include the amounts of these dietary fibers in a serving of food in the dietary fiber declarations on the products' Nutrition and Supplement Facts labels.

Interested parties can ask us to list additional isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrates in the definition of dietary fiber in § 101.9(c)(6)(i) if we determine that the new isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrate meets our dietary fiber definition. For example, a manufacturer who wants FDA to amend the definition of dietary fiber to include another added non-digestible carbohydrate could submit a citizen petition under 21 CFR 10.30. Elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**, we have published a notice announcing the availability of a draft guidance document entitled, ''Scientific Evaluation of the Evidence on the Beneficial Physiological Effects of Isolated or Synthetic Non-Digestible Carbohydrates Submitted as a Citizen Petition (21 CFR 10.30): Guidance for Industry.'' The draft guidance describes the type of evidence and the scientific evaluation process we plan to use in determining the strength of the evidence for the relationship between an isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrate that is added to food and a physiological effect that is beneficial to human health.

In addition to issuing the draft guidance and determining that the seven isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrates identified in the final rule's definition of dietary fibers have physiological effects that are beneficial to human health, we have conducted a scientific literature review of clinical studies associated with 26 isolated or synthetic non-digestible carbohydrates, such as gum acacia, carboxymethyl cellulose, inulin, polydextrose, and xanthan gum, that are not listed as a dietary fiber in § 101.9(c)(6)(i). Our review is consistent with the factors we provide in the draft guidance entitled, ''Scientific Evaluation of the Evidence on the Beneficial Physiological Effects of Isolated or Synthetic Non-Digestible Carbohydrates Submitted as a Citizen Petition (§ 10.30); Guidance for Industry'' to evaluate whether the available scientific evidence is sufficient to support a physiological effect that is beneficial to human health, based on the factors set forth in the draft guidance. We have summarized the clinical studies that we have identified for these 26 non-digestible carbohydrates and have provided summaries of the studies and related references in a document entitled ''Evaluation of the Beneficial Physiological Effects of Isolated or Synthetic Non-Digestible Carbohydrates.'' The purpose of this **Federal Register** notice is to invite interested parties to submit additional scientific data, information, and comments regarding:

- The physiological endpoints that we have addressed in the science review for each of the 26 non-digestible carbohydrates, and
- Other beneficial physiological endpoints and the relevant scientific data for a particular fiber. We have identified the main endpoints, such as cholesterol or glucose levels, but ask for scientific data on additional physiological endpoints (blood pressure) for which a non-digestible carbohydrate may have a beneficial physiological effect.

II. Reference

The following reference is on display at the Division of Dockets Management (see **ADDRESSES**) and is available for viewing by interested persons between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday; it is also available electronically at *http://www.regulations.gov*. FDA has verified the Web site address, as of the date this document publishes in the **Federal Register**, but Web sites are subject to change over time.

1. FDA, 2016. ''Evaluation of the Beneficial Physiological Effects of Isolated or Synthetic Non-Digestible Carbohydrates.'' Available at: *http://www.fda.gov/Food/IngredientsPackagingLabeling/LabelingNutrition/ucm525656.htm*.

Dated: *November 14, 2016.*

Leslie Kux,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–27950 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

[Docket No. FDA–2013–D–0558]

Contract Manufacturing Arrangements for Drugs: Quality Agreements; Guidance for Industry; Availability

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or Agency) is announcing the availability of a guidance for industry entitled ''Contract Manufacturing Arrangements for Drugs: Quality Agreements.'' This guidance describes FDA's current thinking on defining, establishing, and documenting manufacturing activities of the parties involved in contract drug manufacturing subject to current good manufacturing practice (CGMP) requirements. In particular, we describe how parties involved in contract drug manufacturing can use quality agreements to delineate their manufacturing activities to ensure compliance with CGMP.

DATES: Submit either electronic or written comments on Agency guidances at any time.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments as follows:

Electronic Submissions

Submit electronic comments in the following way:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: https://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments. Comments submitted electronically, including attachments, to *https://www.regulations.gov* will be posted to the docket unchanged. Because your comment will be made public, you are solely responsible for ensuring that your comment does not include any confidential information that you or a third party may not wish to be posted, such as medical information, your or anyone else's Social Security number, or confidential business information, such as a manufacturing process. Please note that if you include your name, contact information, or other information that identifies you in the body of your comments, that information will be posted on *https://www.regulations.gov/.*
- If you want to submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made available to the public, submit the comment as a written/paper submission and in the manner detailed (see ''Written/Paper Submissions'' and ''Instructions'').

Written/Paper Submissions

Submit written/paper submissions as follows:

- *Mail/Hand delivery/Courier (for written/paper submissions):* Division of Dockets Management (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.
- For written/paper comments submitted to the Division of Dockets Management, FDA will post your comment, as well as any attachments, except for information submitted, marked and identified, as confidential, if submitted as detailed in ''Instructions.''

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket No. FDA–2013–D–0558 for ''Contract Manufacturing Arrangements for Drugs: Quality Agreements.'' Received comments will be placed in the docket and, except for those submitted as ''Confidential Submissions,'' publicly viewable at *https://www.regulations.gov/* or at the Division of Dockets Management between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

- Confidential Submissions—To submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made publicly available submit your comments only as a written/paper submission. You should submit two copies total. One copy will include the information you claim to be confidential with a heading or cover note that states ''THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.'' The Agency will review this copy, including the claimed confidential information, in its consideration of comments. The second copy, which will have the claimed confidential information redacted/blacked out, will be available for public viewing and posted on *https://www.regulations.gov/.* Submit both copies to the Division of Dockets Management. If you do not wish your name and contact information to be made publicly available, you can provide this information on the cover sheet and not in the body of your comments and you must identify this information as ''confidential.'' Any information marked as ''confidential'' will not be disclosed except in accordance with 21 CFR 10.20 and other applicable disclosure law. For more information about FDA's posting of comments to public dockets, see 80 FR 56469, September 18, 2015, or access the information at: *http://www.fda.gov/regulatoryinformation/dockets/default.htm.*

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or the electronic and written/paper comments received, go to *https://www.regulations.gov/* and insert the docket number, found in brackets in the heading of this document, into the ''Search'' box and follow the prompts and/or go to the Division of Dockets Management, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

Submit written requests for single copies of this guidance to the Division of Drug Information, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10001 New Hampshire Ave., Hillandale Bldg., 4th Floor, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002; the Office of Communication, Outreach and Development, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 71, Rm. 3128, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002; or the Policy and Regulations Staff, HFV–6, Center for Veterinary Medicine, Food and Drug Administration, 7519 Standish Pl., Rockville, MD 20855. Send one self-addressed adhesive label to assist that office in processing your requests. See the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for electronic access to the guidance document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paula Katz, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 51, Rm. 4330, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002, 301–796–6972; Stephen Ripley, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 71, Rm. 7301, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002, 240–402–7911; or Jonathan Bray, Center for Veterinary Medicine (HFV–232), Food and Drug Administration, 7519 Standish Pl., Rm. 130, Rockville, MD 20855, 240–402–5623.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

FDA is announcing the availability of a guidance for industry entitled ''Contract Manufacturing Arrangements for Drugs: Quality Agreements.'' This guidance describes FDA's current thinking on defining, establishing, and documenting manufacturing activities of the parties involved in contract drug manufacturing subject to CGMP requirements. Owners and contract facilities can draw on quality management principles to carry out the complicated process of contract drug manufacturing by defining, establishing, and documenting their activities for ensuring compliance with CGMP and to ensure the quality, safety, and effectiveness of drugs.

This guidance replaces the draft guidance of the same name that published in the **Federal Register** of May 28, 2013 (78 FR 31943). We have carefully reviewed and considered the comments that were received on the draft guidance and have made changes for clarification. In particular, our revisions clarified the scope and applicability of the guidance and key terms used in the guidance.

Regarding scope and applicability, we have clarified that the guidance is limited to commercial manufacturing activities. Although the principles articulated may be useful in approaching quality agreements for other kinds of activities, such as clinical research, development, or distribution, these are outside the scope of this particular document.

Many comments concerned the terms ''owner'' and ''contract facility.'' Although some comments recommended that this guidance adopt the terms ''contract giver'' and ''contract acceptor,'' these terms do not align with our goal of showing how the parties to a contract manufacturing arrangement can work together to define, establish, and document agreements that delineate manufacturing activities and ensure compliance with CGMP.

This guidance is being issued consistent with FDA's good guidance practices regulation (21 CFR 10.115). The guidance represents the current thinking of FDA on Contract Manufacturing Arrangements for Drugs: Quality Agreements. It does not establish any rights for any person and is not binding on FDA or the public. You can use an alternative approach if it satisfies the requirements of the applicable statutes and regulations.

II. The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

This guidance refers to previously approved collections of information found in FDA regulations. These collections of information are subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520) and have been approved under OMB control number 0910–0139.

III. Electronic Access

Persons with access to the Internet may obtain the document at either *http://www.fda.gov/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/default.htm, http://www.fda.gov/BiologicsBloodVaccines/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/default.htm, http://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/GuidanceComplianceEnforcement/GuidanceforIndustry/default.htm,* or *https://www.regulations.gov/.*

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Leslie Kux,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28122 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Cancer Institute Amended Notice of Meeting

Notice is hereby given of a change in the meeting of the Joint Board meeting of the National Cancer Advisory Board and NCI Board of Scientific Advisors, December 5, 2016, 4:30 p.m. to December 7, 2016, 12:00 p.m., National Cancer Institute Shady Grove, Shady Grove, 9609 Medical Center Drive, 7W116, Rockville, MD 20850 which was published in the **Federal Register** on October 31, 2016, 81 FR 75423.

The meeting notice is amended to change the date, time and location of the meeting and to cancel the *Ad Hoc* Subcommittee on Global Cancer Research on December 5, 2016. There will be a National Cancer Advisory Board *Ad hoc* Subcommittee on Clinical Investigations on December 5, 2016, from 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the Pooks Hill Marriott Hotel, Annapolis and Chesapeake Room, 5151 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, MD 20814. The Joint meeting of the National Cancer Advisory Board and NCI Board of Scientific Advisors will now be held on December 6, 2016 at the National Institutes of Health, Building 31, Conference Room 10, 31 Center Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892. The open session is from 8:30 a.m. to 3:45 p.m. The closed session will begin at 4:00 p.m. and end at 5:00 p.m. The meeting is partially closed to the public.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Melanie J. Pantoja,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28146 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases: Notice of Closed Meetings

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given of the following meetings.

The meetings will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases Special Emphasis Panel; NIDDK DDK–B Member, Conflict Application Review.

Date: December 5, 2016.

Time: 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, Two Democracy Plaza, 6707 Democracy Boulevard, Bethesda, MD 20892, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Carol J. Goter-Robinson, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Review Branch, DEA, NIDDK, National Institutes of Health, Room 7347, 6707 Democracy Boulevard, Bethesda, MD 20892–5452, (301) 594–7791, *goterrobinsonc@extra.niddk.nih.gov*.

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the timing limitations imposed by the review and funding cycle.

Name of Committee: National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases Special Emphasis Panel; PAR 14–301: NIDDK Central Repositories Sample Access (X01).

Date: January 18, 2017.

Time: 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, Two Democracy Plaza, 6707 Democracy Boulevard, Bethesda, MD 20892, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Najma Begum, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Review Branch, DEA, NIDDK, National Institutes of Health, Room 7349, 6707 Democracy Boulevard, Bethesda, MD 20892–5452, (301) 594–8894, *begumn@niddk.nih.gov*.

Name of Committee: National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases Special Emphasis Panel; PAR–15–067: U01 Applications.

Date: January 24, 2017.

Time: 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, Two Democracy Plaza, 6707 Democracy Boulevard, Bethesda, MD 20892, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: JIAN YANG, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Review Branch, DEA, NIDDK, National Institutes of Health, Room 7111, 6707 Democracy Boulevard, Bethesda, MD 20892–5452, (301) 594–7799, *yangj@extra.niddk.nih.gov*.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.847, Diabetes, Endocrinology and Metabolic Research; 93.848, Digestive Diseases and Nutrition Research; 93.849, Kidney Diseases, Urology and Hematology Research, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: November 17, 2016.

David Clary,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28148 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

Center for Scientific Review; Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given of the following meeting.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel, Urology and Urogynecology Small Business Applications.

Date: December 1–2, 2016.

Time: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892 (Virtual Meeting).

Contact Person: Ryan G. Morris, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 4205, MSC 7814, Bethesda, MD 20892, 301–435–1501, *morrisr@csr.nih.gov*.

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the timing limitations imposed by the review and funding cycle.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.306, Comparative Medicine; 93.333, Clinical Research, 93.306, 93.333, 93.337, 93.393–93.396, 93.837–93.844, 93.846–93.878, 93.892, 93.893, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: November 17, 2016.

David Clary,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28142 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism; Notice of Closed Meetings Pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as Amended (5 U.S.C. App.), Notice Is Hereby Given of the Following Meetings.

The meetings will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Initial Review Group Clinical; Treatment and Health Services Research Review Subcommittee.

Date: February 22, 2017.

Time: 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Terrace Conference Room 508/509, 5635 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20851.

Contact Person: Ranga V. Srinivas, Ph.D., Chief, Extramural Project Review Branch, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institutes of Health, 5365 Fishers Lane, Room 2085, Rockville, MD 20852, (301) 451–2067, *srinivar@mail.nih.gov*.

Name of Committee: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Initial Review Group; Neuroscience Review Subcommittee.

Date: March 1, 2017.

Time: 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Terrace Conference Room 508/509, 5635 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20852.

Contact Person: Beata Buzas, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institutes of Health, 5635 Fishers Lane, Room 2081, Rockville, MD 20852, 301–443–0800, *bbuzas@mail.nih.gov*.

Name of Committee: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Initial Review Group; Epidemiology, Prevention and Behavior Research Review Subcommittee.

Date: March 6, 2017.

Time: 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Terrace Conference Room 508/509, 5635 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20852.

Contact Person: Anna Ghambaryan, M.D., Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Extramural Project Review Branch, Office of Extramural Activities, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institutes of Health, 5635 Fishers Lane, Room 2019, Rockville, MD 20852, 301–443–4032, *anna.ghambaryan@nih.gov*.

Name of Committee: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Initial Review Group; Biomedical Research Review Subcommittee.

Date: March 7, 2017.

Time: 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Terrace Conference Room 508/509, 5635 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20851.

Contact Person: Philippe Marmillot, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institutes of Health, 5635 Fishers Lane, Room 2017, Bethesda, MD 20892, 301–443–2861, *marmillotp@mail.nih.gov*.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.271, Alcohol Research Career Development Awards for Scientists and Clinicians; 93.272, Alcohol National Research Service Awards for Research Training; 93.273, Alcohol Research Programs; 93.891, Alcohol Research Center Grants; 93.701, ARRA Related Biomedical Research and Research Support Awards., National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Melanie J. Pantoja,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28147 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

Center for Scientific Review; Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given of the following meeting.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel; Member Conflict: AIDS and Related Research.

Date: December 9, 2016.

Time: 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892, (Virtual Meeting).

Contact Person: Barna Dey, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 3184, Bethesda, MD 20892, 301–451–2796, *bdey@mail.nih.gov.*

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the timing limitations imposed by the review and funding cycle.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.306, Comparative Medicine; 93.333, Clinical Research, 93.306, 93.333, 93.337, 93.393–93.396, 93.837–93.844, 93.846–93.878, 93.892, 93.893, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: November 17, 2016.

David Clary,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28141 Filed 11–2–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Cancer Institute; Notice of Closed Meetings

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given of the following meetings.

The meetings will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and contract proposals and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications and contract proposals, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: National Cancer Institute Special Emphasis Panel; Research Centers for Cancer Systems Biology Consortium.

Date: December 20, 2016.

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Cancer Institute, Shady Grove, 9609 Medical Center Drive, Room 7W234, Rockville, MD 20850 (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Adriana Stoica, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Resources and Training Review Branch, Division of Extramural Activities, National Cancer Institute, 9609 Medical Center Drive, Room 7W234, Rockville, MD 20892–9750, 240–276–6368, *stoicaa2@mail.nih.gov.*

Name of Committee: National Cancer Institute Special Emphasis Panel, Pediatric Drug Delivery Devices.

Date: February 8, 2017.

Time: 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate contract proposals.

Place: National Cancer Institute, Shady Grove, 9609 Medical Center Drive, Room 2W030, Rockville, MD 20850 (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Jun Fang, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Research Technology and Contract Review Branch, Division of Extramural Activities, National Cancer Institute, 9609 Medical Center Drive, Room 7W246, Rockville, MD 20892–9750, 240–276–5460, *jfang@mail.nih.gov.*

Name of Committee: National Cancer Institute Special Emphasis Panel, TME Dynamics.

Date: February 10, 2017.

Time: 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate contract proposals.

Place: National Cancer Institute, Shady Grove, 9609 Medical Center Drive, Room 7W030, Rockville, MD 20850 (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Eduardo Emilio Chufan, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Research Technology and Contract Review Branch, Division of Extramural Activities, National Cancer Institute, 9609 Medical Center Drive, Room 7W254, Rockville, MD 20892–9750, 240–276–7975, *chufanee@mail.nih.gov.*

Name of Committee: National Cancer Institute Special Emphasis Panel, Cancer Metabolomic.

Date: February 24, 2017.

Time: 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate contract proposals.

Place: National Cancer Institute Shady Grove, 9609 Medical Center Drive, Room 7W030, Rockville, MD 20850 (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Eduardo Emilio Chufan, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Research Technology and Contract Review Branch, Division of Extramural Activities, National Cancer Institute, 9609 Medical Center Drive, Room 7W254, Rockville, MD 20892–9750, 240–276–7975, *chufanee@mail.nih.gov.*

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.392, Cancer Construction; 93.393, Cancer Cause and Prevention Research; 93.394, Cancer Detection and Diagnosis Research; 93.395, Cancer Treatment Research; 93.396, Cancer Biology Research; 93.397, Cancer Centers Support; 93.398, Cancer Research Manpower; 93.399, Cancer Control, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Melanie J. Pantoja,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28145 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Institute of General Medical Sciences; Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given of the following meeting.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: National Institute of General Medical Sciences Special Emphasis Panel PA16–294; NIH Support for Conferences and Scientific Meetings (Parent R13).

Date: November 22, 2016.

Time: 2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, Natcher Building, Room 3AN.18, 45 Center Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892 (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Margaret J. Weidman, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Office of Scientific Review, National Institute of General Medical Sciences, National Institutes of Health, 45 Center Drive, Room 3AN18B, Bethesda, MD 20892, 301–594–3663.

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the timing limitations imposed by the review and funding cycle.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.375, Minority Biomedical Research Support; 93.821, Cell Biology and

Biophysics Research; 93.859, Pharmacology, Physiology, and Biological Chemistry Research; 93.862, Genetics and Developmental Biology Research; 93.88, Minority Access to Research Careers; 93.96, Special Minority Initiatives; 93.859, Biomedical Research and Research Training, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Melanie J. Pantoja,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28149 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

Center for Scientific Review; Notice of Closed Meetings

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given of the following meetings.

The meetings will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel; Member Conflict: AIDS and Related Research.

Date: December 5–6, 2016.

Time: 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892, (Virtual Meeting).

Contact Person: Kenneth A Roebuck, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 5106, MSC 7852, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 435–1166, *roebuckk@csr.nih.gov.*

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the timing limitations imposed by the review and funding cycle.

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel; Social Sciences and Population Studies: Special Topics.

Date: December 8, 2016.

Time: 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Kate Fothergill, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 3142, Bethesda, MD 20892, 301–435–2309, *fothergillke@mail.nih.gov.*

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the timing limitations imposed by the review and funding cycle.

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel; Member Conflict: AIDS and AIDS Related Research.

Date: December 9, 2016.

Time: 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institute of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Jose H Guerrier, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 5218, MSC 7852, Bethesda, MD 20892, 301–435–1137, *guerriej@csr.nih.gov.*

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the timing limitations imposed by the review and funding cycle.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.306, Comparative Medicine; 93.333, Clinical Research, 93.306, 93.333, 93.337, 93.393–93.396, 93.837–93.844, 93.846–93.878, 93.892, 93.893, National Institutes of Health, HHS).

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Michelle Trout,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28143 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Cancer Institute; Amended Notice of Meeting

Notice is hereby given of a change in the meeting of the National Cancer Institute Special Emphasis Panel, November 18, 2016, 03:00 p.m. to November 18, 2016, 05:00 p.m., National Cancer Institute Shady Grove, 9609 Medical Center Drive, 3W030, Rockville, MD 20850 which was published in the **Federal Register** on October 17, 2016, 81 FR 71516.

The meeting notice is amended to change the date and time from November 18, 2016, 3:00 p.m.–5:00 p.m. to December 15, 2016, 12:30 p.m.–2:30 p.m. The meeting is closed to the public.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Melanie J. Pantoja,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28144 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

In compliance with Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 concerning opportunity for public comment on proposed collections of information, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) will publish periodic summaries of proposed projects. To request more information on the proposed projects or to obtain a copy of the information collection plans, call the SAMHSA Reports Clearance Officer on (240) 276–1243.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collections of information are necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Proposed Project: Evaluation of the Cooperative Agreements to Benefit Homeless Individuals (CABHI) Program (OMB No. 0930–0339)—REVISION

SAMHSA is conducting a cross-site evaluation of the FY2016 cohort of the CABHI grant program. The CABHI Evaluation builds on a previous evaluation of SAMHSA's 2009–2012 homeless services grant programs (*i.e.,* Grants for the Benefit of Homeless Individuals, Services in Supportive Housing, and CABHI), under which the approved data collection tools were developed and implemented. SAMHSA is requesting approval from OMB to revise the burden inventory, which has been calculated based on the number of FY2016 CABHI grantees, and to modify

the data collection mode of a project director interview.

In 2016, SAMHSA awarded 30 CABHI grants across three levels: States (up to $1.5 million per year), Local Governments (up to $800,000 per year), and Communities (up to $400,000 per year). The grantees are united by the goal of enhancing and expanding infrastructure and capacity for mental health and substance abuse treatment and related support services for individuals experiencing chronic homelessness or veterans, families, or youth experiencing homelessness as a result of these conditions. This is accomplished through the provision of permanent supportive housing, behavioral health treatment, and recovery support services, and enrollment in health insurance, Medicaid, or other mainstream benefit programs.

The primary task of the CABHI evaluation is to conduct a comprehensive process and outcome evaluation, addressing questions related to the implementation of the CABHI grant projects and the extent to which they were able to meet the program's goals. Process evaluation primarily represents what is done to and for the client (*e.g.,* services provided); this aspect of the evaluation will also include a focus on structure, or the resources available in the service delivery system, which represent the capacity to deliver quality care, but not the care itself. The outcome evaluation will focus on outputs, which are the most immediate or proximal results of project activities (*e.g.,* changes in partner collaboration, the number of clients enrolled in mainstream benefits), and client outcomes, particularly those related to behavioral health and homelessness and housing instability. The data collection tools included in this request collect a wide range of quantitative and qualitative data on characteristics of the grantee organization and its partnerships; the system within which the project is embedded; relationships with stakeholders; characteristics of the target population; services received, including implementation of EBPs; staffing patterns; costs of services; barriers and facilitators of project implementation; and project sustainability efforts. Data collection efforts that will support the evaluation are described below.

The *Project Director (PD) Phone Interview/Web Survey* is designed to systematically collect key grant project characteristics which will directly inform the process evaluation component and will also provide essential data by documenting the partnerships and services each grantee includes in their project. The interview includes two components, a semi-structured telephone interview and a Web survey, which represents a change from the original approval. The interview was developed to be conducted as a telephone interview; however, some sections are better suited for self-administration through a Web-based survey (*e.g.,* reporting which services the project is providing to clients) and the instrument has been modified accordingly. The *PD Phone Interview/Web Survey* is composed of the following sections: Grantee Agency and Project Characteristics, Target Population, Stakeholders/Partners, Services, Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs), Housing, Project Organization and Implementation, Sustainability, Local Evaluation, Technical Assistance, and Lessons Learned. A total of 39 respondents are expected to complete the *PD Phone Interview/Web Survey;* this includes one respondent from all of the CABHI grantees (n=30) and the State sub-recipients (n=9). This data collection will occur one time during Year 1 and one time during Year 3 of the evaluation.

Site Visits will consist of in-person, semi-structured discussions with grant project directors, State sub-recipient coordinators, project evaluators, financial staff, behavioral health treatment staff, case managers, housing providers, other support services staff, primary partner staff and other key stakeholders, and project client participants. The purpose of the *Site Visits* is to collect detailed qualitative information and economic data on project activities conducted by the grantees and their partners, which will directly inform the process evaluation. The qualitative data will also provide essential information for the outcome evaluation component by documenting the interventions provided to clients and the implementation, barriers, facilitators, challenges and successes for each grant project visited. Each CABHI grant project (n=30) will be visited once during Year 2 and once during Year 3 of the evaluation. No changes have been made to the *Site Visit* instruments.

The *EBP Self-Assessment* is a Web-based survey designed to collect information on the services implemented in CABHI grant projects that have a demonstrable evidence base, providing a description of the EBP interventions received by project clients. The *EBP Self-Assessment* tool is divided into two parts. Part 1 collects information on general implementation of the projects' primary EBPs (*i.e.,* those received by the most project clients). Thirty-six respondents (9 State sub-recipients, 12 Local Governments, and 15 Communities) are expected to complete Part 1 of the *EBP Self-Assessment,* which may be completed up to 3 times based on the number of primary EBPs being implemented by the project. Part 2 collects detailed implementation data on a selected group of EBPs (*i.e.,* Assertive Community Treatment, Integrated Dual Disorders Treatment, Illness Management and Recovery, Supported Employment, Critical Time Intervention, and Supplemental Security Income [SSI]/Social Security Disability Insurance [SSDI] Outreach, Access, and Recovery) and will be administered only to projects using the selected EBPs and only for the EBPs they are implementing. Thirty-six respondents (9 State sub-recipients, 12 Local Governments, and 15 Communities) are expected to complete Part 2 of the *EBP Self-Assessment,* which may be completed up to 3 times based on the number of Part 2 EBPs being implemented by the project. Respondents for both Part 1 and 2 may include grant project directors, State sub-recipient coordinators, or other staff knowledgeable about the project's EBPs. The *EBP Self-Assessment* will be administered in Year 2 of the evaluation. No changes have been made to the *EBP Self-Assessment* instrument.

The *Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Self-Assessment* is a Web-based survey completed by the CABHI grant projects to understand the extent to which they are implementing key dimensions of PSH and capture the variability of the PSH model among the projects. Information is collected on the following dimensions: Choice of housing, separation of housing and services; decent, safe, and affordable housing; housing integration; tenancy rights; access to housing; flexible, voluntary services; service philosophy; and team-based behavioral health. Thirty-six respondents (9 State sub-recipients, 12 Local Governments, and 15 Communities) are expected to complete the *PSH Self-Assessment* one time, and may include grant project directors, State sub-recipient coordinators, or other staff knowledgeable about the project's PSH model. The *PSH Self-Assessment* will be administered in Year 2 of the evaluation. No changes have been made to the *PSH Self-Assessment* instrument.

ANNUALIZED BURDEN HOURS

Instrument/activity	Number of respondents	Responses per respondent	Total number of responses	Hours per response	Total burden hours
PD Phone Interview/Web Survey	39	1	39	2.1	82
Site Visits:					
Opening Session/Project Director Interview	[a] 300	1	300	2.5	750
Case Manager, Treatment, Housing Staff/Provider Interview	[b] 540	1	540	2	1,080
Stakeholder Interview	[c] 270	1	270	1.5	405
Evaluator Interview	[d] 60	1	60	1	60
Client Focus Group	[e] 450	1	450	1.5	675
Cost Interview	[f] 60	1	60	2	120
Evidence-Based Practice Self-Assessment Part 1	36	3	108	0.58	63
Evidence-Based Practice Self-Assessment Part 2	36	3	108	0.25	27
Permanent Supportive Housing Self-Assessment	36	1	36	0.67	24
Total	[g] 1,650		1,971		3,286

[a] 10 respondents × 30 site visits = 300 respondents.
[b] 18 respondents × 30 site visits = 540 respondents.
[c] 9 respondents × 30 site visits = 270 respondents.
[d] 2 respondents × 30 site visits = 60 respondents.
[e] 15 respondents × 30 site visits = 450 respondents.
[f] 2 respondents × 30 site visits = 60 respondents.
[g] This is an unduplicated count of total respondents.

Send comments to Summer King, SAMHSA Reports Clearance Officer, 5600 Fishers Lane, Room 15E57–B, Rockville, MD 20857 *OR* email a copy to *summer.king@samhsa.hhs.gov.* Written comments should be received by January 23, 2017.

Summer King,

Statistician.

[FR Doc. 2016–28211 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4162–20–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Docket ID: FEMA–2016–0006; OMB No. 1660–0006]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; National Flood Insurance Program Policy Forms

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) will submit the information collection abstracted below to the Office of Management and Budget for review and clearance in accordance with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The submission will describe the nature of the information collection, the categories of respondents, the estimated burden (*i.e.,* the time, effort and resources used by respondents to respond) and cost, and the actual data collection instruments FEMA will use.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments on the proposed information collection to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget. Comments should be addressed to the Desk Officer for the Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and sent via electronic mail to *oira.submission@omb.eop.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection should be made to Director, Records Management Division, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472–3100, or email address *FEMA-Information-Collections-Management@fema.dhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This proposed information collection previously published in the **Federal Register** on March 27, 2016 at 81 FR 14459 with a 60 day public comment period. No comments were received. The purpose of this notice is to notify the public that FEMA will submit the information collection abstracted below to the Office of Management and Budget for review and clearance.

Collection of Information

Title: National Flood Insurance Program Policy Forms.

Type of Information Collection: Revision of a currently approved information collection.

OMB Number: 1660–0006.

Form Titles and Numbers: FEMA Form 086–0–1, Flood Insurance Application; FEMA From 086–0–2, Flood Insurance Cancellation/Nullification Request Form; FEMA Form 086–0–3, Flood Insurance General Change Endorsement; FEMA Form 086–0–4, V-Zone Risk Factor Rating Form and Instructions; FEMA Form 086–0–5, Flood Insurance Preferred Risk Policy and Newly Mapped Application.

Abstract: In order to provide for the availability of policies for flood insurance, policies are marketed through the facilities of licensed insurance agents or brokers in the various States. Applications from agents or brokers are forwarded to a servicing company designated as fiscal agent by the Federal Insurance Administration. Upon receipt and examination of the application and required premium, the servicing company issues the appropriate Federal flood insurance policy.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; State, local or Tribal Government; Business or other for profit; Not-for-profit institutions; and Farms.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 601,067.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 91,016 hours.

Estimated Cost: The cost to respondents is $6,500 for engineer or architect services.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Richard W. Mattison,

Records Management Program Chief, Mission Support Bureau, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

[FR Doc. 2016–28137 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA–4291–DR]; [Docket ID FEMA–2016–0001]

Virginia; Amendment No. 2 to Notice of a Major Disaster Declaration

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice amends the notice of a major disaster declaration for the Commonwealth of Virginia (FEMA–4291–DR), dated November 2, 2016, and related determinations.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 15, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dean Webster, Office of Response and Recovery, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–2833.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The notice of a major disaster declaration for the Commonwealth of Virginia is hereby amended to include the Public Assistance program for the following areas among those areas determined to have been adversely affected by the event declared a major disaster by the President in his declaration of November 2, 2016.

The independent cities of Franklin, Portsmouth, and Suffolk and the counties of Isle of Wight and Southampton for Public Assistance.

The independent cities of Chesapeake, Norfolk, and Virginia Beach for Public Assistance (already designated for Individual Assistance).

The following Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers (CFDA) are to be used for reporting and drawing funds: 97.030, Community Disaster Loans; 97.031, Cora Brown Fund; 97.032, Crisis Counseling; 97.033, Disaster Legal Services; 97.034, Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA); 97.046, Fire Management Assistance Grant; 97.048, Disaster Housing Assistance to Individuals and Households In Presidentially Declared Disaster Areas; 97.049, Presidentially Declared Disaster Assistance—Disaster Housing Operations for Individuals and Households; 97.050 Presidentially Declared Disaster Assistance to Individuals and Households—Other Needs; 97.036, Disaster Grants—Public Assistance (Presidentially Declared Disasters); 97.039, Hazard Mitigation Grant.

W. Craig Fugate,

Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 2016–28131 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111–23–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA–4289–DR; Docket ID FEMA–2016–0001]

Iowa; Major Disaster and Related Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This is a notice of the Presidential declaration of a major disaster for the State of Iowa (FEMA–4289–DR), dated October 31, 2016, and related determinations.

DATES: *Effective Date:* October 31, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dean Webster, Office of Response and Recovery, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–2833.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that, in a letter dated October 31, 2016, the President issued a major disaster declaration under the authority of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, 42 U.S.C. 5121 *et seq.* (the ''Stafford Act''), as follows:

I have determined that the damage in certain areas of the State of Iowa resulting from severe storms and flooding during the period of September 21 to October 3, 2016, is of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant a major disaster declaration under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, 42 U.S.C. 5121 *et seq.* (the ''Stafford Act''). Therefore, I declare that such a major disaster exists in the State of Iowa.

In order to provide Federal assistance, you are hereby authorized to allocate from funds available for these purposes such amounts as you find necessary for Federal disaster assistance and administrative expenses.

You are authorized to provide Public Assistance in the designated areas and Hazard Mitigation throughout the State. Consistent with the requirement that Federal assistance be supplemental, any Federal funds provided under the Stafford Act for Hazard Mitigation will be limited to 75 percent of the total eligible costs. Federal funds provided under the Stafford Act for Public Assistance also will be limited to 75 percent of the total eligible costs, with the exception of projects that meet the eligibility criteria for a higher Federal cost-sharing percentage under the Public Assistance Alternative Procedures Pilot Program for Debris Removal implemented pursuant to section 428 of the Stafford Act.

Further, you are authorized to make changes to this declaration for the approved assistance to the extent allowable under the Stafford Act.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) hereby gives notice that pursuant to the authority vested in the Administrator, under Executive Order 12148, as amended, James N. Russo, of FEMA is appointed to act as the Federal Coordinating Officer for this major disaster.

The following areas of the State of Iowa have been designated as adversely affected by this major disaster:

Allamakee, Benton, Black Hawk, Bremer, Buchanan, Butler, Cerro Gordo, Chickasaw, Clayton, Delaware, Des Moines, Fayette, Floyd, Franklin, Howard, Linn, Mitchell, Winneshiek, and Wright Counties for Public Assistance.

All areas within the State of Iowa are eligible for assistance under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.

The following Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers (CFDA) are to be used for reporting and drawing funds: 97.030, Community Disaster Loans; 97.031, Cora Brown Fund; 97.032, Crisis Counseling; 97.033, Disaster Legal Services; 97.034, Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA); 97.046, Fire Management Assistance Grant; 97.048, Disaster Housing Assistance to Individuals and Households In Presidentially Declared Disaster Areas; 97.049, Presidentially Declared Disaster Assistance—Disaster Housing Operations for Individuals and Households; 97.050, Presidentially Declared Disaster Assistance to Individuals and Households—Other Needs; 97.036, Disaster Grants—Public Assistance (Presidentially Declared Disasters); 97.039, Hazard Mitigation Grant.

W. Craig Fugate,

Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 2016–28134 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111–23–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Docket ID: FEMA–2016–0031; OMB No. 1660–0086]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Write Your Own (WYO) Company Participation Criteria; New Applicant

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Emergency Management Agency, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on an extension, without change, of a currently approved information collection. In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice seeks comments concerning the type of information that insurance companies that wish to join the National Flood Insurance Program's Write Your Own Program may need to submit to FEMA to show their ability to meet their responsibilities to FEMA and to their customers.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before January 23, 2017.

ADDRESSES: To avoid duplicate submissions to the docket, please use only one of the following means to submit comments:

(1) *Online.* Submit comments at *www.regulations.gov* under Docket ID FEMA–2016–0031. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

(2) *Mail.* Submit written comments to Docket Manager, Office of Chief Counsel, DHS/FEMA, 500 C Street SW., 8NE., Washington, DC 20472–3100.

All submissions received must include the agency name and Docket ID. Regardless of the method used for submitting comments or material, all submissions will be posted, without change, to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov,* and will include any personal information you provide. Therefore, submitting this information makes it public. You may wish to read the Privacy Act notice that is available via the link in the footer of *www.regulations.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Berstein, Esq. I&PR, Mitigation, National Flood Insurance Program, (202) 212–2113. You may contact the Records Management Division for copies of the proposed collection of information at email address: *FEMA-Information-Collections-Management@fema.dhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the National Flood Insurance Program's (NFIP) Write Your Own (WYO) Program, FEMA may enter into arrangements authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended (the Act) with individual private sector insurance companies that are licensed to engage in the business of property insurance. These companies may offer flood insurance coverage to eligible property owners utilizing their customary business practice. To facilitate the marketing of flood insurance, the federal government will be a guarantor of flood insurance coverage for WYO companies policies issued under the WYO Program Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement (Arrangement). To ensure that a company seeking to return or participate in the WYO program is qualified, FEMA is requiring a one-time submission of information to determine the company's qualifications, as set forth in 44 CFR 62.24.

Collection of Information

Title: Write Your Own (WYO) Company Participation Criteria; New Applicant

Type of Information Collection: Extension, without change, of a currently approved information collection.

OMB Number: 1660–0086.

FEMA Forms: There is no FEMA form number.

Abstract: Under the NFIP, WYO Program, FEMA may enter into arrangements with individual private sector insurance companies that are licensed to engage in the business of offering NFIP flood insurance coverage. The federal government acts as underwriter of this flood insurance. To ensure that a company seeking to return or participate in the WYO program is qualified, FEMA requires an initial submission of information to determine the company's qualifications, as set forth in 44 CFR 62.24.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 5.

Number of Responses: 5.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 35.

Estimated Cost: $1727.95.

Comments

Comments may be submitted as indicated in the **ADDRESSES** caption above. Comments are solicited to (a) evaluate whether the proposed data collection is necessary for the proper performance of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Richard W. Mattison

Records Management Program Chief, Mission Support, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

[FR Doc. 2016–28129 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111–52–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Docket ID FEMA–2016–0002; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA–B–1658]

Proposed Flood Hazard Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Comments are requested on proposed flood hazard determinations, which may include additions or modifications of any Base Flood Elevation (BFE), base flood depth, Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) boundary or zone designation, or regulatory floodway on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), and where applicable, in the supporting Flood Insurance Study (FIS) reports for the communities listed in the table below. The purpose of this notice is to seek general information and comment regarding the preliminary FIRM, and where applicable, the FIS report that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has provided to the affected communities. The FIRM and FIS report are the basis of the floodplain management measures that the community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of having in effect in order to qualify or remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). In addition,

the FIRM and FIS report, once effective, will be used by insurance agents and others to calculate appropriate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings and the contents of those buildings.

DATES: Comments are to be submitted on or before February 21, 2017.

ADDRESSES: The Preliminary FIRM, and where applicable, the FIS report for each community are available for inspection at both the online location and the respective Community Map Repository address listed in the tables below. Additionally, the current effective FIRM and FIS report for each community are accessible online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov* for comparison.

You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. FEMA–B–1658, to Rick Sacbibit, Chief, Engineering Services Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, FEMA, 400 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–7659, or (email) *patrick.sacbibit@fema.dhs.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rick Sacbibit, Chief, Engineering Services Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, FEMA, 400 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–7659, or (email) *patrick.sacbibit@fema.dhs.gov;* or visit the FEMA Map Information eXchange (FMIX) online at *www.floodmaps.fema.gov/fhm/fmx_main.html.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: FEMA proposes to make flood hazard determinations for each community listed below, in accordance with section 110 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4104, and 44 CFR 67.4(a).

These proposed flood hazard determinations, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are the minimum that are required. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own or pursuant to policies established by other Federal, State, or regional entities. These flood hazard determinations are used to meet the floodplain management requirements of the NFIP and also are used to calculate the appropriate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings built after the FIRM and FIS report become effective.

The communities affected by the flood hazard determinations are provided in the tables below. Any request for reconsideration of the revised flood hazard information shown on the Preliminary FIRM and FIS report that satisfies the data requirements outlined in 44 CFR 67.6(b) is considered an appeal. Comments unrelated to the flood hazard determinations also will be considered before the FIRM and FIS report become effective.

Use of a Scientific Resolution Panel (SRP) is available to communities in support of the appeal resolution process. SRPs are independent panels of experts in hydrology, hydraulics, and other pertinent sciences established to review conflicting scientific and technical data and provide recommendations for resolution. Use of the SRP only may be exercised after FEMA and local communities have been engaged in a collaborative consultation process for at least 60 days without a mutually acceptable resolution of an appeal. Additional information regarding the SRP process can be found online at *http://floodsrp.org/pdfs/srp_fact_sheet.pdf.*

The watersheds and/or communities affected are listed in the tables below. The Preliminary FIRM, and where applicable, FIS report for each community are available for inspection at both the online location and the respective Community Map Repository address listed in the tables. For communities with multiple ongoing Preliminary studies, the studies can be identified by the unique project number and Preliminary FIRM date listed in the tables. Additionally, the current effective FIRM and FIS report for each community are accessible online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov* for comparison.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 97.022, ''Flood Insurance.'')

Dated: October 31, 2016.

Roy E. Wright,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Insurance and Mitigation, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

MORGAN COUNTY, COLORADO AND INCORPORATED AREAS

[Maps Available for Inspection Online at: *http://www.fema.gov/preliminaryfloodhazarddata*]

Community	Community map repository address
Project: 08–08–0407S Preliminary Date: March 16, 2016	
City of Brush ..	City Hall, 600 Edison Street, Brush, CO 80723.
City of Fort Morgan.	City Hall, 110 Main Street, Fort Morgan, CO 80701.
Town of Wiggins.	Town Hall, 304 Central Avenue, Wiggins, CO 80654.
Unincorporated Areas of Morgan County.	Morgan County Planning and Zoning Department, 231 Ensign Street, Fort Morgan, CO 80701.

[FR Doc. 2016–28132 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–12–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Docket ID FEMA–2016–0002; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA–B–1659]

Proposed Flood Hazard Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Comments are requested on proposed flood hazard determinations, which may include additions or modifications of any Base Flood Elevation (BFE), base flood depth, Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) boundary or zone designation, or regulatory floodway on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), and where applicable, in the supporting Flood Insurance Study (FIS) reports for the communities listed in the table below. The purpose of this notice is to seek general information and comment regarding the preliminary FIRM, and where applicable, the FIS report that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has provided to the affected communities. The FIRM and FIS report are the basis of the floodplain management measures that the community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of having in effect in order to qualify or remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). In addition, the FIRM and FIS report, once effective, will be used by insurance agents and others to calculate appropriate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings and the contents of those buildings.

DATES: Comments are to be submitted on or before February 21, 2017.

ADDRESSES: The Preliminary FIRM, and where applicable, the FIS report for each community are available for inspection at both the online location and the respective Community Map Repository address listed in the tables below. Additionally, the current effective FIRM and FIS report for each community are accessible online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov* for comparison.

You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. FEMA–B–1659, to Rick Sacbibit, Chief, Engineering Services Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, FEMA, 400 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–7659, or (email) *patrick.sacbibit@fema.dhs.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rick Sacbibit, Chief, Engineering Services Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, FEMA, 400 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–7659, or (email) *patrick.sacbibit@fema.dhs.gov;* or visit the FEMA Map Information eXchange (FMIX) online at *www.floodmaps.fema.gov/fhm/fmx_main.html.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: FEMA proposes to make flood hazard determinations for each community listed below, in accordance with section 110 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4104, and 44 CFR 67.4(a).

These proposed flood hazard determinations, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are the minimum that are required. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own or pursuant to policies established by other Federal, State, or regional entities. These flood hazard determinations are used to meet the floodplain management requirements of the NFIP and also are used to calculate the appropriate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings built after the FIRM and FIS report become effective.

The communities affected by the flood hazard determinations are provided in the tables below. Any request for reconsideration of the revised flood hazard information shown on the Preliminary FIRM and FIS report that satisfies the data requirements outlined in 44 CFR 67.6(b) is considered an appeal. Comments unrelated to the flood hazard determinations also will be considered before the FIRM and FIS report become effective.

Use of a Scientific Resolution Panel (SRP) is available to communities in support of the appeal resolution process. SRPs are independent panels of experts in hydrology, hydraulics, and other pertinent sciences established to review conflicting scientific and technical data and provide recommendations for resolution. Use of the SRP only may be exercised after FEMA and local communities have been engaged in a collaborative consultation process for at least 60 days without a mutually acceptable resolution of an appeal. Additional information regarding the SRP process can be found online at *http://floodsrp.org/pdfs/srp_fact_sheet.pdf.*

The watersheds and/or communities affected are listed in the tables below. The Preliminary FIRM, and where applicable, FIS report for each community are available for inspection at both the online location and the respective Community Map Repository address listed in the tables. For communities with multiple ongoing Preliminary studies, the studies can be identified by the unique project number and Preliminary FIRM date listed in the tables. Additionally, the current effective FIRM and FIS report for each community are accessible online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov* for comparison.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 97.022, ''Flood Insurance.'')

Dated: October 31, 2016.

Roy E. Wright,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Insurance and Mitigation, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

I. Non-watershed-based studies:

Community	Community Map Repository Address
Jefferson County, Washington and Incorporated Areas	
Maps Available for Inspection Online at: *http://www.fema.gov/preliminaryfloodhazarddata*	
Project: 14–10–0586S Preliminary Date: February 12, 2016	
City of Port Townsend	City Hall, 250 Madison Street, Suite 2, Port Townsend, WA 98368.
Hoh Indian Tribe	Hoh Indian Tribe Natural Resources Department, 2267 Lower Hoh Road, Forks, WA 98331.
Unincorporated Areas of Jefferson County	Jefferson County Department of Community Development, 621 Sheridan Street, Port Townsend, WA 98368.
Thurston County, Washington and Incorporated Areas	
Maps Available for Inspection Online at: *http://www.fema.gov/preliminaryfloodhazarddata*	
Project: 12–10–0394S Preliminary Date: June 30, 2016	
City of Lacey	City Hall, 420 College Street Southeast, Lacey, WA 98503.
City of Olympia	City Hall, 601 4th Avenue East, Olympia, WA 98501.
City of Tumwater	City Hall, 555 Israel Road Southwest, Tumwater, WA 98501.
Unincorporated Areas of Thurston County	Thurston County Courthouse, 2000 Lakeridge Drive Southwest, Building 1, Olympia, WA 98502.

[FR Doc. 2016–28135 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–12–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Docket ID FEMA–2014–0022]

Technical Mapping Advisory Council

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Committee management; Notice of Federal Advisory Committee meeting.

SUMMARY: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Technical Mapping Advisory Council (TMAC) will meet in person on December 13–14, 2016 in Arlington, Virginia. The meeting will be open to the public.

DATES: The TMAC will meet on Tuesday, December 13, 2016 from 8:00 a.m.–5:30 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST), and Wednesday, December 14, 2016 from 8:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m. EST. Please note that the meeting will close early if the TMAC has completed its business.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at 3101 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia, 22201. Members of the public who wish to attend the meeting must register in advance by sending an email to *FEMA-TMAC@fema.dhs.gov* (Attention: Mark Crowell) by 11:00 p.m. EST on Tuesday, December 6, 2016. Members of the public must check in at the front desk on the ground floor of 3101 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia, 22201 and photo identification is required. For information on facilities or services for individuals with disabilities or to request special assistance at the meeting, contact the person listed in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** below as soon as possible.

To facilitate public participation, members of the public are invited to provide written comments on the issues to be considered by the TMAC, as listed in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below. Associated meeting materials will be available at *www.fema.gov/TMAC* for review by Tuesday, December 6, 2016. Written comments to be considered by the committee at the time of the meeting must be submitted and received by Wednesday, December 7, 2016, identified by Docket ID FEMA–2014–0022, and submitted by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Email:* Address the email TO: *FEMA-RULES@fema.dhs.gov* and CC: *FEMA-TMAC@fema.dhs.gov.* Include the docket number in the subject line of the message. Include name and contact detail in the body of the email.
- *Mail:* Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of Chief Counsel, FEMA, 500 C Street SW., Room 8NE, Washington, DC 20472–3100.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the words ''Federal Emergency Management Agency'' and the docket number for this action. Comments received will be posted without alteration at *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided. *Docket:* For docket access to read background documents or comments received by the TMAC, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and search for the Docket ID FEMA–2014–0022.

A public comment period will be held on Tuesday, December 13, 2016, from 4:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. EST and again on Wednesday, December 14, 2016, from 3:00 to 3:30 p.m. EST. Speakers are requested to limit their comments to no more than three minutes. The public comment period will not exceed 30 minutes. Please note that the public comment period may end before the time indicated, following the last call for comments. Contact the individual listed below to register as a speaker by close of business on Thursday, December 8, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Crowell, Designated Federal Officer for the TMAC, FEMA, 400 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20024, telephone (202) 646–3432, and email *mark.crowell@fema.dhs.gov.* The TMAC Web site is: *http://www.fema.gov/TMAC.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice of this meeting is given under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. Appendix.

As required by the *Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012,* the TMAC makes recommendations to the FEMA Administrator on: (1) How to improve, in a cost-effective manner, the (a) accuracy, general quality, ease of use, and distribution and dissemination of flood insurance rate maps and risk data; and (b) performance metrics and milestones required to effectively and efficiently map flood risk areas in the United States; (2) mapping standards and guidelines for (a) flood insurance rate maps, and (b) data accuracy, data quality, data currency, and data eligibility; (3) how to maintain, on an ongoing basis, flood insurance rate maps and flood risk identification; (4) procedures for delegating mapping activities to State and local mapping partners; and (5)(a) methods for improving interagency and intergovernmental coordination on flood mapping and flood risk determination, and (b) a funding strategy to leverage and coordinate budgets and expenditures across Federal agencies. Furthermore, the TMAC is required to submit an annual report to the FEMA Administrator that contains: (1) A description of the activities of the Council; (2) an evaluation of the status and performance of flood insurance rate maps and mapping activities to revise and update Flood Insurance Rate Maps; and (3) a summary of recommendations made by the Council to the FEMA Administrator.

Agenda: During the two-day meeting, TMAC members will receive briefings from subject matter experts, and will present and deliberate on the draft content and potential recommendations to be incorporated in the TMAC 2016 Annual Report. In addition, the TMAC members will identify and coordinate on the TMAC's next steps for Annual Report production. A brief public comment period will take place each day during the meeting and will occur prior to any vote. The full agenda and related briefing materials will be posted for review by December 7, 2016 at *http://www.fema.gov/TMAC.*

Dated: November 9, 2016.

Roy E. Wright,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Insurance and Mitigation, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 2016–28139 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–12–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–5913–N–34]

60-Day Notice of Proposed Information Collection: FHA Single Family Model Mortgage Documents

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing- Federal Housing Commissioner, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: HUD is seeking approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for the information collection described below. In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, HUD is requesting comment from all interested parties on the proposed collection of information. The purpose of this notice is to allow for 60 days of public comment.

DATES: *Comments Due Date: January 23, 2017.*

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB Control Number and should be sent to: Colette Pollard, Reports Management Officer, QDAM, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW., Room 4176, Washington, DC 20410–5000; telephone 202–402–3400 (this is not a toll-free number) or email at *Colette.Pollard@hud.gov* for a copy of the proposed forms or other available information. Persons with hearing or speech impairments may access this number through TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Relay Service at (800) 877–8339.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kevin Stevens, 451 7th Street SW., Washington, DC 20410; email *Kevin L. Stevens@hud.gov;* or telephone 202–402–2673. This is not a toll-free number. Persons with hearing or speech impairments may access this number through TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Relay Service at (800) 877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice informs the public that HUD is seeking approval from OMB for the information collection described in Section A.

A. Overview of Information Collection

Title of Information Collection: FHA Single Family Model Mortgage Documents.

OMB Approval Number: 2502–New.

Type of Request: Approval of a new collection of information.

Form Number: N/A.

Description of the need for the information and proposed use:

This notice advises of FHA's review and proposed revisions to the Single Family Model Forward Mortgage document. The majority of the proposed changes are conforming or technical in nature (*e.g.,* correction of internal references and typographical errors). Included in this category is the proposed change to Section 19. As provided in FHA's Instructions for Model Mortgages (located at *http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/housing/sfh/model_documents*) the FHA Model Forward Mortgage document is based largely on the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation and Federal National Mortgage Association (the ''Government Sponsored Enterprises'' or ''GSEs'') security instrument covenants, with certain FHA-specific revisions. When incorporating the GSE covenants into the Model Forward Mortgage document, the second paragraph of Section 19 was unintentionally omitted, but reference to that paragraph was retained in the section heading, resulting in an apparent internal discrepancy in the Model Forward Mortgage. Because the omission of this paragraph was not identified as an FHA-Specific Modification (as that term is used in the Instructions for Model Mortgages), mortgagees have been free to adopt the analogous GSE covenant provision to resolve this discrepancy. Therefore, although the proposed change to Section 19 appear substantive, it should bring the Model Forward Mortgage into closer conformity with current FHA-insured mortgages and industry standard.

In addition to these technical changes, FHA is proposing one set of substantive changes to the Model Forward Mortgage, reflected in the judicial and non-judicial versions of Section 22 (hereinafter ''Sections 22'') and Section 20. Prior to the September, 2014 publication of the current Model Forward Mortgage, the former Model Forward Mortgage contained the following provision: ''[i]n many circumstances regulations issued by the Secretary will limit Lender rights, in the case of payment defaults, to require immediate payment in full and foreclose if not paid. This Security Instrument does not authorize acceleration or foreclosure if not permitted by regulations of the Secretary.'' (hereinafter ''Paragraph 9(d)''). Because Paragraph 9(d) is not serve to again further this goal.

The Department is also proposing a revision to Section 20, which generally provides that the borrower is not a third-party beneficiary to the contract of mortgage insurance between the lender and FHA. Legally, FHA borrowers have never been deemed third-party beneficiaries of the mortgage insurance contract between FHA and the mortgagee, and therefore, have had no authority to enforce any provisions thereof. However, as reflected in the proposed changes to Sections 22, the borrower and lender will enjoy contractual rights and obligations under the private mortgage contract that happen to mirror elements of the mortgage insurance contract because they both separately rely on HUD's regulations. By asserting rights under the private mortgage contract, even those that incorporate elements of the regulations forming the mortgage insurance contract, borrowers would not be enforcing the contract of mortgage insurance and FHA regulations as such, but rather enforcing the private contractual terms incorporated into the mortgage contract that mirror those regulations.

While aiming to clearly delineate the lines between the private mortgage contract and the contract of mortgage insurance through the language contained in Section 20, the Department does not wish to cause any confusion concerning the borrower's ability to enforce his or her rights that have been granted through the incorporation of certain regulatory provisions. Therefore, for clarity, the Department is proposing a revision to Section 20 that eliminates any confusion regarding the borrower's ability to assert rights under the private mortgage contract with the mortgagee as provided in the proposed changes to Section 22. The proposed revision to Section 20 does not jeopardize the settled fact that borrowers are not third-party beneficiaries of the mortgage insurance contract and do not have the authority to enforce any provisions thereof. This is a consequence of well-established legal principals governing contractual relationships and private, which will remain unchanged not with standing the proposed revision. HUD expects, therefore, that the proposed change renders Section 20 more apparently consistent with the proposed changes to Sections 22, but does not intend to create third-party rights under the mortgage insurance contract.

The following information regarding respondents and number of responses is based on information related to the actual legal mortgage document, not the model mortgage document.

Affected *Respondents:* Businesses or other for-profit.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 2,535.

Estimated Number of Responses: 164,447.

Frequency of Response: On Occasion.

Average Hours per Response: .05.

Total Estimated Burdens: 822 hours.

B. Solicitation of Public Comment

This notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected parties concerning the collection of information described in Section A on the following:

(1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including through the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information

technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

HUD encourages interested parties to submit comment in response to these questions.

Authority: Section 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Janet M. Golrick,

Associate General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Housing Associate Deputy Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 2016–28245 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–5993–N–01]

Notice of HUD Vacant Loan Sales (HVLS 2017–1)

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner, HUD.

ACTION: Notice of sales of reverse mortgage loans.

SUMMARY: This notice announces HUD's intention to competitively offer multiple residential reverse mortgage pools consisting of approximately 1,700 reverse mortgage notes secured by properties with an aggregate broker price opinion of approximately $220 million. The sale will consist of due and payable Secretary-held reverse mortgage loans. The mortgage loans consist of first liens secured by single family, vacant residential properties, where all borrowers are deceased and no borrower is survived by a non-borrowing spouse.

This notice also generally describes the bidding process for the sale and certain persons who are ineligible to bid. This is the first sale offering of its type and the sale will be held on November 30, 2016.

DATES: For this sale action, the Bidder's Information Package (BIP) is expected to be made available to qualified bidders on or about October 28, 2016. Bids for the HVLS 2017–1 sale will be accepted on the Bid Date of November 30, 2016 (Bid Date). HUD anticipates that award(s) will be made on or about December 1, 2016 (the Award Date).

ADDRESSES: To become a qualified bidder and receive the BIP, prospective bidders must complete, execute, and submit a Confidentiality Agreement and a Qualification Statement acceptable to HUD. Both documents are available via the HUD Web site at: *http://www.hud.gov/sfloansales* or via: *http://www.verdiassetsales.com.* Please mail and fax executed documents to Verdi Consulting, Inc.: Verdi Consulting, Inc., 8400 Westpark Drive, 4th Floor, McLean, VA 22102, *Attention:* HUD SFLS Loan Sale Coordinator, Fax: 1–703–584–7790.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Lucey, Director, Asset Sales Office, Room 3136, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20410–8000; telephone 202–708–2625, extension 3927. Hearing- or speech-impaired individuals may call 202–708–4594 (TTY). These are not toll-free numbers.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

HUD announces its intention to sell in HVLS 2017–1 due and payable Secretary-held reverse mortgage loans. The loans consist of first liens secured by single family, vacant residential properties, where all borrowers are deceased and no borrower is survived by a non-borrowing spouse.

A listing of the mortgage loans is included in the due diligence materials made available to qualified bidders. The mortgage loans will be sold without FHA insurance and with servicing released. HUD will offer qualified bidders an opportunity to bid competitively on the mortgage loans. The loans are expected to be offered in five regional pools.

The Bidding Process

The BIP describes in detail the procedure for bidding in HVLS 2017–1. The BIP also includes a standardized non-negotiable Conveyance, Assignment and Assumption Agreement for HVLS 2017–1 (CAA). Qualified bidders will be required to submit a deposit with their bid. Deposits are calculated based upon each qualified bidder's aggregate bid price.

HUD will evaluate the bids submitted and determine the successful bid, in terms of the best value to HUD, in its sole and absolute discretion. If a qualified bidder is successful, the qualified bidder's deposit will be non-refundable and will be applied toward the purchase price. Deposits will be returned to unsuccessful bidders.

This notice provides some of the basic terms of sale. The CAA, which is included in the BIP, provides comprehensive contractual terms and conditions. To ensure a competitive bidding process, the terms of the bidding process and the CAA are not subject to negotiation.

Due Diligence Review

The BIP describes how qualified bidders may access the due diligence materials remotely via a high-speed Internet connection.

Mortgage Loan Sale Policy

HUD reserves the right to remove mortgage loans from HVLS 2017–1 at any time prior to the Award Date. HUD also reserves the right to reject any and all bids, in whole or in part, and include any reverse mortgage loans in a later sale. Deliveries of mortgage loans will occur in conjunction with settlement and servicing transfer, approximately 30 to 45 days after the Award Date.

The HVLS 2017–1 reverse mortgage loans were insured by and were assigned to HUD pursuant to section 255 of the National Housing Act, as amended. The sale of the reverse mortgage loans is pursuant to section 204(g) of the National Housing Act.

Mortgage Loan Sale Procedure

HUD selected an open competitive whole-loan sale as the method to sell the mortgage loans for this specific sale transaction. For HVLS 2017–1, HUD has determined that this method of sale optimizes HUD's return on the sale of these loans, affords the greatest opportunity for all qualified bidders to bid on the mortgage loans, and provides the quickest and most efficient vehicle for HUD to dispose of the mortgage loans.

Bidder Ineligibility

In order to bid in HVLS 2017–1 as a qualified bidder, a prospective bidder must complete, execute and submit both a Confidentiality Agreement and a Qualification Statement acceptable to HUD. In the Qualification Statement, the prospective bidder must provide certain representations and warranties regarding the prospective bidder, including but not limited to (i) the prospective bidder's board of directors, (ii) the prospective bidder's direct parent, (iii) the prospective bidder's subsidiaries, (iv) any related entity with which the prospective bidder shares a common officer, director, subcontractor or sub-contractor who has access to Confidential Information as defined in the Confidentiality Agreement or is involved in the formation of a bid transaction (collectively the ''Related Entities''), and (v) the prospective bidder's repurchase lenders. The prospective bidder is ineligible to bid on any of the reverse mortgage loans included in HVLS 2017–1 if the prospective bidder, its Related Entities or its repurchase lenders, is any of the following, unless other exceptions apply as provided for the in Qualification Statement.

1. An individual or entity that is currently debarred, suspended, or excluded from doing business with

HUD pursuant to the Governmentwide Suspension and Debarment regulations at 2 CFR parts 180 and 2424;

2. An individual or entity that is currently suspended, debarred or otherwise restricted by any department or agency of the federal government or of a state government from doing business with such department or agency;

3. An individual or entity that is currently debarred, suspended, or excluded from doing mortgage related business, including having a business license suspended, surrendered or revoked, by any federal, state or local government agency, division or department;

4. An entity that has had its right to act as a Government National Mortgage Association (''Ginnie Mae'') issuer terminated and its interest in mortgages backing Ginnie Mae mortgage-backed securities extinguished by Ginnie Mae;

5. An individual or entity that is in violation of its neighborhood stabilizing outcome obligations or post-sale reporting requirements under a Conveyance, Assignment and Assumption Agreement executed for any previous mortgage loansale of HUD;

6. An employee of HUD's Office of Housing, a member of such employee's household, or an entity owned or controlled by any such employee or member of such an employee's household with household to be inclusive of the employee's father, mother, stepfather, stepmother, brother, sister, stepbrother, stepsister, son, daughter, stepson, stepdaughter, grandparent, grandson, granddaughter, father-in-law, mother-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, first cousin, the spouse of any of the foregoing, and the employee's spouse;

7. A contractor, subcontractor and/or consultant or advisor (including any agent, employee, partner, director, or principal of any of the foregoing) who performed services for or on behalf of HUD in connection with the sale;

8. An individual or entity that knowingly acquired or will acquire prior to the sale date material non-public information, other than that information which is made available to Bidder by HUD pursuant to the terms of this Qualification Statement, about mortgage loans offered in the sale;

9. An individual or entity that knowingly uses the services, directly or indirectly, of any person or entity ineligible under 1 through 10 to assist in preparing any of its bids on the mortgage loans;

10. An individual or entity which knowingly employs or uses the services of an employee of HUD's Office of Housing (other than in such employee's official capacity); or

The Qualification Statement has additional representations and warranties which the prospective bidder must make, including but not limited to the representation and warranty that the prospective bidder or its Related Entities are not and will not knowingly use the services, directly or indirectly, of any person or entity that is, any of the following (and to the extent that any such individual or entity would prevent the prospective bidder from making the following representations, such individual or entity has been removed from participation in all activities related to this sale and has no ability to influence or control individuals involved in formation of a bid for this sale):

(1) An entity or individual is ineligible to bid on any included reverse mortgage loan or on the pool containing such reverse mortgage loan because it is an entity or individual that:

(a) serviced or held such reverse mortgage loan at any time during the two-year period prior to the bid, or

(b) is any principal of any entity or individual described in the preceding sentence;

(c) any employee or subcontractor of such entity or individual during that two-year period; or

(d) any entity or individual that employs or uses the services of any other entity or individual described in this paragraph in preparing its bid on such reverse mortgage loan.

Freedom of Information Act Requests

HUD reserves the right, in its sole and absolute discretion, to disclose information regarding HVLS 2017–1, including, but not limited to, the identity of any successful qualified bidder and its bid price or bid percentage for any pool of loans or individual loan, upon the closing of the sale of all the Mortgage Loans. Even if HUD elects not to publicly disclose any information relating to SFLS 2017–1, HUD will disclose any information that HUD is obligated to disclose pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act and all regulations promulgated thereunder.

Scope of Notice

This notice applies to HVLS 2017–1 and does not establish HUD's policy for the sale of other mortgage loans.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Edward L. Golding,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Housing.

[FR Doc. 2016–28244 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[15XL LLIDB00100 LF1000000.HT0000 LXSS020D0000 241A 4500084766]

Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Bruneau-Owyhee Sage-Grouse Habitat Project, Owyhee County, Idaho

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the proposed Bruneau-Owyhee Sage-Grouse Habitat (BOSH) Project and by this notice is announcing the opening of the comment period.

DATES: To ensure comments will be considered, the BLM must receive written comments on the Bruneau-Owyhee Sage-Grouse Habitat Project Draft EIS within 45 days of this Notice of Availability being published in the **Federal Register**. The BLM will announce future meetings or hearings and any other public involvement activities at least 15 days in advance through public notices, media releases, and mailings.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments related to the proposed Bruneau-Owyhee Sage-Grouse Habitat Project by any of the following methods:

- Web site: *http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/nepa_register/BOSH-juniper-removal.html.*
- Email: *blm_id_bruneauowyheesagegrouse@blm.gov.*
- *Fax:* 208–384–3205.
- *Mail:* 3948 S. Development Ave., Boise, ID 83705.

Please title your correspondence, ''BOSH Project'' and include ''Attn: Mike McGee.'' Electronic copies of the proposed Bruneau-Owyhee Sage-Grouse Habitat Project Draft EIS are available at the BLM Boise District Office at the above address; you may also view or download the Draft EIS at the Web site listed above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mike McGee, Project Lead/Wildlife Biologist, 3948 S. Development Ave., Boise, ID 83705; via email at *blm_id_bruneauowyheesagegrouse@blm.gov;* or phone (208) 384–3464. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Relay Service at 1–800–877–8339 to contact Mr. McGee. The Service

is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with Mr. McGee. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Loss of suitable sage-grouse habitat from conversion of sagebrush steppe to juniper woodlands is a major threat to Greater Sage-Grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) in southwest Idaho. The BLM, in collaboration with other Federal and State agencies and local groups, is proposing to remove encroaching juniper in areas that would provide the greatest benefit to existing sage-grouse habitat and improve the long-term viability and persistence of sage-grouse in the BOSH project area. The purpose of the project is to restore, improve, and maintain Greater Sage-Grouse habitat at a landscape scale that is being and/or has been degraded by the encroachment of western juniper (*Juniperus occidentalis*) into sagebrush communities.

The proposed BOSH project boundary encompasses approximately 1.5 million acres in the BLM Owyhee and Bruneau Field Office management areas in Owyhee County, Idaho. Within the proposed project area, an approximately 600,000-acre focal treatment area has been identified based on modeling and treatment criteria. The preferred alternative is to remove all juniper within 3 kilometers of occupied sage-grouse leks (breeding habitat areas where male sage-grouse gather each spring to perform courtship displays to attract and mate with females), all juniper in the early phases of encroachment (greater than 20 percent canopy cover), as well as 5-acre or smaller patches of later phases of juniper encroachment (less than 20 percent canopy cover) in riparian areas deemed important for sage-grouse in the focal treatment area. Old growth juniper trees, as identified in the Draft EIS, will not be removed during these treatments.

Proposed treatment methods include cutting juniper with handsaws or chainsaws, lopping with pruning shears, or using heavy equipment such as a track-hoe fitted with a grinding implement (masticator) or a shearing implement (large, powerful pruning shears). Juniper material (logs, branches, etc.) may be scattered on site and left, or the material may be jackpot-burned or piled and burned where scattering cut material is not feasible or desirable (*e.g.,* where there would be too much material to scatter, or in riparian areas).

The focal treatment area includes approximately 47,000 acres of designated wilderness where only non-motorized hand tools would be used to cut juniper, which must be less than or equal to eight inches diameter at breast height, and access to treatment areas would be permitted on foot only. Juniper treatment in wilderness is included in the preferred alternative because 92 percent of the wilderness area (43,000 acres) is identified as a Priority Habitat Management Area for sage-grouse, and the remaining 8 percent (4,000 acres) is considered a General Habitat Management Area. Habitat management areas are delineated in the Record of Decision for the 2015 Greater Sage-Grouse Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments for Idaho and Southwest Montana. The BLM used the Minimum Requirements Decision Guide (MRDG) to ensure that juniper treatments in wilderness areas would produce the least disturbance possible (*e.g.,* hand saws only, no vehicle travel off designated roads, foot traffic only, etc.).

The other alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS include the No Action alternative (*i.e.,* present management would continue as usual and the project would not be implemented in any form) and an action alternative to treat juniper on approximately 553,000 acres within the project area boundary that excludes wilderness (*i.e.,* juniper in the 47, 000 acres of designated wilderness would remain untreated).

Internal meetings and meetings with collaborators to discuss and develop the project proposal began in 2013. A 30-day public scoping period was held from January 20 to February 20, 2015 to aid the BLM in project development. The scoping period included public meetings held at the Boise District Office on February 4, 2015 and at the Owyhee County Historical Museum on February 5, 2015. Important issues identified during internal and public scoping and addressed in the document include effects to the following: wildlife habitat (especially sage-grouse and migratory birds), native plant communities, riparian areas and vegetation, soils, visual resources, spread of noxious weeds and invasive plants, wilderness values, recreation values, cultural resources, and social values.

Please note that public comments and information submitted including names, street addresses, and email addresses of persons who submit comments will be available for public review and disclosure at the above address during regular business hours (8 a.m. to 4 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays.

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Authority: 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10.

Lara Douglas,

BLM Boise District Manager.

[FR Doc. 2016–28236 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–GG–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

[Docket No. BOEM–2016–0003]; [MAA104000]

Notice of Availability of the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Final Program

AGENCY: Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) is announcing the availability of the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Final Program (''Proposed Final Program'' or ''PFP''). This proposal is the last of three proposals for the 2017–2022 OCS Oil and Gas Leasing Program that will succeed the current, 2012–2017 Program. The PFP provides information and analyses to inform the Secretary of the Interior's (Secretary) decision on the size, timing, and location of leasing in the 2017–2022 Program. Section 18 of the OCS Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) specifies a multi-step process of consultation and analysis that must be completed before the Secretary may approve a new OCS Oil and Gas Leasing Program, commonly known as the Five-Year Program. The required steps following this notice include a minimum 60-day period after the submission of the PFP to the President and Congress before the Secretary may approve the 2017–2022 Program. Concurrently with this notice, and pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), BOEM is publishing a Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the 2017–2022 Program.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Kelly Hammerle, Five-Year Program Manager, at (703) 787–1613 or *Kelly.hammerle@boem.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Section 18 of the OCS Lands Act requires the Secretary to prepare and maintain a schedule of proposed OCS oil and gas lease sales determined to ''best meet national energy needs for the five-year period following its approval or reapproval.'' This PFP is the last of three proposed leasing schedules for OCS lease sales under the 2017–2022 Program. The first proposal, the Draft Proposed Program (DPP), was published on January 29, 2015, and was followed by a 60-day comment period that ended on March 30, 2015. The second proposal, the Proposed Program, was published on March 18, 2016, with a 90-day comment period that closed on June 16, 2016.

The areas identified in the PFP were chosen after careful consideration of the factors specified in Section 18 of the OCS Lands Act and the comments received during the Program development process. Included in this PFP is an analysis of the lease sale options identified by the Secretary in the Proposed Program. The development of the Five-Year Program is a winnowing process; thus, only those areas that the Secretary decided were appropriate to include in the Proposed Program are analyzed in the PFP and the associated Final PEIS. The PFP and Final PEIS will be submitted to the President and Congress at least 60 days prior to Secretarial approval of the 2017–2022 Program.

Summary of the Proposed Final Program

As part of the Administration's energy strategy, the PFP is designed to best meet the nation's energy needs. It takes into account the Section 18 requirement to balance the potential for discovery of offshore oil and gas resources with the potential for environmental damage and the potential for adverse impact on the coastal zone. In weighing the Section 18 factors to develop a nationwide program, region-specific considerations were taken into account, including information about resource potential, the status of resource development and infrastructure to support oil and gas activities and emergency response capabilities, industry interest, and the regional interests and policies of affected states. Through the Five-Year Program winnowing process, the Secretary gathers information to determine the timing of lease sales and the combination of offshore areas that will, if leased, best meet the energy needs of the nation while protecting against environmental damage and adverse impact to the coastal zone.

Grounded in the above principles, and after careful consideration of public input and the OCS Lands Act Section 18(a)(2) factors, the PFP contains a proposed lease sale schedule of 11 lease sales, 10 in those portions of three OCS planning areas in the Gulf of Mexico that are not subject to moratorium, and one in the Cook Inlet offshore Alaska. These areas have high resource potential, existing Federal or state leases and infrastructure, and more manageable potential environmental and coastal conflicts from development as compared to other OCS areas that are not included in the 2017–2022 Program. In total, the PFP makes available approximately 70 percent of the resources that are economically recoverable at an oil price of $40 per barrel, and nearly one half of the estimated undiscovered technically recoverable OCS oil and gas resources.

TABLE 1—2017–2022 PROPOSED FINAL PROGRAM LEASE SALE SCHEDULE

Year	Planning area	Sale No.
1. 2017	Gulf of Mexico	249
2. 2018	Gulf of Mexico	250
3. 2018	Gulf of Mexico	251
4. 2019	Gulf of Mexico	252
5. 2019	Gulf of Mexico	253
6. 2020	Gulf of Mexico	254
7. 2020	Gulf of Mexico	256
8. 2021	Gulf of Mexico	257
9. 2021	Cook Inlet	258
10. 2021	Gulf of Mexico	259
11. 2022	Gulf of Mexico	261

Gulf of Mexico Region

The Gulf of Mexico combines abundant proven and estimated oil and gas resources, broad industry interest, and well-developed infrastructure. The oil and gas resource potential of the Western and Central Gulf of Mexico, as well as the portion of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico that is not subject to Congressional moratorium, is the best understood of all of the OCS planning areas. Not only are the oil and gas resource volume estimates for the Gulf of Mexico OCS unparalleled, the existing infrastructure to support development is mature for and able to support oil and gas activity and response capabilities in the event of an emergency.

Of the 11 lease sales included in the PFP, 10 are in the Gulf of Mexico (see Figure 1), where infrastructure is well established, and there is strong adjacent state support and significant oil and gas resource potential. The Gulf of Mexico proposal includes region-wide sales: One sale in 2017 and 2022, and two sales in 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021.

Alaska Region

In Alaska, the PFP includes a Cook Inlet lease sale in 2021 that comprises the northern portion of the Cook Inlet Planning Area (see Figure 2). Cook Inlet is a mature basin with a long history of oil and gas development in State waters, where existing infrastructure is capable of supporting new activity. The design of this lease sale area allows for the protection of the endangered beluga whale, and for the protection of northern sea otter critical habitat, and makes available those areas with the greatest industry interest and significant oil and gas resource potential. BOEM will continue to use developing scientific information and stakeholder feedback to determine, in advance of any sale, which specific areas offer the greatest resource potential, while minimizing conflicts with environmental, subsistence, and multiple use considerations in Cook Inlet.

The DPP and Proposed Program included one sale each in the Chukchi Sea and Beaufort Sea Planning Areas. After considering all available information and analyses, the Secretary removed the Chukchi Sea and Beaufort Sea Program Areas from the PFP. The Secretary's decision to remove the Beaufort Sea and Chukchi Sea Program Areas was based on a consideration of the Section 18(a)(2) factors, which include regional geographical, geological and ecological characteristics of the region; equitable sharing of developmental benefits and environmental risks among regions; environmental and predictive information; industry interest; regional and national energy markets; state goals and policy; environmental sensitivity; and other uses of the various planning areas.

While there are significant hydrocarbon resources in the Arctic, the region is a unique, sensitive, and costly environment in which to operate. Unlike the Cook Inlet, the Arctic OCS is remote, and would require substantially more new investment for large-scale OCS development. Industry voiced its interest in the Arctic OCS in the comment period on the Proposed Program. However, foreshadowed by Shell's disappointing 2015 drilling season and subsequent announcement that it would leave the U.S. Arctic for the foreseeable future, industry has demonstrated its declining interest in the Arctic OCS with the relinquishment of the majority of leases in these two

Planning Areas. In fact, the number of active leases in the Arctic OCS has declined by more than 90 percent in a matter of months, from 527 in February 2016 to only 43 as of October 2016, with most of these expected to expire in 2017.

While the Arctic OCS has the potential to provide domestic energy production when economic conditions are considerably more favorable, the increase in domestic onshore production from shale formations and other market factors have shifted expectations regarding oil and gas price trajectories and have substantially reduced the economic incentives for Arctic exploration and production. As described in Chapter 6 of the PFP, recent developments in domestic oil and natural gas markets have reduced the United States' reliance on imported petroleum. With the existing U.S. onshore crude production increasing in every year since 2008, and substantial Gulf of Mexico offshore production continuing, U.S. domestic energy supply remains strong. While new production can be beneficial, the Arctic lease sales are not necessary to have a 2017–2022 Program that best meets the energy needs of the nation. BOEM estimates that without the Arctic OCS lease sales, cumulative U.S. oil and gas production will be less than one percent lower over the 70-year life of projected activity, and only four percent lower during the years of peak production. The Nation's energy security remains strong without leasing in the Arctic, and the oil and gas resources in the Arctic will likely become more valuable to potential bidders at some point in the future.

Atlantic Region

As in the Proposed Program, no lease sales are included in the Atlantic Region in the lease sale schedule for 2017–2022.

Pacific Region

As in the DPP and Proposed Program, no lease sales are included in the Pacific Region in the lease sale schedule for 2017–2022.

Assurance of Fair Market Value

Section 18 of the OCS Lands Act requires receipt of fair market value from OCS oil and gas leases. BOEM plans to continue to use the two-phase post-sale bid evaluation process that it has used since 1983 to meet the fair market value requirement. BOEM recently revised its post-sale bid evaluation process (see Summary of Procedures for Determining Bid Adequacy at Offshore Oil and Gas Lease Sales: Effective March 2016 at *http://www.boem.gov/Summary-of-Procedures-For-Determining-Bid-Adequacy/*). Further, the PFP provides that BOEM may set minimum bid levels, rental rates, and royalty rates for each individual lease sale, based on BOEM's assessment of market and resource conditions closer to the date of the lease sale.

Next Steps in the Process

BOEM will submit the PFP and Final PEIS to the President and Congress at least 60 days prior to Secretarial approval of the 2017–2022 Program.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Abigail R. Hopper,

Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

Figure 1: 2017–2022 Lower 48 States Proposed Program Areas



Figure 2: 2017–2022 Alaska Proposed Program Area



[FR Doc. 2016–28296 Filed 11–21–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–C

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE–16–039]

Government in the Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: United States International Trade Commission.

TIME AND DATE: December 2, 2016 at 11:00 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205–2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agendas for future meetings: none.
2. Minutes.
3. Ratification List.
4. Vote in Inv. Nos. 701–TA–249 and 731–TA–262, 263, and 265 (Fourth Review)(Iron Construction Castings from Brazil, Canada, and China). The Commission is currently scheduled to complete and file its determinations and views of the Commission on December 15, 2016.
5. Outstanding action jackets: none.

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: November 17, 2016.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–28360 Filed 11–21–16; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE–16–040]

Government in the Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: United States International Trade Commission.

TIME AND DATE: December 6, 2016 at 11:00 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205–2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agendas for future meetings: none.
2. Minutes.
3. Ratification List.
4. Vote in Inv. Nos. 701–TA–470–471 and 731–TA–1169–1170 (Review) (Coated Paper Suitable for High-Quality Print Graphics Using Sheet-Fed Presses from China and Indonesia). The Commission is currently scheduled to complete and file its determinations and views of the Commission on December 20, 2016.
5. Outstanding action jackets: none.

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: November 17, 2016.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–28361 Filed 11–21–16; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE–16–041]

Government in the Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: United States International Trade Commission.

TIME AND DATE: December 9, 2016 at 11:00 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205–2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agendas for future meetings: none.
2. Minutes.
3. Ratification List.
4. Vote in Inv. Nos. 701–TA–379 and 731–TA–788, 792, and 793 (Third Review) (Stainless Steel Plate from Belgium, South Africa, and Taiwan). The Commission is currently scheduled to complete and file its determinations and views of the Commission on December 22, 2016.
5. Outstanding action jackets: none.

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: November 17, 2016.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–28362 Filed 11–21–16; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Hearing of the Judicial Conference Advisory Committee on Rules of Civil Procedure, Federal Register Citation of Previous Announcement: 81FR 52713

AGENCY: Judicial Conference of the United States Advisory Committee on Rules of Civil Procedure.

ACTION: Revised notice of proposed amendments and open hearings.

SUMMARY: The Advisory Committee on Rules of Civil Procedure has proposed amendments to the following rules: Civil Rules 5, 23, 62, and 65.1. Three public hearings were scheduled on these proposed amendments. An in-person hearing was held on November 3, 2016, in Washington, DC Two additional public hearings are scheduled. There will be an in-person hearing in Phoenix, Arizona, on January 4, 2017, and a telephonic hearing on February 16, 2017. Those wishing to testify in person on January 4, 2017 or telephonically on February 16, 2017, must contact the Secretary by email at: *Rules_Support@ao.uscourts.gov,* with a copy mailed to the address below at least 30 days before the hearing.

Please note: The public hearing on the amendments to the Civil Rules previously scheduled in Dallas/Fort Worth, Texas, for February 16, 2017, will be held via telephone conference.

The text of the proposed rules and the accompanying Committee Notes are posted on the Judiciary's Web site at: *http://www.uscourts.gov/rules-policies/proposed-amendments-published-public-comment.* As previously announced, the public comment period with respect to the proposed amendments opened on August 15, 2016, and written comments or suggestions must be received no later than February 15, 2017. Written comments must be submitted electronically, following the instructions provided on the Web site. All comments submitted will be available for public inspection.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rebecca A. Womeldorf, Secretary, Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Judicial Conference of the United States, Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, One Columbus Circle NE., Suite 7–240, Washington, DC 20544, Telephone (202) 502–1820.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Rebecca A. Womeldorf,

Secretary, Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure, Judicial Conference of the United States.

[FR Doc. 2016–28182 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

On November 10, 2016, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed consent decree with the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey in the lawsuit entitled *United States* v. *Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation,* Civil Action No. 16-cv-8418.

The United States has filed a Complaint brought on behalf of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (''EPA'') against Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation (''SMC'') seeking performance of Operable Units 1 and 2 (''OU1 and OU2'') of the remedial action and past and future response costs at the Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation Superfund Site (''Site'') in Gloucester and Cumberland Counties, New Jersey. The consent decree resolving the claims requires SMC to perform the OU1 and OU2 remedies at the Site. EPA estimates the value of the work to be performed pursuant to the Consent Decree at about $5,635,000. In addition, EPA will receive $505,000 in reimbursement of its past costs and a commitment by SMC to pay future response costs at the Site relating to the work to be performed.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States* v. *Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation,* D.J. Ref. No. 90–11–3–11285. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	Send them to:
By email	*pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov.*
By mail	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

During the public comment period, the consent decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: *https://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees.* We will provide a paper copy of the consent decree upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. Please mail your request and payment to: Consent Decree Library, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for $94.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury. For a paper copy without the appendices, the cost is $11.25.

Robert E. Maher Jr.,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2016–28181 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1121–0220]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Extension Without Change, of a Previously Approved Collection; Bureau of Justice Assistance Application Form: Public Safety Officers Educational Assistance

AGENCY: Bureau of Justice Assistance, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 60-day notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, will submit the following information collection request for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 60 days until January 23, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Michelle Martin, Senior Management Analyst, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 810 Seventh Street NW., Washington, DC 20531 (phone: 202 514–9354).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

—Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, including whether the information will have practical utility;

—Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

—Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and

—Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of this information collection:

1 *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

2 *The Title of the Form/Collection:* Public Safety Officers Educational Assistance.

3 *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* None. The applicable component within the Department of Justice is the Bureau of Justice Assistance, in the Office of Justice Programs.

4 *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Dependents of public safety officers who were killed or permanently and totally disabled in the line of duty.

Abstract: BJA's Public Safety Officers' Benefits (PSOB) division will use the PSOEA Application information to confirm the eligibility of applicants to receive PSOEA benefits. Eligibility is dependent on several factors, including the applicant having received or being eligible to receive a portion of the PSOB Death Benefit, or having a family member who received the PSOB Disability Benefit. Also considered are the applicant's age and the schools being attended. In addition, information to help BJA identify an individual is collected, such as contact numbers and email addresses.

5 *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* It is estimated that no more than 200 respondents will apply a year. Each application takes approximately 30 minutes to complete.

6 *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The estimated public burden associated with this collection is 100 hours. It is estimated that respondents will take 30 minutes to complete an application. The burden hours for collecting respondent data sum to 100 hours (200 respondents × 0.5 hours = 100 hours).

If additional information is required contact: Jerri Murray, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE., Room 3E–405B, Washington, D.C 20530 or Hope D. Janke, Director, Public Safety Officers' Benefits Office, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 810 7th Street NW., Washington, DC 20531.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Jerri Murray,

Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2016–28150 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

On November 16, 2016, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed consent decree with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois in the lawsuit entitled *United States and State of Illinois* v. *North Shore Gas Co.,* Civil Action No. 16–10672.

The proposed consent decree resolves claims by the United States and the State of Illinois in the associated complaint under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act against North Shore Gas Company (''NSG'') for response actions and future response costs relating to the NSG South Plant Manufactured Gas Plant Superfund Alternative Site in Waukegan, Lake County, Illinois (''the Site''). Under the proposed consent decree, NSG agrees to perform the remedial actions, estimated to cost $10.5 million, selected by EPA and to pay future response costs incurred by the United States and the State of Illinois. The proposed consent decree includes a covenant not to sue NSG conditioned upon the satisfactory performance by NSG of its obligations under the proposed consent decree.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the proposed consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States and State of Illinois* v. *North Shore Gas Co.,* D.J. Ref. No. 90–11–3–11472. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	Send them to:
By email	*pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov.*

To submit comments:	Send them to:
By mail	Assistant Attorney General U.S. DOJ—ENRD P.O. Box 7611 Washington, D.C. 20044–7611.

During the public comment period, the consent decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: *https://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees.* We will provide a paper copy of the consent decree upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. Please mail your request and payment to: Consent Decree Library, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for $44.25 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury. For a paper copy without the exhibits and signature pages, the cost is $9.25.

Randall M. Stone,

Acting Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2016–28136 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Notice of Decisions on States' Applications for Relief From Tax Credit Reductions Provided Under Section 3302 of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (FUTA) Applicable in 2016

AGENCY: Employment and Training Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Sections 3302(c)(2)(A) and 3302(d)(3) of the FUTA provide that employers in a State that has an outstanding balance of advances under Title XII of the Social Security Act at the beginning of January 1 of two or more consecutive years are subject to a reduction in credits otherwise available against the FUTA tax for the calendar year in which the most recent such January 1 occurs, if a balance of advances remains at the beginning of November 10 of that year. Further, section 3302(c)(2)(C) of FUTA provides for an additional credit reduction for a year if a State has outstanding advances on five or more consecutive January firsts and has a balance at the beginning of November 10 for such years. Section 3302(c)(2)(C) also provides for waiver of this additional credit reduction and substitution of the credit reduction provided in section 3302(c)(2)(B) if a state meets certain conditions.

California, Connecticut, Ohio, and the Virgin Islands passed January 1, 2016 with outstanding Title XII advances and were potentially subject to FUTA credit reductions.

California, Ohio, and the Virgin Islands applied for a waiver of the 2016 additional credit reduction under section 3302 (c)(2)(C) of FUTA and it has been determined that each one met all of the criteria of that section necessary to qualify for the waiver of the additional credit reduction. Further, the additional credit reduction of section 3302(c)(2)(B) is zero for these States for 2016. Therefore, employers in these States will have no additional credit reduction applied for calendar year 2016.

Connecticut and Ohio repaid all of their outstanding advance balances before the beginning of November 10, 2016. Therefore, employers in those States will have no reduction in FUTA offset credit for calendar year 2016.

California and the Virgin Islands will have a credit reduction of 1.8 for calendar year 2016.

Portia Wu,

Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training.

[FR Doc. 2016–28238 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–FW–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Comment Request; State Exchange on Employment and Disability (SEED) Initiative Implementation Evaluation Survey

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Chief Evaluation Office, Department of Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) [44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)]. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents is properly assessed. Currently, the Department of Labor is soliciting comments concerning the collection of data about the State Exchange on Employment and Disability (SEED) Initiative Implementation Evaluation Survey. A copy of the proposed Information Collection Request (ICR) can be obtained by contacting the office listed in the addressee section of this notice.

DATES: The OMB will consider all written comments that the agency receives on or before January 23, 2017.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by either one of the following methods:

Email: ChiefEvaluationOffice@dol.gov; Mail or Courier: Cherise Hunter, Office of Disability Employment Policy, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Room S–1303, Washington, DC 20210.

Instructions: Please submit one copy of your comments by only one method. All submissions received must include the agency name and OMB Control Number identified above for this information collection. Because we continue to experience delays in receiving mail in the Washington, DC area, commenters are strongly encouraged to transmit their comments electronically via email or to submit them by mail early. Comments, including any personal information provided, become a matter of public record. They will also be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of the information collection request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact Cherise Hunter by email at *chiefevaluationoffice@dol.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background.

The proposed information collection activities described in this notice will provide data for the State Exchange on Employment and Disabilities (SEED) Evaluation. In the fall of 2015, The Office of Disability Employment (ODEP) launched the SEED initiative. The SEED initiative is designed to advance policy at the state and local levels that promote employment opportunities for people with disabilities through collaborative engagement of intermediary organizations that serve as value added interfaces between and among various levels of government and entities with overlapping interests. A formative evaluation of SEED has been undertaken to provide feedback and information to the SEED implementation team to make the initiative as efficient and effective as possible. This **Federal Register** Notice provides the opportunity to comment on one proposed data collection instrument

that will be used in the SEED evaluation:

(1) SEED Implementation Evaluation Survey. This survey will be distributed to a sample of State legislators and their staff who are members of intermediary organizations participating in the SEED initiative. It will identify barriers and needs to inform the SEED implementation team on what SEED could do to assist states interested in adopting disability employment policies. It will also provide feedback from State legislators and staff regarding their perceptions of SEED activities and resources to date as well as identify where State legislators are currently getting their information about disability employment policy issues to improve outreach.

II. Review Focus

Currently, DOL is soliciting comments concerning the above data collection for the evaluation of SEED. DOL is particularly interested in comments that do the following:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

III. Current Action

At this time, DOL is requesting clearance for the SEED Implementation Evaluation Survey.

Type of Review: New Information Collection.

OMB Control Number: 1290–0NEW.

Title: State Exchange on Employment and Disability (SEED) Initiative Implementation Evaluation Survey.

ESTIMATED TOTAL BURDEN HOURS—SEED IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION SURVEY

Respondents	Number of espondents	Number of esponses per respondent	Total esponses	Estimated time per response (hours)	Estimated total burden (hours)
State legislators and staff who are members of organizations participating in the SEED initiative	1,039	1	1,039	.22	228.58

Affected Public: A sample of State legislators and their staff who are members of intermediary organizations participating in the SEED initiative.

Annual Frequency: One time for the SEED initiative evaluation survey.

Comments submitted in response to this comment request will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: November 15, 2016.

Sharon Block,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, U.S. Department of Labor.

[FR Doc. 2016–28264 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–HX–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Wage and Hour Division

Proposed Extension of the Information Collection Disclosure to Workers Under the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act

AGENCY: Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95). 44 U.S.C. 3056(c)(2)(A). This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. Currently, the Wage and Hour Division is soliciting comments concerning its proposal to extend Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval of the Information Collection: Disclosures to Workers Under the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act. A copy of the proposed information request can be obtained by contacting the office listed below in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this Notice.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the **ADDRESSES** section below on or before January 23, 2017.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by Control Number 1235–0002, by either one of the following methods: *Email: WHDPRAComments@dol.gov; Mail, Hand Delivery, Courier:* Division of Regulations, Legislation, and Interpretation, Wage and Hour, U.S. Department of Labor, Room S–3502, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210. *Instructions:* Please submit one copy of your comments by only one method. All submissions received must include the agency name and Control Number identified above for this information collection. Because we continue to experience delays in receiving mail in the Washington, DC area, commenters are strongly encouraged to transmit their comments electronically via email or to submit them by mail early. Comments, including any personal information provided, become a matter of public record. They will also be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of the information collection request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Melissa Smith, U.S. Department of Labor, Room S–3502, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693–0406 (this is not a toll-free number). Copies of this notice may be obtained in alternative formats (Large Print, Braille, Audio Tape, or Disc), upon request, by calling (202) 693–0023 (not a toll-free number). TTY/TTD callers may dial toll-free (877) 889–5627 to obtain information or request materials in alternative formats.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background: The Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act (MSPA) safeguards migrant and seasonal agricultural workers in their interactions with Farm Labor Contractors, Agricultural Employers and Agricultural Associations, and providers of migrant farm worker housing. *See* Public Law 97–470. The MSPA requires Farm Labor Contractors, Agricultural Employers, and Agricultural Associations, who recruit, solicit, hire, employ, furnish, transport, or house agricultural workers, as well as providers of migrant housing, to meet certain minimum requirements in their dealings with migrant and seasonal agricultural workers. Various sections of the MSPA require respondents (*e.g.,* Farm Labor Contractors, Agricultural Employers, and Agricultural Associations to disclose terms and conditions in writing to their workers. MSPA sections 201(g) and 301(f) requires that the DOL make forms available to provide such information. The DOL prints and makes optional-use form WH–516, Worker Information—Terms and Conditions of Employment.

MSPA sections 201(d) and 301(c)—29 U.S.C. 1821(d), 1831(c) and regulations 29 CFR 500.80(a), require each Farm Labor Contractor, Agricultural Employer, and Agricultural Association that employs a migrant or seasonal worker to make, keep, and preserve records for three years for each such worker concerning the: (1) Basis on which wages are paid; (2) number of piece work units earned, if paid on a piece work basis; (3) number of hours worked; (4) total pay period earnings; (5) specific sums withheld and the purpose of each sum withheld; (6) net pay. Respondents are also required to provide an itemized written statement of this information to each migrant and seasonal agricultural worker each pay period. *See* 29 U.S.C. 1821(d), 1831(c), and 29 CFR 500.1-.80(d). Additionally, MSPA sections 201(e) and 301(d) require each Farm Labor Contractor provide copies of all the records noted above for the migrant and seasonal agricultural workers the contractor has furnished to other Farm Labor Contractors, Agricultural Employers, or Agricultural Associations who use the workers. Respondents must also make and keep certain records. Section 201(c) of the MSPA requires all Farm Labor Contractors, Agricultural Employers, and Agricultural Associations providing housing to a migrant agricultural worker to post in a conspicuous place at the site of the housing, or present to the migrant worker, a written statement of any housing occupancy terms and conditions. *See* 29 U.S.C. 1821(c); 29 CFR 500.75. In addition, MSPA section 201(g) requires them to provide such information in English, or as necessary and reasonable, in a language common to the workers. *See* 29 U.S.C. 1821(g). The provision also requires DOL make the optional forms available to provide the required disclosures. *See* 29 U.S.C. 1821(g); 29 CFR 500.1(i)(2).

II. Review Focus: The Department of Labor is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submissions of responses.

III. Current Actions: The Department of Labor seeks an approval for the extension of this information collection in order to ensure effective administration of various special employment programs.

Type of Review: Extension.

Agency: Wage and Hour Division.

Title: Disclosure to Workers Under the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act.

OMB Number: 1235–0002.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit, Not-for-profit institutions, Farms.

Agency Numbers: Forms WH–501 (English and Spanish versions), WH–516 (English, Spanish and Haitian Creole versions), and WH–521.

Total Respondents: 105,587.

Total Annual Responses: 82,418,590.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 1,387,565.

Estimated Time per Response: Various.

Frequency: On occasion.

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup/operation/maintenance): $3,296,743.60.

Dated: November 16, 2016.

Melissa Smith,

Director, Division of Regulations, Legislation, and Interpretation.

[FR Doc. 2016–28265 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–27–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of Workers' Compensation Programs.

Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health: Subcommittee on Medical Advice re: Weighing Medical Evidence

AGENCY: Office of Workers' Compensation Programs.

ACTION: Announcement of meeting of the Subcommittee on Medical Advice re: Weighing Medical Evidence of the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health (Advisory Board) for the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act (EEOICPA).

SUMMARY: The subcommittee will meet via teleconference on December 12, 2016, from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For press inquiries: Ms. Amanda McClure, Office of Public Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, Room S–1028, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone (202) 693–4672; email *mcclure.amanda.c@dol.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Advisory Board is mandated by Section 3687 of EEOICPA. The Secretary of Labor established the Board under this authority and Executive Order 13699 (June 26, 2015). The purpose of the Advisory Board is to advise the Secretary with respect to: (1) The Site Exposure Matrices (SEM) of the Department of Labor; (2) medical guidance for claims examiners for claims with the EEOICPA program, with respect to the weighing of the medical evidence of claimants; (3) evidentiary requirements for claims under Part B of EEOICPA related to lung disease; and (4) the work of industrial hygienists and staff physicians and consulting physicians of the Department of Labor and reports of such hygienists and physicians to ensure quality, objectivity, and consistency. The Advisory Board sunsets on December 19, 2019. This subcommittee is being assembled to gather and analyze data and continue working on advice under Area #2, Medical Advice re: Weighing Medical Evidence.

The Advisory Board operates in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) (5 U.S.C. App. 2) and its implementing regulations (41 CFR part 102–3).

Agenda: The tentative agenda for the Subcommittee on Medical Advice re: Weighing Medical Evidence meeting includes: review of claims filed under

Part E of the EEOICPA; review of available training materials; discuss format of working group meeting with claims examiners.

OWCP transcribes Advisory Board subcommittee meetings. OWCP posts the transcripts on the Advisory Board Web page, *http://www.dol.gov/owcp/energy/regs/compliance/AdvisoryBoard.htm,* along with written comments and other materials submitted to the subcommittee or presented at subcommittee meetings.

Public Participation, Submissions, and Access to the Public Record

Subcommittee meeting: The subcommittee will meet via teleconference on Monday, December 12, 2016, from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time. Advisory Board subcommittee meetings are open to the public. The teleconference number and other details for listening to the meeting will be posted on the Advisory Board's Web site no later than 72 hours prior to the meeting. This information will be posted at *http://www.dol.gov/owcp/energy/regs/compliance/AdvisoryBoard.htm.*

Requests for special accommodations: Please submit requests for special accommodations to participate in the subcommittee meeting by email, telephone, or hard copy to Ms. Carrie Rhoads, OWCP, Room S–3524, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone (202) 343–5580; email *EnergyAdvisoryBoard@dol.gov.*

Submission of written comments for the record: You may submit written comments, identified by the subcommittee name and the meeting date of December 12, 2016, by any of the following methods:

- *Electronically:* Send to: *EnergyAdvisoryBoard@dol.gov* (specify in the email subject line, ''Subcommittee on Medical Advice re: Weighing Medical Evidence'').
- *Mail, express delivery, hand delivery, messenger, or courier service:* Submit one copy to the following address: U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health, Room S–3522, 200 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20210. Due to security-related procedures, receipt of submissions by regular mail may experience significant delays.

Comments must be received by December 5, 2016. OWCP will make available publically, without change, any written comments, including any personal information that you provide. Therefore, OWCP cautions interested parties against submitting personal information such as Social Security numbers and birthdates.

Electronic copies of this **Federal Register** notice are available at *http://www.regulations.gov.* This notice, as well as news releases and other relevant information, are also available on the Advisory Board's Web page at *http://www.dol.gov/owcp/energy/regs/compliance/AdvisoryBoard.htm.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You may contact Antonio Rios, Designated Federal Officer, at *rios.antonio@dol.gov,* or Carrie Rhoads, Alternate Designated Federal Officer, at *rhoads.carrie@dol.gov,* U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Suite S–3524, Washington, DC 20210, telephone (202) 343–5580.

This is not a toll-free number.

Signed at Washington, DC.

Leonard J. Howie III,

Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs.

[FR Doc. 2016–28269 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–24–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of Workers' Compensation Programs

Division of Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Proposed Extension of Existing Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) [44 U.S.C. 3506 (c)(2)(A)] This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. Currently, the Office of Workers' Compensation (OWCP) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed collection: Application for Continuation of Death Benefit for Student (LS–266). A copy of the proposed information collection request can be obtained by contacting the office listed below in the address section of this Notice.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the addresses section below on or before January 23, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Ms. Yoon Ferguson, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave. NW., Room S–3323, Washington, DC 20210, telephone/fax (202) 354–9647, Email *ferguson.yoon@dol.gov.* Please use only one method of transmission for comments (mail, fax, or Email).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background: The Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, (OWCP) administers the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. This Act was amended on October 27, 1972, to provide for continuation of death benefits for a child or certain other surviving dependents after the age of 18 years (to age 23) if the dependent qualifies as a student as defined in section 2(18) of the Act. The benefit would also be terminated if the dependent completes four years of education beyond high school. Form LS–266 is to be submitted by the parent or guardian for whom continuation of benefits is sought. The statements contained on the form must be verified by an official of the education institution. The information is used by the DOL to determine whether a continuation of the benefits is justified. This information collection is currently approved for use through March 31, 2017.

II. Review Focus: The Department of Labor is particularly interested in comments which:

* Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

* evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

* enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and

* minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submissions of responses.

III. Current Actions: The Department of Labor seeks the extension of approval

of this information collection in order to ensure that employers are complying with the reporting requirements of the Act and to ensure that injured claimants receive all compensation benefits to which they are entitled.

Agency: Office of Workers' Compensation Programs.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Application for Continuation of Death Benefit for Student.

OMB Number: 1240–0026.

Agency Number: LS–266.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; Business or other for-profit.

Total Respondents: 20.

Total Annual Responses: 20.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 10.

Estimated Time per Response: 30 minutes.

Frequency: On occasion.

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): $0.

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintenance): $10.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Yoon Ferguson,

Agency Clearance Officer, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, US Department of Labor.

[FR Doc. 2016–28271 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–CF–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of Workers' Compensation Programs

Division of Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Proposed Extension of Existing Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Labor.

ACTION: Notice

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) [44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)] This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. Currently, the Office of Workers' Compensation (OWCP) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed collection: Employer's First Report of Injury or Occupational Disease (LS–202) and Employer's Supplementary Report of Accident or Occupational Illness (LS–210). A copy of the proposed information collection request can be obtained by contacting the office listed below in the address section of this Notice.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the addresses section below on or before January 23, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Ms. Yoon Ferguson, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave. NW., Room S–3323, Washington, DC 20210, telephone/fax (202) 354–9647, Email *ferguson.yoon@dol.gov.* Please use only one method of transmission for comments (mail, fax, or Email).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Office of Workers' Compensation Programs administers the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. The Act provides benefits to workers injured in maritime employment on the navigable waters of the United States and adjoining area customarily used by an employee in loading, unloading, repairing, or building a vessel. The LS–202 is used by employers initially to report injuries that have occurred which are covered under the Longshore Act and its related statutes. The LS–210 is used to report additional periods of lost time from work. This information collection is currently approved for use through March 31, 2017.

II. Review Focus

The Department of Labor is particularly interested in comments which:

* Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

* Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

* Enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and

* Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submissions of responses.

III. Current Actions

The Department of Labor seeks the extension of approval of this information collection in order to ensure that employers are complying with the reporting requirements of the Act and to ensure that injured claimants receive all compensation benefits to which they are entitled.

Agency: Office of Workers' Compensation Programs.

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Request for Earnings Information.

OMB Number: 1240–0003.

Agency Number: LS–202 and LS–210.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit, Not-for-profit institution.

Form	Time to complete	Frequency of response	Number of respondents	Number of responses	Hours burden
LS–202	15 min	occasion	23,490	23,490	5,873
LS–210	15 min	occasion	1,141	1,141	285
Totals			24,631	24,631	6,158

Total Respondents: 24,631.

Total Annual Responses: 24,631.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 6,158.

Estimated Time Per Response: 15 minutes.

Frequency: On occasion.

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): $0.

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintenance): $12,316.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: November 17, 2016.

Yoon Ferguson,

Agency Clearance Officer, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, US Department of Labor.

[FR Doc. 2016–28267 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–CF–P

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: National Credit Union Administration (NCUA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The National Credit Union Administration (NCUA) will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13, on or after the date of publication of this notice.

DATES: Comments should be received on or before December 23, 2016 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Send comments regarding the burden estimate, or any other aspect of the information collection, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to (1) Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for NCUA, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, or email at *OIRA_Submission@OMB.EOP.gov* and (2) NCUA PRA Clearance Officer, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314, Suite 5067, or email at *PRAComments@ncua.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Copies of the submission may be obtained by emailing *PRAComments@ncua.gov* or viewing the entire information collection request at *www.reginfo.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Number: 3133–0103.

Title: Disclosure and Recordkeeping Requirements under Regulation B (Equal Credit Opportunity Act, 12 CFR part 1002); Regulation E (Electronic Fund Transfers, 12 CFR part 1005); Regulation M (Consumer Leasing, 12 CFR part 1013); and Regulation CC (Availability of Funds and Collection of Checks, 12 CFR part 229).

Abstract: The third party disclosure and recordkeeping requirements in this collection are required by statute and regulation. The regulations prescribe certain aspects of the credit application and notification process, making certain disclosures, uniform methods for computing the costs of credit, disclosing credit terms and cost, resolving errors on certain types of credit accounts, and timing requirements and disclosures relating to the availability of deposited funds.

Type of Review: Reinstatement with change of a previously approved collection.

Affected Public: Private Sector: Not-for-profit institutions; Individuals or Households.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 3,245,905.

By Gerard Poliquin, Secretary of the Board, the National Credit Union Administration, on November 18, 2016.

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Dawn D. Wolfgang,

NCUA PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–28266 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7535–01–P

THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Institute of Museum and Library Services

Submission for OMB Review, Comment Request, Proposed Collection: Community Catalyst: The Roles of Libraries and Museums as Enablers of Community Vitality and Co-Creators of Positive Community Change—A National Leadership Grants Special Initiative

AGENCY: Institute of Museum and Library Services, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

ACTION: Submission for OMB review, comment request.

SUMMARY: The Institute of Museum and Library Services announces the following information collection has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 35). This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed.

A copy of the proposed information collection request can be obtained by contacting the individual listed below in the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the CONTACT section below on or before December 23, 2016.

OMB is particularly interested in comments that help the agency to:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.* permitting electronic submissions of responses.

ADDRESSES: Stephanie Burwell, Chief Information Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Institute of Museum and Library Services, 955 L'Enfant Plaza North SW., Suite 4000, Washington, DC 20024–2135. Mrs. Burwell can be reached by Telephone: 202–653–4684, Fax: 202–653–4625, or by email at *sburwell@imls.gov* or by teletype (TTY/TDD) at 202–653–4614. Office hours are from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., E.T., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Institute of Museum and Library Services is the primary source of federal support for the Nation's 123,000 libraries and 35,000 museums. The Institute's mission is to inspire libraries and museums to advance innovation, learning, and civic engagement. The Institute works at the national level and in coordination with state and local organizations to sustain heritage, culture, and knowledge; enhance learning and innovation; and support professional development. IMLS is responsible for identifying national needs for and trends in museum, library, and information services; measuring and reporting on the impact and effectiveness of museum, library

and information services throughout the United States, including programs conducted with funds made available by IMLS; identifying, and disseminating information on, the best practices of such programs; and developing plans to improve museum, library, and information services of the United States and strengthen national, State, local, regional, and international communications and cooperative networks (20 U.S.C. 72, 20 U.S.C. 9108).

The purpose of this survey is to Community Catalyst: The Roles of Libraries and Museums as Enablers of Community Vitality and Co-creators of Positive Community Change (Community Catalyst)—A National Leadership Grants Special Initiative. National Leadership Grants for Libraries (NLG-Libraries) and National Leadership Grants for Museums (NLG-Museums), under which this special initiative falls, support projects that address challenges faced by the library and museum fields and that have the potential to advance practice in those fields. Successful projects will generate results such as new tools, research findings, models, services, practices, or alliances that can be widely used, adapted, scaled, or replicated to extend the benefits of federal investment. This special joint NLG-Libraries and NLG-Museums initiative invites proposals for the development and testing of approaches to deepen and sustain the collaborative work that libraries and museums engage in with their communities. Funded projects will help to create foundations for enhanced collective impact in communities, especially working with those from diverse economic, social and cultural backgrounds and will involve key partners including community service organizations, government entities, community-focused businesses, and/or funders. The goal is to help build additional capacity in libraries and museums to become enablers of community vitality and co-creators of positive community change.

Current Actions: This notice proposes clearance of the Community Catalyst: The Roles of Libraries and Museums as Enablers of Community Vitality and Co-creators of Positive Community Change—A National Leadership Grants Special Initiative, was published in the **Federal Register** on September 9, 2016 (FR vol. 81, No. 175, pgs. 62540). There were no public comments.

Agency: Institute of Museum and Library Services.

Title: Community Catalyst: The Roles of Libraries and Museums as Enablers of Community Vitality and Co-creators of Positive Community Change—A National Leadership Grants Special Initiative.

OMB Number: TBD.

Agency Number: 3137.

Frequency: One time.

Affected Public: Libraries, agencies, institutions of higher education, museums, and other entities that advance the museum and library fields and that meet the eligibility criteria.

Number of Respondents: 60.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 40 hours.

Total Burden Hours: 2,400.

Total Annualized cost to respondents: $68,088.80.

Total Annualized capital/startup costs: 0.

Total Annualized Cost to Federal Government: $18,939.87.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Comments should be sent to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, *Attn.:* OMB Desk Officer for Education, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, (202) 395–7316.

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Kim A. Miller,

Grants Specialist, Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–28275 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7036–01–P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Notice of Permit Applications Received Under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Notice of Permit Applications Received Under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978, Public Law 95–541.

SUMMARY: The National Science Foundation (NSF) is required to publish a notice of permit applications received to conduct activities regulated under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978. NSF has published regulations under the Antarctic Conservation Act at Title 45 Part 670 of the Code of Federal Regulations. This is the required notice of permit applications received.

DATES: Interested parties are invited to submit written data, comments, or views with respect to this permit application by December 23, 2016. This application may be inspected by interested parties at the Permit Office, address below.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Permit Office, Room 755, Division of Polar Programs, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nature McGinn, ACA Permit Officer, at the above address or *ACApermits@nsf.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Science Foundation, as directed by the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978 (Pub. L. 95–541), as amended by the Antarctic Science, Tourism and Conservation Act of 1996, has developed regulations for the establishment of a permit system for various activities in Antarctica and designation of certain animals and certain geographic areas as requiring special protection. The regulations establish such a permit system to designate Antarctic Specially Protected Areas.

Application Details

1. *Applicant—Permit Application:* 2017–036

Lisa Tauxe, Scripps Institute of Oceanography, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92093

Activity for Which Permit Is Requested

Enter Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA). The applicant proposes to enter ASPA No. 124, Cape Crozier, to collect small rock samples. The applicant proposes to enter the ASPA on foot to access sites for rock collection near the ASPA boundary and via helicopter to access sites well within the ASPA, but away from the penguin and skua colonies. The rock samples will be collected from areas of exposed lava flow tops and away from plant life. The samples will be archived at the home institution.

Location

Cape Crozier, ASPA 124.

Dates

December 15–30, 2016.

Nadene G. Kennedy,

Polar Coordination Specialist, Division of Polar Programs.

[FR Doc. 2016–28123 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–79339; File No. SR-BatsEDGX–2016–41]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Bats EDGX Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Designation of Longer Period for Commission Action on Proposed Rule Change Related to the Exchange's Equity Options Platform To Adopt a Price Improvement Auction, the Bats Auction Mechanism

November 17, 2016.

On September 16, 2016, Bats EDGX Exchange, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''EDGX'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] a proposed rule change for the Exchange's equity options platform (''EDGX Options'') to adopt a price improvement auction, the Bats Auction Mechanism. The proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on October 5, 2016.[3] The Commission has received no comment letters on the proposal.

Section 19(b)(2) of the Act [4] provides that within 45 days of the publication of notice of the filing of a proposed rule change, or within such longer period up to 90 days as the Commission may designate if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or as to which the self-regulatory organization consents, the Commission shall either approve the proposed rule change, disapprove the proposed rule change, or institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved. The 45th day for this filing is November 19, 2016.

The Commission is extending the 45-day time period for Commission action on the proposed rule change. The Commission finds that it is appropriate to designate a longer period within which to take action on the proposed rule change so that it has sufficient time to consider and take action on the Exchange's proposed rule change.

Accordingly, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2)(A)(ii)(I) of the Act [5] and for the reasons stated above, the Commission designates January 3, 2017, as the date by which the Commission should either approve or disapprove, or institute proceedings to determine whether to disapprove, the proposed rule change (File No. SR-BatsEDGX–2016–41).

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[6]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28184 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78988 (September 29, 2016), 81 FR 69172.

[4] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[5] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)(A)(ii)(I).

[6] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(31).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–79342; File No. SR–BatsBZX–2016–73]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Bats BZX Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of an Amendment to Rule 8.11, Effective Date of Judgment and the Adoption of Rule 8.18, Release of Disciplinary Complaints, Decisions and Other Information

November 17, 2016.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on November 3, 2016, Bats BZX Exchange, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''BZX'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Exchange has designated this proposal as a ''non-controversial'' proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act [3] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) thereunder,[4] which renders it effective upon filing with the Commission. 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 filed a proposal to add proposed Rule 8.18 to require the publication of the Exchange's disciplinary complaints and disciplinary decisions issued and to remove the part of Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 that currently governs the publication of disciplinary complaints and information related to disciplinary complaints.

The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Exchange's Web site at *www.batstrading.com,* 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 parts of such statements.

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

1. Purpose

Proposed Rule Change

Reorganization of Exchange Rules Governing Release of Disciplinary Complaints, Decisions and Other Information Based on FINRA Rule 8313

Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 currently provides, in part, that the Exchange shall cause details regarding all formal disciplinary actions where a final decision has been issued, except as provided in Rule 8.15(a), to be published on its Web site. Interpretation and Policy .01 also provides that the Exchange shall not issue any press release or other statement to the press concerning any formal or informal disciplinary matter unless the Chief Regulatory Officer recommends a press release to the Executive Committee or the Board of the Exchange and either body determines that such a press release is warranted. The Exchange proposes to remove parts of Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 described above and to add proposed Rule 8.18 modeled after FINRA Rule 8313,[5] as described below, to govern the publication of disciplinary information. The scope of proposed Rule 8.18 would be limited to publication of materials relating to the disciplinary process set forth in Chapter VIII because the Exchange seeks to provide prompt access to more information regarding its disciplinary

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[4] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6)(iii).

[5] New York Stock Exchange, LLC (''NYSE'') similarly adopted rules modeled after FINRA Rule 8313. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78664 (August 24, 2016), 81 FR 59678, 59679 (August 30, 2016) (SR–NYSE–2016–40).

actions to Members and associated persons. By providing more information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary process, including publishing disciplinary complaints at the time they are filed, Members and associated persons will be able to sooner identify conduct that the Exchange views as problematic and have will [sic] the ability to take corrective steps sooner than they can under the current rules that provide only for the publication of disciplinary decisions after they become final. In that regard, the Exchange has determined not to adopt FINRA Rule 8313 in all respects at this time.[6]

General Standards

The Exchange proposes Rule 8.18(a) to be entitled ''General Standards.'' The text would set forth general standards for the release to the public of disciplinary complaints, decisions, or information.

Proposed Rule 8.18(a)(1) would, in part, essentially replace the part of Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 that addresses the publication of disciplinary decisions and conform [sic] to FINRA Rule 8313. The proposed rule would provide that the Exchange shall release to the public a copy of and, at the Exchange's discretion, information with respect to, any disciplinary decision issued by the Exchange, as defined in proposed Rule 8.18(e). Additionally, the proposed rule would provide that the Exchange would release to the public copies of disciplinary complaints as defined in proposed Rule 8.18(e). Also, the decision to issue other related information, including a press release, under proposed Rule 8.18(a)(1) would be in the discretion of the Exchange generally instead of requiring Executive Committee or Exchange Board approval as currently required in Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11. Proposed Rule 8.18(a)(1) would also provide that, in response to a request, the Exchange shall also release to the requesting party a copy of any identified disciplinary complaint or disciplinary decision issued by the Exchange, as defined in proposed Rule 8.18(e). These proposed amendments are modeled after FINRA Rule 8313(a)(1) and would be substantially similar to the FINRA rule.

The Exchange does not propose to incorporate subsections (2), (3), (4) and (6) of FINRA Rule 8313(a) because the Exchange proposes to limit the scope of proposed Rule 8.18 to the publication of materials relating to the disciplinary process set forth in Chapter VIII at this time.[7] The Exchange, however, notes that although Exchange Rules do not provide for temporary cease and desist orders as provided for in FINRA Rule 9800, the Exchange's Client Suspension Rule—Rule 8.17—is similar in its procedure and purpose. The Exchange proposes to include a client suspension order issued pursuant to Rule 8.17 in the definition of ''disciplinary decision'' under proposed Rule 8.18(e)(2) consistent with FINRA's inclusion of its temporary cease and desist orders for publication because the Exchange views client suspension proceedings as disciplinary in nature. For the same reason, the Exchange proposes to include a notice of the initiation of a client suspension proceeding in the definition of ''disciplinary complaint'' under proposed Rule 8.18(e)(1).

The Exchange does not propose to incorporate subsection (5) of FINRA Rule 8313(a) because the Exchange does not have at this time provisions analogous to FINRA Rule 6490[8] and the FINRA Rule 9700 Series.[9] Additionally, the Exchange does not propose to include its procedures for exemptive relief analogous to the FINRA Rule 9600 Series because the Exchange proposes to limit scope of proposed Rule 8.18 to the publication of disciplinary materials.

Release Specifications

The Exchange proposes to include subsection (b) to proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Release Specifications'' modeled after FINRA Rule 8313(b). Proposed Rule 8.18(b)(1) provides that copies of, and information with respect to, any disciplinary complaint released to the public pursuant to paragraph (a) of the proposed rule shall indicate that a disciplinary complaint represents the initiation of a formal proceeding by the Exchange in which findings as to the allegations in the complaint have not been made and does not represent a decision as to any of the allegations contained in the complaint. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(b)(1) except that the proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA.''

Proposed Rule 8.18(b)(2) provides that copies of, and information with respect to, any disciplinary decision released to the public pursuant to paragraph (a) of the proposed rule prior to the expiration of the time period provided for an appeal or call for review as permitted under Exchange Rules or the Act, or while such an appeal or call for review is pending, shall indicate that the findings and sanctions imposed therein are subject to review and modification by the Exchange or the Commission. The proposed rule would be substantially similar to FINRA Rule 8313(b)(2). The proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA'' and would not include a provision relating to the release specifications for an ''other decision, order, notification, or notice'' because, as noted above, the Exchange proposes to limit the rule only to disciplinary complaints and disciplinary decisions.

Discretion To Redact Certain Information or Waive Publication

The Exchange has determined that, subject to limited exceptions, disciplinary information should be released to the public in unredacted form. To provide the standard for such limited exceptions, the Exchange proposes subsection (c) of proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Discretion to Redact Certain Information or Waive

[6] NYSE similarly declined to adopt all provisions of FINRA Rule 8313 insofar as the FINRA rule related to information beyond the formal disciplinary process. *See id.* at 59679.

[7] Subsection (2) of FINRA Rule 8313(a) provides for the publication of statutory disqualification decisions and temporary cease and desist orders.

Subsection (3) provides for the publication of any suspension, cancellation, expulsion, or bar for: failing to keep information current; failing to pay dues; failing to comply with an arbitration award or related settlement or an order of restitution or settlement providing for restitution; failing to meet the eligibility or qualification standards or prerequisites for access to services; or experiencing financial or operational difficulties. Additionally, subsection (3) provides for the publication of any suspension, cancellation, expulsion, or bar imposed as the result of a summary proceeding for actions authorized by Section 15A(h)(3) of the Act.

Subsection (4) addresses procedures for membership proceedings.

The Exchange does not propose to adopt subsections (2), (3), and (4) because, as discussed above, the Exchange's proposal is intended to provide more information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary process to the public so that Members and associated persons will be able to identify conduct that the Exchange views as problematic and will have the ability to take corrective steps sooner. Subsections (2), (3), and (4) to the FINRA rule would not further that purpose because those subsections would require the publication of information generally relating to membership eligibility or failure to satisfy one's membership obligations rather than discipline. Subsection (2) additionally addresses temporary cease and desist proceedings, which the Exchange does not have, and Subsection (3) additionally addresses Section 15A(h)(3) of the Act, which applies only to registered securities associations.

Subsection (6) permits discretionary release of a complaint, decision, order, notification, or notice issued under FINRA rules, where the release of such information is deemed by FINRA's Chief Executive Officer (or such other senior officer as the Chief Executive Officer may designate) to be in the public interest. The Exchange does not propose to adopt this open-ended subsection because [sic] Exchange intends for the proposed rule to instead be limited to disciplinary information for the reasons discussed above.

[8] ''Processing of Company-Related Actions.''

[9] ''Procedure For Grievances Concerning the Automated Systems.''

Publication,'' modeled after FINRA Rule 8313(c).

Proposed Rule 8.18(c)(1) would provide that the Exchange reserves the right to redact, on a case-by-case basis, information that contains confidential customer information, including customer identities, or information that raises significant identity theft, personal safety, or privacy concerns that are not outweighed by investor protection concerns. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(c)(1) except that the proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA.''

Similarly, proposed Rule 8.18(c)(2) provides that, notwithstanding paragraph (a) of the proposed rule, the Exchange may determine, in its discretion, to waive the requirement to release a copy of, or information with respect to, any disciplinary complaint or disciplinary decision under those extraordinary circumstances where the release of such information would violate fundamental notions of fairness or work an injustice. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(c)(2) except that the proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA'' and would not include a provision relating to the waiver of the release of an ''other decision, order, notification, or notice'' because, as noted above, the Exchange proposes to limit the rule only to disciplinary complaints and disciplinary decisions.

Notice of Appeals of Exchange Decisions

The Exchange proposes to include subsection (d) to proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Notice of Appeals of Exchange Decisions to the SEC'' modeled on FINRA Rule 8313(d). Proposed Rule 8.18(d) provides that the Exchange must provide notice to the public when a disciplinary decision of the Exchange is appealed to the Commission and the notice shall state whether the effectiveness of the decision has been stayed pending the outcome of proceedings before the Commission. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(d) except that the proposed Rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA.''

Definitions

Finally, the Exchange proposes subsection (e) of proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Definitions.'' Proposed Rule 8.18(e) would set forth definitions of the terms ''disciplinary complaint'' and ''disciplinary decision'' as used in the rule, modeled after the definitions contained in FINRA Rule 8313(e).

First, proposed Rule 8.18(e)(1) would define the term ''disciplinary complaint'' to mean any statement of charges issued pursuant to Rule 8.4 or any notice served pursuant to Rule 8.17. This proposed rule is based on FINRA Rule 8313(e)(1) except that it replaces the term ''complaint pursuant to the Rule 9200 Series'' with ''statement of charges pursuant to Rule 8.4'' and it includes a notice of the initiation of a client suspension proceeding issued pursuant to Rule 8.17 in the definition of ''disciplinary complaint.''

Second, proposed Rule 8.18(e)(2) would define the term ''disciplinary decision'' to mean any decision issued pursuant to the Chapter VIII, including, decisions issued by a Hearing Panel or the Appeals Committee and accepted offers of settlement. The Exchange additionally proposes to include suspension orders issued pursuant to Rule 8.17 in the definition of ''disciplinary decision.'' The Exchange does not propose to adopt the part of FINRA Rule 8313(e)(2) that discusses decisions issued pursuant to the FINRA Rule 9550 Series, FINRA Rule 9600 Series, FINRA Rule 9700 Series, or FINRA Rule 9800 Series, or decisions, notifications, or notices issued pursuant to the FINRA Rule 9520 Series because, as explained above, the Exchange does not propose to adopt the provisions of the FINRA Rule providing for the publication of such information. Finally, proposed Rule 8.18(e)(2) would provide that minor rule violation plan letters issued pursuant to Rules 8.15 and 25.3 are not subject to the proposed rule.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder that are applicable to a national securities exchange, and, in particular, with the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act.[10] In particular, the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)(1)[11] in that it enables the Exchange to be so organized as to have the capacity to be able to carry out the purposes of the Act and to comply, and to enforce compliance by its exchange members and persons associated with its exchange members, with the provisions of the Act, the rules and regulations thereunder, and the rules of the Exchange. In particular, the Exchange believes that the proposed addition of Rule 8.18 regarding release of disciplinary complaints, decisions and other information are [sic] consistent with Section 6(b)(1) of the Act because it would establish general standards for the release of disciplinary information to the public to provide greater access to information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary actions.

For the same reasons, the Exchange believes that proposed Rule 8.18 furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act[12] because the proposed rule is designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities, and to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system. In particular, proposed Rule 8.18 furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act by providing greater clarity, consistency, and transparency regarding the release of disciplinary complaints, decisions and other information to the public. By adopting the proposed Rule 8.18 modeled after FINRA Rule 8313, the Exchange would establish standards for the release of disciplinary information to the public in line with those in effect at FINRA that provide greater access to information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary actions and describe the scope of information subject to proposed Rule 8.18. The Exchange believes that this proposed rule change promotes greater transparency to the Exchange's disciplinary process, and that the proposed rule change provides greater access to information regarding its disciplinary actions, and also provides valuable guidance and information to Members, associated persons, other regulators, and the investing public.

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. The proposed rule change is not intended to address competitive issues, but rather it is designed to enhance the Exchange's rules governing the release of disciplinary complaints, decisions and other information to the public, thereby providing greater clarity and consistency and resulting in less burdensome and more efficient regulatory compliance and facilitating performance of regulatory functions.

[10] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[11] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(1).

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

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

The Exchange has not solicited, and does not intend to solicit, comments on this proposed rule change. The Exchange has not received any written comments from members or other interested parties.

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

Because the foregoing 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 from the date on which it was filed or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act [13] and paragraph (f)(6) of Rule 19b–4 thereunder.[14]

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. However, Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) [15] permits the Commission to designate a shorter time if such action is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest. In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange requests that the Commission waive the 30-day operative delay. The Exchange states that FINRA performs services for it under a Regulatory Services Agreement (''RSA''), including the filing and prosecution of disciplinary complaints on the Exchange's behalf. FINRA also files and prosecutes disciplinary complaints on its own behalf, sometimes on cases involving identical or similar conduct to the cases it brings on the Exchange's behalf. Without the waiver, the Exchange is concerned that FINRA might publish a complaint during the 30-day operative delay, and that the Exchange would not be permitted to publish its own complaint, prepared by FINRA, regarding the same conduct. According to the Exchange, this would supply the public with an incomplete picture of the disciplinary proceedings, the full nature of which could not be disclosed until much later when a final disciplinary decision is issued. The Exchange, therefore, believes that waiver of the operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest, as it will allow the Exchange to immediately publish any disciplinary complaints or decisions that are filed or issued after the proposal is filed. The Commission believes that waiver of the 30-day operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest because it will allow BZX to publish disciplinary complaints or decisions that have been filed or issued without delay. Therefore, the Commission designates the proposed rule change to be operative upon filing.[16]

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: (1) Necessary or appropriate in the public interest; (2) for the protection of investors; or (3) 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–BatsBZX–2016–73 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-BatsBZX–2016–73. 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 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 Web site 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 such 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–BatsBZX–2016–73 and should be submitted on or before December 14, 2016.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[17]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28186 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[13] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[14] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6).

[15] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6)(iii).

[16] For purposes only of waiving the 30-day operative delay, the Commission also has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. *See* 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

[17] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release Nos. 33–10258; 34–79350; File No. 265–27]

Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Meeting.

SUMMARY: The Securities and Exchange Commission Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies is providing notice that it will hold an open, public telephone meeting on Wednesday, December 7, 2016, beginning at 11:00 a.m. ET. Members of the public may attend the meeting by listening to the audiocast accessible on the Commission's Web site at *www.sec.gov.* Persons needing special accommodations to access the meeting because of a disability should notify the contact person listed below. The agenda for the meeting includes a continuation of discussions started at the Committee's meeting on October 5, 2016, including outreach and board diversity. The public is invited to submit written statements to the Committee.

DATES: The public meeting will be held on Wednesday, December 7, 2016. Written statements should be received on or before Monday, December 5, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Written statements may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Statements

- Use the Commission's Internet submission form (*http://www.sec.gov/info/smallbus/acsec.shtml*); or
- Send an email message to *rule-comments@sec.gov*. Please include File Number 265–27 on the subject line; or

Paper Statements

- Send paper statements to Brent J. Fields, Federal Advisory Committee Management Officer, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File No. 265–27. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help us process and review your statement more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all statements on the Advisory Committee's Web site at *http://www.sec.gov./info/smallbus/acsec.shtml*.

Statements also will be available for Web site 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. All statements received will be posted without change; we do not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Julie Z. Davis, Senior Special Counsel, at (202) 551–3460, Office of Small Business Policy, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–3628.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with Section 10(a) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C.—App. 1, and the regulations thereunder, Keith F. Higgins, Designated Federal Officer of the Committee, has ordered publication of this notice.

Dated: November 18, 2016.

Brent J. Fields,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–28257 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–79345; File No. SR–Phlx–2016–82]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; NASDAQ PHLX LLC; Order Instituting Proceedings To Determine Whether To Approve or Disapprove a Proposed Rule Change To Adopt a New Exception in Exchange Rule 1000(f) for Sub-MPV Split-Price Orders

November 17, 2016.

I. Introduction

On August 3, 2016, NASDAQ PHLX LLC (''Exchange'' or ''Phlx'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] a proposed rule change to provide an additional exception to the mandatory use of the Exchange's Floor Broker Management System (''FBMS'') pursuant to Rule 1000(f)(iii) to permit Floor Brokers to execute certain sub-minimum price increment (''sub-MPV'') split-price orders in the trading crowd. The proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on August 22, 2016.[3] On October 3, 2016, the Commission extended the time period within which to approve the proposed rule change, disapprove the proposed rule change, or institute proceedings to determine whether to approve or disapprove the proposed rule change to November 20, 2016.[4] The Commission received no comments on the proposal. This order institutes proceedings under Section 19(b)(2)(B) of the Act [5] to determine whether to disapprove the proposed rule change.

II. Description of the Proposed Rule Change

Currently, Phlx Rule 1000(f) requires that all Exchange options transactions be executed in one of the following three ways: ''(i) [a]utomatically by the Exchange Trading System pursuant to Rule 1080 and other applicable options rules; (ii) by and among members in the Exchange's options trading crowd none of whom is a Floor Broker; or (iii) through the Options [FBMS] for trades involving at least one Floor Broker.'' [6] Although a Floor Broker may represent orders in the trading crowd, a Floor Broker is not permitted to execute an order in the trading crowd unless one of three exceptions applies.[7] The exceptions to the mandatory use of FBMS [8] are set forth in Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii). These exceptions allow a Floor Broker to execute a transaction in the trading crowd (rather than through FBMS) if: (i) there is a problem with Exchange's systems; (ii) the Floor Broker is executing the trade pursuant to Phlx Rule 1059 (''Accommodation Transactions'') or Phlx Rule 1079 (''Flex Index, Equity and Currency Options''); or (iii) the transaction involves a multi-leg order with more than 15 legs.[9]

Phlx Rule 1014(g)(i)(B) provides a priority rule regarding open outcry split price transactions in equity options and options overlying ETFs to permit a member who is responding to an order for at least 100 contracts who buys (sells) at least 50 contracts at a particular price to have priority over all other orders in purchasing (selling) up to an equivalent number of contracts of the same order at the next lower (higher) price without being required to yield to existing customer interest in the limit order book.[10] Absent Phlx Rule 1014(g)(i)(B), such orders would be required to yield priority. The Exchange states that ''the purpose behind the split-price priority exception was 'to bring about the execution of large orders, which by virtue of their size and the need to execute them at multiple prices may be difficult to execute

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78593 (August 16, 2016), 81 FR 56724 (''Notice'').

[4] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 79023 (October 3, 2016), 81 FR 69877 (October 7, 2016).

[5] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)(B).

[6] *See* Phlx Rule 1000(f).

[7] *See* Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii).

[8] The original FBMS (''FBMS 1'') began operating in 2005. The Exchange retired FBMS 1 on March 31, 2016 after operating it concurrently with the Exchange's enhanced FBMS (''FBMS 2''), which was made available on March 7, 2014. As of March 31, 2016, FBMS 2 is available to all Floor Brokers in all options and is the only FBMS currently in use. The Exchange represents that it has contracted with a third-party to build an alternative system (''FBMS 3'') to replace FBMS 2, and anticipates that FBMS 3 will be ready by November 30, 2016. *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 56725.

[9] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 56726; *see also* Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii)(A)–(C). According to the Exchange, each time a Floor Broker uses one the current exceptions to Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii), the Floor Broker is required by Phlx Rule 1063(e)(ii), to record the information required by Phlx Rule 1063(e)(i) on paper trade tickets. The Exchange further represents that a Floor Broker may only represent an order for execution that has been time stamped with the time of entry on the trading floor. In addition, according to the Exchange, once an execution occurs, the trade ticket must be stamped with the time of execution of such order. *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 56726.

[10] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 56726 (citing Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51820 (June 10, 2005), 70 FR 35759 (June 21, 2005) (SR–Phlx–2005–28)) (approving pilot). *See also* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 55993 (June 29, 2007), 72 FR 37301 (July 9, 2007) (SR–Phlx–2007–44) (permanent approval).

without a limited exception to the priority rules.' '' [11]

According to the Exchange, split-price orders are currently processed using either FBMS 2 or paper tickets, depending on whether the split-price order can be evenly split using simple calculations or whether the transaction involves non-even integers and sub-MPV price points, thus requiring a more complicated computation to determine the number of contracts to trade at two different price points.[12] The Exchange represents that FBMS 2 does not have the capability to calculate specific volumes at different prices for transactions resulting from split-price orders.[13] To compensate for this system limitation, the Exchange is proposing to amend Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii) to add a new exception from the mandatory use of FBMS that would expressly authorize Floor Brokers to execute certain split-price orders in the trading crowd. Accordingly, the Exchange is proposing in Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii)(D) to allow the following split-price orders to be executed in the trading crowd: (1) simple orders not expressed in the applicable sub-MPV and that cannot be evenly split into two whole numbers to create a price at the midpoint of the MPV; and (2) complex and multi-leg orders with at least one option leg with an odd-numbered volume that must trade at a sub-MPV price or one leg that qualifies under (1) above.[14]

The Exchange also proposes that, in addition to split-price orders executed pursuant to proposed Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii)(D), Phlx surveillance staff would approve all executions submitted under Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii) to validate that such executions abide by applicable priority and trade-through rules.[15] The Exchange also proposes to round prices if necessary to execute the trade at the MPV, but only to the benefit of a customer order, or, where multiple customer orders are involved, for the customer order that is earliest in time.[16]

III. Proceedings To Determine Whether To Approve or Disapprove SR–Phlx–2016–82 and Grounds for Disapproval Under Consideration

The Commission is instituting proceedings pursuant to Section 19(b)(2)(B) of the Act,[17] to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved. Institution of such proceedings is appropriate at this time in view of the legal and policy issues raised by the proposed rule change. Institution of proceedings does not indicate that the Commission has reached any conclusions with respect to any of the issues involved. Rather, as described in greater detail below, the Commission seeks and encourages interested persons to comment on the proposed rule change to inform the Commission's analysis of whether to approve or disapprove the proposed rule change.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(2)(B) of the Act,[18] the Commission is providing notice of the grounds for disapproval under consideration. The Commission is instituting proceeding to allow for additional analysis of, and input from commenters with respect to, the consistency of the proposed rule change with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act,[19] which requires that the rules of a national securities exchange be designed, among other things, to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, 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; and not be designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers, or dealers,[20] and with the Order Protection and Locked/Crossed Market Plan.[21]

Finally, under the Commission's rules of procedure, a self-regulatory organization that proposes to amend its rules bears the burden of demonstrating that its proposal is consistent with the Act.[22] In this regard:

> the description of the proposed rule change, its purpose and operation, its effect, and a legal analysis of its consistency with the applicable requirements must all be sufficiently detailed and specific to support an affirmative Commission finding. Any failure of the self-regulatory organization to provide the information elicited by Form 19b-4 may result in the Commission not having a sufficient basis to make an affirmative finding that a proposed rule change is consistent with the Exchange Act and the rules and regulations thereunder that are applicable to the self-regulation organization.[23]

IV. Procedure: Request for Written Comments

The Commission requests that interested persons provide written submissions of their views, data, and arguments with respect to the issues identified above, as well as any other concerns they may have with respect to the proposed rule change. In particular, the Commission invites written views of interested persons concerning whether the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b)(5) or any other provision of the Act, or the rules and regulations thereunder. Although there do not appear to be any issues relevant to approval or disapproval which would be facilitated by an oral presentation of views, data, and arguments, the Commission will consider, pursuant to Rule 19b-4, any request for an opportunity to make an oral presentation.[24]

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments regarding whether the proposal should be approved or disapproved by December 14, 2016. Any person who wishes to file a rebuttal to any other person's submission must file that rebuttal by December 28, 2016. The Commission asks that commenters address the sufficiency and merit of the Exchange's statements in support of the proposed rule change, in addition to any other comments they may wish to submit about the proposed rule change. The Commission notes that Phlx states that ''rounding of prices is used only where necessary to execute a trade at the MPV, and only to the benefit of a customer order. . . .'' [25] The Commission seeks commenters' views on the Exchange's statements, which are set forth in the Notice,[26] regarding how

---

[11] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 56726.

[12] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 56726. Today, when the computation is more complicated, surveillance staff allows a Floor Broker to execute split-price orders involving non-even integers and sub-MPV price points in open outcry using paper tickets pursuant to Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii)(A). *See id.*

[13] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 56726.

[14] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 56724.

[15] *See* proposed Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii).

[16] *See* proposed Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii); *see also* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 56727.

[17] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)(B).

[18] *Id.* Section 19(b)(2)(B) of the Act also provides that proceedings to determine whether to disapprove a proposed rule change must be concluded within 180 days of the date of publication of the notice of the filing of the proposed rule change. The time for conclusion of the proceedings may be extended for up to 60 days if the Commission finds good cause for such extension and publishes its reasons for so finding. *See id.*

[19] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[20] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[21] The Options Order Protection and Locked/Crossed Markets Plan is available at *http://www.optionsclearing.com/components/docs/clearing/services/options_order_protection_plan.pdf.*

[22] Rule 700(b)(3), 17 CFR 201.700(b)(3).

[23] *Id.*

[24] Section 19(b)(2) of the Act, as amended by the Securities Act Amendments of 1975, Public Law 94–29 (June 4, 1975), grants the Commission flexibility to determine what type of proceeding—either oral or notice and opportunity for written comments—is appropriate for consideration of a particular proposal by a self-regulatory organization. *See* Securities Act Amendments of 1975, Senate Comm. on Banking, Housing & Urban Affairs, S. Rep. No. 75, 94th Cong., 1st Sess. 30 (1975).

[25] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 56724.

[26] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3.

the Exchange would round prices for split-price orders, particularly when no customer orders are involved, in addition to any other comments they may wish to submit about the proposed rule change. The Commission seeks comment on whether this aspect of the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)(5), which requires, among other things, that a proposed rule change not be designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers, or dealers.[27]

The Commission is concerned that the Exchange has not made clear what the time of execution would be for split-price orders executed manually by Floor Brokers pursuant to the exception proposed in Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii)(D) or how Floor Brokers would use paper tickets to execute split-price orders under the proposed exception. The Commission seeks commenters' views on the sufficiency of the Exchange's statements regarding the execution of a split-price order by a Floor Broker pursuant to the proposed exception under Phlx Rule 1000(f)(iii)(D). In addition, the Commission seeks comment on whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Options Order Protection and Locked/Crossed Market Plan.

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–2016–82 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–2016–82. The 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 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 Web site 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 such 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 publicly available. All submissions should refer to *File Number* SR–Phlx–2016–82 and should be submitted on or before December 14, 2016. Rebuttal comments should be submitted by December 28, 2016.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[28]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28189 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[27] 15 U.S.C.78f(b)(5).

[28] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(57).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–79343; File No. SR-BatsEDGA–2016–27]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Bats EDGA Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of an Amendment to Rule 8.11, Effective Date of Judgment and the Adoption of Rule 8.18, Release of Disciplinary Complaints, Decisions and Other Information

November 17, 2016.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on November 3, 2016, Bats EDGA Exchange, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''EDGA'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Exchange has designated this proposal as a ''non-controversial'' proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act[3] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) thereunder,[4] which renders it effective upon filing with the Commission. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[4] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6)(iii).

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

The Exchange filed a proposal to add proposed Rule 8.18 to require the publication of the Exchange's disciplinary complaints and disciplinary decisions issued and to remove the part of Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 that currently governs the publication of disciplinary complaints and information related to disciplinary complaints.

The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Exchange's Web site at *www.batstrading.com,* 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 parts of such statements.

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

1. Purpose

Reorganization of Exchange Rules Governing Release of Disciplinary Complaints, Decisions and Other Information Based on FINRA Rule 8313

Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 currently provides, in part, that the Exchange shall cause details regarding all formal disciplinary actions where a final decision has been issued, except as provided in Rule 8.15(a), to be published on its Web site. Interpretation and Policy .01 also provides that the Exchange shall not issue any press release or other statement to the press concerning any formal or informal disciplinary matter unless the Chief Regulatory Officer recommends a press release to the Executive Committee or

the Board of the Exchange and either body determines that such a press release is warranted. The Exchange proposes to remove parts of Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 described above and to add proposed Rule 8.18 modeled after FINRA Rule 8313,[5] as described below, to govern the publication of disciplinary information. The scope of proposed Rule 8.18 would be limited to publication of materials relating to the disciplinary process set forth in Chapter VIII because the Exchange seeks to provide prompt access to more information regarding its disciplinary actions to Members and associated persons. By providing more information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary process, including publishing disciplinary complaints at the time they are filed, Members and associated persons will be able to sooner identify conduct that the Exchange views as problematic and have will [sic] the ability to take corrective steps sooner than they can under the current rules that provide only for the publication of disciplinary decisions after they become final. In that regard, the Exchange has determined not to adopt FINRA Rule 8313 in all respects at this time.[6]

General Standards

The Exchange proposes Rule 8.18(a) to be entitled ''General Standards.'' The text would set forth general standards for the release to the public of disciplinary complaints, decisions, or information.

Proposed Rule 8.18(a)(1) would, in part, essentially replace the part of Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 that addresses the publication of disciplinary decisions and conform [sic] to FINRA Rule 8313. The proposed rule would provide that the Exchange shall release to the public a copy of and, at the Exchange's discretion, information with respect to, any disciplinary decision issued by the Exchange, as defined in proposed Rule 8.18(e). Additionally, the proposed rule would provide that the Exchange would release to the public copies of disciplinary complaints as defined in proposed Rule 8.18(e). Also, the decision to issue other related information, including a press release, under proposed Rule 8.18(a)(1) would be in the discretion of the Exchange generally instead of requiring Executive Committee or Exchange Board approval as currently required in Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11. Proposed Rule 8.18(a)(1) would also provide that, in response to a request, the Exchange shall also release to the requesting party a copy of any identified disciplinary complaint or disciplinary decision issued by the Exchange, as defined in proposed Rule 8.18(e). These proposed amendments are modeled after FINRA Rule 8313(a)(1) and would be substantially similar to the FINRA rule.

The Exchange does not propose to incorporate subsections (2), (3), (4) and (6) of FINRA Rule 8313(a) because the Exchange proposes to limit the scope of proposed Rule 8.18 to the publication of materials relating to the disciplinary process set forth in Chapter VIII at this time.[7] The Exchange, however, notes that although Exchange Rules do not provide for temporary cease and desist orders as provided for in FINRA Rule 9800, the Exchange's Client Suspension Rule—Rule 8.17—is similar in its procedure and purpose. The Exchange proposes to include a client suspension order issued pursuant to Rule 8.17 in the definition of ''disciplinary decision'' under proposed Rule 8.18(e)(2) consistent with FINRA's inclusion of its temporary cease and desist orders for publication because the Exchange views client suspension proceedings as disciplinary in nature. For the same reason, the Exchange proposes to include a notice of the initiation of a client suspension proceeding in the definition of ''disciplinary complaint'' under proposed Rule 8.18(e)(1).

The Exchange does not propose to incorporate subsection (5) of FINRA Rule 8313(a) because the Exchange does not have at this time provisions analogous to FINRA Rule 6490[8] and the FINRA Rule 9700 Series.[9] Additionally, the Exchange does not propose to include its procedures for exemptive relief analogous to the FINRA Rule 9600 Series because the Exchange proposes to limit scope of proposed Rule 8.18 to the publication of disciplinary materials.

Release Specifications

The Exchange proposes to include subsection (b) to proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Release Specifications'' modeled after FINRA Rule 8313(b). Proposed Rule 8.18(b)(1) provides that copies of, and information with respect to, any disciplinary complaint released to the public pursuant to paragraph (a) of the proposed rule shall indicate that a disciplinary complaint represents the initiation of a formal proceeding by the Exchange in which findings as to the allegations in the complaint have not been made and does not represent a decision as to any of the allegations contained in the complaint. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(b)(1) except that the proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA.''

Proposed Rule 8.18(b)(2) provides that copies of, and information with respect to, any disciplinary decision released to the public pursuant to paragraph (a) of the proposed rule prior to the expiration of the time period provided for an appeal or call for review as permitted under Exchange Rules or the Act, or while such an appeal or call for review is pending, shall indicate that the findings and sanctions imposed therein are subject to review and modification by the Exchange or the Commission. The proposed rule would be substantially similar to FINRA Rule 8313(b)(2). The proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for

[5] New York Stock Exchange, LLC (''NYSE'') similarly adopted rules modeled after FINRA Rule 8313. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78664 (August 24, 2016), 81 FR 59678, 59679 (August 30, 2016) (SR–NYSE–2016–40).

[6] NYSE similarly declined to adopt all provisions of FINRA Rule 8313 insofar as the FINRA rule related to information beyond the formal disciplinary process. *See id.* at 59679.

[7] Subsection (2) of FINRA Rule 8313(a) provides for the publication of statutory disqualification decisions and temporary cease and desist orders.

Subsection (3) provides for the publication of any suspension, cancellation, expulsion, or bar for: failing to keep information current; failing to pay dues; failing to comply with an arbitration award or related settlement or an order of restitution or settlement providing for restitution; failing to meet the eligibility or qualification standards or prerequisites for access to services; or experiencing financial or operational difficulties. Additionally, subsection (3) provides for the publication of any suspension, cancellation, expulsion, or bar imposed as the result of a summary proceeding for actions authorized by Section 15A(h)(3) of the Act.

Subsection (4) addresses procedures for membership proceedings.

The Exchange does not propose to adopt subsections (2), (3), and (4) because, as discussed above, the Exchange's proposal is intended to provide more information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary process to the public so that Members and associated persons will be able to identify conduct that the Exchange views as problematic and will have the ability to take corrective steps sooner. Subsections (2), (3), and (4) to the FINRA rule would not further that purpose because those subsections would require the publication of information generally relating to membership eligibility or failure to satisfy one's membership obligations rather than discipline. Subsection (2) additionally addresses temporary cease and desist proceedings, which the Exchange does not have, and Subsection (3) additionally addresses Section 15A(h)(3) of the Act, which applies only to registered securities associations.

Subsection (6) permits discretionary release of a complaint, decision, order, notification, or notice issued under FINRA rules, where the release of such information is deemed by FINRA's Chief Executive Officer (or such other senior officer as the Chief Executive Officer may designate) to be in the public interest. The Exchange does not propose to adopt this open-ended subsection because [sic] Exchange intends for the proposed rule to instead be limited to disciplinary information for the reasons discussed above.

[8] ''Processing of Company-Related Actions.''

[9] ''Procedure For Grievances Concerning the Automated Systems.''

''FINRA'' and would not include a provision relating to the release specifications for an ''other decision, order, notification, or notice'' because, as noted above, the Exchange proposes to limit the rule only to disciplinary complaints and disciplinary decisions.

Discretion To Redact Certain Information or Waive Publication

The Exchange has determined that, subject to limited exceptions, disciplinary information should be released to the public in unredacted form. To provide the standard for such limited exceptions, the Exchange proposes subsection (c) of proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Discretion to Redact Certain Information or Waive Publication,'' modeled after FINRA Rule 8313(c).

Proposed Rule 8.18(c)(1) would provide that the Exchange reserves the right to redact, on a case-by-case basis, information that contains confidential customer information, including customer identities, or information that raises significant identity theft, personal safety, or privacy concerns that are not outweighed by investor protection concerns. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(c)(1) except that the proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA.''

Similarly, proposed Rule 8.18(c)(2) provides that, notwithstanding paragraph (a) of the proposed rule, the Exchange may determine, in its discretion, to waive the requirement to release a copy of, or information with respect to, any disciplinary complaint or disciplinary decision under those extraordinary circumstances where the release of such information would violate fundamental notions of fairness or work an injustice. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(c)(2) except that the proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA'' and would not include a provision relating to the waiver of the release of an ''other decision, order, notification, or notice'' because, as noted above, the Exchange proposes to limit the rule only to disciplinary complaints and disciplinary decisions.

Notice of Appeals of Exchange Decisions

The Exchange proposes to include subsection (d) to proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Notice of Appeals of Exchange Decisions to the SEC'' modeled on FINRA Rule 8313(d). Proposed Rule 8.18(d) provides that the Exchange must provide notice to the public when a disciplinary decision of the Exchange is appealed to the Commission and the notice shall state whether the effectiveness of the decision has been stayed pending the outcome of proceedings before the Commission. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(d) except that the proposed Rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA.''

Definitions

Finally, the Exchange proposes subsection (e) of proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Definitions.'' Proposed Rule 8.18(e) would set forth definitions of the terms ''disciplinary complaint'' and ''disciplinary decision'' as used in the rule, modeled after the definitions contained in FINRA Rule 8313(e).

First, proposed Rule 8.18(e)(1) would define the term ''disciplinary complaint'' to mean any statement of charges issued pursuant to Rule 8.4 or any notice served pursuant to Rule 8.17. This proposed rule is based on FINRA Rule 8313(e)(1) except that it replaces the term ''complaint pursuant to the Rule 9200 Series'' with ''statement of charges pursuant to Rule 8.4'' and it includes a notice of the initiation of a client suspension proceeding issued pursuant to Rule 8.17 in the definition of ''disciplinary complaint.''

Second, proposed Rule 8.18(e)(2) would define the term ''disciplinary decision'' to mean any decision issued pursuant to the Chapter VIII, including, decisions issued by a Hearing Panel or the Appeals Committee and accepted offers of settlement. The Exchange additionally proposes to include suspension orders issued pursuant to Rule 8.17 in the definition of ''disciplinary decision.'' The Exchange does not propose to adopt the part of FINRA Rule 8313(e)(2) that discusses decisions issued pursuant to the FINRA Rule 9550 Series, FINRA Rule 9600 Series, FINRA Rule 9700 Series, or FINRA Rule 9800 Series, or decisions, notifications, or notices issued pursuant to the FINRA Rule 9520 Series because, as explained above, the Exchange does not propose to adopt the provisions of the FINRA Rule providing for the publication of such information. Finally, proposed Rule 8.18(e)(2) would provide that minor rule violation plan letters issued pursuant to Rules 8.15 and 25.3 are not subject to the proposed rule.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder that are applicable to a national securities exchange, and, in particular, with the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act.[10] In particular, the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)(1) [11] in that it enables the Exchange to be so organized as to have the capacity to be able to carry out the purposes of the Act and to comply, and to enforce compliance by its exchange members and persons associated with its exchange members, with the provisions of the Act, the rules and regulations thereunder, and the rules of the Exchange. In particular, the Exchange believes that the proposed addition of Rule 8.18 regarding release of disciplinary complaints, decisions and other information are [sic] consistent with Section 6(b)(1) of the Act because it would establish general standards for the release of disciplinary information to the public to provide greater access to information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary actions.

For the same reasons, the Exchange believes that proposed Rule 8.18 furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act [12] because the proposed rule is designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities, and to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system. In particular, proposed Rule 8.18 furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act by providing greater clarity, consistency, and transparency regarding the release of disciplinary complaints, decisions and other information to the public. By adopting the proposed Rule 8.18 modeled after FINRA Rule 8313, the Exchange would establish standards for the release of disciplinary information to the public in line with those in effect at FINRA that provide greater access to information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary actions and describe the scope of information subject to proposed Rule 8.18. The Exchange believes that this proposed rule change promotes greater transparency to the Exchange's disciplinary process, and that the proposed rule change provides greater access to information regarding its disciplinary actions, and also provides valuable guidance and information to Members, associated persons, other regulators, and the investing public.

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

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose

[10] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[11] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(1).

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The proposed rule change is not intended to address competitive issues, but rather it is designed to enhance the Exchange's rules governing the release of disciplinary complaints, decisions and other information to the public, thereby providing greater clarity and consistency and resulting in less burdensome and more efficient regulatory compliance and facilitating performance of regulatory functions.

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

The Exchange has not solicited, and does not intend to solicit, comments on this proposed rule change. The Exchange has not received any written comments from members or other interested parties.

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

Because the foregoing 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 from the date on which it was filed or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act [13] and paragraph (f)(6) of Rule 19b–4 thereunder.[14]

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. However, Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) [15] permits the Commission to designate a shorter time if such action is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest. In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange requests that the Commission waive the 30-day operative delay. The Exchange states that FINRA performs services for it under a Regulatory Services Agreement (''RSA''), including the filing and prosecution of disciplinary complaints on the Exchange's behalf. FINRA also files and prosecutes disciplinary complaints on its own behalf, sometimes on cases involving identical or similar conduct to the cases it brings on the Exchange's behalf. Without the waiver, the Exchange is concerned that FINRA might publish a complaint during the 30-day operative delay, and that the Exchange would not be permitted to publish its own complaint, prepared by FINRA, regarding the same conduct. According to the Exchange, this would supply the public with an incomplete picture of the disciplinary proceedings, the full nature of which could not be disclosed until much later when a final disciplinary decision is issued. The Exchange, therefore, believes that waiver of the operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest, as it will allow the Exchange to immediately publish any disciplinary complaints or decisions that are filed or issued after the proposal is filed. The Commission believes that waiver of the 30-day operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest because it will allow EDGA to publish disciplinary complaints or decisions that have been filed or issued without delay. Therefore, the Commission designates the proposed rule change to be operative upon filing.[16]

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: (1) Necessary or appropriate in the public interest; (2) for the protection of investors; or (3) 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–BatsEDGA–2016–27 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-BatsEDGA–2016–27. 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 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 Web site 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 such 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–BatsEDGA–2016–27 and should be submitted on or before December 14, 2016.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[17]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28187 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[13] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[14] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6).

[15] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6)(iii).

[16] For purposes only of waiving the 30-day operative delay, the Commission also has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. *See* 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

[17] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–79337; File No. SR–NYSEARCA–2016–145]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE Arca, Inc.; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change To Conform to Proposed Amendments to Securities Exchange Act Rule 15c6–1(A) To Shorten the Standard Settlement Cycle From Three Business Days After the Trade Date (''T+3'') to Two Business Days After the Trade Date (''T+2'')

November 17, 2016.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) [1] of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Act'') [2] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[3] notice is hereby given that, on November 4, 2016, NYSE Arca, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''NYSE Arca'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. 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, through its wholly-owned corporation, NYSE Arca Equities, Inc. (''NYSE Arca Equities''), adopt new NYSE Arca Equities Rule 7.4T (''Rule 7.4T'') to conform to proposed amendments to Securities Exchange Act Rule 15c6–1(a) to shorten the standard settlement cycle from three business days after the trade date to two business days after the trade date. The proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's Web site at *www.nyse.com,* 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 self-regulatory organization 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 those 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 parts of such statements.

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

1. Purpose

The Exchange proposes to adopt a new Rule 7.4T (Ex-Dividend or Ex-Right Dates) conform to proposed amendments to Securities Exchange Act Rule 15c6–1(a) [4] to shorten the standard settlement cycle from T+3 to T+2.

The proposed new rule would have the same numbering as the current rule, but with the modifier ''T'' appended to the rule number. As discussed below, because the Exchange would not implement the proposed rule until after the final implementation of T+2, the Exchange proposes to retain the current version of Rule 7.4 on its books and not delete it until after the proposed rule is approved. The Exchange also proposes to file separate proposed rule changes to establish the operative date of the proposed rule and to delete the current version of the rule.

Background

In 1993, the Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''SEC'' or ''Commission'') adopted Rule 15c6–1(a) [5] under the Act, which established three business days after trade date instead of five business days (''T+5''), as the standard trade settlement cycle for most securities transactions. The rule became effective in June 1995.[6] In November 1994, the Exchange amended its rules to be consistent with the T+3 settlement cycle for securities transactions.[7]

On September 28, 2016, the SEC proposed amendments to Rule 15c6–1(a) to shorten the standard settlement cycle from T+3 to T+2 on the basis that the shorter settlement cycle would reduce the risks that arise from the value and number of unsettled securities transactions prior to completion of settlement, including credit, market and liquidity risk faced by U.S. market participants.[8] The proposed rule amendment was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on October 5, 2016.[9] In light of this action by the SEC, the Exchange proposes new rules to reflect ''regular way'' settlement as occurring on T+2.[10]

Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange proposes a new Rule 7.4T to reflect a T+2 settlement cycle.[11] Current Rule 7.4 provides that transactions in stocks traded ''regular'' shall be ''ex-dividend'' or ''ex-rights'' as the case may be, on the second business day preceding the record date fixed by the company or the date of the closing of transfer books, except when the Board of Directors rules otherwise. Proposed Rule 7.4T would not include the word ''second'' so that the reference would be to the ''business day'' preceding the record date. The current version of Rule 7.4 further provides that if the record date or closing of transfer books occur upon a day other than a business day, the rule shall apply for the third preceding business day. Proposed Rule 7.4T would replace ''third preceding business day'' to ''second preceding business day.''

Operative Date Preambles

As noted above, because the Exchange would not implement the proposed rule until after the final implementation of T+2, the Exchange proposes to retain to retain the current version of Rule 7.4 on its books and not delete it until after the proposed rule is approved. The Exchange also proposes to file separate proposed rule changes as necessary to establish the operative date of Proposed Rule 7.4T and to delete the current version of the rule.

To reduce the potential for confusion regarding which version of the rule governs, the Exchange proposes to add a preamble to current Rule 7.4 providing that: (1) The rule will remain operative until the Exchange files separate

[1] 15 U.S.C.78s(b)(1).

[2] 15 U.S.C. 78a.

[3] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[4] *See* 17 CFR 240.15c6–1(a); *see also* notes 7–8, *infra.*

[5] 17 CFR 240.15c6–1(a).

[6] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 33023 (October 6, 1993), 58 FR 52891 (order adopting Rule 15c6–1) and 34952 (November 9, 1994), 59 FR 59137 (order changing the effective date from June 1, 1995, to June 7, 1995).

[7] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 35110 (December 16, 1994), 59 FR 0 (December 23, 1994) (SR–NYSE–94–40) (Notice) and 35506 (March 17, 1995), 60 FR 15618 (March 24, 1995) (SR–NYSE–94–40) (Approval Order).

[8] *See* SEC Press Release 2016–200: ''SEC Proposes Rule Amendment to Expedite Process for Settling Securities Transactions'' (September 28, 2016).

[9] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78962 (September 28, 2016), 81 FR 69240 (October 5, 2016) (File No. S7–22–16).

[10] Earlier this year the MSRB also filed a rule change to reflect ''regular way'' settlement as occurring on T+2. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 77744 68678 [sic] (April 29, 2016), [sic] 81 FR 14906 (March 18, 2016) (SR–MSRB–2016–04) (approving proposed amendments to MSRB Rules G- 12 and G–15 to define regular-way settlement for municipal securities transactions as occurring on a two-day settlement cycle and technical conforming amendments).

[11] Current Rule 7.4 was adopted originally as Rule 7.7 of the PCX Equities Exchange in 2000 and reflects a T+3 settlement cycle for securities transactions.

proposed rule changes as necessary to establish the operative date of the revised rule, to delete the current rule and proposed preamble, and to remove the preamble text from the revised rule; and (2) in addition to filing the necessary proposed rule changes, the Exchange will announce via Information Memo the operative date of the deletion of the current rule and implementation of proposed Rule 7.4T.

The Exchange also proposes to add a preamble to proposed Rule 7.4T that would provide that: (1) The Exchange will file a separate rule change to establish the operative date of the proposed rule, delete the current version and the proposed preamble, and remove the preamble text from the revised rule; and (2) until such time, the current version of the rule will remain operative and that, in addition to filing the necessary proposed rule changes, the Exchange will announce via Information Memo the implementation of the proposed rule and the operative date of the deletion of the current rule.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,[12] in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act,[13] in particular, because it is designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, promote just and equitable principles of trade, 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 Exchange believes that, by shortening the time period for settlement of most securities transactions, the proposed rule change would protect investors and the public interest by reducing the number of unsettled trades in the clearance and settlement system at any given time, thereby reducing the risk inherent in settling securities transactions to clearing corporations, their members and public investors. The Exchange also believes that adding a preamble to each current rule and to each proposed rule clarifying the operative dates of the respective versions would remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system by adding clarity and transparency to the Exchange's rules, reducing potential confusion, and making the Exchange's rules easier to navigate.

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[13] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

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. The proposed change is not designed to address any competitive issue but rather facilitate the industry's transition to a T+2 regular-way settlement cycle. The Exchange also believes that the proposed rule change will serve to promote clarity and consistency, thereby reducing burdens on the marketplace and facilitating investor protection.

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

No written comments were solicited or received with respect to the proposed rule change.

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

Within 45 days of the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** or up to 90 days (i) as the Commission may designate if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or (ii) as to which the self-regulatory organization consents, the Commission will:

(A) By order approve or disapprove the proposed rule change, or

(B) institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be 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–NYSEArca–2016–145 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–NYSEArca–2016–145. 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 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 Web site 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–NYSEArca–2016–145, and should be submitted on or before December 14,2016.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[14]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28183 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[14] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–79347; File No. SR–MSRB–2016–12]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board; Notice of Filing of Amendment No. 1 and Order Granting Accelerated Approval of a Proposed Rule Change, as Modified by Amendment No. 1, to MSRB Rules G–15 and G–30 To Require Disclosure of Mark-Ups and Mark-Downs to Retail Customers on Certain Principal Transactions and To Provide Guidance on Prevailing Market Price

November 17, 2016.

I. Introduction

On September 2, 2016, the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (''MSRB'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] a proposed rule change to amend MSRB Rule G–15 (''Rule G–15''), on confirmation, clearance, settlement and other uniform practice requirements with respect to retail customer (*i.e.,* non-institutional) transactions, and MSRB Rule G–30 (''Rule G–30''), on prices and commissions to require brokers, dealers and municipal securities dealers (collectively, ''dealers'') to disclose mark-ups and mark-downs (collectively, ''mark-ups'' unless the context requires otherwise) to retail customers on certain principal transactions and to provide dealers guidance on prevailing market price (''PMP'' or ''prevailing market price'') for the purpose of calculating mark-ups and mark-downs and other Rule G–30 determinations (collectively, the ''proposed rule change''). The proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on September 13, 2016.[3] The Commission received seven comment letters in response to the proposal.[4] The Commission also received a letter from the Office of the Investor Advocate (''Investor Advocate'') recommending approval of the proposed rule change.[5] On November 14, 2016, the MSRB responded to the comments [6] and filed Amendment No. 1 to the proposal.[7] The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comment on Amendment No. 1 to the proposal from interested persons and is approving the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, on an accelerated basis.

II. Description of the Proposal, as Modified by Amendment No. 1

A. Background

The MSRB proposes to amend Rule G–15, on confirmation, clearance and other uniform practice requirements with respect to customer transactions, and Rule G–30, on prices and commissions to require dealers to disclose mark-ups and mark-downs to retail customers on certain principal transactions and to provide dealers guidance on prevailing market price for the purpose of calculating mark-ups and mark-downs and other Rule G–30 determinations.[8] The MSRB also proposes to require for all transactions in municipal securities with retail customers, irrespective of whether mark-up/mark-down disclosure is required, that a dealer provide on the confirmation (1) a reference, and hyperlink if the confirmation is electronic, to a Web page hosted by the MSRB that contains publicly available trading data from the MSRB's Electronic Municipal Market Access (''EMMA'') system for the specific security that was traded, in a format specified by the MSRB, along with a brief description of the type of information available on that page; and (2) the execution time of the customer transaction, expressed to the minute.[9]

The MSRB developed this proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, in coordination with the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (''FINRA'') to advance the goal of providing additional pricing information, including transaction cost information, to retail customers in corporate, agency, and municipal debt securities.[10] The MSRB and FINRA have worked toward consistent rule requirements in this area, as appropriate, to minimize the operational burdens for dealers that are registered with the MSRB and FINRA members that transact in multiple types of fixed income securities.[11] The MSRB's proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is before the Commission following a process in which the MSRB solicited comment on related proposals on three separate occasions and subsequently incorporated modifications designed to address commenters' concerns after each solicitation.[12]

1. Confirmation Disclosure of Pricing Information

In November, 2014, the MSRB, concurrently with FINRA, published a regulatory notice requesting comment on a proposal (the ''Initial Proposal'') to require disclosure of pricing information for certain same-day, retail-sized principal transactions.[13] In the Initial Proposal, the MSRB proposed to

---

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78777 (Sep. 7, 2016), 81 FR 62947 (Sep. 13, 2016) (''Notice'').

[4] *See* Letter from Mike Nicholas, Chief Executive Officer, Bond Dealers of America (Oct. 4, 2016) (''BDA Letter''); Letter from Leslie M. Norwood, Managing Director and Associate General Counsel and Sean Davy, Managing Director, Capital Markets Division, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (Oct. 3, 2016) (''SIFMA Letter''); Letter from Manisha Kimmel, Chief Regulatory Officer, Wealth Management, Thomson Reuters (Sept. 19, 2016) (''Thomson Reuters Letter''); Letter from Mary Lou Von Kaenel, Managing Director, Financial Information Forum (Oct. 4, 2016) (''FIF Letter''); Letter from Paige W. Pierce, President & CEO, RW Smith & Associates, LLC (Oct. 4, 2016) (''RW Smith Letter''); Letter from Robert J. McCarthy, Director of Regulatory Policy, Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC (Oct. 4, 2016) (''Wells Fargo Letter''); Letter from Norman L. Ashkenas, Chief Compliance Officer, Fidelity Brokerage Services, LLC, and Richard J. O'Brien, Chief Compliance Officer, National Financial Services, LLC, Fidelity Investments (Oct. 4, 2016) (''Fidelity Letter'').

[5] *See* Letter from Rick A. Fleming, Investor Advocate, Office of the Investor Advocate, to Commission (Nov. 7, 2016) (''Investor Advocate Letter'').

[6] *See* Letter from Michael L. Post, General Counsel–Regulatory Affairs, MSRB, to Secretary, Commission, dated November 14, 2016 (''MSRB Response'').

[7] Amendment No. 1 is available on the Commission's Web site at: *https://www.sec.gov/comments/sr-msrb-2016-12/msrb2016-12-11.pdf.*

[8] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3. For ease of reference, a ''non-institutional customer'' is also alternatively referred to as a ''retail customer'' or ''retail investor,'' which, among others is not included in the definition of an institutional customer.

[9] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7, at 4–5. *See also* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 16 n.29. The MSRB also proposes in Amendment No. 1. to add the term ''offsetting'' to proposed Rule G–15(a)(i)(F)(1)(b) to conform the rule language to the language used to discuss conditions that trigger the disclosure requirement, and extend the implementation period of the proposal from no later than one year to no later than 18 months.

[10] *See, e.g.,* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62949, 62962.

[11] FINRA has filed with the Commission a proposal and amendment that is substantially similar to this proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78573 (Aug. 15, 2016), 81 FR 55500 (Aug. 19, 2016) (SR–FINRA–2016–032) (''FINRA Proposal''); *see also* FINRA Amendment No. 1, *available at: https://www.sec.gov/comments/sr-finra-2016-032/finra2016032-13.pdf.*

[12] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 2.

[13] *See* MSRB *Regulatory Notice* 2014–20, Request for Comment on Draft Rule Amendments to Require Dealers to Provide Pricing Reference Information on Retail Customer Confirmations (Nov. 17, 2014), *available at: http://www.msrb.org/~/media/files/regulatory-notices/rfcs/2014-20.ashx. The Initial Proposal was published concurrently with a similar proposal by FINRA. See also* FINRA *Regulatory Notice* 14–52, Pricing Disclosure in the Fixed Income Markets: FINRA Requests Comment on a Proposed Rule Requiring Confirmation Disclosure of Pricing Information in Fixed Income Securities Transactions (Nov. 2014), *available at: http://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/notice_doc_file_ref/Notice_Regulatory_14-52.pdf.*

require a dealer to disclose on the customer confirmation its trade price for a defined ''reference transaction'' as well as the difference in price between the reference transaction and the customer trade.[14] The MSRB characterized a reference transaction generally as one in which the dealer, as principal, purchases or sells the same security that is the subject of the confirmation on the same date as the customer trade.[15] Under the Initial Proposal, the disclosure obligation would have been triggered only where the dealer was on the same side of the transaction as the customer (as purchaser or seller) and the size of such dealer transaction(s), in total, equaled or exceeded the size of the customer transaction.[16] Designed to capture transactions with retail investors, the Initial Proposal's proposed disclosure obligation was limited to transactions of 100 bonds or less or bonds with a face value of $100,000 or less.[17]

As more fully summarized in the Notice, the MSRB received a number of comments on the Initial Proposal.[18] Some commenters supported the Initial Proposal, stating that the proposed confirmation disclosure would put investors in a better position to assess both whether they are paying fair prices and the quality of the services provided by their dealer, and also could assist investors in detecting improper practices.[19] Some of these commenters urged the MSRB to expand the Initial Proposal so that it would apply to all trades involving retail investors.[20] But many commenters were critical of the Initial Proposal. Some commenters critical of the Initial Proposal believed that the proposed disclosure obligation would confuse retail investors, fail in its attempt to provide investors with useful information, be overly complex and costly for dealers to implement, and impair liquidity in the municipal securities market.[21]

In response to the comments received on the Initial Proposal, the MSRB made several modifications and solicited comment on a revised proposal (the ''Revised Proposal'').[22] In the Revised Proposal, the MSRB proposed to depart from the ''reference price'' approach and instead require that dealers disclose the amount of mark-up/mark-down from the prevailing market price for certain retail customer transactions.[23] Specifically, the MSRB proposed to require a dealer to disclose its mark-up/mark-down if the dealer bought (sold) the security in one or more transactions in an aggregate trade size that met or exceeded the size of the sale (purchase) to (from) the non-institutional customer within two hours of the customer transaction.[24] The disclosed mark-up/mark-down would be required to be expressed both as a total dollar amount and as a percentage of the PMP.[25] Additionally, the MSRB proposed to require the disclosure of two additional data points on all trade confirmations, even those for which mark-up/mark-down disclosure was not required: a security-specific hyperlink to the publicly available municipal security trade data on EMMA, and the time of execution of the customer's trade.[26]

In response to similar comments received on its initial proposal, FINRA also made several modifications and solicited comment on a revised proposal.[27] These modifications, reflected in FINRA's revised proposal, were designed to ensure that the disclosure applied to transactions with retail investors, enhanced the utility of the disclosure, and reduced the operational complexity of providing the disclosure.[28]

Although the MSRB and FINRA took different approaches in their revised proposals—diverging primarily on the questions of whether to require disclosure of reference price or mark-up/mark-down, and whether to specify a same-day or two-hour time frame—each acknowledged the importance of achieving a consistent approach and invited comments on the relative merits and shortcomings of both approaches.[29] Following a second round of comments, publication of a third related proposal by the MSRB,[30] as well as investor testing conducted jointly by the MSRB and FINRA in mid-2016, the MSRB and FINRA made a third round of revisions to achieve a consistent approach and filed the proposed rule changes that are before the Commission.

2. Prevailing Market Price Guidance

In February, 2016, the MSRB published the PMP Proposal soliciting comment on proposed amendments to Rule G–30 to incorporate therein supplemental material to provide guidance on establishing the prevailing market price and calculating mark-ups and mark-downs for principal transactions in municipal securities.[31] In the PMP Proposal, the MSRB generally proposed that the prevailing market price of a municipal security be presumptively established by referring to the dealer's contemporaneous cost as incurred, or contemporaneous proceeds as obtained.[32] If this presumption is either inapplicable or successfully rebutted, the prevailing market price would generally be determined by

[14] *See* Initial Proposal, *supra* note 13, at 8.

[15] *Id.*

[16] *Id.*

[17] *Id.* at 9–10.

[18] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62958 (summarizing comments received by the MSRB on the Initial Proposal).

[19] *Id.*

[20] *Id.*

[21] *Id.*

[22] *See* MSRB *Regulatory Notice* 15–16, Request for Comment on Draft Rule Amendments to Require Confirmation Disclosure of Mark-ups for Specified Principal Transactions with Retail Customers (Sept. 24, 2015) (''Revised Proposal''), *available at: http://www.msrb.org/~/media/files/regulatory-notices/rfcs/2015-16.ashx.*

[23] *Id.* at 5–6.

[24] *Id.* at 7–8.

[25] *Id.* at 24.

[26] *Id.* at 7–8.

[27] FINRA Regulatory Notice 15–36, Pricing Disclosure in the Fixed Income Markets: FINRA Requests Comment on a Revised Proposal Requiring Confirmation Disclosure of Pricing Information in Corporate and Agency Debt Securities Transactions (Oct. 2015) (''FINRA Revised Proposal''), *available at: http://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/notice_doc_file_ref/Regulatory-Notice-15-36.pdf.*

[28] *See* FINRA Proposal, *supra* note 11, at 55508 (explaining FINRA's modifications to its initial proposal in its revised proposal). FINRA's Revised Proposal included the following revisions: (i) Replacing the ''qualifying size'' requirement with an exclusion for transactions with institutional accounts, as defined in FINRA Rule 4512(c); (ii) excluding transactions which are part of fixed-price offerings on the first trading day and which are sold at the fixed-price offering price; (iii) excluding firm-side transactions that are conducted by a department or trading desk that is functionally separate from the retail-side trading desk; (iv) excluding trades where the member's principal trade was executed with an affiliate of the member and the affiliate's position that satisfied this trade was not acquired on the same trading day; (v) requiring members to provide a hyperlink to publicly available corporate and agency debt security trade data disseminated from TRACE on the customer confirmation; (vi) permitting members to omit the reference price in the event of a material change in the price of the security between the time of the member's principal trade and the customer trade; and (vii) permitting members to use alternative methodologies to determine the reference price in complex trade scenarios, provided the methodologies were adequately documented, and consistently applied. *See* FINRA Revised Proposal, *supra* note 27.

[29] *See* Revised Proposal, *supra* note 22. In the Revised Proposal, consistent with FINRA, proposed that certain categories of transactions be excluded from the disclosure requirement, including (i) transactions with institutional accounts; (ii) firm-side transactions if conducted by a ''functionally separate principal trading desk'' that had no knowledge of the non-institutional customer transaction; and (iii) customer transactions at list offering prices. For trades with an affiliate of the firm, the MSRB also proposed to ''look through'' the firm's trade with the affiliate to the affiliate's trade with the third party for purposes of determining whether disclosure would be required. *See id.* at 9, 23.; *see also* FINRA Revised Proposal, *supra* note 27.

[30] *See* MSRB *Regulatory Notice* 2016–07, Request for Comment on Draft Amendments to MSRB Rule G–30 to Provide Guidance on Prevailing Market Price (Feb. 18, 2016), (''PMP Proposal''), *available at: http://www.msrb.org/~/media/Files/Regulatory-Notices/RFCs/2016-07.ashx.*

[31] *Id.*

[32] *Id.* at 4.

referring in sequence to: (1) A hierarchy of pricing factors, including contemporaneous inter-dealer transaction prices, and, if the subject security is an actively traded security, contemporaneous inter-dealer quotations; (2) prices or yields of contemporaneous inter-dealer or institutional transactions in similar securities, and yields from validated contemporaneous quotations in similar securities; and (3) economic models.[33]

As more fully summarized in the Notice, the MSRB received a number of comments on the PMP Proposal.[34] One commenter supported the PMP Proposal, stating that the proposed guidance was generally useful, clear, and consistent with the existing FINRA prevailing market price guidance, but also noted its concern that the PMP Proposal could permit a dealer to determine a misleading prevailing market price when a dealer sources a municipal security from an affiliated entity.[35] Other commenters were critical of the PMP Proposal. Some commenters argued that the hierarchical approach was inappropriate, that the guidance should incorporate more factors for dealers to consider, and that the guidance should have a more limited scope of applicability.[36] More generally, commenters suggested that the MSRB coordinate its efforts with respect to the PMP Proposal with FINRA to develop prevailing market price guidance that is consistent with FINRA's existing guidance in the supplementary material to FINRA Rule 2121.[37] In response to comments received, the MSRB modified or clarified several aspects of the PMP Proposal and filed the proposed rule change that is before the Commission.[38] The modifications and clarifications reflected in the Notice were designed to make the prevailing market price guidance generally less subjective and more easily susceptible to programming, and, at the same time, provide dealers with a greater degree of flexibility with respect to certain elements of the prevailing market price guidance, thus making the PMP Proposal's hierarchical approach more appropriate for the municipal securities market.[39]

B. Proposed Amendments to Rule G–15 and Rule G–30

1. Mark-Up/Mark-Down Proposal

a. Overview

The MSRB proposes to amend Rule G–15, on confirmation, clearance, settlement and other uniform practice requirements with respect to customer transactions. In particular, proposed Rule G–15(a) would require that a retail customer confirmation for a transaction in a municipal security includes the dealer's mark-up/mark-down, to be calculated from the prevailing market price (as determined in compliance with the proposed amendments to Rule G–30) and expressed as a total dollar amount and as a percentage of the prevailing market price, if the dealer also executes one or more offsetting principal transaction(s) on the same trading day as the retail customer, on the same side of the market as the retail customer, in an aggregate size that meets or exceeds the size of the retail customer trade.[40] The MSRB also proposes to require for all transactions in municipal securities with retail customers, irrespective of whether mark-up disclosure is required, that the dealer provide on the confirmation (1) a reference, and if the confirmation is electronic, a hyperlink, to a Web page hosted by the MSRB that contains publicly available trading data from the MSRB's EMMA system for the specific security that was traded, in a format specified by the MSRB, along with a brief description of the type of information available on that page; and (2) the execution time of the customer transaction, expressed to the minute.[41]

Proposed Rule G–15(a) would specify limited exceptions to the mark-up disclosure obligation,[42] and would address how a dealer's transaction with an affiliate is to be considered.[43]

b. Scope

Under proposed Rule G–15(a), the mark-up disclosure requirement would, subject to certain exceptions, apply to transactions in municipal securities where the dealer buys (or sells) a municipal security on a principal basis from (or to) a retail customer and engages in one or more offsetting principal trade(s) on the same trading day in the same security where the size of the dealer's offsetting principal trade(s), in aggregate, equals or exceeds the size of the retail customer trade.[44] A retail customer would be a customer with an account that is not an institutional account, as defined in Rule G–8(a)(xi) (*i.e.,* a non-institutional account).[45] The proposed mark-up disclosure requirement would apply to transactions in municipal securities, other than municipal fund securities (as defined in MSRB Rule D–12).[46] The disclosure obligation would similarly not be required to be disclosed if the retail customer transaction is a list offering transaction (as defined in paragraph (d)(vii)(A) of Rule G–14 RTRS Procedures), or if a dealer's offsetting same-day principal transaction was executed by a trading desk that is functionally separate from the dealer's trading desk that executed the transaction with the retail customer.[47]

Discussing the rationale for the mark-up disclosure requirement, the MSRB states that the proposed rule change would provide meaningful pricing information to retail investors, who would most benefit from such disclosure, while not imposing unduly burdensome disclosure requirements on dealers.[48] Furthermore, the MSRB states its belief that requiring disclosure for retail customers would be appropriate because such customers typically have less ready access to market and pricing information than institutional customers.[49]

With respect to the same-trading-day timeframe of the proposed disclosure obligation, the MSRB states that it believes that the timeframe is appropriate because it will generally make a dealer's determination of the prevailing market price easier.[50] Additionally, the MSRB emphasizes that the same-trading-day timeframe, as opposed to the two-hour timeframe previously proposed, would produce the added benefits of ensuring that more investors receive the disclosure and reducing the likelihood that dealers would alter their trading behavior to avoid the proposed disclosure requirement.[51]

For purposes of determining whether the mark-up disclosure requirement is triggered, proposed Rule G–15(a) also addresses how dealer transactions with affiliates are to be considered. If a dealer

[33] *Id.* at 6–7.

[34] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62961–62.

[35] *Id.* at 62961.

[36] *Id.* at 62961–62.

[37] *Id.* at 62962.

[38] *Id.*

[39] *Id.*

[40] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7, at 15.

[41] *Id.* at 14. As the MSRB indicated in the MSRB Response, a dealer's existing obligation to disclose the time to trade execution to an institutional customer upon written request is not affected by the proposed rule change. *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 5–6.

[42] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62949–50.

[43] *Id.* at 62949.

[44] *Id.* at 62947.

[45] *Id.* at 62948 & n.14.

[46] *Id.* at 62950.

[47] *Id.* at 62949–50.

[48] *Id.* at 62948.

[49] *Id.* at 62948–49.

[50] *Id.* at 62949.

[51] *Id.* at 62949 & n.18.

executes an offsetting principal trade(s) with an affiliate, the rule would require the dealer to determine whether the transaction was an ''arms-length transaction.'' [52] The proposed rule defines an arms-length transaction as ''a transaction that was conducted through a competitive process in which non-affiliate dealers could also participate, and where the affiliate relationship did not influence the price paid or proceeds received by the dealer.'' [53] If the transaction is not an arms-length transaction, the proposed rule would require the dealer to ''look through'' its transaction in a security with its affiliate to the affiliate's transaction(s) with a third-party in the security to determine whether the proposed mark-up disclosure requirement would apply.[54] The MSRB states that sourcing liquidity through a non-arms-length transaction with an affiliate is functionally equivalent to selling out of a dealer's inventory for purposes of the proposed disclosure requirement, and, therefore, it would be appropriate in those circumstances to require a dealer to ''look through'' to the affiliate's transaction(s) with a third-party to determine whether the proposed disclosure requirement is triggered.[55]

The proposed rule change also specifies three exceptions from the proposed disclosure requirement. First, if the offsetting same-day principal trade was executed by a trading desk that is functionally separate from the dealer's trading desk that executed the transaction with the retail customer, the principal trade by the functionally separate trading desk would not trigger the mark-up disclosure requirement.[56] To avail itself of this exception, the dealer must have in place policies and procedures reasonably designed to ensure that the functionally separate trading desk through which the dealer purchase or sale was executed had no knowledge of the retail customer transaction.[57] According to the MSRB, this exception would allow an institutional desk within a dealer to service an institutional customer without triggering the disclosure requirement for an unrelated trade performed by a separate retail desk with the dealer.[58] The MSRB states that this exception is appropriate because it recognizes the operational cost and complexity that may result from using a dealer principal trade executed by a separate, unrelated trading desk as the basis for determining whether the mark-up disclosure requirement would be triggered.[59] Moreover, the MSRB notes its belief that requiring dealers to have policies and procedures in place that are reasonably designed to ensure that the separate trading desk had no knowledge of the retail customer transaction is a sufficiently rigorous safeguard to protect against potential abuse of this exception.[60]

The second exception to the proposed mark-up disclosure requirement arises in the context of list-offering price transactions (as defined in paragraph (d)(vii)(A) of MSRB Rule G–14 RTRS Procedures).[61] According to the MSRB, municipal securities purchased as part of a list-offering transaction are sold at the same published list offering price to all investors and the compensation paid to a dealer is paid by the issuer of the municipal securities and is typically described in the offering document for such securities.[62] The MSRB notes, therefore, that the proposed mark-up disclosure would not be warranted for list-offering price transactions.[63]

The third exception to the proposed mark-up disclosure requirement arises when a dealer transacts in municipal fund securities.[64] Specifically, the proposed mark-up disclosure requirement would not apply to transactions in municipal fund securities.[65] According to the MSRB, dealer compensation for municipal fund securities transactions is typically not in the form of a mark-up or mark-down and, therefore, the MSRB believes that the proposed mark-up disclosure requirement would not have application for transactions in municipal fund securities.[66]

c. Information To Be Disclosed and/or Provided

i. Mark-Up/Mark-Down

Proposed Rule G–15(a) would require the dealer's mark-up or mark-down to be calculated in compliance with Rule G–30 and supplementary material thereunder, including proposed Supplementary Material .06, and expressed as a total dollar amount and as a percentage of the prevailing market price.[67] The MSRB notes that disclosure of both the total dollar amount and the percentage of the PMP is supported by investor testing, which found the investors believed such disclosures would be useful.[68] According to the MSRB, it would be appropriate to require dealers to calculate the mark-up in compliance with Rule G–30, as new Supplementary Material .06 would provide extensive guidance on how to calculate the mark-up for transactions in municipal securities, including transactions for which disclosure would be required under the proposed rule change, and incorporates a presumption that prevailing market price is established by reference to contemporaneous cost or proceeds.[69] The MSRB recognizes that the determination of prevailing market price for a particular security may not be identical across dealers, but adds that dealers would be expected to have reasonable policies and procedures in place to determine prevailing market price in a manner consistent with Rule G–30, and that such policies and procedures would be applied consistently across customers.[70]

In the Notice, the MSRB acknowledges that certain dealers provide trade confirmations on an intra-day basis, and states that nothing in the proposed rule change is meant to delay a dealer's confirmation generation process.[71] To that end, the MSRB states that a dealer may determine, as a final matter for disclosure purposes, the prevailing market price based on the information the dealer has, based on the use of reasonable diligence as required by proposed Rule G–30, at the time of the dealer's generation of the disclosure.[72]

ii. Reference/Hyperlink to EMMA and Time of Trade

The proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, would require a dealer to provide, in a format specified by the MSRB, a reference and, if the confirmation is electronic, a hyperlink to a Web page on EMMA that contains publicly available trading data for the specific security that was traded, along with a brief description of the type of information available on the

[52] *Id.* at 62949.

[53] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7, at 16.

[54] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62949. The MSRB adds that, in a non-arm's length transaction with an affiliate, the dealer also would be required to ''look through'' to the affiliate's transaction with a third-party and related cost or proceeds by the affiliate as the basis for determining the dealer's calculation of the mark-up/mark-down pursuant to the proposed guidance. *See id.*

[55] *Id.*

[56] *Id.* at 62949–50.

[57] *Id.* at 62950.

[58] *Id.* at 62949–50.

[59] *Id.* at 62949.

[60] *Id.* at 62950.

[61] *Id.*

[62] *Id.*

[63] *Id.*

[64] *Id.*

[65] *Id.*

[66] *Id.*

[67] *Id.*

[68] *Id.* at 62956.

[69] *Id.* at 62950.

[70] *Id.*

[71] *Id.*

[72] *Id.*

page.[73] This disclosure requirement would be limited to transactions with retail customers, but would apply to all such transactions regardless of whether a mark-up disclosure is required for the transaction.[74] According to the MSRB, providing a security-specific URL on a trade confirmation would provide retail investors with a broad picture of the market for a security on a given day and would increase retail investor awareness of, and ability to access, this information.[75]

The proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, would also require a dealer to disclose the time of trade execution (expressed to the minute) on all retail customer trade confirmations, other than those for transactions in municipal fund securities.[76] According to the MSRB, dealers are currently obligated to either disclose the time of execution to their customers or include a statement on trade confirmations that such information is available upon written request thereof, and the proposed rule change essentially deletes the option to provide this information upon request with respect to retail customers.[77] The MSRB believes that time of execution disclosure, together with the provision of a security-specific reference or hyperlink to EMMA on retail customer confirmations, would provide a retail customer a comprehensive view of the market for its security, including the market at the time of trade.[78] Moreover, the MSRB states that these disclosures would also reduce the risk that a customer may overly focus on dealer compensation at the expense of other factors relevant to the investment decision.[79]

2. Prevailing Market Price Proposal

a. Overview

The MSRB proposes to add new supplementary material (paragraph .06 entitled—''Mark-up Policy'') and amend existing supplementary material under Rule G–30, on prices and commissions, to provide guidance on determining the prevailing market price and calculating mark-ups and mark-downs for principal transactions in municipal securities (the ''proposed guidance'').[80] According to the MSRB, the proposed guidance would promote consistent compliance by dealers with their existing fair-pricing obligations under MSRB rules in a manner that would be generally harmonized with the approach taken in other fixed income markets, and would support effective compliance with the proposed amendments to Rule G–15(a).[81] The proposed guidance sets forth a sequence of criteria and procedures that a dealer must consider when determining the prevailing market price for a municipal security.

In general, the proposed guidance provides that the prevailing market price of a municipal security be presumptively determined by referring to the dealer's contemporaneous cost as incurred, or contemporaneous proceeds as obtained; provided, however, if this presumption is either inapplicable or successfully rebutted, the dealer must, among other things, consider, in order (1) a hierarchy of pricing factors, including contemporaneous inter-dealer transaction prices, and, if the subject security is an actively traded security, contemporaneous inter-dealer quotations; (2) prices or yields from contemporaneous inter-dealer or institutional transactions in similar securities, and yields from validated contemporaneous quotations in similar securities; and (3) economic models.[82] The MSRB states that the presumption in favor of contemporaneous costs incurred or proceeds obtained could be overcome in limited circumstances.[83] Moreover, the MSRB notes that the proposed guidance is substantially similar to and generally harmonized with FINRA's existing prevailing market price guidance in the supplementary material to FINRA Rule 2121.[84]

b. Presumptive Use of Contemporaneous Cost

The proposed guidance provides that the best measure of prevailing market price is presumptively established by referring to the dealer's contemporaneous cost (proceeds).[85] Under the proposed guidance, a dealer's cost is (or proceeds are) considered contemporaneous if the transaction occurs close enough in time to the subject transaction that it would reasonably be expected to reflect the current market price for the municipal security.[86] According to the MSRB, reference to a dealer's contemporaneous cost or proceeds in determining the prevailing market price reflects a recognition of the principle that the prices paid or received for a security by a dealer in actual transactions closely related in time are normally a highly reliable indicator of the prevailing market price and that the burden is appropriately on the dealer to establish the contrary.[87]

In the Notice, the MSRB provides guidance to dealers for determining the prevailing market price for a municipal security when a dealer does not have contemporaneous cost or proceeds from an inter-dealer transaction, but instead has contemporaneous cost or proceeds from a retail customer transaction. According to the MSRB, when a dealer's contemporaneous cost or proceeds are derived from a retail customer transaction, the dealer should refer to such contemporaneous cost or proceeds and make an adjustment for any mark-up or mark-down charged in that customer transaction.[88] The MSRB notes that this approach is supported by relevant case law and is consistent with the text of the proposed guidance because under the proposed guidance the presumptive prevailing market price is, through this methodology, established ''by referring to'' the dealer's contemporaneous cost or proceeds.[89] Moreover, the MSRB notes that this approach is consistent with the fundamental principle underlying the proposed guidance because it results in a reasonable proxy for what the dealer's contemporaneous cost or proceeds would have been in an inter-dealer transaction.[90] Finally, the MSRB states that because this adjustment occurs at the first level of the analysis, the prevailing market price so determined from this methodology by the dealer would be presumed to be the prevailing market price for any contemporaneous transactions with the same strength of the presumption that applies to prices from inter-dealer transactions.[91]

c. Criteria for Overcoming Presumption

The proposed guidance recognizes that a dealer may look to other evidence of the prevailing market price (other than contemporaneous cost or contemporaneous proceeds) only where the dealer, when selling (or buying) the security, made no contemporaneous purchases (sales) in the municipal security or can show that in the particular circumstances the dealer's contemporaneous cost (proceeds) is not indicative of the prevailing market

[73] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7, at 14.
[74] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62950–51.
[75] *Id.* at 62951.
[76] *Id.; See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7, at 14.
[77] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62951.
[78] *Id.*
[79] *Id.*
[80] *Id.*
[81] *Id.*
[82] *Id.* at 62952–54.
[83] *Id.* at 62952.
[84] *Id.*
[85] *Id.*
[86] *Id.*
[87] *Id.*
[88] *Id.* at 62954.
[89] *Id.*
[90] *Id.*
[91] *Id.*

price.[92] In such circumstances, the dealer may be able to show that its contemporaneous cost (when it is making a sale to a customer) or proceeds (when it is making a purchase from a customer) are not indicative of the prevailing market price, and thus overcome the presumption, in instances where: (i) Interest rates changed to a degree that such change would reasonably cause a change in the municipal security's pricing; (ii) the credit quality of the municipal security changed significantly; or (iii) news was issued or otherwise distributed and known to the marketplace that had an effect on the perceived value of the municipal security.[93]

d. Pricing Alternatives to Contemporaneous Cost

Under the proposed guidance, if a dealer establishes that its cost is (or proceeds are) not contemporaneous or if the dealer has overcome the presumption that its contemporaneous cost (proceeds) provides the best measure of the prevailing market price, the dealer must consider, in the order listed (subject to Supplementary Material .06(a)(viii), on isolated transactions and quotations), a hierarchy of three additional types of pricing information, referred to herein as the hierarchy of pricing factors: (i) Prices of any contemporaneous inter-dealer transactions in the municipal security; (ii) prices of contemporaneous dealer purchases (or sales) in the municipal security from (or to) institutional accounts with which any dealer regularly effects transactions in the same municipal security; or (iii) if an actively traded security, contemporaneous bid (or offer) quotations for the municipal security made through an inter-dealer mechanism, through which transactions generally occur at displayed quotations.[94] The proposed guidance further provides that in reviewing the available pricing information for each level in the hierarchy of pricing factors, the relative weight of the information depends on the facts and circumstances of the comparison transaction or quotation.[95] The MSRB also states that because of the lack of active trading in many municipal securities, these factors may frequently not be available, and, as such, dealers may often need to consult factors further down the sequence of criteria, such as ''similar'' securities or economic models to identify sufficient relevant and probative pricing information to establish the prevailing market price of a municipal security.[96]

e. Additional Alternatives to Contemporaneous Cost

If none of the three ''hierarchy of pricing factors'' is available, the proposed guidance provides that a dealer may take into consideration a non-exclusive list of factors that are generally analogous to those set forth under the hierarchy of pricing factors, but applied here to prices and yields of specifically defined ''similar'' securities.[97] Unlike the factors set forth in the hierarchy of pricing factors, which must be considered in specified order, the factors related to similar securities are not required to be considered in any particular order or combination.[98] The non-exclusive factors are:

- Prices, or yields calculated from prices, of contemporaneous inter-dealer transactions in a specifically defined ''similar'' municipal security;
- Prices, or yields calculated from prices, of contemporaneous dealer purchase (sale) transactions in a ''similar'' municipal security with institutional accounts with which any dealer regularly effects transactions in the ''similar'' municipal security with respect to customer mark-ups (mark-downs); and
- Yields calculated from validated contemporaneous inter-dealer bid (offer) quotations in ''similar'' municipal securities for customer mark-ups (mark-downs).[99]

With respect to the similar security analysis, the MSRB states that the relative weight of the pricing information obtained through this analysis depends on the facts and circumstances surrounding the comparison transaction, such as whether the dealer in the comparison transaction was on the same side of the market as the dealer in the subject transaction, the timeliness of the information, and, with respect to the final bulleted factor, the relative spread of the quotations in the similar municipal security to the quotations in the subject security.[100]

The proposed guidance provides that a ''similar'' municipal security should be sufficiently similar to the subject security that it would serve as a reasonable alternative investment for the investor.[101] At a minimum, the municipal security or securities should be sufficiently similar that a market yield for the subject security can be fairly estimated from the yields of the ''similar'' security or securities.[102] The proposed guidance also sets forth a set of non-exclusive factors that a dealer may use in determining the degree to which a security is ''similar.'' [103] These include: (i) Credit quality considerations; (ii) the extent to which the spread at which the ''similar'' municipal security trades is comparable to the spread at which the subject security trades; (iii) general structural characteristics and provisions of the issue; (iv) technical factors such as the size of the issue, the float or recent turnover of the issue, and legal restrictions on transferability as compared to the subject security; and (v) the extent to which the federal and/or state tax treatment of the ''similar'' municipal security is comparable to such tax treatment of the subject security.[104]

Due to the unique characteristics of the municipal securities market, the MSRB expects that in order for a security to qualify as sufficiently ''similar'' to the subject security, such security will have to be at least highly similar to the subject security with respect to nearly all of the listed ''similar'' security factors that are relevant to the subject security at issue.[105] The MSRB believes that recognizing this practical aspect of the municipal securities market supports a more rational comparison of a municipal security to only those that are likely to produce relevant and probative pricing information in determining the prevailing market price of the subject security.[106]

f. Economic Models

If it is not possible to obtain information concerning the prevailing market price of the subject security by applying any of the factors discussed above, the proposed guidance permits a dealer to consider as a factor in assessing the prevailing market price of a security the prices or yields derived from economic models.[107] Under the proposed guidance, such economic models may take into account measures such as reported trade prices, credit quality, interest rates, industry sector, time to maturity, call provisions and any other embedded options, coupon

[92] *Id.* at 62952.
[93] *Id.*
[94] *Id.*
[95] *Id.*
[96] *Id.* at 62952–53.
[97] *Id.* at 62953.
[98] *Id.*
[99] *Id.*
[100] *Id.*
[101] *Id.*
[102] *Id.*
[103] *Id.*
[104] *Id.*
[105] *Id.*
[106] *Id.*
[107] *Id.*

rate, face value, and may consider all applicable pricing terms and conventions used.[108] Further, the proposed guidance, as clarified in the MSRB Response, requires that when a dealer utilizes a third-party pricing model it must have a reasonable basis for believing that the third-party pricing service's pricing methodologies produce evaluated prices that reflect actual prevailing market prices.[109] In the MSRB Response, the MSRB cautions dealers that they have the ultimate responsibility to determine the market value of a security and ensure the fairness and reasonableness of a price and any related mark-up or mark-down, and suggests that a dealer, in conducting its due diligence on a pricing service, may wish to consider the inputs, methods, models, and assumptions used by the pricing service to determine its evaluated prices, and how these criteria are affected as market conditions change.[110] The MSRB contrasts its treatment of a dealer's use of an economic model provided by a third-party with the standard for a dealer's use of an economic model that the dealer uses or has developed internally. If a dealer relies on pricing information from an economic model the dealer uses or developed internally, the dealer must be able to provide information that was used on the day of the transaction to develop the pricing information (*i.e.,* the data that were input and the data that the model generated and the dealer used to arrive at the prevailing market price).[111]

g. Isolated Transactions or Quotations

Under the proposed guidance, isolated transactions or isolated quotations would generally have little or no weight or relevance in establishing the prevailing market price of a municipal security.[112] The MSRB notes that due to the unique nature of the municipal securities market, isolated transactions and quotations may be more prevalent therein than in other fixed income markets, and explicitly recognizes that an off-market transaction may qualify as an ''isolated transaction'' under the proposed guidance.[113] Furthermore, the proposed guidance also provides that in considering yields of ''similar'' securities, except in extraordinary circumstances, a dealer may not rely exclusively on isolated transactions or a limited number of transactions that are not fairly representative of the yields in ''similar'' municipal securities taken as a whole.[114]

C. Description of Proposed Amendment No. 1

In response to commenters' suggestions and, in part, to harmonize the proposed rule change with the FINRA Proposal, the MSRB proposes in Amendment No. 1 to amend the proposed rule change. Specifically, the MSRB proposes to amend the proposed rule change to: (1) Clarify the trigger requirements for the proposed mark-up disclosure obligation by inserting the term ''offsetting'' to proposed Rule G–15(a)(i)(F)(1)(b) and thereby make clear the conditions precedent for triggering the mark-up disclosure obligation; [115] (2) replace the requirement for dealers to disclose a hyperlink to a specific existing page on EMMA—the ''Security Details'' page—with a more generic requirement to disclose, in a format specified by the MSRB, a reference and, if the confirmation is electronic, a hyperlink to a Web page on EMMA that contains publicly available trading data for the specific security that was traded; [116] (3) limit a dealer's obligation to disclose the time of trade execution to only retail customers, as opposed to retail and institutional customers (as proposed in the Notice); [117] (4) revise proposed Supplementary Material .06(b)(ii)(B) under Rule G–30 to include reference to ''an applicable index'' and thereby include language to address an appropriate spread relied upon for tax-exempt municipal securities; [118] and (5) extend the implementation date for the proposed rule change from no later than one year following Commission approval of the proposed rule change to no later than 18 months following the Commission's approval thereof.[119]

D. Effective Date of the Proposed Rule Change

The MSRB represents that it will announce an effective date of the proposed rule change in a *regulatory notice* to be published no later than 90 days following Commission approval of the proposed rule change.[120] The MSRB initially proposed that the effective date would be no later than 12 months following Commission approval of the proposed rule change. In Amendment No. 1, the MSRB proposes to extend the effective date so that it would be 18 months following Commission approval of the proposed rule change.[121]

III. Summary of Comments, MSRB's Response and the Investor Advocate's Recommendation

The Commission received seven comment letters regarding the proposed rule change.[122] Many of the commenters expressed support for the goals of the proposal.[123] Many commenters, however, expressed some concern about implementing the proposal and requested guidance or certain changes to the proposal to facilitate and reduce the costs of implementation.[124] Areas of concern included: (1) The scope of the proposal; (2) methodology and timing for determining the PMP; (3) acceptable ways to present mark-up/mark-down disclosure information on the customer confirmations; (4) areas of inconsistency with FINRA's mark-up disclosure proposal; [125] and (5) the effective date of the proposed rule change and the costs of implementation. Additionally, the Investor Advocate submitted to the public comment file its recommendation letter (the ''Investor Advocate Letter''), in which the Investor Advocate recommended that the Commission approve the proposed rule change.[126] The comments received with respect to this proposal, as well as the MSRB's responses, are summarized below, followed by a summary of the Investor Advocate Letter.

A. Scope of the Proposal

Several commenters addressed the same-day offsetting trade aspect of the proposal's scope. Specifically, commenters raised concerns that the same-day nature of the proposal would require a member to look forward to transactions occurring after the execution of a retail customer trade to determine whether that trade requires mark-up/mark-down disclosure, and

[108] *Id.*

[109] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 9.

[110] *Id.* at 8–9.

[111] *Id.* at 8.

[112] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62954.

[113] *Id.*

[114] *Id.*

[115] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7, at 4, 15.

[116] *Id.* at 4–5, 14.

[117] *Id.* at 5, 14.

[118] *Id.* at 5, 20.

[119] *Id.* at 5.

[120] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62947.

[121] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7, at 5.

[122] *See supra* note 4 (for list of comment letters).

[123] *See* SIFMA Letter, at 2 (expressing support for the MSRB's objective to enhance price transparency for retail investors); Wells Fargo Letter, at 3 (supporting the MSRB's efforts to improve price transparency in municipal markets); Fidelity Letter, at 2 (noting Fidelity's appreciation of regulatory efforts to improve price transparency in the fixed income markets); BDA Letter, at 1 (accepting the value of increasing market and price transparency for investors); RW Smith Letter, at 1 (supporting the objective of enhancing price transparency for market participants).

[124] Two commenters suggested that the MSRB would be best served by implementing an alternative disclosure regime focused on providing information about prevailing market conditions through EMMA. *See* SIFMA Letter, at 2; Wells Fargo Letter, at 2.

[125] *See* FINRA Proposal, *supra* note 11.

[126] *See* Investor Advocate Letter, *supra* note 5.

that this would impose costs on members and disrupt the confirmation process.[127] One commenter urged the MSRB to eliminate the ''look-forward requirement'' so dealers could determine the need for disclosure at the time of trade.[128] Another commenter advocated for eliminating not only the look-forward aspect of the proposal, but also the look-back aspect.[129] According to this commenter, mark-up/mark-down disclosure should be calculated by reference to PMP in ''all instances'' and provided for all retail customer transactions ''regardless of their origins.'' [130]

In response, the MSRB stated that, while dealers could incur costs to identify trades subject to disclosure, it believed that disclosure based on a same-day trigger would deliver important benefits associated with increased pricing transparency.[131] The MSRB also noted that it provided guidance in the Notice intended to clarify the timing of the mark-up determination for dealers that voluntarily determine to provide mark-up disclosure more broadly than specifically required by the proposed rule change.[132]

One commenter asked whether the confirmation disclosure requirement is triggered only when a customer trade has an offsetting principal trade or if a dealer must continue to disclose its mark-up/mark-down until the triggering trade has been exhausted, at which point the dealer may choose to continue to disclose or not.[133]

In its response, the MSRB confirmed that there must be offsetting customer and principal trades in order to trigger the mark-up disclosure obligation.[134] The MSRB stated that it was submitting Amendment No. 1 to ensure rule text clarity on this point by adding the word ''offsetting'' to the trigger language.[135] By way of example, the MSRB explained that if a dealer purchased 100 bonds at 9:30 a.m., and then satisfied three customer buy orders for 50 bonds each in the same security on the same day without purchasing any more of the bonds, the proposal would require mark-up disclosure on two of the three trades, since one of the trades would have been satisfied by selling out of the dealer's inventory rather than through an offsetting principal transaction by the dealer.[136]

One commenter questioned how the proposal would apply to certain small institutions that may fit within the MSRB's definition of ''non-institutional customer,'' but trade via accounts that settle on a delivery versus payment/receive versus payment (DVP/RVP) basis and rely on confirmations generated through the Depository Trust and Clearing Corporation's institutional delivery (DTCC ID) system.[137] Because it is possible for those institutions to receive confirms through the DTCC ID process, the commenter asked the MSRB to clarify whether its proposal requires modifications to the DTCC ID system, or, in the alternative, to exempt DVP/RVP accounts from the proposed rule change.[138]

The MSRB responded that it believes that investors who do not meet the ''institutional account'' definition should gain the benefits and protections of the proposed disclosures.[139] Accordingly, the MSRB stated that it does not believe exempting certain classes of ''non-institutional investors'' from receiving the proposed disclosures is desirable or consistent with the intended goals of the proposed rule change.[140]

B. Mark-Up/Mark-Down Disclosure

1. Determination of PMP and Calculation of Mark-Up/Mark-Down in Accordance With Rule G–30

Commenters expressed concern about the need to determine PMP in accordance with Rule G–30, believing that this requirement would be operationally burdensome.[141] These commenters requested that the MSRB provide additional guidance on how dealers may determine PMP and calculate mark-ups/mark-downs to facilitate compliance with this rule.[142] Specifically, two commenters believed that dealers would need to automate the determination of PMP, but that automation of certain factors in the proposed guidance would be impracticable.[143] One commenter believed that it would be ''simply not practicable'' to automate the PMP guidance set forth in Rule G–30 in a manner that would allow dealers to calculate and disclose mark-ups/mark-downs on an automated basis.[144] In particular, these commenters emphasized that it would be difficult to automate factors in the waterfall that require a subjective analysis of facts and circumstances.[145]

In addition, a commenter also requested clarification from the MSRB that dealers may adopt ''a variety of other reasonable methodologies to automate the calculation of PMP for disclosure purposes, including but not limited to pulling prices from . . . third-party pricing vendors, the dealer's trading book or inventory market-to-market and contemporaneous trades by the dealer in the given security, or some variation thereof.'' [146] This commenter further requested that it be deemed reasonable that dealers may ''calculate PMP solely on the contemporaneous cost of the offsetting transaction(s) without further automating the waterfall.'' [147]

The MSRB responded by initially noting that dealers are not required to automate the PMP determination to comply with the proposed rule change.[148] The MSRB acknowledged, however, that many dealers may need to enhance existing technology to determine PMP in a consistent and efficient manner.[149] To help these dealers determine PMP, the MSRB cited to explanations given in the proposed rule change as well as additional clarifications contained in the MSRB Response on such topics as the determination of similar securities and the use of economic models.[150] The MSRB also stated that it may be reasonable for a dealer that chooses largely to automate the process of determining prevailing market price to establish, in its policies and procedures, objective criteria reasonably designed to implement aspects of the PMP waterfall that are not prescribed and for which dealers would have discretion to

[127] *See* Thomson Reuters Letter, at 3; FIF Letter, at 4–6.

[128] *See* Thomson Reuters Letter, at 3. This commenter also noted that members choosing to provide mark-up/mark-down disclosure on all confirmations in order to ease implementation of the rule might hesitate to do so unless they could provide additional text on customer confirmations to put the mark-up/mark-down disclosure ''in context.'' *Id.*

[129] *See* FIF Letter, at 4–6.

[130] *Id.* at 4–6.

[131] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 3.

[132] *Id.*

[133] *See* SIFMA Letter, at 1. SIFMA made the identical comment in response to the FINRA Proposal. *See* SIFMA Letter to FINRA Proposal (Sept. 9, 2016), at 8.

[134] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 3–4.

[135] *Id.* at 4; *see also* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7, at 4, 15.

[136] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 4.

[137] *See* Thomson Reuters Letter, at 2.

[138] *Id.*

[139] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 15.

[140] *Id.*

[141] *See, e.g.,* BDA Letter, at 2–3; SIFMA Letter, at 6–8.

[142] *See* BDA Letter, at 2–3; SIFMA Letter, at 6–8.

[143] *See* BDA Letter, at 2–3; SIFMA Letter, at 6.

[144] *See* SIFMA Letter, at 6.

[145] *See* BDA Letter, at 2–3 (identifying the portion of Rule G–30 that directs dealers to consider ''similar securities'').

[146] *See* SIFMA Letter, at 6–7.

[147] *Id.* at 7.

[148] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 7.

[149] *Id.*

[150] *Id.* at 7–8.

exercise a degree of subjectivity if the determination were not automated.[151]

On the subject of economic models, the MSRB explained that if a dealer considers economic models as a factor in determining the PMP of a security (which it is permitted to do if the PMP cannot be obtained by applying any of the factors at the higher levels of the waterfall), the dealer, if using an internal economic model, must be able to provide the information that was used on the day of the transaction to develop the pricing information.[152] If the dealer is using a third-party economic model, then the dealer would typically not have access to such information but the dealer still retains the ultimate responsibility to ensure the fairness and reasonableness of a price and any mark-up or mark-down under Rule G–30.[153] The MSRB also explained that, before using a third-party pricing service, a dealer should have a reasonable basis for believing that third-party's pricing service produces evaluated prices that reflect actual prevailing market prices. The MSRB cautioned that such basis would not exist if a periodic review revealed a substantial difference between evaluated prices generated by the third-party pricing service and the prices at which actual transactions in the relevant securities occurred.[154] The MSRB also provided a list of factors for dealers to consider in conducting its due diligence and selecting a price service.[155]

On the subject of alternative methods of determining PMP, the MSRB reaffirmed that dealers must have reasonable policies and procedures in place to determine PMP, and that those policies and procedures must be designed to implement the prevailing market price guidance, not to create an alternative manner of determining PMP.[156] The MSRB also stated that such policies and procedures must be reasonably designed to implement all applicable components of the proposed guidance, such as provisions regarding functionally separate trading desks, inter-affiliate transactions, the calculation of imputed mark-ups and mark-downs, the determination of similar securities, and the use of economic models.[157]

Additionally, one commenter sought acknowledgment that different dealers may reach different conclusions as to whether securities are similar and that dealers may adopt reasonable policies and procedures to make that determination.[158] Another commenter sought clarification on the use of ''isolated'' transactions under the proposed guidance, noting that rule text in the proposed rule change provided that a dealer may give isolated transactions little consideration in establishing PMP, but the language in the proposal suggested a more restrictive approach.[159] Several commenters also requested that the MSRB revise the proposed guidance to more accurately describe the concept of spread in the municipal market.[160] The proposed guidance (as provided in the Notice) includes as one of its non-exclusive list of relevant factors to determine the degree to which a municipal security is similar, the factor of ''the extent to which the spread (*i.e.,* the spread over U.S. Treasury securities of a similar duration) at which the 'similar' municipal security trades is comparable to the spread at which the subject security trades.'' Commenters noted that only taxable municipal bonds trade at a spread to Treasuries.[161]

On the subject of similar securities, the MSRB confirmed that different dealers may reasonably reach different conclusions as to whether securities are similar, and that dealers may adopt reasonable policies and procedures to consistently implement the guidance.[162] On the ''isolated'' transactions issue, the MSRB noted that the descriptive language included in the filing paraphrased the rule text and the actual rule text controls.[163] The MSRB clarified that a dealer may give little or no weight to pricing information resulting from an isolated transaction; the weight, if any, given to such a transaction is dependent on the facts and circumstances surrounding the transaction.[164] With respect to the proposed guidance's suggestion that a similar security analysis consider the spread over U.S. Treasury securities, the MSRB agreed to amend the proposed guidance to include language relevant to the appropriate spread relied upon for non-taxable municipal bonds.[165] The MSRB also agreed to amend the proposed guidance language to clarify that a dealer may also consider the extent to which a spread over the ''applicable index'' at which the similar municipal security trades is comparable.[166]

2. Fair Pricing and Time of Determination of Prevailing Market Price

Commenters stated that the proposed guidance in the proposed rule change should apply solely for the purposes of calculating the mark-up or mark-down to be disclosed, and not ''as an overarching fair pricing methodology under Rule G–30.'' [167] In particular, one commenter stated its belief that the proposed guidance ''originated as a necessary technical clarification solely as part of the retail disclosure requirement,'' and was not general guidance applicable to all trades.[168] In the alternative, such commenter requested that if the MSRB planned to apply the proposed guidance for fair pricing purposes, it should only apply for retail customers, because such a limitation would be consistent with the terms of the proposed mark-up disclosure requirement and be more closely aligned with the prevailing market price guidance provided by FINRA in the supplementary material to FINRA Rule 2121.[169]

In addition, one commenter addressed the issue of timing of the PMP determination, requesting that the MSRB proposal allow determination of the PMP at the time of trade for all processes, including those that capture confirm-related data in real-time, even if the actual issuance of the confirm is not until the end of the day.[170]

The MSRB responded to the fair pricing issue by stating that a dealer that uses reasonable diligence to determine the PMP of a municipal security in accordance with the proposed guidance, and then discloses a mark-up based on such determination, should generally be able to rely on that determination for fair pricing purposes.[171] The MSRB explained that it would be confusing for investors to learn that the mark-up or mark-down disclosed on customer confirmations is not necessarily the mark-up or mark-down examined by regulators for fair pricing analysis.[172]

[151] *Id.* at 12–13.

[152] *Id.* at 8.

[153] *Id.*

[154] *Id.* at 8–9.

[155] *Id.* at 9.

[156] *Id.* at 12.

[157] *Id.*

[158] *See* SIFMA Letter, at 9.

[159] *See* BDA Letter, at 3–4.

[160] *See* SIFMA Letter, at 10; BDA Letter, at 4; RW Smith Letter, at 2.

[161] *See* SIFMA Letter, at 10; BDA Letter, at 4; RW Smith Letter, at 2.

[162] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 13.

[163] *Id.* at 15.

[164] *Id.*

[165] *Id.* at 7; *see also* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7, at 5.

[166] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 7; *see also* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7, at 5.

[167] *See* SIFMA Letter, at 4; *see also* RW Smith Letter, at 2.

[168] *See* SIFMA Letter, at 4.

[169] *Id.* at 5.

[170] *See* Thomson Reuters Letter, at 2.

[171] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 10.

[172] *Id.*

The MSRB also rejected commenter request to limit use of the proposed guidance for fair pricing purposes to retail customers.[173] The MSRB explained that such request was inappropriate because while certain institutional customers, like sophisticated municipal market professionals, could opt out of certain fair pricing protections for agency transactions, such opt-out was not possible for principal transactions.[174] Because the determination of PMP is critical to fair pricing determinations in principal transactions, the MSRB stated that it was not appropriate to limit the proposed guidance to transactions with retail customers only.[175]

Responding to commenter concern, the MSRB confirmed that a dealer may determine the PMP for disclosure purposes based on information the dealer has at the time the dealer inputs the information into its systems to generate the mark-up disclosure, even when the actual issuance of the confirmation is not until the end of the day, as long as the dealer consistently applies its relevant policies and procedures in the same manner for all retail customers.[176] The MSRB also provided an example providing guidance on both timing and fair pricing issues.[177]

C. Presentation of Mark-Up/Mark-Down Information on Customer Confirmations

The MSRB proposes to require that mark-ups/mark-downs be disclosed on confirmations as a total dollar amount (*i.e.,* the dollar difference between the customer's price and the security's PMP, and as a percentage amount, (*i.e.,* the mark-up's percentage of the security's PMP). Several commenters noted that the new disclosures required by the proposal might cause investor confusion, as different members may determine the PMP for the same security differently, resulting in a lack of comparability or consistency across customer confirmations.[178]

Commenters suggested different approaches to resolve potential investor confusion. Several commenters, for instance, argued that dealers should be permitted to label or qualify the mark-up/mark-down disclosed on the confirmation as ''estimated'' or ''approximate.'' [179] Other commenters suggested that dealers be allowed to add a description of the dealer's process for calculating mark-ups and mark-downs.[180] Others suggested that dealers be permitted to describe the meaning of the mark-up/mark-down,[181] or to indicate that it may not reflect profit to the dealer [182] or the exact compensation to the dealer.[183] Two commenters suggested that to ensure consistent disclosure, any explanatory text that dealers may include on customer confirmations should be drafted and prepared by the MSRB.[184]

The MSRB responded by stating that dealers should not be permitted to label the required mark-up/mark-down disclosure as ''estimated'' or ''approximate'', because such labels have the potential to unduly suggest an unreliability of the disclosures or otherwise diminish their value.[185] However, the MSRB agreed that a dealer should be permitted to include explanatory language or disclosures on confirmations to provide context and understanding for investors receiving mark-up and mark-down disclosures, such as an explanation of how the disclosure was derived.[186] In response to commenters' requests for the MSRB to provide standardized or sample disclosures that would be appropriate under the proposal, the MSRB stated that dealers should have the flexibility to determine how to craft such language for their customers, as long as such explanatory language is accurate and not misleading.[187]

D. Time of Execution, Hyperlink to EMMA, and Harmonization With the FINRA Proposal

The MSRB's proposed rule change, as provided in the Notice, requires dealers to include on all trade confirmations a time-of-trade disclosure and on all trade confirmations a CUSIP-specific hyperlink to EMMA's ''security details'' page for that relevant municipal security. Notably, these disclosure requirements exist irrespective of whether the dealer has an obligation to disclose its mark-up or mark-down on a particular transaction. As originally proposed, the FINRA rule change did not contain a similar disclosure requirement. Several commenters, citing a desire for greater harmonization between FINRA and the MSRB, suggested that the MSRB remove or delay implementation of the time-of-trade and CUSIP-specific hyperlink requirements.[188] Other commenters suggested changes to the requirement, including replacing the CUSIP-specific hyperlink with a more general hyperlink to EMMA, which they argued would: Reduce confusion by minimizing the risk of typographical errors made by investors who receive paper confirmations and have to manually type of the hyperlink in a web browser, avoid issues that arise if the web addresses to security-specific pages change, reduce the amount of space needed on the confirmation to fulfill the disclosure requirement, and generally ease the programming and operational burden of compliance.[189]

One commenter also sought guidance on how dealers should implement the time-of-execution disclosure in adviser block-trade executions that are later allocated to that adviser's customers.[190] That same commenter also recommended that dealers should be permitted to combine the security-specific hyperlink disclosure with the official statement delivery obligation for primary issues under MSRB Rule G–32 in order to avoid potentially lengthy and duplicative disclosures.[191]

In response, the MSRB modified the proposed rule change in Amendment No. 1 to harmonize the MSRB's and FINRA's hyperlink and time of execution standards in all relevant, substantive, and technical respects.[192] The harmonized proposals would require the disclosure of the time of trade or time of execution on retail customer confirmations, regardless of whether the dealer would be required to disclosure the mark-up or mark-down on the customer transaction.[193] The proposals would also require a reference and hyperlink to a Web page on FINRA's Trade Reporting Compliance Engine (''TRACE'') or EMMA, as applicable, containing trading data for the specific security that was traded, along with a brief description of the type of information available on that page.[194]

[173] *Id.* at 11.

[174] *Id.*

[175] *Id.*

[176] *Id.* at 10 & n.16.

[177] *Id.* at 10–11.

[178] *See* BDA Letter, at 3; Wells Fargo Letter, at 4; SIFMA Letter, at 8; Fidelity Letter, at 3.

[179] *See* Fidelity Letter, at 3; SIFMA Letter, at 8.

[180] *See* BDA Letter, at 3; Fidelity Letter, at 3; SIFMA Letter, at 8.

[181] *See* Fidelity Letter, at 3.

[182] *See* Wells Fargo Letter, at 4. *See also* Thomson Reuters Letter, at 3 (noting that dealers may not want to provide mark-up/mark-down disclosure on all confirms without the ability to include text indicating that the mark-up/mark-down may not reflect the profit to the firm).

[183] *See* Fidelity Letter, at 3.

[184] *See* Fidelity Letter, at 3; BDA Letter, at 3.

[185] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 11.

[186] *Id.*

[187] *Id.* at 11–12.

[188] *See* Fidelity Letter, at 4–5; FIF Letter, at 1–2; Thomson Reuters Letter, at 3; Wells Fargo Letter, at 2; FIF Letter, at 8.

[189] *See* SIFMA Letter, at 13; Thomson Reuters Letter, at 3; BDA Letter, at 4; FIF Letter, at 8.

[190] *See* Fidelity Letter, at 5.

[191] *Id.* at 5–6.

[192] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 4–5; *see also* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7, at 4–5.

[193] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 5.

[194] *Id.*

Further, to promote harmonization and enhance the user experience, the MSRB agreed to make a technical amendment to its proposed hyperlink requirement, replacing the requirement for a specific Web page hyperlink with a more generic requirement to hyperlink to a Web page on EMMA, in a format specified by the MSRB, containing publicly available trading data for the traded security.[195] The MSRB explained that this change in language is meant to more closely harmonize with the language in FINRA's proposal, and that, by using more general language to describe the hyperlink requirement, the MSRB and FINRA retain some flexibility to consider ways to make the landing page for investors accessing EMMA and TRACE via the hyperlink on confirmations more accessible and user friendly.[196] The MSRB also agreed, in the interest of harmonization and to provide some implementation relief, to amend the proposed rule change to require dealers to disclose time of execution for only retail customer confirmations, explaining that institutional customers are already likely to know the time of execution of their transaction.[197]

In response to comments about investor confusion and potential error caused by the difficulty in typing in a lengthy hyperlink, the MSRB developed a more succinct EMMA URL for direct access to a security-specific page on EMMA. The MSRB stated its belief that this succinct URL, which can be used for the proposed disclosure, is easier to use and would decrease the number of characters an investor may need to type or input to access to relevant page on EMMA.[198] Addressing commenter concerns that such a hyperlink may expire, the MSRB also stated that it does not anticipate any future changes to the protocol for the succinct URL, and therefore it believes that hyperlinks that use the succinct URL will continue to function indefinitely.[199] The MSRB also confirmed that the disclosure of a security-specific hyperlink to EMMA would satisfy a dealer's official statement delivery obligation for primary issues under Rule G–32, as long as the hyperlink and URL are accompanied by the information required under Rule G–32(a)(iii).[200]

E. *Anticipated Costs of Implementing the Proposed Rule Change by the Proposed Effective Date*

Most commenters stated that the proposed rule change was too complex and costly to implement by the proposed effective date—one year from Commission approval of the proposed rule change. Commenters particularly emphasized the significant systems and programming modifications that they believed dealers and their third-party vendors would need to undertake in order to implement the proposal.[201] They also asserted that it would be particularly challenging to implement such changes in light of other regulatory initiatives slated to become effective in the near future.[202] As a result, commenters suggested implementation periods of at least two years and often longer.[203] In response, the MSRB agreed to extend the implementation time to provide that the effective date of the proposed rule change will be no later than eighteen months following Commission approval.[204]

Numerous commenters also expressed concern about the total cost of the proposed rule change.[205] Two commenters questioned whether the costs of implementing the rule may outweigh the benefits, and one questioned whether FINRA and the MSRB had conducted a cost-benefit analysis.[206] Several commenters also expressed the belief that the heaviest costs and burdens would fall on smaller dealers and may lead to dealers to reduce head count or exit the industry.[207] Commenters suggested alternative proposals that they viewed as achieving similar goals in a less costly manner, including focusing more on developing EMMA to achieve greater transparency.[208] One commenter also noted its belief that there was no evidence the MSRB considered or measured the risk that its proposal would impair liquidity in the municipal security market, or that the proposal would cause some principal-holding dealers to shift towards a riskless principal model.[209]

The MSRB acknowledged that the proposed rule change would impose burdens and costs on dealers.[210] The MSRB also noted that, in response to earlier comments it had received, it had already acknowledged and recognized the costs in its filing supporting the proposed rule change.[211] These costs included those that would be incurred by dealers to develop a methodology to satisfy the disclosure requirement, identify the trades subject to the disclosure requirement, and convey the required mark-up and disclosure information to the customer.[212] The MSRB also acknowledged that it had received some cost estimates from one commenter.[213]

However, while recognizing these costs, the MSRB reiterated its belief that the proposed rule change reflects the lowest overall cost approach to achieving a worthy regulatory objective. It noted that retail investors are currently limited in their ability to compare transaction costs associated with transactions in municipal securities.[214] It also noted that mark-up and mark-down disclosure may improve investor confidence, allow customers to better evaluate the services provided by dealers, promote pricing transparency, improve communication between dealers and customers, and make the enforcement of Rule G–30 more efficient.[215] Finally, the MSRB noted that it had engaged in a multi-year rulemaking process on this proposal, had evaluated numerous reasonable regulatory alternatives, and had implemented several changes to make the rule less costly and burdensome.[216]

[195] *Id.; see also* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7, at 4–5.

[196] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 5.

[197] *Id.* at 5–6.

[198] *Id.* at 6.

[199] *Id.*

[200] *Id.* at 6–7.

[201] *See, e.g.,* FIF Letter, at 1–2; Fidelity Letter, at 6–7.

[202] *See* BDA Letter, at 4–5; SIFMA Letter, at 11–12; Fidelity Letter, at 6–7; Thomson Reuters Letter, at 3–4; FIF Letter, at 2–4. Commenters identified the following initiatives: (1) the U.S. Department of Labor's conflict of interest rule, *see* 81 FR 20946 (Apr. 8, 2016); (2) the Consolidated Audit Trail, *see* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 77724 (Apr. 27, 2016), 81 FR 30614 (May 17, 2016); (3) the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network's Customer Due Diligence Requirements for Financial Institutions, *see* 81 FR 29398 (May 11, 2016); and (4) additional other MSRB, FINRA, and Commission rule changes.

[203] *See* Wells Fargo Letter, at 4 (requesting an implementation period of three years but no less than two); Fidelity Letter, at 6 (two years); BDA Letter, at 4 (two years); Thomson Reuters Letter, at 4 (two years); SIFMA Letter, at 11 (three years); and FIF Letter, at 2 (requesting an implementation date ''well into 2018'').

[204] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 13.

[205] *See, e.g.,* RW Smith Letter, at 2; SIFMA Letter, at 2–3.

[206] *See* FIF Letter, at 4; SIFMA Letter, at 3.

[207] *See* FIF Letter, at 4; BDA Letter, at 4–5. *See also* RW Smith Letter, at 2 (noting that ''reputable small firms close their doors and people lose their jobs, and not because they didn't serve their clients well, but instead because decision makers did not stop long enough to consider the unequal and unfair burden being placed on small firms through rule-making'').

[208] *See* RW Smith Letter, at 2; SIFMA Letter, at 2; Wells Fargo Letter, at 2.

[209] *See* SIFMA Letter, at 3–4.

[210] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 14.

[211] *Id.*

[212] *Id.*

[213] *Id.*

[214] *Id.*

[215] *Id.*

[216] *Id.*

F. Recommendation of the Investor Advocate

As noted above, the Investor Advocate submitted to the public comment file its recommendation to the Commission that the Commission approve the proposed rule change.[217] In its recommendation, the Investor Advocate stated its belief that the proposed rule change's ''enhancements to pricing disclosure in the fixed income markets are long overdue and will greatly benefit retail investors.'' [218] Specifically, the Investor Advocate noted that the required mark-up disclosures will better equip retail investors ''to evaluate transactions and the quality of service provided to them by a firm,'' help regulators and retail investors detect improper dealer practices, and make it less likely that dealers will charge excessive mark-ups.[219] Ultimately, the Investor Advocate focused its attention on ''four key issues''—consistency of approach between the MSRB and FINRA; same-day disclosure window; the use of prevailing market price as the basis for calculating mark-ups; and the need for dealers to look through transactions with affiliates—as the focus of its review, and stated ''each of these issues has been resolved to our satisfaction'' in the proposed rule change.[220]

With respect to the MSRB and FINRA adopting consistent rules related to confirmation disclosure, the Investor Advocate highlighted that the proposed rule change and the FINRA Proposal ''provide a coordinated and consistent approach to mark-up disclosure in corporate and municipal bond transactions.'' [221] Accordingly, the Investor Advocate concluded that ''this deliberative approach will lead to consistent disclosures across the fixed income markets and will provide retail investors with better post-trade price transparency.'' [222]

Addressing the same-day disclosure window, the Investor Advocate noted its agreement ''that the window of time for disclosure should be the full trading day.'' [223] According to the Investor Advocate, a shorter time-frame—*e.g.,* the two-hour window previously proposed by the MSRB—could inappropriately incentivize dealers to alter their trading practices to avoid the obligation to disclose mark-ups.[224]

Discussing the proposed rule change's use of prevailing market price as the basis for mark-up disclosure, the Investor Advocate stated its belief that the prevailing market price-based disclosure has advantages over the initially proposed reference price-based disclosure.[225] Specifically, the Investor Advocate noted that though the ''PMP-based disclosure may lead to disclosure of a smaller cost to retail investors under certain circumstances . . . the PMP-based approach provides retail investors with the relevant information about the actual compensation the retail investor is paying the dealer for the transaction . . . [and] . . . [i]t reflects market conditions and has the potential to provide a more accurate benchmark for calculating transaction costs.'' [226] Moreover, the Investor Advocate noted that the prevailing market price-based disclosure regime could more easily be expanded beyond the presently contemplated same-day disclosure window.[227] As a result, the Investor Advocate stated its support for the MSRB's use of the prevailing market price-based disclosure regime.[228] Finally, the Investor Advocate stated its support for the proposed rule change's requirement that dealers express the mark-up both as a total dollar amount and as a percentage of the prevailing market price.[229]

With respect to dealer transactions with affiliates, the Investor Advocate highlighted its concern with dealer-affiliate trading arrangements, and concluded that the proposed rule change ''satisfies [the Investor Advocate's] concerns by making clear that a dealer must look through non-arms-length transactions with affiliates to calculate PMP.'' [230]

Finally, with respect to the implementation of the proposed rule change, the Investor Advocate stated its support for a one-year implementation period, noting that such period would be reasonable despite the technical and system changes that might be required for compliance with the proposed rule change.[231]

IV. Discussion and Commission Findings

After carefully considering the proposed rule change, the comments received, the MSRB Response Letter, and Amendment No. 1, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to the MSRB. In particular, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is consistent with Section 15B(b)(2)(C) of the Act,[232] which requires, among other things, that the MSRB's rules be 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 regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to, and facilitating transactions in municipal securities and municipal financial products, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market in municipal securities and municipal financial products, and, in general, to protect investors, municipal entities, obligated persons, and the public interest, and not be designed to impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

A. Mark-Up/Mark-Down Disclosure

The Commission notes that the goal of improving transaction cost transparency in fixed-income markets for retail investors has long been pursued by the Commission.[233] In particular, in the

[217] *See* Investor Advocate Letter, *supra* note 5.

[218] *Id.* at 2.

[219] *Id.*

[220] *Id.* at 6.

[221] *Id.*

[222] *Id.*

[223] *Id.* at 7.

[224] *Id.*

[225] *Id.*

[226] *Id.* at 7–8.

[227] *Id.* at 8.

[228] *Id.* at 8–9.

[229] *Id.* at 9.

[230] *Id.* at 9–10.

[231] *Id.* at 10–11.

[232] 15 U.S.C. 78*o*–4(b)(2)(C).

[233] *See* Securities & Exchange Commission, Report on the Municipal Securities Market (July 31, 2012) (''2012 Report''), *available at: https://www.sec.gov/news/studies/2012/munireport073112.pdf* (recommending that the MSRB consider possible rule changes that would require dealers acting as riskless principal to disclose on the customer confirmation the amount of any mark-up or mark-down and that the Commission consider whether a comparable change should be made to Rule 10b–10 with respect to confirmation disclosure of mark-ups and mark-downs in riskless principal transactions for corporate bonds); Chair Mary Jo White, Securities and Exchange Commission, Intermediation in the Modern Securities Markets: Putting Technology and Competition to Work for Investors (June 20, 2014), *available at: https://www.sec.gov/News/Speech/Detail/Speech/1370542122012* (Chair White noting that to help investors better understand the cost of their fixed income transactions, staff will work with FINRA and the MSRB in their efforts to develop rules regarding disclosure of mark-ups in certain principal transactions for both corporate and municipal bonds); Statement on Edward D. Jones Enforcement Action (August 13, 2015), *available at: https://www.sec.gov/news/statement/statement-on-edward-jones-enforcement-action.html* (Commissioners Luis A. Aguilar, Daniel M. Gallagher, Kara M. Stein, and Michael S. Piwowar stating, ''We encourage the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA) and the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (MSRB) to complete rules mandating transparency of mark-ups and mark-downs, even in riskless principal trades.''). *See also* Investor Advocate Letter, *supra* note 5, at 2 (supporting the proposed rule change and stating

2012 Report, the Commission stated that the MSRB should consider possible rule changes that would require dealers acting as riskless principal to disclose on customer confirmations the amount of any mark-up/mark-down.[234] The Commission believes that the establishment of a requirement that dealers disclose mark-ups/mark-downs to retail investors, as proposed, will advance the goal of providing retail investors with meaningful and useful information about the pricing of their municipal securities transactions.[235]

The Commission believes the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is reasonably designed to ensure that mark-ups/mark-downs are disclosed to retail investors, at least when a dealer has effected a same-day off-setting transaction, while limiting the impact of operational challenges for dealers. For example, with respect to dealers that generate intra-day trade confirmations, the Commission notes that the MSRB stated that dealers need not delay the confirmation process.[236] The Commission further notes that the MSRB stated that dealers would not be expected to cancel and resend a confirmation to revise the mark-up or mark-down disclosure solely based on the occurrence of a subsequent transaction or event that would otherwise be relevant to the calculation of the mark-up or mark-down under the proposed guidance.[237]

Under the proposed rule change, disclosed mark-ups/mark-downs are to be calculated in compliance with the proposed guidance, and expressed as a total dollar amount and as a percentage of the PMP of the subject security.[238] The Commission believes that this information will, for example, promote transparency of dealers' pricing practices and encourage dialogue between dealers and retail investors about the costs associated with their transactions, thereby better enabling retail investors to evaluate their transaction costs and potentially promoting price competition among dealers.

As discussed above, concerns were raised that the proposed rule change's requirement to determine PMP in compliance with the proposed guidance would make it difficult for dealers to automate PMP determinations at the time of the trade.[239] The Commission believes that the MSRB has adequately responded to these concerns, and that the price and mark-up/mark-down disclosed to the customer on a confirmation must reflect the actual PMP the dealer used to price and mark-up/mark-down the transaction at the time of the trade. The Commission believes that it is feasible to automate the determination of PMP in accordance with the proposed guidance to the extent a dealer chooses to do so, and agrees with the MSRB. The Commission further believes that a dealer's election to use automated processes to support pricing of retail trades, and thus determine the PMP, would not justify departure from the proposed requirement that dealers price municipal securities in accordance with the proposed guidance.

When the Commission approved the prevailing market price guidance contained in FINRA Rule 2121.02 [240] (which is substantially similar to and generally harmonized with the proposed guidance being approved by the Commission in this Order [241]), the Commission stated that such guidance is consistent with long-standing Commission and judicial precedent regarding fair mark-ups, and that it: provides a framework that specifically establishes contemporaneous cost as the presumptive prevailing market price, but also identifies certain dynamic factors that are relevant to whether contemporaneous cost or alternative values provide the most appropriate measure of prevailing market price. The Commission believes that the factors that govern when a dealer may depart from contemporaneous cost and that set forth alternative measures the dealer may use are reasonably designed to provide greater certainty to dealers and investors while providing an appropriate level of flexibility for dealers to consider alternative market factors when pricing debt securities.[242]

The Commission believes this reasoning remains sound and is not persuaded that the proposed requirement to disclose mark-ups/mark-downs on customer confirmations necessitates an approach contrary to the proposed guidance.

Further, in response to commenters that requested confirmation or clarification that firms may adopt reasonable policies and procedures regarding the implementation of particular aspects of the guidance, the MSRB stated its expectation that dealers will have reasonable policies and procedures in place to determine PMP, and that such policies and procedures are consistently applied across customers.[243] The MSRB further explained that it expects those policies and procedures to be designed to implement the proposed guidance, not to create an alternative manner of determining PMP.[244] More specifically, the MSRB stated its expectation that such policies and procedures will be reasonably designed to implement all applicable components of the PMP determination.[245] The MSRB also proposed to extend the implementation date of the proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, from one year to 18 months following Commission approval,[246] and represented that it will continue to engage with FINRA with the goal of promoting generally harmonized interpretations of the proposed guidance and the FINRA guidance, as applicable and to the extent appropriate in light of the differences between the markets.[247] The Commission believes that the MSRB's responses appropriately address commenters' concerns regarding implementation of the proposed rule change.

Also, as discussed above, commenters had questions regarding the presentation of mark-up/mark-down information on customer confirmations, and, in particular, sought the MSRB's concurrence that it would be acceptable to label the required mark-up/mark-down disclosure as an ''estimate'' or an ''approximate'' figure.[248] The Commission agrees with the MSRB,[249] and does not believe that it would be consistent with the Act or the proposed rule change for dealers to label the

that enhancements to pricing disclosure in the fixed-income markets are ''long overdue and will greatly benefit retail investors''); Recommendation of the Investor Advisory Committee to Enhance Information for Bond Market Investors (June 7, 2016), *available at: https://www.sec.gov/spotlight/investor-advisory-committee-2012/recommendation-enhance-information-bond-market-investors-060716.pdf* (recommending that the Commission work with FINRA and the MSRB to finalize mark-up/mark-down disclosure proposals).

[234] *See* 2012 Report, *supra* note 233, at 148.

[235] While MSRB Rule G–15 generally requires a dealer to disclose to customers on the transaction confirmation the amount of any remuneration to be received from the customer, if the dealer is acting as agent, there is no comparable requirement if the dealer is acting as principal. *See* MSRB Rule G–15(a)(i)(A)(1)(e).

[236] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62955.

[237] *Id.*

[238] *Id.* at 62950.

[239] *See* notes 141–147, and accompanying text, *supra.*

[240] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 55638 (Apr. 16, 2007), 72 FR 20150, 20154 (Apr. 23, 2007) (SR–NASD–2003–141) (the ''2007 PMP Order''). When the Commission approved this prevailing market price guidance, such guidance was found in the supplementary material to the then-existing NASD Rule 2440.

[241] For description of the proposed guidance, *see* notes 80–119, and accompanying text, *supra.*

[242] *See* 2007 PMP Order, *supra* note 240.

[243] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 12.

[244] *Id.*

[245] *Id.*

[246] *Id.* at 13.

[247] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62952.

[248] *See* note 179, and accompanying text, *supra.*

[249] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 11.

required mark-up/mark-down disclosure as an ''estimate'' or an ''approximate'' figure, or to otherwise suggest that the dealer is not disclosing the actual amount of the mark-up/mark-down it determined to charge the customer. However, the proposed rule change is appropriately flexible to permit a dealer to include language on confirmations that explains PMP as a concept, or that details the dealer's methodology for determining PMP, or that notes the availability of information about methodology upon request, provided such statements are accurate. The Commission emphasizes that dealers will be required to disclose the actual amount of the mark-up/mark-down that they have determined to charge the customer, in accordance with the proposed amendments to Rules G–15 and G–30 being approved in this Order.

B. Requirement To Provide EMMA Reference/Hyperlink and Time of Execution on All Retail Customer Confirmations

The Commission also believes that the MSRB's proposal to require dealers to disclose, in a format specified by the MSRB, a reference and, if the confirmation is electronic, a hyperlink to Web page on EMMA that contains publicly available trading data for the specific security that was traded is reasonably designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to protect investors, is in the public interest, and does not impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the Act, and is therefore consistent with the Act.

In the Commission's view, providing a retail investor with a security-specific reference or hyperlink on the trade confirmation and the time of trade execution will facilitate retail customers obtaining a comprehensive view of the market for their securities, including the market as of the time of trade. The Commission believes that these items will complement the MSRB's existing order-handling obligations (*e.g.,* best execution) by providing retail investors with meaningful and useful information with which they will be able to independently evaluate the quality of execution obtained from a dealer.

Some commenters urged the MSRB to require a general hyperlink to EMMA, rather than a security-specific hyperlink.[250] According to the MSRB, a security-specific hyperlink would provide retail investors, who typically have less ready access to market and pricing information than institutional customers, with a more comprehensive picture of the market for a security on a given day, and would increase investors' awareness of, and ability to access, this information.[251] Further, in Amendment No. 1, the MSRB made a technical amendment to its proposed hyperlink disclosure requirement that mitigates concerns raised by commenters. The MSRB asserted that the use of such language, which, based on coordination between the MSRB and FINRA, is similar to the language used by FINRA in its related proposal, is responsive to commenter requests for more harmonization and would reduce the potential for confusion.[252] The Commission has carefully considered Amendment No. 1 in light of comments received urging the MSRB and FINRA to harmonize both the substance and timing of their proposals. The Commission concurs with the MSRB that the time of execution along with a security-specific reference or hyperlink on a customer confirmation would provide customers with the ability to obtain a comprehensive view of the market for their security at the time of trade.

C. Prevailing Market Price Guidance

In 2007, the Commission approved detailed interpretive guidance that establishes a framework for how a dealer should determine the PMP for non-municipal debt securities in a variety of scenarios.[253] In the 2012 Report, the Commission recommended that the MSRB should consider possible rule changes that would set forth more detailed guidance as to how dealers should establish the PMP for municipal securities, and that is consistent with that provided by FINRA for non-municipal debt securities.[254]

The proposed guidance is designed to provide a clear and consistent framework to dealers for determining PMP to aid in compliance with their fair-pricing obligations under Rule G–30 and their mark-up/mark-down disclosure obligations under Rule G–15. The proposed guidance provides a framework that specifically establishes contemporaneous cost as the presumptive PMP, but also identifies certain factors that are relevant to whether contemporaneous cost or alternative values provide the most appropriate measure of PMP. The Commission believes that the factors that govern when a dealer may depart from contemporaneous cost and that set forth alterative measures the dealer may use are reasonably designed to provide greater certainty to dealers and investors while providing an appropriate level of flexibility for dealers to consider alternative market factors when pricing municipal securities. As noted in the 2012 Report, providing dealers a clear and consistent framework as to how they should approach the complex task of establishing the PMP of municipal securities should enhance their ability to comply with fair pricing obligations, facilitate regulators' ability to enforce those obligations, and better protect customers.[255]

In addition, by recognizing the facts-and-circumstances nature of the analysis and by setting forth a logical series of factors to be used when a dealer departs from contemporaneous cost, the MSRB has proposed an approach for determining the PMP of a municipal security that is reasonable and practical in addressing the interests of dealers and investors and is consistent with the Act and longstanding Commission and judicial precedent relating to determining PMP and mark-ups. The Commission also notes that the MSRB represented that the proposed guidance is substantially similar to and generally harmonized with the FINRA guidance for non-municipal fixed income securities that is set forth in FINRA Rule 2121.02.[256] While several commenters raised concerns with respect to implementing the proposed guidance,[257] the Commission believes that the MSRB has reasonably addressed the comments.

D. Efficiency, Competition, and Capital Formation

In approving the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, the Commission has considered its impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation.[258] The Commission believes that the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, could affect efficiency, competition, and capital formation in several ways.

The Commission believes that the proposed rule change could have an impact on competition among dealers. For instance, costs associated with the proposed rule change could raise barriers to entry in the retail trading market. The MSRB acknowledges that the proposed rule change may

[250] *See* notes 189, and accompanying text, *supra.*

[251] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62949, 62956.

[252] *See* MSRB Response, *supra* note 6, at 5.

[253] *See* 2007 PMP Order, *supra* note 240.

[254] *See* 2012 Report, *supra* note 233, at 148.

[255] *Id.*

[256] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62952.

[257] *See* notes 141–147, and accompanying text, *supra.*

[258] 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

disproportionately impact less active dealers that, as indicated by data, currently charge relatively higher mark-ups than more active dealers; however, overall, the MSRB believes that the burdens on competition will be limited and the proposed rule change will not impose any additional burdens on competition that are not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.[259] The MSRB recognizes that the proposed rule change could lead dealers to consolidate with other dealers, or to exit the market, however, the MSRB does not believe—and is not aware of any data that suggest—that the number of dealers exiting the market or consolidating would materially impact competition.[260] Additionally, the Commission believes that the proposed rule change provides dealers with the flexibility to develop cost-effective policies and procedures for complying with the proposed rule change that reflect their business needs and are consistent with the regulatory objectives of the proposed rule change.

By increasing disclosure requirements for retail customer confirmations, the proposed rule change could improve efficiency—in particular, price efficiency—and the improvement in pricing efficiency could promote capital formation. The Commission believes that mark-up/mark-down disclosure and the inclusion of a reference/hyperlink to security-specific transaction information on EMMA on retail customer confirmations will promote price competition among dealers and improve trade execution quality. An increase in price competition among dealers would lower transaction costs on retail customer trades. To the extent that the proposed rule change lowers transaction costs on retail customer trades, the proposed rule change could improve the pricing efficiency and price discovery process. The quality of the price discovery process has implications for efficiency and capital formation, as prices that accurately convey information about fundamental value could better facilitate capital allocations across municipalities and capital projects. Furthermore, to the extent that the proposed rule change would lower transaction costs on retail customer trades, the proposed rule change could lower bond financing costs for municipalities and capital projects. Lower transaction costs could attract more investors to the municipal securities market, which could increase the demand for municipal securities. Higher demand could lead to higher municipal security prices and higher municipal security prices could contribute to increased funding opportunities for municipalities and capital projects.

As noted above, the Commission received seven comment letters on the filing. The Commission believes that the MSRB considered carefully and responded adequately to the concerns raised by commenters. For all the foregoing reasons, including those discussed in the MSRB Response, the Commission believes the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is reasonably designed to help the MSRB fulfill its mandate in Section 15B(b)(2)(C) of the Act which requires, among other things, that MSRB's rules be 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 regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to, and facilitating transactions in municipal securities and municipal financial products, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market in municipal securities and municipal financial products, and, in general, to protect investors, municipal entities, obligated persons, and the public interest, and not be designed to impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.[261]

V. Solicitation of Comments on Amendment No. 1

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether Amendment No. 1 to 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–MSRB–2016–12 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–MSRB–2016–12. 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 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 Web site 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 will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of MSRB. 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–MSRB–2016–12 and should be submitted on or before December 14, 2016.

VI. Accelerated Approval of Proposed Rule Change, as Modified by Amendment No. 1

The Commission finds good cause to approve the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, prior to the 30th day after the date of publication of notice of the filing of Amendment No. 1 in the **Federal Register**. Amendment No. 1 amends the proposed rule change to (1) replace the requirement that dealers supply a hyperlink to the ''Security Details'' page on EMMA of specific security that was traded with a requirement to provide, in a format specified by the MSRB, a reference, and if the confirmation is electronic, a hyperlink to a Web page on EMMA that contains publicly available trading data for the specific security that was traded; (2) limit the time of execution disclosure requirement to retail investors; (3) add the term ''offsetting'' to proposed Rule G–15(a)(i)(F)(1)(b) to conform the rule language to the language used to discuss conditions that trigger the disclosure requirement; (4) add the phrase ''an applicable index'' to proposed Supplementary Material .06(b)(ii)(B) of Rule G–30 to ensure that the proposed guidance contemplates an appropriate

[259] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 62956–57.

[260] *Id.*

[261] 15 U.S.C. 78*o*–4(b)(2)(C).

spread relied upon for tax-exempt municipal securities; and (5) extend the implementation period of the proposed rule change from no later than one year to no later than 18 months.

According to the MSRB, it has proposed the revisions included in Amendment No. 1 in response to specific commenter suggestions and commenters' general preference for the MSRB and FINRA to adopt harmonized mark-up disclosure rules and prevailing market price guidance. The Commission notes that the addition of the terms ''offsetting'' and ''an applicable index'' to the proposed rule change is solely a clarification amendment for the avoidance of doubt and that the amendment does not alter the substance of the rule. Furthermore, extension of the implementation period of the proposal from no later than one year to no later than 18 months is appropriate and responsive to the operational and implementation concerns raised by commenters. The Commission also notes that after consideration of the comments the MSRB received on its proposal to require a security-specific hyperlink to EMMA and the execution time of the transaction, the MSRB amended its proposal in a manner that is identical to the Amendment No. 1 that FINRA has filed.[262] Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is consistent with Section 15B(b)(2)(C) of the Act, which requires, among other things, that the MSRB's rules be 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 regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to, and facilitating transactions in municipal securities and municipal financial products, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market in municipal securities and municipal financial products, and, in general, to protect investors, municipal entities, obligated persons, and the public interest, and not be designed to impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.[263]

The Commission notes that it today has approved the FINRA Proposal, as modified by FINRA Amendment No. 1, and believes that in the interests of promoting efficiency in the implementation of both proposals, it is appropriate to approve the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, concurrently. Accordingly, the Commission finds good cause, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Exchange Act,[264] to approve the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, on an accelerated basis.

VII. Conclusion

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,[265] that the proposed rule change (SR–MSRB–2016–12), as modified by Amendment No. 1, is approved on an accelerated basis.

For the Commission, pursuant to delegated authority.[266]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28197 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[262] *See* FINRA Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 11.

[263] 15 U.S.C. 78*o*–4(b)(2)(C).

[264] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[265] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[266] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–79344; File No. SR–BatsEDGX–2016–64]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Bats EDGX Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of an Amendment to Rule 8.11, Effective Date of Judgment and the Adoption of Rule 8.18, Release of Disciplinary Complaints, Decisions and Other Information

November 17, 2016.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on November 3, 2016, Bats EDGX Exchange, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''EDGX'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Exchange has designated this proposal as a ''non-controversial'' proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act [3] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) thereunder,[4] which renders it effective upon filing with the Commission. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[4] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6)(iii).

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

The Exchange filed a proposal to add proposed Rule 8.18 to require the publication of the Exchange's disciplinary complaints and disciplinary decisions issued and to remove the part of Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 that currently governs the publication of disciplinary complaints and information related to disciplinary complaints.

The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Exchange's Web site at *www.batstrading.com,* 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 parts of such statements.

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

1. Purpose

Proposed Rule Change

Reorganization of Exchange Rules Governing Release of Disciplinary Complaints, Decisions and Other Information Based on FINRA Rule 8313

Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 currently provides, in part, that the Exchange shall cause details regarding all formal disciplinary actions where a final decision has been issued, except as provided in Rule 8.15(a), to be published on its Web site. Interpretation and Policy .01 also provides that the Exchange shall not issue any press release or other statement to the press concerning any formal or informal disciplinary matter unless the Chief Regulatory Officer recommends a press release to the Executive Committee or the Board of the Exchange and either body determines that such a press release is warranted. The Exchange proposes to remove parts of Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 described above and to add

proposed Rule 8.18 modeled after FINRA Rule 8313,[5] as described below, to govern the publication of disciplinary information. The scope of proposed Rule 8.18 would be limited to publication of materials relating to the disciplinary process set forth in Chapter VIII because the Exchange seeks to provide prompt access to more information regarding its disciplinary actions to Members and associated persons. By providing more information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary process, including publishing disciplinary complaints at the time they are filed, Members and associated persons will be able to sooner identify conduct that the Exchange views as problematic and have will [sic] the ability to take corrective steps sooner than they can under the current rules that provide only for the publication of disciplinary decisions after they become final. In that regard, the Exchange has determined not to adopt FINRA Rule 8313 in all respects at this time.[6]

General Standards

The Exchange proposes Rule 8.18(a) to be entitled ''General Standards.'' The text would set forth general standards for the release to the public of disciplinary complaints, decisions, or information.

Proposed Rule 8.18(a)(1) would, in part, essentially replace the part of Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 that addresses the publication of disciplinary decisions and conform [sic] to FINRA Rule 8313. The proposed rule would provide that the Exchange shall release to the public a copy of and, at the Exchange's discretion, information with respect to, any disciplinary decision issued by the Exchange, as defined in proposed Rule 8.18(e). Additionally, the proposed rule would provide that the Exchange would release to the public copies of disciplinary complaints as defined in proposed Rule 8.18(e). Also, the decision to issue other related information, including a press release, under proposed Rule 8.18(a)(1) would be in the discretion of the Exchange generally instead of requiring Executive Committee or Exchange Board approval as currently required in Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11. Proposed Rule 8.18(a)(1) would also provide that, in response to a request, the Exchange shall also release to the requesting party a copy of any identified disciplinary complaint or disciplinary decision issued by the Exchange, as defined in proposed Rule 8.18(e). These proposed amendments are modeled after FINRA Rule 8313(a)(1) and would be substantially similar to the FINRA rule.

The Exchange does not propose to incorporate subsections (2), (3), (4) and (6) of FINRA Rule 8313(a) because the Exchange proposes to limit the scope of proposed Rule 8.18 to the publication of materials relating to the disciplinary process set forth in Chapter VIII at this time.[7] The Exchange, however, notes that although Exchange Rules do not provide for temporary cease and desist orders as provided for in FINRA Rule 9800, the Exchange's Client Suspension Rule—Rule 8.17—is similar in its procedure and purpose. The Exchange proposes to include a client suspension order issued pursuant to Rule 8.17 in the definition of ''disciplinary decision'' under proposed Rule 8.18(e)(2) consistent with FINRA's inclusion of its temporary cease and desist orders for publication because the Exchange views client suspension proceedings as disciplinary in nature. For the same reason, the Exchange proposes to include a notice of the initiation of a client suspension proceeding in the definition of ''disciplinary complaint'' under proposed Rule 8.18(e)(1).

The Exchange does not propose to incorporate subsection (5) of FINRA Rule 8313(a) because the Exchange does not have at this time provisions analogous to FINRA Rule 6490[8] and the FINRA Rule 9700 Series.[9] Additionally, the Exchange does not propose to include its procedures for exemptive relief analogous to the FINRA Rule 9600 Series because the Exchange proposes to limit scope of proposed Rule 8.18 to the publication of disciplinary materials.

Release Specifications

The Exchange proposes to include subsection (b) to proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Release Specifications'' modeled after FINRA Rule 8313(b). Proposed Rule 8.18(b)(1) provides that copies of, and information with respect to, any disciplinary complaint released to the public pursuant to paragraph (a) of the proposed rule shall indicate that a disciplinary complaint represents the initiation of a formal proceeding by the Exchange in which findings as to the allegations in the complaint have not been made and does not represent a decision as to any of the allegations contained in the complaint. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(b)(1) except that the proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA.''

Proposed Rule 8.18(b)(2) provides that copies of, and information with respect to, any disciplinary decision released to the public pursuant to paragraph (a) of the proposed rule prior to the expiration of the time period provided for an appeal or call for review as permitted under Exchange Rules or the Act, or while such an appeal or call for review is pending, shall indicate that the findings and sanctions imposed therein are subject to review and modification by the Exchange or the Commission. The proposed rule would be substantially similar to FINRA Rule 8313(b)(2). The proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA'' and would not include a provision relating to the release specifications for an ''other decision, order, notification, or notice'' because, as noted above, the Exchange proposes

[5] New York Stock Exchange, LLC (''NYSE'') similarly adopted rules modeled after FINRA Rule 8313. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78664 (August 24, 2016), 81 FR 59678, 59679 (August 30, 2016) (SR–NYSE–2016–40).

[6] NYSE similarly declined to adopt all provisions of FINRA Rule 8313 insofar as the FINRA rule related to information beyond the formal disciplinary process. *See id.* at 59679.

[7] Subsection (2) of FINRA Rule 8313(a) provides for the publication of statutory disqualification decisions and temporary cease and desist orders.

Subsection (3) provides for the publication of any suspension, cancellation, expulsion, or bar for: Failing to keep information current; failing to pay dues; failing to comply with an arbitration award or related settlement or an order of restitution or settlement providing for restitution; failing to meet the eligibility or qualification standards or prerequisites for access to services; or experiencing financial or operational difficulties. Additionally, subsection (3) provides for the publication of any suspension, cancellation, expulsion, or bar imposed as the result of a summary proceeding for actions authorized by Section 15A(h)(3) of the Act.

Subsection (4) addresses procedures for membership proceedings.

The Exchange does not propose to adopt subsections (2), (3), and (4) because, as discussed above, the Exchange's proposal is intended to provide more information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary process to the public so that Members and associated persons will be able to identify conduct that the Exchange views as problematic and will have the ability to take corrective steps sooner. Subsections (2), (3), and (4) to the FINRA rule would not further that purpose because those subsections would require the publication of information generally relating to membership eligibility or failure to satisfy one's membership obligations rather than discipline. Subsection (2) additionally addresses temporary cease and desist proceedings, which the Exchange does not have, and Subsection (3) additionally addresses Section 15A(h)(3) of the Act, which applies only to registered securities associations.

Subsection (6) permits discretionary release of a complaint, decision, order, notification, or notice issued under FINRA rules, where the release of such information is deemed by FINRA's Chief Executive Officer (or such other senior officer as the Chief Executive Officer may designate) to be in the public interest. The Exchange does not propose to adopt this open-ended subsection because [sic] Exchange intends for the proposed rule to instead be limited to disciplinary information for the reasons discussed above.

[8] ''Processing of Company-Related Actions.''

[9] ''Procedure For Grievances Concerning the Automated Systems.''

to limit the rule only to disciplinary complaints and disciplinary decisions.

Discretion To Redact Certain Information or Waive Publication

The Exchange has determined that, subject to limited exceptions, disciplinary information should be released to the public in unredacted form. To provide the standard for such limited exceptions, the Exchange proposes subsection (c) of proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Discretion to Redact Certain Information or Waive Publication,'' modeled after FINRA Rule 8313(c).

Proposed Rule 8.18(c)(1) would provide that the Exchange reserves the right to redact, on a case-by-case basis, information that contains confidential customer information, including customer identities, or information that raises significant identity theft, personal safety, or privacy concerns that are not outweighed by investor protection concerns. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(c)(1) except that the proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA.''

Similarly, proposed Rule 8.18(c)(2) provides that, notwithstanding paragraph (a) of the proposed rule, the Exchange may determine, in its discretion, to waive the requirement to release a copy of, or information with respect to, any disciplinary complaint or disciplinary decision under those extraordinary circumstances where the release of such information would violate fundamental notions of fairness or work an injustice. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(c)(2) except that the proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA'' and would not include a provision relating to the waiver of the release of an ''other decision, order, notification, or notice'' because, as noted above, the Exchange proposes to limit the rule only to disciplinary complaints and disciplinary decisions.

Notice of Appeals of Exchange Decisions

The Exchange proposes to include subsection (d) to proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Notice of Appeals of Exchange Decisions to the SEC'' modeled on FINRA Rule 8313(d). Proposed Rule 8.18(d) provides that the Exchange must provide notice to the public when a disciplinary decision of the Exchange is appealed to the Commission and the notice shall state whether the effectiveness of the decision has been stayed pending the outcome of proceedings before the Commission. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(d) except that the proposed Rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA.''

Definitions

Finally, the Exchange proposes subsection (e) of proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Definitions.'' Proposed Rule 8.18(e) would set forth definitions of the terms ''disciplinary complaint'' and ''disciplinary decision'' as used in the rule, modeled after the definitions contained in FINRA Rule 8313(e).

First, proposed Rule 8.18(e)(1) would define the term ''disciplinary complaint'' to mean any statement of charges issued pursuant to Rule 8.4 or any notice served pursuant to Rule 8.17. This proposed rule is based on FINRA Rule 8313(e)(1) except that it replaces the term ''complaint pursuant to the Rule 9200 Series'' with ''statement of charges pursuant to Rule 8.4'' and it includes a notice of the initiation of a client suspension proceeding issued pursuant to Rule 8.17 in the definition of ''disciplinary complaint.''

Second, proposed Rule 8.18(e)(2) would define the term ''disciplinary decision'' to mean any decision issued pursuant to the Chapter VIII, including, decisions issued by a Hearing Panel or the Appeals Committee and accepted offers of settlement. The Exchange additionally proposes to include suspension orders issued pursuant to Rule 8.17 in the definition of ''disciplinary decision.'' The Exchange does not propose to adopt the part of FINRA Rule 8313(e)(2) that discusses decisions issued pursuant to the FINRA Rule 9550 Series, FINRA Rule 9600 Series, FINRA Rule 9700 Series, or FINRA Rule 9800 Series, or decisions, notifications, or notices issued pursuant to the FINRA Rule 9520 Series because, as explained above, the Exchange does not propose to adopt the provisions of the FINRA Rule providing for the publication of such information. Finally, proposed Rule 8.18(e)(2) would provide that minor rule violation plan letters issued pursuant to Rules 8.15 and 25.3 are not subject to the proposed rule.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder that are applicable to a national securities exchange, and, in particular, with the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act.[10] In particular, the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)(1)[11] in that it enables the Exchange to be so organized as to have the capacity to be able to carry out the purposes of the Act and to comply, and to enforce compliance by its exchange members and persons associated with its exchange members, with the provisions of the Act, the rules and regulations thereunder, and the rules of the Exchange. In particular, the Exchange believes that the proposed addition of Rule 8.18 regarding release of disciplinary complaints, decisions and other information are [sic] consistent with Section 6(b)(1) of the Act because it would establish general standards for the release of disciplinary information to the public to provide greater access to information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary actions.

For the same reasons, the Exchange believes that proposed Rule 8.18 furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act[12] because the proposed rule is designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities, and to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system. In particular, proposed Rule 8.18 furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act by providing greater clarity, consistency, and transparency regarding the release of disciplinary complaints, decisions and other information to the public. By adopting the proposed Rule 8.18 modeled after FINRA Rule 8313, the Exchange would establish standards for the release of disciplinary information to the public in line with those in effect at FINRA that provide greater access to information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary actions and describe the scope of information subject to proposed Rule 8.18. The Exchange believes that this proposed rule change promotes greater transparency to the Exchange's disciplinary process, and that the proposed rule change provides greater access to information regarding its disciplinary actions, and also provides valuable guidance and information to Members, associated persons, other regulators, and the investing public.

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. The proposed rule change is not intended to

[10] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[11] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(1).

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

address competitive issues, but rather it is designed to enhance the Exchange's rules governing the release of disciplinary complaints, decisions and other information to the public, thereby providing greater clarity and consistency and resulting in less burdensome and more efficient regulatory compliance and facilitating performance of regulatory functions.

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

The Exchange has not solicited, and does not intend to solicit, comments on this proposed rule change. The Exchange has not received any written comments from members or other interested parties.

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

Because the foregoing 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 from the date on which it was filed or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act[13] and paragraph (f)(6) of Rule 19b–4 thereunder.[14]

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. However, Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii)[15] permits the Commission to designate a shorter time if such action is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest. In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange requests that the Commission waive the 30-day operative delay. The Exchange states that FINRA performs services for it under a Regulatory Services Agreement (''RSA''), including the filing and prosecution of disciplinary complaints on the Exchange's behalf. FINRA also files and prosecutes disciplinary complaints on its own behalf, sometimes on cases involving identical or similar conduct to the cases it brings on the Exchange's behalf. Without the waiver, the Exchange is concerned that FINRA might publish a complaint during the 30-day operative delay, and that the Exchange would not be permitted to publish its own complaint, prepared by FINRA, regarding the same conduct. According to the Exchange, this would supply the public with an incomplete picture of the disciplinary proceedings, the full nature of which could not be disclosed until much later when a final disciplinary decision is issued. The Exchange, therefore, believes that waiver of the operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest, as it will allow the Exchange to immediately publish any disciplinary complaints or decisions that are filed or issued after the proposal is filed. The Commission believes that waiver of the 30-day operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest because it will allow EDGX to publish disciplinary complaints or decisions that have been filed or issued without delay. Therefore, the Commission designates the proposed rule change to be operative upon filing.[16]

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: (1) Necessary or appropriate in the public interest; (2) for the protection of investors; or (3) 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–BatsEDGX–2016–64 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–BatsEDGX–2016–64. 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 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 Web site 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 such 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–BatsEDGX–2016–64 and should be submitted on or before December 14, 2016.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[17]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28188 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[13] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[14] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6).

[15] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6)(iii).

[16] For purposes only of waiving the 30-day operative delay, the Commission also has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. *See* 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

[17] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–79341; File No. SR–BatsBYX–2016–32]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Bats BYX Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of an Amendment to Rule 8.11, Effective Date of Judgement and the Adoption of Rule 8.18, Release of Disciplinary Complaints, Decisions and Other Information

November 17, 2016

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on November 3, 2016, Bats BYX Exchange, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''BYX'') filed with the

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Exchange has designated this proposal as a ''non-controversial'' proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act[3] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) thereunder,[4] which renders it effective upon filing with the Commission. 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 filed a proposal to add proposed Rule 8.18 to require the publication of the Exchange's disciplinary complaints and disciplinary decisions issued and to remove the part of Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 that currently governs the publication of disciplinary complaints and information related to disciplinary complaints.

The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Exchange's Web site at *www.batstrading.com,* 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 parts of such statements.

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

1. Purpose

Proposed Rule Change

Reorganization of Exchange Rules Governing Release of Disciplinary Complaints, Decisions and Other Information Based on FINRA Rule 8313

Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 currently provides, in part, that the Exchange shall cause details regarding all formal disciplinary actions where a final decision has been issued, except as provided in Rule 8.15(a), to be published on its Web site. Interpretation and Policy .01 also provides that the Exchange shall not issue any press release or other statement to the press concerning any formal or informal disciplinary matter unless the Chief Regulatory Officer recommends a press release to the Executive Committee or the Board of the Exchange and either body determines that such a press release is warranted. The Exchange proposes to remove parts of Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 described above and to add proposed Rule 8.18 modeled after FINRA Rule 8313,[5] as described below, to govern the publication of disciplinary information. The scope of proposed Rule 8.18 would be limited to publication of materials relating to the disciplinary process set forth in Chapter VIII because the Exchange seeks to provide prompt access to more information regarding its disciplinary actions to Members and associated persons. By providing more information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary process, including publishing disciplinary complaints at the time they are filed, Members and associated persons will be able to sooner identify conduct that the Exchange views as problematic and have will [sic] the ability to take corrective steps sooner than they can under the current rules that provide only for the publication of disciplinary decisions after they become final. In that regard, the Exchange has determined not to adopt FINRA Rule 8313 in all respects at this time.[6]

General Standards

The Exchange proposes Rule 8.18(a) to be entitled ''General Standards.'' The text would set forth general standards for the release to the public of disciplinary complaints, decisions, or information.

Proposed Rule 8.18(a)(1) would, in part, essentially replace the part of Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11 that addresses the publication of disciplinary decisions and conform [sic] to FINRA Rule 8313. The proposed rule would provide that the Exchange shall release to the public a copy of and, at the Exchange's discretion, information with respect to, any disciplinary decision issued by the Exchange, as defined in proposed Rule 8.18(e). Additionally, the proposed rule would provide that the Exchange would release to the public copies of disciplinary complaints as defined in proposed Rule 8.18(e). Also, the decision to issue other related information, including a press release, under proposed Rule 8.18(a)(1) would be in the discretion of the Exchange generally instead of requiring Executive Committee or Exchange Board approval as currently required in Interpretation and Policy .01 to Rule 8.11. Proposed Rule 8.18(a)(1) would also provide that, in response to a request, the Exchange shall also release to the requesting party a copy of any identified disciplinary complaint or disciplinary decision issued by the Exchange, as defined in proposed Rule 8.18(e). These proposed amendments are modeled after FINRA Rule 8313(a)(1) and would be substantially similar to the FINRA rule.

The Exchange does not propose to incorporate subsections (2), (3), (4) and (6) of FINRA Rule 8313(a) because the Exchange proposes to limit the scope of proposed Rule 8.18 to the publication of materials relating to the disciplinary process set forth in Chapter VIII at this time.[7] The Exchange, however, notes

[3] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[4] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6)(iii).

[5] New York Stock Exchange, LLC (''NYSE'') similarly adopted rules modeled after FINRA Rule 8313. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78664 (August 24, 2016), 81 FR 59678, 59679 (August 30, 2016) (SR–NYSE–2016–40).

[6] NYSE similarly declined to adopt all provisions of FINRA Rule 8313 insofar as the FINRA rule related to information beyond the formal disciplinary process. *See id.* at 59679.

[7] Subsection (2) of FINRA Rule 8313(a) provides for the publication of statutory disqualification decisions and temporary cease and desist orders.

Subsection (3) provides for the publication of any suspension, cancellation, expulsion, or bar for: Failing to keep information current; failing to pay dues; failing to comply with an arbitration award or related settlement or an order of restitution or settlement providing for restitution; failing to meet the eligibility or qualification standards or prerequisites for access to services; or experiencing financial or operational difficulties. Additionally, subsection (3) provides for the publication of any suspension, cancellation, expulsion, or bar imposed as the result of a summary proceeding for actions authorized by Section 15A(h)(3) of the Act.

Subsection (4) addresses procedures for membership proceedings.

The Exchange does not propose to adopt subsections (2), (3), and (4) because, as discussed above, the Exchange's proposal is intended to provide more information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary process to the public so that Members and associated persons will be able to identify conduct that the Exchange views as problematic and will have the ability to take corrective steps sooner. Subsections (2), (3), and (4) to the FINRA rule would not further that purpose because those subsections would require the publication of information generally relating to membership eligibility or failure to satisfy one's membership obligations rather than discipline. Subsection (2) additionally addresses temporary cease and desist proceedings, which the Exchange does not have, and Subsection (3) additionally addresses Section 15A(h)(3) of the Act, which applies only to registered securities associations.

Subsection (6) permits discretionary release of a complaint, decision, order, notification, or notice issued under FINRA rules, where the release of such information is deemed by FINRA's Chief

that although Exchange Rules do not provide for temporary cease and desist orders as provided for in FINRA Rule 9800, the Exchange's Client Suspension Rule—Rule 8.17—is similar in its procedure and purpose. The Exchange proposes to include a client suspension order issued pursuant to Rule 8.17 in the definition of ''disciplinary decision'' under proposed Rule 8.18(e)(2) consistent with FINRA's inclusion of its temporary cease and desist orders for publication because the Exchange views client suspension proceedings as disciplinary in nature. For the same reason, the Exchange proposes to include a notice of the initiation of a client suspension proceeding in the definition of ''disciplinary complaint'' under proposed Rule 8.18(e)(1).

The Exchange does not propose to incorporate subsection (5) of FINRA Rule 8313(a) because the Exchange does not have at this time provisions analogous to FINRA Rule 6490 [8] and the FINRA Rule 9700 Series.[9] Additionally, the Exchange does not propose to include its procedures for exemptive relief analogous to the FINRA Rule 9600 Series because the Exchange proposes to limit scope of proposed Rule 8.18 to the publication of disciplinary materials.

Release Specifications

The Exchange proposes to include subsection (b) to proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Release Specifications'' modeled after FINRA Rule 8313(b). Proposed Rule 8.18(b)(1) provides that copies of, and information with respect to, any disciplinary complaint released to the public pursuant to paragraph (a) of the proposed rule shall indicate that a disciplinary complaint represents the initiation of a formal proceeding by the Exchange in which findings as to the allegations in the complaint have not been made and does not represent a decision as to any of the allegations contained in the complaint. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(b)(1) except that the proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA.''

Proposed Rule 8.18(b)(2) provides that copies of, and information with respect to, any disciplinary decision released to the public pursuant to paragraph (a) of the proposed rule prior to the expiration of the time period provided for an appeal or call for review as permitted under Exchange Rules or the Act, or while such an appeal or call for review is pending, shall indicate that the findings and sanctions imposed therein are subject to review and modification by the Exchange or the Commission. The proposed rule would be substantially similar to FINRA Rule 8313(b)(2). The proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA'' and would not include a provision relating to the release specifications for an ''other decision, order, notification, or notice'' because, as noted above, the Exchange proposes to limit the rule only to disciplinary complaints and disciplinary decisions.

Discretion To Redact Certain Information or Waive Publication

The Exchange has determined that, subject to limited exceptions, disciplinary information should be released to the public in unredacted form. To provide the standard for such limited exceptions, the Exchange proposes subsection (c) of proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Discretion to Redact Certain Information or Waive Publication,'' modeled after FINRA Rule 8313(c).

Proposed Rule 8.18(c)(1) would provide that the Exchange reserves the right to redact, on a case-by-case basis, information that contains confidential customer information, including customer identities, or information that raises significant identity theft, personal safety, or privacy concerns that are not outweighed by investor protection concerns. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(c)(1) except that the proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA.''

Similarly, proposed Rule 8.18(c)(2) provides that, notwithstanding paragraph (a) of the proposed rule, the Exchange may determine, in its discretion, to waive the requirement to release a copy of, or information with respect to, any disciplinary complaint or disciplinary decision under those extraordinary circumstances where the release of such information would violate fundamental notions of fairness or work an injustice. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(c)(2) except that the proposed rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA'' and would not include a provision relating to the waiver of the release of an ''other decision, order, notification, or notice'' because, as noted above, the Exchange proposes to limit the rule only to disciplinary complaints and disciplinary decisions.

Notice of Appeals of Exchange Decisions

The Exchange proposes to include subsection (d) to proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Notice of Appeals of Exchange Decisions to the SEC'' modeled on FINRA Rule 8313(d). Proposed Rule 8.18(d) provides that the Exchange must provide notice to the public when a disciplinary decision of the Exchange is appealed to the Commission and the notice shall state whether the effectiveness of the decision has been stayed pending the outcome of proceedings before the Commission. The proposed rule would be the same as FINRA Rule 8313(d) except that the proposed Rule would substitute the term ''Exchange'' for ''FINRA.''

Definitions

Finally, the Exchange proposes subsection (e) of proposed Rule 8.18 entitled ''Definitions.'' Proposed Rule 8.18(e) would set forth definitions of the terms ''disciplinary complaint'' and ''disciplinary decision'' as used in the rule, modeled after the definitions contained in FINRA Rule 8313(e).

First, proposed Rule 8.18(e)(1) would define the term ''disciplinary complaint'' to mean any statement of charges issued pursuant to Rule 8.4 or any notice served pursuant to Rule 8.17. This proposed rule is based on FINRA Rule 8313(e)(1) except that it replaces the term ''complaint pursuant to the Rule 9200 Series'' with ''statement of charges pursuant to Rule 8.4'' and it includes a notice of the initiation of a client suspension proceeding issued pursuant to Rule 8.17 in the definition of ''disciplinary complaint.''

Second, proposed Rule 8.18(e)(2) would define the term ''disciplinary decision'' to mean any decision issued pursuant to the Chapter VIII, including, decisions issued by a Hearing Panel or the Appeals Committee and accepted offers of settlement. The Exchange additionally proposes to include suspension orders issued pursuant to Rule 8.17 in the definition of ''disciplinary decision.'' The Exchange does not propose to adopt the part of FINRA Rule 8313(e)(2) that discusses decisions issued pursuant to the FINRA Rule 9550 Series, FINRA Rule 9600 Series, FINRA Rule 9700 Series, or FINRA Rule 9800 Series, or decisions, notifications, or notices issued pursuant to the FINRA Rule 9520 Series because, as explained above, the Exchange does not propose to adopt the provisions of the FINRA Rule providing for the publication of such information. Finally, proposed Rule 8.18(e)(2) would provide that minor rule violation plan

Executive Officer (or such other senior officer as the Chief Executive Officer may designate) to be in the public interest. The Exchange does not propose to adopt this open-ended subsection because [sic] Exchange intends for the proposed rule to instead be limited to disciplinary information for the reasons discussed above.

[8] ''Processing of Company-Related Actions.''

[9] ''Procedure For Grievances Concerning the Automated Systems.''

letters issued pursuant to Rules 8.15 and 25.3 are not subject to the proposed rule.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder that are applicable to a national securities exchange, and, in particular, with the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act.[10] In particular, the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)(1)[11] in that it enables the Exchange to be so organized as to have the capacity to be able to carry out the purposes of the Act and to comply, and to enforce compliance by its exchange members and persons associated with its exchange members, with the provisions of the Act, the rules and regulations thereunder, and the rules of the Exchange. In particular, the Exchange believes that the proposed addition of Rule 8.18 regarding release of disciplinary complaints, decisions and other information are [sic] consistent with Section 6(b)(1) of the Act because it would establish general standards for the release of disciplinary information to the public to provide greater access to information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary actions.

For the same reasons, the Exchange believes that proposed Rule 8.18 furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act[12] because the proposed rule is designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities, and to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system. In particular, proposed Rule 8.18 furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act by providing greater clarity, consistency, and transparency regarding the release of disciplinary complaints, decisions and other information to the public. By adopting the proposed Rule 8.18 modeled after FINRA Rule 8313, the Exchange would establish standards for the release of disciplinary information to the public in line with those in effect at FINRA that provide greater access to information regarding the Exchange's disciplinary actions and describe the scope of information subject to proposed Rule 8.18. The Exchange believes that this proposed rule change promotes greater transparency to the Exchange's disciplinary process, and that the proposed rule change provides greater access to information regarding its disciplinary actions, and also provides valuable guidance and information to Members, associated persons, other regulators, and the investing public.

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. The proposed rule change is not intended to address competitive issues, but rather it is designed to enhance the Exchange's rules governing the release of disciplinary complaints, decisions and other information to the public, thereby providing greater clarity and consistency and resulting in less burdensome and more efficient regulatory compliance and facilitating performance of regulatory functions.

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

The Exchange has not solicited, and does not intend to solicit, comments on this proposed rule change. The Exchange has not received any written comments from members or other interested parties.

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

Because the foregoing 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 from the date on which it was filed or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act[13] and paragraph (f)(6) of Rule 19b–4 thereunder.[14]

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. However, Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii)[15] permits the Commission to designate a shorter time if such action is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest. In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange requests that the Commission waive the 30-day operative delay. The Exchange states that FINRA performs services for it under a Regulatory Services Agreement (''RSA''), including the filing and prosecution of disciplinary complaints on the Exchange's behalf. FINRA also files and prosecutes disciplinary complaints on its own behalf, sometimes on cases involving identical or similar conduct to the cases it brings on the Exchange's behalf. Without the waiver, the Exchange is concerned that FINRA might publish a complaint during the 30-day operative delay, and that the Exchange would not be permitted to publish its own complaint, prepared by FINRA, regarding the same conduct. According to the Exchange, this would supply the public with an incomplete picture of the disciplinary proceedings, the full nature of which could not be disclosed until much later when a final disciplinary decision is issued. The Exchange, therefore, believes that waiver of the operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest, as it will allow the Exchange to immediately publish any disciplinary complaints or decisions that are filed or issued after the proposal is filed. The Commission believes that waiver of the 30-day operative delay is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest because it will allow BYX to publish disciplinary complaints or decisions that have been filed or issued without delay. Therefore, the Commission designates the proposed rule change to be operative upon filing.[16]

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: (1) Necessary or appropriate in the public interest; (2) for the protection of investors; or (3) 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:

[10] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[11] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(1).

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[13] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[14] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6).

[15] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6)(iii).

[16] For purposes only of waiving the 30-day operative delay, the Commission also has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. *See* 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

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–BatsBYX–2016–32 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–BatsBYX–2016–32. 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 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 Web site 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 such 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–BatsBYX–2016–32 and should be submitted on or before December 14, 2016.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[17]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28185 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[17] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–79346; File No. SR–FINRA–2016–032]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc.; Notice of Filing of Amendment No. 1 and Order Granting Accelerated Approval of a Proposed Rule Change, as Modified by Amendment No. 1, Relating to FINRA Rule 2232 (Customer Confirmations) To Require Members To Disclose Additional Pricing Information on Retail Customer Confirmations Relating to Transactions in Certain Fixed Income Securities

November 17, 2016.

I. Introduction

On August 12, 2016, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (''FINRA'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'' or ''SEC''), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] a proposed rule change to amend FINRA Rule 2232 to require FINRA members to disclose additional pricing information on retail customer confirmations relating to certain transactions in fixed income securities. The proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on August 19, 2016.[3] The Commission received nine comment letters from eight commenters in response to the proposal.[4] On September 28, 2016, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,[5] the Commission designated a longer period within which to either approve the proposed rule change, disapprove the proposed rule change, or institute proceedings to determine whether to disapprove the proposed rule change.[6] The Commission then received a letter from the SEC Office of the Investor Advocate, submitted to the public comment file, recommending approval of the proposed rule change.[7] On November 14, 2016, FINRA responded to the comments [8] and filed Amendment No. 1 to the proposal.[9] The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comment on Amendment No. 1 to the proposal from interested persons and is approving the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, on an accelerated basis.

II. Description of the Proposal, as Modified by Amendment No. 1

A. Background

FINRA proposes to amend FINRA Rule 2232 (Customer Confirmations) to require a member effecting certain transactions as principal with non-institutional customers in a corporate debt or agency debt security to disclose the member's mark-up/mark-down from the prevailing market price (''PMP'') for the security on the customer confirmation.[10] FINRA also proposes to require for all transactions in corporate or agency debt securities with non-institutional customers, irrespective of whether mark-up/mark-down disclosure is required, that the member provide on the confirmation (1) a reference, and hyperlink if the confirmation is electronic, to a Web page hosted by FINRA that contains publicly available trading data from FINRA's Trade Reporting and Compliance Engine

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78573 (Aug. 15, 2016), 81 FR 55500 (Aug. 19, 2016) (''Notice'').

[4] *See* Letter from Manisha Kimmel, Chief Regulatory Officer, Wealth Management, Thomson Reuters, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission (Sept. 19, 2016) (''Thomson Reuters I''); Letter from Mary Lou Von Kaenel, Managing Director, Financial Information Forum, to Robert W. Errett, Deputy Secretary, Commission (Sept. 9, 2016) (''FIF''); Letter from Sean Davy, Managing Director, Capital Markets Division, and Leslie M. Norwood, Managing Director and Associate General Counsel, Municipal Securities Division, SIFMA, to Robert W. Errett, Deputy Secretary, Commission (Sept. 9, 2016) (''SIFMA''); Letter from Norman L. Ashkenas, Chief Compliance Officer, Fidelity Brokerage Services, LLC, and Richard J. O'Brien, Chief Compliance Officer, National Financial Services, LLC, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission (Sept. 9, 2016) (''Fidelity''); Letter from Mike Nicholas, Chief Executive Officer, Bond Dealers of America, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission (Sept. 9, 2016) (''BDA''); Letter from Robert J. McCarthy, Director of Regulatory Policy, Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC, to Robert W. Errett, Deputy Secretary, Commission (Sept. 9, 2016) (''Wells Fargo''); Letter from Scott A. Eichhorn, Practitioner in Residence and Supervising Attorney, Investor Rights Clinic, University of Miami, *et al.,* to Brent Fields, Secretary, Commission (Sept. 8, 2016) (''UMiami''); Letter from Manisha Kimmel, Chief Regulatory Officer, Wealth Management, Thomson Reuters, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission (Sept. 8, 2016) (''Thomson Reuters II''); and Letter from Hugh Berkson, President, PIABA, to Robert W. Errett, Deputy Secretary, Commission (Sept. 7, 2016) (''PIABA'').

[5] *See* 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[6] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34–78965 (Sept. 28, 2016), 81 FR 68492 (Oct. 4, 2016) (FINRA–2016–032).

[7] *See* Letter from Rick A. Fleming, Investor Advocate, Office of the Investor Advocate, to Commission (Nov. 7, 2016) (''Investor Advocate'').

[8] *See* Letter from Alexander Ellenberg, Associate General Counsel, FINRA, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated November 14, 2016 (''FINRA Response Letter'').

[9] Amendment No. 1 is available on the Commission's Web site at: *https://www.sec.gov/comments/sr-finra-2016-032/finra2016032-13.pdf.*

[10] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3. For ease of reference, a ''non-institutional customer'' is also alternatively referred to as a ''retail customer'' or ''retail investor,'' which, among others are not included in the definition of an institutional customer.

(''TRACE'') for the specific security that was traded, in a format specified by FINRA, along with a brief description of the type of information available on that page; and (2) the execution time of the customer transaction, expressed to the second.[11]

FINRA developed the proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, in coordination with the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (''MSRB'') to advance the goal of providing additional pricing information, including transaction cost information, to non-institutional customers in corporate, agency, and municipal debt securities.[12] FINRA and the MSRB have worked toward consistent rule requirements in this area, as appropriate, to minimize the operational burdens for firms that are both FINRA members and MSRB registrants that transact in multiple types of fixed income securities.[13] The proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is before the Commission following a process in which FINRA twice solicited comment on related proposals, and subsequently incorporated modifications designed to address commenters' concerns.[14]

In November 2014, FINRA, concurrently with the MSRB, published a regulatory notice requesting comment on the Initial Proposal to require disclosure of pricing information for certain same-day, retail-sized principal transactions.[15] In the Initial Proposal, FINRA proposed to require customer confirmation disclosure of additional pricing information when a member executes a sell (buy) transaction of ''qualifying size'' with a customer and executes a buy (sell) transaction as principal with one or multiple parties in the same security within the same trading day, where the size of the customer transaction(s) would otherwise be satisfied by the size of one or more same-day principal transaction(s). To supplement the price to the customer, which currently is required to be provided on customer confirmations, members would additionally have been required to disclose (i) the price to the firm of the same-day trade (''reference price''); and (ii) the difference between those two prices. Designed to capture transactions with retail investors, the term ''qualifying size,'' was defined to include transactions of 100 bonds or less or bonds with a face value of $100,000 or less.

As more fully summarized in the Notice, FINRA received a number of comments on the Initial Proposal.[16] Some commenters supported FINRA's Initial Proposal, stating that the proposed confirmation disclosure would provide additional post-trade information that would be otherwise difficult for a retail investor to ascertain and would foster increased price competition in fixed income markets, which would ultimately lower investors' transaction costs.[17] Some of these commenters urged FINRA to expand the Initial Proposal so that it would apply to all trades involving retail investors.[18] But many commenters were critical of the Initial Proposal. Some commenters critical of the Initial Proposal believed that the proposed scope was overbroad, that a reference price was not necessarily a useful point of pricing information, and/or that FINRA's proposed methodologies for calculating the reference price were too complex.[19] In response to the comments received, FINRA made several modifications to the Initial Proposal and solicited comment on a Revised Proposal.[20] The modifications reflected in the Revised Proposal were designed to ensure that the disclosure applied to transactions with retail investors, enhance the utility of the disclosure, and reduce the operational complexity of providing the disclosure.[21]

In response to similar comments received on its initial proposal, the MSRB incorporated several modifications to be consistent with FINRA's proposal;[22] however, the MSRB proposed to depart from the ''reference price'' approach and instead require that firms disclose the amount of mark-up/mark-down from the PMP for certain retail customer transactions.[23] Specifically, the MSRB proposed to require firms to disclose their mark-up/mark-down on the retail customer's trade if the firm bought (sold) the security in one or more transactions in an aggregate trade size that met or exceeded the size of the sale (purchase) to (from) the non-institutional customer within two hours of the customer

[11] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 5. FINRA also proposes in Amendment No. 1 to add the term ''offsetting'' to proposed Rule 2232(c)(2) to conform the rule language to the language used to discuss conditions that trigger the disclosure requirement, and extend the implementation period of the proposal from one year to 18 months.

[12] *See, e.g.,* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55500. The proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, would apply to corporate and agency debt securities. It would not apply to U.S. Treasury Securities. *See* proposed Rules 2232(c), (e), and (f); *see also* note 37 *infra.*

[13] The MSRB has filed with the Commission a proposal and amendment that is substantially similar to this proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78777 (Sep. 7, 2016), 81 FR 62947 (Sep. 13, 2016) (SR–MSRB–2016–12) (''MSRB Proposal''); *see also* MSRB Amendment No. 1, *available at: https://www.sec.gov/comments/sr-msrb-2016-12/msrb201612-11.pdf.*

[14] *See* FINRA *Regulatory Notice* 14–52, Pricing Disclosure in the Fixed Income Markets: FINRA Requests Comment on a Proposed Rule Requiring Confirmation Disclosure of Pricing Information in Fixed Income Securities Transactions (Nov. 2014) (the ''Initial Proposal''), *available at: http://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/notice_doc_file_ref/Notice_Regulatory_14-52.pdf. See also* FINRA *Regulatory Notice* 15-36, Pricing Disclosure in the Fixed Income Markets: FINRA Requests Comment on a Revised Proposal Requiring Confirmation Disclosure of Pricing Information in Corporate and Agency Debt Securities Transactions (Oct. 2015) (''Revised Proposal''), *available at: http://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/notice_doc_file_ref/Regulatory-Notice-15-36.pdf.*

[15] The Initial Proposal was published concurrently with a similar proposal by the MSRB. *See* MSRB *Regulatory Notice* 2014–20, Request for Comment on Draft Rule Amendments to Require Dealers to Provide Pricing Reference Information on Retail Customer Confirmations (Nov. 17, 2014), *available at: http://www.msrb.org/~/media/files/regulatory-notices/rfcs/2014-20.ashx.*

[16] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55507–55508 (summarizing comments received by FINRA on the Initial Proposal).

[17] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55507.

[18] *Id.*

[19] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55507–55508.

[20] *See* Revised Proposal, *supra* note 14.

[21] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55508 (explaining FINRA's modifications to the Initial Proposal in the Revised Proposal). FINRA's Revised Proposal included the following revisions: (i) Replacing the ''qualifying size'' requirement with an exclusion for transactions with institutional accounts, as defined in FINRA Rule 4512(c); (ii) excluding transactions which are part of fixed-price offerings on the first trading day and which are sold at the fixed-price offering price; (iii) excluding firm-side transactions that are conducted by a department or trading desk that is functionally separate from the retail-side trading desk; (iv) excluding trades where the member's principal trade was executed with an affiliate of the member and the affiliate's position that satisfied this trade was not acquired on the same trading day; (v) requiring members to provide a hyperlink to publicly available corporate and agency debt security trade data disseminated from TRACE on the customer confirmation; (vi) permitting members to omit the reference price in the event of a material change in the price of the security between the time of the member's principal trade and the customer trade; and (vii) permitting members to use alternative methodologies to determine the reference price in complex trade scenarios, provided the methodologies were adequately documented, and consistently applied. *See* Revised Proposal, *supra* note 14.

[22] *See* MSRB *Regulatory Notice* 2015–16, Request for Comment on Draft Rule Amendments to Require Confirmation Disclosure of Mark-ups for Specified Principal Transactions with Retail Customers (Sept. 24, 2015), *available at: http://www.msrb.org/~/media/files/regulatory-notices/rfcs/2015-16.ashx.* In its revised proposal, the MSRB, consistently with FINRA, proposed that certain categories of transactions be excluded from the disclosure requirement, including (i) transactions with institutional accounts; (ii) firm-side transactions if conducted by a ''functionally separate principal trading desk'' that had no knowledge of the non-institutional customer transaction; and (iii) customer transactions at list offering prices. For trades with an affiliate of the firm, the MSRB also proposed to ''look through'' the firm's trade with the affiliate to the affiliate's trade with the third party for purposes of determining whether disclosure would be required.

[23] *See id.*

transaction.[24] The disclosed mark-up/mark-down would have been required to be expressed both as a total dollar amount and as a percentage of the PMP.[25] Additionally, the MSRB proposed to require the disclosure of two additional data points on all customer confirmations, even those for which mark-up/mark-down disclosure was not required: A security-specific hyperlink to the publicly available municipal security trade data on the MSRB's Electronic Municipal Market Access (''EMMA'') Web site, and the time of execution of a customer's trade.[26]

Although FINRA and the MSRB took different approaches in their revised proposals—diverging primarily on the questions of whether to require disclosure of reference price or mark-up/mark-down, and whether to specify a same-day or two-hour time frame—each acknowledged the importance of achieving a consistent approach and invited comments on the relative merits and shortcomings of both approaches.[27] Following a second round of comments, publication of a third related proposal by the MSRB,[28] as well as investor testing conducted jointly by FINRA and the MSRB in mid-2016,[29] FINRA and the MSRB made a third round of revisions to achieve a consistent approach and filed the proposed rule changes, each as modified by Amendment No. 1, that are before the Commission.

B. Proposed Amendments to FINRA Rule 2232

1. Overview

FINRA proposes to amend FINRA Rule 2232 (Customer Confirmations) to add new paragraphs (c)–(f). Proposed Rule 2232(c) would require that a customer confirmation for a transaction in a corporate or agency debt security include the member's mark-up/mark-down for the transaction, to be calculated in compliance with FINRA Rule 2121, expressed as a total dollar amount and as a percentage of the PMP if (1) the member effects a transaction in a principal capacity with a non-institutional customer and (2) the member purchased (sold) the security in one or more offsetting transactions in an aggregate trading size meeting or exceeding the size of such sale to (purchase from) the non-institutional customer. Proposed Rule 2232(c) also would address how a member's transactions with affiliates are to be considered. Proposed Rule 2232(d) would specify limited exceptions.[30]

Proposed Rule 2232(e), which is the subject of Amendment No. 1, additionally would require that for all transactions in corporate or agency debt securities with non-institutional customers, irrespective of whether mark-up/mark-down disclosure is required, the member provide on the confirmation (i) a reference, and hyperlink if the confirmation is electronic, to a Web page hosted by FINRA that contains TRACE publicly available trading data for the specific security that was traded, in a format specified by FINRA, along with a brief description of the type of information available on that page; and (ii) the execution time of the customer transaction, expressed to the second.[31]

Proposed Rule 2232(f) would set forth defined terms.[32]

In addition, FINRA Rule 0150 would be amended to make the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, applicable to agency debt securities, but not to U.S. Treasury Securities.[33]

2. Scope of the Mark-Up/Mark-Down Disclosure Requirement

Under proposed Rule 2232(c), mark-up/mark-down disclosure would be required if: (1) The member is effecting a transaction in a principal capacity in a corporate or agency debt security with a non-institutional customer, and (2) the member purchased (sold) the security in one or more offsetting transactions in an aggregate trading size meeting or exceeding the size of such sale to (purchase from) the non-institutional customer on the same trading day as the non-institutional customer transaction.[34]

A non-institutional customer is a customer that does not have an institutional account, as defined in FINRA Rule 4512(c).[35] In addition, the proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, would apply only to transactions in corporate debt securities, as defined in the proposed rule,[36] and agency debt securities, as defined in FINRA Rule 6710(l).[37]

Discussing the rationale for the mark-up/mark-down disclosure requirement generally, FINRA notes that while members already are required, pursuant to Securities Exchange Act Rule 10b–10 (''Rule 10b–10''), to provide pricing information on customer confirmations, including transaction cost information, for transactions in equity securities where the member acted as principal, no comparable requirement currently exists for transactions in fixed-income securities.[38] Discussing the same-day offsetting trade trigger for mark-up/mark-down disclosure more specifically, FINRA states that it believes that a full-day window (as compared to a shorter window such as two-hours) will ensure that more non-institutional investors receive the benefit of mark-up/mark-down disclosure; [39] and adds that limiting the required disclosure to those instances where there is an offsetting trade in the same trading day will reduce the variability of the mark-up/mark-down

[24] *See id.*

[25] *See id.*

[26] *See id.*

[27] *See* Revised Proposal, *supra* note 14; MSRB *Regulatory Notice* 2015–16, *supra* note 22.

[28] *See* MSRB *Regulatory Notice* 2016–07, Request for Comment on Draft Amendments to MSRB Rule G–30 to Provide Guidance on Prevailing Market Price (Feb. 18, 2016), *available at: http://www.msrb.org/~/media/Files/Regulatory-Notices/RFCs/2016-07.ashx.*

[29] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3 at 55502 n.14, 55503, 55504, referencing investor testing.

[30] *See* proposed Rule 2232(d), regarding functionally separate trading desks and certain transactions in new issues.

[31] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 5.

[32] *See* proposed Rule 2232(f).

[33] *See* note 12 *supra*; note 36 *infra.*

[34] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55500. *See also* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 4, in which FINRA further clarifies that disclosure obligations are triggered by ''offsetting'' transactions, and not only by ''matched'' trades.

[35] *See* proposed Rule 2232(f)(4). *See also* FINRA Rule 4512(c), defining an institutional account as: An account of ''(1) a bank, savings and loan association, insurance company or registered investment company; (2) an investment adviser registered either with the SEC under Section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act or with a state securities commission (or any agency or office performing like functions); or (3) any other person (whether a natural person, corporation, partnership, trust or otherwise) with total assets of at least $50 million. FINRA states that use of this definition to define the scope of the proposal is appropriate because firms use this definition in other rule contexts and it will therefore reduce the implementation costs of the proposal. *See* Notice, *supra* note 3 at 55501.

[36] The rule would define a corporate debt security as a ''debt security that is United States (''U.S.'') dollar-denominated and issued by a U.S. or foreign private issuer and, if a 'restricted security' as defined in Securities Act Rule 144(a)(3), sold pursuant to Securities Act Rule 144A, but does not include a Money Market Instrument as defined in FINRA Rule 6710(o) or an Asset-Backed Security as defined in FINRA Rule 6710(cc).'' *See* Proposed Rule 2232(f).

[37] Existing FINRA Rule 6710(l) defines an agency debt security as ''a debt security (i) issued or guaranteed by an Agency as defined in paragraph (k); or (ii) issued or guaranteed by a Government-Sponsored Enterprise as defined in paragraph (n). The term excludes a U.S. Treasury Security as defined in paragraph (p) and a Securitized Product as defined in paragraph (m), where an Agency or a Government-Sponsored Enterprise is the Securitizer as defined in paragraph (s) (or similar person), or the guarantor of the Securitized Product.'' *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55501 n. 9.

[38] *See* Notice, *supr*a note 3, at 55000 n.3.

[39] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55501 and 55509 (discussing data evidencing dispersion in mark-ups/mark-downs in firm principal/customer trades in corporate and agency debt securities).

calculation.[40] FINRA also emphasizes that a full-day window may make members less likely to alter their trading patterns to avoid the rule, as members would be required to hold positions overnight to avoid the customer confirmation disclosure requirement which action may be in contravention of a member's other obligations under FINRA rules.[41]

For purposes of determining whether the mark-up/mark-down disclosure requirement would be triggered, proposed Rule 2232(c) also addresses how a member's transactions with affiliates are to be considered. If a member executes an offsetting principal trade(s) with an affiliate, the rule would require a member to determine whether the transaction was an ''arms-length transaction.'' [42] The rule defines an arms-length transaction as ''a transaction that was conducted through a competitive process in which non-affiliate firms could also participate, and where the affiliate relationship did not influence the price paid or proceeds received by the member.'' [43] If the transaction is not an arms-length-transaction, the rule would require the member to ''look through'' to the time and terms of the affiliate's separate purchase (sale) of the security with a third party to determine whether the confirmation disclosure requirement is applicable.[44] FINRA states that sourcing liquidity through a non-arms-length transaction with an affiliate is functionally equivalent to selling out of its own inventory, and therefore that it is appropriate in the case of a non-arm's length transaction to require a member to ''look through'' to the affiliate's transaction with a third party to determine whether the disclosure requirement is triggered.[45]

The proposed rule also specifies two exceptions from the disclosure requirement. First, if the member's offsetting same-day firm principal trade was executed by a trading desk that is functionally separate from the member's trading desk that executed the transaction with the non-institutional customer, the principal trade by that separate trading desk would not trigger the confirmation disclosure requirement.[46] To avail itself of this exception, a member must have in place policies and procedures reasonably designed to ensure that the functionally separate principal trading desk through which the member purchase or sale was executed had no knowledge of the customer transaction.[47] For example, in the case of a purchase/sale transaction with a non-institutional customer effected by the retail trading desk, if a functionally separate institutional trading desk within the same member firm effected a purchase/sale in the same security to service an institutional customer, that trade would not trigger the disclosure requirement, provided that the institutional trading desk was operated pursuant to policies and procedures reasonably designed to ensure that institutional desk through which the member purchase or member sale was executed had no knowledge of the non-institutional customer transaction.[48] In addition, the rule does not apply if the member acquired the security in a fixed-price offering and sold the security to non-institutional customer(s) at the fixed-price offering price on the day the securities were acquired.[49]

3. Information To Be Disclosed and/or Provided

a. Mark-Up/Mark-Down

Rule 2232(c) would require that the member's mark-up/mark-down for the transaction be calculated in compliance with FINRA Rule 2121 and expressed as a total dollar amount and as a percentage of the PMP.[50] FINRA represents that its determination to require disclosure of both the total dollar amount and the percentage of the PMP is supported by investor testing, which found disclosure of this information in both forms would be more useful than disclosure of the information in only one of these forms.[51] FINRA also explains that members currently are already subject to FINRA Rule 2121, including Supplementary Material .02 to FINRA Rule 2121, which provides extensive guidance on how to determine the PMP and calculate mark-ups/mark-downs for the fixed-income securities to which the proposal would apply, including a presumption to use contemporaneous cost or proceeds.[52] FINRA recognizes that the determination of the PMP of a particular security may not be identical across member firms.[53] FINRA states that members would be expected to have reasonable policies and procedures in place to determine the PMP in a manner consistent with FINRA Rule 2121, and that such policies and procedures be applied consistently across customers.[54] Regarding when a mark-up/mark-down is to be calculated and disclosed, FINRA notes that the mark-up on a customer trade should ''generally be established at the time of that trade'' and states that members may generate customer confirmations that include a mark-up/mark-down disclosure on an intra-day basis.[55]

b. Reference/HyperLink to TRACE and Execution Time of Trade

FINRA initially represented that it would submit a separate filing proposing that confirmations include a hyperlink to publicly available TRACE data and the execution time of the customer trade.[56] FINRA stated that comments received on the Revised Proposal and the results of investor testing justified the addition of these requirements.[57] In response to comments urging FINRA and the MSRB to harmonize both the substance and the time frames of their proposals, FINRA proposes in Amendment No. 1 to

[40] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55501.

[41] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55501 n.11, in which FINRA notes that under FINRA Rule 5310 (Best Execution and Interpositioning) members are required to use reasonable diligence to ascertain the best market for the security and buy or sell in such market so that the resultant price to the customer is as favorable as possible under prevailing market conditions, and that under Supplementary Material .01 to FINRA Rule 5310 a member must make every effort to execute a marketable customer order that it receives fully and promptly. FINRA states that a firm found to purposefully delay the execution of a customer order to avoid the proposed disclosure may be in violation of the proposed rule, FINRA Rule 5310 and FINRA Rule 2010 (Standards of Commercial Honor and Principles of Trade).

[42] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55501.

[43] As a general matter, FINRA would expect that the competitive process used in an ''arms-length'' transaction, *e.g.,* the request for pricing or platform for posting bids and offers, is one in which non-affiliates have frequently participated. *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55501–2.

[44] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55502 n.12. FINRA adds that, in a non-arms-length transaction with an affiliate, the member also would be required to ''look-through'' to the affiliate's transaction with a third party and related cost or proceeds by the affiliate as the basis for determining the member's calculation of the mark-up/mark-down pursuant to FINRA Rule 2121 (Fair Prices and Commissions) *See id.*

[45] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55502.

[46] *See* Proposed Rule 2232(d)(1).

[47] *See id.* In the Notice, FINRA notes that the separate trading desk exception would only determine whether or not the proposed disclosure requirement has been triggered and would not change a member's existing requirements relating to the calculation of its mark-up/mark-down under FINRA Rule 2121. *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55502 n.13.

[48] FINRA further explains that a firm could not use the functionally separate trading desk exception to avoid the proposed disclosure requirement if the institutional desk was used to source securities by the retail desk. *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55502.

[49] *See* Proposed Rule 2232(d)(2).

[50] *See* Proposed Rule 2232(c).

[51] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55502 n.14.

[52] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55502.

[53] *Id.*

[54] *Id.*

[55] *See* Notice *supra* note 3, at 55506. *See also* notes 128–130, *infra,* and accompanying text (discussing FINRA's response to commenters concerned about the proposal's potential to disrupt the intra-day confirmation generation process).

[56] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55502 n.14.

[57] *Id.*

include these requirements in the same manner and form as the MSRB has proposed.[58] Specifically, proposed Rule 2232(e) would require that for all transactions in corporate or agency debt securities with non-institutional customers, the member provide on the confirmation (1) a reference, and hyperlink if the confirmation is electronic, to a Web page hosted by FINRA that contains TRACE publicly available trading data for the specific security that was traded, in a format specified by FINRA, along with a brief description of the type of information available on that page; and (2) the execution time of the customer transaction, expressed to the second.[59] Amendment No. 1, in which FINRA proposes to require inclusion of these additional data points, is more fully discussed below.

C. Effective Date of the Proposed Rule Change

FINRA represents that it will announce the effective date of the proposed rule change and the specific implementation date in a *Regulatory Notice* to be published no later than 90 days following Commission approval of the proposal. FINRA initially proposed that the effective date would be no later than 12 months following Commission approval of the proposal. In Amendment No. 1, FINRA proposes to extend the effective date to 18 months following Commission approval of the proposal.[60]

III. Summary of Comments and FINRA Response Letter, Investor Advocate Recommendation, Amendment No. 1

The Commission received nine comment letters from eight commenters, regarding the proposed rule change, and a letter from the Investor Advocate recommending approval of the proposed rule change.[61] Many of the commenters expressed support for the goals of the proposal.[62] Many commenters, however, expressed some concern about implementing the proposal and requested guidance or certain changes to the proposal to facilitate and reduce the costs of implementation.[63] Areas of concern included: (1) The scope of the proposal; (2) methodology and timing for calculating the PMP; (3) acceptable ways to present mark-up/mark-down disclosure information on the customer confirmation; (4) areas of inconsistency with MSRB Proposal; and (5) the effective date of the proposed rule change due to its anticipated costs.

A. Scope of the Proposal

Several commenters addressed the same-day offsetting trade aspect of the proposal's scope. One commenter stated that the same-day window was too limited.[64] Some commenters expressed concern about the operational impact of the same-day window. Specifically, two commenters were concerned that the same-day nature of the proposal would require a member to look forward to transactions occurring after the execution of the non-institutional trade to determine whether that trade requires mark-up/mark-down disclosure, and that this would disrupt the confirmation process.[65] One of these commenters urged FINRA to eliminate the ''look-forward requirement'' so that members could determine the need for disclosure at the time of trade.[66] Another commenter advocated eliminating not only the look-forward aspect of the proposal, but also the look-back aspect.[67] According to this commenter, mark-up/mark-down disclosure should be provided for all retail customer transactions.[68]

In response, FINRA stated that it ''continues to believe that a same-day timeframe is an appropriate trigger for disclosure.'' [69] FINRA acknowledged that members could incur costs to identify customer trades subject to the proposal's disclosure requirements.[70] However, FINRA indicated that members could avoid the cost associated with the look-forward aspect of the rule by choosing to ''provide mark-up disclosure more broadly if they find it beneficial to do so.'' [71] FINRA also noted that members' best execution obligations and surveillance by FINRA should deter inappropriate gaming of the same-day trigger.[72]

One commenter requested clarification on FINRA's statement in the Notice that disclosure is triggered when a member executes one or more offsetting principal transaction(s) on the same trading day. This commenter asked whether the confirmation disclosure requirement is triggered only when a customer trade has an offsetting principal trade or if a firm must continue to disclose its mark-up/mark-down until the triggering trade has been exhausted, at which point the firm may choose to continue to disclose or not.[73]

FINRA responded that there must be offsetting customer and firm principal trades for the disclosure requirement to be triggered, and explained that if a member purchased 100 bonds at 9:30 a.m., and then satisfied three customer buy orders for 50 bonds each in the same security on the same day without purchasing any more of the bonds, the proposal would require mark-up disclosure on two of the three trades, since one of the trades would have been satisfied by selling out of the member's inventory rather than through an offsetting principal transaction by the member.[74] In addition, FINRA noted that, in Amendment No. 1, it was proposing to provide added clarity on this point by adding the term ''offsetting'' to Rule 2232(c)(2) to conform the rule language to the

---

[58] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 4. *See also* MSRB Proposal, *supra* note 13, at 62950–62951; MSRB Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 13, at 4–5.

[59] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 5; proposed Rule 2232(e).

[60] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55503; Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 12.

[61] *See supra* notes 4 and 7. The views of the Investor Advocate are noted in the context of specific issues raised by commenters, as well as separately.

[62] *See* PIABA, at 1 (stating that increased transparency on customer confirmation is a necessary step); Wells Fargo, at 3 (supporting FINRA's efforts to improve price transparency in fixed income markets); Fidelity, at 2 (noting Fidelity's appreciation of regulatory efforts to improve price transparency in the fixed income markets); BDA, at 1 (accepting that retail investors could benefit from disclosure of mark-up (mark-down) on same-day trades); SIFMA, at 1 (expressing support for FINRA's objective to enhance fixed income price transparency for retail investors). *See also* UMiami, at 1–3 (more generally expressing support for the proposal). *See also* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 2 (recommending that the Commission approve the proposal).

[63] *See generally* SIFMA; BDA, Thomson Reuters II; Wells Fargo; Fidelity; FIF. Among these commenters SIFMA and Wells Fargo suggested that FINRA instead pursue a proposal focusing exclusively on providing information about prevailing market conditions through TRACE. *See* SIFMA, at 2; Wells Fargo, at 2.

[64] *See* PIABA, at 1–2. This commenter encouraged FINRA to emphasize that ''[a]ny intentional delay of a customer execution to avoid the proposed rule . . . would be contrary to [Best Execution] duties to customers.'' *But see* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 7 (stating that a same-day window of time for disclosure was appropriate and that a full-day window would deter members from adjusting their behavior to avoid the disclosure requirements.)

[65] *See* Thomson Reuters II, at 3; FIF, at 2, 4–5.

[66] *See* Thomson Reuters II, at 3. This commenter also noted that members choosing to provide mark-up/mark-down disclosure on all confirmations in order to ease implementation of the rule might hesitate to do so unless they could provide additional text on customer confirmations to put the mark-up/mark-down disclosure ''in context.'' *Id.*

[67] *See* FIF, at 2, 4–5. FIF suggested that the ''trigger'' be eliminated from the rule to avoid members having to wait to determine if a trigger trade occurred later in the day (look-forward) or to assess whether a trigger trade existed at the end of the day (look-back). *Id.*

[68] *See id.*

[69] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 3.

[70] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 4.

[71] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 4–5.

[72] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 3.

[73] *See* SIFMA, at 8.

[74] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 4–5.

language used to discuss conditions that trigger the disclosure requirement.[75] FINRA further explained that the proposal applies to ''offsetting'' transactions, and is not limited to ''matched'' trades.[76] FINRA also noted in its response to comments that a member could ''develop reasonable policies and procedures to identify and account for offsetting trades that trigger the [p]roposal, provided the member applies those policies and procedures in a consistent manner.'' [77]

One commenter questioned how the proposal would apply to certain small institutions that may fall into FINRA's definition of ''non-institutional customer,'' but trade via accounts that settle on a delivery versus payment/receive versus payment (DVP/RVP) basis and rely on confirmations generated through the Depository Trust and Clearing Corporation's institutional delivery (DTCC ID) system.[78] Because it is possible for those firms to receive confirms through the DTCC ID process, the commenter asked FINRA to clarify whether its proposal requires modifications to the DTCC ID system.[79]

FINRA responded that it believes that few non-institutional accounts settle on a DVP/RVP basis and that it would not be appropriate to exempt such accounts from the scope of the proposal.[80] FINRA noted that non-institutional accounts that settle on a DVP/RVP basis using the services of the DTCC ID system ''could receive mark-up disclosure without necessitating changes to the DTCC ID system, whether through free text fields currently in the system or by other means.'' [81] Accordingly, FINRA stated that it continues to believe that mark-up/mark-down disclosure ''is appropriate for any account that does not qualify as an institutional account.'' [82]

Another commenter questioned whether FINRA planned to broaden the scope of the rule to cover financial products other than corporate debt and agency securities, asking if the rule would be expanded to include other financial products like TRACE eligible mortgage backed securities, TBAs, asset backed securities or Treasuries.[83]

One commenter addressed the exception for trades executed by a functionally separate trading desk. That commenter seemed to conflate this exception with a separate provision in the proposed rule change that would require a firm to ''look through'' a non-arms-length transaction with its affiliate to determine whether the proposed disclosure obligations are applicable.[84] Specifically, the commenter characterized the functionally separate trading desk exception, as an exception to the ''look through'' requirement.[85]

In response, FINRA clarified that the look-through provision and functionally separate desk exception are separate provisions of the proposal, intended to operate independently of each other.[86] FINRA noted that it is possible that both provisions may be applicable to the same trade; however, each provision would need to be analyzed and applied on its own.[87]

B. Mark-Up/Mark-Down Disclosure

1. Determination of PMP and Mark-Up/Mark-Down in Accordance with FINRA Rule 2121

The Investor Advocate supported the mark-up/mark-down disclosure requirement, stating that this approach has advantages over the reference price approach FINRA contemplated in the Initial Proposal and the Revised Proposal because the mark-up/mark-down approach ''provides retail investors with the relevant information about the actual compensation the retail investor is paying the dealer for the transaction . . . [and] reflects market conditions and has the potential to provide a more accurate benchmark for calculating transaction costs.'' [88] Another commenter did not believe that a mark-up/mark-down disclosure requirement was better than the approach contemplated in the Initial Proposal and the Revised Proposal.[89]

Other commenters expressed concern about the need to determine PMP in accordance with FINRA Rule 2121, believing that this requirement would be operationally burdensome.[90] These commenters requested that FINRA provide additional guidance on how members may determine PMP and calculate mark-ups/mark-downs to facilitate compliance with the rule.[91] Specifically, these two commenters believed that members would need to automate the determination of PMP in order to consistently produce accurate values in the limited time afforded.[92] One commenter believed that it would be ''simply unworkable'' to automate the guidance set forth in FINRA Rule 2121 in a manner that would allow members to calculate and disclose mark-ups/mark-downs on a systematic basis.[93] The other commenter stated that FINRA Rule 2121 would not be easy to convert to the automated operational framework that would be required to comply with the proposed rule change.[94] Both commenters particularly emphasized that it would be difficult to automate factors in the waterfall that require a subjective analysis of facts and circumstances.[95] One of these commenters further questioned whether these challenges could result in the disclosure of inaccurate information on customer confirmations.[96]

In addition, one commenter requested explicit guidance from FINRA that the use of ''reasonable policies and procedures'' would permit member firms to use ''alternative methodologies'' to determine PMP in an automated manner.[97] This commenter, SIFMA, particularly requested that members be permitted to make reasonable assumptions in calculating PMP ''that do not follow the prescriptive waterfall.'' [98] SIFMA suggested that FINRA ''clarify'' that reasonable policies for automated calculation of PMP may include pulling prices from: Third-party pricing vendors, the firm's trading book or inventory market-to-market and contemporaneous trades, or ''some variation thereof.'' [99] SIFMA also requested that it be deemed reasonable for FINRA members to choose to calculate PMP based solely on the contemporaneous cost of the offsetting transaction, without further automating the waterfall.[100]

---

[75] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 4 n.16.

[76] *See id. See also* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 4; MSRB Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 13, at 4 n.6.

[77] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 5.

[78] *See* Thomson Reuters II, at 2.

[79] *See id.*

[80] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 11.

[81] *See id.*

[82] *See id.*

[83] *See* FIF, at 8. FINRA did not respond directly to this comment. However, the Commission notes that FINRA's rationale for the proposal is based in part on the data it has analyzed for TRACE and that this comment is beyond the scope of FINRA's present proposal, which applies to transactions in corporate or agency debt securities *See* Notice, *supra,* at note 3, at 55503–55507.

[84] *See* FIF, at 5 n.8.

[85] *See* FIF, at 5 n.8.

[86] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 3 n.11.

[87] *Id.*

[88] *See* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 7–8; *see also* Section III.F. *infra.*

[89] *See* PIABA, at 2.

[90] *See, e.g.,* BDA, at 3–4; SIFMA, at 5–7.

[91] *See id.*

[92] *See id.*

[93] *See* SIFMA, at 5–7.

[94] *See* BDA, at 3–4.

[95] *See* BDA, at 3–4 (identifying the portion of FINRA Rule 2121 that directs firms to consider ''similar securities''); SIFMA at 6–7 (identifying the portion of FINRA Rule 2121 that directs firms to consider whether ''news was issued . . . that had an effect on the perceived value of the debt security'').

[96] *See* BDA, at 4.

[97] *See* SIFMA, at 5–7.

[98] *See* SIFMA, at 7.

[99] *See* SIFMA, at 6.

[100] *Id.*

In addition, SIFMA suggested that FINRA clarify that members may adjust their PMP determination to account for certain characteristics that may affect pricing, such as ''the discount or premium inherent in pricing small or institutional-size transactions,'' the ''difference between inter-dealer and customer markets,'' the size of a transaction, and the ''side of the market.'' [101] SIFMA further requested that FINRA provide specific examples demonstrating how to calculate PMP in order to aid the development of reasonable policies, procedures, and methodologies.[102]

In response to comments, FINRA stated that it continues to believe that mark-up/mark-down disclosure should be based on FINRA Rule 2121 guidance.[103] FINRA noted that members have been subject to FINRA Rule 2121 for ten years, and that it has provided a consistent, prescriptive framework for PMP determination.[104] FINRA believes that the continued use of FINRA Rule 2121 will foster more comparable mark-up/mark-down disclosures across firms.[105] FINRA emphasized that it expects a very significant percentage of the trades that require mark-up/mark-down disclosure to have relatively close-in-time offsetting principal trades, which would presumptively establish PMP under the first step of FINRA Rule 2121.02 and, therefore, FINRA did not believe that the proposal's reliance on FINRA Rule 2121 would present logistical operational challenges to the degree argued by commenters.[106]

FINRA also addressed commenters' requests for additional guidance on establishing reasonable policies and procedures to comply with FINRA Rule 2121.02. FINRA indicated that it did not believe a member's PMP determination under FINRA Rule 2121 must be fully and strictly automated.[107] FINRA nevertheless stated that members may rely on reasonable policies and procedures to facilitate automated PMP determination, provided these policies and procedures are consistent with FINRA Rule 2121.[108] Explaining how the use of reasonable policies and procedures would be consistent with FINRA Rule 2121, FINRA stated that members could, for example, make reasonable judgments about how they apply FINRA Rule 2121. For example, members could calculate contemporaneous costs (proceeds) at the preliminary stage of the FINRA Rule 2121 analysis in cases where the member has multiple principal trades that offset one or more customer trades subject to disclosure.[109] Members also could establish a methodology to adjust contemporaneous costs and proceeds in cases where the member's offsetting trades that trigger disclosure under the proposal are both customer transactions, to avoid ''double counting'' in the mark-up and mark-down it disclosed to each customer.[110] FINRA did not believe, however, that additional adjustments to contemporaneous cost calculations, such as adjustments to reflect the size or side of a contemporaneous trade, as SIFMA requested, are consistent with FINRA Rule 2121.[111] Providing further examples, FINRA noted that members could develop policies and procedures to address subsequent steps of the FINRA Rule 2121 guidance.[112] FINRA believes that certain judgments could be documented up front with the requisite assumptions explained in a member's procedures, including decisions regarding whether a transaction is ''contemporaneous,'' whether there is trade or quotation activity in a subject or similar security, and what economic models provide about the price of an illiquid security.[113] FINRA acknowledged that these steps involve potentially subjective judgments, such as the relative weight of trade or quote activity in a given security, or the number or type of characteristics a different security must share with a given security to be considered ''similar,'' [114] but believes, based on outreach to firms and its own experience with market data, that there are ways for members to represent subjective judgments with objective logic that could be documented and applied consistently through reasonable policies and procedures.[115] In particular, FINRA stated that it understands that many members already have in place some systematic approach to fixed income pricing that allows them to provide traders with automated pricing information or to run compliance checks against the prices that traders use to mark their inventory each day.[116] Although current systems may not evaluate pricing information exactly as set out in FINRA Rule 2121, FINRA noted that the existence of such systems illustrates the possibility for programming the kinds of decision-making required by FINRA Rule 2121.[117] FINRA therefore believes that FINRA Rule 2121 is subject to automation without the need for the ''artificial intelligence'' that SIFMA suggested would be required.[118]

Further, in response to comments suggesting that members be permitted to use third-party pricing services, FINRA stated that, under the proposal, members would not be prohibited from engaging third-party service providers to document and perform the steps of the FINRA Rule 2121 analysis, particularly those that look beyond a firm's own transaction history to more broadly available information.[119] FINRA added, however, that members employing such services would retain compliance responsibility, and it would be incumbent on them to perform the due diligence necessary to ensure that third-party service providers were providing them with calculations performed consistently with FINRA Rule 2121.[120] FINRA cautioned that members would be expected to perform regular reviews of their policies and procedures for mark-up/mark-down disclosure—whether the procedures document steps taken within a member's own operations or the member's oversight of third party vendors—to ensure they are adequate, appropriate, and consistently applied.[121]

Recognizing that members may have more detailed, specific implementation questions FINRA represented that it would work closely with the industry and the MSRB during the implementation period to issue further guidance as necessary.[122]

[101] *See* SIFMA, at 9.

[102] *See* SIFMA, at 10.

[103] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 7.

[104] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 7–8. FINRA noted that BDA, while commenting on the potential complexity of automating FINRA Rule 2121 guidance, nevertheless acknowledged that the principles and processes that guide fair pricing assessments—*i.e.,* FINRA Rule 2121—are an appropriate guide for the confirmation disclosure process. *Id. See also* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 8 (opining that a PMP-based approach provides retail investors with relevant information that reflects market conditions and potentially a more accurate benchmark for calculating transaction costs than a ''reference price'' approach).

[105] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 8.

[106] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 7–8.

[107] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 8 n.32.

[108] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 8.

[109] *See id.* FINRA noted, citing the Revised Proposal, that it previously provided detailed guidance to illustrate the average weighted price or last price methodologies that might be appropriate in this scenario. *See id.*

[110] *See id.*

[111] *See id.*

[112] *See id.*

[113] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 8–9.

[114] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 9.

[115] *See id.*

[116] *See id.*

[117] *See id.*

[118] *See id.*

[119] *See id.*

[120] *See id.*

[121] *See id.*

[122] *See id.*

2. Time of PMP Determination and Mark-Up/Mark-Down Disclosure

Commenters also addressed the time at which PMP must be determined and the mark-up/mark-down must be calculated and disclosed. Although some commenters believed that the Notice was clear that the proposal permitted members to determine PMP at the time of the customer trade to avoid delay in the confirmation process,[123] others sought confirmation and requested additional detail on the determination of PMP at the time of the customer trade.[124] Specifically, one commenter believed that FINRA had made clear that the PMP determination for calculating a mark-up could be done at the time of trade, but sought confirmation from FINRA that this would also be so for purposes of calculating a mark-down.[125] Another commenter asked FINRA to acknowledge that changes to the price to the customer would not necessitate changes to the PMP from which the disclosure was calculated and also that members need not resend a corrected confirmation based solely on the occurrence of a subsequent transaction or events that might otherwise be relevant.[126] This commenter also requested that FINRA provide assurance that an automated calculation of PMP for the purpose of mark-up/mark-down disclosure, based only on the information available at the time of the trade, would not be deemed incorrect by regulators for the purposes of a fair pricing determination.[127]

As noted above, with regard to timing questions, FINRA responded that members may maintain real-time, intra-day confirmation generation processes, stating that ''members may determine PMP, as a final matter for disclosure purposes, based on the information the member has available to it as a result of reasonable diligence at the time the member inputs the PMP and associated mark-up information into its systems to generate a confirmation,'' [128] which is generally at the time of the trade.[129] FINRA also confirmed that it would not expect members to send revised confirmations solely based on the occurrence of a subsequent transaction or event that would otherwise be relevant to PMP calculation under FINRA Rule 2121.02.[130] FINRA added that, notwithstanding this guidance, it did not believe it was necessary to make a formal distinction between PMP determination for disclosure purposes as opposed to other regulatory purposes, as requested by SIFMA.[131]

C. Presentation of Mark-Up/Mark-Down Information on Customer Confirmations

FINRA proposes to require that mark-ups/mark-downs be disclosed on confirmations as a total dollar amount (*i.e.,* the dollar difference between the customer's price and the security's PMP), and as a percentage amount (*i.e.,* the mark-up's percentage of the security's PMP). Several commenters noted that the new disclosures required by the proposal might cause investor confusion, as different members may determine the PMP for the same security differently, resulting in a lack of comparability or consistency across customer confirmations.[132] One commenter encouraged FINRA to address this issue by monitoring and reviewing relevant policies and procedures.[133] Other commenters sought clarity on members' ability to provide various explanatory statements or qualifying language on the confirmation. Two commenters, for instance, argued that firms should be permitted to label or qualify the mark-up/mark-down disclosed on the confirmation as ''estimated'' or ''approximate.'' [134] Commenters therefore suggested that members be allowed to add a description of the member's process for calculating mark-ups and mark-downs [135] or to explain that the determination of PMP for a particular security may not be identical across firms.[136] Others suggested that members be permitted to describe the meaning of the mark-up/mark-down,[137] or to indicate that it may not reflect profit to the member [138] or the exact compensation to the member.[139] One commenter suggested that, to ''standardize retail investor understanding,'' acceptable explanatory text should be drafted and prepared by FINRA.[140]

FINRA responded by reiterating that the determination of the PMP of a particular security may not be identical across firms.[141] According to FINRA, this is the reason that it will expect members to have reasonable policies and procedures in place to determine PMP and to apply these policies and procedures consistently across customers.[142] FINRA also made clear that it does not believe that members should be permitted to label the required mark-up/mark-down disclosure as an ''estimate'' or an ''approximate'' figure, as such labels have the potential to unduly suggest an unreliability of the disclosures or otherwise diminish their value.[143] However, FINRA believes that a member would not be prohibited from including language on confirmations that provides explanation of PMP as a concept, or provides detail about the member's methodology for determining PMP (or notes the availability of information about methodology upon request), provided such statements are accurate.[144] In response to commenters' requests for FINRA to provide standardized or sample disclosures that would be appropriate under the proposal, FINRA represented that it will engage with members to evaluate the potential need for and use of such guidance.[145]

D. Harmonization With the MSRB Proposal and Amendment No. 1

Commenters generally urged harmonization with the MSRB Proposal,[146] focusing mostly on the MSRB's proposal to require firms to include a security-specific hyperlink to EMMA and the execution time of the customer's trade on the confirmation,[147] and FINRA's statement that it would propose those requirements in a separate filing.[148]

Although two commenters urged FINRA and the MSRB to harmonize

[123] *See* Thomson Reuters II, at 2; Fidelity, at 4.

[124] See Wells Fargo, at 3–4; SIFMA, at 8.

[125] *See* Wells Fargo, at 3–4.

[126] *See* SIFMA, at 8.

[127] *See* SIFMA, at 7.

[128] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 6. FINRA adds that it will conduct surveillance to protect against potential gaming of this guidance, as it will with other elements of the proposal. FINRA further states that it would find it inconsistent with the proposal, associated guidance, and potentially other FINRA rules as well if a member manipulated the order or timing of its trades to result in more favorable PMP calculations. *See* FINRA Response Letter at 6 n.21.

[129] *See supra* note 55 and accompanying text.

[130] *See id.*

[131] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 6 n.22.

[132] *See* Wells Fargo, at 4; SIFMA, at 3; Fidelity, at 3; PIABA, at 2. *See also* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55506.

[133] *See* PIABA, at 2.

[134] *See* Fidelity, at 3; SIFMA, at 4.

[135] *See* Wells Fargo, at 4; Fidelity, at 3.

[136] *See* SIFMA, at 4.

[137] *See* Fidelity, at 3.

[138] *See* Wells Fargo, at 4–5; SIFMA, at 4. *See also* Thomson Reuters II, at 3 (noting that firms may not want to provide mark-up/mark-down disclosure on all confirms without the ability to include text indicating that the mark-up/mark-down may not reflect the profit to the firm).

[139] *See* Fidelity, at 3.

[140] *Id.*

[141] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 10.

[142] *See id.*

[143] *See id.*

[144] *See id.*

[145] *See id.*

[146] *See, e.g.,* Wells Fargo, at 2; BDA, at 2; SIFMA, at 2–3; Thomson Reuters II, at 1–2. *See also* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 6.

[147] *See* MSRB Proposal, *supra* note 13, at 62950–62951.

[148] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55502 n.14.

their approach, they did not address the substance of the MSRB's proposal to include a security-specific hyperlink to EMMA.[149] However, two other commenters expressly opposed the inclusion of a security-specific hyperlink, despite their general support for harmonization with the MSRB.[150] These commenters asserted that customers who typically receive paper confirmations would likely not type in the long universal resource locator (''URL'') of a security-specific hyperlink into an internet browser.[151] One commenter also stated that it would be difficult to maintain security-specific hyperlinks [152] and that inclusion of a security-specific hyperlink would reduce the amount of space available on an already-crowded confirmation.[153] The other commenter believed that FINRA should provide only a general hyperlink to publicly available TRACE data.[154] One commenter suggested that FINRA delay any requirement to include a hyperlink to TRACE on customer confirmations until the mark-up/mark-down disclosure requirement had been fully implemented.[155]

With respect to the inclusion of the time of trade on customer confirmations, two commenters urged FINRA and the MSRB to harmonize their approach, but did not address the substance of the MSRB's proposal to include the time of trade on customer confirmations.[156] One commenter, despite its general support for harmonization with the MSRB Proposal, opposed the inclusion of the time of the trade on customer confirmations, stating that including the time of trade would not only be costly, but that mark-up/mark-down disclosure would obviate the need for this disclosure.[157] This commenter also stressed the practical difficulties on providing this disclosure.[158] One commenter suggested that FINRA delay any requirement to include the time of trade on customer confirmations until the mark-up/mark-down disclosure requirement had been fully implemented.[159]

In response, FINRA agreed with commenters that it was important to harmonize with the MSRB on both of these items.[160] FINRA pointed out that it solicited comments on these potential requirements in the Revised Proposal and that it had reviewed the comments submitted to the MSRB regarding its proposal.[161] After reviewing all such comments, FINRA determined that it was appropriate to require disclosure of a security-specific hyperlink to TRACE and time of execution on customer confirmations, and it further stated that the additional requirements could be implemented in a way that would mitigate the concerns raised by commenters.[162] Accordingly, FINRA submitted Amendment No. 1 to propose requirements that it believes to be ''identical to the MSRB's proposed requirements in all material respects,'' stating that this would further a ''more harmonized implementation schedule.'' [163]

E. Anticipated Costs of Implementing the Proposed Rule Change by the Proposed Effective Date

Several commenters stated that the cost and complexity of the proposed rule change would make it difficult to implement by the proposed effective date. Commenters particularly emphasized the need for significant systems and programming modifications on their part and on the part of their third-party vendors.[164] They also asserted that it would be particularly challenging to implement such changes in light of other regulatory initiatives slated to become effective in the near future.[165] One commenter requested that FINRA or the Commission perform additional outreach to the industry to gather information on the operational costs,[166] while two commenters felt the burdens imposed by the proposal were so high that they questioned whether an adequate cost-benefit analysis had been performed.[167]

In light of these issues, most commenters urged FINRA and the MSRB to agree on a harmonized implementation time frame longer than the one-year period set forth in the proposal. Commenters suggested time frames ranging from 18 months to three years.[168] Two commenters further

[149] *See* BDA, at 2; SIFMA, at 12. In subsequent letters regarding the MSRB Proposal, however, both commenters recommended that FINRA and the MSRB allow firms to provide a general hyperlink to TRACE and/or EMMA, rather than a security-specific hyperlink. *See* Letter from Mike Nicholas, Chief Executive Officer, Bond Dealers of America, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission (Oct. 4, 2016) (''BDA II''), at 4; Letter from Leslie M. Norwood, Managing Director and Associate General Counsel, Municipal Securities Division, and Sean Davy, Managing Director, Capital Markets Division, SIFMA, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission (Oct. 3, 2016) (''SIFMA II''), at 13. They nevertheless continued to stress harmonization as the critical point. *See id.*

[150] *See* Thomson Reuters II, at 3; FIF, at 9.

[151] *See* Thomson Reuters II, at 3 (also stating that investors typing in a long URL would make mistakes in doing so); FIF, at 9. *See also* SIFMA II, at 13 (stating that investors typing in a long URL would make mistakes in doing so).

[152] *See* FIF, at 8. *See also* BDA II, at 4 (noting that dealers are concerned that web addresses to specific security pages may change without their knowledge).

[153] *See* FIF, at 8. In a subsequent letter regarding the MSRB Proposal, however, FIF made it clear that their preference was to remove the requirement for a hyperlink altogether. *See* Letter from Mary Lou Von Kaenel, Managing Director, Financial Information Forum, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission (Oct. 4, 2016) (''FIF II''), at 8. *See also* SIFMA II, at 13 (noting that a short, general hyperlink would reduce the amount of space needed on a confirmation to fulfill the requirement).

[154] *See* Thomson Reuters II, at 3. *See also* BDA II, at p. 4 (recommending that FINRA and the MSRB provide a general hyperlink to search page); SIFMA II, at 13 (recommending that FINRA and the MSRB allow firms to provide a general hyperlink).

[155] *See* SIFMA, at 12. In subsequent letters regarding the MSRB Proposal, three commenters added recommendations that the MSRB delay action on this particular issue in order to coordinate with FINRA. *See* FIF II, at 8; Letter from Norman L. Ashkenas, Chief Compliance Officer, Fidelity Brokerage Services, LLC, and Richard J. O'Brien, Chief Compliance Officer, National Financial Services, LLC, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission (Oct. 4, 2016) (''Fidelity II''), at 5; Letter from Robert J. McCarthy, Director of Regulatory Policy, Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission (Oct. 4, 2016) (''Wells Fargo II''), at 5.

[156] *See* BDA, at 2; SIFMA, at 12.

[157] *See* FIF, at 8.

[158] *See id.* (expressing concerns about providing this disclosure in the context of trade modifications, cancellations or corrections, and in the context of block trades subsequently allocated to sub-accounts). Fidelity did not address this issue in its letter regarding the FINRA proposal, but it did echo the concerns expressed by FIF in a subsequent letter regarding the MSRB Proposal. *See* Fidelity II, at 5.

[159] *See* SIFMA, at 12. In subsequent letters regarding the MSRB Proposal, two commenters added recommendations that the MSRB delay action on this particular issue in order to coordinate with FINRA. *See* FIF II, at 8; Fidelity II, at 5.

[160] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 11.

[161] *See id.*

[162] *See id. See also* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 12.

[163] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 4.

[164] *See, e.g.,* FIF, at 1–2, 7; Fidelity, at 5.

[165] *See* BDA, at 2–3; SIFMA, at 11–12; Fidelity, at 5–6; Thomson Reuters II, at 4; FIF, at 2. Commenters identified the following initiatives: (1) The U.S. Department of Labor's conflict of interest rule, *see* 81 FR 20946 (Apr. 8, 2016); (2) amendments to FINRA Rule 4210 for mortgage security margin, *see* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 76148 (Oct. 14, 2015), 80 FR 63603 (Oct. 20, 2015) (FINRA–2016–036); (3) the proposed transition to a T+2 settlement cycle, *see* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78962 (September 28, 2016), 81 FR 69240 (October 5, 2016); (4) amendments to TRACE to support Treasuries, *see* Securities Exchange Release Act No. 78359 (July 19, 2016), 81 FR 48465 (July 25, 2016) (FINRA–2016–027); (5) the Consolidated Audit Trail, *see* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 77724 (Apr. 27, 2016), 81 FR 30614 (May 17, 2016); and (6) the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network's Customer Due Diligence Requirements for Financial Institutions, *see* 81 FR 29398 (May 11, 2016).

[166] *See* BDA, at 4.

[167] *See* SIFMA, at 2; FIF, at 3.

[168] *See* BDA, at 3 (requesting an 18-month period); FIF, at 3 (requesting a minimum of 18–21 months); Fidelity, at 5 (requesting a two-year period); Thomson Reuters II, at 4 (requesting a two- to three-year period); Wells Fargo, at 4 (requesting a three-year period, while acknowledging that a shorter time frame might be feasible); SIFMA, at 11–12 (requesting a three-year period, while

Continued

proposed a phased approach that would first focus on PMP determination and then focus on calculation of the mark-up/mark-down and presentation of this information on customer confirmations.[169]

By contrast, one commenter and the Investor Advocate believed that a one-year implementation period was reasonable.[170] The commenter argued that the benefits of the proposed rule change far outweighed any associated costs.[171] This commenter noted that firms already have an obligation to calculate mark-ups/mark-downs in compliance with FINRA Rule 2121 and maintained that the proposal would impose a limited burden, insofar as it only requires members to provide disclosure in instances when offsetting sales (purchases) occur within the same trading day.[172] Furthermore, this commenter believed that the proposed mark-up/mark-down disclosures might actually stimulate the market by increasing investor confidence, which could create more competitive prices and reduce transaction costs.[173]

FINRA responded that it continues to believe that the proposal is justified.[174] FINRA stated that it ''included significant economic analysis in the [p]roposal, which was based on a multi-year process during which FINRA published two *Regulatory Notices* to solicit feedback on the potential impacts of additional pricing disclosure.'' [175] FINRA represented that it understands the cost concerns expressed by commenters and the firms FINRA has spoken with, particularly those associated with altering the current practice of near straight-through processing of confirmations after a transaction and the potential for regulatory and legal risk associated with errors, but added that it has received no additional data about the magnitude of these costs.[176]

FINRA stated that the proposal's economic impact assessment was premised on the adherence to FINRA Rule 2121 guidance by members, and thus, for members that are not reasonably following FINRA Rule 2121's step-by-step guidance to determine PMP in the manner they would need to under the proposal, the implementation costs of the proposal may be substantially higher than for other firms.[177] However, in the absence of any new data on potential costs that FINRA did not already consider in the proposal, FINRA continues to believe that the proposal's economic impact assessment was sufficient and appropriate.[178] FINRA also believes that the guidance provided in the FINRA Response Letter may reduce the potential costs or burdens of the proposal.[179] To further reduce potential costs or burdens, FINRA further noted that it was proposing in Amendment No. 1 to harmonize the proposal with the MSRB Proposal, as amended, and extend the implementation time frame from one year to 18 months.[180]

F. Recommendation of the Investor Advocate

As noted above, the Investor Advocate submitted to the public comment file its recommendation to the Commission that the Commission approve the proposed rule change.[181] In its recommendation, the Investor Advocate stated its belief that the proposed rule change's ''enhancements to pricing disclosure in the fixed income markets are long overdue and will greatly benefit retail investors.'' [182] Specifically, the Investor Advocate noted that the required mark-up/mark-down disclosures will better equip retail investors ''to evaluate transactions and the quality of service provided to them by a firm,'' help regulators and retail investors detect improper dealer practices, and make it less likely that dealers will charge excessive mark-ups.[183] Ultimately, the Investor Advocate focused its attention on ''four key issues''—consistency of approach between FINRA and the MSRB; same-day disclosure window; the use of PMP as the basis for calculating mark-ups; and the need for dealers to look through transactions with affiliates—as the focus of its review, and stated ''each of these issues has been resolved to our satisfaction'' in the proposed rule change.[184]

With respect to FINRA and the MSRB adopting consistent rules related to confirmation disclosure, the Investor Advocate highlighted that the proposed rule change and the MSRB Proposal ''provide a coordinated and consistent approach to mark-up disclosure in corporate and municipal bond transactions.'' [185] Accordingly, the Investor Advocate concluded that ''this deliberative approach will lead to consistent disclosures across the fixed income markets and will provide retail investors with better post-trade price transparency.'' [186]

Addressing the same-day disclosure window, the Investor Advocate noted its agreement ''that the window of time for disclosure should be the full trading day.'' [187] According to the Investor Advocate, a shorter time-frame—*e.g.,* the two-hour window previously proposed by the MSRB—could inappropriately incentivize dealers to alter their trading practices to avoid the obligation to disclose mark-ups.[188]

Discussing the proposed rule change's use of PMP as the basis for mark-up disclosure, the Investor Advocate stated its belief that the PMP-based disclosure has advantages over the initially proposed reference price-based disclosure.[189] Specifically, the Investor Advocate noted that though the ''PMP-based disclosure may lead to disclosure of a smaller cost to retail investors under certain circumstances . . . the PMP-based approach provides retail investors with the relevant information about the actual compensation the retail investor is paying the dealer for the transaction . . . [and] . . . [i]t reflects market conditions and has the potential to provide a more accurate benchmark for calculating transaction costs.'' [190] Moreover, the Investor Advocate notes that the PMP-based disclosure regime could more easily be expanded beyond the presently contemplated same-day disclosure window.[191] As a result, the Investor Advocate stated its support for the use of the PMP-based disclosure regime.[192] Finally, the Investor Advocate stated its support for the proposed rule change's requirement that dealers express the mark-up both as a total dollar amount and as a percentage of the PMP.[193]

With respect to dealer transactions with affiliates, the Investor Advocate highlighted its concern with dealer-affiliate trading arrangements, and concluded that the proposed rule change ''satisfies [the Investor

acknowledging that a shorter time frame might be feasible). In a subsequent letter regarding the MSRB Proposal, BDA requests a two-year period. *See* BDA II, at 4–5.

[169] *See* Fidelity, at 6; FIF, at 3.

[170] *See* UMiami, at 3; Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 10–11.

[171] *See* UMiami, at 3.

[172] *See* UMiami, at 2–3.

[173] *See* UMiami, at 3.

[174] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 12. *See also* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 12.

[175] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 12.

[176] *See id.*

[177] *See id.*

[178] *See id.*

[179] *See id.*

[180] *See* FINRA Response Letter, at 11, 13; *see also* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 3.

[181] *See* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7.

[182] *See* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 2.

[183] *See id.*

[184] *See* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 6.

[185] *See id.*

[186] *See id.*

[187] *See* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 7.

[188] *See id.*

[189] *See id.*

[190] *See* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 7–8.

[191] *See* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 8.

[192] *See* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 8–9.

[193] *See* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 9.

Advocate's] concerns by making clear that a dealer must look through non-arms-length transactions with affiliates to calculate PMP.'' [194]

Finally, with respect to the implementation of the proposed rule change, the Investor Advocate stated its support for a one-year implementation period, noting that such period would be reasonable despite the technical and system changes that might be required for compliance with the proposed rule change.[195]

G. Amendment No. 1

To complement the mark-up/mark-down disclosure proposal and further harmonize its proposal with the MSRB Proposal, FINRA proposes in Amendment No. 1 to require that for all transactions in corporate or agency debt securities with non-institutional customers, irrespective of whether mark-up/mark-down disclosure is required, the member provide on the confirmation the following additional information: (1) A reference, and a hyperlink if the confirmation is electronic, to a Web page hosted by FINRA that contains TRACE publicly available trading data for the specific security that was traded, in a format specified by FINRA, along with a brief description of the type of information available on that page; and (2) the execution time of the transaction, expressed to the second.[196]

In support of the Amendment, FINRA notes that four commenters—BDA, Thomson Reuters, SIFMA, and FIF—addressed FINRA's statement in the Notice that it intended to submit an additional filing to require members to add disclosures to non-institutional confirmations of the time of trade and a hyperlink to trade data reported to TRACE, and that three of these commenters asked that FINRA conform its forthcoming filing to parallel requirements included in the MSRB Proposal.[197] In addition, in support of the proposed additional requirements, FINRA discusses comments received on the Initial and Revised Proposals.

Regarding the reference/hyperlink to TRACE, FINRA notes that one commenter stated in response to *Regulatory Notice* 14–52 that providing CUSIP-specific hyperlinks to TRACE on customer confirmations would be ''fairly easy'' if FINRA adopts a retail customer-friendly hyperlink protocol.[198] In addition, FINRA states that three commenters on *Regulatory Notice* 15–36 supported adding a hyperlink to TRACE data in some form,[199] although one commenter requested a short URL [200] and one preferred a general hyperlink to the TRACE Web site.[201] Regarding comments on the proposed requirement to disclose the time of the execution of the customer transaction, FINRA notes that some commenters on *Regulatory Notice* 15–36 supported including the time of execution of the customer trade because it would allow customers to identify their trade on TRACE and understand the market for the security at the time of their trade,[202] and that others opposed it as unnecessary and costly.[203]

FINRA represents that it also has evaluated the comments submitted on the MSRB Proposal, which includes the proposed additional requirements.[204] FINRA states that the commenters that opposed these elements of the MSRB's Proposal did so primarily on the basis of harmonization, because FINRA had not yet proposed the same requirements, and on the basis of operational cost or burden.[205]

FINRA believes that the proposed additional requirements are consistent with the Act because they will provide retail customers with meaningful and useful additional information that is either not readily available through existing data sources, or is not always known or easily accessible to investors.[206] FINRA notes that its conduct of investor testing indicated that investors would find the proposed additional information useful, and that their inclusion will better enable customers to evaluate the cost of the services that members provide, and will promote transparency into members' pricing practices and encourage communications between members and their customers about the execution of their fixed income transactions.[207]

Addressing cost concerns that commenters have raised regarding the proposed additional requirements,[208] FINRA represents that it is developing technology that it believes may mitigate costs associated with modifying systems to include the required security-specific reference or hyperlink to TRACE data prior to the rule's implementation date.[209] In addition, while FINRA recognizes that there will be operational burdens associated with the time of execution requirement, FINRA believes that the systems to capture this information for provision to customers should already be in place, given that current rules already require members to capture and maintain this information with respect to each customer transaction.[210] As a result, FINRA expects the cost to implement the proposed additional requirements to be limited.[211]

FINRA represents that it has thoroughly and carefully evaluated all of the comments that relate to the additional requirements it proposes in Amendment No. 1, and believes it is appropriate to pursue these requirements as an amendment to the proposal in response to the strong call from commenters to harmonize the proposed disclosure requirements put forth by FINRA and the MSRB.[212] In addition, FINRA believes it has modified the requirements in a way that significantly mitigates the operational concerns that commenters have identified, particularly with respect to the format for the required reference or hyperlink to TRACE data.[213] FINRA also notes that it is extending the implementation timeline for the proposal from one year to eighteen months, which it believes should

[194] *See* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 9–10.

[195] *See* Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 10–11.

[196] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 5; proposed Rule 2232(e). As discussed above, FINRA also proposes in Amendment No. 1. to add the term ''offsetting'' to proposed Rule 2232(c)(2) to conform the rule language to the language used to discuss conditions that trigger the disclosure requirement, and extend the implementation period of the proposal from one year to 18 months. *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 3. *See also supra* notes 75–77and accompanying text.

[197] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 4. FINRA noted that the Investor Advocate also stated generally that it is important for FINRA and the MSRB to adopt consistent rules related to confirmation disclosure. *Id.*

[198] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 10.

[199] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 11.

[200] *See id.*

[201] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 12.

[202] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 11.

[203] *See id.*

[204] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 12.

[205] *See id.*

[206] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 7.

[207] *See id.*

[208] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 9.

[209] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 9–10. Specifically, FINRA is in the process of developing a Web page linkage system that will create a short, uniform hyperlink template that could be included on customer confirmations. FINRA anticipates that the hyperlink template would include a short domain name followed by a slash and the specific security CUSIP. FINRA believes that, by developing this short, uniform hyperlink template, it can limit the space required on each confirmation for the required TRACE reference or hyperlink. FINRA also believes a short, uniform hyperlink template would make automation of the requirement more feasible, since the hyperlink would only include two pieces of information: (1) The short domain name, which would remain constant; and (2) the security-specific CUSIP, which members already include on customer confirmations. FINRA intends to work with firms to obtain input and expects to finalize and publish the short uniform hyperlink template well before the rule takes effect, with sufficient time for further feedback and implementation.

[210] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 7.

[211] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 9.

[212] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 10–12.

[213] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 12.

mitigate the commenters' potential concerns with these requirements even further.[214] FINRA believes that the extension of the time period for implementation of the rule is an appropriate balance of the commenters' concerns and the desire to begin delivering additional pricing information to retail customers.[215]

IV. Discussion and Commission Findings

After carefully considering the proposed rule change, the comments received, the FINRA Response Letter, and Amendment No. 1, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No.1, is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities association. In particular, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is consistent with Section 15A(b)(6) of the Act,[216] which requires, among other things, that FINRA's rules be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest, and Section 15A(b)(9) of the Act,[217] which requires the rules of a national securities association not impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the Exchange Act.

A. Mark-Up/Mark-Down Disclosure

The Commission notes that the goal of improving transaction cost transparency in fixed-income markets for retail investors has long been pursued by the Commission.[218] The Commission believes that the establishment of a requirement that FINRA members disclose mark-ups/mark-downs to retail investors, as proposed, will advance the goal of providing retail investors with meaningful and useful information about the pricing of their fixed-income transactions.[219]

The Commission believes the proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is reasonably designed to ensure that mark-ups/mark-downs are disclosed to retail investors, at least when a member has effected a same-day off-setting transaction, while limiting the impact of operational challenges for members. For example, in response to commenters concerned that the proposal would disrupt intra-day confirmation generation processes, FINRA has clarified that members need not wait until the end of the day to determine the information to be included in a confirmation, and may maintain real-time, intra-day confirmation generation processes; and, further, that members will not be expected to send revised confirmations solely based on the occurrence of a subsequent transaction or event that would otherwise be relevant to the determination of PMP under FINRA Rule 2121.02.[220]

Under the proposal, disclosed mark-ups/mark-downs are to be calculated in compliance with FINRA Rule 2121, and expressed as a total dollar amount and as a percentage of the PMP.[221] The Commission believes that this information will, for example, promote transparency of members' pricing practices and encourage dialogue between members and retail investors about the costs associated with their transactions, thereby better enabling retail investors to evaluate their transaction costs and potentially promoting price competition among member firms.

As discussed above, concerns were raised that the proposal's requirement to determine PMP in compliance with FINRA Rule 2121 and the supplementary material thereunder would make it difficult for members to automate PMP determinations at the time of the trade.[222] The Commission believes that FINRA has adequately responded to these concerns, and that the price and mark-up/mark-down disclosed to the customer on a confirmation must reflect the actual PMP the member used to price and mark-up/mark-down the transaction at the time of the trade. The Commission believes that it is feasible to automate the determination of PMP in accordance with FINRA Rule 2121 to the extent a member chooses to do so, and agrees with FINRA that a firm's election to use automated processes to support pricing of retail trades, and thus determine the PMP, would not justify departure from the current requirement that members price securities in accordance with FINRA Rule 2121.[223] When it approved FINRA Rule 2121.02, the Commission stated that such guidance is consistent with long-standing Commission and judicial precedent regarding fair mark-ups, and that it:

> provides a framework that specifically establishes contemporaneous cost as the presumptive prevailing market price, but also identifies certain dynamic factors that are relevant to whether contemporaneous cost or alternative values provide the most appropriate measure of prevailing market price. The Commission believes that the factors that govern when a dealer may depart from contemporaneous cost and that set forth alternative measures the dealer may use are reasonably designed to provide greater certainty to dealers and investors while providing an appropriate level of flexibility for dealers to consider alternative market factors when pricing debt securities.[224]

The Commission believes this reasoning remains sound and is not persuaded that the proposed requirement to disclose mark-ups/mark-downs on customer confirmations necessitates an

---

[214] *See id.*

[215] *See id.*

[216] 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(6).

[217] 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(9).

[218] *See* Securities & Exchange Commission, Report on the Municipal Securities Market (July 31, 2012) (''2012 Report''), *available at: https://www.sec.gov/news/studies/2012/munireport073112.pdf* (recommending that the MSRB consider possible rule changes that would require dealers acting on a riskless principal basis to disclose on the customer confirmation the amount of any mark-up or mark-down and that Commission consider whether a comparable change should be made to Rule 10b–10 with respect to confirmation disclosure of mark-ups and mark-downs in riskless principal transactions for corporate bonds); Chair Mary Jo White, Securities and Exchange Commission, Intermediation in the Modern Securities Markets: Putting Technology and Competition to Work for Investors (June 20, 2014), *available at: https://www.sec.gov/News/Speech/Detail/Speech/1370542122012* (Chair White noting that to help investors better understand the cost of their fixed income transactions, staff will work with FINRA and the MSRB in their efforts to develop rules regarding disclosure of mark-ups in certain principal transactions for both corporate and municipal bonds); Statement on Edward D. Jones Enforcement Action (August 13, 2015), *available at: https://www.sec.gov/news/statement/statement-on-edward-jones-enforcement-action.html* (Commissioners Luis A. Aguilar, Daniel M. Gallagher, Kara M. Stein, and Michael S. Piwowar, stating, ''We encourage the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA) and the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (MSRB) to complete rules mandating transparency of mark-ups and mark-downs, even in riskless principal trades.''). *See* also Investor Advocate, *supra* note 7, at 2 (supporting the proposed rule change and stating that enhancements to pricing disclosure in the fixed-income markets are ''long overdue and will greatly benefit retail investors''); Recommendation of the Investor Advisory Committee to Enhance Information for Bond Market Investors (June 7, 2016), *available at: https://www.sec.gov/spotlight/investor-advisory-committee-2012/recommendation-enhance-information-bond-market-investors-060716.pdf* (recommending that the Commission work with FINRA and the MSRB to finalize mark-up/mark-down disclosure proposals).

[219] As FINRA notes, while SEC Rule 10b–10 requires members to provide pricing information, including transaction cost information, in connection with a purchase or sale of equity securities where the member acted as principle, no comparable requirement currently exists for transactions in fixed-income securities. *See* 17 CFR 240.10b–10(a)(2); Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55500.

[220] *See supra* notes 128–130 and accompanying text.

[221] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55500–55502.

[222] *See* notes 90–96, *supra,* and accompanying text.

[223] *See* notes 103–106, *supra,* and accompanying text.

[224] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 55638 (Apr. 16, 2007), 72 FR 20150, 20154 (Apr. 23, 2007) (NASD–2003–141).

approach contrary to FINRA Rule 2121.02.

Further, in response to commenters that requested additional guidance concerning how they could develop reasonable policies and procedures to comply with the rule,[225] FINRA states that members may rely on reasonable policies and procedures to facilitate the determination of PMP, provided they do so consistent with FINRA Rule 2121.[226] More specifically, FINRA explained that a member could, for example, develop reasonable policies and procedures to: (i) Employ a methodology to determine PMP when there are multiple principal trades that offset one or more customer trades subject to disclosure; (ii) employ a methodology to adjust contemporaneous cost and proceeds in cases where the member's offsetting trades that trigger disclosure under the proposal are both customer transactions; and/or (iii) employ the use of economic models provided by a third-party pricing service.[227] Because the determination of the PMP of a particular security may not be identical across firms, FINRA will expect members to have reasonable policies and procedures in place to determine PMP and to apply these policies and procedures consistently across customers.[228] FINRA also has proposed to extend the implementation date of the proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, from one year to 18 months,[229] and represented that it will work closely with the industry and MSRB during the rule's implementation period to issue further guidance as necessary.[230] The Commission believes FINRA's response appropriately addresses commenters' concerns regarding implementation of the proposal.

Also, as discussed above, commenters had questions regarding the presentation of mark-up/mark-down information on customer confirmations, and in particular sought FINRA's concurrence that it would be acceptable to label the required mark-up/mark-down disclosure as an ''estimate'' or an ''approximate'' figure.[231] The Commission agrees with FINRA,[232] and does not believe that it would be consistent with the Act or the proposal for members to label the required mark-up/mark-down disclosure as an ''estimate'' or an ''approximate'' figure, or to otherwise suggest that the member is not disclosing the actual amount of the mark-up/mark-down it determined to charge the customer. However, the proposal is appropriately flexible to permit a member to include language on confirmations that explains PMP as a concept, or that details the member's methodology for determining PMP, or notes the availability of information about methodology upon request, provided such statements are accurate.[233] The Commission emphasizes that members will be required to disclose the actual amount of the mark-up/mark-down that they have determined to charge the customer, in accordance with FINRA Rule 2121, and the amendments to FINRA Rule 2232 being approved hereby.

B. Harmonization With the MSRB Proposal: Requirement To Provide TRACE Reference/Hyperlink and Time of Execution on All Non-Institutional Customer Confirmations

The Commission also believes that FINRA's proposal to require members to reference (or include, if the confirmation is electronic) a security-specific hyperlink to a Web page hosted by FINRA that contains TRACE publicly available trade data and to disclose the time of trade execution on all retail trade confirmations, is reasonably designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to protect investors, and in the public interest, and does not impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the Act, and is therefore consistent with the Act.

In the Commission's view, providing a retail investor with a security-specific reference or hyperlink on the trade confirmation and the time of trade execution will facilitate retail customers obtaining a comprehensive view of the market for their securities, including the market as of the time of trade. The Commission believes that these items will complement FINRA's existing order-handling obligations (*e.g.,* best execution) by providing retail investors with meaningful and useful information with which they will be able to independently evaluate the quality of execution obtained from a firm.

Although some commenters urged a general hyperlink to TRACE publicly available trade data, rather than a security-specific hyperlink,[234] FINRA believes that a security-specific hyperlink will better enable retail investors, who typically have less ready access to market and pricing information than institutional customers, to access important data related to fixed-income securities, providing them with a more comprehensive picture of the market for a security on a given day, and ultimately assist them in understanding and comparing the transaction costs associated with their purchases and sales of fixed income securities.[235] Further, in Amendment No. 1, FINRA represents that the proposed requirements can be implemented in a way that mitigates the concerns raised by commenters, as FINRA intends to develop technology that it believes may reduce the costs associated with modifying systems to include the required security-specific reference or hyperlink prior to the rule's implementation date.[236] The Commission has carefully considered Amendment No. 1 in light of comments received urging FINRA and the MSRB to harmonize both the substance and timing of their proposals,[237] as well comments submitted on the MSRB Proposal which proposed analogous requirements.[238] The Commission concurs with FINRA that the time of execution along with a security-specific reference or hyperlink on a customer confirmation would provide customers with the ability to obtain a comprehensive view of the market for their security at the time of trade.

C. Efficiency, Competition, and Capital Formation

In approving the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, the Commission has considered its impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation.[239] The Commission believes that the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, could affect efficiency, competition, and capital formation in several ways.

The Commission believes that the proposed rule could have an impact on competition among broker-dealers. For instance, costs associated with the proposed rule could raise barriers to

[225] *See* notes 97–102, *supra,* and accompanying text.

[226] *See* note 108, *supra,* and accompanying text.

[227] *See* notes 109–121, *supra,* and accompanying text.

[228] *See* note 141–142, *supra,* and accompanying text.

[229] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 12.

[230] *See* note 122, *supra,* and accompanying text.

[231] *See* notes 132–140, *supra,* and accompanying text.

[232] *See* notes 141–145, *supra,* and accompanying text.

[233] *See* notes 144–145, *supra,* and accompanying text.

[234] *See* notes 150–154, *supra,* and accompanying text.

[235] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 6.

[236] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 9, at 9.

[237] *See* note 146, *supra,* and accompanying text.

[238] *See* Wells Fargo II; Fidelity II; BDA II; FIF II; SIFMA II; Thomson Reuters II. *See also* Letter from Paige W. Pierce, President and CEO, RW Smith & Associates, LLC, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission (Oct. 4, 2016).

[239] 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

entry in the non-institutional trading market. Further, in the Notice, FINRA considers the possibility that the mark-up/mark-down disclosure proposal could have a differing operational impact and costs across members.[240] FINRA acknowledges that the proposal could result in higher costs for small broker-dealers and broker-dealers less active in non-institutional trading, that the proposed rule could lead small broker-dealers to consolidate with large broker-dealers, or to exit the market, but believes that FINRA's data analysis suggested that this effect could be limited.[241] Additionally, the Commission believes that the proposal provides members with the flexibility to develop cost effective policies and procedures for complying with the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1,that reflect their business needs and are consistent with the regulatory objectives of the proposal.

By increasing disclosure requirements in non-institutional customer confirmation, the proposed rule could improve efficiency—in particular, price efficiency—and the improvement in pricing efficiency could promote capital formation. The Commission believes that mark-up/mark-down disclosure and the inclusion of a security-specific reference/hyperlink to TRACE data on non-institutional customer confirmations would promote price competition among broker-dealers and improve trade execution quality. An increase in price competition among broker-dealers would lower transaction costs on non-institutional customer trades. To the extent that the proposed rule lowers transaction costs on non-institutional customer trades, the proposed rule could improve the pricing efficiency and price discovery process. The quality of the price discovery process has implications for efficiency and capital formation, as prices that accurately convey information about fundamental value improve the efficiency with which capital is allocated across projects and firms. Furthermore, to the extent that the proposed rule lowers transaction costs on non-institutional customer trades, the proposed rule could lower bond financing costs for projects and firms.

As noted above, the Commission received nine comment letters on the filing. The Commission believes that FINRA considered carefully and responded adequately to the concerns raised by commenters. For all of the foregoing reasons, including those discussed in the FINRA Response Letter, the Commission believes the proposal is reasonably designed to help FINRA fulfill its mandate in Section 15A(b)(6) of the Act which requires that FINRA rules be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest, and Section 15A(b)(9) of the Act, which requires, among other things, that FINRA's rules do not impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(5) of the Act,[242] the Commission consulted with and considered the views of the Treasury Department in determining whether to approve the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1. The Treasury Department did not object to the proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1. Pursuant to Section 19(b)(6) of the Act,[243] the Commission has considered the sufficiency and appropriateness of existing laws and rules applicable to government securities brokers, government securities dealers, and their associated persons in approving the proposal.

V. Solicitation of Comments on Amendment No. 1

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether Amendment No. 1 to 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–FINRA–2016–032 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–FINRA–2016–032. 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 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, as modified by Amendment No. 1, that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, 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 Web site 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 will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of FINRA. 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–FINRA–2016–032 and should be submitted on or before December 14, 2016.

VI. Accelerated Approval of Proposed Rule Change, as Modified by Amendment No. 1

The Commission finds good cause to approve the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, prior to the thirtieth day after the date of publication of notice of the filing of Amendment No. 1 in the **Federal Register**. Amendment No. 1 supplements the proposed rule change by amending FINRA Rule 2232 to require members to provide the following additional information on customer confirmations: (1) A reference, and a hyperlink if the confirmation is electronic, to a Web page hosted by FINRA that contains TRACE publicly available trading data for the specific security that was traded, in a format specified by FINRA, along with a brief description of the type of information available on that page; and (2) the execution time of the transaction, expressed to the second. FINRA also proposes in Amendment No. 1. to add the term ''offsetting'' to proposed Rule 2232(c)(2) to conform the rule language to the language used to discuss conditions that trigger the disclosure requirement, and extend the

[240] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55505–55506.

[241] *See* Notice, *supra* note 3, at 55506.

[242] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(5) (providing that the Commission ''shall consult with and consider the views of the Secretary of the Treasury prior to approving a proposed rule filed by a registered securities association that primarily concerns conduct related to transactions in government securities, except where the Commission determines that an emergency exists requiring expeditious or summary action and publishes its reasons therefor'').

[243] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(6).

implementation period of the proposal from one year to 18 months.

The Commission finds that requiring members to include a reference or hyperlink to a security-specific TRACE Web page and include the time of trade on all retail customer confirmations is responsive to commenters' requests for harmonization of the FINRA Proposal and MSRB Proposal and therefore helped the Commission find that the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is consistent with Section 15A(b)(6) of the Act,[244] which requires, among other things, that FINRA's rules be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest, and Section 15A(b)(9) of the Act,[245] which requires, among other things, that FINRA's rules do not impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The Commission notes that the addition of the term ''offsetting'' to the rule is solely a clarification for the avoidance of doubt and that the change does not alter the substance of the rule. Furthermore, extension of the implementation period of the proposal from one year to 18 months is appropriate and responsive to the operational and implementation concerns raised by commenters. The Commission also notes that after consideration of the comments the MSRB received on its proposal to require a security-specific hyperlink to EMMA and the execution time of the transaction, the MSRB amended its proposal in a manner that is identical to the Amendment No. 1 that FINRA has filed.[246] The Commission notes that it today has approved the MSRB Proposal, as modified by MSRB Amendment No. 1, and believes that in the interests of promoting efficiency in the implementation of both proposals, it is appropriate to approve FINRA's proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, concurrently. Accordingly, the Commission finds good cause, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Exchange Act,[247] to approve the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, on an accelerated basis.

V. Conclusion

It Is Therefore Ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,[248] that the proposed rule change (SR–FINRA–2016–032), as modified by Amendment No. 1, is approved on an accelerated basis.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[249]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–28190 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[244] 15 U.S.C. 78o 3(b)(6).

[245] 15 U.S.C. 78o 3(b)(9).

[246] *See* MSRB Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 13, at 4–5.

[247] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[248] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[249] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

[Docket No. FD 36069]

Kokomo Rail, LLC—Acquisition and Operation Exemption—Rail Line of Kokomo Rail Co., Inc.

Kokomo Rail, LLC (KR), a noncarrier, has filed a verified notice of exemption [1] under 49 C.F.R 1150.31 to acquire, from Kokomo Rail Co., Inc. (KRC),[2] and to operate, approximately 12.55 miles of rail line between milepost 134.48 at or near Marion and milepost 147.07 at or near Amboy, in Howard and Grant Counties, Ind. (the Line).

According to KR, KRC acquired the 12.55-mile line from CSX Transportation, Inc.[3] KR states that KRC was voluntarily dissolved as a corporation, and that dissolution makes it necessary to transfer KRC's authority to own and operate the Line from KRC to KR.

KR states that the proposed transaction does not involve any interchange commitments. KR certifies that its projected annual revenues as a result of this transaction will not result in the creation of a Class I or Class II rail carrier and that its projected annual revenues do not exceed $5 million.

The transaction may be consummated on or after December 7, 2016, the effective date of the exemption (30 days after the verified notice was filed).

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void ab initio. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the effectiveness of the exemption. Petitions to stay must be filed no later than November 30, 2016 (at least seven days before the exemption becomes effective).

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to Docket No. FD 36069, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20423–0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on applicant's representative, Thomas F. McFarland, Thomas F. McFarland, P.C., 208 South LaSalle Street, Suite 1666, Chicago, IL 60604.

According to KR, this action is categorically excluded from environmental review under 49 CFR 1105.6(c).

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at ''*WWW.STB.GOV.*''

Decided: November 18, 2016.

By the Board, Scott M. Zimmerman, Acting Director, Office of Proceedings.

Rena Laws-Byrum,

Clearance Clerk.

[FR Doc. 2016–28222 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915–01–P

[1] The verified notice was originally filed on October 27, 2016. On November 7, 2016, KR filed supplemental information, including the relevant mileposts, and noted that KRC was dissolved in 1999. Therefore, November 7, 2016, is the official filing date.

[2] KR is an affiliate of Kokomo Grain Co., Inc., as was KRC.

[3] *See Kokomo Rail Co.—Acquis. & Operation Exemption—Line of CSX Transp. Between Marion & Amboy, Ind.,* FD 32231 et al. (ICC served Dec. 15, 1993).

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

[Docket No. AB 290 (Sub-No. 343X)]

Central of Georgia Railroad Company—Abandonment Exemption—in Newton County, Ga.

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board.

ACTION: Correction to notice of exemption.

On July 1, 2013, Central of Georgia Railroad Company (CGA) [1] filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR pt. 1152 subpart F—*Exempt Abandonments* to abandon approximately 14.90 miles of rail line between milepost E 65.80 and milepost E 80.70, in Newton County, Ga. The notice was served and published in the **Federal Register** on July 19, 2013 (78 FR 43,273).

Before the exemption became effective, Newton County Trail-Path Foundation, Inc. (Newton Trail) filed a request for a notice of interim trail use (NITU). The Board issued a NITU on August 19, 2013, and on September 28, 2016, CGA and Newton Trail filed a notice informing the Board that they had entered into a lease agreement for interim trail use and rail banking for the 14.90 miles of rail line that was subject to abandonment.

On October 14, 2016, CGR filed a letter stating that the map attached as

[1] CGA is a wholly owned subsidiary of Norfolk Southern Railway Company.

Appendix A to its July 1, 2013 verified notice did not properly depict the location of milepost E 65.80, and that parentheticals in the notice incorrectly refer to milepost E 65.80 as: ''(at the point of the Line's crossing of Route 229 in Newborn).'' [2] Thus, CGR requests that the Board accept the corrected map attached to the October 14, 2016 letter and clarify the parenthetical references to milepost E 65.80 in its July 1, 2013 verified notice and the notice the Board served and published on July 19, 2013, to read: ''(a point just east of the Ziegler Road crossing west of downtown Newborn)''. These corrections are recognized here. All of the remaining information in the July 19, 2013 notice remains unchanged.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at ''*WWW.STB.DOT.GOV.*''

Decided: November 18, 2016.

By the Board, Scott M. Zimmerman, Acting Director, Office of Proceedings.

Jeffrey Herzig,

Clearance Clerk.

[FR Doc. 2016–28295 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Approval of Noise Compatibility Program for Bob Hope Airport, Burbank, California

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces its findings on the noise compatibility program submitted by Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 47501 *et seq.* (formerly the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act, hereinafter referred to as ''the Act'') and 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 150 (hereinafter referred to as ''Part 150''). These findings are made in recognition of the description of Federal and nonfederal responsibilities in Senate Report No. 96–52 (1990). On October 10, 2013, the FAA determined that the noise exposure maps submitted by Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority under Part 150 were in compliance with applicable requirements. On October 24, 2016, the FAA approved the Bob Hope Airport noise compatibility program. Fifteen (15) of the eighteen (18) total number of recommendations of the program were approved. Two (2) of the eighteen (18) total number of recommendations of the program were approved in part. For one (1) of the eighteen (18) program measures there was no action required at this time. No program elements relating to new or revised flight procedures for noise abatement were proposed by the airport operator.

DATES: *Effective Date:* The effective date of the FAA's approval of the noise compatibility program for Bob Hope Airport is October 24, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Victor Globa, Environmental Protection Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Los Angeles Airports District Office, Mailing Address: P.O. Box 92007, Los Angeles, California 90009–2007. Street Address: 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Lawndale, California 90261. Telephone: 310/725–3637. Documents reflecting this FAA action may be reviewed at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice announces that the FAA has given its overall approval to the noise compatibility program for Bob Hope Airport, effective October 24, 2016.

Under section 47504 of the Act, an airport operator who has previously submitted a noise exposure map may submit to the FAA a noise compatibility program which sets forth the measures taken or proposed by the airport operator for the reduction of existing non-compatible land uses and prevention of additional non-compatible land uses within the area covered by the noise exposure maps. The Act requires such programs to be developed in consultation with interested and affected parties including local communities, government agencies, airport users, and FAA personnel.

Each airport noise compatibility program developed in accordance with Part 150 is a local program, not a Federal program. The FAA does not substitute its judgment for that of the airport proprietor with respect to which measures should be recommended for action. The FAA's approval or disapproval of Part 150 program recommendations is measured according to the standards expressed in Part 150 and the Act and is limited to the following determinations:

a. The noise compatibility program was developed in accordance with the provisions and procedures of Part 150;

b. Program measures are reasonably consistent with achieving the goals of reducing existing non-compatible land uses around the airport and preventing the introduction of additional non-compatible land uses;

c. Program measures would not create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce, unjustly discriminate against types or classes of aeronautical uses, violate the terms of airport grant agreements, or intrude into areas preempted by the Federal Government; and

d. Program measures relating to the use of flight procedures can be implemented within the period covered by the program without derogating safety, adversely affecting the efficient use and management of the navigable airspace and air traffic control systems, or adversely affecting other powers and responsibilities of the Administrator prescribed by law.

Specific limitations with respect to FAA's approval of an airport noise compatibility program are delineated in Part 150, section 150.5. Approval is not a determination concerning the acceptability of land uses under Federal, state, or local law. Approval does not by itself constitute an FAA implementing action. A request for Federal action or approval to implement specific noise compatibility measures may be required. Prior to an FAA decision on a request to implement the action, an environmental review of the proposed action may be required. Approval does not constitute a commitment by the FAA to financially assist in the implementation of the program nor a determination that all measures covered by the program are eligible for grant-in-aid funding from the FAA. Where federal funding is sought, requests for project grants must be submitted to the FAA Los Angeles Airports District Office in the Western-Pacific Region.

Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority submitted to the FAA on June 27, 2013 the noise exposure maps, descriptions and other documentation produced during the noise compatibility planning study conducted from September 13, 2011 through October 24, 2016. The Bob Hope Airport noise exposure maps were determined by FAA to be in compliance with applicable requirements on October 10, 2013. Notice of this determination was published in the **Federal Register** (78 FR 64048) on October 25, 2013.

The Bob Hope Airport study contains a proposed noise compatibility program comprised of actions designed for phased implementation by airport management and adjacent jurisdictions from December 30, 2014 to the year

[2] On October 14, 2016, CGA and Newton Trail also filed a letter to correct their September 28, 2016 notification that a lease agreement for interim trail use and rail banking had been reached. This filing as well as the modification of the NITU to reflect the correct location of milepost E 65.80 will be addressed in a separate decision.

2017. It was requested that the FAA evaluate and approve this material as a noise compatibility program as described in section 47504 of the Act. The FAA began its review of the program on May 11, 2016, and was required by a provision of the Act to approve or disapprove the program within 180 days (other than the use of new or modified flight procedures for noise control). Failure to approve or disapprove such program within the 180-day period shall be deemed to be an approval of such program.

The submitted program contained 18 proposed actions for noise abatement, noise mitigation, land use planning and program management measures on and off the airport. The FAA completed its review and determined that the procedural and substantive requirements of the Act and Part 150 have been satisfied. The overall program was approved by the FAA, effective October 24, 2016.

FAA approval was granted for fifteen (15) specific program measures. The approved measures included such items as: Continue Requiring All Transport Category and Turbojet Aircraft to Comply with Federal Aircraft Noise Regulations; Continue Requiring Compliance with the Airport's Engine Test Run-up Policy; Continue Promoting Use of AC 91–53A, Noise Abatement Departure Procedures by Air Carrier Jets as voluntary only; Continue Promoting Use of NBAA Noise Abatement Procedures, or Equivalent Manufacturer Procedures, by General Aviation Jet Aircraft as voluntary only; Continue Working with the FAA Airport Traffic Control Tower to Maintain the Typical Traffic Pattern Altitude of 1,800 feet MSL as voluntary only; Continue the Placement of New Buildings on the Airport North of Runway 8–26 to Shield Nearby Neighborhood From Noise on Runway; Designate Runway 26 as Nighttime Preferential Departure Runway as voluntary only; Build Engine Maintenance Run-Up Enclosure; Revise Residential Acoustical Treatment Program to Include Single Family Homes Within 65 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) Contour Based on 2017 NEM that were constructed or existed before October 1, 1998; Establish Acoustical Treatment Program for Multi-Family Dwelling Units Within the 2017 Acoustical Treatment Eligibility Area that were constructed or existed before October 1, 1998; Provision for Retention or an Easement Preventing Noise-Sensitive Land Uses of Property Located in the Northeast Quadrant of the Airport within the 2017 65 CNEL Noise Exposure Contour (This measure would prevent the development of noise-sensitive land uses within the 65 CNEL noise contour and that would jeopardize the long-term viability of the airport.); Continue Noise Abatement Information Program (For the purpose of aviation safety, this approval does not extend to the use of monitoring equipment for enforcement purposes by in-situ measurement of any pre-set noise thresholds.); Monitor Implementation of Updated Noise Compatibility Program; Update Noise Exposure Maps and Noise Compatibility Program (In order to comply with 14 CFR part 150, the proposed changes should be submitted to FAA for approval after local consultation and a public hearing has been conducted.); Maintain Log of Nighttime Runway Use and Operations by Aircraft Type.

FAA approved in part, disapproved in part on two (2) specific program measures. The first approved in part, disapproved in part measure is: Continue Existing Acoustical Treatment Program for Single Family Homes. The portion of this measure that is approved is limited to single family homes that are located within the 65 CNEL noise contour for the forecasted year 2017 accepted by the FAA on October 10, 2013. The portion that is disapproved is acoustical treatment of homes that previously were within the 65 CNEL contour for the forecast year 2000 NEM submitted in 1988, but that are now outside of the 65 CNEL contours for the NEMs submitted with this Part 150 update; The second approved in part, disapproved in part measure is: For Otherwise Qualified Property Owners Who Have Been Unable to Participate in the Residential Acoustical Treatment Program (RATP) Due to Building Code Deficiencies, Offer to Purchase a Noise Easement as an Option for Owners of Single Family and Multi-Family Properties in the 2017 Acoustical Treatment Eligibility Area That Have Not Been Treated. The portion of this measure that is approved is the Airport Authority may offer avigation easements to property owners within the 2017 65 CNEL noise contour accepted by the FAA on October 10, 2013. The portions that are disapproved are the additional local requirements proposed for easement eligibility.

FAA determined that there is no action required at this time on one (1) specific program measure. This measure is Establish Noise Abatement Departure Turn for Jet Takeoffs on Runway 26. This measure relates to flight procedures under Section 104(b). Additional review by FAA is necessary to evaluate the operational safety, feasibility, and environmental effects of this proposal.

These determinations are set forth in detail in a Record of Approval signed by the Director, Office of Airports, Western-Pacific Region (AWP–600) on October 24, 2016. The Record of Approval, as well as other evaluation materials and the documents comprising the submittal, are available for review at the FAA office listed above and at the administrative offices of the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority.

The Record of Approval also will be available on-line at: *http://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/airport_noise/part_150/states/*

Issued in Hawthorne, California, on November 17, 2016.

Mark A. McClardy,

Director, Office of Airports, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 2016–28291 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA–FMCSA–2007–29035; FMCSA–2008–0293; FMCSA–2009–0242; FMCSA–2011–0277; FMCSA–2011–0278; FMCSA–2013–0184; FMCSA–2013–0187; FMCSA–2013–0190]

Qualification of Drivers; Exemption Applications; Diabetes

AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of final disposition.

SUMMARY: FMCSA announces its decision to renew exemptions of 133 individuals from its prohibition in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs) against persons with insulin-treated diabetes mellitus (ITDM) from operating commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) in interstate commerce. The exemptions enable these individuals with ITDM to continue to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

DATES: Each group of renewed exemptions were effective on the dates stated in the discussions below and will expire on the dates stated in the discussions below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Christine A. Hydock, Chief, Medical Programs Division, 202–366–4001, *fmcsamedical@dot.gov,* FMCSA, Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Room W64–224, Washington, DC 20590–0001. Office hours are from 8 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. If you have

questions regarding viewing or submitting material to the docket, contact Docket Services, telephone (202) 366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Electronic Access

You may see all the comments online through the Federal Document Management System (FDMS) at: *http://www.regulations.gov.*

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments, go to *http//www.regulations.gov* and/or Room W12–140 on the ground level of the West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Privacy Act: In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to better inform its rulemaking process. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to *http://www.regulations.gov,* as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL–14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at *http://www.dot.gov/privacy.*

II. Background

On November 27, 2015, FMCSA published a notice announcing its decision to renew exemptions for 133 individuals from the insulin-treated diabetes mellitus prohibition in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3) to operate a CMV in interstate commerce and requested comments from the public (80 FR 74196). The public comment period ended on December 28, 2015 and no comments were received.

As stated in the previous notice, FMCSA has evaluated the eligibility of these applicants and determined that renewing these exemptions would achieve a level of safety equivalent to or greater than the level that would be achieved by complying with the current regulation 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3).

The physical qualification standard for drivers regarding diabetes found in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3) states that a person is physically qualified to drive a CMV if that person has no established medical history or clinical diagnosis of diabetes mellitus currently requiring insulin for control.

III. Discussion of Comments

FMCSA received no comments in this preceding.

IV. Conclusion

Based upon its evaluation of the 133 renewal exemption applications and that no comments were received, FMCSA confirms its decision to exempt the following drivers from the rule prohibiting drivers with ITDM from driving CMVs in interstate commerce in 49 CFR 391.64(3):

As of December 1, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 10 individuals have satisfied the renewal conditions for obtaining an exemption from the rule prohibiting drivers with ITDM from driving CMVs in interstate commerce (74 FR 48338; 74 FR 62883; 80 FR 74196):

Charles E. Boyd (NE)
Warren B. Copple, Jr. (MI)
Hernan Hernandez (CT)
Jeffrey E. Kiehl (MI)
Jesus G. Maesse (TX)
Jackson R. Olive (NY)
Thomas N. Pico (PA)
Paul Ramirez (OK)
Jon C. Thomas (MT)
Dennis M. Thyfault (UT)

The drivers were included in Docket No. FMCSA–2009–0242. Their exemptions are effective as of December 1, 2015, and will expire on December 1, 2017.

As of December 10, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 7 individuals, have satisfied the renewal conditions for obtaining an exemption from the rule prohibiting drivers with ITDM from driving CMVs in interstate commerce (73 FR 63042; 73 FR 75163; 80 FR 74196):

Herschel J. Crawford (AK)
James E. Gaines (NJ)
Allan D. Gralapp (IA)
Scott L. Halm (OH)
Jason P. Smith (GA)
Dean A. Sullivan (KY)
Lawrence W. Thomas (AR)

The drivers were included in Docket No. FMCSA–2008–0293. Their exemptions are effective as of December 10, 2015, and will expire on December 10, 2017.

As of December 17, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 60 individuals have satisfied the renewal conditions for obtaining an exemption from the rule prohibiting drivers with ITDM from driving CMVs in interstate commerce (78 FR 63298; 78 FR 76397; 80 FR 74196):

James L. Barnes (GA)
Toni Benfield (SC)
Peter J. Benz (FL)
Robert J. Berger, III (PA)
Daniel A. Bryan (PA)
Travis D. Clarkston (IN)
Romero Coleman (WI)
Michael L. Collins (WA)
Thomas S. Crawford (NY)
Stephen A. Cronin (FL)
Steven M. Dent (IA)
John S. Duvall (PA)
Robert S. Engel (IN)
Steven M. Ference (CT)
David W. Foster (TN)
Francis M. Garlach III (PA)
Allen D. Goddard (MO)
Brian L. Gregory (IL)
Alfonso Grijalva (CA)
Jason E. Jacobus (KY)
Bobby H. Johnson (GA)
Isadore Johnson Jr. (NY)
Jerry D. Joseph (OH)
Neal S. Kassebaum (TN)
Ervin A. Klocko, Jr.
Kevin E. Kneff (MO)
Margaret Lopez (NY)
John D. May (KS)
Kenneth B. Maynard, Jr. (NH)
Mike C. McDowell (TX)
Charles B. McKay (FL)
Norman C. Mertz (PA)
Travis F. Moon (GA)
Ronald Mooney (ID)
Martin J. Mostyn (OH)
Floyd P. Murray, Jr. (UT)
Steven D. Nowakowski (MD)
Gary D. Peters (NE)
Mark A. Pille (IA)
Stephen Plesz (CT)
Glen E. Pozernick (ID)
Jody R. Prause (MI)
Walter A. Przewrocki, Jr. (PA)
Andrew Quaglia (NY)
Stanley A. Sabin (KY)
Joseph F. Schafer, Jr. (PA)
Francis J. Schultz (PA)
Gary A. Sjokvist (ND)
Gary L. Snelling (AL)
Charles W. Sterling (WA)
Thomas L. Stoudnour (PA)
Matthew S. Thompson (PA)
Robin S. Travis (CO)
Richard A. Treadwell (PA)
James R. Troutman (PA)
William R. Van Gog (WA)
Charles S. Watson (IL)
William E. Wyant III (IA)
Mark A. Yurian (MT)
David M. Zanicky (PA)

The drivers were included in Docket No. FMCSA–2013–0187. Their exemptions are effective as of December 17, 2015, and will expire on December 17, 2017.

As of December 19, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 27 individuals have satisfied the renewal conditions for obtaining an exemption from the rule prohibiting drivers with ITDM from driving CMVs in interstate commerce (72 FR 62514; 72 FR 71996; 76 FR 64165; 76 FR 78718; 80 FR 74196):

Robin R. Baumgartner (WI)
Joseph K. Beasley (GA)
Toni A. Brown (AR)

Glenn W. Burke (NY)
David P. Charest (FL)
Charles Demesmin (NJ)
Derek E. Dowling (PA)
Donald E. Dupke, Jr. (IN)
Frederick E. Dyer (MA)
Donald N. Ellis (IN)
Tim E. Holmberg (WI)
Russell D. Jordan (ND)
Warren D. Knabe (NE)
Jackie L. Lane (TX)
Dennis L. Lorenz (IN)
Robert J. Malone (NJ)
Clayton A. Powers (CA)
Dennis R. Scheel (SD)
Michael K. Schulist (MI)
Andrew P. Shirk (MS)
Jerry L. Smit (MN)
Reese L. Sullivan (TX)
Randy J. Voss (IL)
Robert M. Walker (PA)
Robert E. Weiss (MI)
Robert A. Wild (OR)
Randy L. Wyant (OR)

The drivers were included in Docket No. FMCSA–2007–29035; FMCSA–2011–0277. Their exemptions are effective as of December 19, 2015 and will expire on December 19, 2017.

As of December 22, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 11 individuals have satisfied the renewal conditions for obtaining an exemption from the rule prohibiting drivers with ITDM from driving CMVs in interstate commerce (76 FR 66120; 76 FR 79759; 80 FR 74196):

Lennie D. Cook (OH)
David R. Cornelius (IL)
Scott A. Edwards (PA)
Ronald J. Ezell (MO)
Marcus M. Gagne (ME)
David P. Govero (MO)
Christopher A. Jones (WY)
Donald R. McClure, Jr. (PA)
Clyde G. Rishel, Jr. (PA)
Kurt Schneider (VT)
Douglas O. Sundby (ND)

The drivers were included in Docket No. FMCSA–2011–0278. Their exemptions are effective as of December 22, 2015, and will expire on December 22, 2017.

As of December 24, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 17 individuals have satisfied the renewal conditions for obtaining an exemption from the rule prohibiting drivers with ITDM from driving CMVs in interstate commerce (78 FR 64267; 78 FR 77784; 80 FR 74196):

John D. Clark (NJ)
David S. Monroe (KS)
William I. Harbolt (MT)
Mark G. Kahler (TX)
Larry W. Hines (NM)
Theeir L. Coleman (VA)
Michael W. McCrary (GA)
Jerry D. Zimmerman (ND)
James S. Tracy (ID)
John Baltich (PA)
Donald A. Spivey (TN)
Thomas B. Quirk (CT)
Steven M. Oliver (AZ)
Sean T. McMahon (WI)
David G. Shultz (PA)
Ryan L. Harrier (MI)
John E. Parker (KS)

The drivers were included in Docket No. FMCSA–2013–0184. Their exemptions are effective as of December 24, 2015, and will expire on December 24, 2017.

As of December 31, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following individual, Gary L. Crawford (OH), has satisfied the renewal conditions for obtaining an exemption from the rule prohibiting drivers with ITDM from driving CMVs in interstate commerce (78 FR 65034; 79 FR 3917; 80 FR 74196).

The driver was included in Docket No. FMCSA–2013–0190. The exemption is effective as of December 31, 2015, and will expire on December 31, 2017.

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31315, each exemption will be valid for two years from the effective date unless revoked earlier by FMCSA. The exemption will be revoked if the following occurs: (1) The person fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the exemption; (2) the exemption has resulted in a lower level of safety than was maintained prior to being granted; or (3) continuation of the exemption would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of 49 U.S.C. 31136 and 31315.

Issued on: November 8, 2016.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28216 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA–2016–0225]

Qualification of Drivers; Exemption Applications; Diabetes Mellitus

AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA).

ACTION: Notice of applications for exemptions; request for comments.

SUMMARY: FMCSA announces receipt of applications from 52 individuals for exemption from the prohibition against persons with insulin-treated diabetes mellitus (ITDM) operating commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) in interstate commerce. If granted, the exemptions would enable these individuals with ITDM to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments bearing the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Docket No. FMCSA–2016–0225 using any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001.
- *Hand Delivery:* West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.
- *Fax:* 1–202–493–2251.

Instructions: Each submission must include the Agency name and the docket numbers for this notice. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act heading below for further information.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* at any time or Room W12–140 on the ground level of the West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. If you want acknowledgment that we received your comments, please include a self-addressed, stamped envelope or postcard or print the acknowledgement page that appears after submitting comments on-line.

Privacy Act: In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to better inform its rulemaking process. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to *www.regulations.gov,* as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL–14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at *www.dot.gov/privacy.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Christine A. Hydock, Chief, Medical Programs Division, (202) 366–4001, *fmcsamedical@dot.gov,* FMCSA, Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room W64–113, Washington, DC 20590–0001. Office hours are 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA may grant an exemption from the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations for a 2-year period if it finds ''such exemption would likely achieve a level of safety that is equivalent to or greater than the level that would be achieved absent such exemption.'' The statute also allows the Agency to renew exemptions at the end of the 2-year period. The 52 individuals listed in this notice have recently requested such an exemption from the diabetes prohibition in 49 CFR 391.41(b) (3), which applies to drivers of CMVs in interstate commerce. Accordingly, the Agency will evaluate the qualifications of each applicant to determine whether granting the exemption will achieve the required level of safety mandated by statute.

II. Qualifications of Applicants

Rickey C. Alvis

Mr. Alvis, 74, has had ITDM since 2013. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Alvis understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Alvis meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from North Carolina.

Vicki L. Bailey

Ms. Bailey, 48, has had ITDM since 2014. Her endocrinologist examined her in 2016 and certified that she has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. Her endocrinologist certifies that Ms. Bailey understands diabetes management and monitoring has stable control of her diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Ms. Bailey meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). Her optometrist examined her in 2016 and certified that she does not have diabetic retinopathy. She holds an operator's license from Wisconsin.

Bennie L. Baker

Mr. Baker, 53, has had ITDM since 2013. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Baker understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Baker meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Texas.

Darious A. Ballou, III

Mr. Ballou, 44, has had ITDM since 1995. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Ballou understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Ballou meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from North Carolina.

Salauddin Baset

Mr. Baset, 55, has had ITDM since 2012. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Baset understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Baset meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Texas.

Emmett G. Bell

Mr. Bell, 53, has had ITDM since 2010. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Bell understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Bell meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class C CDL from Delaware.

Ralph G. Caffee

Mr. Caffee, 48, has had ITDM since 2015. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Caffee understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Caffee meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Pennsylvania.

James L. Calman

Mr. Calman, 72, has had ITDM since 2008. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting

in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Calman understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Calman meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Washington.

Michael J. Carey

Mr. Carey, 53, has had ITDM since 2016. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Carey understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Carey meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class B CDL from New York.

David L. Cheshire

Mr. Cheshire, 35, has had ITDM since 2016. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Cheshire understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Cheshire meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class C CDL from Michigan.

Allan S. Clugston

Mr. Clugston, 59, has had ITDM since 2016. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Clugston understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Clugston meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from New York.

Sean M. Collins

Mr. Collins, 30, has had ITDM since 2001. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Collins understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Collins meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Minnesota.

Jimmy D. Curtis

Mr. Curtis, 56, has had ITDM since 2015. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Curtis understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Curtis meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Texas.

Larry D. Dearth

Mr. Dearth, 55, has had ITDM since 2016. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Dearth understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Dearth meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Wisconsin.

Keith M. Dickerson

Mr. Dickerson, 62, has had ITDM since 2013. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Dickerson understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Dickerson meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Wisconsin.

James J. Dorio

Mr. Dorio, 66, has had ITDM since 2016. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Dorio understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Dorio meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined

him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class B CDL from Pennsylvania.

Virgil J. Erhardt

Mr. Erhardt, 74, has had ITDM since 2011. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Erhardt understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Erhardt meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Iowa.

Jimmy J. Fanelli

Mr. Fanelli, 58, has had ITDM since 2002. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Fanelli understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Fanelli meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Oregon.

Craig W. Ferris

Mr. Ferris, 58, has had ITDM since 2013. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Ferris understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Ferris meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Connecticut.

William L. Garrity

Mr. Garrity, 63, has had ITDM since 2012. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Garrity understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Garrity meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Connecticut.

Robin D. Gibson

Ms. Gibson, 47, has had ITDM since 2006. Her endocrinologist examined her in 2016 and certified that she has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. Her endocrinologist certifies that Ms. Gibson understands diabetes management and monitoring has stable control of her diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Ms. Gibson meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). Her optometrist examined her in 2016 and certified that she does not have diabetic retinopathy. She holds a Class B CDL from Washington, DC

Richard E. Harger

Mr. Harger, 66, has had ITDM since 2015. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Harger understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Harger meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Indiana.

Steven W. Harry

Mr. Harry, 52, has had ITDM since 2005. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Harry understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Harry meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class C CDL from Oregon.

Jay M. Hill

Mr. Hill, 52, has had ITDM since 2015. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Hill understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Hill meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Colorado.

Paul J. Horne

Mr. Horne, 44, has had ITDM since 2015. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Horne understands diabetes management and monitoring,

has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Horne meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from New York.

Eric C. Irwin

Mr. Irwin, 70, has had ITDM since 2016. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Irwin understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Irwin meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Illinois.

John E. Kerby

Mr. Kerby, 62, has had ITDM since 2015. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Kerby understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Kerby meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class B CDL from Nebraska.

Adam R. Kleist, Jr.

Mr. Kleist, 57, has had ITDM since 2015. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Kleist understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Kleist meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Oregon.

Jacob A. Knezevich

Mr. Knezevich, 50, has had ITDM since 2010. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Knezevich understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Knezevich meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from New Mexico.

Joel A. Kroll

Mr. Kroll, 40, has had ITDM since 2015. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Kroll understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Kroll meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from South Dakota.

Stephen T. Labay

Mr. Labay, 77, has had ITDM since 2010. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Labay understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Labay meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Ohio.

Edwin J. Lundquist

Mr. Lundquist, 26, has had ITDM since 2003. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Lundquist understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Lundquist meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Minnesota.

Brian A. McCarthy

Mr. McCarthy, 56, has had ITDM since 2010. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. McCarthy understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. McCarthy meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Georgia.

Daniel F. Mesiano

Mr. Mesiano, 42, has had ITDM since 2014. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the

assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Mesiano understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Mesiano meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Washington.

Lucjan Metkowski

Mr. Metkowski, 63, has had ITDM since 2010. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Metkowski understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Metkowski meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a chauffer's license from Michigan.

Stephen C. Mickle

Mr. Mickle, 36, has had ITDM since 1992. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Mickle understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Mickle meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Alabama.

Bryan K. Moreland

Mr. Moreland, 51, has had ITDM since 2016. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Moreland understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Moreland meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from California.

Tyler J. Oakland

Mr. Oakland, 27, has had ITDM since 1997. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Oakland understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Oakland meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Nebraska.

Yesenia Orozco Marquez

Ms. Orozco Marquez, 36, has had ITDM since 1996. Her endocrinologist examined her in 2016 and certified that she has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. Her endocrinologist certifies that Ms. Orozco Marquez understands diabetes management and monitoring has stable control of her diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Ms. Orozco Marquez meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). Her ophthalmologist examined her in 2016 and certified that she has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. She holds an operator's license from Oklahoma.

Salvador Pacheco, Jr.

Mr. Pacheco, 66, has had ITDM since 2015. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Pacheco understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Pacheco meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Texas.

Martin J. Reding

Mr. Reding, 55, has had ITDM since 2015. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Reding understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Reding meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Oregon.

Daniel A. Rivera

Mr. Rivera, 50, has had ITDM since 2006. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Rivera understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using

insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Rivera meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Florida.

Gerald J. Rosauer

Mr. Rosauer, 52, has had ITDM since 2013. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Rosauer understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Rosauer meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Wisconsin.

Chester G. Selfridge, Jr.

Mr. Selfridge, 65, has had ITDM since 2014. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Selfridge understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Selfridge meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Pennsylvania.

Paul A. Sheehan

Mr. Sheehan, 50, has had ITDM since 2016. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Sheehan understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Sheehan meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from Pennsylvania.

Brent L. Stroud

Mr. Stroud, 53, has had ITDM since 2015. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Stroud understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Stroud meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class B CDL from Illinois.

Michael W. Sutton

Mr. Sutton, 66, has had ITDM since 2010. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Sutton understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Sutton meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Washington.

Carlos Swepson, Sr.

Mr. Swepson, 47, has had ITDM since 2016. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Swepson understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Swepson meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class B CDL from Rhode Island.

Noah E. Thompson

Mr. Thompson, 24, has had ITDM since 1996. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Thompson understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely. Mr. Thompson meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His optometrist examined him in 2016 and certified that he does not have diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Alabama.

Thomas P. Verdon

Mr. Verdon, 52, has had ITDM since 2010. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Verdon understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely.

Mr. Verdon meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. He holds an operator's license from Pennsylvania.

Richard F. Wiltgen

Mr. Wiltgen, 73, has had ITDM since 2006. His endocrinologist examined him

in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Wiltgen understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely.

Mr. Wiltgen meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class B CDL from Iowa.

Richard C. Wright

Mr. Wright, 50, has had ITDM since 2000. His endocrinologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has had no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the last 5 years. His endocrinologist certifies that Mr. Wright understands diabetes management and monitoring, has stable control of his diabetes using insulin, and is able to drive a CMV safely.

Mr. Wright meets the requirements of the vision standard at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). His ophthalmologist examined him in 2016 and certified that he has stable nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. He holds a Class A CDL from New Jersey.

III. Request for Comments

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA requests public comment from all interested persons on the exemption petitions described in this notice. We will consider all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated in the date section of the notice.

FMCSA notes that section 4129 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users requires the Secretary to revise its diabetes exemption program established on September 3, 2003 (68 FR 52441).[1] The revision must provide for individual assessment of drivers with diabetes mellitus, and be consistent with the criteria described in section 4018 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (49 U.S.C. 31305).

Section 4129 requires: (1) elimination of the requirement for 3 years of experience operating CMVs while being treated with insulin; and (2) establishment of a specified minimum period of insulin use to demonstrate stable control of diabetes before being allowed to operate a CMV.

In response to section 4129, FMCSA made immediate revisions to the diabetes exemption program established by the September 3, 2003 notice. FMCSA discontinued use of the 3-year driving experience and fulfilled the requirements of section 4129 while continuing to ensure that operation of CMVs by drivers with ITDM will achieve the requisite level of safety required of all exemptions granted under 49 U.S.C.. 31136 (e).

Section 4129(d) also directed FMCSA to ensure that drivers of CMVs with ITDM are not held to a higher standard than other drivers, with the exception of limited operating, monitoring and medical requirements that are deemed medically necessary.

The FMCSA concluded that all of the operating, monitoring and medical requirements set out in the September 3, 2003 notice, except as modified, were in compliance with section 4129(d). Therefore, all of the requirements set out in the September 3, 2003 notice, except as modified by the notice in the **Federal Register** on November 8, 2005 (70 FR 67777), remain in effect.

IV. Submitting Comments

You may submit your comments and material online or by fax, mail, or hand delivery, but please use only one of these means. FMCSA recommends that you include your name and a mailing address, an email address, or a phone number in the body of your document so that FMCSA can contact you if there are questions regarding your submission.

To submit your comment online, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and in the search box insert the docket number FMCSA–2016–0225 and click the search button. When the new screen appears, click on the blue ''Comment Now!'' button on the right hand side of the page. On the new page, enter information required including the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation. If you submit your comments by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit comments by mail and would like to know that they reached the facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope.

We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. FMCSA may issue a final determination at any time after the close of the comment period.

V. Viewing Comments and Documents

To view comments, as well as any documents mentioned in this preamble, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and in the search box insert the docket number FMCSA–2016–0225 and click ''Search.'' Next, click ''Open Docket Folder'' and you will find all documents and comments related to this notice.

Issued on: November 16, 2016.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28217 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

[1] Section 4129(a) refers to the 2003 notice as a ''final rule.'' However, the 2003 notice did not issue a ''final rule'' but did establish the procedures and standards for issuing exemptions for drivers with ITDM.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[FMCSA Docket No. FMCSA–[2016–0221]

Qualification of Drivers; Exemption Applications; Diabetes Mellitus

AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of final disposition.

SUMMARY: FMCSA confirms its decision to exempt 39 individuals from its rule prohibiting persons with insulin-treated diabetes mellitus (ITDM) from operating commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) in interstate commerce. The exemptions enable these individuals to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

DATES: The exemptions were effective on November 1, 2016. The exemptions expire on November 1, 2018.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Christine A. Hydock, Chief, Medical Programs Division, (202) 366–4001, *fmcsamedical@dot.gov,* FMCSA, Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room W64–113, Washington, DC 20590–0001. Office hours are from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Electronic Access

You may see all the comments online through the Federal Document Management System (FDMS) at: *http://www.regulations.gov.*

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and/or Room W12–140 on the ground level of the West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Privacy Act: In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to better inform its rulemaking process. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to *www.regulations.gov,* as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL–14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at *www.dot.gov/privacy.*

II. Background

On September 30, 2016, FMCSA published a notice of receipt of Federal diabetes exemption applications from 39 individuals and requested comments from the public (81 FR 67425. The public comment period closed on October 31, 2016, and no comments were received.

FMCSA has evaluated the eligibility of the 39 applicants and determined that granting the exemptions to these individuals would achieve a level of safety equivalent to or greater than the level that would be achieved by complying with the current regulation 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3).

Diabetes Mellitus and Driving Experience of the Applicants

The Agency established the current requirement for diabetes in 1970 because several risk studies indicated that drivers with diabetes had a higher rate of crash involvement than the general population. The diabetes rule provides that ''A person is physically qualified to drive a commercial motor vehicle if that person has no established medical history or clinical diagnosis of diabetes mellitus currently requiring insulin for control'' (49 CFR 391.41(b)(3)).

FMCSA established its diabetes exemption program, based on the Agency's July 2000 study entitled ''A Report to Congress on the Feasibility of a Program to Qualify Individuals with Insulin-Treated Diabetes Mellitus to Operate in Interstate Commerce as Directed by the Transportation Act for the 21st Century.'' The report concluded that a safe and practicable protocol to allow some drivers with ITDM to operate CMVs is feasible. The September 3, 2003 (68 FR 52441), **Federal Register** notice in conjunction with the November 8, 2005 (70 FR 67777), **Federal Register** notice provides the current protocol for allowing such drivers to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

These 39 applicants have had ITDM over a range of 1 to 36 years. These applicants report no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness or seizure, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning symptoms, in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the past 5 years. In each case, an endocrinologist verified that the driver has demonstrated a willingness to properly monitor and manage his/her diabetes mellitus, received education related to diabetes management, and is on a stable insulin regimen. These drivers report no other disqualifying conditions, including diabetes-related complications. Each meets the vision requirement at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10).

The qualifications and medical condition of each applicant were stated and discussed in detail in the September 30, 2016, **Federal Register** notice and they will not be repeated in this notice.

III. Discussion of Comments

FMCSA received no comments in this proceeding.

IV. Basis for Exemption Determination

Under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA may grant an exemption from the diabetes requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3) if the exemption is likely to achieve an equivalent or greater level of safety than would be achieved without the exemption. The exemption allows the applicants to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

To evaluate the effect of these exemptions on safety, FMCSA considered medical reports about the applicants' ITDM and vision, and reviewed the treating endocrinologists' medical opinion related to the ability of the driver to safely operate a CMV while using insulin.

Consequently, FMCSA finds that in each case exempting these applicants from the diabetes requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3) is likely to achieve a level of safety equal to that existing without the exemption.

V. Conditions and Requirements

The terms and conditions of the exemption will be provided to the applicants in the exemption document and they include the following: (1) that each individual submit a quarterly monitoring checklist completed by the treating endocrinologist as well as an annual checklist with a comprehensive medical evaluation; (2) that each individual reports within 2 business days of occurrence, all episodes of severe hypoglycemia, significant complications, or inability to manage diabetes; also, any involvement in an accident or any other adverse event in a CMV or personal vehicle, whether or not it is related to an episode of hypoglycemia; (3) that each individual provide a copy of the ophthalmologist's or optometrist's report to the medical examiner at the time of the annual medical examination; and (4) that each individual provide a copy of the annual medical certification to the employer for retention in the driver's qualification file, or keep a copy in his/her driver's qualification file if he/she is self-employed. The driver must also have a copy of the certification when driving, for presentation to a duly authorized Federal, State, or local enforcement official.

VI. Conclusion

Based upon its evaluation of the 39 exemption applications, FMCSA exempts the following drivers from the diabetes requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3), subject to the requirements cited above 49 CFR 391.64(b):

Thomas A. Alcon (NM)
John K. Bottkol (FL)
Donald J. Brinkman (CO)
John D. Cline (AZ)
Paul H. Coleman, Jr. (PA)
John D. Colpitts (NC)
Salvatore A. Corrao (MA)
Patrick R. Dawson (NY)
Kevin A. Dietz (IL)
Steven M. Dunham (NH)
James H. Elliott (OH)
Frank A. W. Emrath (WI)
Kirk M. Faria (MA)
Richard L. Farris (WA)
Alex J. Gerena-Santiago (PA)
Matthew D. Homan (MI)
Donna J. Jones (IL)
Jamison G. Land (VA)
Richard H. Leger (LA)
Solomon J. Mayfield (GA)
Calvin W. McDaniel (MI)
Clay A. McDaniel (MO)
Steven D. Mellott (OH)
Sean R. T. Murray (MN)
Chris A. Perez (IL)
Luther S. Pickell (KS)
Michael K. Piirto (IN)
William A. Pope, Jr. (PA)
Jeffrey E. Prevost (ME)
Eric W. Ransom (WY)
Phillip A. Rentschler (IN)
Steven L. Saddler (FL)
Allan C. Smith (IA)
Craig A. Squib (PA)
Timothy B. Suck (MI)
Tyrel J. Turner (ID)

Daniel R. Violette (OR)
Robert C. Williams (OR)
David W. Wiltrout (PA)

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315 each exemption is valid for two years unless revoked earlier by FMCSA. The exemption will be revoked if the following occurs: (1) the person fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the exemption; (2) the exemption has resulted in a lower level of safety than was maintained before it was granted; or (3) continuation of the exemption would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315. If the exemption is still effective at the end of the 2-year period, the person may apply to FMCSA for a renewal under procedures in effect at that time.

Issued on: November 16, 2016.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28215 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA–1999–5578; FMCSA–2001–9258; FMCSA–2001–10578; FMCSA–2002–11426; FMCSA–2003–14223; FMCSA–2003–15892; FMCSA–2003–16241; FMCSA–2005–21711; FMCSA–2005–22194; FMCSA–2007–27897; FMCSA–2007–29019; FMCSA–2009–0121; FMCSA–2009–0154; FMCSA–2009–0206; FMCSA–2011–0092; FMCSA–2011–0142; FMCSA–2011–0275; FMCSA–2011–0276; FMCSA–2011–26690; FMCSA–2013–0022; FMCSA–2013–0166; FMCSA–2013–0169]

Qualification of Drivers; Exemption Applications; Vision

AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of final disposition.

SUMMARY: FMCSA confirms its decision to renew exemptions for 99 individuals from the vision requirement in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs) for interstate commercial motor vehicle (CMV) drivers. The exemptions enable these individuals to continue to operate CMVs in interstate commerce without meeting the vision requirement in one eye.

DATES: Each group of renewed exemptions were effective on the dates stated in the discussions below and will expire on the dates stated in the discussions below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Christine A. Hydock, Chief, Medical Programs Division, 202–366–4001, *fmcsamedical@dot.gov,* FMCSA, Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room W64–224, Washington, DC 20590–0001. Office hours are from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. If you have questions regarding viewing or submitting material to the docket, contact Docket Services, telephone (202) 366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Electronic Access

You may see all the comments online through the Federal Document Management System (FDMS) at: *http://www.regulations.gov.*

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments, go to *http//www.regulations.gov* and/or Room W12–140 on the ground level of the West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Privacy Act: In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to better inform its rulemaking process. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to *http://www.regulations.gov,* as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL–14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at *http://www.dot.gov/privacy.*

II. Background

On November 2, 2015, FMCSA published a notice announcing its decision to renew exemptions for 99 individuals from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10) to operate a CMV in interstate commerce and requested comments from the public (80 FR 67481). The public comment period ended on December 2, 2015, and no comments were received.

As stated in the previous notice, FMCSA has evaluated the eligibility of these applicants and determined that renewing these exemptions would achieve a level of safety equivalent to or greater than the level that would be achieved by complying with the current regulation 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10).

The physical qualification standard for drivers regarding vision found in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10) states that a person is physically qualified to driver a CMV if that person:

> Has distant visual acuity of at least 20/40 (Snellen) in each eye without corrective lenses or visual acuity separately corrected to 20/40 (Snellen) or better with corrective lenses, distant binocular acuity of a least 20/40 (Snellen) in both eyes with or without corrective lenses, field of vision of at least 70° in the horizontal meridian in each eye, and the ability to recognize the colors of traffic signals and devices showing red, green, and amber.

III. Discussion of Comments

FMCSA received no comments in this preceding.

VI. Conclusion

Based upon its evaluation of the 99 renewal exemption applications and comments received, FMCSA confirms its' decision to exempt the following drivers from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41 (b)(10), subject to the requirements cited above:

As of December 5, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 17 individuals have satisfied the conditions for obtaining a renewed exemption from the vision requirements (66 FR 17743; 66 FR 33990; 68 FR 10301; 68 FR 19596; 68 FR 35772; 68 FR 52811; 68 FR 61860; 70 FR 25878; 70 FR 33937; 70 FR 61165; 72 FR 32705; 72 FR 46261; 72 FR 54972; 72 FR 58359; 72 FR 58362; 72 FR 67344; 74 FR 26461; 74 FR 26464; 74 FR 34630; 74 FR 43217; 74 FR 53581; 74 FR 57551; 74 FR 57553; 76 FR 25766; 76 FR 34135; 76 FR 37168; 76 FR 37885; 76 FR 54530; 76 FR 64169; 76 FR 64171; 76 FR 66123; 76 FR 70212; 76 FR 75943; 78 FR 12815; 78 FR 22602; 78 FR 62935; 78 FR 65032; 78 FR 68137; 78 FR 76395; 78 FR 77782; 78 FR 78477; 80 FR 67481):

Daniel F. Albers (CA)
Keith Bell (FL)
Kevin G. Clem (SD)
David N. Cleveland (ME)
David J. Comeaux (LA)
Tommy R. Crouse (LA)
Albion C. Doe, Sr. (NH)
Mark D. Kraft (IL)
Rocky J. Lachney (LA)
Chase L. Larson (WA)
Herman G. Lovell (OR)
Danny C. Pope (IL)
James B. Prunty (WV)
Rick E. Smith (IL)
Robert E. Smith (CT)
Fred L. Stotts (OK)
Randell K. Tyler (AL)

The drivers were included in one of the following dockets: Docket Nos. FMCSA–2001–9258; FMCSA–2003–14223; FMCSA–2003–15892; FMCSA–2007–27897; FMCSA–2007–29019; FMCSA–2009–0121; FMCSA–2009–0206; FMCSA–2011–0092; FMCSA–2011–26690; FMCSA–2013–0022; FMCSA–2013–0166. Their exemptions are effective as of December 5, 2015 and will expire on December 5, 2017.

As of December 6, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 7 individuals have

satisfied the conditions for obtaining a renewed exemption from the vision requirements (70 FR 57353; 70 FR 72689; 72 FR 62897; 74 FR 43217; 74 FR 57551; 74 FR 60021; 76 FR 70210; 78 FR 66099; 80 FR 67481):

John E. Bell (AZ)
Henry L. Chastain (GA)
Thomas R. Crocker (SC)
Thomas C. Meadows (NC)
David A. Morris (TX)
Richard P. Stanley (MA)
Scott A. Tetter (IL)

The drivers were included in one of the following dockets: Docket No. FMCSA–2005–22194; FMCSA–2009–0206. Their exemptions are effective as of December 6, 2015, and will expire on December 6, 2017.

As of December 13, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following individual, Bernard T. Gillette (PA), has satisfied the conditions for obtaining a renewed exemption from the vision requirements (78 FR 62935; 78 FR 76395; 80 FR 67481).

This driver was included in the following docket: Docket No. FMCSA–2013–0166. The exemption is effective as of December 13, 2015, and will expire on December 13, 2017.

As of December 17, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 8 individuals have satisfied the conditions for obtaining a renewed exemption from the vision requirements (78 FR 62935; 78 FR 76395; 80 FR 67481):

Herbert R. Benner (ME)
Steven M. Hoover (IL)
Lewis J. Johnson (PA)
Michael E. Miles (IL)
Carlos A. Osollo (NM)
Henry D. Smith (NC)
Kolby W. Strickland (WA)
Cesar Villa (NM)

The drivers were included in one of the following dockets: Docket No. FMCSA–2013–0166. Their exemptions are effective as of December 17, 2015, and will expire on December 17, 2017.

As of December 22, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 5 individuals have satisfied the conditions for obtaining a renewed exemption from the vision requirements (72 FR 58362; 72 FR 67344; 74 FR 57553; 76 FR 49528; 76 FR 61143; 76 FR 64164; 76 FR 67248; 76 FR 70212; 76 FR 75940; 76 FR 79761; 78 FR 67460; 80 FR 67481):

Frank E. Johnson, Jr. (FL)
Todd A. McBrain (OK)
Robert E. Morgan, Jr. (GA)
David M. Taylor (MO)
James D. Zimmer (OH)

The drivers were included in one of the following dockets: Docket No. FMCSA–2007–29019; FMCSA–2011–0142; FMCSA–2011–0275; FMCSA–2011–0276. Their exemptions are effective as of December 22, 2015, and will expire on December 22, 2017.

As of December 24, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 38 individuals have satisfied the conditions for obtaining a renewed exemption from the vision requirements (78 FR 64274; 78 FR 77778; 80 FR 67481):

Lawrence A. Angle (MO)
Ernest J. Bachman (PA)
Wayne Barker (OK)
Eugene R. Briggs (MI)
Matthew S. Burns (OH)
Ryan J. Burnworth (MO)
Michael D. Champion (VT)
Kevin J. Cobb (PA)
Lee A. DeHaan (SD)
Bradley R. Dishman (KY)
Matthew Eck (PA)
Christopher T. Faber (FL)
Gregory K. Frazier (GA)
John E. Gannon, Jr. (NV)
Thomas G. Gholston (MS)
David B. Jones (FL)
Thomas L. Kitchen (VA)
David G. Lamborn (ND)
Luther D. Long (GA)
George Malivuk (WI)
Stephen R. Marshall (MS)
Edgar H. Meraz (NM)
Chad A. Miller (IA)
William L. Paschall (MD)
Kerry R. Powers (IN)
Glennis R. Reynolds (KY)
Noel S. Robbins (PA)
Joseph Saladino (FL)
Raymond C. Schultz (OH)
Eugene D. Self, Jr.
James A. Shepard (NY)
Darren B. Shields (NV)
Roye T. Skelton (MS)
Mark P. Thiboutot (NH)
Robert Thomas (PA)
Herman D. Truewell (FL)
Donald L. Urmston (OH)
Janusz K. Wis (IL)

The drivers were included in one of the following dockets: Docket No. FMCSA–2013–0169. Their exemptions are effective as of December 24, 2015 and will expire on December 24, 2017.

As of December 27, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 17 individuals have satisfied the conditions for obtaining a renewed exemption from the vision requirements (64 FR 27027; 64 FR 51568; 66 FR 53826; 66 FR 63289; 66 FR 66966; 67 FR 10471; 67 FR 19798; 68 FR 64944; 68 FR 69434; 69 FR 19611; 70 FR 48797; 70 FR 53412; 70 FR 57353; 70 FR 61493; 70 FR 67776; 70 FR 72689; 70 FR 74102; 72 FR 39879; 72 FR 52422; 74 FR 37295; 74 FR 48343; 74 FR 49069; 74 FR 60021; 76 FR 75942; 78 FR 67452; 80 FR 67481):

Anthony Brandano (MA)
Stanley E. Elliott (UT)
Elmer E. Gockley (PA)
Danny R. Gray (OK)
Glenn T. Hehner (KY)
Vladmir M. Kats (NC)
Alfred Keehn (AZ)
Randall B. Laminack (TX)
Robert W. Lantis (MT)
Jerry J. Lord (PA)
Ronald S. Mallory (OK)
Eldon Miles (IN)
Neal A. Richard (LA)
Rene R. Trachsel (OR)
Stanley W. Tyler, Jr. (NC)
Kendle F. Waggle, Jr. (IN)
DeWayne Washington (NC)

The drivers were included in one of the following dockets: Docket No. FMCSA–1999–5578; FMCSA–2001–10578; FMCSA–2002–11426; FMCSA–2005–21711; FMCSA–2005–22194; FMCSA–2007–27897; FMCSA–2009–0154. Their exemptions are effective as of December 27, 2015, and will expire on December 27, 2017.

As of December 31, 2015, and in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, the following 6 individuals have satisfied the conditions for obtaining a renewed exemption from the vision requirements (66 FR 53826; 66 FR 66966; 68 FR 61857; 68 FR 69434; 68 FR 75715; 70 FR 74102; 71 FR 646; 72 FR 71993; 72 FR 71998; 74 FR 65846; 76 FR 78729; 78 FR 67454; 78 FR 67462; 79 FR 4803; 80 FR 67481):

Martiniano L. Espinosa (FL)
Dustin K. Heimbach (PA)
James G. LaBair (MI)
Lonnie Lomax, Jr. (IL)
Eugene C. Murphy (FL)
John H. Voigts (AZ)

The drivers were included in one of the following dockets: Docket No. FMCSA–2001–10578; FMCSA–2003–16241. Their exemptions are effective as of December 31, 2015, and will expire on December 31, 2017.

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31315, each exemption will be valid for two years from the effective date unless revoked earlier by FMCSA. The exemption will be revoked if the following occurs: (1) The person fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the exemption; (2) the exemption has resulted in a lower level of safety than was maintained prior to being granted; or (3) continuation of the exemption would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of 49 U.S.C. 31136 and 31315.

Issued on: November 16, 2016.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28228 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[FMCSA Docket No. FMCSA–[2016–0218]

Qualification of Drivers; Exemption Applications; Diabetes Mellitus

AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), DOT

ACTION: Notice of final disposition.

SUMMARY: FMCSA confirms its decision to exempt 46 individuals from its rule prohibiting persons with insulin-treated diabetes mellitus (ITDM) from operating commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) in interstate commerce. The exemptions enable these individuals to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

DATES: The exemptions were effective on September 8, 2016. The exemptions expire on September 8, 2018.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Christine A. Hydock, Chief, Medical Programs Division, (202) 366–4001, *fmcsamedical@dot.gov,* FMCSA, Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room W64–113, Washington, DC 20590–0001. Office hours are from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Electronic Access

You may see all the comments online through the Federal Document Management System (FDMS) at: *http://www.regulations.gov.*

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and/or Room W12–140 on the ground level of the West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Privacy Act: In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to better inform its rulemaking process. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to *www.regulations.gov,* as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL–14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at *www.dot.gov/privacy.*

II. Background

On August 8, 2016, FMCSA published a notice of receipt of Federal diabetes exemption applications from 46 individuals and requested comments from the public (81 FR 52505. The public comment period closed on September 7, 2016, and no comments were received.

FMCSA has evaluated the eligibility of the 46 applicants and determined that granting the exemptions to these individuals would achieve a level of safety equivalent to or greater than the level that would be achieved by complying with the current regulation 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3).

Diabetes Mellitus and Driving Experience of the Applicants

The Agency established the current requirement for diabetes in 1970 because several risk studies indicated that drivers with diabetes had a higher rate of crash involvement than the general population. The diabetes rule provides that ''A person is physically qualified to drive a commercial motor vehicle if that person has no established medical history or clinical diagnosis of diabetes mellitus currently requiring insulin for control'' (49 CFR 391.41(b)(3)).

FMCSA established its diabetes exemption program, based on the Agency's July 2000 study entitled ''A Report to Congress on the Feasibility of a Program to Qualify Individuals with Insulin-Treated Diabetes Mellitus to Operate in Interstate Commerce as Directed by the Transportation Act for the 21st Century.'' The report concluded that a safe and practicable protocol to allow some drivers with ITDM to operate CMVs is feasible. The September 3, 2003 (68 FR 52441), **Federal Register** notice in conjunction with the November 8, 2005 (70 FR 67777), **Federal Register** notice provides the current protocol for allowing such drivers to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

These 46 applicants have had ITDM over a range of 1 to 24 years. These applicants report no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness or seizure, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning symptoms, in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the past 5 years. In each case, an endocrinologist verified that the driver has demonstrated a willingness to properly monitor and manage his/her diabetes mellitus, received education related to diabetes management, and is on a stable insulin regimen. These drivers report no other disqualifying conditions, including diabetes-related complications. Each meets the vision requirement at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10).

The qualifications and medical condition of each applicant were stated and discussed in detail in the August 8, 2016, **Federal Register** notice and they will not be repeated in this notice.

III. Discussion of Comments

FMCSA received no comments in this proceeding.

IV. Basis for Exemption Determination

Under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA may grant an exemption from the diabetes requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3) if the exemption is likely to achieve an equivalent or greater level of safety than would be achieved without the exemption. The exemption allows the applicants to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

To evaluate the effect of these exemptions on safety, FMCSA considered medical reports about the applicants' ITDM and vision, and reviewed the treating endocrinologists' medical opinion related to the ability of the driver to safely operate a CMV while using insulin.

Consequently, FMCSA finds that in each case exempting these applicants from the diabetes requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3) is likely to achieve a level of safety equal to that existing without the exemption.

V. Conditions and Requirements

The terms and conditions of the exemption will be provided to the applicants in the exemption document and they include the following: (1) That each individual submit a quarterly monitoring checklist completed by the treating endocrinologist as well as an annual checklist with a comprehensive medical evaluation; (2) that each individual reports within 2 business days of occurrence, all episodes of severe hypoglycemia, significant complications, or inability to manage diabetes; also, any involvement in an accident or any other adverse event in a CMV or personal vehicle, whether or not it is related to an episode of hypoglycemia; (3) that each individual provide a copy of the ophthalmologist's or optometrist's report to the medical examiner at the time of the annual medical examination; and (4) that each individual provide a copy of the annual medical certification to the employer for retention in the driver's qualification file, or keep a copy in his/her driver's qualification file if he/she is self-

employed. The driver must also have a copy of the certification when driving, for presentation to a duly authorized Federal, State, or local enforcement official.

VI. Conclusion

Based upon its evaluation of the 46 exemption applications, FMCSA exempts the following drivers from the diabetes requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10), subject to the requirements cited above 49 CFR 391.64(b)):

Robert C. Bartleson (WI)
Jeffrey H. Blankenhorn (OR)
Melvin J. Bowers (SC)
Howard A. Cambridge (PA)
Donald J. Charette (CT)
Robert C. Davis (PA)
Matthew P. Delaney (MA)
Scot D. Dragon (CT)
Patrick J. Flynn (IA)
Tyson E. Frazier (NH)
Christopher G. Furlong (TN)
Austin G. Granby (IL)
Charles R. Hurston (LA)
James E. Ingles (KY)
Lovie L. Ivory (AL)
Rodrigo Jackson (TX)
Keith L. Jaynes (ME)
James J. Jopp (MN)
Evan D. Keese (TN)
Michael J. Kelly (NY)
Mark A. Lewis (SD)
Mitchell R. Loge (CO)
Lloyd I. Lynn (IA)
Vincent Marino (WV)
Pedro Mata, Jr. (MI)
Dean A. McCoy (IA)
Bruce A. Miller (IA)
William C. Mirabello, III (MD)
Eric J. O'Neal (MD)
Eugene E. Patterson, III (TX)
Luis A. Santiago (CT)
Connor J. Sarmiento (MT)
Michael G. Schleining (WA)
Ryan A. Scopino (ME)
Robert W. Shafer (SD)
Francisco Simental, Jr. (TX)
Ronald C. Snide (NY)
Terry J. Southards (KS)
Timothy T. Stanton (MN)
Eric W. Thomason (KS)
Grady R. Thompson (OK)
Glenn M. Turley (WV)
John V. Wallace (MA)
Randy R. Wallace (MO)
Merle L. Weyer (SD)
Norman D. Zamarche (UT)

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315 each exemption is valid for two years unless revoked earlier by FMCSA. The exemption will be revoked if the following occurs: (1) The person fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the exemption; (2) the exemption has resulted in a lower level of safety than was maintained before it was granted; or (3) continuation of the exemption would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315. If the exemption is still effective at the end of the 2-year period, the person may apply to FMCSA for a renewal under procedures in effect at that time.

Issued on: November 16, 2016.

Larry W. Minor,

Associate Administrator for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2016–28219 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket No. MARAD–2016–0119]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws: Vessel ROCK TIME; Invitation for Public Comments

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: As authorized by 46 U.S.C. 12121, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below.

DATES: Submit comments on or before December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2016–0119. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov.* All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., E.T., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at *http://www.regulations.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bianca Carr, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room W23–453, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202–366–9309, Email *Bianca.carr@dot.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel ROCK TIME is:

Intended Commercial Use of Vessel: Snorkel tours.

Geographic Region: ''Florida''.

The complete application is given in DOT docket MARAD–2016–0119 at *http://www.regulations.gov.* Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with 46 U.S.C. 12121 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388, that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388.

Privacy Act

Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477–78).

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

Dated: November 10, 2016.

T. Mitchell Hudson, Jr.,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 2016–28213 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket No. MARAD–2016–0118]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws: Vessel HO'ONANEA; Invitation for Public Comments

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the

Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below.

DATES: Submit comments on or before December 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2016–0118. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov.* All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., E.T., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at *http://www.regulations.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bianca Carr, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room W23–453, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202–366–9309, Email *Bianca.carr@dot.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel HO'ONANEA is:

Intended Commercial Use of Vessel: Passenger charters: Snorkeling, Scuba, Whale watching, Sport fishing (not commercial).

Geographic Region: ''Hawaii.''

The complete application is given in DOT docket MARAD–2016–0118 at *http://www.regulations.gov.* Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with 46 U.S.C. 12121 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388, that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388.

Privacy Act

Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477–78).

Dated: November 10, 2016.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

T. Mitchell Hudson, Jr.,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 2016–28214 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2016–0120]

Reports, Forms, and Recordkeeping Requirements: Agency Information Collection Activity

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Request for public comment on a proposed collection of information.

SUMMARY: Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, it must receive approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Under procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before seeking OMB approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatements of previously approved collections. This document describes one collection of information for which NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted by January 23, 2017.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by Docket No. NHTSA–2016–0120 through one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail or Hand Delivery:* Docket Management Facility, US Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Telephone: 202–366–9826.
- *Fax:* 202–493–2251.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number for this proposed collection of information. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy heading below.

Privacy Act: Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, *etc.*). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477–78) or you may visit *http://www.dot.gov/privacy.html* .

Docket: For access to the docket to read comments received, go to *http://www.regulations.gov,* or the street address listed above. Follow the online instructions for accessing the dockets.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: For access to background documents, contact Eric Traube, Office of Vehicle Safety Research, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, 20590; Telephone: 202–366–5673.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before an agency submits a proposed collection of information to OMB for approval, it must first publish a document in the **Federal Register** providing a 60-day comment period and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information. OMB has promulgated regulations describing what must be included in such a document. Under OMB's regulation (at 5 CFR 1320.8(d)), an agency must ask for public comment on the following:

(i) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) How to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected;

(iv) How to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use

of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.* permitting electronic submission of responses.

The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

In compliance with these requirements, NHTSA asks for public comments on the following proposed collection of information for which the agency is seeking approval from OMB:

OMB Control Number: Not assigned.

Title: Driver Alcohol Detection System for Safety—Field Operational Test.

Form Numbers: None.

Type of Review: New Information Collection.

Abstract: NHTSA and the Automotive Coalition for Traffic Safety (ACTS) began research efforts in February 2008 to try to find potential in-vehicle approaches to address the problem of alcohol-impaired driving. Members of ACTS comprise motor vehicle manufacturers representing approximately 99 percent of light vehicle sales in the U.S. This cooperative research partnership, known as the Driver Alcohol Detection System for Safety (DADSS) Program, is exploring the feasibility, potential benefits of, and public policy challenges associated with a more widespread use of non-invasive, in-vehicle technology to prevent alcohol-impaired driving. In a 2008 cooperative agreement, NHTSA and ACTS outlined a research program to assess the state of detection technologies that are capable of measuring blood alcohol concentration (BAC) or Breath Alcohol Concentration (BrAC) and to support the creation and testing of prototypes and subsequent hardware that could be installed in vehicles. As part of the research program, NHTSA and ACTS will build research vehicles that include both a breath- and touch-based sensor in order to evaluate the potential implementation and integration of both breath- and touch-based sensor technologies.

This collection, which will begin on September 1, 2017, pertains to a field operational test (FOT) of both the breath- and touch-based research vehicles developed under this program. A key to the establishment of effective, unobtrusive in-vehicle alcohol detection systems is an understanding of real-world use of the technology. This FOT will allow NHTSA and ACTS to evaluate the functionality of these research vehicles under varying operating conditions by having study participants drive DADSS research vehicles through preset routes. The research vehicles are the first vehicles of this kind, and will be used to gather data regarding sensor validity and reliability. This study will provide a greater understanding of drivers using the technology under varying environmental conditions. Data collected from the DADSS FOT will be used to further refine the DADSS Performance Specifications and evaluate system performance.

Description of the Need for the Information and Proposed Use of the Information: The collection of information consists of: (1) An eligibility interview (2) a multi-day FOT of DADSS sensors, and (3) a post-test day questionnaire.

The information to be collected will be used for the following purposes:

- *Eligibility interview* will be used to obtain self-reported eligibility information, including health, driving/criminal record, and drinking behavior, that participants must meet to qualify for participation in this study (*e.g.,* must hold valid driver's license). Participants will also be asked to provide their height and weight.
- *The DADSS FOT* will be used to establish effective non-invasive, in-vehicle alcohol detection systems through an understanding of the real-world use of the technology. Breath-and touch-based sensor data along with video data (for in-vehicle validation of sensor data) collected from the DADSS FOT will be used to further refine the DADSS Performance Specifications and evaluate subsystem/sensor performance. This study will provide a greater understanding of drivers using the technology under varying environmental conditions.
- *Post-test day questionnaire(s)* will be used to get information about any technical difficulties or issues drivers may have had with the DADSS–FOT vehicles at the end of each test day.
- *Participants must:*

○ Be at least 21 years of age
○ Hold a valid U.S. or Canadian driver's license
○ Have no more than one (1) driving infraction and/or conviction on their driving record for the previous three years
○ Be free of any criminal conviction in their past including criminal driving offenses
○ Be willing to work at least five (5) days per week for 12 consecutive weeks during a three-month data collection cycle
○ Meet health criteria:
i. Cannot have a substance abuse condition including alcoholism
ii. Cannot have a history of neck or back conditions which still limit their ability to participate in certain activities.
iii. Cannot have a history of brain damage from stroke, tumor, head injury, recent concussion, or disease or infection of the brain
iv. Cannot have a current heart condition which limits their ability to participate in certain activities
v. Cannot have current uncontrolled respiratory disorders or disorders requiring oxygen
i. Cannot have had epileptic seizures or lapses of consciousness within the last 12 months
ii. Cannot have chronic migraines or tension headaches (no more than one per month during the past 12 months).
iii. Cannot have current problems with motion sickness, inner ear problems, dizziness, vertigo, or balance problems
iv. Cannot have uncontrolled diabetes (have they been recently diagnosed or have they been hospitalized for this condition, or any changes in their insulin prescription during the past 3 months)
v. Must not have had any major surgery within the past 6 months (including eye procedures).
vi. Cannot currently be taking any medications or supplements that may interfere with driving ability (*i.e.,* cause drowsiness or impair motor abilities).
vii. Must not be pregnant or planning to become pregnant.
○ Have normal (or corrected-to-normal) hearing and vision.
○ Self-report that they are able to read, write, speak and understand English.
○ Be excluded if anyone in their household works in or is retired from any of the following businesses, occupations, or industries, which may constitute a conflict of interest with the DADSS–FOT:
i. The police force or another law enforcement agency, working as a police officer, corrections officer, or probation officer
ii. A newspaper, magazine, radio or television station, or related Web site or online news site
iii. An advertising, marketing, or public relations agency
iv. A market or public opinion research company
v. The automobile or automotive industry
vi. Liquor sales or hospitality, such as bartending

vii. Law, such as a lawyer or attorney, or working at a law firm, or in the legal profession

viii. The federal, state, or county Departments of Transportation

○ Be excluded if anyone in their immediate family has been a victim of drunk driving, or if they personally know someone that has been a victim.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 600.

Estimated Time per Response: Completion of the eligibility interview is expected to take 15 minutes. Following the eligibility/demographic interview, 480 of the 600 initial participants are expected to attend a one- (1) hour orientation session and participate in the FOT. On a given test day, the DADSS FOT will require four (4) hours per day, including a post-test day interview.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: Fifteen (15) minutes for each ineligible participant and 241 hours per participant (115,830 hours total).

Estimated Frequency: One (1) time for the eligibility interview and 60 times (days) for the DADSS–FOT and post-test day interviews.

TABLE 1—ESTIMATED BURDEN HOURS

Instrument	Number of individuals	Frequency of responses	Number of questions	Estimated individual burden	Total estimated burden hours	Total cost of burden hours over 24-month study period
Eligibility/Demographic Interview.	600	1	32	15 min	150 hr	* $1,087.50
Orientation	480	1	N/A	1 hr	480	** 9,360.00
FOT including post-test questions.	480	650 tests per participant.	8 (post-test-day questions).	4 hr/day for 60 days.	115,200	** 2,246,400.00
TOTAL					115,830 hr	2,258,685.00

* Interviewees will not be compensated for the eligibility/demographic interview, but we calculate the estimated burden hour cost to the public using the prevailing Federal minimum wage rate of $7.25/hour.

** Participants in the FOT will be compensated $19.50 per hour for their time in the orientation and the FOT study and this rate was used to calculate their burden hours.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44. U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended; 5 CFR part 1320; and 49 CFR 1.95.

Nathaniel Beuse,

Associate Administrator for Vehicle Safety Research.

[FR Doc. 2016–28151 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2016–0098; Notice 2]

General Motors LLC, Withdrawal of Petition To Amend Takata DIR Schedule

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice of petition mootness.

SUMMARY: General Motors, LLC (GM) petitioned the Agency to alter the Part 573 defect information report (DIR) filing schedule set forth in paragraph 14 of the May 4, 2016 Amendment to November 3, 2015 Consent Order between NHTSA and TK Holdings Inc. (Takata). More specifically, GM requested that NHTSA modify the DIR schedule with respect to certain GM-branded motor vehicles to defer the filing date from December 31, 2016 to December 31, 2017. GM has since withdrawn this petition.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Mykytiuk, Office of the Chief Counsel, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, at (202) 366–2992.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On May 4, 2016, NHTSA issued, and Takata agreed to, an Amendment to the November 3, 2015 Consent Order (the ''Amendment''), under which Takata is bound to declare a defect in all frontal driver and passenger inflators that contain a phase-stabilized ammonium nitrate (PSAN)-based propellant and do not contain a moisture-absorbing desiccant. Such defect declarations are to be made on a rolling basis. *See* Amendment at ¶ 14. Takata timely submitted the first scheduled DIR on May 16, 2016. *See* Recall Nos. 16E–042, 16E–043, and 16E–044. The next scheduled DIR is due to be filed by Takata on December 31, 2016. That second DIR is expected to include passenger inflators installed as original equipment on certain motor vehicles manufactured by GM (the ''covered passenger inflators''), as well as inflators installed as original equipment on motor vehicles manufactured by a number of other automakers, which are not at issue here. The Takata filing of the second DIR will trigger GM's obligation to file a DIR for affected GM vehicles. *See* 49 CFR part 573; Amendment at ¶ 16; November 3, 2015 Coordinated Remedy Order at ¶ 46.[1]

Paragraph 17 of the Amendment sets forth the following procedure under which the DIR schedule may be modified or amended:

> Based on the presentation of additional test data, analysis, or other relevant and appropriate evidence, by Takata, an automobile manufacturer, or any other credible source, NHTSA may, after consultation with Takata, alter the schedule set forth in Paragraph 14 to modify or amend a DIR or to defer certain inflator types or vehicles, or a portion thereof, to a later DIR filing date. Any such evidence must be submitted to NHTSA no later than one-hundred-twenty (120) days before the relevant DIR filing date. This paragraph applies only to the DIRs scheduled to be issued on or after December 31, 2016 under the schedule established by Paragraph 14 of this Amendment.

On July 22, 2016, NHTSA issued Enforcement Guidance Bulletin 2016–03 to inform the public of the process and procedure the Agency had established in connection with paragraph 17, as well as the standards and criteria that would guide Agency decision-making. *See* 81 FR 47854. Therein, the Agency stated that it may grant a petition to modify or amend the DIR schedule ''if

[1] Under 49 CFR 573.5(a), a vehicle manufacturer is responsible for any safety-related defect determined to exist in any item of original equipment.

the Agency finds that the written data, information, and arguments regarding the petition and other available information demonstrate, by a preponderance of the evidence, that either: (i) There has not yet been, nor will be for some period of years in the future, sufficient propellant degradation to render the inflators contained in the particular class of vehicles unreasonably dangerous in terms of susceptibility to rupture; or (ii) the service life expectancy of the inflators installed in the particular class of vehicles is sufficiently long that they will not pose an unreasonable risk to motor vehicle safety if recalled at a later date.'' *Id.* at 47856. The Agency also clarified that the paragraph 17 petition process could not be used to expedite or expand the DIR schedule, or to eliminate a population of vehicles from the recall altogether. *Id.*

On September 2, 2016, GM filed a petition pursuant to paragraph 17 of the Amendment and Enforcement Guidance Bulletin 2016–03. Therein, GM requested that NHTSA modify the DIR schedule to defer the inclusion of certain GM passenger-side inflators from December 31, 2016 to December 31, 2017. *See* General Motors LLC's Petition to Amend Takata DIR Schedule.

Notice of receipt of GM's petition was published in the **Federal Register**, and a public comment period commenced on September 20, 2016 (81 FR 64575). Six comments were received, including one comment from GM that, after further consideration, it would withdraw the petition and will instead address the subject population through an alternative procedure. *See* Letter from Jeffrey Boyer to Jeffrey Giuseppe (Nov. 15, 2016). To view the petition and all supporting documents visit the Federal Docket Management System Web site at: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Then, follow the online search instructions to locate docket number ''NHTSA–2016–0098.''

II. NHTSA's Decision

Petitions filed under Paragraph 17 are actionable by the Agency only so long as they are submitted and maintained by the petitioner. In its comment to the petition, GM explained that it was withdrawing the petition and that it will address the subject vehicle population through an alternative procedure. *See* Boyer Letter (Nov. 15, 2016).

Because GM has withdrawn its petition to defer the inclusion of the covered passenger inflators in the Takata equipment DIR, that petition is moot and no further action on the petition is warranted. Therefore, the DIR schedule set forth in Paragraph 14 of the Amendment is unchanged. The covered passenger inflators shall be included in Takata's equipment DIR submission due on December 31, 2016. *See* 49 CFR part 573; Amendment at ¶ 16; November 3, 2015 Coordinated Remedy Order at ¶ 46.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30101, *et seq.,* 30118, 30162, 30166(b)(1), 30166(g)(1); delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.95(a); 49 CFR parts 573, 577.

Issued: November 17, 2016.

Michael L. Brown,

Acting Director, Office of Defect Investigations.

[FR Doc. 2016–28227 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of Foreign Assets Control

Unblocking of Specially Designated National and Blocked Person Pursuant to Executive Order 13391

AGENCY: Office of Foreign Assets Control, Treasury.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) is publishing the name of one individual whose property and interests in property have been unblocked pursuant to Executive Order 13391 of November 22, 2005, ''Blocking Property of Additional Persons Undermining Democratic Processes or Institutions in Zimbabwe.''

DATES: OFAC's actions described in this notice are effective as of November 18, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Associate Director for Global Targeting, tel.: 202/622–2420, Assistant Director for Sanctions Compliance & Evaluation, tel.: 202/622–2490, Assistant Director for Licensing, tel.: 202/622–2480, Office of Foreign Assets Control, or Chief Counsel (Foreign Assets Control), tel.: 202/622–2410 (not toll free numbers).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Availability

The list of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons (SDN List) and additional information concerning OFAC sanctions programs are available from OFAC's Web site (*www.treasury.gov/ofac*).

Notice of OFAC Actions

On November 18, 2016, OFAC, in consultation with the U.S. Department of State, removed from the SDN List the individual listed below, whose property and interests in property were blocked pursuant to Executive Order 13391 (E.O. 13391).

1. NGUNI, Sylvester Robert; DOB 04 May 1955; Passport ZE215371 (Zimbabwe); Deputy Minister of Agriculture (individual) [ZIMBABWE—E.O. 13391].

Dated: November 18, 2016.

John E. Smith,

Acting Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control.

[FR Doc. 2016–28248 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–AL–P

FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 81 Wednesday,

No. 226 November 23, 2016

Book 2 of 2 Books

Pages 84695–85104

Part II

Securities and Exchange Commission

Joint Industry Plan; Order Approving the National Market System Plan Governing the Consolidated Audit Trail; Notice

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–79318; File No. 4–698]

Joint Industry Plan; Order Approving the National Market System Plan Governing the Consolidated Audit Trail

November 15, 2016.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

On February 27, 2015, pursuant to Section 11A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Exchange Act'' or ''Act'') [1]

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78k–1.

and Rules 608 and 613 of Regulation NMS thereunder,[2] BATS Exchange, Inc. (n/k/a Bats BZX Exchange, Inc.), BATS–Y Exchange, Inc. (n/k/a Bats BYX Exchange, Inc.), BOX Options Exchange LLC, C2 Options Exchange, Incorporated, Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated, Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc., EDGA Exchange, Inc. (n/k/a Bats EDGA Exchange, Inc.), EDGX Exchange, Inc. (n/k/a Bats EDGX Exchange, Inc.), Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (''FINRA''), International Securities Exchange, LLC, ISE Gemini, LLC, Miami International Securities Exchange LLC, NASDAQ OMX BX, Inc. (n/k/a NASDAQ BX, Inc.), NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC (n/k/a NASDAQ PHLX LLC), The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC, National Stock Exchange, Inc., New York Stock Exchange LLC, NYSE MKT LLC, and NYSE Arca, Inc. (collectively, ''self-regulatory organizations'', ''SROs'' or ''Participants''), filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'' or ''SEC'') a National Market System (''NMS'') Plan Governing the Consolidated Audit Trail (the ''CAT NMS Plan,'' ''CAT Plan'' or ''Plan'').[3] The SROs filed amendments to the CAT NMS Plan on December 24, 2015, and on February 8, 2016.[4] The CAT NMS Plan, as amended, was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on May 17, 2016.[5]

The Commission received 24 comment letters in response to the CAT NMS Plan.[6] On July 29, 2016, the Commission extended the deadline for Commission action on the CAT NMS Plan and designated November 10, 2016 as the new date by which the Commission would be required to take action.[7] On September 2, 2016, the Participants submitted a response to the comment letters that the Commission received in response to the CAT NMS Plan.[8] The Participants submitted additional response letters on September 23, 2016 and October 7, 2016.[9] On November 2 and 14, 2016, the Participants submitted additional letters.[10] This Order approves the CAT NMS Plan, with limited changes as described in detail below. The Commission concludes that the Plan, as amended, is necessary and appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors and the maintenance of fair and orderly markets, to remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of a national market system, or is otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. A copy of the CAT NMS Plan, as adopted, is attached as Exhibit A hereto.

II. Background

The Commission believes that the regulatory data infrastructure on which the SROs and the Commission currently must rely generally is outdated and inadequate to effectively oversee a complex, dispersed, and highly automated national market system. In performing their oversight responsibilities, regulators today must attempt to pull together disparate data from a variety of existing information systems lacking in completeness, accuracy, accessibility, and/or timeliness [11]—a model that neither

[2] 17 CFR 242.608.

[3] *See* Letter from Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated February 27, 2015. Pursuant to Rule 613, the SROs were required to file the CAT NMS Plan on or before April 28, 2013. At the SROs' request, the Commission granted exemptions to extend the deadline for filing the CAT NMS Plan to December 6, 2013, and then to September 30, 2014. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 69060 (March 7, 2013), 78 FR 15771 (March 12, 2013); 71018 (December 6, 2013), 78 FR 75669 (December 12, 2013). The SROs filed the CAT NMS Plan on September 30, 2014 (the ''Initial CAT NMS Plan''). *See* Letter from the SROs, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated September 30, 2014. The CAT NMS Plan filed on February 27, 2015, was an amendment to and replacement of the Initial CAT NMS Plan.

[4] On December 24, 2015, the SROs submitted an Amendment to the CAT NMS Plan. *See* Letter from Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated December 23, 2015. On February 9, 2016, the Participants filed with the Commission an identical, but unmarked, version of the February 27, 2015 CAT NMS Plan, as modified by the December 24, 2015 Amendment, as well as a copy of the request for proposal issued by the Participants to solicit Bids from parties interested in serving as the Plan Processor for the consolidated audit trail. *See* Letter from Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated February 8, 2016.

[5] The Commission voted to publish the February 9, 2016 version of the CAT NMS Plan for public comment on April 27, 2016, and this version of the Plan was published in the **Federal Register** on May 17, 2016. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 77724, 81 FR 30614 (the ''Notice''). Unless the context otherwise requires, the ''CAT NMS Plan'' shall refer to the February 27, 2015 CAT NMS Plan, as modified by the December 24, 2015 Amendment and published for comment on May 17, 2016. The Commission notes that the application of ISE Mercury, LLC (''ISE Mercury'') for registration as a national securities exchange was granted on January 29, 2016. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 76998 (January 29, 2016), 81 FR 6066 (February 4, 2016). In addition, the application of the Investors Exchange LLC (''IEX'') for registration as a national securities exchange was granted on June 17, 2016. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78101 (June 17, 2016), 81 FR 41142 (June 23, 2016). ISE Mercury and IEX will become Participants in the CAT NMS Plan and are thus accounted for as Participants for purposes of this Order.

[6] *See* Letters to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, from Kathleen Weiss Hanley, Bolton-Perella Chair in Finance, Lehigh University, et al., dated July 12, 2016 (''Hanley Letter''); Courtney Doyle McGuinn, FIX Operations Director, FIX Trading Community, dated July 14, 2016 (''FIX Trading Letter''); Kelvin To, Founder and President, Data Boiler Technologies, LLC, dated July 15, 2016 (''Data Boiler Letter''); Richard Foster, Senior Vice President and Senior Counsel for Regulatory and Legal Affairs, Financial Services Roundtable, dated July 15, 2016 (''FSR Letter''); David T. Bellaire, Executive Vice President & General Counsel, Financial Services Institute, dated July 18, 2016 (''FSI Letter''); Stuart J. Kaswell, Executive Vice President & Managing Director, General Counsel, Managed Funds Association, dated July 18, 2016 (''MFA Letter''); David W. Blass, General Counsel, Investment Company Institute, dated July 18, 2016 (''ICI Letter''); Larry E. Thompson, Vice Chairman and General Counsel, Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation, dated July 18, 2016 (''DTCC Letter''); Manisha Kimmel, Chief Regulatory Officer, Wealth Management, Thomson Reuters, dated July 18, 2016 (''TR Letter''); Theodore R. Lazo, Managing Director and Associate General Counsel, and Ellen Greene, Managing Director, Financial Services Operations, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, dated July 18, 2016 (''SIFMA Letter''); Anonymous, received July 18, 2016 (''Anonymous Letter I''); Mary Lou Von Kaenel, Managing Director, Financial Information Forum, dated July 18, 2016 (''FIF Letter''); Marc R. Bryant, Senior Vice President, Deputy General Counsel, Fidelity Investments, dated July 18, 2016 (''Fidelity Letter''); Mark Husler, CEO, UnaVista, and Jonathan Jachym, Head of North America Regulatory Strategy & Government Relations, London Stock Exchange Group, dated July 18, 2016 (''UnaVista Letter''); Gary Stone, Chief Strategy Officer for Trading Solutions and Global Regulatory and Policy Group, Bloomberg, L.P., dated July 18, 2016 (''Bloomberg Letter''); Bonnie K. Wachtel, Wachtel Co Inc., dated July 18, 2016 (''Wachtel Letter''); Dennis M. Kelleher, President & CEO, Stephen W. Hall, Legal Director & Securities Specialist, Lev Bagramian, Senior Securities Policy Advisor, Better Markets, dated July 18, 2016 (''Better Markets Letter''); John A. McCarthy, General Counsel, KCG Holdings, Inc., dated July 20, 2016 (''KCG Letter''); Industry Members of the Development Advisory Group (''DAG'') (including Financial Information Forum, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association and Securities Traders Association), dated July 20, 2016 (''DAG Letter''); Joanne Moffic-Silver, EVP, General Counsel & Corporate Secretary, Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated, dated July 21, 2016 (''CBOE Letter''); Elizabeth K. King, NYSE Group, Inc., dated July 21, 2016 (''NYSE Letter''); James Toes, Securities President & CEO, Securities Traders Association, dated July 25, 2016 (''STA Letter''); Anonymous, received August 12, 2016 (''Anonymous Letter II''); Scott Garrett, Member of Congress, et al., dated October 14, 2016 (''Garrett Letter''). *See* Exhibit B for a citation key to the comment letters received by the Commission on the proposed CAT NMS Plan.

[7] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78441 (July 29, 2016), 81 FR 51527 (August 4, 2016).

[8] *See* Letter from Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated September 2, 2016 (''Response Letter I'').

[9] *See* Letters from Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated September 23, 2016 (''Response Letter II'') and October 7, 2016 (''Response Letter III'').

[10] *See* Letter from Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated November 2, 2016 (''Participants' Letter I''); Letter from Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated November 14, 2016 (''Participants' Letter II'').

[11] Completeness refers to whether a data source represents all market activity of interest to regulators, and whether the data is sufficiently detailed to provide the information regulators require. While current data sources provide the trade and order data required by existing rules and regulations, those sources generally do not provide all of the information of interest to regulators in one consolidated audit trail. Accuracy refers to whether the data about a particular order or trade is correct and reliable. Accessibility refers to how the data is

Continued

supports the efficient aggregation of data from multiple trading venues nor yields the type of complete and accurate market activity data needed for robust market oversight.

Currently, FINRA and the exchanges maintain their own separate audit trail systems for trading activity, which vary in scope, required data elements and format. In performing their market oversight responsibilities, SRO and Commission Staffs must rely heavily on data from these various SRO audit trails. However, each of these systems has shortcomings in completeness, accuracy, accessibility, or timeliness. Some of these shortcomings are a result of the disparate nature of the systems, which makes it impractical, for example, to follow orders through their entire lifecycle as they may be routed, aggregated, re-routed, and disaggregated across multiple markets. These systems also lack key information useful for regulatory oversight, such as the identity of the customers who originate orders, or that two sets of orders may have been originated by the same customer.[12] Although SRO and Commission Staffs also have access to sources of market activity data other than SRO audit trails, these sources likewise suffer from their own drawbacks.[13]

Recognizing these shortcomings, on July 11, 2012, the Commission adopted Rule 613 of Regulation NMS under the Act,[14] which requires the SROs to submit an NMS plan to create, implement, and maintain a consolidated audit trail (''CAT'') that would capture customer and order event information for orders in NMS securities, across all markets, from the time of order inception through routing, cancellation, modification, or execution in a single, consolidated data source.[15] Specifically, Rule 613 requires the Participants to ''jointly file . . . a national market system plan to govern the creation, implementation, and maintenance of a consolidated audit trail and Central Repository.'' [16] The purpose of the Plan, and the creation, implementation and maintenance of a comprehensive audit trail for the U.S. securities markets described therein, is to ''substantially enhance the ability of the SROs and the Commission to oversee today's securities markets and fulfill their responsibilities under the federal securities laws.'' [17] As contemplated by Rule 613, the CAT ''will allow for the prompt and accurate recording of material information about all orders in NMS securities, including the identity of customers, as these orders are generated and then routed throughout the U.S. markets until execution, cancellation, or modification. This information will be consolidated and made readily available to regulators in a uniform electronic format.'' [18]

The SROs filed the CAT NMS Plan pursuant to Rule 613,[19] as modified by exemptive relief granted by the Commission, pursuant to Rule 0–12 under the Act,[20] from certain requirements of Rule 613.[21]

The CAT NMS Plan filed by the SROs incorporates the SROs' NMS plan approval process for reviewing, evaluating and ultimately selecting the Plan Processor,[22] as set forth in a separate NMS plan submitted by the SROs and approved by the Commission (the ''Selection Plan'').[23] On February 26, 2013, the Participants published a request for proposal (''RFP'') soliciting Bids from parties interested in serving as the Plan Processor.[24] As of the publication date of this Order, the Participants, through the process described in the Selection Plan, have narrowed the pool of Bidders to three remaining Shortlisted Bidders.[25]

The CAT NMS Plan also includes an economic analysis that, as required by Rule 613, was conducted by the SROs.

---

stored, how practical it is to assemble, aggregate, and process the data, and whether all appropriate regulators could acquire the data they need. Timeliness refers to when the data is available to regulators and how long it would take to process before it could be used for regulatory analysis. *See* Adopting Release, *infra* note 14, at 45727.

[12] The Commission notes that the SROs have taken steps in recent years to update their audit trail requirements. For example, NYSE, NYSE Amex LLC (n/k/a ''NYSE MKT LLC'') (''NYSE Amex''), and NYSE ARCA, Inc. (''NYSE Arca'') have adopted audit trail rules that coordinate with FINRA's Order Audit Trail System (''OATS'') requirements. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 65523 (October 7, 2011), 76 FR 64154 (October 17, 2011) (concerning NYSE); Securities Exchange Act Release No. 65524 (October 7, 2011), 76 FR 64151 (October 17, 2011) (concerning NYSE Amex); Securities Exchange Act Release No. 65544 (October 12, 2011), 76 FR 64406 (October 18, 2011) (concerning NYSE Arca). This allows the SROs to submit their data to FINRA pursuant to a Regulatory Service Agreement (''RSA''), which FINRA can then reformat and combine with OATS data. Despite these efforts, however, significant deficiencies remain. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.D.2.b.

[13] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.D.2.b (discussing the limitations of current trade and order data systems).

[14] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 67457 (July 18, 2012), 77 FR 45722 (August 1, 2012) (''Adopting Release''); *see also* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 62174 (May 26, 2010), 75 FR 32556 (June 8, 2010) (''Proposing Release'').

[15] 17 CFR 242.613(a)(1), (c)(1), (c)(7).

[16] 17 CFR 242.613(a)(1).

[17] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45726.

[18] *Id.* The Plan also includes certain recording and reporting obligations for OTC Equity Securities.

[19] *See supra* note 4.

[20] 17 CFR 240.0–12.

[21] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 77265 (March 1, 2016), 81 FR 11856 (March 7, 2016) (''Exemption Order''); Letter from Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated January 30, 2015 (''Exemptive Request Letter''). Specifically, the SROs requested exemptive relief from the Rule's requirements related to: (i) The reporting of Options Market Maker quotations, as required under Rule 613(c)(7)(ii) and (iv); (ii) the reporting and use of the Customer-ID under Rule 613(c)(7)(i)(A), (iv)(F), (viii)(B) and 613(c)(8); (iii) the reporting of the CAT-Reporter-ID, as required under Rule 613(c)(7)(i)(C), (ii)(D), (ii)(E), (iii)(D), (iii)(E), (iv)(F), (v)(F), (vi)(B), and (c)(8); (iv) the linking of executions to specific subaccount allocations, as required under Rule 613(c)(7)(vi)(A); and (v) the timestamp granularity requirement of Rule 613(d)(3) for certain manual order events subject to reporting under Rule 613(c)(7)(i)(E), (ii)(C), (iii)(C) and (iv)(C). On April 3, 2015, the SROs filed a supplement related to the requested exemption for Rule 613(c)(7)(vi)(A). *See* Letter from Robert Colby, FINRA, on behalf of the SROs, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated April 3, 2015 (''April 2015 Supplement''). This supplement provided examples of how the proposed relief related to allocations would operate. On September 2, 2015, the SROs filed a second supplement to the Exemptive Request Letter. *See* Letter from the SROs to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated September 2, 2015 (''September 2015 Supplement''). This supplement to the Exemptive Request Letter further addressed the use of an ''effective date'' in lieu of a ''date account opened.'' Unless the context otherwise requires, the ''Exemption Request'' shall refer to the Exemptive Request Letter, as supplemented by the April 2015 Supplement and the September 2015 Supplement.

[22] As set forth in Section 1.1 of the CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, the Plan Processor ''means the Initial Plan Processor or any other Person selected by the Operating Committee pursuant to SEC Rule 613 and Sections 4.3(b)(i) and 6.1 [to] perform the CAT processing functions required by SEC Rule 613 and set forth in [the CAT NMS Plan].'' All capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meaning ascribed to them in Rule 613, the Adopting Release, or the CAT NMS Plan, as applicable.

[23] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 70892 (November 15, 2013), 78 FR 69910 (November 21, 2013) (''Selection Plan Notice''); 75192 (June 17, 2015), 80 FR 36028 (June 23, 2015) (Order Approving Amendment No. 1 to the Selection Plan); 75980 (September 24, 2015), 80 FR 58796 (September 30, 2015) (Order Approving Amendment No. 2 to the Selection Plan); 77917 (May 25, 2016), 81 FR 35072 (June 1, 2016) (Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Amendment No. 3 to the Selection Plan); 78477 (August 4, 2016), 81 FR 52917 (August 10, 2016) (Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Amendment No. 4 to the Selection Plan); *see also* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 71596 (February 21, 2014), 79 FR 11152 (February 27, 2014) (''Selection Plan Approval Order''); 74223 (February 6, 2015), 80 FR 7654 (February 11, 2015) (Notice of Amendment No. 1 to the Selection Plan); 75193 (June 17, 2015), 80 FR 36006 (June 23, 2015) (Notice of Amendment No. 2 to the Selection Plan).

[24] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30885–30952 for a complete version of the Consolidated Audit Trail National Market System Plan Request for Proposal (issued February 26, 2013, version 3.0 updated March 4, 2014). Other materials related to the RFP are *available at http://catnmsplan.com/process/*. Among other things, the RFP describes the technical, business, and operational requirements for CAT and outlines the information that must be submitted by Bidders in response to the RFP.

[25] ''Shortlisted Bidders'' were selected by the Selection Committee through the voting and scoring processes described in Section 5.2 of the CAT NMS Plan. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1; *see also* Section III.4, *infra* (describing the selection of the Plan Processor).

The Commission notes that, in the Adopting Release for Rule 613, the Commission considered the economic effects of the actions the SROs were required to undertake pursuant to Rule 613, specifically the requirement that the SROs develop an NMS plan, utilizing their own resources and undertaking their own research, that addresses the specific details, cost estimates, considerations, and other requirements of the Rule.[26] The Commission noted in the Adopting Release that Rule 613 provided the SROs with ''flexibility in how they [chose] to meet the requirements of the adopted Rule,'' [27] allowing the SROs to consider a number of different approaches in developing the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission also noted that ''the costs and benefits of creating a consolidated audit trail, and the consideration of specific costs as related to specific benefits, is more appropriately analyzed once the SROs narrow the expanded array of choices they have under the adopted Rule and develop a detailed NMS plan.'' [28] Accordingly, the Commission required the SROs to conduct an economic analysis and deferred the Commission's own economic analysis of the actual creation, implementation, and maintenance of the CAT until after submission of the required NMS plan. In accordance with this approach, the Commission included its preliminary analysis and conclusions regarding the economic effects of the CAT NMS Plan when it published the CAT NMS Plan for public comment.

III. Description of the Proposed Plan

The Commission notes that this Section III describes the CAT NMS Plan, as filed by the Participants pursuant to Rule 613 and modified by the Exemption Order,[29] that was published for public comment by the Commission.[30] Section IV, below, discusses the comments received as well as amendments that the Commission is making to the Plan in light of some of the comments; these amendments are marked against the proposed Plan in Exhibit A to this Order.

1. LLC Agreement

The Participants propose to conduct the activities related to the CAT in a Delaware limited liability company pursuant to a limited liability company agreement, entitled the Limited Liability Company Agreement (''LLC Agreement'') of CAT NMS, LLC (''Company'' or ''CAT LLC'').[31] The Participants will jointly own on an equal basis the Company.[32] The Company will create, implement and maintain the CAT.[33] The LLC Agreement, itself, including its appendices, is the proposed Plan, which would be a national market system plan as defined in Rule 600(b)(43) of NMS.[34]

2. Participants

Each national securities exchange and national securities association currently registered with the Commission would be a Participant in the Plan.[35] The names and addresses of each Participant are set forth in Exhibit A to the Plan.[36] Article III of the Plan provides that any entity approved by the Commission as a national securities exchange or national securities association under the Exchange Act after the Effective Date may become a Participant by submitting to the Company a completed application in the form provided by the Company and satisfying each of the following requirements: (1) Executing a counterpart of the LLC Agreement as then in effect; and (2) paying a fee to the Company in an amount determined by a Majority Vote [37] of the Operating Committee as fairly and reasonably compensating the Company and the Participants for costs incurred in creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT (including such costs incurred in evaluating and selecting the Initial Plan Processor [38] and any subsequent Plan Processor) and for costs the Company incurs in providing for the prospective Participant's participation in the Company, including after consideration of certain factors identified in Section 3.3(b) of the Agreement (''Participation Fee'').[39] Amendment of the Plan reflecting the admission of a new Participant will be effective only when: (1) It is approved by the SEC in accordance with Rule 608 or otherwise becomes effective pursuant to Rule 608; and (2) the prospective Participant pays the Participation Fee.[40]

A number of factors are relevant to the determination of a Participation Fee.[41] Such factors are: (1) The portion of costs previously paid by the Company for the development, expansion and maintenance of the CAT which, under generally accepted accounting principles (''GAAP''), would have been treated as capital expenditures and would have been amortized over the five years preceding the admission of the prospective Participant; (2) an assessment of costs incurred and to be incurred by the Company for modifying the CAT or any part thereof to accommodate the prospective Participant, which costs are not otherwise required to be paid or reimbursed by the prospective Participant; (3) Participation Fees paid by other Participants admitted as such after the Effective Date; (4) elapsed time from the Effective Date to the anticipated date of admittance of the prospective Participant; and (5) such other factors, if any, as may be determined to be appropriate by the Operating Committee and approved by the Commission.[42] In the event that the Company and a prospective Participant do not agree on the amount of the Participation Fee, such amount will be subject to review by the SEC pursuant to Section 11A(b)(5) of the Exchange Act.[43]

An applicant for participation in the Company may apply for limited access to the CAT System [44] for planning and testing purposes pending its admission as a Participant by submitting to the Company a completed Application for Limited Access to the CAT System in a

[26] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45726.

[27] *Id.* at 45725.

[28] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45725.

[29] *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21.

[30] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5.

[31] *Id.*

[32] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 3.2(d).

[33] *Id.* at Section 2.6.

[34] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30618.

[35] *Id.*

[36] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 3.1.

[37] ''Majority Vote'' means the affirmative vote of at least a majority of all of the members of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, as applicable, authorized to cast a vote with respect to a matter presented for a vote (whether or not such a member is present at any meeting at which a vote is taken) by the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, as applicable (excluding, for the avoidance of doubt, any member of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, as applicable, that is recused or subject to a vote to recuse from such matter pursuant to Section 4.3(d) of the CAT NMS Plan). *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[38] The ''Initial Plan Processor'' means the first Plan Processor selected by the Operating Committee in accordance with Rule 613, Section 6.1 and the Selection Plan. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[39] *Id.* at Section 3.3(a).

[40] *Id.* at Section 3.3(a)–(b).

[41] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30618.

[42] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 3.3(b).

[43] *Id.; see also* Exchange Act Section 11A(b)(2), 15 U.S.C. 78k–l(b)(5) (which provides that a prohibition or limitation on access to services by a registered securities information processor must be reviewed by the Commission upon application by an aggrieved person).

[44] ''CAT System'' means all data processing equipment, communications facilities, and other facilities, including equipment, utilized by the Company or any third parties acting on the Company's behalf in connection with operation of the CAT and any related information or relevant systems pursuant to the LLC Agreement. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

form provided by the Company, accompanied by payment of a deposit in the amount established by the Company, which will be applied or refunded as described in such application.[45] To be eligible to apply for such limited access, the applicant must have been approved by the SEC as a national securities exchange or national securities association under the Exchange Act but the applicant has not yet become a Participant of the Plan, or the SEC must have published such applicant's Form 1 Application or Form X–15AA–1 Application to become a national securities exchange or a national securities association, respectively.[46]

All Company Interests will have the same rights, powers, preferences and privileges and be subject to the same restrictions, qualifications and limitations.[47] Once admitted, each Participant will be entitled to one vote on any matter presented to Participants for their consideration and to participate equally in any distribution made by the Company (other than a distribution made pursuant to Section 10.2 of the Plan).[48] Each Participant will have a Company Interest equal to that of each other Participant.[49]

Article III also describes a Participant's ability to Transfer a Company Interest. A Participant may only Transfer any Company Interest to a national securities exchange or national securities association that succeeds to the business of such Participant as a result of a merger or consolidation with such Participant or the Transfer of all or substantially all of the assets or equity of such Participant (''Permitted Transferee'').[50] A Participant may not Transfer any Company Interest to a Permitted Transferee unless: (1) Such Permitted Transferee executes a counterpart of the Plan; and (2) the amendment to the Plan reflecting the Transfer is approved by the SEC in accordance with Rule 608 or otherwise becomes effective pursuant to Rule 608.[51]

In addition, Article III addresses the voluntary resignation and termination of participation in the Plan. Any Participant may voluntarily resign from the Company, and thereby withdraw from and terminate its right to any Company Interest, only if: (1) A Permitted Legal Basis[52] for such action exists; and (2) such Participant provides to the Company and each other Participant no less than thirty days prior to the effective date of such action written notice specifying such Permitted Legal Basis, including appropriate documentation evidencing the existence of such Permitted Legal Basis, and, to the extent applicable, evidence reasonably satisfactory to the Company and other Participants that any orders or approvals required from the SEC in connection with such action have been obtained.[53] A validly withdrawing Participant will have the rights and obligations discussed below with regard to termination of participation.[54]

A Participant's participation in the Company, and its right to any Company Interest, will terminate as of the earliest of: (1) The effective date specified in a valid resignation notice; (2) such time as such Participant is no longer registered as a national securities exchange or national securities association; or (3) the date of termination for failure to pay fees.[55] With regard to the payment of fees, each Participant is required to pay all fees or other amounts required to be paid under the Plan within thirty days after receipt of an invoice or other notice indicating payment is due (unless a longer payment period is otherwise indicated) (the ''Payment Date'').[56] If a Participant fails to make such a required payment by the Payment Date, any balance in the Participant's Capital Account will be applied to the outstanding balance.[57] If a balance still remains with respect to any such required payment, the Participant will pay interest on the outstanding balance from the Payment Date until such fee or amount is paid at a per annum rate equal to the lesser of: (1) The Prime Rate plus 300 basis points; or (2) the maximum rate permitted by applicable law.[58] If any such remaining outstanding balance is not paid within thirty days after the Payment Date, the Participants will file an amendment to the Plan requesting the termination of the participation in the Company of such Participant, and its right to any Company Interest, with the SEC.[59] Such amendment will be effective only when it is approved by the SEC in accordance with Rule 608 or otherwise becomes effective pursuant to Rule 608.[60]

From and after the effective date of termination of a Participant's participation in the Company, profits and losses of the Company will cease to be allocated to the Capital Account of the Participant.[61] A terminated Participant will be entitled to receive the balance in its Capital Account as of the effective date of termination adjusted for profits and losses through that date, payable within ninety days of the effective date of termination, and will remain liable for its proportionate share of costs and expenses allocated to it for the period during which it was a Participant, for obligations under Section 3.8(c) regarding the return of amounts previously distributed (if required by a court of competent jurisdiction), for its indemnification obligations pursuant to Section 4.1, and for obligations under Section 9.6 regarding confidentiality, but it will have no other obligations under the Plan following the effective date of termination.[62] The Plan will be amended to reflect any termination of participation in the Company of a Participant, provided that such amendment will be effective only when it is approved by the SEC in accordance with Rule 608 or otherwise becomes effective pursuant to Rule 608.[63]

3. Management

Article IV of the Plan establishes the overall governance structure for the management of the Company. Specifically, the Participants propose that the Company be managed by an Operating Committee.[64]

The Operating Committee will consist of one voting member representing each Participant and one alternate voting member representing each Participant who will have a right to vote only in the absence of the Participant's voting member of the Operating Committee.[65] Each of the voting and alternate voting members of the Operating Committee will be appointed by the Participant that he or she represents, will serve at the will of the Participant appointing such member and will be subject to the confidentiality obligations of the

[45] *Id.* at Section 3.3(c).

[46] *Id.*

[47] *Id.* at Section 3.2(a).

[48] *Id.* at Sections 3.2(b), 10.2.

[49] *Id.* at Section 3.2(d).

[50] *Id.* at Section 3.4(b).

[51] *Id.* at Section 3.4(c).

[52] ''Permitted Legal Basis'' means the Participant has become exempt from, or otherwise has ceased to be subject to, Rule 613 or has arranged to comply with Rule 613 in some manner other than through participation in the LLC Agreement, in each instance subject to the approval of the Commission. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[53] *Id.* at Section 3.6.

[54] *Id.* at Sections 3.6, 3.7.

[55] *Id.* at Section 3.7(a).

[56] *Id.* at Section 3.7(b).

[57] *Id.*

[58] *Id.*

[59] *Id.*

[60] *Id.*

[61] *Id.* at Section 3.7(c).

[62] *Id.*

[63] *Id.*

[64] The Operating Committee will manage the Company except for situations in which the approval of the Participants is required by the Plan or by non-waivable provisions of applicable law. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Article IV.

[65] *Id.* at Section 4.2(a).

Participant that he or she represents as set forth in Section 9.6.[66] One individual may serve as the voting member of the Operating Committee for multiple Affiliated Participants, and such individual will have the right to vote on behalf of each such Affiliated Participant.[67]

The Operating Committee will elect, by Majority Vote, one of its members to act as Chair for a term of two years.[68] No Person may serve as Chair for more than two successive full terms, and no Person then appointed to the Operating Committee by a Participant that then serves, or whose Affiliate then serves, as the Plan Processor will be eligible to serve as the Chair.[69] The Chair will preside at all meetings of the Operating Committee, designate a Person to act as Secretary, and perform such other duties and possess such other powers as the Operating Committee may from time to time prescribe.[70] The Chair will not be entitled to a tie-breaking vote at any meeting of the Operating Committee.[71]

Each of the members of the Operating Committee, including the Chair, will be authorized to cast one vote for each Participant that he or she represents on all matters voted upon by the Operating Committee.[72] Action of the Operating Committee will be authorized by Majority Vote (except under certain designated circumstances), subject to the approval of the SEC whenever such approval is required under the Exchange Act and the rules thereunder.[73] For example, the Plan specifically notes that a Majority Vote of the Operating Committee is required to: (1) Select the Chair; (2) select the members of the Advisory Committee (as described below); (3) interpret the Plan (unless otherwise noted therein); (4) approve any recommendation by the Chief Compliance Officer (''CCO'') pursuant to Section 6.2(a)(v)(A); (5) determine to hold an Executive Session of the Operating Committee; (6) determine the appropriate funding-related policies, procedures and practices consistent with Article XI; and (7) act upon any other matter specified elsewhere in the Plan (which includes the Appendices to the Plan) as requiring a vote, approval or other action of the Operating Committee (other than those matters expressly requiring a Supermajority Vote or a different vote of the Operating Committee).[74]

Article IV requires a Supermajority Vote[75] of the Operating Committee, subject to the approval of the SEC when required, for the following: (1) Selecting a Plan Processor, other than the Initial Plan Processor selected in accordance with Article V of the Plan; (2) terminating the Plan Processor without cause in accordance with Section 6.1(q); (3) approving the Plan Processor's appointment or removal of the Chief Information Security Officer (''CISO''), CCO, or any Independent Auditor in accordance with Section 6.1(b); (4) entering into, modifying or terminating any Material Contract (if the Material Contract is with a Participant or an Affiliate of a Participant, such Participant and Affiliated Participant will be recused from any vote); (5) making any Material Systems Change; (6) approving the initial Technical Specifications or any Material Amendment to the Technical Specifications proposed by the Plan Processor; (7) amending the Technical Specifications on its own motion; and (8) acting upon any other matter specified elsewhere in the Plan (which includes the Appendices to the Plan) as requiring a vote, approval or other action of the Operating Committee by a Supermajority Vote.[76]

A member of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee thereof (as discussed below) shall recuse himself or herself from voting on any matter under consideration by the Operating Committee or such Subcommittee if such member determines that voting on such matter raises a Conflict of Interest.[77] In addition, if the members of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee (excluding the member thereof proposed to be recused) determine by Supermajority Vote that any member voting on a matter under consideration by the Operating Committee or such Subcommittee raises a Conflict of Interest, such member shall be recused from voting on such matter.[78] No member of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee will be automatically recused from voting on any matter except matters involving Material Contracts as discussed in the prior paragraph, as otherwise specified in the Plan, and as follows: (1) If a Participant is a Bidding Participant[79] whose Bid remains under consideration, members appointed to the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee by such Participant or any of its Affiliated Participants will be recused from any vote concerning: (a) Whether another Bidder may revise its Bid; (b) the selection of a Bidder; or (c) any contract to which such Participant or any of its Affiliates would be a party in its capacity as Plan Processor; and (2) if a Participant is then serving as Plan Processor, is an Affiliate of the Person then serving as Plan Processor, or is an Affiliate of an entity that is a Material Subcontractor to the Plan Processor, then in each case members appointed to the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee by such Participant or any of its Affiliated Participants shall be recused from any vote concerning: (a) The proposed removal of such Plan Processor; or (b) any contract between the Company and such Plan Processor.[80]

Article IV also addresses meetings of the Operating Committee.[81] Meetings of the Operating Committee may be attended by each Participant's voting Representative and its alternate voting Representative and by a maximum of two nonvoting Representatives of each Participant, by members of the Advisory Committee, by the CCO, by other Representatives of the Company and the Plan Processor, by Representatives of the SEC and by such other Persons that the Operating Committee may invite to attend.[82] The Operating Committee, however, may, where appropriate, determine to meet in Executive Session during which only voting members of the Operating Committee will be present.[83] The Operating Committee,

[66] *Id.* at Sections 4.2(a), 9.6.

[67] *Id.* at Section 4.2(a). An ''Affiliated Participant'' means any Participant controlling, controlled by, or under common control with another Participant. *Id.* at Section 1.1.

[68] *Id.* at Section 4.2(b).

[69] *Id.*

[70] *Id.*

[71] *Id.*

[72] *Id.* at Section 4.3(a).

[73] *Id.*

[74] *Id.*

[75] ''Supermajority Vote'' means the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all of the members of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, as applicable, authorized to cast a vote with respect to a matter presented for a vote (whether or not such a member is present at any meeting at which a vote is taken) by the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, as applicable (excluding, for the avoidance of doubt, any member of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, as applicable, that is recused or subject to a vote to recuse from such matter pursuant to Section 4.3(d)); provided that if two-thirds of all of such members authorized to cast a vote is not a whole number then that number shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number. *Id.* at Section 1.1.

[76] *Id.* at Section 4.3(b).

[77] *Id.* at Section 4.3(d).

[78] *Id.*

[79] ''Bidding Participant'' means a Participant that: (a) Submits a Bid; (b) is an Affiliate of an entity that submits a Bid; or (c) is included, or is an Affiliate of an entity that is included, as a Material Subcontractor as part of a Bid. *Id.* at Section 1.1.

[80] *Id.* at Section 4.3(d).

[81] Article IV also addresses, among other things, different types of Operating Committee meetings (regular, special and emergency), frequency of such meetings, how to call such meetings, the location of the meetings, the role of the Chair, and notice regarding such meetings. *Id.* at Section 4.4.

[82] *Id.* at Section 4.4(a).

[83] *Id.*

however, may invite other Representatives of the Participants, of the Company, of the Plan Processor (including the CCO and the CISO) or the SEC, or such other Persons that the Operating Committee may invite to attend, to be present during an Executive Session.[84] Any determination of the Operating Committee to meet in an Executive Session will be made upon a Majority Vote and will be reflected in the minutes of the meeting.[85] In addition, any Person that is not a Participant but for which the SEC has published a Form 1 Application or Form X–15AA–1 to become a national securities exchange or national securities association, respectively, will be permitted to appoint one primary Representative and one alternate Representative to attend regularly scheduled Operating Committee meetings in the capacity of a non-voting observer, but will not be permitted to have any Representative attend a special meeting, emergency meeting or meeting held in Executive Session of the Operating Committee.[86]

The Operating Committee may, by Majority Vote, designate by resolution one or more Subcommittees it deems necessary or desirable in furtherance of the management of the business and affairs of the Company.[87] For any Subcommittee, any member of the Operating Committee who wants to serve thereon may so serve.[88] If Affiliated Participants have collectively appointed one member to the Operating Committee to represent them, then such Affiliated Participants may have only that member serve on the Subcommittee or may decide not to have only that collectively appointed member serve on the Subcommittee.[89] Such member may designate an individual other than himself or herself who is also an employee of the Participant or Affiliated Participants that appointed such member to serve on a Subcommittee in lieu of the particular member.[90] Subject to the requirements of the Plan and non-waivable provisions of Delaware law, a Subcommittee may exercise all the powers and authority of the Operating Committee in the management of the business and affairs of the Company as so specified in the resolution of the Operating Committee designating such Subcommittee.[91]

Article IV requires that the Operating Committee maintain a Compliance Subcommittee for the purpose of aiding the CCO as necessary, including with respect to issues involving: (1) The maintenance of the confidentiality of information submitted to the Plan Processor or Central Repository pursuant to Rule 613, applicable law, or the Plan by Participants and Industry Members; (2) the timeliness, accuracy, and completeness of information submitted pursuant to Rule 613, applicable law or the Plan by Participants and Industry Members; and (3) the manner and extent to which each Participant is meeting its obligations under Rule 613, Section 3.11, and as set forth elsewhere in the Plan and ensuring the consistency of the Plan's enforcement as to all Participants.[92]

Article IV also sets forth the requirements for the formation and functioning of an Advisory Committee, which will advise the Participants on the implementation, operation and administration of the Central Repository, including possible expansion of the Central Repository to other securities and other types of transactions.[93]

Article IV describes the composition of the Advisory Committee. No member of the Advisory Committee may be employed by or affiliated with any Participant or any of its Affiliates or facilities.[94] The Operating Committee will select one member from representatives of each of the following categories to serve on the Advisory Committee on behalf of himself or herself individually and not on behalf of the entity for which the individual is then currently employed: (1) A broker-dealer with no more than 150 Registered Persons; (2) a broker-dealer with at least 151 and no more than 499 Registered Persons; (3) a broker-dealer with 500 or more Registered Persons; (4) a broker-dealer with a substantial wholesale customer base; (5) a broker-dealer that is approved by a national securities exchange: (a) To effect transactions on an exchange as a specialist, market maker or floor broker; or (b) to act as an institutional broker on an exchange; (6) a proprietary-trading broker-dealer; (7) a clearing firm; (8) an individual who maintains a securities account with a registered broker or dealer but who otherwise has no material business relationship with a broker or dealer or with a Participant; (9) a member of academia with expertise in the securities industry or any other industry relevant to the operation of the CAT System; (10) an institutional investor trading on behalf of a public entity or entities; (11) an institutional investor trading on behalf of a private entity or entities; and (12) an individual with significant and reputable regulatory expertise.[95] The individuals selected to represent categories (1) through (12) above must include, in the aggregate, representatives of no fewer than three broker-dealers that are active in the options business and representatives of no fewer than three broker-dealers that are active in the equities business.[96] In addition, upon a change in employment of any such Advisory Committee member, a Majority Vote of the Operating Committee will be required for such member to be eligible to continue to serve on the Advisory Committee.[97] Furthermore, the SEC's Chief Technology Officer (or the individual then currently employed in a comparable position providing equivalent services) will serve as an observer of the Advisory Committee (but not be a member).[98] The members of the Advisory Committee will have a term of three years.[99]

Members of the Advisory Committee will have the right to attend meetings of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, to receive information concerning the operation of the Central Repository, and to submit their views to the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee on matters pursuant to the Plan prior to a decision by the Operating Committee on such matters.[100] A member of the Advisory Committee will not have a right to vote on any matter considered by the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee.[101] In addition, the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee may meet in Executive Session if the Operating Committee or Subcommittee determines by Majority Vote that such an Executive Session is advisable.[102] The Operating Committee may solicit and consider views of other stakeholders on the operation of the Central Repository in addition to those of the Advisory Committee.[103] Although members of the Advisory Committee

[84] *Id.*

[85] *Id.*

[86] *Id.* at Section 4.4(b).

[87] *Id.* at Section 4.12(a).

[88] *Id.*

[89] *Id.*

[90] *Id.*

[91] *Id.*

[92] *Id.* at Section 4.12(b).

[93] *Id.* at Section 4.13(a), (d).

[94] *Id.* at Section 4.13(b).

[95] *Id.*

[96] *Id.*

[97] *Id.*

[98] *Id.*

[99] Four of the initial twelve members of the Advisory Committee will have an initial term of one year, and another four of the initial twelve members of the Advisory Committee will have an initial term of two years. *Id.* at Section 4.13(c).

[100] *Id.* at Section 4.13(d).

[101] *Id.*

[102] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30621 n.54.

[103] *Id.*

will have the right to receive information concerning the operation of the Central Repository, the Operating Committee retains the authority to determine the scope and content of information supplied to the Advisory Committee, which will be limited to that information that is necessary and appropriate for the Advisory Committee to fulfill its functions.[104] Any information received by members of the Advisory Committee will remain confidential unless otherwise specified by the Operating Committee.[105]

Article IV also describes the appointment of Officers for the Company. Specifically, the CCO and the CISO, each of whom will be employed solely by the Plan Processor and neither of whom will be deemed or construed in any way to be an employee of the Company, will be Officers of the Company.[106] Neither such Officer will receive or be entitled to any compensation from the Company or any Participant by virtue of his or her service in such capacity (other than if a Participant is then serving as the Plan Processor, compensation paid to such Officer as an employee of such Participant).[107] Each such Officer will report directly to the Operating Committee.[108] The CCO will work on a regular and frequent basis with the Compliance Subcommittee and/or other Subcommittees as may be determined by the Operating Committee.[109] Except to the extent otherwise provided in the Plan, including Section 6.2, each such Officer will have such fiduciary and other duties with regard to the Plan Processor as imposed by the Plan Processor on such individual by virtue of his or her employment by the Plan Processor.[110]

In addition, the Plan Processor will inform the Operating Committee of the individual who has direct management responsibility for the Plan Processor's performance of its obligations with respect to the CAT.[111] Subject to approval by the Operating Committee of such individual, the Operating Committee will appoint such individual as an Officer.[112] In addition, the Operating Committee by Supermajority Vote may appoint other Officers as it shall from time to time deem necessary.[113] Any Officer appointed pursuant to Section 4.6(b) will have only such duties and responsibilities as set forth in the Plan, or as the Operating Committee shall from time to time expressly determine.[114] No such Officer shall have any authority to bind the Company (which authority is vested solely in the Operating Committee) or be an employee of the Company, unless in each case the Operating Committee, by Supermajority Vote, expressly determines otherwise.[115] No person subject to a ''statutory disqualification'' (as defined in Section 3(a)(39) of the Exchange Act) may serve as an Officer.[116] It is the intent of the Participants that the Company have no employees.[117]

4. Initial Plan Processor Selection

Article V of the Plan sets forth the process for the Participants' evaluation of Bids and the selection process for narrowing down the Bids and choosing the Initial Plan Processor.[118] The initial steps in the evaluation and selection process were and will be performed pursuant to the Selection Plan; the final two rounds of evaluation and voting, as well as the final selection of the Initial Plan Processor, will be performed pursuant to the Plan.[119]

As discussed above, the Selection Committee has selected the Shortlisted Bids pursuant to the Selection Plan. After reviewing the Shortlisted Bids, the Participants have identified the optimal proposed solutions for the CAT and, to the extent possible, included such solutions in the Plan.[120] The Selection Committee will determine, by majority vote, whether Shortlisted Bidders will have the opportunity to revise their Bids.[121] To reduce potential conflicts of interest, no Bidding Participant may vote on whether a Shortlisted Bidder will be permitted to revise its Bid if a Bid submitted by or including the Participant or an Affiliate of the Participant is a Shortlisted Bid.[122] The Selection Committee will review and evaluate all Shortlisted Bids, including any permitted revisions submitted by Shortlisted Bidders.[123] In performing this review and evaluation, the Selection Committee may consult with the Advisory Committee and such other Persons as the Selection Committee deems appropriate, which may include the DAG until the Advisory Committee is formed.[124]

After receipt of any permitted revisions, the Selection Committee will select the Initial Plan Processor from the Shortlisted Bids in two rounds of voting where each Participant has one vote via its Voting Senior Officer in each round.[125] No Bidding Participant, however, will be entitled to vote in any round if the Participant's Bid, a Bid submitted by an Affiliate of the Participant, or a Bid including the Participant or an Affiliate of the Participant is considered in such round.[126] In the first round, each Voting Senior Officer, subject to the recusal provision in Section 5.2(e)(ii), will select a first and second choice, with the first choice receiving two points and the second choice receiving one point.[127] The two Shortlisted Bids receiving the highest cumulative scores in the first round will advance to the second round.[128] In the event of a tie, the tie will be broken by assigning one point per vote to the tied Shortlisted Bids, and the Shortlisted Bid with the most votes will advance.[129] If this procedure fails to break the tie, a revote will be taken on the tied Bids with each vote

[104] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 4.13(e).

[105] *Id.*

[106] *Id.* at Section 4.6(a).

[107] *Id.*

[108] *Id.*

[109] *Id.*

[110] *Id.* at Sections 4.6(a), 6.2.

[111] *Id.* at Section 4.6(b).

[112] *Id.*

[113] *Id.*

[114] *Id.*

[115] *Id.*

[116] *Id.* The Plan uses the term ''statutory disqualification'' as defined in Section 3(a)(39) of the Exchange Act, which addresses disqualification from membership or participation in, or association with a member of, an SRO. While Officers of the Plan are not persons associated with a member of an SRO, the Commission interprets this provision of the Plan to mean that no person that is subject to one of the statutory disqualifications set forth in Sections 3(a)(39)(A) through (F) of the Exchange Act may serve as Officer.

[117] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 4.6(b).

[118] The Plan Processor selection process set forth in the CAT NMS Plan is identical to the post-CAT NMS Plan approval selection process set forth in the Selection Plan. *See* Selection Plan, *supra* note 23.

[119] By its terms, the Selection Plan will terminate upon Commission approval of the Plan. *Id.*

[120] As noted above, the Participants stated their belief that certain exemptive relief is necessary to include in the Plan all of the provisions the Participants believe are part of the optimal solution for the CAT. The Commission notes that the request for exemptive relief was granted on March 1, 2016. *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21.

[121] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 5.2(c)(ii).

[122] *Id.* at Section 5.1(b)(ii).

[123] *Id.*

[124] *Id.*

[125] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30623. If the proposed amendment to the Selection Plan is approved, the Selection Committee may determine to narrow the number of Shortlisted Bids prior to the two rounds of voting. *Id.* at 30623 n.58.

[126] This recusal provision is included in the Plan, as well as in an amendment to the Selection Plan. *See* Order Approving Amendment No. 2 to the Selection Plan, *supra* note 23.

[127] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 5.2(e)(iii)(A).

[128] *Id.* at Section 5.2(e)(iii)(C). Each round of voting throughout the Plan is independent of other rounds. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30623 n.60.

[129] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 5.2(e)(iii)(D).

receiving one point.[130] If the tie persists, the Participants will identify areas for discussion, and revotes will be taken until the tie is broken.[131]

Once two Shortlisted Bids have been chosen, the Voting Senior Officers of the Participants (other than those subject to recusal) will vote for a single Shortlisted Bid from the final two to determine the Initial Plan Processor.[132] If the tie persists, the Participants will identify areas for discussion and, following these discussions, revotes will be taken until the tie is broken.[133] As set forth in Article VI of the Plan, following the selection of the Initial Plan Processor, the Participants will file with the Commission a statement identifying the Initial Plan Processor and including the information required by Rule 608.[134]

5. Functions and Activities of the CAT System

a. Plan Processor

Article VI describes the responsibilities of the selected Plan Processor. The Company, under the direction of the Operating Committee, will enter into one or more agreements with the Plan Processor obligating the Plan Processor to perform the functions and duties contemplated by the Plan to be performed by the Plan Processor, as well as such other functions and duties the Operating Committee deems necessary or appropriate.[135]

As set forth in the Plan, the Plan Processor is required to develop and, with the prior approval of the Operating Committee, implement policies, procedures, and control structures related to the CAT System that are consistent with Rule 613(e)(4), Appendix C and Appendix D.[136] The Plan Processor will: (1) Comply with applicable provisions of 15 U.S. Code § 78u–6 (Securities Whistleblower Incentives and Protection) and the recordkeeping requirements of Rule 613(e)(8); (2) consistent with Appendix D, Central Repository Requirements, ensure the effective management and operation of the Central Repository; (3) consistent with Appendix D, Data Management, ensure the accuracy of the consolidation of the CAT Data [137] reported to the Central Repository; and (4) consistent with Appendix D, Upgrade Process and Development of New Functionality, design and implement appropriate policies and procedures governing the determination to develop new functionality for the CAT including, among other requirements, a mechanism by which changes can be suggested by Advisory Committee members, Participants, or the Commission.[138] Such policies and procedures also shall: (1) Provide for the escalation of reviews of proposed technological changes and upgrades to the Operating Committee; and (2) address the handling of surveillance, including coordinated, Rule 17d–2 under the Exchange Act or Regulatory Surveillance Agreement(s) (''RSA'') surveillance queries and requests for data.[139] Any policy, procedure or standard (and any material modification or amendment thereto) applicable primarily to the performance of the Plan Processor's duties as the Plan Processor (excluding any policies, procedures or standards generally applicable to the Plan Processor's operations and employees) will become effective only upon approval by the Operating Committee.[140] The Plan Processor also will, subject to the prior approval of the Operating Committee, establish appropriate procedures for escalation of matters to the Operating Committee.[141] In addition to other policies, procedures and standards generally applicable to the Plan Processor's employees and contractors, the Plan Processor will have hiring standards and will conduct and enforce background checks (*e.g.,* fingerprint-based) for all of its employees and contractors to ensure the protection, safeguarding and security of the facilities, systems, networks, equipment and data of the CAT System, and will have an insider and external threat policy to detect, monitor and remedy cyber and other threats.[142]

The Plan Processor will enter into appropriate Service Level Agreements (''SLAs'') governing the performance of the Central Repository, as generally described in Appendix D, Functionality of the CAT System, with the prior approval of the Operating Committee.[143] The Plan Processor in conjunction with the Operating Committee will regularly review and, as necessary, update the SLAs, in accordance with the terms of the SLAs.[144] As further contemplated in Appendix C, System Service Level Agreements (SLAs), and in Appendix D, System SLAs, the Plan Processor may enter into appropriate service level agreements with third parties applicable to the Plan Processor's functions related to the CAT System (''Other SLAs''), with the prior approval of the Operating Committee.[145] The CCO and/or the Independent Auditor will, in conjunction with the Plan Processor, and as necessary the Operating Committee, regularly review and, as necessary, update the Other SLAs, in accordance with the terms of the applicable Other SLA.[146] In addition, the Plan Processor: (1) Will, on an ongoing basis and consistent with any applicable policies and procedures, evaluate and implement potential system changes and upgrades to maintain and improve the normal day-to-day operating function of the CAT System; [147] (2) in consultation with the Operating Committee, will, on an as needed basis and consistent with any applicable operational and escalation policies and procedures, implement such material system changes and upgrades as may be required to ensure effective functioning of the CAT System; [148] and (3) in consultation with the Operating Committee, will, on an as needed basis, implement system changes and upgrades to the CAT System to ensure compliance with applicable laws, regulations or rules (including those promulgated by the SEC or any Participant).[149] Furthermore, the Plan Processor will develop and, with the prior approval of the Operating Committee, implement a securities trading policy, as well as necessary procedures, control structures and tools to enforce this policy.[150]

In addition, the Plan Processor will provide the Operating Committee regular reports on the CAT System's operation and maintenance.[151] Furthermore, upon request of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, the Plan Processor will attend any meetings of the Operating Committee or such Subcommittee.[152]

The Plan Processor may appoint such officers of the Plan Processor as it deems necessary and appropriate to perform its functions under the Plan and Rule 613.[153] The Plan Processor, however, will be required to appoint, at a

[130] *Id.*

[131] *Id.*

[132] *Id.* at Section 5.2(e)(iii)(E).

[133] *Id.*

[134] *Id.* at Section 6.7(a)(i).

[135] *Id.* at Section 6.1(a).

[136] *Id.* at Section 6.1(d).

[137] ''CAT Data'' means data derived from Participant Data, Industry Member Data, SIP Data, and such other data as the Operating Committee may designate as ''CAT Data'' from time to time. *Id.* at Section 1.1.

[138] *Id.* at Section 6.1(d).

[139] *Id.*

[140] *Id.* at Section 6.1(e).

[141] *Id.* at Section 6.1(f).

[142] *Id.* at Section 6.1(g).

[143] *Id.* at Section 6.1(h).

[144] *Id.*

[145] *Id.*

[146] *Id.*

[147] *Id.* at Section 6.1(i).

[148] *Id.* at Section 6.1(j).

[149] *Id.* at Section 6.1(k).

[150] *Id.* at Section 6.1(l).

[151] *Id.* at Section 6.1(o).

[152] *Id.* at Section 6.1(p).

[153] *Id.* at Section 6.1(b).

minimum, the CCO, the CISO, and the Independent Auditor.[154] The Operating Committee, by Supermajority Vote, will approve any appointment or removal of the CCO, CISO, or the Independent Auditor.[155]

In addition to a CCO, the Plan Processor will designate at least one other employee (in addition to the person then serving as CCO), which employee the Operating Committee has previously approved, to serve temporarily as the CCO if the employee then serving as the CCO becomes unavailable or unable to serve in such capacity (including by reason of injury or illness).[156] Any person designated to serve as the CCO (including to serve temporarily) will be appropriately qualified to serve in such capacity based on the duties and responsibilities assigned to the CCO and will dedicate such person's entire working time to such service (or temporary service) except for any time required to attend to any incidental administrative matters related to such person's employment with the Plan Processor that do not detract in any material respect from such person's service as the CCO.[157] Article VI sets forth various responsibilities of the CCO. With respect to all of his or her duties and responsibilities in such capacity (including those as set forth in the Plan), the CCO will be directly responsible and will directly report to the Operating Committee, notwithstanding that she or he is employed by the Plan Processor.[158] The Plan Processor, subject to the oversight of the Operating Committee, will ensure that the CCO has appropriate resources to fulfill his or her obligations under the Plan and Rule 613.[159] The compensation (including base salary and bonus) of the CCO will be payable by the Plan Processor, but be subject to review and approval by the Operating Committee.[160] The Operating Committee will render the CCO's annual performance review.[161]

In addition to a CISO, the Plan Processor will designate at least one other employee (in addition to the person then serving as CISO), which employee the Operating Committee has previously approved, to serve temporarily as the CISO if the employee then serving as the CISO becomes unavailable or unable to serve in such capacity (including by reason of injury or illness).[162] Any person designated to serve as the CISO (including to serve temporarily) will be appropriately qualified to serve in such capacity based on the duties and responsibilities assigned to the CISO under the Plan and will dedicate such person's entire working time to such service (or temporary service) except for any time required to attend to any incidental administrative matters related to such person's employment with the Plan Processor that do not detract in any material respect from such person's service as the CISO.[163]

The Plan Processor, subject to the oversight of the Operating Committee, will ensure that the CISO has appropriate resources to fulfill the obligations of the CISO set forth in Rule 613 and in the Plan, including providing appropriate responses to questions posed by the Participants and the SEC.[164] In performing such obligations, the CISO will be directly responsible and directly report to the Operating Committee, notwithstanding that he or she is employed by the Plan Processor.[165] The compensation (including base salary and bonus) of the CISO will be payable by the Plan Processor, but be subject to review and approval by the Operating Committee, and the Operating Committee will render the CISO's annual performance review.[166] Consistent with Appendices C and D, the CISO will be responsible for creating and enforcing appropriate policies, procedures, standards, control structures and real-time tools to monitor and address data security issues for the Plan Processor and the Central Repository, as described in the Plan.[167] At regular intervals, to the extent that such information is available to the Company, the CISO will report to the Operating Committee the activities of the Financial Services Information Sharing and Analysis Center (''FS–ISAC'') or comparable bodies to the extent that the Company has joined FS–ISAC or other comparable body.[168]

The Plan Processor will afford to the Participants and the Commission such access to the Representatives of the Plan Processor as any Participant or the Commission may reasonably request solely for the purpose of performing such Person's regulatory and oversight responsibilities pursuant to the federal securities laws, rules, and regulations or any contractual obligations.[169] The Plan Processor will direct such Representatives to reasonably cooperate with any inquiry, investigation, or proceeding conducted by or on behalf of any Participant or the Commission related to such purpose.[170]

The Operating Committee will review the Plan Processor's performance under the Plan at least once each year, or more often than once each year upon the request of two or more Participants that are not Affiliated Participants.[171] The Operating Committee will notify the SEC of any determination made by the Operating Committee concerning the continuing engagement of the Plan Processor as a result of the Operating Committee's review of the Plan Processor and will provide the SEC with a copy of any reports that may be prepared in connection therewith.[172]

The Operating Committee, by Supermajority Vote, may remove the Plan Processor from such position at any time.[173] However, the Operating Committee, by Majority Vote, may remove the Plan Processor from such position at any time if it determines that the Plan Processor has failed to perform its functions in a reasonably acceptable manner in accordance with the provisions of the Plan or that the Plan Processor's expenses have become excessive and are not justified.[174] In making such a determination, the Operating Committee will consider, among other factors: (1) The reasonableness of the Plan Processor's response to requests from Participants or the Company for technological changes or enhancements; (2) results of any assessments performed pursuant to Section 6.6; (3) the timeliness of preventative and corrective information technology system maintenance for reliable and secure operations; (4) compliance with requirements of Appendix D; and (5) such other factors related to experience, technological capability, quality and reliability of service, costs, back-up facilities, failure to meet service level agreement(s) and regulatory considerations as the Operating Committee may determine to be appropriate.[175]

In addition, the Plan Processor may resign upon two year's (or such other shorter period as may be determined by the Operating Committee by

[154] *Id.*
[155] *Id.*
[156] *Id.*
[157] *Id.*
[158] *Id.* at Section 6.2(a)(iii).
[159] *Id.* at Section 6.2(a)(ii).
[160] *Id.* at Section 6.2(a)(iv).
[161] *Id.* at Section 6.2(b)(i).
[162] *Id.*
[163] *Id.*
[164] *Id.* at Section 6.2(b)(ii).
[165] *Id.* at Section 6.2(b)(iii).
[166] *Id.* at Section 6.2(b)(iv).
[167] *Id.* at Section 6.2(b)(v).
[168] *Id.* at Section 6.2(b)(vi).
[169] *Id.* at Section 6.1(u).
[170] *Id.*
[171] *Id.* at Section 6.1(n).
[172] *Id.*
[173] *Id.* at Section 6.1(q).
[174] *Id.* at Section 6.1(r).
[175] *Id.*

Supermajority Vote) prior written notice.[176] The Operating Committee will fill any vacancy in the Plan Processor position by Supermajority Vote, and will establish a Plan Processor Selection Subcommittee to evaluate and review Bids and make a recommendation to the Operating Committee with respect to the selection of the successor Plan Processor.[177]

b. Central Repository

The Central Repository, under the oversight of the Plan Processor, and consistent with Appendix D, Central Repository Requirements, will receive, consolidate, and retain all CAT Data.[178] The Central Repository will collect (from a Securities Information Processor (''SIP'') or pursuant to an NMS plan) and retain on a current and continuing basis, in a format compatible with the Participant Data and Industry Member Data, all data, including the following: (1) Information, including the size and quote condition, on quotes, including the National Best Bid and National Best Offer for each NMS Security; [179] (2) Last Sale Reports and transaction reports reported pursuant to an effective transaction reporting plan filed with the SEC pursuant to, and meeting the requirements of, Rules 601 and 608; [180] (3) trading halts, Limit Up-Limit Down price bands and LULD indicators; [181] and (4) summary data or reports described in the specifications for each of the SIPs and disseminated by the respective SIP.[182]

Consistent with Appendix D, Data Retention Requirements, the Central Repository will retain the information collected pursuant to paragraphs (c)(7) and (e)(7) of Rule 613 in a convenient and usable standard electronic data format that is directly available and searchable electronically without any manual intervention by the Plan Processor for a period of not less than six years. Such data, when available to the Participants' regulatory Staff and the SEC, will be linked.[183] In addition, the Plan Processor will implement and comply with the records retention policy contemplated by Section 6.1(d)(i).[184]

Consistent with Appendix D, Data Access, the Plan Processor will provide Participants and the SEC access to the Central Repository (including all systems operated by the Central Repository), and access to and use of the CAT Data stored in the Central Repository, solely for the purpose of performing their respective regulatory and oversight responsibilities pursuant to the federal securities laws, rules and regulations or any contractual obligations.[185] The Plan Processor will create and maintain a method of access to the CAT Data stored in the Central Repository that includes the ability to run searches and generate reports.[186] The method in which the CAT Data is stored in the Central Repository will allow the ability to return results of queries that are complex in nature, including market reconstructions and the status of order books at varying time intervals.[187] The Plan Processor will, at least annually and at such earlier time promptly following a request by the Operating Committee, certify to the Operating Committee that only the Participants and the SEC have access to the Central Repository (other than access provided to any Industry Member for the purpose of correcting CAT Data previously reported to the Central Repository by such Industry Member).[188]

c. Data Recording and Reporting by Participants

The Plan also sets forth the requirements regarding the data recording and reporting by Participants.[189] Each Participant will record and electronically report to the Central Repository the following details for each order and each Reportable Event,[190] as applicable (''Participant Data;'' also referred to as ''Recorded Industry Member Data'', as discussed in the next Section):

for original receipt or origination of an order: (1) Firm Designated ID(s) (FDIs) for each customer; [191] (2) CAT-Order-ID; [192] (3) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member receiving or originating the order; [193] (4) date of order receipt or origination; [194] (5) time of order receipt or origination (using time stamps pursuant to Section 6.8); [195] and (6) the Material Terms of the Order.[196]

for the routing of an order: (1) CAT-Order-ID; [197] (2) date on which the order is routed; [198] (3) time at which the order is routed (using time stamps pursuant to Section 6.8); [199] (4) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member or Participant routing the order; [200] (5) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member or Participant to which the order is being routed; [201] (6) if routed internally at the Industry Member, the identity and nature of the department or desk to which the order is routed; [202] and (7) the Material Terms of the Order.[203]

for the receipt of an order that has been routed, the following information: (1) CAT-Order-ID; [204] (2) date on which the order is received; [205] (3) time at which the order is received (using time stamps pursuant to Section 6.8); [206] (4) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member or Participant receiving the order; [207] (5) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member or Participant routing the order; [208] and (6) the Material Terms of the Order.[209]

if the order is modified or cancelled: (1) CAT-Order-ID; [210] (2) date the modification or cancellation is received or originated; [211] (3) time at which the modification or cancellation is received or originated (using time stamps pursuant to Section 6.8); [212] (4) price and remaining size of the order, if modified; [213] (5) other changes in Material Terms, if modified; [214] and (6) whether the modification or cancellation instruction was given by the Customer, or was initiated by the Industry Member or Participant.[215]

[176] *Id.* at Section 6.1(s).

[177] *Id.* at Section 6.1(t).

[178] *Id.* at Section 6.5(a)(i).

[179] *Id.* at Section 6.5(a)(ii)(A).

[180] *Id.* at Section 6.5(a)(ii)(B).

[181] *Id.* at Section 6.5(a)(ii)(C).

[182] *Id.* at Section 6.5(a)(ii)(D).

[183] *Id.* at Section 6.5(b)(i).

[184] *Id.* at Section 6.5(b)(ii).

[185] *Id.* at Section 6.5(c)(i).

[186] *Id.* at Section 6.5(c)(ii).

[187] *Id.* at Section 6.5(c)(ii).

[188] *Id.* at Section 6.5(c)(iii); *see also id.* at Appendix C, The Security and Confidentiality of Information Reported to the Central Repository, and Appendix D, Data Security, describe the security and confidentiality of the CAT Data, including how access to the Central Repository is controlled.

[189] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.3. Participants may, but are not required to, coordinate compliance with the recording and reporting efforts through the use of regulatory services agreements and/or agreements adopted pursuant to Rule 17d-2 under the Exchange Act.

[190] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(d). The CAT NMS Plan defines ''Reportable Event'' as ''includ[ing], but . . . not limited to, the original receipt or origination, modification, cancellation, routing, execution (in whole or in part) and allocation of an order, and receipt of a routed order.'' *Id.* at Section 1.1.

[191] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(i)(A).

[192] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(i)(B).

[193] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(i)(C).

[194] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(i)(D).

[195] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(i)(E).

[196] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(i)(F). For a discussion of the Material Terms of the Order required by Rule 613, *see* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45750–52. The Commission notes that the Participants include in the Plan a requirement for the reporting of the OTC Equity Security symbol as one of the ''Material Terms of the Order.'' *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[197] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.3(d)(ii)(A).

[198] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(ii)(B).

[199] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(ii)(C).

[200] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(ii)(D).

[201] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(ii)(E).

[202] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(ii)(F).

[203] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(ii)(G).

[204] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iii)(A).

[205] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iii)(B).

[206] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iii)(C).

[207] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iii)(D).

[208] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iii)(E).

[209] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iii)(F).

[210] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iv)(A).

[211] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iv)(B).

[212] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iv)(C).

[213] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iv)(D).

[214] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iv)(E).

[215] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iv)(F).

if the order is executed, in whole or in part: (1) CAT-Order-ID; [216] (2) date of execution; [217] (3) time of execution (using time stamps pursuant to Section 6.8); [218] (4) execution capacity (principal, agency or riskless principal); [219] (5) execution price and size;[220] (6) the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Participant or Industry Member executing the order; [221] (7) whether the execution was reported pursuant to an effective transaction reporting plan or the Plan for Reporting of Consolidated Options Last Sale Reports and Quotation Information; [222] and (8) other information or additional events as may otherwise be prescribed in Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements.[223]

As contemplated in Appendix D, Data Types and Sources, each Participant will report Participant Data to the Central Repository for consolidation and storage in a format specified by the Plan Processor, approved by the Operating Committee and compliant with Rule 613.[224] As further described in Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements, each Participant is required to record the Participant Data contemporaneously with the Reportable Event.[225] In addition, each Participant must report the Participant Data to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time (''ET'') on the Trading Day following the day that the Participant recorded the Participant Data.[226] Participants may voluntarily report the Participant Data prior to the 8:00 a.m. ET deadline.[227]

Each Participant that is a national securities exchange is required to comply with the above recording and reporting requirements for each NMS Security registered or listed for trading on such exchange or admitted to unlisted trading privileges on such exchange.[228] Each Participant that is a national securities association is required to comply with the above recording and reporting requirements for each Eligible Security for which transaction reports are required to be submitted to the association.[229]

d. Data Reporting and Recording by Industry Members

The Plan also sets forth the data reporting and recording requirements for Industry Members. Specifically, subject to Section 6.4(c), and Section 6.4(d)(iii) with respect to Options Market Makers, and consistent with Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements, each Participant, through its Compliance Rule, will require its Industry Members to record and electronically report to the Central Repository for each order and each Reportable Event the information referred to in Section 6.3(d), as applicable (''Recorded Industry Member Data'')—that is, Participant Data discussed above.[230] In addition, subject to Section 6.4(c), and Section 6.4(d)(iii) with respect to Options Market Makers, and consistent with Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements, each Participant, through its Compliance Rule, will require its Industry Members to record and report to the Central Repository the following (''Received Industry Member Data'' and, collectively with the Recorded Industry Member Data, ''Industry Member Data''): (1) If the order is executed, in whole or in part: (a) An Allocation Report; [231] (b) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the clearing broker or prime broker, if applicable; and (c) CAT-Order-ID of any contra-side order(s); (2) if the trade is cancelled, a cancelled trade indicator; and (3) for original receipt or origination of an order, information of sufficient detail to identify the Customer.[232]

With respect to the reporting obligations of an Options Market Maker with regard to its quotes in Listed Options, Reportable Events required pursuant to Sections 6.3(d)(ii) and (iv) will be reported to the Central Repository by an Options Exchange in lieu of the reporting of such information by the Options Market Maker.[233] Each Participant that is an Options Exchange will, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members that are Options Market Makers to report to the Options Exchange the time at which a quote in a Listed Option is sent to the Options Exchange (and, if applicable, any subsequent quote modifications and/or cancellation time when such modification or cancellation is originated by the Options Market Maker).[234] Such time information also will be reported to the Central Repository by the Options Exchange in lieu of reporting by the Options Market Maker.[235]

Each Participant will, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to record and report to the Central Repository other information or additional events as prescribed in Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements.[236]

As contemplated in Appendix D, Data Types and Sources, each Participant will require its Industry Members to report Industry Member Data to the Central Repository for consolidation and storage in a format(s) specified by the Plan Processor, approved by the Operating Committee and compliant with Rule 613.[237] As further described in Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements, each Participant will require its Industry Members to record Recorded Industry Member Data contemporaneously with the applicable Reportable Event.[238] In addition, consistent with Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements, each Participant will require its Industry Members to report: (1) Recorded Industry Member Data to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. ET on the Trading Day following the day the Industry Member records such Recorded Industry Member Data; and (2) Received Industry Member Data to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. ET on the Trading Day following the day the Industry Member receives such Received Industry Member Data.[239] Each Participant will permit its Industry Members to voluntarily report Industry Member Data prior to the applicable 8:00 a.m. ET deadline.[240]

Each Participant that is a national securities exchange must require its Industry Members to report Industry Member Data for each NMS Security registered or listed for trading on such exchange or admitted to unlisted trading privileges on such exchange.[241] Each Participant that is a national securities association must require its Industry Members to report Industry Member Data for each Eligible Security for which transaction reports are required to be submitted to the association.[242]

e. Written Assessment

As described in Article VI, the Participants are required to provide the Commission with a written assessment of the operation of the CAT that meets the requirements set forth in Rule 613, Appendix D, and the Plan at least every

[216] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(v)(A).
[217] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(v)(B).
[218] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(v)(C).
[219] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(v)(D).
[220] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(v)(E).
[221] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(v)(F).
[222] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(v)(G).
[223] *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(vi).
[224] *Id.* at Section 6.3(a); Appendix D, Section 2.1.
[225] *Id.* at Section 6.3(b)(i); Appendix D, Section 3.
[226] *Id.* at Section 6.3(b)(ii).
[227] *Id.* at Section 6.3(b)(ii).
[228] *Id.* at Section 6.3(c)(i).
[229] *Id.* at Section 6.3(c)(ii).
[230] *Id.* at Section 6.4(d)(i).
[231] *Id.* at Section 6.4(d)(ii).
[232] *Id.*
[233] *Id.* at Section 6.4(d)(iii).
[234] *Id.*
[235] *Id.*
[236] *Id.* at Section 6.4(d)(v).
[237] *Id.* at Section 6.4(e).
[238] *Id.* at Section 6.4(b)(i).
[239] *Id.* at Section 6.4(b)(ii).
[240] *Id.*
[241] *Id.* at Section 6.4(c)(i).
[242] *Id.* at Section 6.4(c)(ii).

two years or more frequently in connection with any review of the Plan Processor's performance under the Plan pursuant to Section 6.1(n).[243] The CCO will oversee this assessment and will provide the Participants a reasonable time to review and comment upon the written assessment prior to its submission to the SEC.[244] In no case will the written assessment be changed or amended in response to a comment from a Participant; rather any comment by a Participant will be provided to the SEC at the same time as the written assessment.[245]

f. Business Clock Synchronization and Timestamp

Section 6.8 of the Plan discusses the synchronization of Business Clocks [246] and timestamps.

Each Participant is required to synchronize its Business Clocks (other than such Business Clocks used solely for Manual Order Events) at a minimum to within 50 milliseconds of the time maintained by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (''NIST''), consistent with industry standards.[247] In addition, each Participant must, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to: (1) Synchronize their respective Business Clocks (other than such Business Clocks used solely for Manual Order Events) at a minimum to within 50 milliseconds of the time maintained by the NIST, and maintain such a synchronization; (2) certify periodically that their Business Clocks meet the requirements of the Compliance Rule; and (3) report to the Plan Processor and the Participant any violation of the Compliance Rule pursuant to the thresholds set by the Operating Committee.[248] Furthermore, each Participant is required to synchronize its Business Clocks and, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to synchronize their Business Clocks used solely for Manual Order Events at a minimum to within one second of the time maintained by the NIST, consistent with industry standards, and maintain such synchronization.[249] Each Participant will require its Industry Members to certify periodically (according to a schedule defined by the Operating Committee) that their Business Clocks used solely for Manual Order Events meet the requirements of the Compliance Rule.[250] The Compliance Rule of a Participant shall require its Industry Members using Business Clocks solely for Manual Order Events to report to the Plan Processor any violation of the Compliance Rule pursuant to the thresholds set by the Operating Committee.[251] Pursuant to Section 6.8(c) of the CAT NMS Plan, the CCO, in conjunction with the Participants and other appropriate Industry Member advisory groups, annually must evaluate and make a recommendation to the Operating Committee as to whether the industry standard has evolved such that the clock synchronization standard should be tightened.[252]

Appendix C discusses mechanisms to ensure compliance with the 50 millisecond clock offset tolerance.[253] The Participants anticipate that they and Industry Members will adopt policies and procedures to verify the required clock synchronization each trading day before the market opens, as well as periodically throughout the trading day.[254] The Participants also anticipate that they and Industry Members will document their clock synchronization procedures and maintain a log recording the time of each clock synchronization performed, and the result of such synchronization, specifically identifying any synchronization revealing any clock offset between the Participant's or Industry Member's Business Clock and the time maintained by the NIST exceeding 50 milliseconds.[255] The CAT NMS Plan states that once both large and small broker-dealers begin reporting to the Central Repository, and as clock synchronization technology matures further, the Participants will assess, in accordance with Rule 613, tightening the CAT's clock synchronization standards to reflect changes in industry standards.[256]

Each Participant shall, and through its Compliance Rule require its Industry Members to, report information required by Rule 613 and the Plan to the Central Repository in milliseconds.[257] To the extent that any Participant utilizes timestamps in increments finer than the minimum required by the Plan, the Participant is required to make reports to the Central Repository utilizing such finer increment when reporting CAT Data to the Central Repository so that all Reportable Events reported to the Central Repository could be adequately sequenced. Each Participant will, through its Compliance Rule: (1) Require that, to the extent that its Industry Members utilize timestamps in increments finer than the minimum required in the Plan, such Industry Members will utilize such finer increment when reporting CAT Data to the Central Repository; and (2) provide that a pattern or practice of reporting events outside of the required clock synchronization time period without reasonable justification or exceptional circumstances may be considered a violation of SEC Rule 613 and the Plan.[258] Notwithstanding the preceding sentences, each Participant and Industry Member will be permitted to record and report Manual Order Events to the Central Repository in increments up to and including one second, provided that Participants and Industry Members will be required to record and report the time when a Manual Order Event has been captured electronically in an order handling and execution system of such Participant or Industry Member (''Electronic Capture Time'') in milliseconds.[259] In conjunction with Participants' and other appropriate Industry Member advisory groups, the CCO will annually evaluate and make a recommendation to the Operating Committee as to whether industry standards have evolved such that the required synchronization should be shortened or the required timestamp should be in finer increments.[260] The Operating Committee will make determinations regarding the need to revise the synchronization and timestamp requirements.[261]

[243] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.6(a)(i).

[244] *Id.* at Section 6.6(a)(ii).

[245] *Id.*

[246] *Id.* at Section 1.1. The CAT NMS Plan defines a ''Business Clock'' to mean ''a clock used to record the date and time of any Reportable Event required to be reported under SEC Rule 613.'' *Id.*

[247] *Id.* at Section 6.8(a)(i). Participants and Industry Members reviewed their respective internal clock synchronization technology practices, and reviewed the results of The Financial Information Forum (''FIF'') Clock Offset and determined that a 50 millisecond clock offset tolerance was consistent with the current industry clock synchronization standard. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.3(c) and D.12(p); *see also* Financial Information Forum, FIF Clock Offset Survey Preliminary Report (February 17, 2015), *available at http://www.catnmsplan.com/industryfeedback/p602479.pdf* and *http://catnmsplan.com/web/groups/catnms/@catnms/documents/appsupportdocs/p602479.pdf* (''FIF Clock Offset Survey'').

[248] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.8(a)(ii).

[249] *Id.* at Section 6.8(a)(iii).

[250] *Id.*

[251] *Id.*

[252] *Id.* at Section 6.8(c).

[253] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(c).

[254] *See id.*

[255] *See id.* It was noted that such a log would include results for a period of not less than five years ending on the then current date. *Id.*

[256] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section D.12(p).

[257] *See id.* at Section 6.8(b).

[258] *Id.* at Section 6.8(b).

[259] *Id.*

[260] *Id.* at Section 6.8(c).

[261] *Id.* at Sections 6.8(a)(ii)(C), 6.8(a)(iii).

g. Technical Specifications

Section 6.9 of the Plan establishes the requirements involving the Plan Processor's Technical Specifications. The Plan Processor will publish Technical Specifications that are at a minimum consistent with Appendices C and D, and updates thereto as needed, providing detailed instructions regarding the submission of CAT Data by Participants and Industry Members to the Plan Processor for entry into the Central Repository.[262] The Technical Specifications will be made available on a publicly available Web site to be developed and maintained by the Plan Processor.[263] The initial Technical Specifications and any Material Amendments thereto will require the approval of the Operating Committee by Supermajority Vote.[264]

The Technical Specifications will include a detailed description of the following: (1) The specifications for the layout of files and records submitted to the Central Repository; (2) the process for the release of new data format specification changes; (3) the process for industry testing for any changes to data format specifications; (4) the procedures for obtaining feedback about and submitting corrections to information submitted to the Central Repository; (5) each data element, including permitted values, in any type of report submitted to the Central Repository; (6) any error messages generated by the Plan Processor in the course of validating the data; (7) the process for file submissions (and re-submissions for corrected files); (8) the storage and access requirements for all files submitted; (9) metadata requirements for all files submitted to the CAT System; (10) any required secure network connectivity; (11) data security standards, which will, at a minimum: (a) Satisfy all applicable regulations regarding database security, including provisions of Regulation Systems Compliance and Integrity under the Exchange Act (''Reg SCI''); (b) to the extent not otherwise provided for under the Plan (including Appendix C thereto), set forth such provisions as may be necessary or appropriate to comply with Rule 613(e)(4); and (c) comply with industry best practices; and (12) any other items reasonably deemed appropriate by the Plan Processor and approved by the Operating Committee.[265]

Amendments to the Technical Specifications may be made only in accordance with Section 6.9(c).[266] The process for amending the Technical Specifications varies depending on whether the change is material. An amendment will be deemed ''material'' if it would require a Participant or an Industry Member to engage in significant changes to the coding necessary to submit information to the Central Repository pursuant to the Plan, or if it is required to safeguard the security or confidentiality of the CAT Data.[267] Except for Material Amendments to the Technical Specifications, the Plan Processor will have the sole discretion to amend and publish interpretations regarding the Technical Specifications; however, all non-Material Amendments made to the Technical Specifications and all published interpretations will be provided to the Operating Committee in writing at least ten days before being published.[268] Such non-Material Amendments and published interpretations will be deemed approved ten days following provision to the Operating Committee unless two or more unaffiliated Participants call for a vote to be taken on the proposed amendment or interpretation.[269] If an amendment or interpretation is called for a vote by two or more unaffiliated Participants, the proposed amendment must be approved by Majority Vote of the Operating Committee.[270] Once a non-Material Amendment has been approved or deemed approved by the Operating Committee, the Plan Processor will be responsible for determining the specific changes to the Central Repository and providing technical documentation of those changes, including an implementation timeline.[271]

Material Amendments to the Technical Specifications require approval of the Operating Committee by Supermajority Vote.[272] The Operating Committee, by Supermajority Vote, may amend the Technical Specifications on its own motion.[273]

h. Surveillance

Surveillance requirements are described in Section 6.10. Using the tools provided for in Appendix D, Functionality of the CAT System, each Participant will develop and implement a surveillance system, or enhance existing surveillance systems, reasonably designed to make use of the consolidated information contained in the Central Repository.[274] Unless otherwise ordered by the SEC, within fourteen months after the Effective Date, each Participant must initially implement a new or enhanced surveillance system(s) as required by Rule 613 and Section 6.10(a) of the Plan.[275] Participants may, but are not required to, coordinate surveillance efforts through the use of regulatory services agreements and agreements adopted pursuant to Rule 17d-2 under the Exchange Act.[276]

Consistent with Appendix D, Functionality of the CAT System, the Plan Processor will provide Participants and the SEC with access to all CAT Data stored in the Central Repository. Regulators will have access to processed CAT Data through two different methods: (1) An online targeted query tool; and (2) user-defined direct queries and bulk extracts.[277] The online targeted query tool will provide authorized users with the ability to retrieve CAT Data via an online query screen that includes the ability to choose from a variety of pre-defined selection criteria.[278] Targeted queries must include date(s) and/or time range(s), as well as one or more of a variety of fields.[279] The user-defined direct queries and bulk extracts will provide authorized users with the ability to retrieve CAT Data via a query tool or language that allows users to query all available attributes and data sources.[280]

Extraction of CAT Data will be consistent with all permission rights granted by the Plan Processor.[281] All CAT Data returned will be encrypted, and PII data [282] will be masked unless users have permission to view the PII contained in the CAT Data that has been requested.[283]

The Plan Processor will implement an automated mechanism to monitor direct query usage.[284] Such monitoring will

[262] *Id.* at Section 6.9(a).

[263] *Id.*

[264] *Id.*

[265] *Id.* at Section 6.9(b).

[266] *Id.* at Section 6.9(c).

[267] *Id.*

[268] *Id.* at Section 6.9(c)(i).

[269] *Id.*

[270] *Id.*

[271] *Id.*

[272] *Id.* at Section 6.9(c)(ii).

[273] *Id.* at Section 6.9(c)(iii).

[274] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.10(a).

[275] *Id.*

[276] *Id.* at Section 6.10(b).

[277] *Id.* at Section 6.10(c)(i).

[278] *Id.* at Section 6.10(c)(i)(A).

[279] *Id.*

[280] *Id.* at Section 6.10(c)(i)(B).

[281] *Id.* at Section 6.10(c)(ii).

[282] The proposed CAT NMS Plan defines PII as ''personally identifiable information, including a social security number or tax identifier number or similar information.'' *Id.* at Section 1.1.

[283] *Id.* at Section 6.10(c)(ii).

[284] *Id.* at Section 6.10(c)(iii) (providing that ''[s]uch monitoring shall include automated alerts to notify the Plan Processor of potential issues with bottlenecks or excessively long queues for queries or CAT Data extractions. The Plan Processor shall provide the Operating Committee or its designee(s)

Continued

include automated alerts to notify the Plan Processor of potential issues with bottlenecks or excessively long queues for queries or CAT Data extractions.[285] The Plan Processor will provide the Operating Committee or its designee(s) details as to how the monitoring will be accomplished and the metrics that will be used to trigger alerts.[286]

The Plan Processor will reasonably assist regulatory Staff (including those of Participants) with creating queries.[287] Without limiting the manner in which regulatory Staff (including those of Participants) may submit queries, the Plan Processor will submit queries on behalf of regulatory Staff (including those of Participants) as reasonably requested.[288] The Plan Processor will staff a CAT help desk, as described in Appendix D, CAT Help Desk, to provide technical expertise to assist regulatory Staff (including those of Participants) with questions about the content and structure of the CAT Data.[289]

i. Information Security Program

As set forth in Section 6.12, the Plan Processor is required to develop and maintain a comprehensive information security program for the Central Repository that contains, at a minimum, the specific requirements detailed in Appendix D, Data Security. The information security program must be approved and reviewed at least annually by the Operating Committee.[290]

6. Financial Matters

Articles VII and VIII of the Plan address certain financial matters related to the Company. In particular, the Plan states that, subject to certain special allocations provided for in Section 8.2, any net profit or net loss will be allocated among the Participants equally.[291] In addition, subject to Section 10.2, cash and property of the Company will not be distributed to the Participants unless the Operating Committee approves by Supermajority Vote a distribution after fully considering the reason that such distribution must or should be made to the Participants, including the circumstances contemplated under Section 8.3, Section 8.6, and Section 9.3.[292] To the extent a distribution is made, all Participants will participate equally in any such distribution except as otherwise provided in Section 10.2.[293]

Article XI addresses the funding of the Company. On an annual basis the Operating Committee will approve an operating budget for the Company.[294] The budget will include the projected costs of the Company, including the costs of developing and operating the CAT System for the upcoming year, and the sources of all revenues to cover such costs, as well as the funding of any reserve that the Operating Committee reasonably deems appropriate for prudent operation of the Company.[295]

Subject to certain funding principles set forth in Article XI, the Operating Committee will have discretion to establish funding for the Company, including: (1) Establishing fees that the Participants will pay; and (2) establishing fees for Industry Members that will be implemented by Participants.[296] In establishing the funding of the Company, the Operating Committee will seek to: (1) Create transparent, predictable revenue streams for the Company that are aligned with the anticipated costs to build, operate and administer the CAT and the other costs of the Company; (2) establish an allocation of the Company's related costs among Participants and Industry Members that is consistent with the Exchange Act, taking into account the timeline for implementation of the CAT and distinctions in the securities trading operations of Participants and Industry Members and their relative impact upon Company resources and operations; (3) establish a tiered fee structure in which the fees charged to: (a) CAT Reporters that are Execution Venues, including Alternative Trading Systems (''ATSs''), are based upon the level of market share, (b) Industry Members' non-ATS activities are based upon message traffic, and (c) the CAT Reporters with the most CAT-related activity (measured by market share and/or message traffic, as applicable) are generally comparable (where, for these comparability purposes, the tiered fee structure takes into consideration affiliations between or among CAT Reporters, whether Execution Venues and/or Industry Members); (4) provide for ease of billing and other administrative functions; (5) avoid any disincentives such as placing an inappropriate burden on competition and a reduction in market quality; and (6) build financial stability to support the Company as a going concern.[297] The Participants will file with the SEC under Section 19(b) of the Exchange Act any such fees on Industry Members that the Operating Committee approves, and such fees will be labeled as ''Consolidated Audit Trail Funding Fees.'' [298]

To fund the development and implementation of the CAT, the Company will time the imposition and collection of all fees on Participants and Industry Members in a manner reasonably related to the timing when the Company expects to incur such development and implementation costs.[299] In determining fees for Participants and Industry Members, the Operating Committee shall take into account fees, costs and expenses (including legal and consulting fees and expenses) incurred by the Participants on behalf of the Company prior to the Effective Date in connection with the creation and implementation of the CAT, and such fees, costs and expenses shall be fairly and reasonably shared among the Participants and Industry Members.[300] Consistent with Article XI, the Operating Committee will adopt policies, procedures, and practices regarding the budget and budgeting process, assignment of tiers, resolution of disputes, billing and collection of fees, and other related matters.[301] As a part of its regular review of fees for the CAT, the Operating Committee will have the right to change the tier assigned to any particular Person pursuant to this Article XI.[302] Any such changes will be effective upon reasonable notice to such Person.[303]

The Operating Committee will establish fixed fees to be payable by Execution Venues as follows. Each Execution Venue that executes transactions, or, in the case of a national securities association, has trades reported by its members to its trade reporting facility or facilities for reporting transactions effected otherwise than on an exchange, in NMS Stocks or OTC Equity Securities will pay a fixed fee depending on the market share of that Execution Venue in NMS

details as to how the monitoring will be accomplished and the metrics that will be used to trigger alerts'').

[285] *Id.*

[286] *Id.*

[287] *Id.* at 6.10(c)(iv).

[288] *Id.* at Section 6.10(c)(v).

[289] *Id.* at Section 6.10(c)(vi).

[290] *Id.* at Section 6.12.

[291] *Id.* at Section 8.1.

[292] *Id.* at Section 8.5(a).

[293] *Id.*

[294] *Id.* at Section 11.1(a).

[295] *Id.*

[296] *Id.* at Section 11.1(b).

[297] *Id.* at Section 11.2.

[298] *Id.* at Section 11.1(b).

[299] *Id.* at Section 11.1(c).

[300] *Id.*

[301] *Id.* at Section 11.1(d).

[302] The Commission notes that Section 11.1(b) of the CAT NMS Plan states that the Participants would file fees for Industry Members approved by the Operating Committee with the Commission. The Operating Committee may only change the tier to which a Person is assigned in accordance with a fee schedule filed with the Commission.

[303] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 11.1(d).

Stocks and OTC Equity Securities.[304] The Operating Committee will establish at least two and no more than five tiers of fixed fees, based on an Execution Venue's NMS Stocks and OTC Equity Securities market share.[305] For these purposes, market share will be calculated by share volume.[306] In addition, each Execution Venue that executes transactions in Listed Options will pay a fixed fee depending on the Listed Options market share of that Execution Venue.[307] The Operating Committee will establish at least two and no more than five tiers of fixed fees, based on an Execution Venue's Listed Options market share, with market share calculated by contract volume.[308] Changes to the number of tiers after approval of the Plan would require a Supermajority Vote of the Operating Committee and Commission approval under Section 19(b) of the Exchange Act, as would the establishment of the initial fee schedule and any changes to the fee schedule within the tier structure.[309]

The Operating Committee also will establish fixed fees payable by Industry Members, based on the message traffic generated by such Industry Member.[310] The Operating Committee will establish at least five and no more than nine tiers of fixed fees, based on message traffic.[311] For the avoidance of doubt, the fixed fees payable by Industry Members pursuant to this paragraph will, in addition to any other applicable message traffic, include message traffic generated by: (1) An ATS that does not execute orders that is sponsored by such Industry Member; and (2) routing orders to and from any ATS system sponsored by such Industry Member.[312]

Furthermore, the Operating Committee may establish any other fees ancillary to the operation of the CAT that it reasonably determines appropriate, including: fees for the late or inaccurate reporting of information to the CAT; fees for correcting submitted information; and fees based on access and use of the CAT for regulatory and oversight purposes (and not including any reporting obligations).[313]

The Company will make publicly available a schedule of effective fees and charges adopted pursuant to the Plan as in effect from time to time.[314] Such schedule will be developed after the Plan Processor is selected.[315] The Operating Committee will review the fee schedule on at least an annual basis and will make any changes to such fee schedule that it deems appropriate.[316] The Operating Committee is authorized to review the fee schedule on a more regular basis, but will not make any changes on more than a semi-annual basis unless, pursuant to a Supermajority Vote, the Operating Committee concludes that such change is necessary for the adequate funding of the Company.[317]

The Operating Committee will establish a system for the collection of fees authorized under the Plan.[318] The Operating Committee may include such collection responsibility as a function of the Plan Processor or another administrator.[319] Alternatively, the Operating Committee may use the facilities of a clearing agency registered under Section 17A of the Exchange Act to provide for the collection of such fees.[320]

Each Participant will require each Industry Member to pay all applicable fees authorized under Article XI within thirty days after receipt of an invoice or other notice indicating payment is due (unless a longer payment period is otherwise indicated).[321] If an Industry Member fails to pay any such fee when due, such Industry Member will pay interest on the outstanding balance from such due date until such fee is paid at a per annum rate equal to the lesser of: (1) The Prime Rate plus 300 basis points; or (2) the maximum rate permitted by applicable law.[322] Each Participant will pay all applicable fees authorized under Article XI as required by Section 3.7(b).[323]

Disputes with respect to fees the Company charges Participants pursuant to Article XI will be determined by the Operating Committee or a Subcommittee designated by the Operating Committee.[324] Decisions by the Operating Committee on such matters shall be binding on Participants, without prejudice to the rights of any Participant to seek redress from the SEC pursuant to SEC Rule 608 or in any other appropriate forum.[325] The Participants will adopt rules requiring that disputes with respect to fees charged to Industry Members pursuant to Article XI be determined by the Operating Committee or a Subcommittee.[326] Decisions by the Operating Committee or Subcommittee on such matters will be binding on Industry Members, without prejudice to the rights of any Industry Member to seek redress from the SEC pursuant to SEC Rule 608 or in any other appropriate forum.[327]

7. Amendments

Section 12.3 of the CAT NMS Plan, which governs amendments to the Plan, states that, except with respect to the addition of new Participants (Section 3.3), the transfer of Company Interest (Section 3.4), the termination of a Participant's participation in the Plan (Section 3.7), amendments to the Selection Plan (Section 5.3 [sic]) and special allocations (Section 8.2), any change to the Plan requires a written amendment authorized by the affirmative vote of not less than two-thirds of all of the Participants, or with respect to Section 3.8 by the affirmative vote of all the Participants.[328] Such proposed amendment must be approved by the Commission pursuant to Rule 608 or otherwise becomes effective under Rule 608.[329] Notwithstanding the foregoing, to the extent that the Commission grants exemptive relief applicable to any provision of the LLC Agreement, Participants and Industry Members will be entitled to comply with such provision pursuant to the terms of the exemptive relief so granted at the time such relief is granted irrespective of whether the LLC Agreement has been amended.[330]

---

[304] *Id.* at Section 11.3(a)(i).

[305] *Id.*

[306] *Id.*

[307] *Id.* at Section 11.3(a)(ii).

[308] *Id.*

[309] The Commission notes that the Participants could choose to submit the proposed fee schedule to the Commission as individual SROs pursuant to Rule 19b–4 or jointly as Participants to an NMS plan pursuant to Rule 608 of Regulation NMS. Because the proposed fee schedule would establish fees, whether the Participants individually file it pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, or jointly file it pursuant to Rule 608(b)(3)(i) of Regulation NMS, the proposed fee schedule could take effect upon filing with the Commission. *See* 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii); 17 CFR 242.608(b)(3)(i); *see also* Section IV.F, *infra*.

[310] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 11.3(b).

[311] *Id.*

[312] *Id.*

[313] As it relates to fees that the Operating Committee may impose for access and use of the CAT for regulatory and oversight purposes, the Commission interprets the provisions in the Plan relating to the collection of fees as applying only to Participants and Industry Members, and thus the Commission would not be subject to such fees. *See* Section IV.F, *infra,* for further discussion regarding the funding of the Company.

[314] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 11.3(d).

[315] *Id.*

[316] *Id.; see also supra* note 309.

[317] *Id.*

[318] *Id.* at Section 11.4.

[319] *Id.*

[320] *Id.*

[321] *Id.*

[322] *Id.*

[323] *Id.*

[324] *Id.* at Section 11.5.

[325] *Id.*

[326] *Id.*

[327] *Id.*

[328] *Id.* at Section 12.3.

[329] *Id.*

[330] *Id.*

8. Compliance Rule Applicable to Industry Members

Under Article III, each Participant agrees to comply with and enforce compliance by its Industry Members with the provisions of Rule 613 and the Plan, as applicable, to the Participant and its Industry Members.[331] Accordingly, the Participants will endeavor to promulgate consistent rules (after taking into account circumstances and considerations that may impact Participants differently) requiring compliance by their respective Industry Members with the provisions of Rule 613 and the Plan.[332]

9. Plan Appendices

The Plan includes three appendices.[333] Appendix A provides the Consolidated Audit Trail National Market System Plan Request for Proposal, as issued February 26, 2013 and subsequently updated. In addition, Rule 613(a)(1) requires that the Plan discuss twelve considerations that explain the choices made by the Participants to meet the requirements specified in Rule 613 for the CAT. In accordance with this requirement, the Participants have addressed each of the twelve considerations in Appendix C. Finally, Appendix D describes the technical requirements for the Plan Processor.

As mentioned, Appendix C discusses the various ''considerations'' regarding how the Participants propose to develop and implement the CAT required to be discussed by Rule 613.[334] These considerations, include: (i) The reporting of data to the Central Repository, including the sources of the data and the manner in which the Central Repository will receive, extract, transform, load, and retain the data; (ii) the time and method by which the data in the Central Repository will be made available to regulators; (iii) the reliability and accuracy of the data reported to and maintained by the Central Repository throughout its lifecycle; (iv) the security and confidentiality of the information reported to the Central Repository; (v) the flexibility and scalability of the systems used by the Central Repository to collect, consolidate and store CAT Data; (vi) the feasibility, benefits and costs of broker-dealers reporting certain information to the CAT in a timely manner; (vii) an analysis of expected benefits and estimated costs for creating, implementing, and maintaining the CAT pursuant to the proposed CAT NMS Plan; (viii) an analysis of the proposed CAT NMS Plan's impact on competition, efficiency, and capital formation; (ix) a plan to eliminate rules and systems that will be rendered duplicative by the CAT; (x) objective milestones to assess progress toward the implementation of the proposed CAT NMS Plan; (xi) the process by which Participants solicited views of members and other parties regarding creation, implementation, and maintenance of CAT and a summary of these views and how the Participants took them into account in preparing the CAT NMS Plan; and (xii) a discussion of reasonable alternative approaches that the Participants considered to create, implement, and maintain the CAT.[335]

The technical requirements discussed in Appendix D to the CAT NMS Plan, CAT NMS Plan Processor Requirements, include an outline of minimum functional and technical requirements established by the Participants of the CAT NMS Plan for the Plan Processor. Appendix D provides the Plan Processor with details and guidelines for compliance with the requirements contained in Article VI that are not expressly stated therein.

Appendix D also outlines technical architecture, capacity and data retention requirements for the Central Repository,[336] as well as describes the types of data that would be reported to the Central Repository and the sources of such information.[337] The Appendix outlines specific requirements relating to reporting data, linking data, validating and processing data and timing for availability to regulators.[338] Appendix D further discusses how regulators would be able to access and use the data.[339] It also provides requirements related to data security, and specific requirements governing how Customer and Customer Account Information must be captured and stored, separate from transactional data.[340] Appendix D outlines requirements for the Plan Processor's disaster recovery and business continuity plans.[341] Finally, Appendix D describes plans for technical, operational, and business support to CAT Reporters for all aspects of reporting, and describes how upgrades and new functionality would be incorporated.[342]

10. Reporting Procedures

The CAT NMS Plan requires CAT Reporters to comply with specific reporting procedures when reporting CAT Data to the Central Repository.[343] Specifically, CAT Reporters must format CAT Data to comply with the format specifications approved by the Operating Committee.[344] CAT Reporters must record CAT Data contemporaneously with the applicable Reportable Event [345] and report such data to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. ET on the next Trading Day.[346] The obligation to report CAT Data applies to ''each NMS Security registered or listed for trading on [a national securities] exchange or admitted to unlisted trading privileges on such exchange,'' and ''each Eligible Security for which transaction reports are required to be submitted to such [national securities] association.'' [347] Further, the Participants are required to adopt Compliance Rules [348] that require Industry Members, subject to their SRO jurisdiction, to report CAT Data.[349]

The CAT NMS Plan requires specific data elements of CAT Data that must be recorded and reported to the Central Repository upon: (i) ''original receipt or

[331] *Id.* at Section 3.11.

[332] *Id.*

[333] Appendix B is reserved for future use.

[334] 17 CFR 242.613(a).

[335] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Sections A.1–6, B.7–8, C.9–10.

[336] *Id.* at Appendix D, Sections 1.1, 1.3–1.4.

[337] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 2.1.

[338] *Id.* at Appendix D, Sections 3, 6.1–6.2, 7.2.

[339] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 8.1.

[340] *Id.* at Appendix D, Sections 4.1, 9.1.

[341] *Id.* at Appendix D, Sections 5.3–5.4.

[342] *Id.* at Appendix D, Sections 10, 11.

[343] *Id.* at Sections 6.3–6.4; Appendix D, at Section 2.1.

[344] *Id.* at Sections 6.3(a), 6.4(a). The CAT NMS Plan also requires that the Operating Committee-approved format must be a format specified by the Plan Processor and Rule 613 compliant.

[345] *Id.* at Sections 6.3(b)(i), 6.4(b)(i).

[346] *Id.* at Sections 6.3(b)(ii); 6.4(b)(ii); Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(ii). Participants may voluntarily report CAT Data prior to the 8:00 a.m. ET deadline. *Id.* The CAT NMS Plan defines ''Trading Day'' as the date ''as is determined by the Operating Committee.'' The CAT NMS Plan also provides that ''the Operating Committee may establish different Trading Days for NMS Stocks (as defined in SEC Rule 600(b)(47), Listed Options, OTC Equity Securities, and any other securities that are included as Eligible Securities from time to time.'') *Id.* at Section 1.1.

[347] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 6.3(c)(i)–(ii), 6.4(c)(i)–(ii).

[348] The CAT NMS Plan defines the ''Compliance Rule'' to mean ''with respect to a Participant, the rules promulgated by such Participant as contemplated by Section 3.11.'' *Id.* at Section 1.1. Section 3.11 of the CAT NMS Plan provides that ''each Participant shall comply with and enforce compliance, as required by SEC Rule 608(c), by its Industry Members with the provisions of SEC Rule 613 and of [the LLC Agreement], as applicable, to the Participant and its Industry Members. The Participants shall endeavor to promulgate consistent rules (after taking into account circumstances and considerations that may impact Participants differently) requiring compliance by their respective Industry Members with the provisions of SEC Rule 613 and [the LLC Agreement].'' *Id.* at Section 3.11.

[349] *See id.* at Section 6.4(c)(i)–(ii).

origination of an order,'' [350] (ii) ''routing of an order,'' [351] and (iii) ''receipt of an order that has been routed.'' [352] Additionally, the CAT NMS Plan requires that a CAT Reporter must record and report data related to an ''order [that] is modified or cancelled,'' [353] and an ''order [that] is executed, in whole or in part,'' [354] as well as ''other information or additional events as may be prescribed in Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements.'' [355] The CAT NMS Plan also requires Industry Member CAT Reporters to report additional data elements for (i) an ''order [that] is executed, in whole or in part,'' [356] (ii) a ''trade [that] is cancelled,'' [357] or (iii) ''original receipt or origination of an order.'' [358] Further, each Participant shall, through Compliance Rules, require Industry Members to record and report to the Central Repository information or additional events as may be prescribed to accurately reflect the complete lifecycle of each Reportable Event.[359]

11. Timeliness of Data Reporting

Section 6.3(b)(ii) of the CAT NMS Plan requires each Participant to report Participant Data to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. ET on the Trading Day following the day the Participant records such data.[360] Additionally, a Participant may voluntarily report such data prior to this deadline.[361] Section 6.4(b)(ii) states that each Participant shall, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to report Recorded Industry Member Data to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. ET on the Trading Day following the day the Industry Member records such data, and Received Industry Member Data to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. ET on the Trading Day following the day the Industry Member receives such data.[362] Section 6.4(b)(ii) of the CAT NMS Plan also states that each Participant shall, through its Compliance Rule, permit its Industry Members to voluntarily report such data prior to the applicable 8:00 a.m. ET deadline.[363]

12. Uniform Format

The CAT NMS Plan does not mandate the format in which data must be reported to the Central Repository.[364] Appendix D states that the Plan Processor will determine the electronic format in which data must be reported, and that the format will be described in the Technical Specifications.[365] Appendix C specifies that CAT Reporters could be required to report data either in a uniform electronic format, or in a manner that would allow the Central Repository to convert the data to a uniform electronic format, for consolidation and storage.[366] Similarly, Sections 6.3(a) and 6.4(a) of the CAT NMS Plan require that CAT Reporters report data to the Central Repository in a format or formats specified by the Plan Processor, approved by the Operating Committee, and compliant with Rule 613.[367]

The CAT NMS Plan requires that data reported to the Central Repository be stored in an electronic standard format.[368] Specifically, Section 6.5(b)(i) of the CAT NMS Plan requires the Central Repository to retain the information collected pursuant to Rule 613(c)(7) and (e)(7) in a convenient and usable standard electronic data format that is directly available and searchable electronically without any manual intervention by the Plan Processor for a period of not less than six (6) years.[369] Such data must be linked when it is made available to the Participant's regulatory Staff and the Commission.[370]

13. Symbology

The CAT NMS Plan also addresses the symbology that CAT Reporters must use when reporting CAT Data. The CAT NMS Plan requires CAT Reporters to report data using the listing exchange's symbology. The CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to create and maintain a symbol history and mapping table, as well as provide a tool to regulators and CAT Reporters showing the security's complete symbol history, along with a start-of-day and end-of-day list of reportable securities for use by CAT Reporters, in .csv format, by 6:00 a.m. on each trading day.[371] The Participants will be responsible for providing the Plan Processor with issue symbol information, and issue symbol validation must be included in the

[350] For ''original receipt or origination of an order,'' the CAT NMS Plan specifies the following data elements: (i) Firm Designated ID(s) for each Customer; (ii) CAT-Order-ID; (iii) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member receiving or originating the order; (iv) date of order receipt or origination; (v) time of order receipt or origination (using timestamps pursuant to Section 6.8 of the CAT NMS Plan); and (vi) Material Terms of the Order. *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(i).

[351] For ''routing of an order,'' the CAT NMS Plan specifies the following data elements: (i) CAT-Order-ID; (ii) date on which the order is routed; (iii) time at which the order is routed (using timestamps pursuant to Section 6.8 of the CAT NMS Plan); (iv) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member or Participant routing the order; (v) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member or Participant to which the order is being routed; (vi) if routed internally at the Industry Member, the identity and nature of the department or desk to which the order is routed; and (vii) Material Terms of the Order. *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(ii).

[352] For ''receipt of an order that has been routed,'' the CAT NMS Plan specifies the following data elements: (i) CAT-Order-ID; (ii) date on which the order is received; (iii) time at which the order is received (using timestamps pursuant to Section 6.8); (iv) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member or Participant receiving the order; (v) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member or Participant routing the order; and (vi) Material Terms of the Order. *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iii).

[353] For an ''order [that] is modified or cancelled,'' the CAT NMS Plan specifies the following data elements: (i) CAT-Order-ID; (ii) date the modification or cancellation is received or originated; (iii) time at which the modification or cancellation is received or originated (using timestamps pursuant to Section 6.8 of the CAT NMS Plan); (iv) price and remaining size of the order, if modified; (v) other changes in the Material Terms of the Order, if modified; and (vi) whether the modification or cancellation instruction was given by the Customer or was initiated by the Industry Member or Participant. *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(iv).

[354] For an ''order [that] is executed, in whole or in part,'' the CAT NMS Plan specifies the following data elements: (i) CAT-Order-ID; (ii) date of execution; (iii) time of execution (using timestamps pursuant to Section 6.8 of the CAT NMS Plan); (iv) execution capacity (principal, agency or riskless principal); (v) execution price and size; (vi) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Participant or Industry Member executing the order; and (vii) whether the execution was reported pursuant to an effective transaction reporting plan or the Plan for Reporting of Consolidated Options Last Sale Reports and Quotation Information. *Id.* at Section 6.3(d)(v).

[355] *See id.* at Section 6.3(d)(vi).

[356] For an ''order [that] is executed, in whole or in part,'' the CAT NMS Plan specifies the following additional data elements: (i) an Allocation Report; (ii) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the clearing broker or prime broker, if applicable; and (iii) CAT-Order-ID of any contra-side order(s). *Id.* at Section 6.4(d)(ii)(A).

[357] For a ''trade [that] is cancelled,'' the CAT NMS Plan specifies the following additional data element: a cancelled trade indicator. *Id.* at Section 6.4(d)(ii)(B).

[358] For ''original receipt or origination of an order,'' the CAT NMS Plan specifies the following additional data element(s): the Firm Designated ID, Customer Account Information, and Customer Identifying Information for the relevant Customer. *Id.* at Section 6.4(d)(ii)(C).

[359] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 3.

[360] *Id.* at Section 6.3(b)(ii); *see also id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(ii); Appendix D, Sections 3.1, 6.1.

[361] *Id.* at Section 6.3(b)(ii).

[362] *Id.* at Section 6.4(b)(ii).

[363] *Id.*

[364] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section D.12(f); *see also id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a).

[365] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 2.1. Appendix D states that more than one format may be allowed to support the various market participants that would report information to the Central Repository. *Id.; see also id.* at Section 6.9.

[366] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(b).

[367] *Id.* at Sections 6.3(a), 6.4(a).

[368] Pursuant to the Plan, for data consolidation and storage, as noted above, such data must be reported in a uniform electronic format or in a manner that would allow the Central Repository to convert the data to a uniform electronic format. *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(b).

[369] *Id.* at Section 6.5(b)(i).

[370] *Id.*

[371] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 2.

processing of data submitted by CAT Reporters.[372]

14. CAT-Reporter-ID

Sections 6.3 and 6.4 of the CAT NMS Plan require CAT Reporters to record and report to the Central Repository an SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier [373] for orders and certain Reportable Events to be used by the Central Repository to assign a unique CAT-Reporter-ID [374] for purposes of identifying each CAT Reporter associated with an order or Reportable Event (the ''Existing Identifier Approach'').[375] The CAT NMS Plan requires the reporting of SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers of: The Industry Member receiving or originating an order; [376] the Industry Member or Participant from which (and to which) an order is being routed; [377] the Industry Member or Participant receiving (and routing) a routed order; [378] the Industry Member or Participant executing an order, if an order is executed; [379] and the clearing broker or prime broker, if applicable, if an order is executed.[380] An Industry Member would report to the Central Repository its existing SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier used by the relevant SRO specifically for transactions occurring at that SRO.[381] Similarly, an exchange reporting CAT Reporter information would report data using the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier used by the Industry Member on that exchange or its systems.[382] Over-the-counter (''OTC'') orders and Reportable Events would be reported with an Industry Member's FINRA SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier.[383]

The CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to develop and maintain the mechanism to assign (and to change, if necessary) CAT-Reporter-IDs.[384] For the Central Repository to link the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier to the CAT-Reporter-ID, each SRO must submit, on a daily basis, all SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers used by its Industry Members (or itself), as well as information to identify the corresponding market participant (for example, a CRD number or Legal Entity Identifier (''LEI'') to the Central Repository.[385] Additionally, each Industry Member shall be required to submit to the Central Repository information sufficient to identify such Industry Member (*e.g.,* CRD number or LEI, as noted above).[386] The Plan Processor would use the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers and identifying information (*i.e.,* CRD number or LEI) to assign a CAT-Reporter-ID to each Industry Member and SRO for internal use across all data within the Central Repository.[387] The Plan Processor would create and maintain a database in the Central Repository that would map the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers to the appropriate CAT-Reporter-ID.[388]

The CAT must be able to capture, store, and maintain current and historical SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers.[389] The SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier must also be included on the Plan Processor's acknowledgment of its receipt of data files from a CAT Reporter or Data Submitter,[390] on daily statistics provided by the Plan Processor after the Central Repository has processed data,[391] and on a secure Web site that the Plan Processor would maintain that would contain each CAT Reporter's daily reporting statistics.[392] In addition, data validations by the Plan Processor must include confirmation of a valid SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier.[393]

15. Customer-ID

a. Customer Information Approach

Rule 613(c)(7)(i)(A) requires that for the original receipt or origination of an order, a CAT Reporter report the ''Customer-ID(s) for each Customer.'' [394] ''Customer-ID'' is defined in Rule 613(j)(5) to mean ''with respect to a customer, a code that uniquely and consistently identifies such customer for purposes of providing data to the Central Repository.'' [395] Rule 613(c)(8) requires that ''[a]ll plan sponsors and their members shall use the same Customer-ID and CAT-Reporter-ID for each customer and broker-dealer.'' [396]

In Appendix C, the Participants describe the ''Customer Information Approach,'' [397] an alternative approach to the requirement that a broker-dealer report a Customer-ID for every Customer upon original receipt or origination of an order.[398] Under the Customer Information Approach, the CAT NMS Plan would require each broker-dealer to assign a unique Firm Designated ID to each Customer.[399] As the Firm Designated ID, broker-dealers would be permitted to use an account number or any other identifier defined by the firm,

[372] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a).

[373] The CAT NMS Plan defines an ''SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier'' as ''an identifier assigned to an Industry Member by an SRO or an identifier used by a Participant.'' *Id.* at Section 1.1.

[374] Rule 613 defines a CAT-Reporter-ID as ''a code that uniquely and consistently identifies [a CAT Reporter] for purposes of providing data to the central repository.'' 17 CFR 242.613(j)(2).

[375] The SROs requested exemptive relief from Rule 613 so that the CAT NMS Plan may permit the Existing Identifier Approach, which would allow a CAT Reporter to report an existing SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier in lieu of requiring the reporting of a universal CAT-Reporter-ID. *See* Exemptive Request Letter, *supra* note 21, at 19. The Commission granted exemptive relief on March 1, 2016 in order to allow this alternative to be included in the CAT NMS Plan and subject to notice and comment. *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21.

[376] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 6.3(d)(i), 6.4(d)(i).

[377] *Id.* at Sections 6.3(d)(ii), 6.4(d)(i).

[378] *Id.* at Sections 6.3(d)(iii), 6.4(d)(i).

[379] *Id.* at Sections 6.3(d)(v), 6.4(d)(i).

[380] *Id.* at Section 6.4(d)(ii)(A)(2). Industry Members are required by the CAT NMS Plan to record and report this information. *Id.* at Section 6.4(d)(ii).

[381] *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21, at 31–41.

[382] *See id.* at 20.

[383] *Id.*

[384] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 10.1. Changes to CAT-Reporter-IDs must be reviewed and approved by the Plan Processor. *Id.* The CAT NMS Plan also requires the Central Repository to generate and assign a unique CAT-Reporter-ID to all reports submitted to the system based on sub-identifiers that are currently used by CAT Reporters in their order handling and trading processes (described in the Exemption Request as SRO-assigned market participant identifiers). *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 3; *see also* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21, at 31–41.

[385] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.3(e)(i).

[386] *Id.* at Section 6.4(d)(vi).

[387] *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21, at 31–41.

[388] *Id.* at 20.

[389] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 2.

[390] *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 7.1.

[391] *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 7.2.

[392] *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 10.1.

[393] *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 7.2. The CAT NMS Plan also notes that both the CAT-Reporter-ID and the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier would be data fields for the online targeted query tool described in the CAT NMS Plan as providing authorized users with the ability to retrieve processed and/or validated (unlinked) data via an online query screen. *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 8.1.1.

[394] 17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(i)(A).

[395] 17 CFR 242.613(j)(5).

[396] 17 CFR 242.613(c)(8).

[397] The SROs requested exemptive relief from Rule 613 so that the CAT NMS Plan may permit the Customer Information Approach, which would require each broker-dealer to assign a unique Firm Designated ID to each trading account and to submit an initial set of information identifying the Customer to the Central Repository, in lieu of requiring each broker-dealer to report a Customer-ID for each Customer upon the original receipt or origination of an order. *See* Exemptive Request Letter, *supra* note 21, at 12. The Commission granted exemptive relief on March 1, 2016 in order to allow this alternative to be included in the CAT NMS Plan and subject to notice and comment. *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21.

[398] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii).

[399] *Id.* The CAT NMS Plan defines a ''Firm Designated ID'' as ''a unique identifier for each trading account designated by Industry Members for purposes of providing data to the Central Repository, where each such identifier is unique among all identifiers from any given Industry Member for each business date.'' *See id.* at Section 1.1.

provided each identifier is unique across the firm for each business date (*i.e.,* a single firm may not have multiple separate customers with the same identifier on any given date).[400] According to the CAT NMS Plan, broker-dealers would submit an initial set of Customer information to the Central Repository, including, as applicable, the Firm Designated ID, the Customer's name, address, date of birth, individual tax payer identifier number (''ITIN'')/social security number (''SSN''), individual's role in the account (*e.g.,* primary holder, joint holder, guardian, trustee, person with power of attorney) and LEI,[401] and/or Large Trader ID (''LTID''), if applicable, which would be updated as set forth in the CAT NMS Plan.[402]

Under the Customer Information Approach, broker-dealers would be required to report only the Firm Designated ID for each new order submitted to the Central Repository, rather than the ''Customer-ID'' as defined by Rule 613(c)(j)(5) and as required by Rule 613(c)(7)(i)(A), and the Plan Processor would associate specific Customers and their Customer-IDs with individual order events based on the reported Firm Designated IDs.[403] Within the Central Repository, each Customer would be uniquely identified by identifiers or a combination of identifiers such as an ITIN/SSN, date of birth, and, as applicable, LEI and LTID.[404] The Plan Processor would be required to use these unique identifiers to map orders to specific Customers across all broker-dealers.[405] To ensure information identifying a Customer is updated, broker-dealers would be required to submit to the Central Repository daily updates for reactivated accounts, newly established or revised Firm Designated IDs, or associated reportable Customer information.[406]

Appendix C provides additional requirements that the Plan Processor must meet under the Customer Information Approach.[407] The Plan Processor must maintain information of sufficient detail to uniquely and consistently identify each Customer across all CAT Reporters, and associated accounts from each CAT Reporter, and must document and publish, with the approval of the Operating Committee, the minimum list of attributes to be captured to maintain this association.[408] In addition, the Plan Processor must maintain valid Customer and Customer Account Information [409] for each trading day and provide a method for Participants and the Commission to easily obtain historical changes to that information (*e.g.,* name changes, address changes).[410] The Plan Processor also must design and implement a robust data validation process for submitted Firm Designated IDs, Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information, and be able to link accounts that move from one CAT Reporter to another due to mergers and acquisitions, divestitures, and other events.[411] Under the Customer Information Approach, Industry Members will initially submit full account lists for all active accounts to the Plan Processor and subsequently submit updates and changes on a daily basis.[412] Finally, the Plan Processor must have a process to periodically receive full account lists to ensure the completeness and accuracy of the account database.[413]

b. Account Effective Date vs. Account Open Date

Rule 613(c)(7)(viii)(B) requires broker-dealers to report to the Central Repository ''Customer Account Information'' upon the original receipt or origination of an order.[414] The CAT NMS Plan defines ''Customer Account Information'' to include, in part, the Customer's account number, account type, customer type, date account opened and LTID (if applicable).[415] The Plan, however, provides that in two limited circumstances, a broker-dealer could report the ''Account Effective Date'' in lieu of the date an account was opened.[416] The first circumstance is where a relationship identifier—rather than an actual parent account—has been established for an institutional Customer relationship.[417] In this case, no account open date is available for the institutional Customer parent relationship because there is no parent account, and for the same reason, there is no account number or account type available.[418] Thus, the Plan provides that in this circumstance, a broker-dealer could report the ''Account Effective Date'' of the relationship in

[400] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii).

[401] The CAT NMS Plan provides that where a validated LEI is available for a Customer or entity, this may obviate a need to report other identifier information (*e.g.,* Customer name, address, EIN). *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii) n.31.

[402] The CAT NMS Plan states that the Participants anticipate that Customer information that is initially reported to the CAT could be limited to Customer accounts that have, or are expected to have, CAT Reportable Event activity. For example, the CAT NMS Plan notes accounts that are considered open, but have not traded Eligible Securities in a given time frame, may not need to be pre-established in the CAT, but rather could be reported as part of daily updates after they have CAT Reportable Event activity. *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii) n.32.

[403] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii). The CAT NMS Plan also requires Industry Members to report ''Customer Account Information'' upon the original receipt of origination of an order. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 1.1, 6.4(d)(ii)(C).

[404] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii).

[405] *Id.*

[406] The CAT NMS Plan notes that because reporting to the CAT is on an end-of-day basis, intra-day changes to information could be captured as part of the daily updates to the information. To ensure the completeness and accuracy of Customer information and associations, in addition to daily updates, broker-dealers would be required to submit periodic full refreshes of Customer information to the CAT. The scope of the ''full'' Customer information refresh would need to be further defined, with the assistance of the Plan Processor, to determine the extent to which inactive or otherwise terminated accounts would need to be reported. *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii) n.33.

[407] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii).

[408] *Id.* Section 9.1 of Appendix D also addresses, among other things, the minimum attributes that CAT must capture for Customers and the validation process for such attributes. *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 9.1.

[409] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 9.1. In relevant part, ''Customer Account Information'' is defined in the Plan to include, but not be limited to, account number, account type, customer type, date account opened, and large trader identifier (if applicable). *See id.* at Section 1.1.

[410] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii).

[411] *Id.* The CAT NMS Plan defines ''Customer Identifying Information'' to mean ''information of sufficient detail to identify a Customer, including, but not limited to, (a) with respect to individuals: Name, address, date of birth, individual tax payer identification number (''ITIN'')/social security number (''SSN''), individual's role in the account (*e.g.,* primary holder, joint holder, guardian, trustee, person with the power of attorney); and (b) with respect to legal entities: Name, address, Employer Identification Number (''EIN'')/LEI) or other comparable common entity identifier, if applicable; provided, however, where the LEI or other common entity identifier is provided, information covered by such common entity identifier (*e.g.,* name, address) would not need to be separately submitted to the Central Repository.'' *See id.* at Section 1.1.

[412] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii).

[413] *Id.*

[414] 17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(viii)(B). ''Customer Account Information'' is defined in Rule 613(j)(4) to ''include, but not be limited to, account number, account type, customer type, date account opened, and large trader identifier (if applicable).'' 17 CFR 242.613(j)(4).

[415] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[416] *Id.* The SROs requested exemptive relief from Rule 613 so that the CAT NMS Plan may permit broker-dealers to report to the Central Repository the ''effective date'' of an account in lieu of requiring each broker-dealer to report the date the account was opened in certain limited circumstances. *See* Exemptive Request Letter, *supra* note 21, at 13. The Commission granted exemptive relief on March 1, 2016 in order to allow this alternative to be included in the CAT NMS Plan and subject to notice and comment. *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21.

[417] *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21; *see also* September 2015 Supplement, *supra* note 21, at 4–5.

[418] *See* September 2015 Supplement, *supra* note 21, at 6.

lieu of an account open date.[419] Further, the Plan provides that where such an institutional Customer relationship was established *before* the broker-dealer's obligation to report audit trail data, the ''Account Effective Date'' would be either (i) the date the broker-dealer established the relationship identifier, or (ii) the date when trading began (*i.e.,* the date the first order was received) using the relevant relationship identifier, and if both dates are available and differ, the earlier date.[420] Where such relationships are established *after* the broker-dealer's obligation to report audit trail data is required, the ''Account Effective Date'' would be the date the broker-dealer established the relationship identifier and would be no later than the date the first order was received.[421] Regardless of when the relationship was established for such institutional Customers, the Plan provides that broker-dealers may report the relationship identifier in place of Rule 613(c)(7)(viii)(B)'s requirement to report the ''account number,'' and report ''relationship'' in place of ''account type.''[422]

The second circumstance where a broker-dealer may report the ''Account Effective Date'' rather than the date an account was opened as required in Rule 613(c)(7)(viii)(B) is when particular legacy system data issues prevent a broker-dealer from providing an account open date for any type of account (*i.e.,* institutional, proprietary or retail) that was established before the CAT's implementation.[423] According to the Plan, these legacy system data issues may arise because:

(1) A broker-dealer has switched back office providers or clearing firms and the new back office/clearing firm system identifies the account open date as the date the account was opened on the new system;

(2) A broker-dealer is acquired and the account open date becomes the date that an account was opened on the post-merger back office/clearing firm system;

(3) Certain broker-dealers maintain multiple dates associated with accounts in their systems and do not designate in a consistent manner which date constitutes the account open date, as the parameters of each date are determined by the individual broker-dealer; or

(4) No account open date exists for a proprietary account of a broker-dealer.[424]

Thus, when legacy systems data issues arise due to one of the four reasons above and no account open date is available, the Plan provides that broker-dealers would be permitted to report an ''Account Effective Date'' in lieu of an account open date.[425] When the legacy systems data issues and lack of account open date are attributable to above reasons (1) or (2), the ''Account Effective Date'' would be the date the account was established, either directly or via a system transfer, at the relevant broker-dealer.[426] When the legacy systems data issues and lack of account open date are attributable to above reason (3), the ''Account Effective Date'' would be the earliest available date.[427] When the legacy systems data issues and lack of account open date are attributable to above reason (4), the ''Account Effective Date'' would be (i) the date established for the proprietary account in the broker-dealer or its system(s), or (ii) the date when proprietary trading began in the account, *i.e.,* the date on which the first order was submitted from the account.[428]

c. Modification/Cancellation

Rule 613(c)(7)(iv)(F) requires that ''[t]he CAT-Reporter-ID of the broker-dealer or Customer-ID of the *person* giving the modification or cancellation instruction'' be reported to the Central Repository.[429] Because the Customer Information Approach no longer requires, as permitted by the Exemption Order, that a Customer-ID be reported upon original receipt or origination of an order, and because reporting the Customer-ID of the specific person that gave the modification or cancellation instruction would result in an inconsistent level of information regarding the identity of the person giving the modification or cancellation instruction versus the identity of the Customer that originally received or originated an order, Section 6.3(d)(iv)(F) of the CAT NMS Plan modifies the requirement in Rule 613 and instead requires CAT Reporters to report whether the modification or cancellation instruction was ''given by the Customer or was initiated by the Industry Member or Participant.''[430]

16. Order Allocation Information

Section 6.4(d)(ii)(A)(1) of the CAT NMS Plan provides that each Participant through its Compliance Rule must require that Industry Members record and report to the Central Repository an Allocation Report that includes the Firm Designated ID when an execution is allocated in whole or part.[431] The CAT NMS Plan defines an Allocation Report as ''a report made to the Central Repository by an Industry Member that identifies the Firm Designated ID for any account(s), including subaccount(s), to which executed shares are allocated *and* provides the security that has been allocated, the *identifier of the firm reporting the allocation, the price per share* of shares allocated, the side of shares allocated, the number of shares allocated to each account, and the time of the allocation.''[432] The CAT NMS Plan explains, for the avoidance of doubt, that an Allocation Report shall not be required to be linked to particular orders or executions.[433]

17. Options Market Maker Quotes

Section 6.4(d)(iii) of the CAT NMS Plan states that, with respect to the reporting obligations of an Options Market Maker under Sections 6.3(d)(ii) and (iv) regarding its quotes[434] in Listed

[419] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[420] *Id.*

[421] *Id.*

[422] *Id.*

[423] *Id.; see also* September 2015 Supplement, *supra* note 21, at 7–9.

[424] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[425] *Id.*

[426] *Id.*

[427] *Id.*

[428] *Id.*

[429] 17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(iv)(F) (emphasis added).

[430] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.3(d)(iv)(F). The SROs requested exemptive relief from Rule 613 so that the CAT NMS Plan may permit CAT Reporters to report whether a modification or cancellation instruction was given by the Customer associated with the order, or was initiated by the broker-dealer or exchange associated with the order, in lieu of requiring CAT Reporters to report the Customer-ID of the person giving the modification or cancellation instruction. *See* Exemptive Request Letter, *supra* note 21, at 12–13. The Commission granted exemptive relief on March 1, 2016 in order to allow this alternative to be included in the CAT NMS Plan and subject to notice and comment. *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21.

[431] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.4(d)(ii)(A)(1); *see also* April 2015 Supplement, *supra* note 21. The SROs requested exemptive relief from Rule 613 so that the CAT NMS Plan may permit Industry Members to record and report to the Central Repository an Allocation Report that includes the Firm Designated ID when an execution is allocated in whole or part in lieu of requiring the reporting of the account number for any subaccount to which an execution is allocated, as is required by Rule 613. *See* Exemptive Request Letter, *supra* note 21, at 26–27. The Commission granted exemptive relief on March 1, 2016 in order to allow this alternative to be included in the CAT NMS Plan and subject to notice and comment. *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21.

[432] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1; *see also* April 2015 Supplement, *supra* note 21.

[433] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[434] Rule 613(c)(7) provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require reporting of the details for each

Options, such quotes shall be reported to the Central Repository by the relevant Options Exchange in lieu of reporting by the Options Market Maker.[435] Section 6.4(d)(iii) further states that each Participant that is an Options Exchange shall, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members that are Options Market Makers to report to the Options Exchange the time at which a quote in a Listed Option is sent to the Options Exchange (and, if applicable, the time of any subsequent quote modification and/or cancellation where such modification or cancellation is originated by the Options Market Maker).[436] Such time information also shall be reported to the Central Repository by the Options Exchange in lieu of reporting by the Options Market Maker.[437]

18. Primary Market Transactions, Debt Securities and Futures

Rule 613 and the CAT NMS Plan do not require the reporting of audit trail data for Primary Market Transactions,[438] debt securities, and futures. However, Rule 613(i) requires that, within six months after the effective date of the CAT NMS Plan, the SROs shall jointly provide to the Commission ''a document outlining how such exchanges and associations could incorporate into the consolidated audit trail information with respect to equity securities that are not NMS securities,[439] debt securities, primary market transactions in equity securities that are not NMS securities, and primary market transactions in debt securities, including details for each order and reportable event that may be required to be provided, which market participants may be required to provide the data, an implementation timeline, and a cost estimate.'' [440]

19. Error Rates

The CAT NMS Plan defines Error Rate as ''the percentage of [R]eportable [E]vents collected by the [C]entral [R]epository in which the data reported does not fully and accurately reflect the order event that occurred in the market.'' [441] Under the CAT NMS Plan, the Operating Committee sets the maximum Error Rate that the Central Repository would tolerate from a CAT Reporter reporting data to the Central Repository.[442] The Operating Committee reviews and resets the maximum Error Rate, at least annually.[443] If a CAT Reporter reports CAT Data to the Central Repository with errors such that their error percentage exceeds the maximum Error Rate, then such CAT Reporter would not be in compliance with the CAT NMS Plan or Rule 613.[444] As such, ''the Participants as Participants or the SEC may take appropriate action for failing to comply with the reporting obligations under the CAT NMS Plan and SEC Rule 613.'' [445] The CAT NMS Plan, however, does not detail what specific compliance enforcement provisions would apply if a CAT Reporter exceeds the maximum Error Rate.[446]

The CAT NMS Plan sets the initial maximum Error Rate at 5% for any data reported pursuant to subparagraphs (3) and (4) of Rule 613(c).[447] The SROs highlight that ''the Central Repository will require new reporting elements and methods for CAT Reporters and there will be a learning curve when CAT Reporters begin to submit data to the Central Repository'' in support of a 5% initial rate.[448] Further, the SROs state that ''many CAT Reporters may have never been obligated to report data to an audit trail.'' [449] The SROs believe an initial maximum Error Rate of 5% ''strikes the balance of making allowances for adapting to a new reporting regime, while ensuring that the data provided to regulators will be capable of being used to conduct surveillance and market reconstruction.'' [450] In the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants compared the contemplated Error Rates of CAT Reporters to the error rates of OATS reporters in the time periods immediately following three significant OATS releases in the last ten years.[451] The Participants state that for the three comparative OATS releases [452]: An average of 2.42% of order events did not pass systemic validations; an average of 0.36% of order events were not submitted in a timely manner; an average of 0.86% of orders were unsuccessfully matched to a trade reporting facility trade report; an average of 3.12% of OATS Route Reports were unsuccessfully matched to an exchange order; and an average of 2.44% of OATS Route Reports were unsuccessfully matched to a report by another reporting entity.[453]

The Participants, moreover, anticipate reviewing and resetting the maximum Error Rate once Industry Members (excluding Small Industry Members) begin to report to the Central Repository and again once Small Industry Members report to the Central Repository.[454]

The Participants thus propose a phased approach to lowering the maximum Error Rates among CAT Reporters based on the period of time reporting to the Central Repository and whether the CAT Reporters are Participants, large broker-dealers or

order and each Reportable Event, including the routing and modification or cancellation of an order. 17 CFR 242.613(c)(7). Rule 613(j)(8) defines ''order'' to include ''any bid or offer.'' 17 CFR 242.613(j)(8).

[435] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.4(d)(iii). The SROs requested exemptive relief from Rule 613 so that the CAT NMS Plan may permit Options Market Maker quotes to be reported to the Central Repository by the relevant Options Exchange in lieu of requiring that such reporting be done by both the Options Exchange and the Options Market Maker, as is required by Rule 613. *See* Exemptive Request Letter, *supra* note 21, at 2. In accord with the exemptive relief requested, the SROs committed to require Options Market Makers to report to the Exchange the time at which a quote in a Listed Option is sent to the Options Exchange. *Id.* at 3. The Commission granted exemptive relief on March 1, 2016 in order to allow this alternative to be included in the CAT NMS Plan and subject to notice and comment. *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21.

[436] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.4(d)(iii).

[437] *Id.*

[438] The CAT NMS Plan defines ''Primary Market Transaction'' to mean ''any transaction other than a secondary market transaction and refers to any transaction where a Person purchases securities in an offering.'' *Id.* at Section 1.1.

[439] The Commission notes that in the CAT NMS Plan some non-NMS equities (specifically, OTC equity securities) are required to be reported. *Id.* at Sections 1.1, 6.3 (requiring Eligible Securities data to be reported, and where Eligible Securities is defined as all NMS securities and all OTC equity securities).

[440] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(i); *see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.11. The CAT NMS Plan defines ''NMS Securities'' to mean ''any security or class of securities for which transaction reports are collected, processed, and made available pursuant to an effective transaction reporting plan, or an effective national market system plan for reporting transactions in Listed Options.'' *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1. The CAT NMS Plan defines ''OTC Equity Securities'' as ''any equity security, other than an NMS Security, subject to prompt last sale reporting rules of a registered national securities association and reported to one of such association's equity trade reporting facilities.'' *Id.*

[441] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1; *see also* Rule 613(j)(6).

[442] *Id.* at Section 6.5(d)(i).

[443] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(b).

[444] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(b); Rule 613(g)–(h).

[445] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(b).

[446] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30645.

[447] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(d)(i).

[448] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(b).

[449] *Id.*

[450] *Id.*

[451] *Id.* The SROs note that the three comparative releases are known as ''(1) OATS Phase III, which required manual orders to be reported to OATS; (2) OATS for OTC Securities which required OTC equity securities to be reported to OATS; and (3) OATS for NMS which required all NMS stocks to be reported to OATS.'' *Id.*

[452] *Id.* The SROs note that the calculated ''combined average error rates for the time periods immediately following [the OATS] release across five significant categories for these three releases'' was used in setting in the initial maximum Error Rate. *Id.*

[453] *Id.*

[454] *Id.*

small broker-dealers.[455] The Plan sets forth a goal of the following maximum Error Rates [456] where ''Year(s)'' refers to year(s) after the CAT NMS Plan's date of effectiveness:

TABLE 1—MAXIMUM ERROR RATES SCHEDULE

	One year (%)	Two years (%)	Three years (%)	Four years (%)
Participants	5	1	1	1
Large Industry Members	N/A	5	1	1
Small Industry Members	N/A	N/A	5	1

The CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to: (i) Measure and report errors every business day; [457] (ii) provide CAT Reporters daily statistics and error reports as they become available, including a description of such errors; [458] (iii) provide monthly reports to CAT Reporters that detail a CAT Reporter's performance and comparison statistics; [459] (iv) define educational and support programs for CAT Reporters to minimize Error Rates; [460] and (v) identify, daily, all CAT Reporters exceeding the maximum allowable Error Rate.[461] To timely correct data-submitted errors to the Central Repository, the Participants require that the Central Repository receive and process error corrections at all times.[462] Further, the CAT NMS Plan requires that CAT Reporters be able to submit error corrections to the Central Repository through a web-interface or via bulk uploads or file submissions, and that the Plan Processor, subject to the Operating Committee's approval, support the bulk replacement of records and the reprocessing of such records.[463] The Participants, furthermore, require that the Plan Processor identify CAT Reporter data submission errors based on the Plan Processor's validation processes.[464]

20. Retirement of Existing Trade and Order Data Rules and Systems

a. Duplicative or Partially Duplicative Rules and Systems

As required by Rule 613(a)(1)(ix),[465] the CAT NMS Plan provides a plan to eliminate rules and systems that will be rendered duplicative by the CAT.[466] Under the CAT NMS Plan, each Participant will initiate an analysis of its rules and systems to determine which require information that is duplicative of the information available to the Participants through the Central Repository. The CAT NMS Plan states that each Participant has begun reviewing its rulebook and is waiting for the publication of the final reporting requirements to the Central Repository to complete its analysis. According to the Plan, each Participant should complete its analysis within twelve months after Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository (or a later date to be determined by each Participant if sufficient data is not available to complete the analysis in that timeframe).[467]

Similarly, the CAT NMS Plan provides that each Participant will analyze which of its rules and systems require information that is partially duplicative of the information available to the Participants through the Central Repository.[468] According to the CAT NMS Plan, this analysis should include a determination as to: (i) Whether the Participant should continue to collect the duplicative information available in the Central Repository; (ii) whether the Participant can use the duplicative information made available in the Central Repository without degrading the effectiveness of the Participant's rules or systems; and (iii) whether the Participant should continue to collect the non-duplicative information or, alternatively, whether it should be added to information collected by the Central Repository. The CAT NMS Plan states that each Participant has begun reviewing its rulebook and is waiting for the publication of the final reporting requirements to the Central Repository to complete its analysis. According to the Plan, each Participant should complete this analysis within eighteen months after Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository (or a later date to be determined by each Participant if sufficient data is not available to complete the analysis in that timeframe).[469]

The CAT NMS Plan also discusses the elimination of specific trade and order data collection systems that may be duplicative or partially duplicative of CAT.[470] With respect to FINRA's OATS, the CAT NMS Plan notes that FINRA's ability to retire OATS is dependent on whether the Central Repository contains complete and accurate CAT Data that is sufficient to ensure that FINRA can effectively conduct surveillance and investigations of its members for potential violations of FINRA rules and federal laws and regulations.[471] Based on an analysis conducted by the Participants, there are 33 data elements currently captured in OATS that are not specified in SEC Rule 613. The Plan notes that the Participants believe it is appropriate to incorporate data elements into the Central Repository that are necessary to retire OATS, and that these additional data elements will increase the likelihood that the Central

[455] *Id.*

[456] *Id.*

[457] *Id.* The CAT NMS Plan sets forth that the Plan Processor shall provide the Operating Committee with regular Error Rate reports. *Id.* at Section 6.1(o)(v). The Error Rate reports shall include each of the following—if the Operating Committee deems them necessary or advisable—''Error Rates by day and by delta over time, and Compliance Thresholds by CAT Reporter, by Reportable Event, by age before resolution, by symbol, by symbol type (*e.g.,* ETF and Index) and by event time (by hour and cumulative on the hour)[.]'' *Id.*

[458] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(b).

[459] *See id.*

[460] *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 10.1. The CAT NMS Plan sets forth support programs that shall include educational programs, including FAQs, a dedicated help desk, industry-wide trainings, certifications, industry-wide testing, maintaining Technical Specifications with defined intervals for new releases/updates, emailing CAT Reporter data outliers, conducting annual assessments, using test environments prior to releasing new code to production, and imposing CAT Reporter attendance requirements for testing sessions and educational and industry-wide trainings. *Id.*

[461] *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 10.4.

[462] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(b).

[463] *See id.*

[464] *See id.* At a minimum, the processes would include validating the data's file format, CAT Data format, type, consistency, range, logic, validity, completeness, timeliness and linkage. *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 7.2.

[465] 17 CFR 242.613(a)(1)(ix).

[466] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.7(d); Appendix C, Section C.9.

[467] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section C.9.

[468] *Id.*

[469] *Id.*

[470] *Id.*

[471] *Id.*

Repository will include sufficient order information to ensure that FINRA can continue to perform its surveillance with CAT Data rather than OATS data and can more quickly eliminate OATS. However, the Plan notes that OATS cannot be entirely eliminated until all FINRA members who currently report to OATS are reporting to the Central Repository, and that there will likely be some period of dual reporting until FINRA can verify that the data in the Central Repository is of sufficient quality for surveillance purposes and that data reported to the Central Repository meets the Error Rate standards set out in the CAT NMS Plan.[472] With respect to rules and systems other than OATS, the CAT NMS Plan notes that based on preliminary industry analyses, broker-dealer recordkeeping and large trader reporting requirements under SEC Rule 17h–1 could potentially be eliminated. The Plan, however, notes that large trader self-identification and reporting responsibilities on Form 13H appear not be covered by the CAT.[473]

Based on these analyses of duplicative or partially duplicative rules, the CAT NMS Plan provides that each Participant will prepare appropriate rule change filings to implement the rule modifications or deletions that can be made.[474] The rule change filings should describe the process for phasing out the requirements under the relevant rule. Under the CAT NMS Plan, each Participant will file with the SEC the relevant rule change filing to eliminate or modify its rules within six months of the Participant's determination that such modification or deletion is appropriate.[475] Similarly, the CAT NMS Plan provides that each Participant will analyze the most appropriate and expeditious timeline and manner for eliminating duplicative and partially duplicative rules and systems. Upon the Commission's approval of relevant rule changes, each Participant will implement this timeline. In developing these timelines, each Participant must consider when the quality of CAT Data will be sufficient to meet the surveillance needs of the Participants (*i.e.,* to sufficiently replace current reporting data) before existing rules and systems can be eliminated.[476]

b. Non-Duplicative Rules and Systems

The CAT NMS Plan provides that each Participant will conduct an analysis to determine which of its rules and systems related to monitoring quotes, orders, and executions provide information that is not rendered duplicative by the CAT.[477] Under the CAT NMS Plan, each Participant must analyze: (i) Whether collection of such information remains appropriate; (ii) if still appropriate, whether such information should continue to be separately collected or should instead be incorporated into the consolidated audit trail; and, (iii) if no longer appropriate, how the collection of such information could be efficiently terminated, the steps the Participants would need to take to seek Commission approval for the elimination of such rules and systems, and a timetable for such elimination. Each Participant should complete this analysis within eighteen months after Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository (or a later date to be determined by each Participant if sufficient data is not available to complete the analysis in that timeframe).[478]

c. Elimination of SEC Rules

In addition, to the extent that the Commission eliminates rules that require information that is duplicative of information available through the Central Repository, the CAT NMS Plan provides that each Participant will analyze its rules and systems to determine whether any modifications to such rules or systems are necessary (*e.g.,* to delete references to outdated SEC rules) to support data requests made pursuant to such SEC rules.[479] Each Participant should complete its analysis within three months after the SEC approves the deletion or modification of an SEC rule related to the information available through the Central Repository. The CAT NMS Plan also provides that Participants will coordinate with the Commission regarding modification of the CAT NMS Plan to include information sufficient to eliminate or modify those Exchange Act rules or systems that the Commission deems appropriate.[480]

21. Regulatory Access

Under Section 6.5(c) of the CAT NMS Plan and as discussed above, the Plan Processor must provide regulators access to the Central Repository for regulatory and oversight purposes and create a method of accessing CAT Data that includes the ability to run complex searches and generate reports.[481] Section 6.10(c) requires regulator access by two different methods: (1) An online targeted query tool with predefined selection criteria to choose from; and (2) user-defined direct queries and bulk extractions of data via a query tool or language allowing querying of all available attributes and data sources.[482] Additional requirements concerning regulator access appear in Section 8 of Appendix D.[483]

The CAT NMS Plan requires that the CAT must support a minimum of 3,000 regulatory users and at least 600 such users accessing the CAT concurrently without an unacceptable decline in performance.[484] Moreover, the CAT must support an arbitrary number of user roles and, at a minimum, include defined roles for both basic and advanced regulatory users.[485]

a. Online Targeted Query Tool

Sections 8.1.1, 8.1.2, and 8.1.3 of Appendix D contain further specifications for the online targeted query tool.[486] The tool must allow for retrieval of processed and/or validated (unlinked) data via an online query screen that includes a choice of a variety of pre-defined selection criteria.[487] Targeted queries must include date(s) and/or time range(s), as well as one or more of a variety of fields listed in Section 8.1.1 (*e.g.,* product type, CAT-Reporter-ID, and Customer-ID).[488] Targeted queries would be logged such that the Plan Processor could provide monthly reports to the SROs and the SEC concerning metrics on performance and data usage of the search tool.[489] The CAT NMS Plan further requires that acceptable response times for the targeted search be in increments of less than one minute; for complex queries scanning large volumes of data or large result sets (over one million records) response times must be available within 24 hours of the request; and queries for data within one business date of a 12-month period must return results within

[472] *Id.*

[473] *Id.*

[474] *Id.*

[475] *Id.*

[476] *Id.*

[477] *Id.*

[478] *Id.*

[479] *Id.*

[480] *Id.*

[481] *Id.* at Section 6.5(c). Appendix C provides objective milestones to assess progress concerning regulator access to the Central Repository. *See id.* at Appendix C, Section C.10(d).

[482] *Id.* at Section 6.10(c). Section 6.10(c) also requires the Plan Processor to reasonably assist regulatory Staff with queries, submit queries on behalf of regulatory Staff as requested, and maintain a help desk to assist regulatory Staff with questions concerning CAT Data. *Id.*

[483] *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 8.

[484] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 8.1.

[485] *Id.*

[486] *Id.* at Appendix D, Sections 8.1.1–8.1.3.

[487] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 8.1.1.

[488] *Id.*

[489] *Id.*

three hours regardless of the complexity of criteria.[490] Under the CAT NMS Plan, regulators may access all CAT Data except for PII data (access to which would be limited to an authorized subset of Participant and Commission employees) and the Plan Processor must work with regulators to implement a process for providing them with access and routinely verifying a list of active users.[491]

b. User-Defined Direct Queries and Bulk Extraction of Data

Section 8.2 of Appendix D outlines the requirements for user-defined direct queries and bulk extraction of data, which regulators would use to obtain large data sets for internal surveillance or market analysis.[492] Under the CAT NMS Plan, regulators must be able to create, save, and schedule dynamic queries that would run directly against processed and/or unlinked CAT Data.[493] Additionally, CAT must provide an open application program interface (''API'') that allows use of analytic tools and database drivers to access CAT Data.[494] Queries submitted through the open API must be auditable and the CAT System must contain the same level of control, monitoring, logging, and reporting as the online targeted query tool.[495] The Plan Processor must also provide procedures and training to regulators that would use the direct query feature.[496] Sections 8.2.1 and 8.2.2 of Appendix D contain additional specifications for user-defined direct queries and bulk data extraction, respectively.[497]

c. Regulatory Access Schedule

Section A.2 of Appendix C addresses the time and method by which CAT Data would be available to regulators.[498] Section A.2(a) requires that data be available to regulators any point after the data enters the Central Repository and passes basic format validations.[499] After errors are communicated to CAT Reporters on T+1, CAT Reporters would be required to report corrected data back to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+3.[500] Regulators must then have access to corrected and linked order and Customer data by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+5.[501] Section A.2(b) generally describes Bidders' approaches regarding regulator access and use of CAT Data and notes that although the SROs set forth the standards the Plan Processor must meet, they do not endorse any particular approach.[502] Section A.2(c) outlines requirements the Plan Processor must meet for report building and analysis regarding data usage by regulators, consistent with, and in addition to, the specifications outlined in Section 8 of Appendix D.[503]

22. Upgrades and New Functionalities

Under Article VI of the CAT NMS Plan, the Plan Processor is responsible for consulting with the Operating Committee and implementing necessary upgrades and new functionalities. In particular, the Plan Processor would be required to, consistent with Appendix D, Upgrade Process and Development of New Functionality, design and implement appropriate policies and procedures governing the determination to develop new functionality for the CAT including, among other requirements, a mechanism by which changes can be suggested by Advisory Committee members, Participants, or the SEC.[504] The Plan Processor shall, on an ongoing basis and consistent with any applicable policies and procedures, evaluate and implement potential system changes and upgrades to maintain and improve the normal day-to-day operating function of the CAT System.[505] In consultation with the Operating Committee, the Plan Processor shall, on an as-needed basis and consistent with any applicable operational and escalation policies and procedures, implement such material system changes and upgrades as may be required to ensure effective functioning of the CAT System.[506] Also in consultation with the Operating Committee, the Plan Processor shall, on an as-needed basis, implement system changes and upgrades to the CAT System to ensure compliance with applicable laws, regulations or rules (including those promulgated by the Commission or any Participant).[507]

Appendix D provides additional detail about the obligations of the Plan Processor with respect to CAT Functional Changes, CAT Infrastructure Changes, and Testing of New Changes.[508] In particular, the Plan Processor is required to propose a process for considering new functions, which must include a mechanism for suggesting changes to the Operating Committee from Advisory Committee members, the Participants and the Commission. The process must also include a method for developing impact assessments, including implementation timelines for proposed changes, and a mechanism by which functional changes that the Plan Processor wishes to undertake could be reviewed and approved by the Operating Committee.[509]

The CAT NMS Plan also requires that the Plan Processor develop a similar process to govern the changes to the Central Repository—*i.e.,* business-as-usual changes that could be performed by the Plan Processor with only a summary report to the Operating Committee, and infrastructure changes that would require approval by the Operating Committee.[510] Finally, a process for user testing of new changes must be developed by the Plan Processor.[511]

In addition, the CAT NMS Plan requires that the Plan Processor ensure that the Central Repository's technical

[490] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 8.1.2. Appendix D, Section 8.1.2 contains further performance requirements applicable to data and the architecture of the online query tool. *Id.*

[491] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 8.1.3.

[492] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 8.2.

[493] *Id.*

[494] *Id.*

[495] *Id.* Direct queries must not return or display PII data but rather display non-PII unique identifiers (*e.g.,* Customer-ID or Firm Designated ID). The PII corresponding to these identifiers could be gathered using the PII workflow described in Appendix D, Data Security, PII Data Requirements. *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.1.6.

[496] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 8.2.

[497] *Id.* at Appendix D, Sections 8.2.1 and 8.2.2.

[498] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2.

[499] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2(a). Appendix C, Section A.3(e) indicates this would be no later than noon EST on T+1. *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(e).

[500] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iv); Appendix D, Section 6.1.

[501] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2(a).

[502] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2(b).

[503] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2(c). Appendix C, Section A.2(d) addresses system service level agreements that the SROs and Plan Processor would enter into. *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2(d).

[504] *Id.* at Section 6.1(d)(iv). Such policies and procedures also shall: (A) Provide for the escalation of reviews of proposed technological changes and upgrades (including as required by Section 6.1(i) and Section 6.1(j) or as otherwise appropriate) to the Operating Committee; and (B) address the handling of surveillance, including coordinated, SEC Rule 17d–2 or RSA surveillance queries and requests for data. *Id.*

[505] *Id.* at Section 6.1(i). Section 11 of Appendix D sets out the obligations of the Plan Processor with respect to the requirements discussed above (*e.g.,* to develop a process to add functionality to CAT, including reviewing suggestions submitted by the Commission). The Plan Processor must create a defined process for developing impact assessments, including implementation timelines for proposed changes, and a mechanism by which functional changes that the Plan Processor wishes to undertake could be reviewed and approved by the Operating Committee. Section 11 further states that the Plan Processor must implement a process to govern changes to CAT (including ''business-as-usual'' changes and isolated infrastructure changes). Further, Section 11 states that the Plan Processor is required to implement a process governing user testing of changes to CAT functionality and infrastructure. *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 11.

[506] *Id.* at Section 6.1(j).

[507] *Id.* at Section 6.1(k).

[508] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 11.

[509] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 11.1.

[510] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 11.2.

[511] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 11.3.

infrastructure is scalable (to increase capacity to handle increased reporting volumes); adaptable (to support future technology developments so that new requirements could be incorporated); and current (to ensure, through maintenance and upgrades, that technology is kept current, supported, and operational).[512]

23. Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery

The CAT NMS Plan provides that the Plan Processor must develop disaster recovery and business continuity plans to support the continuation of CAT business operations.[513] The Plan Processor is required to provide the Operating Committee with regular reports on the CAT System's operation and maintenance that specifically address Participant usage statistics for the Plan Processor and the Central Repository, including capacity planning studies and daily reports called for by Appendix D, as well as business continuity planning and disaster recovery issues for the Plan Processor and the Central Repository, taking into account the business continuity planning and disaster recovery requirements in the Business Continuity Planning/Disaster Recovery (''BCP/DR'') Process set forth in Appendix D.[514]

The CAT NMS Plan requires the Business Continuity Plan to address protection of data, service for data submissions, processing, data access, support functions and operations.[515] Additionally, the Plan Processor must develop a process to manage and report breaches.[516] A secondary site that is fully equipped for immediate use must be selected to house critical staff necessary for CAT business operations, and planning should consider operational disruption and significant staff unavailability, but the Business Continuity Plan must also establish an effective telecommuting solution for critical staff which must ensure that CAT Data may not be downloaded to equipment that is not CAT-owned or compliant with CAT security requirements.[517] The Business Continuity Plan will include a bi-annual test of CAT operations from the secondary site, and CAT operations staff must maintain and annually test remote access to ensure smooth operations in case of a ''site un-availability event.'' [518] The Business Continuity Plan must also identify critical third-party dependencies to be involved in tests on an annual basis, and the Plan Processor will develop and annually test a crisis management plan to be invoked in specified circumstances.[519] The Plan Processor must also conduct the following: An annual Business Continuity Audit using an Independent Auditor approved by the Operating Committee; and regular third party risk assessments to verify that security controls are in accordance with NIST SP 800–53.[520] Appendix C mandates the use of a hot-warm structure for disaster recovery, where in the event of a disaster, the software and data would need to be loaded into the backup site for it to become operational.[521]

Appendix D also requires that the Plan Processor provide an industry test environment that is discrete and separate from the production environment, but functionally equivalent to the production environment. The industry test environment must have end-to-end functionality meeting the standards of the production SLA, the performance metrics of the production environment, and management with the same information security policies applicable to the production environment.[522] The industry test environment must have minimum availability of 24x6, and must support such things as: Testing of technical upgrades by the Plan Processor, testing of CAT code releases impacting CAT Reporters, testing of changes to industry data feeds, industry-wide disaster recovery testing, individual CAT Reporter and Data Submitter testing of their upgrades against CAT interfaces and functionality, and multiple, simultaneous CAT Reporter testing.[523] The Plan Processor must provide the linkage processing of data submitted during industry-wide testing, as well as support for industry testing.[524]

24. Records and Accounting and Dissolution and Termination of the Company

Article IX of the CAT NMS Plan sets forth the Company's obligations and policies related to books and records, accounting, company funds and tax matters.[525] The CAT NMS Plan provides that the Company must maintain complete and accurate books and records of the Company in accordance with Rule 17a–1.[526] The CAT NMS Plan further provides that books and records will be maintained and be made available at the office of the Plan Processor and/or such other Company designated locations.[527] The CAT NMS Plan specifies that all CAT Data and other Company books and records are the property of the Company (and not the property of the Plan Processor), and to the extent in the possession of the Plan Processor, they will be made available to the Commission upon reasonable request.[528]

Article IX also includes a confidentiality provision (subject to several express carve-outs) wherein the Receiving Party (the Company or a Participant) must hold in confidence information received from a Disclosing Party (the Company or any other Participant); and the Receiving Party may only disclose such information if prior written approval from the Disclosing Party is obtained.[529] The confidentiality provision applies to information that is disclosed in connection with the CAT NMS Plan or the CAT System but expressly carves out the following: (i) CAT Data or information otherwise disclosed pursuant to the requirements of Rule 613; [530] (ii) any information that was already lawfully in the Receiving Party's possession and, to the knowledge of the Receiving Party, free from any confidentiality obligation to the Disclosing Party at the time of receipt from the Disclosing Party; (iii) any information that is, now or in the future,

[512] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.5(a).

[513] *Id.* at Appendix D, Sections 5.3–5.4.

[514] *Id.* at Section 6.1(o)(iii).

[515] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 5.1.

[516] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 5.2.

[517] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 5.3.

[518] *Id.*

[519] *Id.*

[520] *Id.*

[521] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section 12(o). Appendix D, Section 5, provides details on how the CAT's BCP/DR process would be structured. In part, Appendix D states, ''[a] secondary processing site must be capable of recovery and restoration of services at the secondary site within a minimum of 48 hours, but with the goal of achieving next day recovery after a disaster event. The selection of the secondary site must consider sites with geographic diversity that do not rely on the same utility, telecom and other critical infrastructure services. The processing sites for disaster recovery and business continuity must adhere to the ''Interagency Paper on Sound Practices to Strengthen the Resilience of the U.S. Financial System.'' *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 5.1.

[522] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 1.2.

[523] *Id.*

[524] *Id.*

[525] *Id.* at Article IX.

[526] 17 CFR 240.17a–1. Upon request, representative copies of books and records maintained under Rule 17a–1 must be furnished to the Commission. 17 CFR 240.17a–1(c); *see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 9.1.

[527] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 9.1.

[528] *Id.*

[529] *Id.* at Section 9.6. The CAT NMS Plan states that the information is disclosed by or on behalf of the Company or a Participant (the ''Disclosing Party'') to the Company or any other Participant (the ''Receiving Party'') in connection with the Agreement or the CAT System, but excludes any CAT Data or information otherwise disclosed pursuant to the requirements of Rule 613. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 9.6(a).

[530] 17 CFR 242.613.

public knowledge; (iv) any information that was lawfully obtained from a third party having the right to disclose it free from any obligation of confidentiality; or (v) any information that was independently developed by the Receiving Party prior to disclosure by a Disclosing Party.[531] Finally, the CAT NMS Plan provides that the confidentiality provision does not restrict disclosures required by: (i) Applicable laws and regulations, stock market or exchange requirements or the rules of any self-regulatory organization having jurisdiction; (ii) an order, subpoena or legal process; or (iii) for the conduct of any litigation or arbitral proceeding among the Participants (and their respective representatives) and/or the Company.[532]

The CAT NMS Plan includes provisions relating to the dissolution of the Company.[533] Any dissolution of the Company requires SEC approval and must be as a result of one of the following events (a ''Triggering Event''): (i) Unanimous written consent of the Participants; (ii) an event makes it unlawful or impossible for the Company business to be continued; (iii) the termination of one or more Participants such that there is only one remaining Participant; or (iv) a decree of judicial dissolution.[534] If a Triggering Event has occurred and the SEC approves the Company's dissolution, the Operating Committee would act as liquidating trustee and liquidate and distribute the Company pursuant to the following necessary steps under the CAT NMS Plan: (i) Sell the Company's assets; and (ii) apply and distribute the sale proceeds by first, paying the Company's debts and liabilities; second, establishing reasonably necessary reserves for contingent recourse liabilities and obligations; and third, making a distribution to the Participants in proportion to the balances in their positive Capital Accounts.[535]

25. Security of Data

The CAT NMS Plan provides that the Plan Processor is responsible for the security and confidentiality of all CAT Data received and reported to the Central Repository, including during all communications between CAT Reporters and the Plan Processor, data extraction, data manipulation and transformation, loading to and from the Central Repository, and data maintenance by the Central Repository.[536] The Plan Processor must, among other things, require that individuals with access to the Central Repository agree to use CAT Data only for appropriate surveillance and regulatory activities and to employ safeguards to protect the confidentiality of CAT Data.[537]

In addition, the Plan Processor must develop a comprehensive information security program as well as a training program that addresses the security and confidentiality of all information accessible from the CAT and the operational risks associated with accessing the Central Repository.[538] The Plan Processor must also designate one of its employees as CISO; among other things, the CISO is responsible for creating and enforcing appropriate policies, procedures, and control structures regarding data security.[539] The Technical Specifications, which the Plan Processor must publish, must include a detailed description of the data security standards for CAT.[540] Appendix D of the CAT NMS Plan sets forth minimum data security requirements for CAT that the Plan Processor must meet.[541]

a. General Standards

The CAT NMS Plan provides that the data security standards of the CAT System shall, at a minimum satisfy all applicable regulations regarding database security, including provisions of Reg SCI.[542] Appendix D of the CAT NMS Plan contains a partial list of industry standards to which the Plan Processor will adhere, including standards issued by the NIST; [543] by the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council,[544] and the International Organization for Standardization.[545]

The CAT NMS Plan specifies that the Plan Processor is responsible for the security and confidentiality of all CAT Data received and reported to the Central Repository, including during all communications between CAT Reporters and the Plan Processor, data extraction, data manipulation and transformation, loading to and from the Central Repository, and data maintenance by the Central Repository.[546] The Plan Processor must also designate one of its employees as the CISO; among other things, the CISO is responsible for creating and enforcing appropriate policies, procedures, and control structures regarding data security.[547]

b. Data Confidentiality

The CAT NMS Plan also requires that the Plan Processor must develop a comprehensive information security program, with a dedicated staff for the Central Repository, that employs state of the art technology, which program will be regularly reviewed by the CCO and CISO, as well as a training program that addresses the security and confidentiality of all information accessible from the CAT and the operational risks associated with accessing the Central Repository.[548] The Plan Processor must also implement and maintain a mechanism to confirm the identity of all individuals permitted to access the CAT Data stored in the Central Repository; maintain a record of all instances where such CAT Data was accessed; and implement and maintain appropriate policies regarding limitations on trading activities of its employees and independent contractors

[531] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 9.6(a).

[532] *Id.*

[533] *Id.* at Article X.

[534] *Id.* at Section 10.1.

[535] *Id.* at Section 10.2.

[536] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(f)(i), (iv)(A).

[537] *Id.* at Section 6.5(f)(i)(A).

[538] *Id.* at Sections 6.1(m), 6.12.

[539] *Id.* at Section 6.2(b)(i), (v).

[540] *Id.* at Section 6.9(b)(xi).

[541] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.

[542] 17 CFR 242.1000–1007; *see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.9(b)(xi).

[543] Standards issued by NIST that are explicitly listed in the CAT NMS Plan include NIST Security and Privacy Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations (Special Publication 800–53 Rev. 4); NIST Contingency Planning Guide for Federal Information Systems (Special Publication 800–34 Rev. 1), particularly Chapters 3, 4 & 5; NIST Guidelines to Federal Organizations on Security Assurance and Acquisition/Use of Test/Evaluated Products (Special Publication 800–23); NIST Technical Guide to Information Security Testing and Assessment (Special Publication 800–115); NIST Guide to Enterprise Password Management (Special Publication 800–118); NIST Recommendation for Cryptographic Key Generation (Special Publication 800–133); and NIST Information Security Continuous Monitoring for Federal Information Systems and Organizations (Special Publication 800–137). *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Sections 4.2, 5.2 and 5.3.

[544] Standards issued by the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council that are explicitly listed in the CAT NMS Plan include FFIEC Authentication Best Practices, and the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, Supplement to Authentication in an Internet Banking Environment (June 22, 2011). *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Sections 4.1.1, 4.2.

[545] Standards issued by the International Organization for Standardization that are explicitly listed in the CAT NMS Plan include ISO/IEC 27001—Information Security Management. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.2. The CAT NMS Plan also states that the CAT System must adhere to the 2003 Interagency White Paper on Sound Practices to Strengthen the Resilience of the U.S. Financial System, Securities Exchange Act Release No. 47638 (April 8, 2003), 68 FR 17809 (April 11, 2003). *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 5.3.

[546] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(f)(i), (iv)(A).

[547] *Id.* at Section 6.2(b)(i), (v).

[548] *Id.* at Sections 6.1(m), 6.5(f)(i)(C).

involved with all CAT Data.[549] The Technical Specifications, which will be published after the Plan Processor is selected, must include a detailed description of the data security standards for the CAT.[550]

According to the CAT NMS Plan, the Plan Processor must require that individuals with access to the Central Repository (including the respective employees and consultants of the Participants and the Plan Processor, but excluding employees and Commissioners of the SEC) to agree: (i) To use appropriate safeguards to ensure the confidentiality of the CAT Data stored in the Central Repository and (ii) to not use CAT Data stored in the Central Repository for purposes other than surveillance and regulation in accordance with such individual's employment duties.[551] A Participant, however, is permitted to use the CAT Data it reports to the Central Repository for regulatory, surveillance, commercial or other purposes as permitted by applicable law, rule, or regulation.[552] In addition, the CAT NMS Plan provides that all individuals with access to the Central Repository (including the respective employees and consultants of the Participants and the Plan Processor, but excluding employees and Commissioners of the SEC) must execute a personal ''Safeguard of Information Affidavit'' in a form approved by the Operating Committee providing for personal liability for misuse of data.[553]

c. Data Security

Appendix D of the CAT NMS Plan sets forth minimum data security requirements for CAT that the Plan Processor must meet, including various connectivity, data transfer, and encryption requirements.[554]

Appendix D states that the CAT Systems must have encrypted internet connectivity, and that CAT Reporters must connect to the CAT infrastructure using secure methods such as private lines or, for smaller broker-dealers, Virtual Private Network connections over public lines.[555] Remote access to the Central Repository must be limited to authorized Plan Processor Staff and must use secure ''Multi-factor Authentication'' (or ''MFA'') that meets or exceeds Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council security guidelines surrounding authentication best practices.[556] Appendix D also notes that CAT databases must be deployed within the network infrastructure so that they are not directly accessible from external end-user networks.[557] If public cloud infrastructures are used, Appendix D states that network segments or private tenant segmentation must be used to isolate CAT Data from unauthenticated public access.[558]

Regarding data encryption, Appendix D states that all CAT Data must be encrypted in-flight using industry standard best practices (*e.g.,* SSL/TLS).[559] Appendix D provides that symmetric key encryption must use a minimum key size of 128 bits or greater (*e.g.,* AES–128), though larger keys are preferable.[560] Asymmetric key encryption (*e.g.,* PGP) for exchanging data between Data Submitters and the Central Repository is desirable.[561]

Appendix D further states that CAT Data stored in a public cloud must be encrypted at-rest.[562] Non-personally identifiable information in CAT Data stored in a Plan Processor private environment is not required to be encrypted at-rest.[563] If public cloud managed services are used that would inherently have access to the data (*e.g.,* BigQuery, S3, Redshift), then the key management surrounding the encryption of that data must be documented (particularly whether the cloud provider manages the keys, or if the Plan Processor maintains that control).[564] Auditing and real-time monitoring of the service for when cloud provider personnel are able to access/decrypt CAT Data must be documented, as well as a response plan to address instances where unauthorized access to CAT Data is detected.[565] Key management/rotation/revocation strategies and key chain of custody must also be documented in detail.[566]

Regarding CAT Data storage, the CAT NMS Plan states that data centers housing CAT Systems (whether public or private) must, at a minimum, be SOC 2 certified by an independent third-party auditor.[567] The frequency of the audit must be at least once per year.[568] Furthermore, CAT computer infrastructure may not be commingled with other non-regulatory systems (or tenets, in the case of public cloud infrastructure).[569] Systems hosting the CAT processing for any applications must be segmented from other systems as far as is feasible on a network level (firewalls, security groups, ACL's, VLAN's, authentication proxies/bastion hosts and similar).[570] In the case of systems using inherently shared infrastructure/storage (*e.g.,* public cloud storage services), an encryption/key management/access control strategy that effectively renders the data private must be documented.[571]

Appendix D further requires that the Plan Processor must include penetration testing and an application security code audit by a reputable (and named) third party prior to the launch of CAT as well as periodically as defined in the SLAs.[572] Reports of the audit will be provided to the Operating Committee as well as a remediation plan for identified issues.[573] The penetration test reviews of the Central Repository's network, firewalls, and development, testing and production systems should help the CAT evaluate the systems' security and resiliency in the face of attempted and successful systems intrusions.[574]

The CAT NMS Plan also addresses issues surrounding access to CAT Data. Among other things, the CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to provide an overview of how access to PII and other CAT Data by Plan Processor employees and administrators is restricted.[575] This overview must include items such as, but not limited to, how the Plan Processor will manage access to the systems, internal segmentation, MFA, separation of duties, entitlement management, and background checks.[576] The Plan Processor must develop and maintain policies and procedures reasonably designed to prevent, detect, and mitigate the impact of unauthorized access or usage of data in the Central Repository.[577] The CAT NMS Plan also specifically states that a Role Based Access Control (''RBAC'') model must

[549] *Id.* at Section 6.5(f)(i)(D), (E).

[550] *Id.* at Section 6.9.

[551] *Id.* at Section 6.5(f)(i)(A).

[552] *Id.*

[553] *Id.* at Section 6.5(f)(i)(B).

[554] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.

[555] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.1.1.

[556] *Id.* Multi-factor authentication, or MFA, is a method requiring a person to provide more than one factor (*e.g.,* biometrics/personal information in addition to a password) in order to be validated by the system.). *See id.* at Appendix C, Section D.12(e), n.250.

[557] *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.1.1.

[558] *Id.*

[559] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.1.2.

[560] *Id.*

[561] *Id.*

[562] *Id.*

[563] *Id.*

[564] *Id.*

[565] *Id.*

[566] *Id.*

[567] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.1.3.

[568] *Id.*

[569] *Id.*

[570] *Id.*

[571] *Id.*

[572] *Id.*

[573] *Id.*

[574] *Id.*

[575] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.1.4.

[576] *Id.*

[577] *Id.*

be used to permission users with access to different areas of the CAT System.[578] The Plan Processor must log every instance of access to Central Repository data by users.[579] The CAT NMS Plan also has specific provisions related to passwords and logins, particularly as these relate to accessing PII in the Central Repository.[580] Any login to the system that is able to access PII data must follow non-PII password rules and must be further secured via MFA.[581]

Appendix D also addresses what should be done in the event there is a breach in the security systems protecting CAT Data. Appendix D requires the Plan Processor to develop policies and procedures governing its responses to systems or data breaches.[582] Such policies and procedures will include a formal cyber incident response plan, and documentation of all information relevant to breaches.[583] The cyber incident response plan will provide guidance and direction during security incidents, and the plan will be subject to approval by the Operating Committee.[584]

d. *Data Access and Use*

The CAT NMS Plan states that the Plan Processor shall provide Participants and the Commission with access to and use of the CAT Data stored in the Central Repository solely for the purpose of performing their respective regulatory and oversight responsibilities pursuant to federal securities laws, rules and regulations or any contractual obligations.[585] The Plan specifies that Participants shall establish, maintain and enforce written policies and procedures reasonably designed to ensure the confidentiality of the CAT Data obtained from the Central Repository and limit the use of CAT Data obtained from the Central Repository to surveillance and regulatory purposes.[586] The CAT NMS Plan provides that Participants must adopt and enforce policies and procedures that implement effective information barriers between each Participant's regulatory and non-regulatory Staff with regard to CAT Data, permit only persons designated by Participants to have access to the CAT Data stored in the Central Repository; and impose penalties for Staff non-compliance with any of its or the Plan Processor's policies and procedures with respect to information security.[587] However, the Plan provides that a Participant may use the Raw Data[588] it reports to the Central Repository for ''commercial or other'' purposes if not prohibited by applicable law, rule or regulation.[589]

Article VI of the CAT NMS Plan requires that the Plan Processor provide regulators access to the Central Repository for regulatory and oversight purposes and create a method of accessing CAT Data that includes the ability to run complex searches and generate reports.[590] Section 6.10(c) of the CAT NMS Plan requires regulator access by two different methods: (i) An online targeted query tool with predefined selection criteria to choose from; and (ii) user-defined direct queries and bulk extractions of data via a query tool or language allowing querying of all available attributes and data sources.[591] Appendix D contains technical details and parameters for use by the Plan Processor in developing the systems that will allow regulators access to CAT Data.[592]

Appendix C addresses the time and method by which CAT Data would be available to regulators.[593] Specifically, Appendix C requires that data be available to regulators any point after the data enters the Central Repository and passes basic format validations.[594] After errors are communicated to CAT Reporters on a T+1 basis, CAT Reporters would be required to report corrected data back to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+3.[595] Regulators must then have access to corrected and linked order and Customer data by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+5.[596] Appendix C further outlines requirements the Plan Processor must meet for report building and analysis regarding data usage by regulators, consistent with, and in addition to, the specifications outlined in Appendix D.[597]

e. Personally Identifiable Information

According to the CAT NMS Plan, there are two separate categories of CAT Data for data security and confidentiality purposes: (i) PII; and (ii) other data related to orders and trades reported to the CAT.[598] The Plan requires additional levels of protection for PII that is collected from Customers and reported to the Central Repository.[599] For example, the CAT NMS Plan requires that all CAT Data provided to regulators must be encrypted, but that PII data shall be masked unless users have permission to view the CAT Data that has been requested.[600] The Plan requires that all PII data must be encrypted *both* at-rest and in-flight, including archival data storage methods such as tape backup.[601] Storage of unencrypted PII data is prohibited.[602] The Plan Processor must describe how PII encryption is performed and the key management strategy (*e.g.,* AES–256, 3DES).[603]

An additional protection afforded to PII concerns specific requirements for access. The CAT NMS Plan specifies that by default, users entitled to query CAT Data are not automatically authorized for PII access, and that the process by which a person becomes entitled for PII access, and how they then go about accessing PII data, must be documented by the Plan Processor.[604] Access to PII will be based on a Role Based Access Control (''RBAC'') model, and shall follow the ''least privileged'' practice of limiting access as much as possible.[605] In this regard, the CAT NMS Plan states that access will be limited to a ''need-to-know'' basis, and it is expected that the number of people given access to PII

[578] *Id.*

[579] *Id.*

[580] *See id.*

[581] *Id.*

[582] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.1.5.

[583] *Id.*

[584] *Id.*

[585] *See id.* at Section 6.5(c)(i).

[586] *Id.* at Section 6.5(g). The Commission notes that regulatory purposes includes, among other things, analysis and reconstruction of market events, market analysis and research to inform policy decisions, market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30649 n.266.

[587] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(f)(ii).

[588] Raw Data is defined as ''Participant Data and Industry Member Data that has not been through any validation or otherwise checked by the CAT System.'' *Id.* at Section 1.1.

[589] *Id.* at Section 6.5(h).

[590] *Id.* at Section 6.5(c)(i), (ii). Appendix C provides objective milestones to assess progress concerning regulator access to the Central Repository. *See id.* at Appendix C, Section C.10(d).

[591] *Id.* at Section 6.10(c)(i). Section 6.10(c) also requires the Plan Processor to reasonably assist regulatory Staff with queries, submit queries on behalf of regulatory Staff as requested, and maintain a help desk to assist regulatory Staff with questions concerning CAT Data. *Id.* at 6.10(c)(iv)–(vi).

[592] *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 8.

[593] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2.

[594] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2(a). Appendix C, Section A.3(e) indicates this would be no later than noon EST on T+1. *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(e).

[595] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iv); Appendix D, Section 6.1.

[596] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2(a).

[597] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2(c). Appendix C, Section A.2(d) addresses system service level agreements that the SROs and Plan Processor would enter into. *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2(d).

[598] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.4.

[599] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.4(a).

[600] *See id.* at Section 6.10(c)(ii).

[601] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.1.2

[602] *Id.*

[603] *Id.*

[604] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.1.6.

[605] *Id.*

associated with Customers and accounts will be much lower than the number granted access to non-PII CAT Data.[606] The CAT NMS Plan further specifies that any login system that is able to access PII must follow non-PII password rules and must be further secured via MFA.[607] MFA authentication for all logins (including non-PII) is required to be implemented by the Plan Processor.[608]

The CAT NMS Plan also requires that a designated officer or employee at each Participant and the Commission, such as the chief regulatory officer, must, at least annually, review and certify that persons with PII access have appropriately been designated to access PII in light of their respective roles.[609] The CAT NMS Plan requires that a full audit trail of access to the PII collected at the Central Repository—which would include who accessed what data and when—must be maintained, and that the CCO and CISO shall have access to daily PII reports that list all users who are entitled for PII access, as well as the audit trail of all PII access that has occurred for the day being reported on.[610]

The CAT NMS Plan also restricts the circumstances under which PII can be provided to an authorized person. The CAT NMS Plan provides, for example, that PII must not be included in the result set(s) from online or direct query tools, reports or bulk data extraction.[611] Instead, the CAT NMS Plan requires any such results, reports or extractions to be displayed with ''non-PII unique identifiers (*e.g.,* Customer-ID or Firm Designated ID).'' [612] The CAT NMS Plan states that the PII corresponding to these non-PII identifiers can be gathered by using a separate ''PII workflow.'' [613]

Finally, the CAT NMS Plan further protects PII by requiring that PII data be stored separately from other CAT Data.[614] The Plan specifies that PII cannot be stored with the transactional CAT Data, and it must not be accessible from public internet connectivity.[615]

26. Governing or Constituent Documents

Rule 608 requires copies of all governing or constituent documents relating to any person (other than a self-regulatory organization) authorized to implement or administer such plan on behalf of its sponsors.[616] The Participants will submit to the Commission such documents related to the Plan Processor when the Plan Processor is selected.[617]

27. Development and Implementation Phases

The terms of the Plan will be effective immediately upon approval of the Plan by the Commission (the ''Effective Date'').[618] The Plan sets forth each of the significant phases of development and implementation contemplated by the Plan, together with the projected date of completion of each phase.[619] These include the following, each of which is subject to orders otherwise by the Commission:

Within two months after the Effective Date, the Participants will jointly select the winning Shortlisted Bid and the Plan Processor pursuant to the process set forth in Article V. Following the selection of the Initial Plan Processor, the Participants will file with the Commission a statement identifying the Plan Processor and including the information required by Rule 608;

Within four months after the Effective Date, each Participant will, and, through its Compliance Rule, will require its Industry Members to, synchronize its or their Business Clocks and certify to the Chief Compliance Officer (in the case of Participants) or the applicable Participant (in the case of Industry Members) that it has met this requirement;

Within six months after the Effective Date, the Participants must jointly provide to the SEC a document outlining how the Participants could incorporate into the CAT information with respect to equity securities that are not NMS Securities,[620] including Primary Market Transactions in securities that are not NMS Securities, which document will include details for each order and Reportable Event that may be required to be provided, which market participants may be required to provide the data, the implementation timeline, and a cost estimate;

Within one year after the Effective Date, each Participant must report Participant Data to the Central Repository;

Within fourteen months after the Effective Date, each Participant must implement a new or enhanced surveillance system(s);

Within two years after the Effective Date, each Participant must, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) to report Industry Member Data to the Central Repository; and

Within three years after the Effective Date, each Participant must, through its Compliance Rule, require its Small Industry Members to provide Industry Member Data to the Central Repository.[621]

In addition, Industry Members and Participants will be required to participate in industry testing with the Central Repository on a schedule to be determined by the Operating Committee. Furthermore, Appendix C, A Plan to Eliminate Existing Rules and Systems (Rule 613(a)(1)(ix)), and Appendix D, Data Types and Sources, set forth additional implementation details concerning the elimination of rules and systems.

The CCO will appropriately document objective milestones to assess progress toward the implementation of the CAT.[622]

As required by Rule 613(a)(1)(x),[623] the CAT NMS Plan also sets forth detailed objective milestones, with projected completion dates, towards CAT implementation.[624] The milestones discussed in the Plan include timeframes for when the Plan Processor will publish Technical Specifications for Participants and Industry Members to report order and market maker quote data and Customer Account Information [625] to the Central

[606] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.4.

[607] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.1.4. MFA is a method requiring a person to provide more than one factor (*e.g.,* biometrics/personal information in addition to a password) in order to be validated by the system. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section D.12(e), n.250.

[608] *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.1.4.

[609] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 4.1.6.

[610] *Id.*

[611] *Id.*

[612] *Id.*

[613] *Id.*

[614] *Id.*

[615] *Id.*

[616] 17 CFR 242.608(a)(4)(i).

[617] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.7(a)(i).

[618] Effective Date is defined as ''the date of approval of [the CAT NMS Plan] by the Commission.'' *Id.* at Section 1.1.

[619] *Id.* at Section 6.7, Appendix C, Section C.10.

[620] *See id.* at Section 6.7(a). In the Amendment to the CAT NMS Plan, Section 6.11 excludes OTC Equity Securities from the document the Participants would submit to the Commission, since the Participants plan to include OTC Equity Securities as well as NMS Securities in the initial phase in of CAT. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30634 n.82.

[621] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.7(a).

[622] *See id.* at Section 6.7(b).

[623] 17 CFR 242.613(a)(1)(x).

[624] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section C.10. The CAT NMS Plan requires the CCO to document these objective milestones to assess progress toward the implementation of CAT. *See id.* at Section 6.7(b).

[625] ''Customer Account Information'' shall include, but not be limited to, account number, account type, customer type, date account opened, and large trader identifier (if applicable); except, however, that (a) in those circumstances in which an Industry Member has established a trading relationship with an institution but has not established an account with that institution, the Industry Member will (i) provide the Account Effective Date in lieu of the ''date account opened''; (ii) provide the relationship identifier in lieu of the ''account number''; and (iii) identify the ''account type'' as a ''relationship''; (b) in those circumstances in which the relevant account was established prior to the implementation date of the CAT NMS Plan applicable to the relevant CAT Reporter (as set forth in Rule 613(a)(3)(v) and (vi)), and no ''date account opened'' is available for the account, the Industry Member will provide the Account Effective Date in the following circumstances: (i) Where an Industry Member changes back office providers or clearing firms and the date account opened is changed to the date the

Continued

Repository, as well as timeframes for connectivity and acceptance testing for the reporting of this information.[626] For example, the Plan Processor will publish Technical Specifications for Industry Member submission of order data one year before Industry Members are required to begin submitting this data to the Central Repository, and the Plan Processor will begin connectivity testing and accepting order data from Industry Members for testing purposes six months before Industry Members are required to begin submitting this data to the Central Repository.[627] The Plan Processor will begin connectivity testing and accepting order and market maker quote data from Participants for testing purposes three months before Participants are required to begin reporting this data to the Central Repository and will publish Technical Specifications for Participant submission of this data six months before Participants are required to submit this data to the Central Repository.[628] The CAT NMS Plan also includes implementation timeframes for the linkage of the lifecycle of order events, regulator access to the Central Repository, and the integration of other data (such as SIP quote and trade data) into the Central Repository.[629]

28. Written Understanding or Agreements Relating to Interpretation of, or Participation in, the Plan

The Participants have no written understandings or agreements relating to interpretations of, or participation in, the Plan other than those set forth in the Plan itself.[630] For example, Section 4.3(a)(iii) states that the Operating Committee only may authorize the interpretation of the Plan by Majority Vote, Section 6.9(c)(i) addresses interpretations of the Technical Specifications, and Section 8.2 addresses the interpretation of Sections 8.1 and 8.2.[631] In addition, Section 3.3 sets forth how any entity registered as a national securities exchange or national securities association under the Exchange Act may become a Participant.[632]

29. Dispute Resolution

The Plan does not include a general provision addressing the method by which disputes arising in connection with the operation of the Plan will be resolved.[633] The Plan does, however, provide the means for resolving disputes regarding the Participation Fee.[634] Specifically, Article III states that, in the event that the Company and a prospective Participant do not agree on the amount of the Participation Fee, such amount will be subject to the review by the Commission pursuant to Section 11A(b)(5) of the Exchange Act.[635] In addition, the Plan addresses disputes with respect to fees charged to Participants and Industry Members pursuant to Article XI. Specifically, such disputes will be determined by the Operating Committee or a Subcommittee designated by the Operating Committee.[636] Decisions by the Operating Committee or such designated Subcommittee on such matters will be binding on Participants and Industry Members, without prejudice to the rights of any Participant or Industry Member to seek redress from the Commission pursuant to Rule 608 or in any other appropriate forum.[637]

IV. Discussion and Commission Findings

In 1975, Congress directed the Commission, through the enactment of Section 11A of the Act,[638] to facilitate the establishment of a national market system. Section 11A(a)(3)(B) of the Act authorizes the Commission, ''by rule or order, to authorize or require self-regulatory organizations to act jointly with respect to matters as to which they share authority under this title in planning, developing, operating, or regulating a national market system (or a subsystem thereof) or one or more facilities.'' [639] The Commission adopted Rule 613 of Regulation NMS under the Act,[640] requiring the SROs to submit an NMS plan to create, implement, and maintain the CAT.[641]

Rule 613 tasks the Participants with the responsibility to develop a CAT NMS Plan that achieves the goals set forth by the Commission. Because the Participants will be more directly responsible for the implementation of the CAT NMS Plan, in the Commission's view, it is appropriate that they make the judgment as to how to obtain the benefits of a consolidated audit trail in a way that is practicable and cost-effective in the first instance. The Commission's review of an NMS plan is governed by Rule 608 and, under that rule, approval is conditioned upon a finding that the proposed plan is ''necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors and the maintenance of fair and orderly markets, to remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a national market system, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.'' [642] Further, Rule 608 provides the Commission with the authority to approve an NMS plan, ''with such changes or subject to such conditions as the Commission may deem necessary or appropriate.'' [643] In reviewing the policy choices made by the Participants in developing the CAT NMS Plan, the Commission has sought to ensure that they are supported by an adequate rationale, do not call into question the Plan's satisfaction of the approval standard in Rule 608, and reasonably achieve the benefits of a consolidated audit trail without imposing unnecessary burdens. In addition, because of the evolving nature of the data captured by the CAT and the technology used, as well as the number of decisions still to be made in the process of implementing the CAT NMS Plan, the Commission has paid particular attention to the structures in place to guide decision-making going forward. These include the governance of the Company, the provisions made for Commission and other oversight, the standards established, and the development milestones provided for in the Plan.

The Commission received 24 comment letters on the CAT NMS Plan.[644] The commenters included, among others, national securities exchanges, technology providers, academics, broker-dealers, investors, and organizations representing industry participants. Of the comment letters received regarding the Plan, 13

account was opened on the new back office/clearing firm system; (ii) where an Industry Member acquires another Industry Member and the date account opened is changed to the date the account was opened on the post-merger back office/clearing firm system; (iii) where there are multiple dates associated with an account in an Industry Member's system, and the parameters of each date are determined by the individual Industry Member; and (iv) where the relevant account is an Industry Member proprietary account.'' *See id.* at Section 1.1.

[626] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section C.10(a)–(b).

[627] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section C.10(b).

[628] *See id.*

[629] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section C.10(c)–(e).

[630] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30635.

[631] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 4.3(a)(iii), 6.9(c)(i), 8.2.

[632] *See id.* at Section 3.3.

[633] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30635.

[634] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 3.3(b).

[635] *See id.; see also* 15 U.S.C. 78k–l(b)(5).

[636] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 11.5.

[637] *Id.*

[638] 15 U.S.C. 78k–1.

[639] 15 U.S.C. 78k–1(a)(3)(B).

[640] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14; see also Proposing Release, supra note 14.

[641] 17 CFR 242.613(a)(1), (c)(1), (c)(7).

[642] 17 CFR 242.608(b)(2); *see also* 15 U.S.C. 78k–1(a).

[643] 17 CFR 242.608(b)(2).

[644] *See supra* note 6.

expressed general support,[645] 3 comment letters expressed opposition to the Plan,[646] and 8 comment letters neither supported nor opposed the Plan.[647] Many of the commenters suggested modifications to certain provisions of the Plan or identified what they believed were deficiencies in the Plan.

The most significant areas raised in the comment letters pertained to: (i) The security and confidentiality of CAT Data (especially of PII); (ii) the cost and funding of the CAT; (iii) the timing of the retirement of duplicative regulatory reporting systems; (iv) the implementation time frame; (v) governance (particularly with respect to industry representation); (vi) the clock synchronization standard; (vi) error rates; and (vii) an overall lack of detail in the CAT NMS Plan.

As discussed in detail below, the Commission has determined to approve the CAT NMS Plan, as amended, pursuant to Section 11A of the Act[648] and Rule 608.[649] The Commission believes that the Plan is reasonably designed to improve the completeness, accuracy, accessibility and timeliness of order and execution data used by regulators. The Commission believes that the Plan will facilitate regulators' access to more complete, accurate and timely audit trail data. The Plan will also allow for more efficient and effective surveillance and analysis, which will better enable regulators to detect misconduct, reconstruct market events, and assess potential regulatory changes. As a result, the CAT NMS Plan should significantly improve regulatory efforts by the SROs and the Commission, including market surveillance, market reconstructions, enforcement investigations, and examinations of market participants. The Commission believes that improved regulatory efforts, in turn, will strengthen the integrity and efficiency of the markets, which will enhance investor protection and increase capital formation.

As noted, commenters raised concerns about, and suggested alternatives to, certain Plan provisions. The Participants submitted five letters which responded to the comments and provided certain suggestions for amendments to the Plan, as discussed in detail below. After considering the proposed Plan, the issues raised by commenters, and the Participants' responses, the Commission has amended certain aspects of the Plan and has determined that the proposed Plan, as amended by the Commission, satisfies the standard of Rule 608. The Commission finds that the CAT NMS Plan is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors and the maintenance of fair and orderly markets, to remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of a national market system, or is otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.[650] The Commission does not believe that the remaining concerns identified by commenters individually or collectively call into question the Plan's satisfaction of the approval standard in Rule 608, or otherwise warrant a departure from the policy choices made by the Participants.

A. Definitions, Effectiveness of Agreement, and Participation (Articles I, II, and III)

Article I of the CAT NMS Plan sets forth definitions for certain terms used in the CAT NMS Plan, as well as principles of interpretation. Article II of the CAT NMS Plan describes the corporate structure under which the Participants will build and maintain the CAT, and Article III addresses participation in the Plan, including admission of new Participants, resignation and termination of Participants, and the obligations and liability of Participants.[651]

The Commission did not receive any comments relating to Article II or III of the CAT NMS Plan, and is approving them as proposed, with certain technical conforming changes to reflect the Participants' proposal to treat the Company as a non-profit and certain Exchange Act obligations.[652] The Commission did receive comments on three definitions:[653] (1) Allocation Report;[654] (2) Trading Day;[655] and (3) Eligible Security.[656]

For the definition of Allocation Report,[657] one commenter stated that ''allocation time is not consistently defined or captured,'' and that without further guidance, CAT Reporters may have difficulties reporting this data element.[658] The Participants responded to this comment by explaining that the Participants have not yet determined how ''time of the allocation'' will be defined, but indicated that they would address this in the Technical Specifications.[659]

For the definition of Trading Day,[660] one commenter stated that the cut-off time for Trading Day is not defined and argued that, consistent with OATS, the cut-off time should be 4:00 p.m., ET.[661] The commenter argued a later cut-off time would compress the time CAT Reporters have to collect, validate, and report data in a timely manner.[662] The Participants responded to this comment by explaining that a universal cut-off time for Trading Day is not recommended for the CAT because cut-off times may differ based on the different types of Eligible Securities (including the potential expansion of the security types covered in Eligible Securities). Rather, the Participants stated that the Operating Committee should determine cut-off times for the Trading Day and indicated that they would address this in the Technical Specifications.[663]

For the definition of Eligible Security,[664] one commenter stated that ''a full audit trail would include transactions both on and off

[645] FSR, FSI, MFA, ICI, TR, SIFMA, FIF, Fidelity, UnaVista, CBOE, KCG, and NYSE Letters.

[646] Better Markets, Bloomberg, and Data Boiler Letters.

[647] Anonymous I, Anonymous II, DAG, STA, DTCC, Hanley, Wachtel, FIX Trading, and Garrett Letters.

[648] 15 U.S.C. 78k–1.

[649] 17 CFR 242.608(b)(2).

[650] *See* 17 CFR 242.608(b)(2).

[651] *See* Section III.1.; Section III.2., *supra.*

[652] *See* Sections IV.B and IV.F, *infra.*

[653] The Commission notes that some commenters recommended changing specific provisions in the CAT NMS Plan, which would also result in modifications to certain definitions set forth in Article I (*e.g.,* Error Rate and Primary Market Transaction). The Commission discusses such comments in the Sections below in conjunction with the relevant substantive CAT NMS Plan provisions.

[654] TR Letter at 9.

[655] FIF Letter at 95–96.

[656] Anonymous Letter I at 9.

[657] The Plan defines ''Allocation Report'' to mean a report made to the Central Repository by an Industry Member that identifies the Firm Designated ID for any account(s), including subaccount(s), to which executed shares are allocated and provides the security that has been allocated, the identifier of the firm reporting the allocation, the price per share of shares allocated, the side of shares allocated, the number of shares allocated to each account, and the time of the allocation; provided, for the avoidance of doubt, any such Allocation Report shall not be required to be linked to particular orders or executions. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[658] TR Letter at 9.

[659] Response Letter I at 25.

[660] The Plan states that ''Trading Day'' shall have such meaning as is determined by the Operating Committee. For the avoidance of doubt, the Operating Committee may establish different Trading Days for NMS Stocks (as defined in SEC Rule 600(b)(47), Listed Options, OTC Equity Securities, and any other securities that are included as Eligible Securities from time to time. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[661] FIF Letter at 95–96.

[662] *Id.* at 96, 124.

[663] Response Letter I at 31.

[664] The CAT NMS Plan provides that ''Eligible Security'' includes (a) all NMS Securities and (b) all OTC Equity Securities. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

exchange.'' [665] The Participants noted that the CAT will capture on- and off-exchange transactions for NMS Securities and OTC Equity Securities, as the CAT would ''capture orders and transactions in NMS Securities and OTC Equity Securities, even if they occur in ATSs/dark pools, other trading venues or internally within broker-dealers.'' [666]

The Commission believes that the definitions and principles of interpretation set forth in Article I of the CAT NMS Plan are reasonably designed to provide clarity to the terms set forth in the CAT NMS Plan. In response to the commenters that recommended modifications to the definitions of Allocation Report and Trading Day, the Commission believes it is reasonable for the Participants to address the Allocation Report and Trading Day specifics raised by commenters in the Technical Specifications to provide the CAT with necessary flexibility during its implementation, and based on the Plan's requirement that the Technical Specifications will be published no later than one year prior to when Industry Member reporting begins.[667] With respect to Eligible Securities, the Commission believes that the commenter's concern is addressed already in the Plan.

The Commission also notes that the Participants submitted a letter to the Commission indicating that the names of certain Participants had changed and that two new exchanges have been approved by the Commission.[668] Specifically, the Participants stated that BATS Exchange, Inc. is now known as Bats BZX Exchange, Inc.; BATS Y-Exchange, Inc. is now known as Bats BYX Exchange, Inc.; EDGA Exchange, Inc. is now known as Bats EDGA Exchange, Inc.; EDGX Exchange, Inc. is now known as Bats EDGX Exchange, Inc.; NASDAQ OMX BX, Inc. is now known as NASDAQ BX, Inc.; and NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC is now known as NASDAQ PHLX LLC.[669] In addition, the Participants stated that two new exchanges were approved by the Commission: ISE Mercury, LLC and Investors' Exchange, LLC.[670] Thus, the Participants suggested that the Commission amend the Plan to reflect that ISE Mercury, LLC and Investors' Exchange LLC are Participants to the CAT NMS Plan, and to include their names on the signature block for the CAT NMS Plan (including the Plan's appendices).[671] The Commission believes it is appropriate to amend the CAT NMS Plan to reflect the name changes of certain Participants because this will ensure that the names of those Participants are accurately reflected, and to amend the CAT NMS Plan to add ISE Mercury, LLC and Investors' Exchange, LLC as Participants to the CAT NMS Plan because all SROs are intended to be Participants to the CAT NMS Plan.[672]

B. Management of the Company (Article IV)

Article IV of the CAT NMS Plan describes the management structure of CAT NMS, LLC.[673] Many commenters raised concerns related to the governance structure set forth in the CAT NMS Plan.[674] Most of the governance comments focused on the role, composition, obligations and powers of the Operating Committee and the Advisory Committee.[675] A few commenters identified potential conflicts of interest (both with respect to the Officers and the Participants) as well as other governance concerns, including whether the CAT should be under the Commission's direct and sole control.[676]

1. Operating Committee

Article IV of the CAT NMS Plan provides that an Operating Committee will manage the CAT, where each Participant appoints one member of the Operating Committee, and each Participant appointee has one vote.[677] Article IV also sets forth certain other provisions relating to the Operating Committee, including identification of those actions requiring a Majority Vote, a Supermajority Vote, or a unanimous vote; and the management of conflicts of interest. Commenters raised concerns about the composition, voting and independence of the Operating Committee.

Some commenters argued that the composition of the Operating Committee should not be limited to the SROs,[678] arguing that non-SROs also should have full voting powers.[679] Commenters recommended that the Operating Committee should include members who are broker-dealers,[680] and other non-SRO and non-broker-dealer market participants,[681] institutional investors, broker-dealers with a substantial retail base, broker-dealers with a substantial institutional base, a data management expert, and a federal agency representative with national security cybersecurity experience.[682] Another commenter recommended including representatives of registered funds as members of the Operating Committee, noting their strong interest in ensuring the security of CAT Data and that CAT Reporter position information and trading strategies not be compromised.[683] Two commenters argued that no legal authority bars broker-dealers or other non-SROs from serving on the Operating Committee.[684]

In support of their recommendation to expand the Operating Committee's membership, commenters stressed the need for meaningful input by stakeholders with specific expertise, which they believed would improve the implementation and maintenance of the CAT.[685] One commenter described the CAT as ''a uniquely complex facility'' [686] and another commenter described the CAT as ''a critical market utility designed to benefit the national market system and all market participants,'' and stated that as such ''the governance and operation of the CAT NMS Plan should be structured to obtain meaningful input from the broker-dealer community.'' [687] One of these commenters noted broker-dealers would have complementary ''expertise and insight'' to the SROs, insofar as broker-dealers would be ''providing the

[665] Anonymous Letter I at 9.

[666] Response Letter I at 25.

[667] *See* Section IV.D.8.a, *infra.*

[668] Participants' Letter I at 1.

[669] *Id.*

[670] *Id.*

[671] *Id.*

[672] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30618.

[673] *See* Section III.3, *supra.*

[674] FSI Letter at 3; MFA Letter at 3–4; ICI Letter at 10–13; TR Letter at 6–7; SIFMA Letter at 24–29; FIF Letter at 14, 135–37; Fidelity Letter at 6–8; Better Markets Letter at 4–6; KCG Letter at 5–7; DAG Letter at 3; NYSE Letter at 4–6; STA Letter at 1–2.

[675] MFA Letter at 3–4; ICI Letter at 10–13; SIFMA Letter at 24–29; KCG Letter at 5–7; DAG Letter at 3; NYSE Letter at 4–6; TR Letter at 6–7; FIF Letter at 14, 135–37; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations).

[676] FSI Letter at 3; MFA Letter at 3–4; ICI Letter at 10–13; Better Markets Letter at 4–6.

[677] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 4.2, Appendix C, Section D.11(b).

[678] MFA Letter at 3–4; ICI Letter at 10–13; SIFMA Letter at 24–26; KCG Letter at 5–7; DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations).

[679] SIFMA Letter at 24–26; KCG Letter at 5–7; DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations).

[680] SIFMA Letter at 25; MFA Letter at 3; DAG Letter at 3; KCG Letter at 6; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations).

[681] KCG Letter at 6; MFA Letter at 3.

[682] MFA Letter at 3.

[683] ICI Letter at 11. This commenter further noted that registered funds' expertise in protecting trade and order information could help formulate CAT-related data security policies. *Id.*

[684] KCG Letter at 6; ICI Letter at 11.

[685] SIFMA Letter at 25; KCG Letter at 7.

[686] SIFMA Letter at 25.

[687] KCG Letter at 7. KCG suggested that the Advisory Committee alone would have ''almost no voice in the operation [of the] NMS plan'' based on the feedback regarding the administration and operation of other NMS plans. KCG Letter at 7.

lion's share of the reported data to the CAT.'' [688] This commenter clarified that, in recommending broker-dealer participation on the Operating Committee, the commenter ''does not expect (or request) that broker-dealer representatives would have access to the surveillance patterns and other regulatory means by which the SROs will use the data collected by the CAT.'' [689]

One commenter described the industry's experience as part of the DAG as informing its belief that full industry participation on the Operating Committee is required.[690] This commenter stated that ''the SROs limited the Industry's participation in important aspects of the development process'' to an extent that direct engagement with Bidders ''provided a more complete and relevant picture of the proposed CAT solution than had been received through involvement in the DAG.'' [691] This commenter argued the Operating Committee should include non-SRO industry participants because it would allow them to participate in selecting a Plan Processor and developing the CAT operating procedures.[692]

One commenter recommended that the allocation of voting rights among the Participants be reevaluated, noting that the Commission's Equity Market Structure Advisory Committee (''EMSAC'') provided a similar recommendation regarding plan governance generally.[693] This commenter also recommended limiting the number of Operating Committee actions that require unanimous voting.[694]

Commenters also recommended that the Operating Committee include ''independent directors.'' [695] One commenter recommended that these independent directors be both non-industry and non-SRO.[696] Other commenters argued that the ''CAT governance structure should include independent directors, comprised of both non-[i]ndustry and [i]ndustry participants.'' [697]

In response to comments regarding the composition of the Operating Committee, the Participants argued that the Operating Committee should remain as a committee solely of SROs because only SROs have a statutory obligation under the Exchange Act to create, implement and maintain the CAT and regulate securities markets, whereas broker-dealers do not.[698] The Participants also identified potential conflicts of interest if the ''subjects of surveillance [are] involved in decision-making of a plan that, at its core has SEC and [SRO] regulatory surveillance as its primary objective.'' [699] Finally, the Participants discussed their belief that the Advisory Committee, discussed below, is the appropriate forum for non-Participants to provide their views.[700]

In response to comments regarding the allocation of voting rights among the Participants, the Participants explained that each Participant has one vote to permit equal representation among the Participants.[701] The Participants indicated their commitment to this allocation of voting rights because each Participant independently has obligations with regard to the CAT under Rule 613, and each Participant's regulatory surveillance obligations are not constrained by revenues or market share. The Participants also noted that this voting model is common among other NMS plans.[702]

In response to the commenter suggesting that the CAT NMS Plan should limit the number of provisions requiring a unanimous vote, the Participants highlighted that only three extraordinary circumstances require a unanimous vote under the CAT NMS Plan: (i) Obligating Participants to make a loan or capital contribution to the Company;[703] (ii) dissolving the Company; [704] and (iii) acting by written consent in lieu of a meeting.[705]

In response to comments recommending the CAT governance structure include independent directors, the Participants noted that many of the Participants have independent representation on their governing boards, such that each Participant's input regarding the CAT would reflect independent views.[706]

The Commission notes that the Participants' proposed governance structure—with both an Operating Committee and an Advisory Committee—is similar to the governance structure used today by other NMS plans, and the Commission believes that this general structure is reasonably designed to allow the Participants to fulfill their regulatory obligations and, at the same time, provide an opportunity for meaningful input from the industry and other stakeholders.[707]

---

[688] SIFMA Letter at 25; *see also* ICI Letter at 11 (''The perspective of other market participants—particularly given that the central repository will house their sensitive information—would help in the development and maintenance of the CAT.''); MFA Letter at 3 (''The decisions of the Operating Committee, such as those related to data security . . . will have a significant impact on market participants immediately and in the future.''). One commenter further noted that ''the SROs expect the broker-dealers to help fund the costs of the CAT, and they proposed a funding model under which the vast majority of the CAT building and operating costs would be imposed on the broker-dealer firms.'' SIFMA Letter at 25.

[689] SIFMA Letter at 25.

[690] DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations).

[691] DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations).

[692] DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations).

[693] Fidelity Letter at 7. The Commission also notes that although the commenter did not include the EMSAC's rationale for the reallocation of voting rights recommendation, in the EMSAC Recommendations cited by the commenter, the EMSAC explained that it recommended reallocating voting rights because the ''reallocation of voting rights [among NMS plan participants] is intended to better reflect the proportional interests of NMS [p]lan participants''). *See* EMSAC, Recommendations Regarding Enhanced Industry Participation in Certain SRO Regulatory Matters (June 10, 2016), *available at https://www.sec.gov/spotlight/emsac/emsac-trading-venues-regulation-subcommittee-recomendation-61016.pdf (''EMSAC Recommendations'').*

[694] Fidelity Letter at 7. This commenter noted that the EMSAC provided this recommendation. The Commission notes that although the commenter did not include the EMSAC's rationale for this recommendation, in the EMSAC Recommendations cited by the commenter, the EMSAC explained that it recommended the limited use of unanimous voting requirements ''to prevent undue friction or delay in [p]lan voting matters.'' *See* EMSAC Recommendations, *supra* note 693, at 8.

[695] *See* Better Markets Letter at 6; DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations); SIFMA Letter at 25 n.4 (noting Rule 613 does not preclude the SROs from including independent directors in the Operating Committee).

[696] Better Markets Letter at 6.

[697] DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations).

[698] Response Letter I at 6; *see also,* NYSE Letter at 5.

[699] Response Letter I at 6.

[700] *Id.* at 7.

[701] *Id.*

[702] *Id.*

[703] The Participants explained this would impose an additional and direct financial burden on each Participant, thus each Participant's approval is important. *Id.* at 8.

[704] The Participants explained this would directly impact each Participant's ability to meet its regulatory and compliance requirements, so it is critical that each Participant consent to this action. *Id.*

[705] The Participants explained that this would ensure that all Operating Committee members would have knowledge of, and consider, all actions taken by the Operating Committee if an action by written consent is effected in lieu of a meeting. *Id.*

[706] *Id.* at 7.

[707] *See* 17 CFR 242.613; *see, e.g.,* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 77679 (April 21, 2016), 81 FR 24908 (April 21, 2016) (NMS plan regarding addressing extraordinary market volatility); 75660 (August 11, 2015), 80 FR 48940 (August 14, 2015) (NMS plan regarding the consolidated tape association); 75504 (July 22, 2015), 80 FR 45252 (July 29, 2015) (NMS plan regarding consolidated quotations); 75505 (July 22, 2015), 80 FR 45254 (July 29, 2015) (NMS plan regarding unlisted trading privileges). The Commission believes it is reasonable for the CAT NMS Plan to include a governance structure similar to that utilized by

Continued

The Commission believes that it is reasonable for the Operating Committee to be composed exclusively of SROs. As the Participants point out, the CAT NMS Plan is the vehicle through which they will fulfill key regulatory and oversight responsibilities. The Commission notes the Participants' statutory obligations as SROs, the opportunity for Advisory Committee input on the CAT NMS Plan decisions, the opportunity for public comment on Plan amendments, and close Commission oversight, when reaching that determination.[708]

Furthermore, the Commission notes that the current provisions, which allocate voting rights such that each Participant has one vote, is consistent with other NMS plans and recognizes that the obligations imposed by Rule 613 on the SROs are also imposed on each SRO independently. With respect to the limited use of a unanimous voting standard, the Commission believes that the Plan is reasonably designed to facilitate effective governance and notes that only the three extraordinary Operating Committee actions specified above require unanimity, whereas all other Operating Committee actions can be accomplished with either a Majority Vote or Supermajority Vote.

The Commission notes that Commission Staff may observe all meetings (regular and special), including Executive Sessions, of the Operating Committee and Advisory Committee and receive all minutes.[709] The Commission anticipates that only a few members of Commission Staff would observe any given meeting.

The Commission also notes that independent of its review of the CAT NMS Plan, the EMSAC has been reviewing, among other things, the issues surrounding NMS plan governance. On June 10, 2016, the EMSAC presented its recommendations in this area to the Commission.[710]

Finally, the Commission is amending Section 4.4(b) of the Plan to specify that the Operating Committee's discretion to deviate from the treatment, as set forth therein, of persons submitting a Form 1 application to become a national securities exchange or persons submitting a Form X–15AA–A application to become a national securities association, must be reasonable and not impose any unnecessary or inappropriate burden on competition. The Commission is also amending Section 3.3(b)(v) of the Plan to specify that the Operating Committee's discretion, in considering other factors in determining the Participation Fee of a new Participant, must be reasonable, equitable and not unfairly discriminatory. The Commission believes these amendments are appropriate because they set forth in the CAT NMS Plan specific limitations with respect to the Operating Committee's discretion that are consistent with existing SRO obligations under the Exchange Act.[711]

2. Advisory Committee

Article IV of the Plan establishes an Advisory Committee charged with advising the SROs on the implementation, operation, and administration of the Central Repository.[712] Under the Plan, the Advisory Committee has the right to attend Operating Committee and Subcommittee meetings—unless they are held in Executive Session—and submit its views prior to a decision by the Operating Committee.[713] As proposed, the composition of the Advisory Committee includes: (i) Broker-dealers of varying sizes and types of business, including a clearing firm, (ii) an individual who maintains a securities account, (iii) an academic, (iv) institutional investors, and (v) the Commission's Chief Technology Officer (or Commission equivalent), who while not formally a member of the Advisory Committee, serves as an observer.[714]

Most comments regarding the Advisory Committee recommended formalizing and expanding its role.[715] Commenters made the following recommendations: (i) Change the selection process of, and expand the membership of, the Advisory Committee; [716] (ii) form the Advisory Committee before the CAT NMS Plan is approved; [717] (iii) formalize procedures for Advisory Committee meetings, including requiring specific documentation and written correspondence; (iv) narrow the use of Operating Committee Executive Sessions, whereby the Advisory Committee is excluded from participating; and (v) adopt in the CAT NMS Plan, the EMSAC's recommendations for NMS plan advisory committees.[718]

One commenter suggested that the process for selecting Advisory Committee members should change to ensure that the Advisory Committee membership is independent of the SROs.[719] The commenter noted selection of Advisory Committee members independent from the Participants is critical in light of the inherent conflict of interest the Participants face as sponsors and overseers of a Plan that will, at the same time, impose obligations on the very same Participants.[720] This commenter also recommended that the Advisory Committee members should be selected by broker-dealer representatives—not by the SROs—and in support of this position argued that the Advisory Committee's purpose ''should be to represent the interest of the industry and bring to bear the wide expertise of broker-dealers.'' [721]

Those commenters that advocated expanding the membership of the Advisory Committee [722] suggested including: (i) Trade processing and order management service bureaus; (ii) registered funds; (iii) inter-dealer brokers; (iv) agency brokers; (v) retail brokers; (vi) institutional brokers; (vii) proprietary trading firms; (viii) smaller broker-dealers; (ix) firms with a floor presence; (x) and industry/trade associations.[723] One commenter recommended expanding the Advisory Committee to 20 members, with a

other NMS plans that the Commission previously has found to be consistent with the Act. As noted above, the Commission is separately reviewing the EMSAC recommendations. *See supra* note 693.

[708] For these reasons, the Commission does not believe it is necessary to mandate independent directors in the governance of the CAT.

[709] *See* Section IV.B.2, *infra.*

[710] *See supra* note 693.

[711] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4)–(5), (8).

[712] *See* Section III.3, *supra; see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 4.13(a), (d).

[713] *See* Section III.3, *supra; see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 4.13(d).

[714] *See* Section III.3, *supra; see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 4.13(b).

[715] DAG Letter at 3; ICI Letter at 10–13; SIFMA Letter at 26–29; FIF Letter at 14, 135–37; *see also* STA Letter at 1–2 (supporting the SIFMA, FIF and DAG Letters' Advisory Committee recommendations); *but see* NYSE Letter.

[716] TR Letter at 6–7; SIFMA Letter at 26–27; FIF Letter at 14, 135–37; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA and FIF Letters' Advisory Committee recommendations).

[717] DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations).

[718] SIFMA Letter at 26; ICI Letter at 10–13; *see also* STA Letter at 1–2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[719] SIFMA Letter at 27; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[720] SIFMA Letter at 27; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[721] SIFMA Letter at 27; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[722] SIFMA Letter at 27; FIF Letter at 14, 135–37; TR Letter at 6–7 (arguing that a service bureau representative should be added to the Advisory Committee to offer a ''collective perspective'' that comes from supporting multiple clients); ICI Letter at 10–13; *see also* STA Letter at 1–2 (supporting the SIFMA and FIF Letters' Advisory Committee recommendations).

[723] TR Letter at 6; SIFMA Letter at 27; FIF Letter at 135; ICI Letter at 12; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA and FIF Letters' Advisory Committee recommendations).

minimum of 12 broker-dealers.[724] Another commenter suggested including two financial economists (preferably academic) with expertise in both econometrics and the economics of the primary market and market microstructure.[725]

Another commenter recommended forming the Advisory Committee prior to the CAT NMS Plan receiving the Commission's approval to ''allow representative participation in the selection of the [Plan] Processor and in developing [o]perating procedures.'' [726]

Commenters suggested increasing the governance role of the Advisory Committee, with one commenter advocating that ''the Advisory Committee should be involved in every aspect of the CAT,'' [727] such as budgets, fees and charges, and new requirements that may significantly burden broker-dealers.[728]

To facilitate increasing the Advisory Committee's role in the CAT's governance, a few commenters offered concrete recommendations for procedural safeguards.[729] Two commenters suggested that the Operating Committee be required to document a written rationale any time the Operating Committee rejects an Advisory Committee recommendation.[730] One of these commenters recommended that all documents prepared for or submitted to the Operating Committee by the Plan Processor also be submitted to the Advisory Committee, to keep the Advisory Committee fully informed.[731] One commenter recommended that agendas and documentation for Operating Committee meetings be distributed to Advisory Committee members in advance of meetings.[732]

A commenter also recommended that all information concerning the operation of the Central Repository be made available to the Advisory Committee, except for limited information of a confidential regulatory nature.[733] This commenter added that when information is deemed to be of a confidential regulatory nature, the SROs should maintain a written record of what is designated confidential (and excluded from the Advisory Committee) and include an explanation of such designation.[734]

Two commenters recommended revising the confidentiality policies related to the CAT to permit Advisory Committee members to ''share information from the [Advisory Committee] meetings with their colleagues and with other industry participants.'' [735] One commenter further suggested that an Advisory Committee member should be allowed to make other firm personnel available that may have relevant expertise if the Advisory Committee is ''tasked with evaluating issues outside the members' subject matter expertise.'' [736]

Two commenters suggested that the Advisory Committee should have a right to review proposed amendments to the CAT NMS Plan that would affect CAT Reporters.[737] One of these commenters noted that ''[i]t may not be obvious to the Operating Committee when a change to the Plan impacts CAT [R]eporters in a material way.'' [738] The other commenter suggested modifying the Plan's definition of a Material Amendment [739] to distinguish between amendments that are internal or external to the Plan Processor.[740] This commenter recommended that both internal and external material amendments to the CAT NMS Plan be reviewed by the Advisory Committee, but be designated for different levels of review. This commenter suggested that material amendments that are ''internal'' to the Plan Processor would only be reviewed to ensure that that they do not materially affect CAT Reporters; whereas, amendments that are ''external'' to the Plan Processor would require Advisory Committee consultation and an implementation plan with reasonable time for development and testing.[741]

A commenter recommended specific CAT NMS Plan governance changes to expand and clarify the role of the Advisory Committee.[742] This commenter supported: (i) Clarifying the process for selecting Advisory Committee representatives; (ii) expanding and formalizing the role of the Advisory Committee, such as providing it formal votes on matters before the Operating Committee and the ability to initiate its own recommendations; and (iii) significantly narrowing the use of Executive Sessions for the Operating Committee.[743] Moreover, a commenter recommended that when the Operating Committee meets in Executive Session, the SROs should maintain a written record including an explanation of why an Executive Session is required.[744]

One commenter, an SRO, stated that ''the governance structure in the proposed CAT NMS Plan would establish an appropriate advisory role for the Advisory Committee that is consistent with the requirements specified by the Commission in Rule

[724] FIF Letter at 135; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the FIF Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[725] Hanley Letter at 6.

[726] DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[727] SIFMA Letter at 27; *see also* ICI Letter at 11; FIF Letter at 14, 135–37; STA Letter at 2 (supporting the FIF and SIFMA Letters' Advisory Committee recommendations).

[728] SIFMA Letter at 27; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[729] SIFMA Letter 27–29; ICI Letter at 10–13; TR Letter at 6–7; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations). These recommendations are similar to the recommendations of the EMSAC.

[730] SIFMA Letter at 28; ICI Letter at 13; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[731] ICI Letter at 13.

[732] SIFMA Letter at 28; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations and noting its concern with the frequency and timeliness of information provided to the Advisory Committee).

[733] SIFMA Letter at 28; ICI Letter at 10–13; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[734] SIFMA Letter at 28; *see also* Fidelity Letter at 7 (noting the ''Operating Committee determines the scope and content of information supplied to the Advisory Committee''); STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[735] SIFMA Letter at 27, 28; DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1–2 (supporting the SIFMA and DAG Letters' Advisory Committee recommendations).

[736] SIFMA Letter at 27; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[737] TR Letter at 7; FIF Letter at 136; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the FIF Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[738] TR Letter at 7.

[739] The CAT NMS Plan defines a ''Material Amendment'' to the Technical Specifications as an amendment that requires ''a Participant or an Industry Member to engage in significant changes to the coding necessary to submit information to the Central Repository pursuant to the LLC Agreement or if it is required to safeguard the security or confidentiality of the CAT Data.'' *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.9(c).

[740] FIF Letter at 136; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the FIF Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations). The commenter references ''external'' material amendments as any change that affects the CAT Reporter Interface, such as coding or configuration changes. ''Internal'' material amendments are changes that do not affect the CAT Reporter interface (*i.e.,* does not require coding or configuration changes).

[741] FIF Letter at 136; *see also* STA Letter at 2 (supporting the FIF Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[742] Fidelity Letter at 7.

[743] *Id.* This commenter noted that the EMSAC provided these recommendations; *see also* SIFMA Letter at 28; STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

[744] SIFMA Letter at 28; *see also* Fidelity Letter at 7 (noting there are ''no limitations on when the Operating Committee can call an Executive Session'' and that the Operating Committee can, for any reason, ''prohibit the Advisory Committee from attending any Executive Session of the Operating Committee by a majority vote''); STA Letter at 2 (supporting the SIFMA Letter's Advisory Committee recommendations).

613.'' [745] This commenter stressed that while the SROs have a legal obligation under Commission rules to create, implement and maintain a consolidated audit trail and central repository, non-SROs do not have this legal obligation. Accordingly, this commenter stated its belief that Advisory Committee members should not have a voting right with respect to Operating Committee actions.[746] Finally, this commenter argued that having non-SRO Advisory Committee members vote in connection with the CAT NMS Plan would be incompatible with the requirements of the Exchange Act and Commission rules that squarely place the obligations to implement and enforce ''the CAT NMS Plan on the shoulders of the SROs.'' [747] In this regard, the commenter highlighted the Rule 613(f) requirement that SROs ''develop and implement a surveillance system, or enhance existing surveillance systems, reasonably designed to make use of the consolidated information contained in the consolidated audit trail.'' [748]

Regarding the size and composition of the Advisory Committee, the Participants recommended amending the Plan to include a service bureau representative, because service bureaus ''perform audit trail reporting on behalf of their customers . . . [and] would provide a valuable perspective on how the CAT and any enhancements thereto would affect the service bureau clients, which often include a number of small and medium-sized firms.'' [749] The Participants also recommended augmenting the institutional investor representation on the Advisory Committee by including institutional investor representation by an adviser from registered funds, and increasing from two to three institutional investor representatives with at least one of the institutional investor representatives trading on behalf of an investment company or group of investment companies registered pursuant to the Investment Company Act of 1940.[750] The Participants also suggested removing references in the Advisory Committee eligibility requirements for those institutional investors ''on behalf of a public entity . . . and on behalf of a private entity,'' which is in response to a comment noting the vagueness of the terms ''public'' and ''private'' with respect to institutional investors.[751]

The Participants, however, disagreed with commenters that the academic representative of the Advisory Committee should be limited to a financial economist because a general requirement that ''a member of academia with expertise in the securities industry or any other industry relevant to the operation of the CAT System,'' does not preclude a financial economist serving on the Advisory Committee so long as they have the relevant expertise.[752] The Participants also disagreed with commenters that members of industry trade groups should also serve on the Advisory Committee, noting that the CAT NMS Plan includes a variety of representatives from the members of such trade groups and would provide ''a meaningful opportunity for the representation of the views of industry trade groups.'' [753] Furthermore, the Participants disagreed with commenters who advocated increasing the number of broker-dealer representatives on the Advisory Committee from seven to twelve, and increasing the size of the Advisory Committee from twelve to twenty members. The Participants noted that, in ''balancing the goal of having a sufficient cross section of representation with the goal of having a well-run committee,'' seven broker-dealers of varying sizes and business types would provide ''significant opportunity to provide [broker-dealers'] views'' and increasing an Advisory Committee from twelve to twenty creates a committee structure that would ''likely hamper, rather than facilitate,'' discussion.[754]

In response to commenters recommending a more active and participatory role in operation of the CAT for non-SRO stakeholders, the Participants stated that the Plan strikes an appropriate balance between providing the ''industry with an active role in governance while recognizing the Participants' regulatory obligations with regard to the CAT.'' [755] In response to a commenter recommending that Advisory Committee members be selected by broker-dealer representatives, the Participants stated their belief that the Operating Committee should select the members, but agreed with commenters that the Advisory Committee should be permitted to advise the Operating Committee regarding potential Advisory Committee members.[756] The Participants suggested that the CAT NMS Plan be amended to permit the Advisory Committee to advise the Operating Committee on Advisory Committee member selection, provided however, that the Operating Committee in its sole discretion would select members of the Advisory Committee.[757]

In response to comments recommending formalized modes of written communication between the Operating Committee and the Advisory Committee, the Participants recommended that the CAT NMS Plan remain unchanged.[758] In support, the Participants stated their belief that the proposed structure adequately addresses the commenters' concerns, while recognizing the need for the Participants to have the opportunity to discuss certain matters, particularly certain regulatory and security issues, without the participation of the industry.[759] The Participants also noted that the Advisory Committee is permitted to attend all of the non-Executive Session Operating Committee meetings, where information concerning the operation of the CAT is received (subject to the Operating Committee's authority to determine the scope and content of information supplied to the Advisory Committee).[760] Further, the Participants stated that minutes, subject to customary exceptions for confidentiality and privilege considerations, will be provided to the Advisory Committee. Finally, the Participants did not support instituting formalized modes of written communication between the Operating Committee and the Advisory Committee because such ''an overly formulaic approach to [Operating Committee] interactions'' would ''hamper, rather than enhance, [Operating Committee] interactions with the Advisory Committee.'' [761]

With respect to comments recommending narrowing the use of Operating Committee Executive Sessions, the Participants stated their belief that the Operating Committee's capabilities to meet in Executive Session are appropriate and cited the Commission's statement in the Adopting Release that: ''meet[ing] in [E]xecutive [S]ession without members of the Advisory Committee appropriately balances the need to provide a mechanism for industry input into the operation of the central repository, against the regulatory imperative that the operations and decisions regarding the consolidated

[745] NYSE Letter at 4.

[746] *Id.*

[747] *Id.* at 6.

[748] *Id.*

[749] Response Letter I at 9.

[750] *Id.* at 10.

[751] *Id.*

[752] *Id.*

[753] *Id.*

[754] *Id.* at 10–12.

[755] *Id.* at 13–14.

[756] *Id.*

[757] *Id.*

[758] *Id.* at 15–16.

[759] *Id.* at 16.

[760] *Id.*

[761] *Id.*

audit trail be made by SROs who have a statutory obligation to regulate the securities markets, rather than by members of the SROs, who have no corresponding statutory obligation to oversee the securities markets.'' [762] The Participants represented that their intended use of an Executive Session is for limited purposes requiring confidentiality and offered four examples: Matters that present an actual or potential conflict of interest for Advisory Committee members (*e.g.,* relating to member's regulatory compliance); discussion of actual or potential litigation; CAT security issues; and personnel issues. The Participants also noted that Executive Sessions must be called by a Majority Vote and that the meeting minutes are recorded, subject to confidentiality and attorney-client privilege considerations.[763]

Finally, in response to comments that the Advisory Committee should form before the approval of the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants noted that the Plan itself provides for the establishment of the Operating Committee and the Advisory Committee and thus cannot be formed until the Commission approves the Plan. The Participants also noted that the DAG provides the Participants with ''advice regarding the development of the Plan from an industry perspective.'' [764]

For reasons discussed below, the Commission finds reasonable the Participants' suggested modifications to add a service bureau representative, increase the number of institutional investor representatives on the Advisory Committee, remove terms that create vagueness for the institutional investor representative categories, and make the applicable conforming changes to Section 4.13 of the Plan. Accordingly, after considering the comments, the Commission is amending Section 4.13 of the Plan to include a service bureau representative, increase the number of institutional investor representatives from two (2) to three (3), and remove the terms that a commenter identified as creating vagueness with respect to the institutional investor category.

The Commission understands that service bureaus frequently serve a core role in reporting CAT Data on behalf of broker-dealers, and as such, the Commission finds appropriate their inclusion as an Advisory Committee member. Further, the Commission finds the increase from two to three members on the Advisory Committee representing institutional investors, as well as removing the references to ''on behalf of a public entity'' and ''on behalf of a private entity'' due to the vagueness of such terms with respect to institutional investor Advisory Committee members, to be reasonable responses to commenters seeking additional representation and clarity. The Commission also agrees with the Participants that it is reasonable to not mandate inclusion of representatives on the Advisory Committee from industry and trade associations, given the existing substantial industry representation on the Advisory Committee, which is reasonably designed to ensure a wide range of meaningful industry perspectives.

The Commission agrees with commenters who argued that the academic representative on the Advisory Committee should be a financial economist. The Commission acknowledges the Participants' response that a financial economist is not precluded from serving as the academic representative of the Advisory Committee, but the Commission believes that specifying that the academic representative must be a financial economist is appropriate to ensure the Advisory Committee and the Operating Committee have access to such expertise in assessing the CAT's operations and development. Accordingly, the Commission is amending Section 4.13(b)(ix) of the Plan to specify that the academic representative on the Advisory Committee must be a financial economist.

The Commission agrees with the Participants' suggestion, in response to commenters, to permit the Advisory Committee to recommend Advisory Committee candidates to the Operating Committee. Accordingly, the Commission is amending Section 4.13(d) of the Plan to permit the Advisory Committee to recommend Advisory Committee candidates to the Operating Committee, but notes that the Operating Committee still maintains the sole discretion to select members of the Advisory Committee.

The Commission believes the amendment is reasonably designed to ensure a robust selection process for Advisory Committee membership that identifies candidates that best represent the industry perspective. With respect to the comment suggesting that the Advisory Committee be established before the approval of the CAT NMS Plan, the Commission notes it would be premature and technically not possible to establish an advisory committee to an NMS plan before such plan has been approved by the Commission. Moreover, the Commission notes that the interests of the industry and other stakeholders have been represented through the DAG, the public comment process, and through the SROs themselves as the CAT NMS Plan has been developed.

The Commission is amending the Executive Sessions provision in Section 4.4(a) of the Plan, as well as the Advisory Committee provision in Section 4.13(b) of the Plan related to the Commission's Chief Technology Officer (or equivalent) being an observer of the Advisory Committee. As the Commission is responsible for regulatory oversight of the Participants and the CAT NMS Plan, the Commission believes that it is appropriate for the Plan to expressly provide that Commission Staff may attend all CAT NMS Plan meetings, including those held in Executive Session. Similarly, because the Commission has broad regulatory responsibility for the Plan, the Commission does not believe it is appropriate to limit to the Commission's Chief Technology Officer (or equivalent) the right to serve as an observer at Advisory Committee meetings. Accordingly, the Commission is amending Sections 4.4(a) and 4.13(b) to provide that Commission Staff may attend Executive Sessions, and to permit the Commission to select the Commission representative to observe Advisory Committee meetings. The Commission anticipates that only a few members of Commission Staff would observe any given meeting.

The Commission also is amending Section 4.13(e) of the Plan in response to comments to provide that the Advisory Committee shall receive the same documents and information concerning the operation of the Central Repository as the Operating Committee. The Operating Committee may, however, withhold such information to the extent it reasonably determines such information requires confidential treatment. Although the Plan as filed permits Advisory Committee members to attend all of the non-Executive Session Operating Committee meetings, with respect to information concerning the operation of the CAT, it allows the Operating Committee broad discretion to determine the scope and content of information supplied to the Advisory Committee. The Commission believes it is important for the Advisory Committee to fulfill its role that its members receive full information on Plan operations (other than confidential information) and that it is therefore appropriate to amend Section 4.13(e) of the Plan accordingly.

[762] *Id.* at 15.

[763] *Id.*

[764] *Id.* at 16.

With respect to the other comments regarding authority, composition and role of the Advisory Committee, as well as the use of the Operating Committee Executive Sessions, the Commission notes that the Plan provisions relating to the Advisory Committee and the Operating Committee Executive Sessions are similar to those in other NMS plans and are, therefore, reasonable.[765]

3. Officers of the Company

The CAT NMS Plan requires the Company to appoint a CISO and a CCO, who shall be employees solely of the Plan Processor.[766] The Plan acknowledges that the CISO and CCO may have fiduciary and other similar duties to the Plan Processor pursuant to their employment with the Plan Processor, and the Plan, as proposed, sets forth that to the extent permitted by law, the CISO and CCO will have no fiduciary or similar duties to the Company.[767]

One commenter expressed concern that appointing a CISO and CCO who would both be officers of the Company and employees of the Plan Processor ''creates a potential conflict of interest that would undermine the ability of these officers to effectively carry out their responsibilities under the CAT NMS Plan because they would owe a fiduciary duty to the Plan Processor rather than to the [Company].'' [768] This commenter recommended that the officers of the Company should be required to act in the best interest of the [Company] to avoid conflicts of interest in carrying out their oversight activities.[769] In addition, this commenter suggested that the CAT NMS Plan impose a fiduciary duty on the CISO and CCO, or at a minimum require the Plan Processor to select individuals who do not have a fiduciary duty to the Plan Processor to serve in these roles.[770]

In response to these comments, the Participants suggested that the CAT NMS Plan be changed so that all Officers of the Company, including the CISO and CCO, have fiduciary duties to the Company in the same manner and extent as an officer of a Delaware corporation.[771] The Participants also represented that the Operating Committee, in an agreement with the Plan Processor, will have the Plan Processor acknowledge that the Officers of the Company will owe fiduciary duties to the Company, and to the extent that the duties owed to the Company by the Officers of the Company, including the CISO or CCO, conflict with any duties owed to the Plan Processor, the duties to the Company should control.[772]

The Commission believes that the suggested modifications by the Participants in response to comments about potential conflicts of interest are reasonable. Accordingly, the Commission is amending Section 4.7(c) of the Plan so that each Officer shall have the same fiduciary duties and obligations to the Company as a comparable officer of a Delaware corporation and in all cases shall conduct the business of the Company and execute his or her duties and obligations in good faith and in the manner that the Officer reasonably believes to be in the best interests of the Company. Furthermore, the Commission is amending Section 4.6(a) of the Plan to codify the Participants' representation that that the Operating Committee, in an agreement with the Plan Processor, will have the Plan Processor acknowledge that the Officers of the Company will owe fiduciary duties to the Company, and to the extent that the duties owed to the Company by the Officers of the Company, including the CISO or CCO, conflict with any duties owed to the Plan Processor, the duties to the Company should control.

The Commission believes that amending the CAT NMS Plan to expressly affirm the Officers' fiduciary duties or similar duties or obligations to the Company provides clarity and assurances that the Officers will act in the best interests of the Company.[773] The Commission also believes it is reasonable, as the Participants have suggested in their response to comments, to have the Company and the Plan Processor enter into an agreement that specifies not only that Officers have fiduciary duties and obligations to the Company, but that if such Officers may have competing duties and obligations owed to the Company and to the Plan Processor, the duties and obligations to the Company should control. At this time, it is unclear what competing duties and obligations Officers may owe to the Company and the Plan Processor. While in many cases, the Officers' duties towards the Plan Processor and the Company are likely to be aligned, there may be circumstances (*e.g.,* related to the performance of the Plan Processor) where such duties may conflict and the Commission finds reasonable that in such circumstances, the duties to the Company should control in order to mitigate any conflict between the interests of the Plan Processor and those of the Company in administering the CAT. The Commission further notes that the CAT NMS Plan provides reasonable oversight of the Officers by the Operating Committee, for example, the Plan requires: (i) The Operating Committee to approve the CISO and CCO with a Supermajority Vote [774]; (ii) the CISO and CCO to devote, with minor exceptions, their entire working time to serving as the CISO and CCO [775]; (iii) the Operating Committee to oversee that the Plan Processor allocates appropriate resources for the CISO and CCO to fulfill their obligations [776]; (iv) the CISO and CCO to report directly to the Operating Committee with respect to their duties [777]; (v) the compensation of the CISO and CCO to be subject to the Operating Committee's review and approval [778]; and (vi) an annual performance review of the CISO and CCO to be conducted by the Operating Committee.[779]

4. Additional Governance Provisions

Commenters raised additional governance concerns related to conflicts of interest for the Participants, whether there should be an audit committee, and whether the Participants should be required to coordinate the administration of the CAT from a legal, administrative, supervisory and enforcement perspective.[780]

Some commenters expressed concern that the Participants would have a conflict of interest because of the various roles they perform with respect

[765] As previously stated, the Commission believes it is reasonable for the CAT NMS Plan to include a governance structure similar to that utilized by other NMS plans that the Commission previously has found to be consistent with the Act. As with the comments regarding the Operating Committee, some of the suggestions made by commenters regarding the Advisory Committee are mirrored in the EMSAC recommendations. As already discussed, the Commission is separately reviewing these EMSAC recommendations. *See supra* note 693.

[766] *See* Section III.3, *supra; see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 4.6(a).

[767] *See* Section III.3, *supra; see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 4.6(a), 4.7(c).

[768] FSI Letter at 3.

[769] *Id.*

[770] *Id.*

[771] Response Letter I at 18–19.

[772] *Id.* at 18.

[773] While the SROs expressly waive fiduciary obligations to the Company, the SROs are subject to statutory obligations to regulate the securities markets and to create, implement and maintain the CAT.

[774] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.2(a)(i), (b)(i).

[775] *See id.* at Section 6.2(a)(i), (b)(i).

[776] *See id.* at Section 6.2(a)(ii), (b)(ii).

[777] *See id.* at Section 6.2(a)(iii), (b)(iii).

[778] *See id.* at Section 6.2(a)(iv), (b)(iv).

[779] *See id.* at Section 6.2(a)(iv), (b)(iv).

[780] *See* SIFMA Letter at 27, 29; ICI Letter at 12; Better Markets Letter at 5–6; DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations).

to the CAT. One commenter stated that the Participants are ''sponsors and overseers of the Plan, while at the same time, the Plan will impose obligations on [them].'' [781] Another commenter raised concerns that the Participants would ''control the [O]perating [C]ommittee for the [P]lan, use CAT [D]ata for regulatory purposes, and potentially commercialize the information that they report to the CAT.'' [782] This commenter suggested that these roles may ''present conflicting incentives'' for Participants.[783]

One commenter argued that the Participants should not oversee and control the CAT and recommended instead that the Commission should build and host the CAT, which would then be under the Commission's direct and sole control.[784] In support of this view, the commenter stated the Commission's statutory mission to protect investors would make it better positioned to operate the CAT, as compared to for-profit SROs, who would seek to maximize profits from the CAT Data.[785] The commenter suggested that the Commission could outsource the building of the CAT and fund the CAT similar to how it funds its EDGAR system.[786] The commenter stated that CAT NMS, LLC should reorganize as a not-for-profit entity and set forth an organizational purpose aligned with the Commission's mission statement.[787] Finally, the commenter argued that the Commission solely should control access to and usage of the CAT System.[788]

Two commenters recommended that the Company governance structure include an audit committee.[789] One commenter noted that the audit committee should be comprised of mostly independent directors.[790] Another commenter stated the audit committee should be responsible for the oversight of how the CAT's revenue sources are used for regulatory purposes, and that the costs and financing of the CAT must be fully transparent and publicly disclosed in annual reports, including audited financial statements.[791]

Finally, one commenter suggested that the SROs should coordinate the administration of the CAT through a single centralized body from a legal, administrative, supervisory and enforcement perspective.[792] The commenter recommended amending the Plan to require this coordination, and suggested that such coordination could be facilitated through agreements under SEC Rule 17d–2, regulatory service agreements or some combination thereof.[793] In support of this view, the commenter noted that different CAT-related compliance requirements among the SROs might arise and subject firms to duplicative regulation and enforcement, with the accompanying inefficiencies, additional costs, and potential inconsistencies.[794]

In response to commenters suggesting the formation of an audit committee, the Participants stated that they would have the ability to review CAT-related issues objectively because ''members of the Operating Committee are not employed by the [Company] and are fulfilling mandated regulatory oversight responsibilities, and that the [Company] will not operate as a profit-making company, which may need more scrutiny as compared to a company that is operating on a break-even basis.'' [795] Further, the Participants noted that the CAT NMS Plan requires that a Compliance Subcommittee be established—and noted that the Operating Committee in the future could decide if an audit committee should be formed as a subcommittee.[796]

In response to commenters regarding the coordinated compliance and enforcement oversight of the CAT, the Participants acknowledged the benefits of having a single Participant be responsible for enforcing compliance with Rule 613 and the CAT NMS Plan through Rule 17d–2 agreements, regulatory services agreements or some other approach and represented that they would consider such an arrangement after the CAT NMS Plan's approval.[797] As discussed in Section IV.H, the Commission is amending Section 6.6 of the Plan to require that the Participants provide the Commission within 12 months of effectiveness of the Plan, a report detailing the Participants' consideration of coordinated surveillance (*e.g.,* entering into 17d–2 agreements or regulatory services agreements).[798]

The Commission acknowledges the commenters' concern about the conflicts inherent in having SROs performing various roles as overseers of the Plan and at the same time enforcing compliance with Rule 613. The Commission, however, highlights that the Participants are performing roles specified pursuant to obligations under the Exchange Act and the rules thereunder and remain under the direct oversight of the Commission. With respect to comments expressing concerns that the Participants may be in a position to commercialize the respective Raw Data reported by each SRO submitting to the CAT, order and execution information is already collected by SROs from its members and they are permitted under current law to commercialize this data (*e.g.,* direct market feeds, provided that the terms are fair and reasonable and not unreasonably discriminatory [799]) subject to appropriate rule filings and oversight by the Commission.[800] Thus, the Plan does not expand the Participants' ability to commercialize their Raw Data beyond what is currently permitted.

With respect to comments that suggested that the Participants should not oversee and control the CAT, but that instead it should be under the Commission's direct and sole control, the Commission notes that in the Adopting Release, the Commission mandated that the Participants develop an NMS plan for the development and operation of the CAT. As such, the CAT NMS Plan, as noticed, whereby the Participants directly manage the CAT, was in furtherance of Rule 613 as adopted. Additionally, because the Participants, as SROs, currently serve as front-line regulators of many aspects of the securities markets, including

[781] SIFMA Letter at 27.

[782] ICI Letter at 12.

[783] *Id.*

[784] Better Markets Letter at 5.

[785] *Id.* at 5–6.

[786] *Id.* at 6.

[787] *Id.* The commenter recommended that the board of directors of such entity contain a super-majority of independent directors to oversee the not-for-profit CAT NMS, LLC, and that the chair of the board of directors should be non-industry and appointed by the Commission. Further, the commenter recommended that the Director of the Division of Trading and Markets permanently serve as the vice-chair of the board of directors. Better Markets Letter at 6; *see also* DAG Letter at 3 (arguing that the CAT corporate governance structure should have independent directors comprised of both non-industry and industry participants); STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations).

[788] Better Markets Letter at 6.

[789] SIFMA Letter at 29; DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations).

[790] DAG Letter at 3; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's governance recommendations). The Commission notes that the commenter specified in its comment that their definition of independent director includes industry participants (*i.e.,* broker-dealers). *See* DAG Letter at 3.

[791] SIFMA Letter at 29.

[792] *Id.*

[793] *Id.*

[794] *Id.*

[795] Response Letter I at 8.

[796] *Id.* at 9.

[797] *Id.* at 17.

[798] *See* Section IV.H., *supra.*

[799] 17 CFR 242.603.

[800] *See, e.g.,* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 73918 (December 23, 2014), 79 FR 78920 (December 31, 2014) (BATS One Feed); 74128 (January 23, 2015), 80 FR 4951 (January 29, 2015) (NYSE Integrated Feed).

administering the existing sources of regulatory data, the Commission believes they are well positioned to oversee the CAT. Moreover, the Commission believes that any potential conflicts arising from the status of certain Participants as for profit enterprises are reasonably addressed through the Plan provisions and Commission oversight.

The Commission concurs with the Participants that it is reasonable for the Company not to have an audit committee at this time. Further, the Participants are permitted to form an audit committee, as a subcommittee of the Operating Committee. The Commission notes that the absence of a requirement for an audit committee is consistent with other NMS plans.

Section 9.2(a) of the Plan states that the Operating Committee shall maintain a system of accounting for the Company established and administered in accordance with GAAP (or another standard if determined appropriate by the Operating Committee). Section 9.2(a) also requires, among other things, that the Company prepare and provide to each Participant an audited balance sheet, income statement and statement of cash flow, to the extent the Operating Committee deems advisable. In addition, Section 9.2(c) of the Plan states that all matters concerning accounting procedures shall be determined by the Operating Committee. The Participants recommended that the Commission amend Section 9.2(a) to eliminate the flexibility for the Company to administer a system of accounting in accordance with non-GAAP standards, thus requiring that all financial statements or information that may be supplied to the Participants shall be prepared in accordance with GAAP.[801] In addition, the Participants recommended amending the Plan to eliminate the discretion of the Operating Committee to provide financials only if it deems advisable and instead to require that the Company's audited annual balance sheet, income statement, and statement of cash flows be audited by an independent public accounting firm and made publicly available.[802] The Commission believes that the changes recommended by the Participants are reasonable because they will promote greater accuracy and transparency with respect to the Company's financial accounting and is therefore amending the Plan accordingly.

Section 6.1(o)(vi) of the Plan states that financial statements of the Plan Processor, prepared in accordance with GAAP and audited by an independent public accounting firm or certified by the Plan Processor's Chief Financial Officer, shall be provided to the Operating Committee no later than 90 days after the Plan Processor's fiscal year end. The Participants recommended that the Commission amend the Plan to change this timeframe to 180 days after the Plan Processor's fiscal year end to provide further flexibility to the Plan Processor with respect to the preparation of its financial statements.[803] The Commission believes that it is reasonable to provide this additional flexibility and is therefore amending the Plan accordingly.

The Commission also agrees with the commenters and Participants that a coordinated approach to self-regulatory oversight may have benefits, such as regulatory efficiencies and consistency, but believes that it is reasonable for such an arrangement to be considered by the Participants after the CAT NMS Plan's approval rather than mandating a specific approach for SRO coordination under the Plan at this time—as the Plan Processor has not been selected nor has the CAT System been developed. The Commission nevertheless notes that, as described above, it is amending the CAT NMS Plan to require a written assessment by the Participants within 12 months of effectiveness of the Plan, considering coordinated surveillance (*e.g.,* entering into Rule 17d–2 agreements, regulatory services agreements or other arrangements, to facilitate regulatory coordination).[804]

Finally, the Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan provides that books and records of the CAT LLC shall be made available to the Commission upon ''reasonable request.'' [805] Because the CAT LLC is a facility of the Participants, the Commission has the right to the books and records of CAT LLC ''upon request'' under Exchange Act Rule 17a–1,[806] and therefore is amending Section 9.1 of the Plan to delete the requirement that any request for the CAT LLC's books and records be ''reasonable.''

C. Plan Processor Selection (Article V)

Article V of the CAT NMS Plan sets forth the process for selecting the Plan Processor following approval of the CAT NMS Plan.[807] The Plan Processor selection provisions in Article V are identical to the selection process set forth in the Selection Plan.[808]

The Commission received three comments suggesting that the Plan Processor selection process be accelerated,[809] with some commenters suggesting that the Selection Plan be amended to require the selection of the Plan Processor prior to the approval of the CAT NMS Plan.[810] According to one commenter, the earlier selection of a Plan Processor would advance the release and development of the Technical Specifications.[811] Another commenter offered support for a specific Bidder, noting their regulatory and technical competencies.[812] One commenter recommended that the Commission re-open the Plan Processor's agreement with CAT NMS, LLC every five years to ensure that the Plan remains state-of-the-art, and to provide a process for public input.[813] Another commenter stated that the Plan does not set forth sufficient incentives for the Plan Processor and the Participants to incorporate new technology into or to continuously innovate and strive to reduce the costs of the CAT System.[814]

In response to the comments to accelerate the Plan Processor selection process, the Participants acknowledged that the selection of the Plan Processor will likely affect implementation issues and related costs,[815] but that it is not feasible to accelerate the selection of the Plan Processor prior to the Commission's approval of the Plan. The Participants noted that until the Plan is finalized and approved by the Commission, the requirements of the CAT could change, which could impact the selection of the Plan Processor.[816] Moreover, the Participants noted that Rule 613's requirement that the Plan Processor be selected within two months after effectiveness of the Plan ensures that the selection of the Plan

[801] Participants' Letter II at 2.

[802] Participants' Letter II at 2.

[803] Participants' Letter II at 1.

[804] *See* Section IV.H, *infra.*

[805] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 9.1.

[806] 17 CFR 240.17a–1(c).

[807] *See* Section III.4, *supra,* for a more detailed description of the Selection Plan.

[808] *See* Selection Plan, *supra* note 23.

[809] FSR Letter at 10; TR Letter at 4–5; FIF Letter at 42–43.

[810] TR Letter at 4–5; FIF Letter at 42–43.

[811] TR Letter at 4–5; *see also* Section V.G.4, *infra,* for a further discussion of these comment letters.

[812] Anonymous Letter I at 1 (advocating for FINRA's regulatory abilities related to OATS); *but see* Anonymous Letter II (criticizing FINRA's handling of OATS non-compliance).

[813] Better Markets Letter at 7.

[814] Data Boiler Letter at 17, 27.

[815] Response Letter I at 51.

[816] The Participants note in Response Letter I that the Selection Plan contemplates the selection of the Plan Processor after the approval of the Plan. *Id.* at 52.

Processor will occur expeditiously once the Commission approves the Plan.[817]

In response to the comment in support for a specific Bidder, the Participants stated that they determined that utilizing a competitive bidding process to select the Plan Processor was the most appropriate way to promote an innovative and efficient CAT solution.[818] Pursuant to that process, the Participants noted that they have reduced the number of Bidders to three Shortlisted Bidders.

In response to the comment to re-open the Plan Processor's agreement with the CAT LLC every five years and to provide a process for public input on the agreement, the Participants stated that they agree that it is important to ensure that the CAT solution remains effective and efficient going forward.[819] Accordingly, the Participants noted that they have proposed a process for regularly reviewing the performance of the Plan Processor throughout the term of the Plan Processor's agreement and for modifying it if necessary to avoid an outdated CAT solution. The Participants added that, as set forth in the Plan, the Operating Committee will review the Plan Processor's performance under the Plan at least once each year, or more often than once each year upon the request of two or more Participants that are not Affiliated Participants.[820] In addition, the Participants noted that the Plan sets forth the process for removing the Plan Processor. Specifically, the Participants noted that the Operating Committee, by Supermajority Vote, may remove the Plan Processor from such position at any time, and that the Operating Committee may, by Majority Vote, remove the Plan Processor from such position at any time if it determines that the Plan Processor has failed to perform its functions in a reasonably acceptable manner in accordance with the provisions of the Plan. The Participants stated that if they were to vote to remove the Plan Processor, the Operating Committee would select a new Plan Processor through a competitive bidding process.

In approving the Selection Plan, the Commission stated that the Selection Plan is reasonably designed to achieve its objective of facilitating the development of the CAT NMS Plan and the selection of the Plan Processor.[821] The Commission also found that the Selection Plan is reasonably designed to govern the process by which the SROs will formulate and submit the CAT NMS Plan, including the review, evaluation, and narrowing down of Bids in response to the RFP, and ultimately choosing the Plan Processor that will build, operate, and maintain the consolidated audit trail.[822] The Commission believes that the process set out in the Selection Plan for selecting a Plan Processor remains a reasonable approach, which will facilitate the selection of Plan Processor through a fair, transparent and competitive process and that no modifications to the Selection Plan are required to meet the approval standard. In response to the commenters recommending that the Plan Processor selection process be accelerated, the Commission agrees with the Participants that changes to the CAT NMS Plan that are being made in this Order may be relevant to the selection of the Plan Processor. The Commission believes that selecting the Plan Processor within two months of Plan approval, rather than prior to Plan approval, will allow the remaining Bidders to consider the CAT NMS Plan, as amended and approved by the Commission, and to make any necessary modifications to their Bids, which will enable the Participants to make a more fully informed decision on the Plan Processor in light of the amended and approved CAT NMS Plan.[823] The Commission believes this timeframe to select the Plan Processor—two months following Commission approval of the Plan—will not result in the untimely release of the Technical Specifications.

In response to the comment that offered support for a specific Bidder, the Commission agrees with the Participants that the competitive bidding process to select the Plan Processor is a reasonable and effective way to choose a Plan Processor and thus believes that the process set forth in the Selection Plan should be permitted to continue. In response to the commenter that recommended that the Commission re-open the Plan Processor's agreement with the CAT LLC every five years and provide a process for public input on the agreement, the Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan already contains provisions that permit the reevaluation—and possible replacement—of the Plan Processor. Thus, the Commission is not amending the plan to require that the Plan Processor's agreement with the CAT LLC be reevaluated every five years.

Finally, in response to the commenter that stated that the Plan does not provide sufficient incentives for the Plan Processor and the Participants to incorporate new technology, innovate and reduce the costs of the CAT System, the Commission believes that requirements for regular evaluations of the operation of the CAT, the identification of potential improvements, and the delivery of a written assessment to the Commission, as well as the Plan's provisions regarding the possible removal of the Plan Processor provide sufficient incentives for the Plan Processor and the Participants in these areas.[824]

D. Functions and Activities of the CAT System (Article VI)

Article VI of the CAT NMS Plan sets forth the functions and activities of the CAT System.[825]

1. Data Recording and Reporting Requirements

Article VI of the Plan imposes requirements regarding what data elements must be reported to the Central Repository and by when. The Commission received comments regarding to whom these requirements should apply and the appropriateness of the provisions.

One commenter recommended that firms using manual orders that are currently exempt from OATS reporting pursuant to FINRA Rule 7470 should also be exempt from the CAT reporting obligations.[826] This commenter argued that to qualify for such an exemption, a firm would need to ''eliminate many practices of regulatory concern'' and have a ''perfect regulatory history,'' and that the exemption would have little impact on the CAT because it would exclude only the reporting of events that take place prior to delivery of an order to a market venue. The commenter argued that the exemption is necessary to keep currently-exempt firms in business due to the high costs that CAT reporting would impose.[827] This commenter further argued that the requested exemption for OATS-exempt firms would not be the same as an exemption for ''small firms,'' and that wrongdoers would not fall within this exemption because of the limitations on the level of market activity, the

[817] 17 CFR 242.613(a)(3)(i).

[818] Response Letter I at 52.

[819] *Id.*

[820] *See supra* note 67 for a definition of ''Affiliated Participants.''

[821] *See* Selection Plan Approval Order, *supra* note 23.

[822] *See id.*

[823] In addition, the Commission notes that, pursuant to an amendment to the Selection Plan, the Participants have already narrowed the Bidders to three Shortlisted Bidders, which will facilitate the timely completion of the Plan Processor selection process. *See* Selection Plan, *supra* note 23.

[824] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 4.3(b)(ii) (providing that the Operating Committee may terminate the Plan Processor without cause).

[825] *See* Section IV.B., *supra.*

[826] Wachtel Letter at 1–2.

[827] *Id.*

voluntary restrictions from operations such as market making and trading with customers, the use of manual orders, and the expected high levels of compliance.[828]

Another commenter broadly stated that the data recording and reporting procedures described in the CAT NMS Plan are inappropriate and unreasonable.[829] This commenter also stated that it may be easier for the Plan Processor to work directly with service bureaus, rather than with individual CAT Reporters, on data submission.[830]

In response to the commenter's request that OATS-exempt firms also be exempted from reporting to the CAT, the Commission believes that completely exempting any group of broker-dealers from reporting requirements would be contradictory to the goal of Rule 613, which is to create an accurate, complete, accessible and timely audit trail.[831] To permit such an exemption would eliminate the collection of audit trail information from a segment of broker-dealers and would thus result in an audit trail that does not capture all orders by all participants in the securities markets. The Commission believes that the CAT should contain data from all broker-dealers, including those that may appear to be at low risk for wrong-doing based on their history of compliance or business model. Regulators will not only use the CAT for surveillance and investigations, but also for market reconstructions and market analyses. Therefore, data from all broker-dealers is necessary.[832]

The Commission believes that the data recording and reporting procedures outlined in the CAT NMS Plan meet the requirements of Rule 613 [833] and are reasonable in that they are designed to ensure that data is recorded and reported in a manner that will provide regulators access to linked CAT Data that is timely, accurate, secure, and complete.[834] Further, while under certain circumstances it might be efficient for the Plan Processor to work directly with service bureaus, the reporting requirements in the CAT NMS Plan apply to CAT Reporters, which are regulated entities, and therefore, it is necessary that the Plan Processor deal directly with CAT Reporters in determining matters related to reporting CAT Data.[835]

2. Format

The CAT NMS Plan does not mandate the format in which data must be reported to the Central Repository.[836] Rather, the Plan provides that the Plan Processor will determine the electronic format in which data must be reported, and that the format will be described in the Technical Specifications.[837]

Two commenters expressed support for allowing the Plan Processor to determine the format for reporting data.[838] One of these commenters stated that prescribing an approach in the Plan may hinder scalability and future system development.[839]

Three commenters, however, recommended that the format be specified in the Plan.[840] One commenter argued that mandating an approach in the Plan, rather than waiting for the Technical Specifications, would give the industry more time to develop approaches to reporting using that format.[841] The commenter also argued that if the format is not known until the Technical Specifications are published, this would limit the opportunity to make changes to the format, if necessary, without disrupting the implementation schedule.[842] The commenter suggested that at least guidelines for a messaging protocol be included in the Plan.[843]

Commenters also expressed opinions about whether the Plan Processor should allow CAT Reporters to use multiple formats or one uniform format to report CAT Data. Four commenters generally supported an approach that would allow CAT Reporters to report CAT Data using a non-uniform format.[844] Under such an approach, the Central Repository would be responsible for normalizing the data into a uniform format to link and store the data. These commenters noted that CAT Reporters should be permitted to use any of the currently existing industry protocols widely used by industry participants, such as OATS, SWIFT or FIX.[845] One commenter advocated for the use of its own electronic communications protocol, FIX, stating that it would result in quicker implementation times and simplify data aggregation.[846] This commenter noted that FIX is currently used by thousands of firms in the financial services industry and that it would not make sense to require firms to convert from a FIX format to a proprietary format designed by the Plan Processor and mandated for CAT reporting.[847] The commenter stated that FIX already tracks the lifecycle of an order both within an organization and across organizations, thus making it a good choice as the format for the CAT.[848] It also noted that it is used globally and can be used for products beyond listed options and equities. Finally, the commenter represented that FIX can handle any identifier, including LEI, and can support the CAT NMS Plan's use of Customer-ID, average price processing, options reporting, and the daisy chain approach for reporting.[849]

---

[828] *Id.*

[829] Data Boiler Letter at 18. Specifically, the commenter argued that to link information accurately, there must be ''a robust event sequencing method,'' and stated that the Plan lacks sufficient detail on this matter. The commenter further suggested that order and execution information should be represented in a meaningful way and recommended expressing this information in audio/musical notes form.

[830] *Id.* at 19–20.

[831] The Participants did not respond to this comment.

[832] As discussed in more detail below, the Commission believes that even if regulatory burdens reduce the number of small broker-dealers in specialized segments, overall competition in those segments may not be harmed. *See* Section V.G.1, *infra.*

[833] 17 CFR 242.613(c).

[834] In the Adopting Release for Exchange Act Rule 613, the Commission stated that the data recording and reporting procedures are reasonably designed ''to ensure that the [CAT] will be designed in a way that provides regulators with the accurate, complete, accessible, and timely market activity data they need for robust market oversight.'' *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45743.

[835] The Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan also requires the Plan Processor to measure and monitor latency within the CAT. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 8.3.

[836] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section D.12(f); *see also id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a). The CAT NMS Plan states that CAT Reporters could be required to report data either in a uniform electronic format, or in a manner that would allow the Central Repository to convert the data to a uniform electronic format, for consolidation and storage. *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(b).

[837] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 2.1. Appendix D states that more than one format may be allowed to support the various market participants that would report information to the Central Repository. *Id.; see also id.* at Section 6.9.

[838] ICI Letter at 13.

[839] Data Boiler Letter at 9. This commenter also stated that the formatting procedures in the Plan were insufficient and recommended using an audio/musical approach. *Id.* at 18.

[840] FIF Letter at 90–92; FIX Trading Letter at 1; Better Markets Letter at 7 (stating that ''the Commission should mandate the most widely used, open-sourced, machine-readable data format possible.'')

[841] FIF Letter at 90–91.

[842] *Id.* at 90.

[843] *Id.* at 91–92.

[844] FIF Letter at 90–92; ICI Letter at 13; FIX Trading Letter at 1–2; Data Boiler Letter at 41.

[845] ICI Letter at 13; FIX Trading Letter at 1–2; Data Boiler Letter at 41; FIF Letter at 91. FIF stated that CAT Reporters could use either an existing format or a ''native'' format developed by the Plan Processor. Another commenter was against trying to develop a native CAT format. Data Boiler Letter at 20. This commenter suggested preserving data in its most original format and then converting trade streams into ''music formats'' for ease of storage and comparison and to facilitate surveillance. *Id.*

[846] FIX Trading Letter at 1–2.

[847] *Id.* at 1; *see also* FIF Letter at 92.

[848] FIX Trading Letter at 2.

[849] *Id.* at 2–3.

One commenter stated that while mandating one uniform format would reduce the burden on the Central Repository for consolidating and storing data, it would impose a burden on CAT Reporters to accurately translate their current reporting format into a uniform CAT interface that could result in more errors than if the conversion to a uniform format occurred at the Central Repository.[850] Conversely, another commenter cautioned that requiring one uniform format would create a monopoly.[851]

One commenter argued that while data reported in a non-uniform format can be reliably converted into a uniform format, there are benefits to using a uniform format.[852] Specifically, the commenter stated that using a uniform format can reduce data integrity issues within the Plan Processor, reduce data processing times, lower error correction rates between T+1 and T+3, reduce time and resources needed to on-board participants, and improve data accuracy and consistency across broker-dealers.[853] The commenter also stated that use of a uniform format would improve data completeness because exact fields and standards would be defined.

In their response, the Participants stated that they do not believe that the Plan should mandate a specific format for reporting to the Central Repository, but rather should allow the Bidders to use discretion in selecting the format that will work most efficiently with their solution.[854] The Participants stated that the nature of data ingestion is key to the architecture of the CAT and therefore the Plan does not mandate a data ingestion format, but allows the Plan Processor to determine the format.[855] The Participants also noted that the remaining three Bidders propose accepting existing messaging protocols (*e.g.,* FIX), rather than requiring CAT Reporters to use a new format.[856] The Participants stated that when they evaluate each Bidder's solution, they will consider whether the Bidder's proposed approach for a message format is easily understood and adoptable by the industry. The Participants also stated that they will take into consideration each Bidder's ability ''to reliably and accurately convert data to a uniform electronic format for consolidation and storage, regardless of the message formats in which the CAT Reporters would be required to report data to the Central Repository.'' [857]

The Commission believes it is reasonable to allow the Plan Processor to determine the electronic format in which data must be reported, and whether the format is uniform or whether multiple formats can be used to report CAT Data. The Commission recognizes that if a format were mandated in the CAT NMS Plan, CAT Reporters would have the information necessary to accommodate the format sooner than if they need to wait for the Plan Processor to choose the format. Although the Commission recognizes the benefit of early notice, mandating a particular format(s) in the Plan could limit the Plan Processor's options for designing the operation of the CAT as envisioned. Moreover, the Commission notes that the Participants have stated that they will consider whether a Bidder has proposed a format that is easily understood and adoptable by the industry.[858] Further, because the Plan contemplates there will be iterations of the Technical Specifications, as well as time between publication of the Technical Specifications and the time by which data reporting must begin, the Commission believes that Industry Members will have sufficient time to comply with the ultimate format chosen by the Plan Processor. Therefore, the Commission believes that, rather than mandating the decision regarding the format for reporting in the CAT NMS Plan, it is reasonable for the format to be determined by the Plan Processor as a component of the CAT design.

3. Reporting Timelines

The CAT NMS Plan provides that CAT Reporters must report order event and trading information into the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. ET on the Trading Day following the day the CAT Reporter records such information.[859] A CAT Reporter must report post-trade information by 8:00 a.m. ET on the Trading Day following the day the CAT Reporter receives such information.[860] The CAT NMS Plan provides that CAT Reporters may voluntarily report Participant Data prior to the 8:00 a.m. ET deadline.[861]

Commenters expressed opinions about the timeframe in which data should be reported by CAT Reporters to the Central Repository. One commenter expressed general support for the proposed reporting deadline, but noted that without having detailed Technical Specifications and validation rules, it could not assess the feasibility of meeting this deadline.[862] The commenter stated that more information is needed regarding the CAT data reporting requirements to determine whether collating and formatting for the required data fields is achievable within the deadlines.[863]

In contrast, two commenters suggested that data should be reported in real-time, or near real-time, rather than at 8:00 a.m. ET the Trading Day following the day that the data was recorded.[864] One commenter noted under the CAT NMS Plan's reporting deadlines, if a trade were completed at 9:30 a.m. ET on a Friday on an exchange, it would not have to be reported until Monday at 8:00 a.m. ET.[865] The commenter stated that the CAT NMS Plan does not present a convincing reason for the 8:00 a.m. ET deadline given that market participants have access to the data in real-time and should be able to report it in seconds or less.[866] The commenter opined that real-time, or near real-time, reporting would allow for more robust surveillance and a ''quicker reaction time.'' [867] Another commenter argued that data should be reported within 50 milliseconds so that regulators can conduct real-time surveillance.[868] The commenter recommended that CAT support real-time ingestion, processing and surveillance.[869]

This commenter also questioned the Plan Processor's ability to receive data from all CAT Reporters at 8:00 a.m. ET, and suggested that receiving data in real-time would alleviate any potential

[850] FIF Letter at 92.

[851] Data Boiler Letter at 36, 41.

[852] UnaVista Letter at 2.

[853] *Id.*

[854] Response Letter I at 29.

[855] Response Letter III at 14.

[856] *Id.*

[857] Response Letter I at 29.

[858] *Id.*

[859] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 6.3, 6.4.

[860] *See id.* at Section 6.4. Post-trade information includes: (1) If an order is executed in whole or part: (a) An Allocation Report; (b) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the clearing broker or prime broker, if applicable; and (c) CAT-Order-ID of any contra-side order(s); (2) if the trade is cancelled, a cancelled trade indicator; and (3) for original receipt or origination of an order, the Firm Designated ID, Customer Account Information, and Customer Identifying Information for the relevant Customer.

[861] *See id.* at Sections 6.3, 6.4.

[862] UnaVista Letter at 2.

[863] *Id.*

[864] Data Boiler Letter at 18; Better Markets Letter at 6.

[865] Better Markets Letter at 6.

[866] *Id.*

[867] *Id.*

[868] Data Boiler Letter at 19.

[869] *Id.* at 1. This commenter suggested that if CAT Data was going to be reported in real-time, SIP data should also be reported in real-time. *See* Data Boiler Letter at 42. Because the Commission does not believe that real-time reporting should be mandated by the Plan, the commenter's suggestion that SIP data be reported in real-time if CAT Data is going to be reported in real-time, is moot.

problems in this regard.[870] Another commenter also addressed concerns regarding CAT's capacity if a significant number of CAT Reporters choose to submit data at or around the same time, and recommended that the Plan Processor model its methodology on a system that has proven it can successfully project and manage large amounts of data, such as the Options Price Reporting Authority (''OPRA'').[871]

In response to these comments, the Participants noted that the Commission considered the idea of requiring real-time reporting in Rule 613, but instead imposed a reporting deadline of 8:00 a.m. ET.[872] Therefore, the Participants are not required to file a plan containing real-time reporting.[873] Further, in response to the commenter that stated that real-time, or near real-time, reporting would assist with surveillance and early warning of market events,[874] the Participants noted that certain of them already have real-time surveillance tools in place that will not be affected by the implementation of the CAT.[875]

As the Participants noted, the Commission considered whether CAT Reporters should be required to report data in real-time when it adopted Rule 613 under Regulation NMS.[876] In response to the Proposing Release which proposed that data be collected in real-time, commenters questioned the accuracy, cost, and usability of data reported in real-time.[877] The Commission concluded that there were practical advantages to taking a more gradual approach for an undertaking such as the CAT, and acknowledged that while there might be certain advantages to receiving data intraday, the greater majority of benefits to be realized from development of the CAT do not require real-time reporting.[878] Further, the Commission recognized that not requiring real-time reporting upon implementation would result in significant cost savings for industry participants.[879] After reviewing the CAT NMS Plan and considering the commenters' statements, the Commission continues to adhere to that view.

Further, in response to the commenter that questioned the feasibility of reporting data by the 8:00 a.m. ET reporting deadline without having detailed Technical Specifications and validation rules,[880] the Commission notes that this reporting deadline is the same as that currently required for OATS reporting. Therefore, while again acknowledging the importance of timely delivery of Technical Specifications, the Commission believes many CAT Reporters already have the capability to report in compliance with the deadline proposed in the Plan and that such deadline is reasonable.

Additionally, in response to the commenter that questioned the Plan Processor's ability to simultaneously receive data from all CAT Reporters at 8:00 a.m. ET and suggested that receiving data in real-time would alleviate potential problems resulting from an influx of all the data at one time, the Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to have the capacity to handle two times the historical peak daily volume to ensure that, if CAT Reporters choose to submit data all at one time, the Plan Processor can handle the influx of data.[881] Furthermore, because CAT Reporters have the option to report data throughout the day, the Commission anticipates that CAT Reporters, consistent with certain reporting practices, such as OATs reporting, will stagger their reports, thus alleviating concerns that a flurry of activity shortly before the 8:00 a.m. ET deadline would impose unnecessary burdens on the Plan Processor.

4. Data Elements

The CAT NMS Plan requires that numerous data elements be reported to the Central Repository to ensure there is sufficient information to create the lifecycle of an order, and provide regulators with sufficient detail about an order to perform their regulatory duties.

The Commission received a number of comments regarding specific data elements that CAT Reporters are required to report to the Central Repository. In addition, one commenter questioned generally if the SEC should reconsider the scope of Rule 613 and ''ask whether a more broad and complete audit trail is really what regulators need to efficiently and effectively perform their duties.'' [882] This commenter also questioned whether the data being captured is ''relevant to achieve the SEC's goals, or whether the data is being collected for statistical purposes and would simply overwhelm usability of the audit trail.'' [883]

The Commission continues to believe that the overall scope of Rule 613 is appropriate. However, the Commission has considered comments on each data element contained in the CAT NMS Plan and its necessity to achieving the goal of creating a consolidated audit trail, and has determined to amend or eliminate certain of the requirements proposed in the CAT NMS Plan as detailed below.

a. Customer-ID

(1) Customer Information Approach

Article VI of the CAT NMS Plan adopts the ''Customer Information Approach'' for creating and utilizing a Customer-ID and identifying a Customer, which reflects the exemptive relief granted by the Commission.[884] Several commenters expressed general support for the Customer Information Approach.[885] Two commenters, however, requested a modification to the Customer Information Approach to permit Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information to be reported as part of the ''customer definition process'' [886] instead of upon the original receipt or origination of an order.[887] One of these commenters also stated that this modification would improve the security of Customer Account Information and the CAT because sensitive customer PII data ''would not need to [be] passed to order management systems or stored with the firm's CAT Reporting systems, but would remain with Customer Information Repositories which would issue the 'Customer definition' CAT Report.'' [888] One commenter stated that a unique identifier for every client may not be necessary and a unique identifier could be applied to only those with a

[870] *Id.* at 19–20.

[871] FIF Letter at 125.

[872] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45765.

[873] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(3). *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45765. Indeed, Rule 613 stated that the CAT NMS Plan may not impose a reporting deadline earlier than 8:00 a.m. ET on the Trading Day after the trade date. 17 CFR 242.613(c)(3).

[874] Better Markets Letter at 6.

[875] Response Letter I at 31, 43.

[876] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45765.

[877] *Id.* at 45768–69.

[878] *Id.* at 45768.

[879] *Id.* at 45769.

[880] UnaVista Letter at 2.

[881] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.1.(a).(ii).

[882] Anonymous Letter I at 1.

[883] *Id.* at 3.

[884] *See* Exemptive Request Letter, *supra* note 21, at 8–18; *see also* Section III.15, *supra*.

[885] FIF Letter at 9–10, 67–72; Data Boiler Letter at 22–24; TR Letter at 8; *see also* UnaVista Letter at 3; DAG Letter at 2; STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's Exemptive Request Letter recommendations).

[886] Under the ''customer definition process,'' broker-dealers would submit an initial set of information identifying the Customer to the Central Repository.

[887] FIF Letter at 9–10, 70–71; TR Letter at 8.

[888] FIF Letter at 67; *see also* DAG Letter at 2; STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's Exemptive Request Letter recommendations).

certain threshold of trading activity.[889] Another commenter expressed general support for the Customer Information Approach, but suggested that the CAT system should tag related trade patterns with each identifiable customer and counterparties as a ''fingerprint (unique ID) to a customer and/or counterparty.'' [890]

Several commenters commented on the specific data elements required to be reported under the Customer Information Approach. One commenter suggested that the definition of ''account type'' should be consistent with existing OATS definitions.[891] Another commenter noted that it could not find the definition of ''customer type'' in the CAT NMS Plan or Rule 613.[892] This commenter recommended using an existing field currently reported to the SROs or the SEC for ''customer type'' to minimize implementation effort.[893] This commenter also stated that an individual's ''role in the account,'' required to be reported as part of Customer Identifying Information, may not be consistently maintained across firms and that population and maintenance of this data field may be an issue.[894] As a result, this commenter believed that the field for an individual's role in the account should only be required to be reported when firms create new accounts after the implementation of reporting under the CAT.[895]

One commenter requested clarification that Industry Members would only be required to report CAT Data for ''active'' accounts, and then offered that ''active accounts would be defined as those with activity in CAT reportable securities.'' [896] One commenter discussed whether Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information should be ''refreshed'' (*i.e.,* updated) by an Industry Member. This commenter suggested ''having the functional support for a voluntary full refresh, but . . . eliminat[ing] the mandated requirement to provide full refreshes periodically,'' and stated that, ''the initial load, daily updates and standard error processing should be sufficient to maintain data integrity.'' [897] This commenter added that while eliminating the periodic refresh of the information used to identify a Customer ''may slightly reduce the burden or cost on the broker-dealer community as well as the Plan Processor, it would eliminate the need for unneeded transmission and handling of sensitive PII data.'' [898]

Another commenter noted the different data elements that identify a Customer under the Customer Information Approach and recommended that ''customer information fields be categorized based on degree of importance for market surveillance and market reconstruction, so that focus can be concentrated on ensuring accuracy of the most important fields from a surveillance viewpoint.'' [899] This commenter added that ''[d]ifferent criteria could be established based on the customer data categorization for correction turn-around time; *e.g.,* customer unique identifier (LTID or social security number) would be of highest priority; zip code may be of lesser importance and not impact regulators' ability to surveil the marketplace.'' [900] This commenter requested clarification whether only ''active'' accounts are required to report customer identifying information as part of the customer definition process.[901]

One commenter opposed the Customer Information Approach. This commenter stated that the Commission should require ''a universal customer ID to aid in the accuracy, integrity, and consolidation of CAT Data'' and that ''[f]irm-based IDs will significantly increase the complexity and fragmentation of the dataset, slowing down consolidation.'' [902]

According to the Participants, the Customer Information Approach would not have an adverse effect on the various ways in which, and purposes for which, regulators would use, access, and analyze the audit trail data reported under Rule 613 nor would it compromise the linking of order events, alter the time and method by which regulators may access the data, or limit the use of the CAT audit trail data. The Participants noted the unique nature of the existing identifiers to be used under the Customer Information Approach, which would allow the Plan Processor to create customer linkages with the same level of accuracy as the Customer-ID. The Participants also stated that the reliability and accuracy of the data reported to the Central Repository under the Customer Information Approach is the same as under the approach outlined in Rule 613 with regard to Customer-IDs because the identifiers used under the proposed Customer Information Approach are also unique identifiers. In some cases, the Participants stated that the Customer Information Approach may result in more accurate data, as errors may be minimized because broker-dealers will not have to adjust their systems to capture and maintain the additional Customer-ID data element, and only a single entity will have to perform the mapping of firm-designated account information to Customer-ID. The Participants also noted that a universal identifier that is tied to personally identifiable information could create a substantial risk of misuse and of possible identify theft as the universal identifiers are passed between the Plan Processor and each CAT Reporter.

The Participants further argued that the benefits of the Customer Information Approach outweigh any potential disadvantages.[903] The Participants added that based upon their analysis of this issue and discussions with the industry, as detailed in the Exemptive Request Letter and the Plan, the Participants disagree that the Customer Information Approach will increase complexity or slow down consolidation. The Participants stated that utilizing a single Customer-ID within the CAT while allowing firms to report using existing identifiers would substantially reduce costs and speed implementation without limiting the regulatory use of the data. Indeed, the Participants noted that the additional cost required to comply with the Customer-ID approach set forth in the Rule, rather than with the Customer Information Approach as proposed in the CAT NMS Plan, would be at least $195 million for the largest CAT Reporters.[904]

The Participants clarified in their response at what point Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information must be reported under the Plan.[905] The Participants stated that the approach discussed in the Exemptive Request Letter was intended to require CAT Reporters to supply Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information as part of the customer definition process—that is, prior to the origination or original receipt of an order—rather than as information submitted with each order. The Participants noted that Section

[889] Anonymous Letter I at 3.
[890] Data Boiler Letter at 23.
[891] TR Letter at 9.
[892] *Id.*
[893] *Id.*
[894] *Id.* at 10.
[895] *Id.*
[896] FIF Letter at 10.
[897] *Id.* at 122.
[898] *Id.* at 93.
[899] *Id.*
[900] *Id.*
[901] *Id.* at 10.
[902] Better Markets Letter at 9.
[903] Response Letter I at 33.
[904] *See* Exemptive Request Letter, *supra* note 21, at 17.
[905] Response Letter I at 34.

6.4(d)(iv) of the Plan describes this customer definition process, which includes the process for submitting customer information and for assigning Customer-IDs for use within the CAT. According to the Participants, the operation of Sections 6.3(d)(i) and 6.4(d)(i) of the Plan clarify that a CAT Reporter is required to submit the Firm Designated IDs with the new order reports, but not the information to identify a Customer. The Participants recognized, however, that the language in Section 6.4(d)(ii)(C) of the Plan could be read to suggest that the customer identifying information must be provided with each new order report (*i.e.,* that the Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information must be submitted contemporaneously with each order, rather than submitting such information pursuant to the customer definition process). The Participants proposed that the CAT NMS Plan be amended to make clear that customer information would be submitted pursuant to the customer definition process rather than with each original receipt or origination of an order.

The Participants also noted that they do not believe that trading activity thresholds with respect to identifiers would be consistent with the requirements of Rule 613.[906] The Participants stated that the use of unique IDs is essential to the effectiveness and usefulness of the CAT because these data elements will help regulatory users conduct surveillance across market centers and identify activity originating from multiple market participants.

In their response, the Participants stated that they have not yet determined how ''account type'' and ''customer type'' will be defined for purposes of reporting to the Central Repository and anticipate that they will be defined in the Technical Specifications.[907]

With respect to limiting the reporting of a Customer's ''role in the account'' on a going-forward basis (*i.e.,* after implementation of the CAT), the Participants stated that the Plan does not distinguish between legacy and new accounts with regard to this requirement and the Participants do not believe that this change is necessary.[908]

The Participants stated in their response that the CAT NMS Plan currently anticipates that Industry Member CAT Reporters would only report information to identify a customer for ''active accounts'' as part of the customer definition process.[909] Specifically, the Plan states that ''broker-dealers will initially submit full account lists for all active accounts to the Plan Processor and subsequently submit updates and changes on a daily basis,'' [910] and defines ''active accounts'' as ''accounts that have had activity within the last six months.'' [911] Moreover, the Participants noted that the Plan states that ''[t]he Participants anticipate that Customer information that is initially reported to the CAT could be limited to only customer accounts that have, or are expected to have, CAT-reportable activity. For example, accounts that are considered open, but have not traded Eligible Securities in a given timeframe may not need to be pre-established in the CAT, but rather could be reported as part of daily updates after they have CAT-reportable activity.'' [912] Accordingly, the Participants suggested that the CAT NMS Plan be amended to clarify that only active accounts are required to report Customer Identifying Information during the customer definition process.

With respect to the Plan's requirement to periodically refresh Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information, the Participants stated in their response that they believe that maintaining the accuracy of customer information is vital to the operation of the CAT.[913] Therefore, the Participants noted that a periodic refresh of customer information is beneficial because it will help to ensure that all customer information remains accurate and up to date. The Participants further acknowledged the concern with maintaining the confidentiality of PII and other CAT Data.[914] To that end, the Participants highlighted Section 6.12 of the Plan, which requires the Plan Processor to develop and maintain a comprehensive information security program that meets certain requirements set forth in the Plan, and the fact that the information security program must be approved and reviewed at least annually by the Operating Committee. The Participants stated that they continue to assess the Bidders' proposed security solutions and believe that once the CAT is operational the information security program will address the commenters' concerns regarding data security.

Finally, the Participants noted that the Plan will define the scope of a ''full'' customer information refresh and the extent to which inactive or other accounts would need to be reported.[915]

The Participants further stated that they do not agree that it would be appropriate to rank the importance of particular data elements reported to the Central Repository for data correction or other purposes for several reasons.[916] First, the Participants pointed out that Rule 613 does not indicate that any data elements are more or less important for market surveillance or market reconstruction purposes. The Participants noted that Rule 613(c)(7) states that the Plan ''shall require each national securities exchange, national securities association, and any member of such exchange or association to record and electronically report to the central repository *details for each order and each reportable event,* including, but not limited to [the information set forth in Rule 613(c)(7)(i)–(viii)]'' (emphasis added). Second, the Participants noted that ranking the importance of data elements for market surveillance and market reconstruction purposes might inappropriately reveal the confidential, proprietary surveillance processes used by each Participant. Third, the Participants stated that with respect to data accuracy, the Participants have included provisions in the Plan to take into account minor and major inconsistencies in Customer information. In particular, the Participants noted that Appendix D explains that ''[t]he Plan Processor must design and implement procedures and mechanisms to handle both minor and material inconsistencies in Customer information.'' [917] Additionally, material inconsistencies must be communicated to the submitting CAT Reporter(s) and resolved within the established error correction timeframe, as detailed in Sections 6–7 of Appendix D of the Plan.[918] The Participants stated that the Central Repository also must have an audit trail showing the resolution of all errors.[919] Finally, the Participants noted that they intend to monitor errors in the customer information fields and will consider, as appropriate, whether to prioritize the correction of certain data fields over others.

The Commission believes that the clarification provided by the

[906] *Id.* at 23.

[907] *Id.* at 24.

[908] *Id.* at 23.

[909] *Id.* at 35.

[910] *Id.* at 22 (citing the CAT NMS Plan, Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii)).

[911] *Id.* (citing the CAT NMS Plan, Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii), n.39).

[912] *Id.* (citing the CAT NMS Plan, Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iii), n.36).

[913] *Id.* at 31.

[914] *Id.* at 32.

[915] *Id.*

[916] *Id.*

[917] *Id.* at 22 (citing the CAT NMS Plan at Appendix D, Section 9.4).

[918] *Id.*

[919] *Id.*

Participants that Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information are reported as part of the customer definition process, rather than with each original receipt or origination of an order, is reasonable. The Commission believes that this will clarify the process for submitting information to identify a Customer under the CAT NMS Plan and will remove any ambiguity as to the reporting responsibilities of Industry Members. The Commission further believes that this clarification also will reduce the prospect of unnecessarily passing sensitive customer PII data. Accordingly, the Commission is amending Section 6.4(d)(ii)(C) of the CAT NMS Plan to clarify that Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information will be reported as part of the Customer definition process, rather than upon original receipt or origination of an order.

The Commission also agrees that creating a unique Customer-ID as contemplated by the CAT NMS Plan, regardless of the Customer's trading activity threshold, is reasonable. The Commission notes that surveillance and enforcement efforts are necessary, even for accounts with low levels of trading activity.

The Commission further believes that it is reasonable to allow the Plan Processor, in conjunction with the Operating Committee, to define the specific ''account types'' and ''customer types'' in the Technical Specifications for the CAT NMS Plan. This approach will allow the Plan Processor to assess the various definitions of ''account type'' and ''customer type'' that exist among the CAT Reporters, and then make a determination as to how to appropriately classify them for purposes of CAT reporting. The Commission expects the Plan Processor will define these terms with sufficient precision so that the reporting requirements will be clear.

The Commission agrees that a Customer's role in the account should be a data element that is reported as part of the customer definition process, regardless of whether the account existed prior to implementation of the CAT or was created thereafter. The CAT NMS Plan does not distinguish between legacy and new accounts, for purposes of reporting Customer Identifying Information, and the Commission believes identifying the Customer's role in the account will facilitate surveillance and enforcement efforts.

The Commission also believes that it is reasonable to limit the reporting of Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information to only those accounts that are ''active,'' defined as a Customer account that has had activity (*i.e.,* received or originated an order), in an Eligible Security within the last six months. This will alleviate the need for CAT Reporters to update the Customer Identifying Information or Customer Account Information for accounts that have not received or originated an order for more than six months, but still ensures that the Central Repository will collect audit trail data for Customer accounts that have any Reportable Events. The Commission notes that pursuant to the Plan and the Customer Information Approach, a CAT Reporter must upload any Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information to the Central Repository *prior* to a Customer originating an order. Because of this requirement, even if a CAT Reporter has not been updating the Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information for a Customer with an account with no Reportable Events for six months, if the Customer decides to submit or originate an order, the CAT Reporter would upload the required information identifying the Customer on the same day the Customer submits the order, and upon submission of the order, the Central Repository will collect the audit trail data required by Section 6.4 of the Plan. Accordingly, the Commission is amending Section 1.1 of the CAT NMS Plan to add a definition of ''Active Accounts'' to mean an account that has received or originated an order in an Eligible Security within the last six months. In addition, the Commission will amend Section 6.4(d)(iv) of the Plan to require that Industry Members submit an initial set of Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information to the Central Repository only for Active Accounts; and require Industry Members to update Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information only for Active Accounts.

The Commission also believes that it is reasonable for the CAT NMS Plan to require the periodic refresh of such information to ensure that the Central Repository has the most current information identifying a Customer. The Commission notes that both daily updates and periodic refreshes will require the uploading of PII, along with other CAT Data, to the Central Repository, but believes that the robust information security program to be implemented and maintained by the Plan Processor should sufficiently protect all CAT Data.[920]

(2) Modification or Cancellation of an Order

In connection with their proposal to adopt the Customer Information Approach, as discussed above, the Participants also suggested modification to Rule 613(c)(7)(iv)(F), which requires that ''[t]he CAT-Reporter-ID of the broker-dealer or Customer-ID of the *person* giving the modification or cancellation instruction'' be reported to the Central Repository.[921] In the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants proposed that CAT Reporters report whether a modification or cancellation instruction was given by the Customer associated with the order, or was initiated by the broker-dealer or exchange associated with the order.[922] According to the Participants, it is most critical for regulatory purposes to ascertain whether the modification or cancellation instruction was given by the Customer or was instead initiated by the broker-dealer or exchange, rather than capturing the identity of the specific person who gave the instruction.[923]

One commenter believed that modification and cancellation instructions are as important as other Reportable Events and, therefore, the identity of the person giving such instructions is ''vital information for market surveillance purpose[s].'' [924] The commenter opposed the Participants' approach of permitting CAT Reporters to report whether a modification or cancellation of an order was given by a Customer or initiated by a broker-dealer or exchange, in lieu of requiring the reporting of the Customer-ID of the person giving the modification or cancellation instruction.[925]

In their response, the Participants noted that reporting a single, specific Customer-ID for all modifications and cancellations is not possible under the Customer Information Approach because broker-dealers would not maintain Customer-IDs; instead, each broker-dealer would provide Firm-Designated IDs to the Central Repository

[920] The Commission also finds it reasonable not to rank CAT data elements in terms of relative importance because importance of the CAT data elements will necessarily vary in accordance with the manner in which the data is used.

[921] 17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(iv)(F) (emphasis added).

[922] *See* Exemption Request Letter, *supra* note 21, at 12.

[923] *Id.*

[924] Data Boiler Letter at 24 (responding to Question 161 of the Plan Proposing Release).

[925] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.3(d)(iv)(F).

to identify a Customer.[926] The Participants also stated that requiring CAT Reporters to report the Customer-ID of the specific individual initiating a cancellation or modification would introduce an inconsistent level of granularity in customer information between order origination and order modifications or cancellations, because Rule 613(c)(7)(i) does not require the reporting of the specific individual originating an order.

The Commission has considered the commenter's concern and the Participants' response, and believes that requiring that CAT Reporters report whether a modification or cancellation instruction was given by the Customer associated with the order, or was initiated by the broker-dealer or exchange associated with the order, is a reasonable approach to providing useful audit trail data regarding the modification or cancellation of an order. The approach set forth in the Plan also will not result an inconsistent level of granularity between the Reportable Events of origination or receipt of an order, and the modification or cancellation of the order because it would not require the identity of the person that gave the modification or cancellation instruction—which is not required under the CAT NMS Plan nor Rule 613.

(3) Reporting an Account Effective Date

In connection with their proposal to adopt the Customer Information Approach, as discussed above, the Participants also proposed an alternative method for reporting the date an account was opened, as required by Rule 613(c)(7)(viii)(B).[927] When reporting ''Customer Account Information,'' an Industry Member is required to report the date an account was opened.[928] The SROs requested an exemption to allow an ''effective date'' be reported in lieu of an account open date in certain limited circumstances.[929] As a result, an Industry Member will report the date an account was opened; except, however, that (a) in those circumstances in which an Industry Member has established a trading relationship with an institution but has not established an account with that institution, the Industry Member will (i) provide the Account Effective Date in lieu of the ''date account opened''; (ii) provide the relationship identifier in lieu of the ''account number''; and (iii) identify the ''account type'' as a ''relationship''; [930] and (b) in those circumstances in which the relevant account was established prior to the implementation date of the CAT NMS Plan applicable to the relevant CAT Reporter and no ''date account opened'' is available for the account, the Industry Member will provide the Account Effective Date in the following circumstances: (i) Where an Industry Member changes back office providers or clearing firms and the date account opened is changed to the date the account was opened on the new back office/clearing firm system; (ii) where an Industry Member acquires another Industry Member and the date account opened is changed to the date the account was opened on the post-merger back office/clearing firm system; (iii) where there are multiple dates associated with an account in an Industry Member's system, and the parameters of each date are determined by the individual Industry Member; and (iv) where the relevant account is an Industry Member proprietary account.[931] Several commenters supported the Participants' approach to reporting an account effective date rather than the date an account was opened, as set forth in the CAT NMS Plan, and which reflects the exemptive relief granted by the Commission.[932] The Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan's approach to reporting an account effective date, rather than the date an account was opened, is reasonable and will not impact the quality or usefulness of the information available to regulators.

(4) Identifying a Customer Using LEI

The Commission also received several comments stating that the Commission should mandate the use of LEIs whenever applicable.[933] One commenter, also noting its support for using a global entity identifier in general and LEI specifically, stated that while it agrees that the system should provide for the capture and reporting of LEIs for customer identification, it would be appropriate to provide for a transitional approach to the collection of the LEIs. Under the commenter's recommended transitional approach, broker-dealers would provide the LEI to the CAT in each instance where the LEI is already known and collected.[934] This commenter also believed that it would be important to establish the CAT in a way that captures the LEI as part of the initial implementation of the system, rather than having to adapt the system at a future date, and that use of LEIs is important for both risk management and operational efficiency.[935] Another commenter, however, did not recommend that the LEI be mandated for use by broker-dealers and argued that mandating the use of LEIs would disadvantage small broker-dealers who have no business requirement at this time to use LEI.[936]

In their response, the Participants stated that based on discussions with the DAG, they agree with the commenters that it would be reasonable to require an Industry Member to report its LEI or the LEI of a Customer to the Central Repository as part of Customer Identifying Information if the Industry Member has or acquires an LEI.[937] The Participants added that Industry Members that report LEIs would do so in addition to, rather than in lieu of, the other Customer Identifying Information required by the Plan.[938] The Participants do not believe, however, that the Plan should require Industry Members or others to obtain an LEI for a Customer if they do not already have one.[939]

The Participants further stated that, based on discussions with the DAG, they believe that Industry Members should be permitted to provide Customer LEIs in their possession without the imposition of any due diligence obligations beyond those that may exist today with respect to information associated with an LEI.[940] The Participants noted that, although Industry Members should not be required to perform additional due diligence with regard to the LEIs for CAT purposes, Industry Members will be required to accurately provide the LEIs in their records and may not knowingly submit inaccurate LEIs to the CAT.[941] In addition, the Participants

[926] Response Letter I at 24.

[927] *See* September 2015 Supplement, *supra* note 21.

[928] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[929] *See* September 2015 Supplement, *supra* note 21.

[930] The Commission notes that because ''account type'' will be defined in the Technical Specifications for purposes of reporting to the Central Repository, one type of ''account type'' will be ''relationship,'' *See* Section IV.D.4.a(1), *supra.*

[931] CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[932] Data Boiler Letter at 24; TR Letter at 8; FIF Letter at 9, 81–83; *see also* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21.

[933] Better Markets Letter at 8; DTCC Letter at 1; *see also* UnaVista Letter at 3 (supporting the use of LEIs in conjunction with other personal identifiers to identify Customers).

[934] SIFMA Letter at 36.

[935] *Id.* at 37; *see also* DTCC Letter at 2–4 (noting industry and regulatory support for LEIs and, that if LEIs were mandated, it would facilitate the ability for regulators to aggregate systemic risk exposures across markets).

[936] FIF Letter at 70.

[937] Response Letter II at 5–6.

[938] Response Letter III at 12.

[939] Response Letter II at 5.

[940] *Id.*

[941] *Id.*

stated that all of the remaining Bidders have indicated that their solutions will be able to support the use of LEIs.[942] Moreover, although the Participants believed that there are costs related to requiring Industry Members to provide an LEI if they have one, the Participants believed that the benefits outweigh the costs.[943]

The Commission has considered the commenters' views on the merits of reporting an LEI to the Central Repository as part of Customer Identifying Information and the Participants' response and believes that it is reasonable to require an Industry Member to report an LEI for its Customer if the Industry Member has or acquires the LEI for its Customer. Accordingly, the Commission is amending the definition of ''Customer Identifying Information'' in Section 1.1 of the Plan to require that an Industry Member report an LEI to identify a Customer that is a legal entity, if the Industry Member has or acquires the LEI of such Customer. However, the Commission is also making clear that the LEI is not reported in lieu of the other Customer Identifying Information for a legal entity (*e.g.,* name, address, or employer identification number), but must be reported along with other Customer Identifying Information.

The Commission believes use of the LEI enhances the quality of identifying information for Customers by incorporating a global standard identifier increasingly used throughout the financial markets. The Commission notes that according to the Plan, Industry Members will still be required to report other Customer Identifying Information even if the Industry Member reports an LEI to identify a Customer; thus the LEI supplements the other information that will be used by the Central Repository to identify a Customer.

The Commission further believes that it is reasonable to not require an Industry Member to obtain an LEI for its Customer or for itself if the Industry Member does not already have an LEI for its Customer or itself because such a requirement would impose an additional burden. However, the Commission believes that requiring Industry Members to accurately provide the LEIs in their records and not knowingly submit inaccurate LEIs to the CAT is reasonable, because reporting accurate information to the CAT is a fundamental requirement of the Plan.[944]

In response to the commenter that believed that such a requirement might disadvantage small broker-dealers, the Commission notes that the requirement to report LEIs does not mandate that a broker-dealer obtain an LEI to comply with the Plan; therefore, small broker-dealers that do not currently have an LEI will not be required to report one and thus will not be disadvantaged.

b. CAT-Reporter-ID

(1) Existing Identifier Approach

Article VI of the CAT NMS Plan reflects the ''Existing Identifier Approach'' for purposes of identifying each CAT Reporter associated with an order or Reportable Event.[945] Under the Existing Identifier Approach, CAT Reporters are required to record and report to the Central Repository an SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier for orders and certain Reportable Events to be used by the Central Repository to assign a unique CAT-Reporter-ID to identify CAT Reporters. An Industry Member is required to report its existing SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier used by the relevant SRO specifically for transactions occurring on that SRO to the Central Repository.[946] Similarly, an exchange reporting CAT Reporter information is required to report data using the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier used by the Industry Member on that exchange or its systems.[947] Off-exchange orders and Reportable Events will be reported with an Industry Member's FINRA SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier.[948]

For the Central Repository to link the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier to the CAT-Reporter-ID, each SRO will submit, on a daily basis, all SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers used by its Industry Members (or itself), as well as information sufficient to identify the corresponding market participant (*e.g.* a CRD number or LEI) to the Central Repository.[949] Additionally, each Industry Member will be required to submit to the Central Repository information sufficient to identify such Industry Member (*e.g.,* CRD number or LEI, as noted above).[950] The Plan Processor will use the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers and identifying information (*i.e.,* CRD number or LEI) to assign a CAT-Reporter-ID to each Industry Member and SRO for internal use within the Central Repository.[951]

The reporting of an existing SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier differs from Rule 613 in that under Rule 613(c)(8), CAT Reporters would be required to report a universal CAT-Reporter-ID for certain Reportable Events.[952] In the Exemptive Request Letter, the SROs requested an exemption to permit a CAT Reporter to report an existing SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier in lieu of requiring the reporting of a universal CAT-Reporter-ID.[953] Specifically, the Participants stated that the Existing Identifier Approach would not negatively impact regulators' access, use, and analysis of CAT Data, and that it could allow additional levels of granularity compared to the universal CAT-Reporter-ID approach, in that SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers may contain additional information not mandated by the CAT NMS Plan, such as the specific desk or department responsible for trades.[954] The Participants also stated that they believe the reliability and accuracy of CAT Data under the Existing Identifier Approach would not be undermined,[955] and represented that the Existing Identifier Approach could result in fewer errors and more reliable and accurate linkage

[942] *Id.* at 5–6.

[943] The Participants do not believe that the proposed use of LEIs would reduce the granularity of information provided as the proposed use of LEIs would not change the provisions related to the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers (*e.g.,* MPIDs). *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 1.1 (definition of SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier), 6.3 (requiring reporting of SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier).

[944] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(d).

[945] *See id.* at Section 6.3(e).

[946] *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21, at 31–41.

[947] *See id.* at 20.

[948] *Id.*

[949] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.3(e)(i).

[950] *Id.* at Section 6.4(d)(vi).

[951] *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21, at 31–41.

[952] Rule 613(c)(8) requires that CAT Reporters use the same CAT-Reporter-ID for each broker-dealer. 17 CFR 242.613(c)(8). The Reportable Events for which CAT-Reporter-IDs must be reported are: The broker-dealer receiving or originating an order (17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(i)(C)); the broker-dealer or national securities exchange from which (or to which) an order is being routed (17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(ii)(D) and (E)); if the order is routed to a national securities association, then the CAT-Reporter-ID of that national securities association must be reported (17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(ii)(E)); the broker-dealer or national securities exchange receiving (or routing) a routed order (17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(iii)(D) and (E)); if a national securities association receives the routed order, then the CAT-Reporter-ID of that national securities association must be reported (17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(iii)(D)); the broker-dealer, if applicable, giving a modification or cancellation instruction, if an order is modified or cancelled (17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(iv)(F)); the national securities exchange or broker-dealer executing an order, if an order is executed (17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(v)(F)); and the clearing broker or prime broker, if applicable, if an order is executed (17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(vi)(B)).

[953] *See* Exemptive Request Letter, *supra* note 21, at 19.

[954] *See id.* at 23, 26.

[955] *Id.* at 23.

of order information.[956] Further, the Participants noted their belief—based upon discussion with the DAG—that the Existing Identifier Approach would reduce the cost and implementation burdens on CAT Reporters to comply with Rule 613,[957] as it would allow them to continue using their current business practices and data flows instead of building new infrastructure to support the CAT-Reporter-ID requirement.[958]

Several commenters expressed support for the Existing Identifier Approach.[959] Two of the commenters listed benefits of the Existing Identifier Approach over the approach required in Rule 613.[960] One of the commenters stated that the Existing Identifier Approach would be more efficient and cost-effective than the Rule 613 approach.[961] The other commenter listed the following benefits: The Existing Identifier Approach would allow the industry to keep its current business processes and identifiers; coordination of a single CAT-Reporter-ID to be used across all Participants to identify broker-dealers would not be necessary; CAT Reporters would not have to expand their information repositories to store and manage a new CAT-Reporter-ID; the Plan Processor would manage the translation between the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers and the CAT-Reporter-ID; since the Plan Processor would be assigning CAT-Reporter-IDs, CAT Reporters would not be subject to errors with respect to the application of CAT-Reporter-IDs; a common information technology solution would be used; the Existing Identifier Approach would allow regulators to surveil on a more granular level; and the Existing Identifier Approach would save CAT Reporters the expense of maintaining and supplying a unique CAT-Reporter-ID for every Reportable Event.[962] Both commenters stated that the Existing Identifier Approach would not affect the accuracy, accessibility, timeliness or security and confidentiality of CAT Data over the Rule 613 approach.[963]

Three commenters offered recommendations for modifying the Existing Identifier Approach.[964] Two commenters asked that the FINRA MPID be permitted for non-execution reports.[965] One commenter stated that, regardless of whether the Existing Identifier Approach or the Rule 613 approach is used, the CAT should ''tag'' trade patterns with the trading desk and trader.[966]

In response to the two commenters that requested that the FINRA MPID be used for non-execution reports,[967] the Participants stated that the practices described by the two commenters would be acceptable under the Existing Identifier Approach, explaining that a broker-dealer CAT Reporter would be permitted to use any existing SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier (*e.g.,* FINRA MPID, NASDAQ MPID, NYSE Mnemonic, CBOE User Acronym and CHX Acronym) when reporting order information to the Central Repository, regardless of the eventual execution venue.[968]

Based on the Participants' representations in the Plan, the Commission believes that the Existing Identifier Approach is designed to provide the same regulatory benefits in terms of identifying CAT Reporters as would be achieved under Rule 613, at a reduced cost and implementation burden on CAT Reporters.[969] The Existing Identifier Approach is designed to link, within the Central Repository, all SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers to the appropriate CAT-Reporter-ID, and ultimately to the CAT Reporter, in a manner that is efficient, accurate, and reliable.

The Commission notes that one commenter recommended that the CAT be able to link trades to the responsible trading desk and trader.[970] The Commission notes that an additional benefit of the Existing Identifier Approach is that, as the Participants have represented, it may allow for the voluntary collection of additional levels of granularity, such as responsible trading desk or trader.[971]

(2) Use of LEI

Section 6.3(e)(i) of the CAT NMS Plan requires each Participant to submit, on a daily basis, all SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers used by its Industry Members or itself, as well as information to identify the corresponding market participant to the Central Repository, such as a CRD number or LEI, but does not require the reporting of LEIs. Section 6.4(d)(vi) of the CAT NMS Plan requires each Industry Member to submit to the Central Repository information sufficient to identify such Industry Member, such as a CRD number or LEI, but similarly does not require the reporting of LEIs.

As discussed above in relation to the Customer-ID, several commenters recommended, or noted, the use of LEIs in lieu, or as part of the development of, a CAT-Reporter-ID.[972] One commenter stated that it supported requiring Industry Members to provide their LEIs, as long as LEIs are already being captured by their systems.[973] Another commenter supported the optional use of LEIs, believing that mandatory use of LEIs would unfairly burden small broker-dealers that may not currently accommodate LEIs in their systems.[974]

In recognition of the comments that encouraged the use of LEIs in the CAT, and based on discussions with the DAG, the Participants have recommended that Sections 6.3(e)(i) and 6.4(d)(vi) of the CAT NMS Plan be amended to require a Participant to submit an Industry Member's LEI if the Participant has (or acquires) an LEI for an Industry Member, and to require Industry Members to submit to the Central Repository their LEIs if they have LEIs.[975] This information will be

[956] *Id.*

[957] *Id.* at 21, 22, 24.

[958] *Id.* at 24.

[959] *See* Data Boiler Letter at 22; FIF Letter at 73–74 ; TR Letter at 7–8; *see also* DAG Letter at 2; STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's Exemptive Request Letter recommendations).

[960] Data Boiler Letter at 22; FIF Letter at 73–74.

[961] Data Boiler Letter at 22.

[962] FIF Letter at 73–74.

[963] Data Boiler Letter at 22; FIF Letter at 74.

[964] Data Boiler Letter; TR Letter; FIF Letter.

[965] TR Letter at 8–9; FIF Letter at 10–11.

[966] Data Boiler at 22.

[967] TR Letter at 8–9; FIF Letter at 10–11. The Participants did not respond to the comment suggesting the CAT should ''tag'' trade patterns with the trading desk and trader.

[968] Response Letter I at 33.

[969] According to the Participants, requiring the reporting of unique CAT-Reporter-IDs of: (i) The Industry Member receiving or originating an order; (ii) the Industry Member or Participant from which (and to which) an order is being routed; (iii) the Industry Member or Participant receiving (and routing) a routed order; (iv) the Industry Member or Participant executing an order; and (v) the clearing broker or prime broker, would have imposed technical implementation difficulties on CAT Reporters and the Plan Processor alike to adopt the infrastructure to comply with the reporting, collection, and maintenance of CAT-Reporter-IDs. *See* Exemptive Request Letter, *supra* note 21, at 26. The Commission has considered the economic implications of the exemptive relief permitting the Existing Identifier Approach, as well as the other approaches in the CAT NMS Plan (options market maker quotes, Customer-ID, linking of executions to specific subaccount allocations on Allocation Reports, and timestamp granularity for Manual Order Events) that required exemptive relief from Rule 613 for inclusion in its economic analysis. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30709.

[970] Data Boiler Letter at 22.

[971] *See* Exemptive Request Letter, *supra* note 21, at 23. Further, the Commission notes that Section 6.3(d)(ii)(F) of the CAT NMS Plan currently requires the reporting of the identity and nature of the department or desk to which an internally routed order is being routed, so the identity of a trading desk for internally routed orders will be captured through this provision.

[972] FIX Letter at 2; FIF Letter at 75, Data Boiler Letter at 22; DTCC Letter at 1–6.

[973] Data Boiler Letter at 22.

[974] FIF Letter at 11.

[975] Response Letter II at 6; Response Letter III at 12.

reported to the Central Repository as part as the information the Plan Processor will use to assign CAT-Reporter-IDs.

The Commission considers the suggested modifications by the Participants to Section 6.3(e)(i) and Section 6.4(d)(vi) of the CAT NMS Plan to require the Participants and Industry Members to provide Industry Member LEIs, if known, by such Participant or Industry Member to be reasonable and an improvement in the information available in the CAT with respect to CAT Reporters. Accordingly, the Commission is amending these sections to require the Participants and Industry Members to provide Industry Member LEIs, if known, by such Participant or Industry Member; however, the Commission is also amending these sections to require the submission of Participant LEIs, if a Participant has an LEI, as well as Industry Member CRD numbers. Specifically, the amendment to Section 6.3(e)(i) would require a Participant (i) for purposes of reporting information to identify itself pursuant to Section 6.3(e)(i), to submit its LEI to the Central Repository, if the Participant has an LEI; and (ii) for purposes of reporting information to identify an Industry Member pursuant to Section 6.3(e)(i), to submit the CRD number for the Industry Member, as well as the LEI of the Industry Member if the Participant has collected such LEI of the Industry Member. The amendment to Section 6.4(d)(vi) with respect to Industry Members would require an Industry Member, for purposes of reporting information to identify itself pursuant to Section 6.4(d)(vi), to submit to the Central Repository the CRD number of the Industry Member as well as the LEI of the Industry Member (if the Industry Member has an LEI).

The Commission believes these amendments are appropriate because they may enhance the quality of identifying information by requiring the submission of the LEI—a global standard identifier increasingly used throughout the financial markets—to the extent it has otherwise been obtained. Because the amendments only impose the requirement to report an LEI on Participants and Industry Members that currently have an LEI, and which is known by the CAT Reporter, it should not impose the additional burden on them to obtain an LEI. Further, the Participants have represented that the Bidders' solutions can support the reporting of LEIs.[976] Although Section 6.3(e)(i) and Section 6.4(d)(vi) currently permit the submission of CRD numbers, the Commission believes that requiring the submission of the Industry Member CRD numbers will provide regulators with consistent identifying information about Industry Members that is useful for regulatory investigations and has significant regulatory benefit. In addition, requiring CRD numbers to be provided should not impose additional burdens on Industry Members because, as registered broker-dealers, all Industry Members currently have CRD numbers.

c. Open/Close Indicator

Rule 613 and the CAT NMS Plan require CAT Reporters to report an open/close indicator as a ''Material Term'' on all orders.

Three commenters objected to the requirement that CAT Reporters report an open/close indicator for equities transactions.[977] One of these commenters requested additional cost-benefit analysis on the open/close indicator.[978] Another commenter argued that the open/close indicator should be reported for options only, noting that this indicator is not currently used for equities.[979] Another commenter noted that including an open/close indicator for equities would require ''significant process changes and involve parties other than CAT Reporters, such as buy-side clients, OMS/EMS vendors, and others.'' [980] This commenter stated that, if the SROs and the Commission believe that there is value in obtaining the open/close indicator for surveillance purposes with respect to equities transactions, then a rule proposal covering this request and a thorough cost-benefit analysis should be filed for public comment.[981] Another commenter characterized the requirement to report an open/close indicator as a ''market structure change'' and likewise stated that the requirement should be subject to its own rulemaking process, including a cost-benefit analysis, and subject to a public comment period.[982]

In response, the Participants stated that they understand that Rule 613 requires that an ''open/close indicator'' be reported as part of the ''material terms of the order'' for both equities and options transactions, but recommended that CAT Reporters not be required to report an open/close indicator for equities transactions, or for options transactions, such as for market marker options transactions, in which the open/close indicator is not captured by current industry practice.[983]

The Commission notes that Rule 613(c)(2) states only that ''the plan *submitted* pursuant to this section'' (emphasis added) must require reporting of a set of ''material terms of the order,'' including an open/close indicator. It does not state that the Plan as *approved* must include that data element. Now that the Participants have submitted a plan in compliance with Rule 613, that rule does not preclude the Commission from approving a Plan that implements the Participants' recommendation to limit the set of transactions to which the requirement to report an open/close indicator would apply. After consideration, the Commission believes that limiting the requirement to provide an open/close indicator to listed options is reasonable. The open/close indicator will provide important information about whether an order is opening or increasing a position in the option, or closing or reducing a position. While this information is useful with respect to non-market maker options activity, the Commission acknowledges the concerns in other areas, including the lack of a clear definition of the term for equities transactions, and the lack of utility of that data at the time of quote entry for options market makers.

Accordingly, as recommended by the Participants, the Commission is amending the Plan to remove the requirement that an open/close indicator be reported as part of the Material Terms of the Order for equities and Options Market Maker quotations.[984]

d. Allocations

(1) Use of Allocation Reports

The CAT NMS Plan requires that broker-dealers submit an Allocation Report following the execution of an order if such order is allocated to one or more accounts or subaccounts (the ''Allocation Report Approach''). An Allocation Report must contain the following information: (i) The Firm Designated ID for any account(s), including subaccount(s), to which executed shares are allocated and the security that has been allocated; (ii) the identifier of the firm reporting the allocation; (iii) the price per share of shares allocated; (iv) the side of shares allocated; (v) the number of shares

[976] Response Letter II at 5–6.

[977] TR Letter at 9; SIFMA Letter at 35–36; FIF Letter at 83–86.

[978] FIF Letter at 84; *see also* SIFMA Letter at 36.

[979] TR Letter at 9.

[980] SIFMA Letter at 35.

[981] SIFMA Letter at 36; *see also* FIF Letter at 83–85.

[982] FIF Letter at 85.

[983] Response Letter I at 22.

[984] ''Material Terms of the Order'' is defined in Section 1.1 of the CAT NMS Plan.

allocated to each account; and (vi) the time of the allocation.[985]

The Allocation Report Approach differs from Rule 613 in that under Rule 613(c)(7)(vi)(A), each CAT Reporter would be required to record and report to the Central Repository ''the account number for any subaccounts to which the execution is allocated (in whole or part).'' [986] Under Rule 613 regulators would be able to link the subaccount to which an allocation was made to a specific order. In contrast, under the Allocation Report Approach, regulators would only be able to link an allocation to the account to which it was made, and not to a specific order.

In the Exemption Request, the Participants represented that, based on discussions with the DAG, broker-dealer systems do not presently link orders with allocations of the resulting executions, and building such functionality would be complex and costly. In addition, the Participants stated that the Allocation Report Approach would not affect the various ways in which, and purposes for which, regulators would use, access, and analyze CAT Data.[987] The Participants represented that the Allocation Report Approach would still provide regulators with the ability to associate allocations with the Customers that received them and would provide regulators with useful information without imposing undue burden on the industry.[988] The Participants also stated that they do not believe that this approach would compromise the linking of order events, alter the time and method by which regulators may access the data, or limit the use of the data as described in the use cases contained in the Adopting Release for Rule 613.[989]

Moreover, the Participants stated that they, along with the industry, believe that linking allocations to specific executions, as mandated by Rule 613, would be artificial and would not otherwise serve a legitimate purpose.[990] The Participants argued that because the Allocation Report Approach leverages existing business processes instead of creating new workflows, it could help improve the reliability and accuracy of CAT Data as well as reduce the time CAT Reporters need to comply with the CAT reporting requirements.[991] The Participants also stated that complying with the requirements of Rule 613(c)(7)(vi)(A) would require additional system and process changes which could potentially impact the reliability and accuracy of CAT Data.[992]

Four commenters expressed support for the Allocation Report Approach, noting that the approach would eliminate the need to re-engineer systems.[993] One of the commenters stated that the information reported in an Allocation Report would provide regulators with sufficient information to link allocations through reference information to the Customer that placed the order, but noted that ''there may not always be sufficient linkage information to relate a specific order, execution and allocation for a customer.'' [994] This commenter argued that it is not possible to link allocations to order lifecycles in the case of many-to-many orders.[995]

One commenter, however, disagreed with the Allocation Report Approach, stating that it would impact the completeness, accessibility and timeliness of CAT Data, and foreseeing challenges in linking the accounts and subaccounts to which an execution is allocated.[996] This commenter believed that broker-dealers can, and should, track order allocation information, including in the case of many-to-many orders.[997]

In response to commenters, the Participants restated their belief that the Allocation Report Approach set forth in the CAT NMS Plan appropriately weights the costs and benefits, and that ''linking allocations to executions could show artificial relationships between these order events.'' [998]

The Commission believes that the Plan's Allocation Report Approach will provide regulators the necessary information to detect abuses in the allocation process without imposing undue burdens on broker-dealers. The use of Allocation Reports will provide the Central Repository the ability to efficiently, accurately, and reliably link the subaccount holder to those with authority to trade on behalf of the account, which will ultimately improve regulatory efforts by SROs and the Commission, including market surveillance, market reconstructions, enforcement investigations, and examinations of market participants.[999] Additionally, by leveraging existing broker-dealer processes, the Plan's Allocation Report Approach could potentially reduce the time CAT Reporters need to comply with CAT reporting requirements and lower costs by using existing business processes.

(2) Time of Allocations

Under the CAT NMS Plan, CAT Reporters would need to submit the time of an allocation on the Allocation Report which, with the exception of Manual Orders, must be at a millisecond level of granularity.[1000]

Two commenters argued that the time of allocation should be reported with a timestamp granularity of no finer than one second.[1001] Three commenters asserted that the timestamps should not be required at all as part of the Allocation Report.[1002] One of those commenters noted that, because allocations are part of the post-trade process, the timing of such allocations is not critical, and requiring timestamps on allocations would represent ''a potentially costly and misleading reporting requirement divorced from the goals of CAT.'' [1003] Another commenter similarly asserted that requiring a timestamp on allocations would be costly and ''will not assist the SEC in achieving the expected regulatory benefit.'' [1004] This commenter explained that instructions for allocations can be communicated by phone, fax, or instant messaging or that standing instructions may be maintained for allocations.[1005] Therefore, the commenter stated, the only consistent point at which to capture a timestamp for an allocation is the time the allocation is booked into an allocation processing system.[1006]

[985] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[986] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(7)(vi)(A).

[987] *See* Exemption Request, *supra* note 21, at 30.

[988] *See id.*

[989] *Id.; see also* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45798–99.

[990] *See* Exemption Request, *supra* note 21, at 30.

[991] *Id.*

[992] *Id.*

[993] *See* FIF Letter at 75–79; TR Letter at 8; *see also* DAG Letter at 2; STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's Exemptive Request Letter recommendations).

[994] FIF Letter at 78, 90.

[995] *Id.* at 90.

[996] Data Boiler Letter at 24–25.

[997] *Id.* at 40.

[998] Response Letter I at 36–37. The Participants estimated compliance costs related to linking orders to executions to be at least $525 million for the largest broker–dealers. *Id.*

[999] *See* April 2015 Supplement, *supra* note 20 (providing examples of how the Allocation Report would be used to link the subaccount holder to those with authority to trade on behalf of the account).

[1000] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 6.4(d)(ii)(A)(1), 6.8(b).

[1001] *Id.* These commenters also expressed the view that Business Clocks that capture the time of allocation should be subject to a clock synchronization standard of one second. *Id.*

[1002] SIFMA Letter at 35; FIF Letter at 86–90; FSR Letter at 9.

[1003] SIFMA Letter at 35.

[1004] FIF Letter at 86. In support of its objection to including a timestamp in the Allocation Report, this commenter explained that, to detect wrongdoing in the collection process, one could compare the average execution price on the allocation to the market price when the allocation was submitted. If any subaccount had a total and an average profit and loss far exceeding the average profit and loss for all subaccounts of the advisor, such subaccount could be highlighted. *Id.*

[1005] FIF Letter at 86.

[1006] *Id.* This commenter also provided an analysis of the cost for adding a timestamp on allocations.

In response, the Participants stated that allocation timestamps would ''be a significant tool for detecting regulatory issues associated with allocations, including allocation fraud,'' and supported requiring them in the Plan.[1007] However, the Participants stated that the cost of changes that would be necessary to capture timestamps to the millisecond may not be justified, particularly in light of the fact that allocations tend to be a manual process. Therefore, the Participants suggested that Allocation Reports should have timestamps with a one second granularity, as is the case with similar Manual Order Events.[1008]

The Commission agrees with the Participants that inclusion of the time of an allocation as part of the data submitted in the Allocation Report is reasonable to help detect abuse that may occur if executions are allocated among subaccounts at the same time. For example, the Commission believes that the time of allocation will assist regulators in assessing regulatory issues that might arise in the allocation process, such as ''cherry-picking'' (systematically favoring one customer over another in connection with specific allocation decisions).[1009] Currently, investigations of potential cherry-picking require a manual, data-intensive process. The Commission believes that having access to data with the time of allocations should improve regulators' ability to spot potential abuses and assess the prevalence of allocation practices industry-wide.[1010] The Commission also believes that data with the time of allocations could assist in examining whether broker-dealers are making allocations in accordance with their policies and procedures.

With regard to the appropriate level of granularity for the timestamps on Allocation Reports, the Commission agrees with the Participants that, given the manual nature of the allocation process, a timestamp granularity of one second is appropriate and would not reduce the regulatory value of the information. The Commission also believes that the clock synchronization standard for Business Clocks that capture the time of an allocation need only be to the second. This approach is consistent with the approach for Manual Order Events. The Commission does not believe that the regulatory benefit of requiring allocation times to be recorded in milliseconds (compared to seconds) and clock synchronization to 50 milliseconds (compared to one second) justifies the costs at this time.[1011]

Accordingly, the Commission is amending Section 6.8(a)(ii) and (b) of the Plan to permit the Business Clocks used solely for the time of allocation on Allocation Reports to be synchronized to no less than within one second of the time maintained by the NIST and the time of allocation on an Allocation Report to the second.

e. Market Maker Quotes

Under the CAT NMS Plan, market maker quotations in Listed Options need to be reported as Reportable Events to the Central Repository only by the applicable Options Exchange [1012] and not by the Options Market Maker.[1013] However, under the Plan: (1) An Options Market Maker must submit to the relevant Options Exchange, along with any quotation, or any modification or cancellation thereof, the time it sent such message to the Options Exchange (''Quote Sent Time''); and (2) Options Exchanges must submit the Quote Sent Time received from Options Market Makers, along with the applicable message, to the Central Repository without change.[1014]

The requirements for reporting Options Market Maker quotes in the Plan differ from the requirements in Rule 613(c)(7), which provide that the CAT NMS Plan must require each CAT Reporter to record and electronically report to the Central Repository details for each order and each reportable event, including the routing and modification or cancellation of an order.[1015] Rule 613(j)(8) defines ''order'' to include ''any bid or offer;'' so that the details for each Options Market Maker quotation must be reported to the Central Repository by both the Options Market Maker and the Options Exchange to which it routes its quote.[1016]

In the Exemption Request, the Participants noted that requiring the applicable Options Exchange to report market maker quotations to the Central Repository would not degrade the reliability or accuracy of the CAT Data, or its security and confidentiality.[1017] Further, the Participants stated that the proposed approach would not have an adverse effect on the ways in which, and purposes for which, regulators would use, access, and analyze the CAT Data.[1018] The Participants included a cost-benefit analysis of options data reporting approaches in support of the Exemption Request.[1019] This analysis noted that the volume of options market maker quotes would be larger than any other category of data to be reported to the Central Repository, generating approximately 18 billion daily records, and that requiring duplicative reporting of this large amount of data would lead to a substantial increase in costs.[1020] The Participants argued in their cost-benefit analysis that eliminating the requirement of Rule 613(c)(7) that both Options Market Makers and Options Exchanges report nearly identical quotation data to the Central Repository would have the potential effect of reducing the projected capacity and other technological requirements of the Central Repository, which could result in significant cost savings.[1021]

A few commenters expressed support for the provisions of the CAT NMS Plan regarding the reporting of Market Maker Quotations in Listed Options.[1022] One of these commenters stated that permitting only Option Exchanges to report Options Market Maker quote information, instead of both Options Market Makers and Options Exchanges, would not affect the completeness, timeliness, accuracy, security or confidentiality of CAT Data, and would

---

The cost analysis concluded that the cost to the industry of reporting timestamps on allocations to the millisecond with a clock offset of 50 milliseconds would be $88,775,000. The cost estimate is discussed further in the economic analysis. *See* Section V.F.3.a(4), *infra.*

[1007] Response Letter I at 37.

[1008] *Id.* at 37–38. Similarly, the Participants also suggested that the Plan be amended to permit Industry Members to synchronize their Business Clocks used solely for reporting of the time of allocation to within one second of NIST, instead of 50 milliseconds. *Id.*

[1009] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section I.e(2).

[1010] The Commission does not believe that the alternative suggested by one commenter, comparing the average execution price on the allocation to the market price when the allocation was submitted and looking for excess profits and losses, would be nearly as effective, given that the time of the actual allocation would not be available.

[1011] As discussed in the economic analysis, the Commission believes that requiring a one-second timestamp instead of a one-millisecond timestamp for the allocation on Allocation Reports could save $44 million in implementation costs and $5 million in annual ongoing costs. *See* Section V.H.5, *infra.*

[1012] As used in the CAT NMS Plan, ''Options Exchange'' means a registered national securities exchange or automated trading facility of a registered securities association that trades Listed Options. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[1013] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.4(d)(iii). As used in the CAT NMS Plan, ''Options Market Maker'' means a broker-dealer registered with an exchange for the purpose of making markets in options contracts traded on the exchange. *See id.* at Section 1.1.

[1014] *Id.*

[1015] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(7).

[1016] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(j)(8).

[1017] *See* Exemption Request, *supra* note 21, at 8.

[1018] *Id.* at 7.

[1019] *Id.* at 6–7.

[1020] *Id.*

[1021] *Id.* at 7.

[1022] FIF Letter at 62–64; TR Letter at 8; *see also* DAG Letter at 2; STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's Exemptive Request Letter recommendations).

result in a cost savings.[1023] One commenter suggested that equities market maker quotes should be handled in the same manner as Options Market Maker quotes.[1024]

Another commenter, however, suggested that providing an exemption to Options Market Makers for reporting Options Market Maker quotes could be ''detrimental to achieving the objective of capturing 'complete audit trails' of all the market activities.'' [1025] The commenter believed that exempting Options Market Makers from reporting their quotes to the CAT risked ''overly discounted/distorted signals'' for market surveillance and manipulation detection purposes.[1026]

In their response, the Participants disagreed that requiring only the Options Exchanges to report market maker quotations to the Central Repository would be detrimental to the CAT.[1027] The Participants noted that all data that would otherwise be reported by Options Market Makers will still be reported, including Quote Sent Time. The only difference between the requirement under Rule 613 and the approach in the Plan is the reporting party.[1028]

With regard to the commenter that suggested equities market maker quotes should be handled in the same manner as Options Market Maker quotes, the Participants explained that they focused on Options Market Makers because of the significant volume of quotes they produce.[1029] The Participants stated that the volume of equities market maker quotes is much smaller than the volume of options market maker quotes, noting that there are far fewer quote updates for every trade in the equities markets, with an approximate average ratio of quotes to trades of 18 to 1 in the equities markets as compared to ratio of 8,634 to 1 for options.[1030]

The Commission believes the proposed approach is reasonable in providing the same regulatory benefits as would be achieved under Rule 613, at a reduced cost and implementation burden on CAT Reporters. The Commission notes that the information that Options Market Makers report to Options Exchanges must be reported to the Central Repository without change, and the information that regulators would receive if Options Market Makers reported their quotation information to the Central Repository would be identical to the information that they will receive under the requirements of the CAT NMS Plan. Therefore, there will be no degradation to the audit trail. The Commission disagrees with the comment that signals for market surveillance and manipulation detection purposes could be distorted if Options Market Makers are not required to report their quotation information [1031] because the exact information that the Options Market Makers would report to the CAT will be reported on their behalf by the Options Exchanges. The Commission acknowledges the commenter who recommended that equity market makers also be exempt from reporting their quotes to the CAT, but does not believe that it is appropriate at this time to grant such an exemption. As noted above, equity market makers produce significantly fewer quotes that Options Market Makers, and the Commission has not been presented with evidence that reporting equity market maker quotes is unduly burdensome.[1032]

f. Data Elements Not Included in the CAT

One commenter recommended a re-examination of the data elements to be collected in the CAT NMS Plan, and questioned whether a ''more broad and complete audit trail'' is needed.[1033] This commenter recommended that the CAT include data on the settlement of securities transactions (*i.e.,* post-execution) from the DTCC and NSCC, short sale information, including lending/borrowing information and pre-execution short sale locate data, and creation/redemption information for Exchange Traded Funds (''ETFs'').[1034]

In response to the commenter, the Participants described how the CAT NMS Plan aligns with the scope of required elements in Rule 613. The Participants generally expressed their view that the potential benefit of requiring additional elements, such as settlement information, lending/borrowing information, short sale locate data,[1035] and ETF creation/redemption data,[1036] would be outweighed by the design and implementation costs at this time.[1037] The Participants committed generally to assess whether additional information should be reported to the CAT in the future.[1038]

The Commission notes that, with regard to a locate identifier on short sales, data could be readily obtained from a follow-up request to a broker-dealer if the other data required to be reported to the CAT, particularly the information relating to the customer behind the order, is included in the consolidated audit trail. [1039] With regard to lending/borrowing information, the Commission understands that some of this data can be obtained through private sources, such as service providers. The Participants stated that they do not believe that the benefits of including this information in the CAT justify the costs for requiring them to be reported. The Commission similarly believes that it is not necessary to require this information in CAT. With regard to the inclusion of information on ETF creations and redemptions, the Commission agrees with the Participants that the relevant market participants may not be included in the current scope of CAT Reporters. Therefore, the Commission is not amending the Plan to include these data elements in the CAT at this time. Nor is it amending the Plan to include information on the settlement of securities transactions from DTCC and NSCC in the CAT, as it would require participation by entities not currently party to the CAT NMS Plan, and the regulatory benefits to the Participants and the Commission would not, at this time, justify the costs.

The Commission appreciates the commenter's perspective that additional data elements may offer some regulatory benefit. However, neither Rule 613 nor the CAT NMS Plan proposed including such data elements. After considering the comments, the Commission believes that it is reasonable to not mandate the reporting of new data elements to the

[1023] FIF Letter at 64–65.

[1024] *Id.* at 65–66.

[1025] Data Boiler Letter at 25.

[1026] *Id.*

[1027] Response Letter I at 36.

[1028] *Id.*

[1029] *Id.*

[1030] *Id.* (noting that this is an approximation based on the equities SIP data from the Consolidated Tape Association/Consolidated Quotation System and UTP Plans from June 2014 to June 2016).

[1031] Data Boiler Letter at 25.

[1032] The Commission notes that, when considering whether to require Options Market Makers to report their quotes to the Central Repository, the Commission was provided a detailed cost analysis of the savings that would result if Options Market Makers were not required to directly report their quote information to the Central Repository.

[1033] Anonymous Letter I at 1, 3; *see also* Anonymous Letter I at 9–15 (stating that CAT Reporters should include ATSs, internalizers, ELPs, clearing firms, the Depository Trust and Clearing Corporation (''DTCC''), National Securities Clearing Corporation (''NSCC'')).

[1034] Anonymous Letter I at 6.

[1035] The Participants noted the definition of Material Terms of the Order includes whether an order is short or short exempt. Response Letter I at 26.

[1036] The Participants explained that the processes involved in the ETF creations and redemptions are distinct from those used for transactions in NMS securities, and may involve parties that are not CAT Reporters. Response Letter I at 25–26.

[1037] Response Letter I at 26.

[1038] *Id.* at 25.

[1039] *See* Proposing Release, *supra* note 14, at 32574.

CAT at this time. The Commission does not believe that the benefits to the Commission and Participants justify the cost for requiring additional data elements to be reported. The Commission or the Participants may consider additional data elements in the future.

5. Symbology

The CAT NMS Plan requires CAT Reporters to report data using the listing exchange's symbology. The CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to create and maintain a symbol history and mapping table, as well as provide a tool for regulators and CAT Reporters showing a security's complete symbol history, along with a start-of-day and end-of-day list of reportable securities for use by CAT Reporters.[1040]

Three commenters objected to the Plan requiring listing exchange symbology to be used by CAT Reporters.[1041] One commenter recommended that CAT Reporters be permitted to use the symbology standard they currently use and that the Central Repository should be responsible for normalizing the various standards.[1042] The commenter stated that while it does not expect that allowing CAT Reporters to use existing symbology would result in a large cost savings, it believes that use of existing symbology would reduce errors.[1043]

Another commenter expressed the view that it would be costly to use the listing exchange's symbology for reporting to the CAT and instead advocated for a standardized nomenclature or symbology across the markets, stating that without a standardized data nomenclature, the integration of a data reporting system and surveillance will be significantly more difficult.[1044] The commenter suggested use of a uniform, global, open, multi-asset identifier, such as the Financial Instrument Global Identifier (''FIGI''), a product developed by Bloomberg LP.[1045] The commenter stated that use of a standard with the characteristics of FIGI would simplify cross-asset surveillance, lower error rates and potentially lower symbology licensing costs.[1046]

The Participants responded that the Plan required CAT Reporters to submit data to the CAT using the listing exchange symbology based on their understanding of current reporting practices.[1047] The Participants noted that Industry Members use solutions and systems that allow them to translate symbology into the correct format of the listing exchange when submitting data to exchanges or regulatory reporting systems, such as OATS and Electronic Blue Sheets (''EBS'').[1048] The Participants further noted that all CAT Reporters subject to OATS or EBS reporting requirements use the symbology of the listing exchange when submitting such reports.[1049] Accordingly, the Participants did not agree with the comment that advocated adopting a new symbology approach, concluding that it would add significant cost and complexity for the industry.[1050] The Participants also noted that permitting CAT Reporters to use symbology other than the listing exchange symbology, and having the Plan Processor translate the symbology of different CAT Reporters to the listing exchange symbology, would require each CAT Reporter to submit regular mapping symbology information to the CAT, thereby increasing the complexity and the likelihood for errors in the CAT.[1051] The Participants stated that the requirement to use exchange symbology is the most efficient, cost-effective and least error-prone approach.[1052] The Participants, however, acknowledged that the Plan Processor may, in the future, determine whether the use of a standardized symbology, other than listing exchange symbology, would be appropriate.[1053]

The Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan's requirement that CAT Reporters report data using the listing exchange's symbol is reasonable. The Commission agrees with the Participants that allowing each CAT Reporter to determine its reporting symbology would impose burdens on, and add complexity for, the Plan Processor by requiring each CAT Reporter to regularly submit to the Plan Processor symbology mappings. Additionally, the Commission believes that using existing symbology may reduce errors, as noted by the Participants. The Commission also understands, based on the Participants' representations, that CAT Reporters that report to OATS and EBS today already have the ability to translate to the listing exchange's symbology.

6. Security of CAT Data

The CAT NMS Plan requires that the Plan Processor develop and, with the prior approval of the Operating Committee, implement, policies, procedures and control structures related to the security of the CAT System.[1054] Appendices C and D describe the general security requirements for CAT data and outline minimum data security requirements that the Plan Processor must meet.[1055]

a. CAT Information Security Program Details

Several commenters believed that the CAT NMS Plan did not provide enough details regarding the security and confidentiality of CAT Data. One commenter noted that ''explicit language indicating requirements for overall security of data transmission and storage, rather than suggestions, should be included in the finalized CAT requirements.'' [1056] Another commenter stated that the Plan does not provide enough granular details related to actual controls, service levels, and technical support that will be implemented by the Plan Processor.[1057] Similarly, another commenter stated that the CAT NMS Plan lacks proper guidance concerning

[1040] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 2.

[1041] FIF Letter at 95; Bloomberg Letter at 5–6; Data Boiler Letter at 36 (recommending the use of multiple formats and favoring use of ''existing market practices/processes'').

[1042] FIF Letter at 95.

[1043] *Id.* The commenter also requested clarity on what symbology would be used for options. *Id.* This comment was not addressed by the Participants.

[1044] Bloomberg Letter at 5.

[1045] *Id.* at 6.

[1046] *Id.*

[1047] Response Letter II at 7.

[1048] Response Letter III at 13.

[1049] Response Letter II at 7 (citing OATS Reporting Technical Specifications (September 12, 2016), *available at http://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/TechSpec_9122016.pdf*. (requiring data to be reported using symbol format published by primary listing exchange for listed securities).

[1050] *Id.* The Plan requires the Participants to provide the Plan Processor with issue symbol information, and the Plan Processor to maintain a complete symbology database, including historical symbology. In addition, issue symbol validation must be included in the processing of data submitted by CAT Reporters. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.1(a); Appendix D, Section 2.

[1051] *Id.*

[1052] Response Letter II at 7.

[1053] The Participants noted, based on conversations with the DAG and as noted by one commenter, certain industry messaging formats, such as some exchange binary formats, require symbology other than the primary listing exchange symbology. *Id.*

[1054] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.1(c); *see also* Sections III.26 and III.27, *supra.*

[1055] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C and D.

[1056] SIFMA Letter at 20; *see also* ICI Letter at 4 (stating that ''despite the highly sensitive nature of the data captured by the CAT, the proposed CAT NMS plan provides only vague details about the information security provisions for the CAT. . . . [W]e understand that certain details of the plan processor's information security program must remain confidential, but the proposed CAT NMS plan sets too low of a bar for information security'').

[1057] FSR Letter at 6; *see also* TR letter at 8 (seeking clarification on the service levels and liability that will be associated with data transfers between CAT Reporters and the CAT Processor, and how information security will be addressed with customer service staff at the Plan Processor that will assist CAT Reporters with troubleshooting).

the requirements for security and confidentiality controls of the CAT System regarding, for example, network security, firewalls, systems management and library controls, IT personnel access to the CAT System and data, system logs and archives.[1058] One commenter ''urg[ed] the SEC to require the SROs to share more detailed information on [data loss prevention, business continuity plans and cyber incident response plans] as a Plan Processor is selected and the Central Repository is built.'' [1059] Other commenters suggested that certain market participants be provided another opportunity to provide feedback on the security controls, policies and procedures that will be adopted by the Plan Processor.[1060] Another commenter supported having an information security officer be responsible for regular updates of the documents and processes, breach identification, and management and processes for periodic penetration tests of all applications.[1061]

In response to commenters that requested more detail regarding the security controls for CAT Data, the Participants noted that in the Adopting Release for Rule 613, the Commission stated that ''an outline or overview description of the policies and procedures that would be implemented under the NMS plan submitted to the Commission for its consideration would be sufficient to satisfy the requirement of the Rule.'' [1062] The Participants also reiterated the position of the Commission at the time of adoption of Rule 613 that ''it is important for the NMS plan submitted to the Commission to establish the fundamental framework of these policies and procedures, but recognizes the utility of allowing the plan sponsors flexibility to subsequently delineate them in greater detail with the ability to make modifications as needed.'' [1063] The Participants noted that Section 6.12 of the CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to develop and maintain a comprehensive information security program for the Central Repository, to be approved and reviewed at least annually by the Operating Committee.[1064]

The Participants also referred to Appendix D of the Plan, which discusses the fundamental framework of this program, including: (1) Appropriate solutions and controls to ensure data confidentiality and security during all communications between CAT Reporters and Data Submitters and the Plan Processor, data extraction, manipulation and transformation, loading to and from the Central Repository and data maintenance by the CAT System; (2) security controls for data retrieval and query reports by Participants and the SEC; and (3) appropriate tools, logging, auditing and access controls for all components of the CAT System.[1065] The Participants further noted the Plan provisions addressing: (1) The physical assets and personnel of the CAT; (2) training of all persons who have access to the Central Repository; (3) encryption; (4) remote access to the CAT System; (5) the handling of PII; (6) data storage (including penetration testing and third party audits); (7) access to PII and other CAT Data; breach management; and (8) the minimum industry standards that must be followed by the Plan Processor in developing and implementing the security and confidentiality policies and procedures for the Plan.[1066] The Participants also provided a high level description of the security requirements for the CAT System, which described the architecture controls, program level controls, and data usage and regulator controls applicable to the CAT.[1067] Notably, the Participants also stated that they believe that ''publicly releasing too many details about the data security and information policies and procedures of the CAT System presents its own security concerns and is not advisable.'' [1068]

The Participants stated that they do not believe that market participants such as experts from Industry Members should be permitted to review and provide feedback on the security controls, policies and procedures of the Plan Processor because each Bidder already has provided information on the various security issues discussed in the Plan and as a result, the Plan Processor will have sufficient information from which to formulate appropriate data security and information policies and procedures.[1069] The Participants added that data security policies and procedures of the Plan Processor will be subject to the review and approval of the Operating Committee, which will seek the views of the Advisory Committee.[1070] Therefore, the Participants do not believe that it is necessary to allow Industry Members to separately review the security controls, policies and procedures of the Plan Processor.[1071]

The Participants also provided additional details concerning certain security controls and protocols required of the Plan Processor. Specifically, the Participants noted that the Plan Processor must establish a penetration testing protocol and that the Participants generally would expect penetration testing to occur following major changes to system architecture (*e.g.,* changes in the network segmentation, major system upgrades, or installation of new management level applications), or when other specific new threats are identified.[1072] The Participants also provided additional detail clarifying their threat monitoring program and stated that they expect that the Plan Processor will ''adhere to industry practice for an infrastructure initiative such as the CAT, and, therefore, the Plan Processor will provide 24x7 operational monitoring, including monitoring and alerting for any potential security issues across the entire CAT environment.'' [1073] Related to threat monitoring, the Participants noted that the CISO also is required to establish policies and procedures to address imminent threats.[1074] Specifically, the Participants stated that they expect the CISO to establish procedures for addressing security threats that require immediate action to prevent security threats to the CAT Data.[1075]

The Commission fully recognizes the importance of maintaining the security of the CAT Data and the need to have sufficient information regarding the policies, procedures and control structures that will be adopted by the Plan Processor that will apply to the security of the CAT Data. The Commission also reiterates its view, as set forth in the Adopting Release and as noted by the Participants in their response, that an outline or overview description of the policies and procedures that would be implemented by the Plan Processor regarding data

[1058] FIF Letter at 131–132.

[1059] Fidelity Letter at 4.

[1060] One commenter, for example, suggested that experts from Industry Members be permitted to review and provide feedback on the security controls, policies and procedures of the Plan Processor. FIF Letter at 130. Another suggested that market participants be provided an opportunity to comment on these important details. Fidelity Letter at 4.

[1061] UnaVista Letter at 5.

[1062] Response Letter I at 53–54 (citing Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45782).

[1063] Response Letter I at 53–54 (citing Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45782).

[1064] *Id.*

[1065] Response Letter I at 54.

[1066] *Id.*

[1067] *Id.*

[1068] *Id.*

[1069] Response Letter I at 55.

[1070] *Id.*

[1071] *Id.*

[1072] Response Letter III at 7.

[1073] *Id.*

[1074] Response Letter III at 8.

[1075] *Id.*

security satisfies the requirements of Rule 613 and that it is reasonable for additional detail about the controls, policies and procedures applicable to the CAT's information security program to be determined and published after the Plan Processor is selected, including through the CAT's Technical Specifications, which will be publicly available.[1076] The Commission also shares the concerns articulated by the Participants that publicly releasing too many details about the technical security requirements, tools and techniques of the CAT NMS Plan could invite exploitation. The Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan must strike a balance between setting out the fundamental framework for the security of the CAT Data while maintaining the ability of the Plan Processor to adopt additional security parameters as it sees fit, some of which the Plan Processor may not want to make public.

The Commission has considered the security provisions in the CAT NMS Plan and finds that a reasonable level of detail regarding the security and confidentiality controls has been provided in the CAT NMS Plan. However, the Commission expects that the Participants will require the Plan Processor to continuously monitor the information security program of the CAT to ensure that it is consistent with the highest industry standards for the protection of data, and to proactively implement appropriate changes to the security program to guard against any unauthorized intrusions or breaches of the Plan Processor's data security protocols and protections. The Commission also expects that, when the Plan Processor is chosen, the Plan Processor will provide more detail about the specific security requirements and attendant obligations placed on the Participants, including through the issuance of Technical Specifications, which will be publicly available; more explicit language indicating requirements for overall security of data transmission and storage; more granularity related to actual controls and service levels; and more details about the technical support that will be implemented by the Plan Processor. The Commission also notes that, as discussed in Section IV.H, the Commission is amending Section 6.6 of the Plan to require that the Participants provide the Commission with an annual evaluation of the information security program to ensure that the program is consistent with the highest industry standards for the protection of data.[1077]

The Commission also believes that, based on the CAT NMS Plan and the Participants' response, a reasonable level of detail and explicit requirements regarding the overall security of data transmission, storage, service levels, and technical support has been provided.[1078] Similarly, the Commission believes that the Plan adequately addresses network security, firewalls, systems management, data loss prevention, business continuity plans and cyber incident response plans.[1079] In response to the commenters that requested that market participants such as experts from Industry Members be permitted to review and provide feedback on the security controls, policies and procedures of the Plan Processor, the Commission believes that such review and feedback is not necessary, particularly in light of input by the Advisory Committee.

In response to the commenter that supported having an information security officer be responsible for regular updates of the documents and processes, breach identification, and management and processes for periodic penetration tests of all applications, the Commission notes that the Plan provides for a CISO who has a broad range of responsibilities regarding the security of the CAT Data.

b. Security Standards for the CAT System

Several commenters put forth various industry security standards that should be adopted by the Plan Processor. One commenter stated that if the CAT System operates using a cloud infrastructure, the CAT should employ a cloud provider rated for security via the Cloud Controls Matrix from the Cloud Security Alliance.[1080] This commenter further recommended that the CAT ''be subject to existing data security and privacy standards like Regulation P [Annual Privacy Notice Requirement under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act], FISMA [Federal Information Security Management Act] and FedRAMP [Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program].'' [1081] One commenter stated that steps should be taken to ensure proper controls are in place to protect the data throughout its lifecycle using secure, authenticated and industry-accepted encryption mechanisms.[1082] Another commenter recommended the use of ''pre-defined extract templates and uniform global formats such as ISO [International Organization for Standardization] 2002.'' [1083] One commenter stated that at a minimum, connection to CAT infrastructure should be protected by transport layer security/secure sockets layer (''TLS/SSL'') through a secure tunnel.[1084] Another commenter suggested that the CAT NMS Plan employ the cybersecurity framework developed by NIST and the cybersecurity assessment tool created by the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (''FFIEC'').[1085]

One commenter noted the need for an ongoing assessment of the risks associated with the CAT System and data to meet the NIST industry standards referenced in the Plan.[1086] In discussing the confidentiality and sensitivity of CAT Data, a commenter noted that ''[t]he emphasis shouldn't be favoring on [sic] a particular prescribed standard . . . but the key is: CAT needs independence [sic] privacy and security assessment at regular intervals. The assessment will include: Vulnerability scan and identifying system nuisances that can cause or already caused privacy and security issues.'' [1087]

With respect to the industry standards applicable to the CAT System, in their response, the Participants noted that at the outset of operation of the CAT, the Plan Processor will adopt all relevant standards from the NIST Cyber Security Framework, NIST 800.53 or ISO 27001 that would be appropriate to apply to the Plan Processor.[1088] The Participants added that because industry standards may evolve over time, the Participants will require that the CAT's security program align with current industry standards and best practices as they evolve in the future.[1089] To this end, the Plan requires that the Plan Processor's information security program be reviewed at least annually by the Operating Committee.[1090]

Regarding security standards applicable to the Participants that access

[1076] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.9(a).

[1077] *See* Section IV.H, *supra.*

[1078] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.1(b) (discussing the manner in which the Central Repository will receive, extract, transform, load, and retain data); Section 6.10(c) (discussing the CAT user Help Desk).

[1079] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4 (Data Security); Section 5 (Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery).

[1080] SIFMA Letter at 21.

[1081] *Id.*

[1082] FSI Letter at 5 (citing to Government Accountability Office, High-Risk Series: An Update, GAO–15–290 at 235 (Feb. 2016)).

[1083] UnaVista Letter at 4.

[1084] FIF Letter at 133.

[1085] ICI Letter at 5.

[1086] FIF Letter at 130–31.

[1087] Data Boiler Letter at 29.

[1088] Response Letter III at 5.

[1089] *Id.*

[1090] *Id.*

CAT Data, the Participants noted that the Plan requires the Participants to ''establish, maintain and enforce written policies and procedures reasonably designed . . . to ensure the confidentiality of the CAT Data obtained from the Central Repository.'' [1091] The Participants stated that ''such policies and procedures will be subject to Reg SCI and oversight by the SEC.'' [1092] Moreover, in their response, the Participants stated that ''[i]n the event that relevant standards evolve, the proposed Plan also requires that ''[e]ach Participant shall periodically review the effectiveness of the policies and procedures . . . and take prompt action to remedy deficiencies in such policies and procedures.'' [1093]

In response to the commenters that believed that an ongoing assessment of the risks associated with the CAT System and data should meet the NIST standards in the Plan, the Participants stated that they agree that the CAT System should be regularly assessed for security risks,[1094] and that the Operating Committee must conduct an annual review of the Plan Processor's information security program.[1095] The Participants further noted that Section 6.2(a)(v)(C) of the Plan provides that the CCO, in collaboration with the CISO, will retain independent third parties with appropriate data security expertise to review and audit on an annual basis the policies, procedures, standards and real-time tools that monitor and address data security issues for the Plan Processor and the Central Repository.[1096]

In response to the commenter that believed that the Plan Processor should be FedRAMP certified, the Participants stated that they do not believe that the Plan Processor should be required to be certified FedRAMP.[1097] The Participants stated that requiring FedRAMP certification could limit the portions of each cloud provider's solutions that each Bidder may access, while also increasing costs for the CAT. The Participants stated that furthermore, FedRAMP certification itself does not provide for additional security controls beyond those contained in the NIST standards, but rather focuses on providing a certification and evaluation process for government applications.[1098] Moreover, the Participants believe that the security controls required in the Plan and proposed by the Bidders, as well as those provided by the Bidders' cloud providers, are robust and would not be materially enhanced by requiring them to be FedRAMP certified.[1099] The Participants also pointed out that regular independent third party audits, as required by the Plan, also would help to ensure the security of the CAT and any cloud solutions in use.[1100]

The Commission notes that Appendix D of the Plan addresses the security standards applicable to the CAT System. Specifically, Section 4.2 of Appendix D of the CAT NMS Plan, as proposed, states that ''[t]he following industry standards, at a minimum, must be followed as such standards and requirements may be replaced by successor publications, or modified, amended, or supplemented and as approved by the Operating Committee (in the event of a conflict between standards, the more stringent standard shall apply, subject to the approval of the Operating Committee).'' [1101] The Plan then lists several NIST standards (*e.g.,* NIST 800), FFIEC's ''Authentication Best Practices,'' and ISO/IEC 27001's ''Information Security Management. Appendix D, Section 4.2, as proposed, also states that the CAT LLC shall join the Financial Services-Information Sharing and Analysis Center (''FS–ISAC'') and comparable bodies as the Operating Committee may determine.

Moreover, in the Commission's view, the Participants' commitment in their response that, at the outset of the operation of CAT, the Plan Processor will adhere to the relevant standards from the NIST Cyber Security Framework is a reasonable step toward ensuring a robust security information program. At this time, the Commission believes that the NIST Cyber Security Framework provides a reliable and comprehensive approach to cybersecurity risks and threats, and helps to ensure that the Plan Processor will be abiding by appropriately rigorous industry standards to help identify, protect, detect, respond and recover from cyberattacks, whether internal or external, domestic or international. Accordingly, the Commission is amending Appendix D, Section 4.2 of the CAT NMS Plan to add the requirement that Plan Processor will adhere to the NIST Cyber Security Framework in its entirety.[1102] The Commission believes that adherence to the standards of the NIST Cyber Security Framework provides a reasonable approach to ensuring that security standards applicable to the CAT System will reflect high industry standards regarding the protection of CAT Data.

In light of the Participants' commitment and ongoing requirement to adhere to the NIST Cyber Security Framework—which will address the security of the CAT cloud provided by the Plan Processor—and the limitations that FedRAMP certification might impose on the cloud provider's solutions that each bidder might access should the bidder be chosen as the Plan Processor, the Commission believes that it is reasonable to not require that the Plan Processor be FedRAMP certified. In addition, the Commission believes that it is reasonable to allow the Plan Processor to evaluate whether it should adhere to the data security and privacy standards like Regulation P, FISMA and ISO 2002, and whether the connection to the CAT infrastructure should be protected by TLS/SSL.

The Commission also notes that in their response, the Participants stated that with respect to partnerships with other private or public organizations and information sharing entities, the Participants do not intend to restrict the CAT LLC's partnership only to the FS–ISAC; the Participants stated that the CAT LLC may seek to join other industry groups such as the National Cyber-Forensic & Training Alliance, the Department of Homeland Security's National Cybersecurity & Communications Integration Center, or other reputable cyber and information security alliances.[1103] The Commission believes the Participants have appropriately clarified that the provisions in Appendix D, Section 4.2 of the Plan listing the other organizations that the CAT LLC may join was not intended to be an exclusive list because the provision explicitly states that the CAT LLC shall endeavor

[1091] Response Letter III at 8.

[1092] *Id.*

[1093] Response Letter III at 8.

[1094] Response Letter I at 61.

[1095] Response Letter III at 5.

[1096] Response Letter I at 61.

[1097] Response Letter III at 5.

[1098] Response Letter III at 5.

[1099] Response Letter III at 5–6.

[1100] *Id.*

[1101] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.2.

[1102] The Commission notes that, in contrast to the Participants' response, the Commission is amending the Plan without limitation to only ''relevant standards'' because the Commission believes that the NIST Cyber Security Framework already provides flexibility to ensure only relevant standards apply, and without specific reference to NIST 800–53 or ISO 27001. The Commission also is amending Appendix D, Section 4.2 of the Plan to clarify that the listed industry standards are not intended to be an exclusive list. The Commission believes this amendment is appropriate to clarify that the Participants may adhere to additional industry standards.

[1103] Response Letter III at 6–7.

to join other ''comparable bodies as the Operating Committee may determine.''

c. CAT User Access Administration

Many commenters discussed issues related to the administration of CAT users. One commenter stated that ''[a]ppropriate policies and procedures should be in place for user access administration, including provisioning of administrators, user data management, password management and audit of user access management.'' [1104] Another commenter noted the need to train employees and contractors with access to CAT Data on how to maintain the security and confidentiality of the data,[1105] while another commenter supported the establishment of processes to prevent access to sensitive data by any individuals who have not attended compliance training.[1106] One commenter stated that persons authorized to access CAT Data should have comprehensive background checks.[1107]

Other commenters discussed the password authentication procedures in the CAT NMS Plan that are meant to ensure that CAT Data is only accessed by credentialed personnel. One commenter stated that all persons with access to the CAT System should have their access secured via multi-factor authentication as prescribed in OMB Memorandum M–06–16.[1108] Another commenter suggested leveraging any authentication procedures at the entity that employs a person seeking access to CAT Data, stating that this approach would also allow for automated deactivation of users that leave the CAT Reporter or Participant.[1109]

In its response to commenters, the Participants noted the provisions in Appendix D of the Plan that require the Plan Processor to develop and maintain policies and procedures reasonably designed to prevent, detect and mitigate the impact of unauthorized access or usage of data in the Central Repository.[1110] The Participants further noted that the Plan requires that such policies and procedures include, at a minimum, (1) information barriers governing access to and usage of data in the Central Repository; (2) monitoring processes to detect unauthorized access to or usage of data in the Central Repository; and (3) escalation procedures in the event that unauthorized access to or usage of data is detected.[1111] The Participants also note that the Plan requires that passwords be stored according to industry best practices and recovered by secure channels, and that all logins will be subject to MFA.[1112] The Participants further note that the Plan Processor will have discretion to consider additional controls on user access in formulating the data security policies and procedures for the CAT System, including, without limitation, deactivating users who have not accessed the CAT System for a specified period of time.[1113]

The Commission believes that monitoring the access to CAT to ensure that only authorized persons are allowed to access the CAT System and CAT Data is critical to ensuring the security of CAT Data. The Commission agrees with the Participants that the requirements set out in Appendix D, and other provisions of the CAT NMS Plan, provide a reasonable outline of CAT user access administration (including provisioning of administrators) in general, as well as user data management and password management.[1114]

In response to specific commenters that believed that only individuals with appropriate training should be permitted access to CAT Data, Section 6.1(m) of the Plan states that ''[t]he Plan Processor shall develop and, with the prior approval of the Operating Committee, implement a training program, which will be made available to all individuals who have access to the Central Repository on behalf of the Participants or the SEC prior to such individuals being granted access to the Central Repository, that addresses the security and confidentiality of all information accessible from the CAT, as well as the operational risks associated with accessing the Central Repository.'' [1115] Appendix D of the Plan also states that the Plan Processor must provide to the Operating Committee a comprehensive security plan that covers all components of the CAT System, including physical assets and personnel, and the training of all persons who have access to the Central Repository consistent with Article VI, Section 6.1(m).[1116] Thus, the Commission believes that these Plan provisions, taken together, indicate that the Plan Processor will require that all persons that have access to CAT Data will be required to complete training prior to accessing CAT Data, and expects that only those persons that have been adequately trained will have access to CAT Data.

In response to the commenter that stated that persons authorized to access CAT Data should have comprehensive background checks, the Commission notes that the Plan provides that ''in addition to other policies, procedures and standards generally applicable to the Plan Processor's employees and contractors, the Plan Processor shall have hiring standards and shall conduct and enforce background checks (*e.g.,* fingerprint-based) for all of its employees and contractors to ensure the protection, safeguarding and security of the facilities, systems, networks, equipment and data of the CAT System. . . .'' [1117] While the Commission believes that this provision sets out a reasonable approach to background checks for employees and contractors of the Plan Processor, the Commission believes that such a requirement generally should extend to Participants with respect to all of their users that have access to CAT Data and therefore is amending the Plan to require that each Participant conduct background checks for its employees and contractors that will use the CAT System.[1118] The Commission believes that this amendment to the Plan is appropriate in order to ensure that only authorized and qualified persons are using the CAT System.

The Commission also notes that the Participants have represented that all logins must be secured by MFA, in response to commenters concerns that authentication procedures for CAT users should ensure that only credentialed persons are accessing the CAT Data. In addition, in response to commenters that expressed concerns about the password authentication procedures of the Plan Processor, the Commission

[1104] SIFMA Letter at 21.

[1105] ICI Letter at 9.

[1106] UnaVista Letter at 4.

[1107] FSR Letter at 5; FSI Letter at 5.

[1108] MFA Letter at 6.

[1109] SIFMA Letter at 21. This commenter also generally recommended automatic deactivation for users who do not access CAT for a specified period of time (*e.g.,* 6 months), or whose access is not re–confirmed by the entity who employs the person requesting CAT Data, or whose firm account has been deactivated. Additionally, the commenter stated that email addresses for CAT users should be immutable and should allow for change via administrative review workflow, and shared user IDs should be prohibited. *Id.*

[1110] Response Letter I at 55–56.

[1111] *Id.*

[1112] The Commission notes that certain provisions of the Plan appeared to require MFA only for access to PII. The Participants clarified in their response letter that MFA is required for all logins. Response Letter III at 6.

[1113] Response Letter I at 56.

[1114] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.4 (discussing an overview of access to CAT Data).

[1115] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.1(m).

[1116] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.

[1117] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.1(g).

[1118] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.4.

notes that the Plan addresses password guidelines such as, for example, the appropriate complexity of passwords and the recovery of lost passwords.[1119] The Commission also believes that the Plan does not prohibit the Plan Processor from considering an approach to authenticating a CAT user that would leverage the authentication procedures at the entity (either a Participant or CAT Reporter) that employs a person seeking access to CAT Data, as suggested by a commenter. The Commission believes these provisions, taken together, provide reasonable protections around CAT user administration.

Finally, with respect to another aspect of CAT user access administration, in their response the Participants noted that they do not believe that memoranda of understanding or similar agreements between the CAT LLC and the Participants are necessary since the Participants will be bound by both their participation in the Plan as well as the agreement between the CAT LLC and the Plan Processor.[1120] However, the Participants stated they believe that it is important that information regarding CAT Data usage, such as contact points and escalation procedures, be shared between the Plan Processor and the Participants; therefore, the Participants state they expect to establish such information sharing agreements between the Plan Processor and the Participants once the Plan Processor is chosen. Moreover, the Participants stated, they expect that one of the CISO's responsibilities would be to make sure that this information is captured and kept up to date appropriately.[1121]

The Commission notes that the Plan Processor has not yet been chosen and thus the execution of such memoranda is not appropriate at this time. However, the Commission believes that explicitly memorializing issues relating to CAT Data usage between the Plan Processor and each Participant would be beneficial to the operation of the CAT System.

The Commission also notes that, with respect to access, the CAT NMS Plan provides that the Plan Processor will provide to the Participants and the Commission access to the Representatives of the Plan Processor as any Participant or the Commission may *reasonably* request solely for the purpose of performing such Person's regulatory and oversight responsibilities pursuant to the federal securities laws, rules, and regulations or any contractual obligations.[1122] The Plan also provides that the Plan Processor will direct its Representatives to *reasonably* cooperate with any inquiry, investigation, or proceeding conducted by or on behalf of any Participant or the Commission related to such purpose.[1123] As filed, this provision would allow the Plan Processor to refuse access to the Commission and/or Participants upon its own determination of ''unreasonableness.'' The Commission believes that Commission or Participant requests for access to Representatives of the Plan Processor should be considered reasonable, absent other circumstances. It is therefore amending the Plan to delete the requirement that the access to Plan Processor Representatives be ''reasonable'' and that the Representatives of the Plan Processor only be required to ''reasonably'' cooperate with any inquiry, investigation, or proceeding conducted by or on behalf of the Commission. The Commission expects that, even without the ''reasonableness'' qualifier, it and the Participants will be reasonable in requesting access to the Representatives of the Plan Processor.

d. Downloading CAT Data By Regulators

Several commenters discussed the security risks associated with the downloading of CAT Data by regulators. One commenter argued that CAT Data should never be extracted, removed, duplicated, or copied from the CAT, noting that such practices would introduce additional risk and render even the most advanced security measures ineffective.[1124] Instead, this commenter recommended allowing data to be imported into a CAT query sub-system if surveillance is needed in conjunction with external data.[1125] Another commenter similarly noted the security risk associated with extracting data from the Central Repository and stated its preference for an approach ''where the data is accessible by the Regulators but the data is not extracted and stored outside the Central Repository, except for extraction of 'comparable' data that would facilitate exemption from duplicative reporting and retirement of high priority duplicative systems.'' [1126] This commenter added ''if combined datasets surveillance is needed (with data external to CAT), the SROs should be allowed to upload external SRO data to a sandbox environment within CAT, in order to enable combined surveillance.'' [1127]

Another commenter stated that the CAT NMS Plan's provision permitting the Commission and SROs to download entire data sets and analyze the data within the regulator's systems or the regulator's cloud, and the Plan's proposal to allow broker-dealers to ''verify certain data that they have submitted to the CAT,'' represent security risks to CAT Data that the SEC and SROs should avoid.[1128] This commenter further noted that having multiple points of access to CAT Data, and the ability to download CAT Data, raise ''significant cybersecurity concerns and outweigh the benefit of access to processed CAT [D]ata.'' [1129] Another commenter believed that CAT Data should remain in the Central Repository, but noted that if the Commission determines to permit the downloading of CAT Data, the CAT NMS Plan should only allow a user to download CAT Data if the information security measures available at the user's site equal or exceed those protecting the data at the Central Repository.[1130]

In response to commenters, the Participants noted that Rule 613 requires regulators to develop and implement a surveillance system, or enhance existing surveillance systems to make use of CAT Data.[1131] The Participants stated that regulators should have flexibility in designing such surveillance systems, including the ability to access and transfer data where necessary and consistent with appropriate data security safeguards.[1132] Such access must be via secure channels (*e.g.,* secure FTP, API or over encrypted lines) as required in the Plan.[1133] The Participants further noted that the Plan requires that Participants have appropriate policies and procedures in place to protect such data.[1134] Specifically, the Plan requires that Participants establish, maintain and enforce written policies and procedures reasonably designed to ensure the

[1119] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.4 (discussing an overview of the CAT password requirements).

[1120] Response Letter III at 8.

[1121] Response Letter III at 9.

[1122] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.1(u).

[1123] *Id.*

[1124] SIFMA Letter at 20; *see also* Data Boiler Letter at 26 (stating ''CAT should under ABSOLUTELY NO CIRCUMSTANCE (including BCP/DR) allow anyone the option of to download the 'entire' data sets, because this essentially opens a 'backdoor' to significant security risk.'').

[1125] SIFMA Letter at 20.

[1126] FIF Letter at 134.

[1127] *Id.*

[1128] Fidelity Letter at 4.

[1129] *Id.*

[1130] ICI Letter at 7.

[1131] Response Letter I at 56.

[1132] *Id.*

[1133] *Id.*

[1134] *Id.*

confidentiality of CAT Data.[1135] The Participants also stated that they believed that all regulators, including the Commission, should be obligated to establish security measures to protect the security and confidentiality of CAT Data for security purposes.[1136]

The Participants also noted that the CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to provide regulators with the ability to perform bulk data extraction and download of CAT Data.[1137] The Participants stated they continue to believe that permitting regulators to download order/transaction data from the Central Repository for regulatory use (*i.e.,* ''bulk data extracts'') is important for their regulatory purposes, and that eliminating or limiting bulk data extracts of the CAT Data may significantly and adversely impact the Participants' ability to effectively conduct surveillance of their markets using CAT Data. The Participants stated that they also plan to enrich their existing surveillance using bulk data extracts of CAT Data.[1138]

Regarding the security of extracted CAT Data, the Participants stated that they ''recognize the security concerns raised by bulk data extracts and any Participant-controlled systems (*e.g.,* Participant sandboxes residing in the Plan Processor's cloud or a Participant's local system) used to store and analyze such data extracts, but the Participants believe that requiring the Participants to adopt and enforce policies and procedures to address these security issues appropriately addresses these concerns without diminishing the surveillance benefits of the CAT.'' [1139] The Participants noted that the Plan requires the Participants to ''establish, maintain and enforce written policies and procedures reasonably designed . . . to ensure the confidentiality of the CAT Data obtained from the Central Repository.'' [1140] Accordingly, the Participants stated that Participants must have policies and procedures reasonably designed to ensure the confidentiality of CAT Data obtained through bulk data extracts and maintained in the Participants' systems.[1141] In their response, the Participants stated that their own security controls, not those of the Plan Processor, would apply to such systems as they would be outside the Plan Processor's control.[1142] The Participants' represented that their security controls would be consistent with industry standards, including security protocols that are compliant with Regulation SCI, and the Participants would periodically review the effectiveness of such controls pursuant to their policies and procedures addressing data security.[1143]

Regarding the Participants' security controls, the Participants stated that the CISO would be obligated to escalate issues that could represent a security threat to CAT Data.[1144] For example, the Participants stated that if the CISO observes activity from a CAT Reporter or Participant that suggests that there may be a security threat to the Plan Processor or the Central Repository, then the CISO, in consultation with the CCO, may escalate the matter to the Operating Committee.[1145] The Participants stated, however, that they do not envision, that ''such policy enforcement [by the CISO] would involve a regulatory enforcement role with regard to the Participants.'' [1146] The Participants further stated that ''[t]he Plan does not give the CISO the authority to engage in such regulatory enforcement.[1147] Moreover, although the Plan permits the Operating Committee to impose fees for late or inaccurate reporting of information to the CAT, it does not authorize the Participants to oversee, or serve enforcement actions against, each other via the Plan Processor. Only the SEC has such authority under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.'' [1148]

The Commission believes that ensuring the security and confidentiality of CAT Data is of utmost importance, and also notes the Participants' recognition that regulators should have flexibility in designing such surveillance systems, including the ability to access and transfer data where necessary and consistent with appropriate data security safeguards. As described above, the Plan Processor has the specific responsibility to develop and implement policies, procedures and control structures related to the security of the CAT System.[1149] The Plan Processor also is responsible for the security and confidentiality of all CAT Data received and reported to the Central Repository, including during all communications between CAT Reporters and the Plan Processor, data extraction, data manipulation and transformation, loading to and from the Central Repository, and data maintenance and storage by the Central Repository.[1150] The Plan Processor also must require the establishment of secure controls for data retrieval and query reports for CAT Data reported to and stored in the Central Repository.[1151]

While the Plan Processor is responsible for the security of the CAT Data collected by and stored in the Central Repository, the Commission agrees with commenters that once CAT Data is extracted into a Participant's regulatory surveillance system, the Plan Processor can no longer assure the security of the CAT Data because the details, requirements and rigor of the policies and procedures regarding the security of CAT Data at each Participant are beyond the direct control of the Plan Processor. This is the case whether the CAT Data is downloaded to a Participant's local server, or downloaded into a dedicated sandbox within the CAT cloud—and whether the CAT Data that is downloaded is a subset of all the CAT Data collected by the Central Repository, or the entirety of the CAT Data (*i.e.,* cloning the entire CAT database).

Therefore, the Commission believes that if a Participant chooses to extract CAT Data, whether into its own local server environment or into its own sandbox within the CAT cloud, the Participant must have policies and procedures regarding CAT Data security that are comparable to those implemented and maintained by the Plan Processor for the Central Repository, and that each Participant must certify and provide evidence to the CISO that its policies and procedures for the security of CAT Data meet the same security standards applicable to the CAT Data that is reported to, and collected and stored by, the Central Repository. Given the necessity of ensuring the security of CAT Data that is collected by and stored in the Central Repository, the Commission believes that this is a reasonable requirement that will ensure that CAT Data is subject to the same standards of security, whether the CAT Data is downloaded by

[1135] *Id.* (citing to CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(f)(iv)).

[1136] *Id.*

[1137] Response Letter III at 10 (citing to Appendix D, Section 8.2 (providing that ''the Central Repository must provide for direct queries, bulk extraction, and download of Data for all regulatory users.'')).

[1138] Response Letter III at 11.

[1139] *Id.*

[1140] *Id.*

[1141] *Id.*

[1142] *Id.*

[1143] *Id.*

[1144] Response Letter III at 7. Notwithstanding the foregoing example, the Participants noted that the details regarding such an escalation policy will not be determined until the Plan Processor has been selected.

[1145] *Id.*

[1146] Response Letter III at 8.

[1147] *Id.*

[1148] *Id.*

[1149] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.1(c).

[1150] *See id.* at Section 6.5(f)(i), (iv).

[1151] *See id.* at Section 6.5(f)(iv).

a Participant onto the Participant's local servers, or downloaded into the Participant's sandbox within the CAT cloud,[1152] and therefore, is amending the plan accordingly.[1153]

The Commission believes that it is critical to the security of the CAT Data to assign responsibility to the CISO to review the data security policies and procedures of Participants that extract CAT Data into their own systems, whether on a local server or within a sandbox within the CAT cloud, to determine whether such policies and procedures are comparable to the data security policies and procedures applicable to the Central Repository. The Commission further believes that if the CISO, in consultation with the CCO, finds that any such information security policies and procedures of a Participant are not comparable to the policies and procedures applicable to the CAT System, and the issue is not promptly addressed by the applicable Participant, the CISO, in consultation with the CCO, will be required to provide notice of any such deficiency to the Operating Committee.[1154]

e. Use of CAT Data for Regulatory and Surveillance Purposes

One commenter stated that access to CAT Data should be restricted to Commission and SRO Staff with regulatory and oversight responsibilities.[1155] Another commenter stated that the proposed model and timeframe for regulatory access to the reported data is consistent with the Commission's broader regulatory objectives.[1156] Another commenter noted that access should not be granted to the academic community.[1157] On the other hand, one commenter believed that aggregated CAT Data should be made available to the public on a limited or time-delayed basis, so as to enable more creative approaches to market surveillance, foster industry collaboration, and augment regulatory efforts.[1158]

The Participants stated that they do not plan to make CAT Data available for use by the public (or academics or other third parties) at this time.[1159] The Participants noted that there may be certain benefits to this type of expanded access, such as promoting academic evaluations of the economic costs and benefits of regulatory policy.[1160] Nevertheless, the Participants believed that the privacy and security concerns raised by such public access would outweigh the potential benefits.[1161] The Participants stated that this conclusion is ''in line with the SEC's statements in the adopting release for SEC Rule 613 that, in light of the privacy and security concerns, 'it is premature to require that the NMS plan require the provision of data to third parties.' ''[1162]

The Commission agrees with the Participants and believes that it is reasonable to continue to limit access to CAT Data to regulatory authorities for regulatory and surveillance use.[1163] As previously noted, the CAT is designed to be a regulatory tool. While the Commission recognizes that there may be benefits to expanding the distribution of CAT Data, the Commission also believes that limiting the use of CAT Data for regulatory and surveillance purposes is reasonable at this time, given the vast scope of the CAT Data and need to ensure the security and confidentiality of the CAT Data.[1164]

Although not raised by commenters, the Commission emphasizes that under the Plan the CCO must develop and implement a notification and escalation process to resolve and remediate any alleged non-compliance with the rules of the CAT by a Participant or Industry Member, which shall include appropriate notification and order of escalation to a Participant, the Operating Committee, or the Commission.[1165] The Commission expects that any additional escalation procedures outlined by the CCO, once the CCO is selected, will adhere to this process.

f. Regulation SCI

Several commenters discussed the applicability of Regulation SCI to the Central Repository.[1166] One commenter stated that because the CAT is an ''SCI System'' and an SCI System of each of the SROs, all obligations associated with Regulation SCI must be complied with by the SROs to ensure the security and integrity of the CAT.[1167] One commenter stated that Industry Members are not subject to Regulation SCI and the CAT NMS Plan should ''make clear that Regulation SCI would not be expanded to apply to an Industry Members [sic] by virtue of its reporting requirements under the CAT Plan.''[1168] Another commenter stated that because the CAT NMS Plan provides that the Plan Processor must be compliant with Regulation SCI requirements, compliance with Regulation SCI requirements should be ''an explicit evaluation criterion as part of the selection process for the CAT Processor.''[1169]

The Participants noted that the Plan Processor will need to satisfy all applicable regulations involving database security, including Regulation SCI, and the Participants have discussed with the Bidders their responsibilities under Regulation SCI on numerous occasions.[1170] They added they do not believe that it is appropriate that the Plan provide details on how the Plan Processor will ensure that the Central Repository will comply with Regulation SCI.[1171]

The Central Repository, as a facility of each of the Participant SROs, is an SCI Entity[1172] and the CAT System is an SCI system, and thus it must comply with Regulation SCI.[1173] The CAT NMS Plan states that data security standards of the CAT System shall, at a minimum, satisfy all applicable regulations regarding database security, including provisions of Regulation SCI.[1174] The Plan Processor thus must establish, maintain and enforce written policies and procedures reasonably designed to ensure that the CAT System has levels of capacity, integrity, resiliency,

[1152] The Commission also notes that each Participant must comply with Regulation SCI. Response Letter III at 8.

[1153] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5 at Section 6.2(b)(vii).

[1154] *See id.*

[1155] Fidelity Letter at 4.

[1156] UnaVista Letter at 4.

[1157] MFA Letter at 6.

[1158] Data Boiler Letter at 14.

[1159] Response Letter I at 44–45.

[1160] *Id.* at 45.

[1161] *Id.*

[1162] *Id.*

[1163] Such purposes include, among other things, analysis and reconstruction of market events, market analysis and research to inform policy decisions, market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions. *See supra* note 586.

[1164] This limitation on the use of CAT Data for regulatory and surveillance purposes does not restrict the ability of a Participant from using the Raw Data that it reports for commercial or other purposes. *See* Section IV.D.6.k, *infra*.

[1165] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.2(a)(v)(L).

[1166] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.9(b)(xi).

[1167] SIFMA Letter at 21–22; *see also* MFA Letter at 4.

[1168] FSR Letter at 6. This commenter also noted that the Plan Processor should ensure access to the PII complies with Regulation SCI and any other applicable federal and state privacy laws. *Id.*

[1169] SIFMA Letter at 45.

[1170] Response Letter I at 58.

[1171] *Id.*

[1172] An ''SCI Entity'' means an SCI self-regulatory organization, SCI alternative trading system, plan processor, or exempt clearing agency subject to the Commission's Automated Review Program (''ARP''). 17 CFR 242.1000.

[1173] An ''SCI System'' means all computer network, electronic, technical, or automated, or similar systems of, or operated by or on behalf of, an SCI entity that, with respect to securities, directly support trading, clearance and settlement, order routing, market data, market regulation, or market surveillance. 17 CFR 242.1000.

[1174] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.9(b)(xi).

availability, and security adequate to maintain its operational capability to comply with Regulation SCI.

According to Regulation SCI, the policies and procedures must require: (i) The establishment of reasonable current and future technology infrastructure capacity planning estimates; (ii) periodic capacity stress tests of such systems to determine their ability to process transactions in an accurate, timely, and efficient manner; (iii) a program to review and keep current systems development and testing methodology for such systems; (iv) regular reviews and testing, as applicable, of such systems, including backup systems, to identify vulnerabilities pertaining to internal and external threats, physical hazards, and natural or manmade disasters; (v) business continuity and disaster recovery plans that include maintaining backup and recovery capabilities sufficiently resilient and geographically diverse and that are reasonably designed to achieve next business day resumption of trading and two-hour resumption of critical SCI systems following a wide-scale disruption; (vi) standards that result in such systems being designed, developed, tested, maintained, operated, and surveilled in a manner that facilitates the successful collection, processing, and dissemination of market data; and (vii) monitoring of such systems to identify potential SCI events.[1175] Compliance with Regulation SCI will also require the Plan Processor to periodically review the effectiveness of the policies and procedures and take prompt action to remedy deficiencies in such policies and procedures.[1176]

For purposes of compliance with Regulation SCI, the Commission has stated that an SCI entity's policies and procedures shall be deemed to be reasonably designed if they are consistent with current SCI industry standards, which are required to be comprised of information technology practices that are widely available to information technology professionals in the financial sector and issued by an authoritative body that is a U.S. governmental entity or agency, association of U.S. governmental entities or agencies, or widely recognized organization, although compliance with current SCI industry standards is not the exclusive means to comply with the requirements of Regulation SCI.[1177] To assist SCI entities in developing policies and procedures consistent with ''current SCI industry standards,'' Staff of the Commission issued Staff Guidance which lists examples of publications describing processes, guidelines, frameworks, or standards that an SCI entity could look to in developing reasonable policies and procedures to comply with Regulation SCI.[1178] The standards under the Staff Guidance address nine subject areas, including application control; capacity planning; computer operations and production environment controls; contingency planning; information security and networking; audit; outsourcing; physical security; and systems development methodology.[1179]

The Commission believes that compliance with Regulation SCI will help to reduce the occurrence of systems issues; improve the resiliency of the technological infrastructure when systems problems do occur; and enhance the Commission's oversight of the Central Repository. In response to a concern by a commenter about the potential of the Plan to expand the scope of Regulation SCI, the Commission clarifies that Industry Members will not be subject to Regulation SCI by virtue of reporting audit trail data to the Central Repository. In addition, in response to the commenter that stated that the Participants should use compliance with Regulation SCI as an explicit evaluation criterion as part of the selection process for the CAT Processor, the Commission expects that the Participants will evaluate a Bidder's ability to comply with Regulation SCI as part of its Bidder evaluation process, as compliance with Regulation SCI is an explicit criteria of the CAT NMS Plan.

g. Physical Security of CAT Systems

The CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to provide a solution addressing physical security controls for corporate, data center and any leased facilities where any CAT Data is transmitted or stored.[1180] One commenter stated that the data centers housing the CAT System must, at a minimum, be SOC 2 certified with such certification annually attested to by a qualified third-party auditor that is not affiliated with the SROs or the Plan Processor.[1181] The Participants stated that they intended for data centers housing the CAT System to be AICPA SOC 2 certified.[1182] In addition, the Participants recommended that the auditor provision should be amended to require a qualified third-party auditor that is not an affiliate of any of the Participants or the Plan Processor.[1183]

The Commission believes that assuring the physical security of the data centers that house the CAT Data, including PII Data, is a critical component of the overall security program and the Commission believes that the Participants' recommendation to amend the standards applicable to ensure the physical security of the CAT System to reflect that it will be AICPA SOC 2 certified and audited by a qualified third-party auditor that is not an affiliate of any Participant or the Plan Processor is reasonable. The Commission therefore is amending the Plan accordingly.[1184]

h. Encryption of CAT Data

Commenters discussed the CAT NMS Plan's provisions regarding encryption of CAT Data, including CAT Data that is PII. One commenter stated that the CAT NMS Plan's data encryption requirements alone were not sufficient to protect CAT Data at-rest and PII, and that many more detailed and technical issues must be considered for the encryption requirements for the CAT System and CAT Data to be sufficient.[1185] The commenter also recommended that the CAT Plan require data to be encrypted both at-rest and in-flight, and that particularly sensitive pieces of data be isolated and compartmentalized.[1186] Another commenter highlighted specific standards for in-transit data (*e.g.,* asymmetric encryptions and transport layer security), data at-rest (*e.g.,* NIST Special Publication 800–57), and data in-use (*e.g.,* implementing data protection controls such as disclosing intended use and duration).[1187]

One commenter requested that Section 4.1.2 of Appendix D of the Plan, which addresses the encryption of CAT Data, be amended to make clear that the monitoring, alerting, auditing, and any other requirements that apply with

[1175] 17 CFR 242.1001(a)(2). ''SCI event'' means an event at an SCI entity that constitutes: (1) A systems disruption; (2) a systems compliance issue; or (3) a systems intrusion. 17 CFR 242.1000.

[1176] 17 CFR 242.1001(a)(3).

[1177] 17 CFR 242.1001(a)(4).

[1178] *See* Staff Guidance on Current SCI Standards, issued on November 19, 2014, *available at https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/2014/staff-guidance-current-sci-industry-standards.pdf.*

[1179] *Id.*

[1180] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.4(a).

[1181] SIFMA Letter at 21.

[1182] Response Letter I at 58.

[1183] *Id.* at 58–59.

[1184] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.3.

[1185] MFA Letter at 8.

[1186] *Id.; see also* SIFMA Letter at 20–21 (stating that ''[t]he CAT Processor should employ strong, evolving encryption and decryption standards that are continuously updated to meet the most stringent data encryption requirements possible'').

[1187] FSR Letter at 5–6; *see also* FIF Letter at 125 (suggesting that if given the option WORM (write once, read man) technology may be convenient and cost effective).

respect to CAT Data also apply to archival CAT Data.[1188] Another commenter opined that the encryption and decryption standards used by the Plan Processor should be continuously updated to meet the most stringent data encryption requirements possible, and designed to support end-to-end data encryption, with data decrypted at the desktop level.[1189]

Commenters also focused on the particular necessity of encrypting PII, both when in-transit and at-rest, to ensure it remains secure and confidential.[1190] One commenter noted the CAT NMS Plan's requirement that CAT Data provided to regulators that contains PII be ''masked,'' [1191] and stated that PII should be masked unless users have permission to view the PII contained in the CAT Data that has been requested,[1192] while another commenter believed that clarification is needed regarding the meaning of ''masked'' under the CAT NMS Plan.[1193]

The Participants stated that ''given that all three remaining bidders propose cloud based solutions, all data will be encrypted in-flight and at-rest.'' [1194]

The Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to describe how PII encryption is performed and the key management strategy. The CAT NMS Plan also requires that PII encryption methods include a secure documented key management strategy such as the use of HSM(s).

The Commission agrees with commenters that encryption of CAT Data is a necessary and critically important means of protecting CAT Data, including PII. Therefore, given the role that encryption plays in maintaining the security of CAT Data, the Commission believes that all CAT Data must be encrypted and is amending the Plan accordingly.[1195]

In response to the commenter that believed that encryption alone was not sufficient to protect CAT Data at-rest and PII, the Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan provides several means of protecting CAT Data in addition to encryption, including provisions addressing connectivity and data transfer requirements, parameters for the storage of CAT Data in general, and PII in particular, and limitations on access to CAT Data by authorized users only. In addition, the Plan states that the Technical Specifications, which will be published one year before Industry Members must report CAT Data to the Central Repository, will include more details about the data security for CAT.[1196] Thus, in response to the commenter that believed that more detailed and technical issues must be considered for the encryption requirements for the CAT System and CAT Data to be sufficient, the Commission believes that preparation and publication of the Technical Specifications referenced above commits the Participants to undertaking an analysis of security requirements, in addition to and as a supplement to, the existing encryption requirements. With respect to the issues raised by the commenter regarding the specific standards for in-transit data (including asymmetric encryptions and transport layer security), data at-rest (*e.g.,* NIST Special Publication 800–57), and data in-use (*e.g.,* implementing data protection controls such as disclosing intended use and duration), the Commission notes that, as amended by the Commission, the Plan requires the Participants to adhere to all relevant standards in the NIST Cyber Security Framework, which includes standards regarding encryption.[1197]

In response to the commenter that stated that encryption and decryption standards used by the Plan Processor should be continuously updated to meet the most stringent data encryption requirements possible, the Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan provides that all CAT Data must be encrypted in-flight and at-rest using industry standard best practices, and that such industry standards may be replaced by successor publications, or modified, amended, or supplemented as approved by the Operating Committee.[1198]

In response to commenters that discussed the need that PII be ''masked,'' the Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan mandates that all CAT Data that is returned in response to a regulatory inquiry will be encrypted, and that PII data returned shall be masked unless users have permission to view the CAT Data that has been requested.[1199] The Commission believes that this requirement adds an additional, reasonable requirement that protects PII from view, unless the person seeking PII is authorized to view the PII.

i. Connectivity

One commenter stated that accessing the CAT System must be done via secure methods, that the SROs should consider mandating the usage of private lines rather than encrypted internet connectivity, and that the CAT Processor's systems should be air-gapped from the internet, thereby eliminating access to the internet and/or any internal non-CAT systems used by the Plan Processor.[1200]

With respect to using private lines to connect to the CAT, the Participants stated that the Plan does not require CAT Reporters to use private lines to connect to the CAT due to cost concerns, particularly for smaller broker-dealers.[1201] Noting that the Plan requires that CAT Reporters access the CAT via a secure, encrypted connection, the Participants also cited to Appendix D which states that ''CAT Reporters must connect to the CAT infrastructure using secure methods such as private lines or (for smaller broker-dealers) Virtual Private Network connection over public lines.'' [1202]

The Participants noted that pursuant to the Bidders' solutions, the core CAT architecture would not be accessible via the public internet.[1203] The Participants cited to Appendix D, Section 4.1.1 of the Plan, which states that ''[t]he CAT databases must be deployed within the network infrastructure so that they are not directly accessible from external end-user networks. If public cloud infrastructures are used, Virtual Private Networking and firewalls/access control lists or equivalent controls such as private network segments or private tenant segmentation must be used to isolate CAT Data from unauthenticated public access.'' [1204]

The Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan's provisions regarding connectivity to the Central Repository reflect a reasonable approach to ensuring secure access to the CAT Data residing within the Central Repository. The Commission believes that leaving

[1188] MFA Letter at 8.

[1189] SIFMA Letter at 20–21.

[1190] FSR Letter at 5; MFA Letter at 8 (also stating that ''[s]trong encryption should be at the heart of the CAT NMS Plan's efforts to protect data'').

[1191] FSR Letter at 4; *see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.10(c)(ii).

[1192] *Id.*

[1193] FIF Letter at 135.

[1194] Response Letter III at 5. The Commission notes that as filed, the CAT NMS Plan had stated that all CAT Data must be encrypted in-flight using industry best practices, and that PII must be encrypted both at-rest and in-flight; storage of unencrypted PII is not permissible; and non-PII CAT Data stored in a Plan Processor private environment is not required to be encrypted at-rest. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.2; *see also* Response Letter I at 57.

[1195] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.2.

[1196] *Id.* at Section 6.9(b)(xi).

[1197] Response Letter III at 8.

[1198] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Sections 4.1.2 and 4.2.

[1199] *Id.* at Section 6.10(c).

[1200] SIFMA Letter at 20.

[1201] Response Letter III at 6.

[1202] *Id.*

[1203] *Id.*

[1204] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.1.

the option for connection via Virtual Private Network for smaller broker-dealers is reasonable, given the potential cost of mandating use of a private line. The Commission also believes that prohibiting access to the CAT System via the public internet is appropriate, given the potential risk to the security of the CAT Data residing in the Central Repository that might be caused by allowing direct access into the CAT using an unsecure method by unauthenticated users.

j. Breach of CAT Security

Commenters also discussed the appropriate action to be taken in the event of a security breach. One commenter recommended that the Commission define a ''reportable incident'' that would trigger implementation of the cyber incident report plan.[1205] Three commenters recommended that the CAT NMS Plan's cyber incident report plan include notification procedures in the event of a cyber incident.[1206] One commenter specifically stated that the Plan should require that notice of an incident be provided to the Operating Committee, affected broker-dealers, other market participants and law enforcement within a designated period of time (*e.g.,* 24 hours).[1207] Another commenter agreed, noting that the Plan should provide a clear mechanism for promptly notifying all victims of a CAT data breach, including Customers.[1208] Similarly, another commenter recommended that the Plan Processor ''release a protocol document describing the specific procedures it will take upon a breach of CAT, including the procedure for notifying [P]articipants and allowing them to suspend CAT submissions temporarily in the event of an ongoing breach.'' [1209] This commenter also requested that the data security plan include a process for reviewing data incidents to determine what corrective actions are required to reduce the likelihood of recurrence.[1210]

Some commenters discussed who should bear the cost of a data breach. One commenter stated that Industry Members should not bear the cost of a security breach that occurs on the systems of the Commission, the Participants, the Plan Processor, Central Repository, or ''in-transit'' amongst the various parties.[1211] Another commenter recommended that the CAT Processor, the SROs, and the Commission indemnify the broker-dealers from any and all liability in the event of a breach that is in no part the fault of the broker-dealers.[1212] Two commenters added that CAT NMS, LLC should purchase an insurance policy that covers potential breaches and extends to Industry Members and their obligations vis-à-vis their clients whose CAT Data is required to be reported by the CAT Plan.[1213]

In response to commenters, the Participants noted that the Plan Processor is required to work with the Operating Committee to develop a breach protocol in accordance with industry practices.[1214] However, the Participants also stated that they believe that providing more details on these processes or procedures raises security issues.[1215] Moreover, the Participants noted, the CAT System will be subject to applicable regulations involving database security, including Regulation SCI and its requirement to provide notice to the Commission and to disseminate information about SCI Events to affected CAT Reporters.[1216]

With respect to breaches of the CAT System and the accompanying protocols for dealing with breaches, the Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan provides that the Plan Processor must develop policies and procedures governing its responses to systems or data breaches,[1217] and the Participants added that the Plan Processor will work with the Operating Committee to develop a breach protocol in accordance with industry practices.[1218] According to the CAT NMS Plan, such policies and procedures will include a formal cyber incident response plan and documentation of all information relevant to breaches.[1219] The cyber incident response plan will provide guidance and direction during security incidents, and may include items such as guidance on crisis communications; security and forensic procedures; Customer notifications; ''playbook'' or quick reference guides that allow responders quick access to key information; insurance against security breaches; retention of legal counsel with data privacy and protection expertise; and retention of a public relations firm to manage media coverage.[1220] The CAT NMS Plan further provides that documentation of information relevant to breaches should include a chronological timeline of events from the breach throughout the duration of the investigation; relevant information related to the breach (*e.g.,* date discovered, who made the discovery, and details of the breach); response efforts, involvement of third parties, summary of meetings/conference calls, and communication; and the impact of the breach, including an assessment of data accessed during the breach and impact on CAT Reporters.[1221]

In response to commenters that requested additional detail about the CAT NMS Plan breach management protocol, such as the definition of a ''reportable incident,'' the Commission notes that the Plan requires the Plan Processor to develop policies and procedures to govern its responses to systems or data breaches and the Commission expects the definition of a ''reportable incident'' will be clearly set forth in those policies and procedures. While the Plan does not explicitly require it, in response to the commenter that requested that notice of a breach be provided to the Operating Committee, the Commission expects that the CAT NMS Plan's cyber incident response plan will incorporate notice of the breach to the Operating Committee, because the Operating Committee is the body that manages the CAT LLC. As a Regulation SCI System, the Plan Processor must also notify the Commission in the event of an SCI Event.[1222]

As for commenters that opined on the other parties that should be notified upon a breach, including affected parties such as Customers, the Commission notes that the Plan explicitly requires customer notifications to be included in the cyber incident response plan, and that the cyber incident response plan may list other market participants that will be notified upon a breach of the CAT System and the procedure for notifying

[1205] MFA Letter at 8. This commenter also suggested that the Plan Processor adopt a ''bug bounty program'' which awards individuals who report software bugs. *Id.*

[1206] SIFMA Letter at 21; ICI Letter at 8; FSI Letter at 4.

[1207] SIFMA Letter at 21.

[1208] ICI Letter at 8; *see also* FSI Letter at 4 (recommending that investors be notified of a breach).

[1209] FSI Letter at 4.

[1210] *Id.*

[1211] FSR Letter at 8.

[1212] SIFMA Letter at 22; *see also* FSI Letter at 5 (suggesting that the Plan Processor should bear responsibility in the event of a data breach and that the Plan Processor should expressly indemnify Participants for any costs or damages incurred as a result of a data breach occurring after they have provided data to the CAT).

[1213] FSR Letter at 8; *see also* SIFMA Letter at 22.

[1214] Response Letter I at 58.

[1215] *Id.*

[1216] *Id.*

[1217] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.5.

[1218] Response Letter I at 58.

[1219] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.5.

[1220] *Id.*

[1221] *Id.*

[1222] Pursuant to Regulation SCI, the Commission must be notified within 24 hours of an SCI Event. *See* 17 CFR 242.1002(b).

relevant participants of the breach.[1223] In response to the commenter that requested that the breach protocol include a process for reviewing ''data incidents'' to determine what corrective actions are required to reduce the likelihood of recurrence, the Commission notes that the Plan requires that the impact of the breach be assessed, and the Commission expects that such assessment will also help identify the corrective actions that must be taken to reduce the likelihood of recurrence.

In response to the several commenters that discussed issues surrounding the cost of a breach, including which parties should bear the cost of a breach, and whether the Plan Processor, the Participants and the Commission should indemnify the broker-dealers from all liability in the event of a breach that is no fault of the broker, the Commission notes that the Plan requires that the Plan Processor's cyber incident response plan must address insurance issues related to security breaches and that as part of the discussions on insurance coverage and liability, further detail about the distribution of costs will be undertaken. The Commission believes that it is reasonable to require, at this stage, that the cyber incident response plan outline the key areas of breach management that must be addressed by the Plan Processor; further details on the breach management protocols, including details about who might bear the cost of a breach and under what specific circumstances, will follow once the Plan Processor is selected.

k. Use of Raw Data for Commercial or Other Purposes

Commenters also discussed the CAT NMS Plan's provision permitting a Participant to use the Raw Data [1224] it reports for commercial or other purposes as long as such use is not prohibited by applicable law, rule or regulation.[1225] One commenter believed that the Plan should be amended to state specifically when a Participant may—or more importantly, according to the commenter, may not—use Raw Data or CAT Data for commercial purposes.[1226] This commenter also noted inconsistencies in the Participants' commercial use of data.[1227] Specifically, the commenter noted that Section 6.5(f)(i)(A) of the Plan states that each SRO may use ''the CAT Data it reports to the Central Repository for regulatory, surveillance, commercial or other purposes as permitted by applicable law, rule or regulation,'' and Section 6.5(h) permits a Participant to ''use the Raw Data it reports to the Central Repository for regulatory, surveillance, commercial or other purposes as otherwise not prohibited by applicable law, rule or regulation.'' [1228] Another commenter stated that the CAT NMS Plan should be amended to clarify that Participants may not use data stored in the Central Repository—beyond the data that the SROs submit to the CAT—for their own commercial purposes.[1229] One commenter provided two recommendations designed to ensure that Participants do not use the CAT NMS Plan to ''enlarge the scope of data that they commercialize.'' [1230] First, the commenter believed that the Plan should specify that no Participant may commercialize customer identifying information, regardless of whether applicable law expressly prohibits its commercialization. Second, the Plan should limit the scope of data subject to commercialization by narrowing the definition of Raw Data to include only data that a Participant must report under Rule 613 or the Plan.[1231]

In response to commenters, the Participants stated that they continue to believe that it is appropriate for the CAT NMS Plan to permit the Participants to use their Raw Data for commercial or other purposes.[1232] Therefore, the Participants do not propose to prohibit such use.[1233] Nevertheless, to address the concern raised by a commenter that the CAT NMS Plan inconsistently uses the terms ''Raw Data'' and ''CAT Data'' in Sections 6.5(f)(i)(A) Section 6.5(h) of the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants recommended that the term ''Raw Data'' replace the term ''CAT Data'' in Section 6.5(f)(i)(A) of the Plan.[1234]

As an initial matter, the Commission finds that it is reasonable to amend the Plan to replace the term ''CAT Data'' with ''Raw Data'' in Section 6.5(f)(i)(A) of the Plan, to remove any inconsistency and potential confusion. The Commission also finds that the CAT NMS Plan's provisions regarding the use of Raw Data by a Participant is a reasonable approach to the use of audit trail data that is reported by the Participant itself. In response to the commenter's request that the Commission define the circumstances under which a Participant cannot use its Raw Data, the Commission finds that the CAT NMS Plan's provision that the use must not be prohibited by applicable law, rule or regulation is sufficient guidance to Participants regarding their use of the Raw Data used for commercial or other purposes.[1235] Similarly, the Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan's definition of ''Raw Data'' is sufficiently clear and further addresses the comments that the Participants may expand the audit trail data that Participants may use for commercial or other purposes. The Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan's definition of ''Raw Data'' limits such data to ''Participant Data'' or ''Industry Member Data.'' [1236] In this regard, in response to the commenter with concerns about a Participant commercializing customer identifying information, the Commission notes that a Participant would never be in a position to report customer identifying information itself; therefore, a Participant could not use customer identifying information for commercial or other purposes. The Commission also believes that, pursuant to the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants may not use CAT Data for commercial purposes.

l. Ownership of CAT Data

Several commenters discussed the ownership of CAT Data. Two commenters believed that the CAT NMS Plan should be amended to indicate that broker-dealers retain ownership rights in all of the data they report to the CAT.[1237] In response to commenters, Participants stated that Rule 613 does not address broker-dealer CAT Reporters' ownership rights with respect to the CAT Data, and the Participants do not believe that it is appropriate to address such ownership rights in the Plan.[1238]

The Commission believes that it is reasonable for the CAT NMS Plan not to address ownership rights to the data that broker-dealers report to the Central Repository. The resolution of legal questions regarding ownership rights to the data that is reported to the Central

[1223] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.5.

[1224] ''Raw Data'' means Participant Data and Industry Member Data that has not been through any validation or otherwise checked by the CAT System. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1. The Commission notes that the Section 6.5(h) of the CAT NMS Plan also limits the use by a Participant of the Raw Data that the Participant has reported to the Central Repository; a Participant may not use the Raw Data reported by another Participant.

[1225] ICI Letter at 10; SIFMA Letter at 31.

[1226] SIFMA Letter at 31.

[1227] *Id.*

[1228] *Id.*

[1229] KCG Letter at 9.

[1230] ICI Letter at 10.

[1231] *Id.*

[1232] Response Letter I at 43.

[1233] *Id.*

[1234] *Id.*

[1235] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(f)(i)(A).

[1236] *See id.* at Section 1.1.

[1237] SIFMA Letter at 30; KCG Letter at 7–8.

[1238] Response Letter I at 44.

Repository by broker-dealers is not required by Rule 613; is outside the scope of Rule 613; and is not necessary to find that the Plan meets the approval standard of Rule 608.

m. Bulk Access to an Industry Member's CAT Data

A few commenters discussed whether Industry Members should be permitted access to their own reported audit trail data through bulk data exports. One commenter stated that it ''would be highly beneficial for CAT Reporters to have access to their own data'' to assist with error identification and correction, and stressed the importance of building such access into CAT as part of the initial design, even if CAT Reporters were not permitted such access during the initial phase of CAT.[1239] To address security concerns, the commenter suggested that retrieval of PII data should be limited to a set of CAT Reporter personnel who are responsible for entering and correcting customer information.[1240] Another commenter noted that broker-dealers should be permitted to access, export and use their data within the Central Repository at no charge and that ''[a]llowing broker-dealers to access their own data will be beneficial for surveillance and internal compliance programs and may incentivize firms to make other internal improvements including, among other things, reducing potential errors.'' [1241] This commenter also argued that broker-dealers should not be subject to additional fees to simply retrieve data they already submitted to the CAT, noting that CAT is the only broker-dealer regulatory reporting service for which the SROs have proposed to impose system-specific fees on broker-dealers.'' [1242] Another commenter stated that ''[a]llowing CAT Reporters to access their own data would be beneficial for surveillance and internal compliance programs. If data access is considered as part of the initial design of the Central Repository, we believe the benefits outweigh the cost.'' [1243] One commenter argued that independent software vendors also should have fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory access, at their client's request, to the data submitted or stored at the Central Repository on their client's behalf.[1244] In support, this commenter noted that OATS permitted access to determine reporting accuracy by ''matching in both directions,'' so that reporters could address matching errors.[1245]

In response to these comments, the Participants noted that during the development of the Plan, the SROs considered whether to provide Industry Members with access to their own data through bulk data exports.[1246] Based on the data security and cost considerations, the Participants stated that they determined that such access was not a cost-effective requirement for the CAT.[1247] Accordingly, the CAT NMS Plan was drafted to state that ''[n]on-Participant CAT Reporters will be able to view their submissions online in a read-only, non-exportable format to facilitate error identification and correction.'' [1248]

In light of the comments that the Commission received and further evaluation of the issue, however, in their response, the Participants stated that they now believe that there may be merit to providing Industry Members and their vendors with bulk access to the CAT Reporters' own unlinked CAT Data.[1249] For example, the Participants stated that such access may facilitate the CAT Reporters' error analysis and internal surveillance and that it may expedite the retirement of duplicative reporting systems.[1250] However, the Participants noted, providing bulk data access also raises a variety of operational, security, cost and other issues related to the CAT.[1251] The Participants stated that they would need to address this additional functionality with the Plan Processor; in addition, the Participants stated that inclusion of this functionality would create additional burdens on the CAT and the Plan Processor and, therefore, may require additional funding from CAT Reporters for such access to the CAT Data.[1252] Therefore, the Participants stated that they will consider this issue once the CAT is operational.[1253]

The Commission recognizes the commenters' desire for bulk access to their own data for surveillance and internal compliance purposes, as well as possible error correction purposes. The Commission also recognizes the Participants' initial approach of not permitting such access for security and cost purposes, as set forth in their response. Given the complexity of initially implementing the CAT, the Commission believes that the Participants' approach that limits Industry Members to only being able to view their submissions online in a read-only, non-exportable format to facilitate error identification and correction is a reasonable approach at the present time. The Commission notes the Participants' representation that they will consider offering bulk access to the audit trail data reported by Industry Members once CAT is operational. The Commission expects the Participants to fulfill this commitment and as part of their evaluation, the Commission expects that the Participants may consider whether a fee for such access would be appropriate and how such a fee might impact the funding of the CAT.[1254]

The Commission disagrees with the commenters that recommended providing access to CAT Data for independent software vendors.[1255] Given the highly sensitive nature of the CAT Data, the Commission believes that it is reasonable to not allow access to parties other than the SROs and the Commission. If the Participants decide to propose granting such access after gaining experience with CAT operations, and are able to ensure the security of data, the Commission will consider, based on the analysis presented, whether granting access to CAT Reporters and other non-regulator industry members is reasonable.

The Commission also notes that, as discussed in Section IV.H, the Commission is amending Section 6.6 of the Plan to require that, within 24 months of effectiveness of the Plan, the Participants provide the Commission with a report discussing the feasibility, benefits, and risks of allowing an Industry Member to bulk download the Raw Data it submitted to the Central Repository.[1256]

n. Regulator Use Cases

One commenter noted that the Plan does not provide any details on how

[1239] FIF Letter at 61.

[1240] *Id.*

[1241] SIFMA Letter at 30. In this regard, this commenter noted that broker-dealers could use their CAT reported data to run complex searches and generate reports to (1) meet their regulatory surveillance requirements; (2) conduct best execution analysis; and (3) conduct transaction costs analysis. *Id.*

[1242] *Id.; see also* KCG Letter at 7.

[1243] TR Letter at 8.

[1244] Bloomberg Letter at 7.

[1245] *Id.* (noting further that independent software vendors could build sophisticated analytics to aid this).

[1246] Response Letter I at 44.

[1247] *Id.*

[1248] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 10.1.

[1249] Response Letter I at 44.

[1250] *Id.*

[1251] *Id.*

[1252] *Id.*

[1253] *Id.*

[1254] The Commission preliminarily believes that if the Participants decide to provide access to broker-dealer CAT Reporters, an amendment to the CAT Plan would be required as this would expand the Plan's restriction that CAT Data only be used by Participants for regulatory and surveillance purposes. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(h).

[1255] Bloomberg Letter at 7.

[1256] *See* Section IV.H, *supra.*

regulators will be able to perform their day-to-day analysis using CAT Data.[1257] Specifically, this commenter analyzed the limitations of the CAT NMS Plan in light of the regulator use cases (''Regulator Use Cases'') contained in the Adopting Release, which provided further detail about how regulators envisioned using, accessing, and analyzing audit trail data under CAT.[1258] This commenter made three recommendations that the commenter believed would provide additional clarity to the CAT NMS Plan: (i) The Plan should clearly specify the analytical capability requirements of the CAT to inform the SROs about the level and limits of the Central Repository's analytical capabilities; (ii) the Plan should precisely describe the technology enhancements required by the SROs and the Commission to effectively and efficiently use the CAT Data; and (iii) the Regulator Use Cases should be a key criteria in the selection of the Plan Processor, which would require Bidders to prove that their solution is capable of facilitating regulators' need to extract and analyze the data.[1259]

The Commission recognizes the commenter's concerns about the lack of details in the CAT NMS Plan regarding how regulators will be able to perform their day-to-day analysis using CAT Data, in light of the Regulator Use Cases. The Commission notes, however, that in the Adopting Release the Commission stated that it was not including the Regulator Use Cases and accompanying questions to endorse a particular technology or approach to the consolidated audit trail; rather, the Regulator Use Cases and accompanying questions were designed to aid the SROs' understanding of the types of useful, specific information that the CAT NMS Plan could contain that would assist the Commission in its evaluation of the Plan.[1260] The Commission noted that its description of Regulator Use Cases includes a non-exclusive list of factors that SROs could consider when developing the NMS plan.[1261] Thus, the Commission believes that the Regulator Use Cases were not intended to serve as a list of specific requirements regarding analytical capability or technological enhancements that should be addressed by the Participants in the CAT NMS Plan. In response to the comment that the Regulator Use Cases should be a key criteria in the selection of the Plan Processor, the Commission reiterates that the Regulator Use Cases were not intended to be used as selection criteria for the Plan but were meant to elicit the types of useful information from the bidders that would assist in the Commission in its evaluation of the CAT NMS Plan.

o. Obligations on Participants and the Commission Regarding Data Security and Confidentiality

Under the CAT NMS Plan as noticed, certain obligations are imposed, or required to be imposed by the Plan Processor upon the Participants and the Commission regarding data security and confidentiality.[1262] However, Commissioners and employees of the Commission are excluded from certain of these obligations.[1263]

Two commenters opined on these provisions. One stated that ''the security of the confidential data stored in the Central Repository and other CAT systems must be of the highest quality and that no authorized users with access to CAT Data should be exempt from any provisions regarding security requirements and standards set forth in the Plan.'' [1264] Another commenter expressed concern that the Plan does not require Commission Staff to abide by the same security protocols for handling PII that other users of CAT Data are required to follow and urged the Commission to adopt these safeguards.[1265]

Specifically, one commenter objected to the exclusion of Commissioners and employees of the Commission from Section 6.5(f)(i)(A) of the Plan, which provides that the Plan Processor must require individuals with access to the Central Repository to use appropriate confidentiality safeguards and to use CAT Data only for surveillance and regulatory purposes.[1266] In addition, the commenter argued that Section 6.5(g) of the Plan, which requires the Participants to establish and enforce policies and procedures regarding CAT Data confidentiality, should also apply to the Commission.[1267] Similarly, another commenter sees no reason why the Commission should not have to follow the requirements of Section 6.5(g) and emphasized that the Commission needs to follow adequate policies and procedures when handling PII.[1268] However, the first commenter noted that it ''do[es] not believe that individuals performing their employment duties should be subject to personal liability and that such liability would not reduce security risks,'' and objected to Section 6.5(f)(i)(B) of the Plan, which requires the submission of a ''Safeguard of Information Affidavit'' providing for personal liability for misuse of data.[1269]

In response to these comments, the Participants stated that they agree that the Plan's security program must take into consideration all users with access to CAT Data, including the Commission, and noted that Commission Staff had requested the exclusion of Commission employees and Commissioners from subsections (A) and (B) of Section 6.5(f)(i) of the Plan.[1270] The Participants, nevertheless, recommended removing these exclusions and applying the requirements of Section 6.5(g) to the Commission.[1271]

The Commission takes very seriously concerns about maintaining the security and confidentiality of CAT Data and believes that it is imperative that all CAT users, including the Commission, implement and maintain a robust security framework with appropriate safeguards to ensure that CAT Data is kept confidential and used only for surveillance and regulatory purposes. However, the Commission is not a party to the Plan.[1272] By statute, the Commission is the regulator of the Participants, and the Commission will oversee and enforce their compliance with the Plan.[1273] To impose obligations

[1257] SIFMA Letter at 32–33.

[1258] *Id.* at 31–33.

[1259] *Id.* at 33.

[1260] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 13, at 45798.

[1261] *Id.*

[1262] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 6.5(f)(i)(A)–(B), 6.5(f)(i)(D), 6.5(f)(iii), 6.5(f)(iv)(B), 6.5(g), Appendix D, Sections 4.1.4, 4.1.6, 11.3; *see also supra* Section III.25.

[1263] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(f)(i)(A)–(B).

[1264] NYSE Letter at 2–4 (noting that ''[i]f employees of the Commission with access to the data stored in the Central Repository or other CAT systems are subject to security standards less stringent than those applicable to other authorized users, the data obtained and held by those individuals may be subject to heightened risk of a data breach.'').

[1265] Garrett Letter at 1–2.

[1266] NYSE Letter at 3.

[1267] *Id.* at 3–4 (citing U.S. Government Accountability Office (''GAO'') report discussing certain weaknesses in the Commission's information security policies).

[1268] Garrett Letter at 1 (noting also that computer systems at the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Internal Revenue Service, Federal Reserve, and Office of Personnel Management have all recently been compromised by cyberattacks and that an April 2016 GAO report identified several weaknesses related to the SEC's cybersecurity protocols that the Commission has not yet addressed).

[1269] NYSE Letter at 3 (also objecting to the terms ''misuse'' and ''data'' (rather than CAT Data) as overly broad and imprecise).

[1270] Response Letter I at 60.

[1271] *Id.* at 60–61.

[1272] *See* 17 CFR 242.608(a)(1) (stating that NMS plans are filed by two or more SROs).

[1273] *See* 17 CFR 242.608(b)(2), (c), (d); 17 CFR 242.613(h).

on the Commission under the Plan would invert this structure, raising questions about the Participants monitoring their own regulator's compliance with the Plan.[1274] Accordingly, the Commission does not believe it is appropriate for its security and confidentiality obligations, or those of its personnel, to be reflected through Plan provisions.[1275] Rather, the obligations of the Commission and its personnel with respect to the security and confidentiality of CAT Data should be reflected through different mechanisms than those of the Participants. The Commission reiterates that in each instance the purpose of excluding Commission personnel from these provisions is *not* to subject the Commission or its personnel to more lenient data security or confidentiality standards. Despite these differences in the origins of their respective obligations, the rules and policies applicable to the Commission and its personnel will be comparable to those applicable to the Participants and their personnel.

The Commission and its personnel are subject to a number of existing federal and Commission rules and policies regarding the security and confidentiality of information that they encounter in the course of their employment. These rules and policies apply with equal force to data that Commission personnel can access in the CAT. For example, existing laws and regulations prohibit Commission personnel from disclosing non-public information [1276] without authorization.[1277] CAT Data available to Commission personnel will contain non-public information. Thus, Commission personnel who disclose or otherwise misuse this data would potentially be subject to criminal penalties (including fines and imprisonment), as well as disciplinary action (including termination of employment), civil injunction, and censure by professional associations (for attorneys and accountants).[1278] The Commission believes that the protections described above provide as strong a deterrent against the possible misuse of CAT Data by Commission personnel as would the submission of the ''Safeguard of Information Affidavit'' required by Section 6.5(f)(i)(B).[1279]

In addition, the Commission already has robust information security policies and procedures developed in accordance with federal directives and NIST standards that prohibit the unauthorized disclosure and inappropriate use of confidential data. Moreover, the Commission will review and update, as necessary, its existing confidentiality and data use policies and procedures to account for access to the CAT, and, like the Participants, will periodically review the effectiveness of these policies and procedures and take prompt action to remedy deficiencies in such policies and procedures. Like other information security controls over information resources that support federal operations and assets, the Commission's policies and procedures applicable to CAT must comply with the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 and the NIST standards required thereunder,[1280] and will be subject to audits by the SEC Office of Inspector General and the GAO.

Notwithstanding the existence of these protections, in light of the scope and nature of CAT Data, the Commission recognizes the need to ensure that it has in place a comprehensive framework for CAT data security. Accordingly, a cross-divisional steering committee of senior Commission Staff is being formed to design policies and procedures regarding Commission and Commission Staff access to, use of, and protection of CAT Data. The policies and procedures will consider, but not be limited to, access controls, appropriate background checks, usage and data protection, as well as incident response. In developing these policies and procedures, the steering committee will, of necessity, take into account how the data collection and other systems are developed in connection with the creation of the CAT. The Commission will ensure that its policies and procedures impose protections upon itself and its personnel that are comparable to those required under the provisions in the Plan from which the

---

[1274] Such an approach also has the potential to create tension with the existing oversight of the Commission conducted by the Office of the Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office.

[1275] Moreover, Commission employees are generally immune from personal liability for actions performed in the course of their duties. *See, e.g., Gilbert* v. *Digress,* 756 F.2d 1455, 1458 (9th Cir. 1985) (''the bar of sovereign immunity cannot be avoided by naming officers and employees of the United States as defendants''); *Clark* v. *Library of Congress,* 750 F.2d 89, 103–04 (D.C. Cir. 1984) (absent a specific waiver by the government, sovereign immunity bars constitutional suits for money damages against government employees in their official capacity, even in cases where the employee acted outside his authority); 28 U.S.C. 2679 (barring claims against government employees under the Federal Tort Claims Act).

[1276] *See, e.g.,* 5 CFR 2635.703(b) (''Nonpublic information is information that the employee gains by reason of Federal employment and that he knows or reasonably should know has not been made available to the general public.'').

[1277] *See, e.g.,* 15 U.S.C. 78x(b) (''It shall be unlawful for any member, officer, or employee of the Commission to disclose to any person other than a member, officer, or employee of the Commission, or to use for personal benefit, any information contained in any application, statement, report, contract, correspondence, notice, or other document filed with or otherwise obtained by the Commission (1) in contravention of the rules and regulations of the Commission under [the Freedom of Information Act], or (2) in circumstances where the Commission has determined pursuant to such rules to accord confidential treatment to such information''); 17 CFR 200.735–3(b)(2)(i) (''A member or employee of the Commission shall not . . . [d]ivulge to any unauthorized person or release in advance of authorization for its release any nonpublic Commission document, or any information contained in any such document or any confidential information: (A) In contravention of the rules and regulations of the Commission promulgated under [the Freedom of Information Act], [the Privacy Act], and [the Sunshine Act]; or (B) in circumstances where the Commission has determined to accord such information confidential treatment''); 5 CFR 2635.703(a) (''An employee shall not engage in a financial transaction using nonpublic information, nor allow the improper use of nonpublic information to further his own private interest or that of another, whether through advice or recommendation, or by knowing unauthorized disclosure.'').

[1278] *See, e.g.,* 18 U.S.C. 1905 (''Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof . . . publishes, divulges, discloses, or makes known in any manner or to any extent not authorized by law any information coming to him in the course of his employment or official duties, . . . which information concerns or relates to the trade secrets, processes, operations, style of work, or apparatus, or to the identity, confidential statistical data, amount or source of any income, profits, losses, or expenditures of any person, firm, partnership, corporation, or association; . . . shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and shall be removed from office or employment''); 5 U.S.C. 552a(h)(i)(1) (''Criminal penalties—Any officer or employee of an agency, who by virtue of his employment or official position, has possession of, or access to, agency records which contain individually identifiable information the disclosure of which is prohibited by this section or by rules or regulations established thereunder, and who knowing that disclosure of the specific material is so prohibited, willfully discloses the material in any manner to any person or agency not entitled to receive it, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than $5,000'').

[1279] A comment from one Participant suggested that persons with access to the Central Repository—regardless of whether they are employed by the Plan Processor, the Commission, or a Participant—should not be subject to personal liability for the misuse of data. The Commission is not amending the Plan to remove personal liability from all categories of such persons. The inclusion in the Plan of a provision providing for personal liability for the misuse of data indicates that the Participants more broadly believe that this is an appropriate and potentially effective way of deterring misuse of data, including by their own employees. And, in the Commission's view, the Participants' belief is reasonable.

[1280] Public Law 113–283 (Dec. 18, 2014); NIST, Security and Privacy Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations, Special Publication 800–53, revision 4 (Gaithersburg, Md.: April 2013); NIST, Contingency Planning Guide for Federal Information Systems, Special Publication 800–34, revision 1 (Gaithersburg, Md.: May 2010).

Commission and its personnel are excluded.

For these reasons, the Commission does not believe that the Plan should be amended to remove the exclusion of ''employees and Commissioners of the SEC'' from Section 6.5(f)(i)(A)–(B) or to extend the requirements of Section 6.5(g) to the Commission. Similarly, the Commission does not believe that the requirements in Section 6.5(g) that Participants establish and enforce policies and procedures designed to ensure the confidentiality of CAT Data obtained from the Central Repository and to limit the use of such data to surveillance and regulatory purposes can or should be extended to the Commission. Moreover, the Commission is further amending the Plan, as set forth below, to remove the Commission from certain other obligations.

First, the Commission is amending the Plan to provide that Section 6.5(f)(iii) does not apply to the Commission or its personnel. As proposed, this provision provided that the Participants and the Commission must, as promptly as reasonably practicable, but in any event within twenty-four hours, report instances of non-compliance with policies and procedures or breaches of the security of the CAT to the CCO. The Commission received no comments on this provision. The Commission notes that, consistent with presidential directives and guidance from the OMB and the Department of Homeland Security United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team (''US–CERT''), its existing incident response policies and procedures require Commission employees to promptly convey any known instances of non-compliance with data security and confidentiality policies and procedures or breaches of the security of its systems to the CISO of the Commission, and this policy will apply to any instances of non-compliance or breaches that occur with respect to the CAT. The Commission's policies and procedures regarding the CAT will also address conveying information regarding any such incidents to the CCO when appropriate.

Second, for the reasons discussed above, the Commission is amending the Plan to clarify that Section 6.5(f)(iv)(B) does not apply to the Commission or its personnel. As proposed, this provision stated that the Plan Processor must ''require the establishment of secure controls for data retrieval and query reports by Participant regulatory Staff and the Commission.'' [1281] The Commission received no comments on this provision. The Commission will ensure that comparable controls governing data retrieval and query reports from the CAT will be included, as applicable, in its policies and procedures.

Third, the Commission is amending the Plan to clarify that the requirement to test changes to CAT functionality in Appendix D, Section 11.3 applies only to the Participants. As proposed, this provision stated that, with respect to changes to CAT functionality and infrastructure, the Plan Processor must ''[d]efine the process by which changes are to be tested by CAT Reporters and regulators.'' The Commission received no comments on this provision. For the reasons discussed above, the Commission is narrowing this provision so that it is applicable only to the Participants. However, the Commission intends to take part in the testing of changes in CAT functionality or infrastructure that would affect the way Commission personnel access and use the CAT System.

Fourth, for the reasons discussed above, the Commission is amending the Plan to exclude the Commission and its personnel from certain CAT user access provisions in Appendix D, Sections 4.1.4 and 4.1.6 of the CAT NMS Plan. The Plan, as proposed, provided that the Plan Processor shall ''implement and maintain a mechanism to confirm the identity of all individuals permitted to access the CAT Data stored in the Central Repository and maintain a record of all instances where such CAT Data was accessed.'' [1282] Specifically, Appendix D, Section 4.1.4 of the CAT NMS Plan provides: that ''[p]eriodic reports detailing the current list of authorized users and the date of their most recent access must be provided to Participants, the SEC and the Operating Committee,'' that the ''reports of the Participants and the SEC will include only their respective list of users,'' that the ''Participants and the SEC must provide a response to the report confirming that the list of users is accurate,'' and that the ''Plan Processor must log every instance of access to Central Repository data by users.''

In addition, the CAT NMS Plan provides that ''[a] full audit trail of PII access (who accessed what data, and when) must be maintained,'' that ''[t]he Chief Compliance Officer and the Chief Information Security Officer shall have access to daily PII reports that list all users who are entitled for PII access, as well as the audit trail of all PII access that has occurred for the day being reported on,'' and that ''[t]he chief regulatory officer, or other such designated officer or employee at each Participant and the Commission must, at least annually, review and certify that people with PII access have the appropriate level of access for their role.'' [1283]

For the reasons discussed above, the Commission is amending the Plan to exclude the Commission from the provisions that require the Commission to ''provide a response to the report confirming that the list of users is accurate'' and to ''review and certify that people with PII access have the appropriate level of access for their role.'' [1284] However, in accordance with Commission information security policies and procedures, the Commission will periodically review the appropriateness of CAT access by personnel and work with the Plan Processor to ensure the list of SEC users authorized to access CAT Data in the Central Repository is appropriate.

7. Personally Identifiable Information

a. Protections Around PII, Regulatory Access to PII

A number of commenters discussed the Plan Processor's provisions to protect the PII reported to and stored in the Central Repository. Two commenters noted that PII should be held to the ''highest'' or ''most stringent'' standards of information protection.'' [1285] However, one commenter stated that ''the protection and security of PII in CAT is ''good enough.'' [1286] Another commenter recommended that the Plan provide further details as to how PII data will be treated and confidentiality maintained, specifically during extraction and transmission of the data.[1287]

Commenters also discussed the Plan's provisions regarding access to PII. One commenter noted that ''access to PII data should be provided only in the rarest of instances (*i.e.,* SEC investigations for securities law

[1281] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(f)(iv)(B).

[1282] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(f)(i)(D).

[1283] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.6.

[1284] *Id.* at Appendix D, Sections 4.1.4 and 4.1.6.

[1285] TR Letter at 8; SIFMA Letter at 22; *see also* NYSE Letter at 3 (discussing CAT Data, including PII reported to the Central Repository, and noting that the security of the confidential data stored in the Central Repository and other CAT systems must be of the highest quality).

[1286] Data Boiler Letter at 29 (stating ''PII should properly be safeguarded . . . . but nothing will be absolutely ''bullet-proof.'').

[1287] SIFMA Letter at 44 (suggesting that the Bidders should be evaluated on how their proposed solutions will meet the confidentiality requirements by a technical panel of experts with representation from broker-dealers).

violations), as regulators and other authorized users should be able to perform the majority, if not all, of their regulatory and oversight responsibilities by utilizing non-PII data, such as the CAT Customer-ID.'' [1288] Another commenter stated that there should be controls, policies and procedures to prohibit the downloading of certain sensitive information, such as PII, and suggested limiting Participant access to sensitive data only to specific enforcement actions.[1289] One commenter recommended that PII data never be exported, extracted, copied or downloaded in any manner or form from the CAT environment.[1290] This commenter added that PII data should not be included in email or other electronic communications, and advocated for use of a special CAT information management tool.[1291] Another commenter believed the PII should be excluded from direct query tools, reports or bulk data extraction.[1292]

In their response, the Participants noted that Section 6.10(c)(i)(B) of the Plan provides that ''[t]he user-defined direct queries and bulk extracts will provide authorized users with the ability to retrieve CAT Data via a query tool or language that allows users to query all available attributes and data sources.'' [1293] The Participants clarified that no customer-related information, including PII, will be included in response to queries of the broader order and transaction database, nor will it be available in bulk extract form.[1294] Instead, the Participants stated that customer-related information, such as PII, will be stored in a separate database, which can be accessed only in accordance with heightened security protocols.[1295] In such case, a regulatory user would have to be specifically authorized to access the database with PII and other customer-related information.[1296] The Participants stated that they expect that the Plan Processor and the CISO will establish policies and procedures to identify abnormal usage of the database containing customer-related information, and to escalate concerns as necessary; and noted that the details regarding such policies and procedures will be determined once the Plan Processor has been selected.[1297]

With respect to the standards of protection for PII, the Commission notes that the Plan Processor must adhere to the NIST Risk Management Framework and implement baseline security controls identified in NIST Special Publication 800–53, which the Commission believes, when applied properly, are sufficiently rigorous industry standards for the protection of sensitive data such as PII.[1298] The Commission also believes that the Participants' general approach to treating PII differently—and with more stringent protections—than other CAT Data is also reasonable, given the highly sensitive nature of PII, and the risk that an individual Customer's orders and transactions could be identified should the Central Repository's data security protections be breached. Thus, the Commission believes that the Plan's provisions which limit who can access PII and how PII can be accessed are a reasonable means of ensuring the protection of PII. Specifically, the Commission believes that requiring access to PII to follow RBAC, adhering to the ''least privileged'' practice of limiting access,[1299] restricting access to PII to those with a ''need-to-know,'' and requiring that any login system that is able to access PII must be further secured via MFA, are reasonable.[1300]

The Commission also believes that the Participants' approach to the use of PII is a reasonable means of protecting PII of Customers reported to the Central Repository. Specifically, the Commission believes that the Plan's provisions setting out specific parameters applicable to the inclusion of PII in queries, as described by the Participants, is a reasonable approach to controlling the disclosure of PII and helps to ensure that PII will only be used by regulators for regulatory and surveillance purposes and, as set out in the Plan, for market reconstruction and analysis.

The Commission notes that the Plan and the Participants' response affirms that access to PII data will only be provided to a limited set of authorized individuals, and only for the limited purpose of conducting regulatory and surveillance activities.[1301] The Plan also contains an explicit prohibition on the ability to bulk download sensitive information such as PII, and this protection must be reinforced through the Plan Processor's controls, policies and procedures.

Thus, the Commission believes that the Plan's provisions addressing the protections of PII, and the limitations on its access and use, provide a reasonable framework for the protection of PII. While it is concluding that the Plan sets forth a reasonable framework for the protection of PII, the Commission notes that the Plan Processor will continually assess, and the CISO and Operating Committee will vigorously oversee, the adequacy of the security of CAT Data, and in particular PII, and will promptly and thoroughly address any deficiencies that are identified.[1302]

b. PII Scope: Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information

One commenter requested clarification on the scope of PII, stating ''[t]he exact scope of PII should be defined, *i.e.,* are all fields associated with a customer included as PII?'' [1303] In their response, the Participants provided additional clarification on their interpretation of PII, as well as on the scope of the Plan's protections for all customer-related information.[1304] Specifically, the Participants clarified that they view all customer-related information—not only PII, but also Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information—as the type of highly sensitive information that requires the highest level of protection under the Plan.[1305] The Participants further stated that because there is some inconsistency in how these terms are used in the Plan, to the extent that any statement in the Plan, including Section 6.10(c) of the Plan, and Appendices C or D thereto, are inconsistent with the above description, the Participants recommend that the Commission amend

[1288] SIFMA Letter at 22.

[1289] FIF Letter at 134–135.

[1290] SIFMA Letter at 22.

[1291] *Id.*

[1292] FSI Letter at 3.

[1293] Response Letter III at 10.

[1294] *Id.*

[1295] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.6.

[1296] For example, in their Response Letter, the Participants noted that if a regulatory user received a tip about a particular person, such user, if he or she were appropriately authorized to do so, could search the customer-related information database and view unmasked information to identify the person's Customer-ID, and then use the Customer-ID to query the broader order and transaction database to view the relevant activity for that Customer-ID. Response Letter III at 10.

[1297] *Id.*

[1298] *See* Section IV.D.6.b, *supra.*

[1299] The Commission understands that the ''least privileged'' practice entails limiting access to the minimal level of access to PII that will allow normal functioning.

[1300] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.4.

[1301] The Commission notes that regulatory uses includes, among other things, analysis and reconstruction of market events, market analysis and research to inform policy decisions, market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions. *See supra* note 586.

[1302] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.1(o)(ii) (requiring the Plan Processor to provide the Operating Committee regular reports addressing, among other things, data security issues for the Plan Processor and the Central Repository taking into account the data security requirements set forth in Appendix D).

[1303] FIF Letter at 135.

[1304] Response Letter III at 9–10.

[1305] Response Letter III at 9.

the Plan to address any potential confusion.[1306]

The Commission agrees with the Participants and believes that the security of Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information, irrespective of whether it meets a common understanding of the definition of PII, should be subject to the highest standards of protection. Accordingly, the Commission is amending the definition of PII in Section 1.1 of the CAT NMS Plan to provide that PII means ''personally identifiable information, including a social security number or tax identifier number or similar information; Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information.'' The Commission believes that this amendment is reasonable in that it will ensure that all information that identifies a Customer will be afforded the same high levels of protection as data that the Participants initially defined as PII.

c. Storage of PII

Commenters also discussed the policies and procedures addressing storage of PII as a means to enhance the security and confidentiality of PII reported to the Central Repository. A few commenters stated that PII should be stored separately from other CAT Data.[1307] One commenter stated that ''PII must be segregated from other transactional data that will be stored by the CAT Processor.'' [1308] Another commenter opined that, while it does not believe that the CAT NMS Plan should mandate a particular storage method, it supported requiring PII to be stored separately, given its sensitive nature and the potential for identify theft or fraud.[1309]

In their response, the Participants clarified that they view all customer-related information (*i.e.,* PII, including Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information) as highly sensitive information that requires the highest level of protection and, as such, all customer-related information will be stored in a different, physically separated architecture.[1310]

The Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan's provisions regarding the storage of PII set forth a reasonable framework for the security of such data. The Plan further provides that the CAT infrastructure may not be commingled with other non-regulatory systems, including being segmented to the extent feasible on a network level, and data centers housing CAT systems must be AICPA SOC–2 certified by a qualified third party auditor that is not an affiliate of any Participant or the Plan Processor.[1311]

8. Implementation Schedule

The CAT NMS Plan sets forth timeframes for key CAT implementation events and milestones, such as when the Plan Processor will release the Technical Specifications, begin accepting data from Participants, begin accepting data from Industry Members for testing purposes, and when Industry Members must begin reporting to CAT.[1312]

a. Specificity and Timing of Implementation Milestones

One commenter stated that the CAT NMS Plan does not provide sufficient detail to allow for implementation planning.[1313] Another commenter argued that the CAT development milestones are unacceptable because they do not promote the objective of facilitating improved market surveillance.[1314]

Other commenters suggested extending the implementation schedule for CAT.[1315] One commenter suggested that there should be additional time to reassess and more carefully tailor the schedules and milestones that are included in the Plan to make the roll-out of the CAT as efficient as possible.[1316] Another commenter suggested extending the implementation schedule for a period of at least six to twelve months beyond the timeframe in the Plan as filed, particularly in light of the fact that many Industry Members will be working to comply with the Department of Labor's new fiduciary duty regulation as well as T+2 implementation during this same timeframe.[1317] This commenter noted that such an extended implementation timetable would also allow for additional testing and synchronization, which would result in a more accurate reporting environment on the ''go-live'' date.[1318] Another commenter noted that the CAT implementation schedule is more aggressive than the actual timeframes for implementing OATS for NMS or large trader reporting, which could lead to, among other things, poorly built systems and an inferior quality of data reporting.[1319] This commenter also presented a detailed alternative implementation and milestone schedule that provides more time for Industry Members to prepare for CAT reporting.[1320]

On the other hand, another commenter believed that the implementation schedule is too protracted, noting that the phased-in approach of requiring CAT reporting first from Participants and then from Industry Members, combined with the fact that market participants typically request additional time to create systems to comply with new recordkeeping requirements, will render the CAT system incomplete for several years.[1321]

Several commenters addressed the CAT NMS Plan's development and testing milestones. One commenter noted that a robust testing period should be included in the implementation schedule and that currently the Plan does not allow sufficient time for thorough testing for broker-dealers or third-party service providers.[1322] This commenter also suggested a trial period to permit industry-wide testing of CAT readiness to ensure that the Plan Processor is capable of meeting reporting and linkage requirements outlined in the Plan.[1323] Another

[1306] Response Letter III at 10.

[1307] FSR Letter at 4; FSI Letter at 3; SIFMA Letter at 22; *see also* MFA Letter at 8 (stating that particularly sensitive pieces of data should be isolated or compartmentalized).

[1308] FIF Letter at 125. Similarly, another commenter recommended that PII data not overlap with access to the other transaction data available in the CAT. *See* SIFMA Letter at 23.

[1309] FSI Letter at 3.

[1310] Response Letter III at 9.

[1311] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.3; *see also* Response Letter I at 58–59.

[1312] *See* Section III.27, *supra.*

[1313] FIF Letter at 43.

[1314] Data Boiler Letter at 17.

[1315] *See, e.g.,* FSR Letter at 10 (noting that the implementation schedule should be extended to provide the industry a sufficient amount of time to comply with the new reporting structure under the CAT NMS Plan, including the ability to report CAT Data in a timely and accurate manner with a reduced error rate); FIF Letter at 7, 40–41, 45 (stating that FIF could not support the Plan's implementation milestones as proposed and that the Plan lacks appropriate risk-mitigating strategies for CAT Reporters to cope with the ''aggressive'' implementation schedule and suggesting several such strategies).

[1316] SIFMA Letter at 23.

[1317] FSR Letter at 10. The Commission notes that, as of the date of this Order, a T+2 standard settlement cycle has been proposed, but not adopted. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78962 (September 28, 2016), 81 FR 69240 (October 5, 2016).

[1318] FSR Letter at 10.

[1319] FIF Letter at 36.

[1320] *Id.* at 41–50. For example, FIF suggested that the Participants should select the Plan Processor prior to Plan approval and that the test environment should be available to CAT Reporters twelve months prior to the start of Industry Member reporting (rather than six months prior to the start of Industry Member reporting as proposed in the Plan). *Id.* at 42–43.

[1321] Anonymous Letter I at 3.

[1322] SIFMA Letter at 24.

[1323] *Id.; see also* TR Letter at 6 (emphasizing the importance of the testing period and noting that the three-month period included in the Plan for testing

commenter recommended that the CAT NMS Plan include ''acceptance criteria'' for the completion of each CAT development milestone to ensure that the implementation of the CAT and the completion of subsequent milestones are not hindered by poor quality at earlier development stages.[1324]

This commenter further supported an earlier start to the development of the Technical Specifications and stated that the six-month period contemplated by the CAT NMS Plan for the industry to test software that will interface with the Plan Processor is insufficient, particularly for third-party service providers and service bureaus.[1325] This commenter suggested, among other things, accelerating the availability of the CAT test environment to earlier in the implementation cycle and allowing a minimum of twelve months of access to the CAT test environment for the first group of Industry Member reporters.[1326] Another commenter proposed a twelve-month testing period with clear criteria established before moving into production, including coordinated testing across industry participants and the vendors that support them.[1327] This commenter also noted that the testing plans that will be used for any potential move to T+2 would be useful in developing industry testing for the CAT and that error rates should be consistent with OATS for reports that are currently reported to OATS.[1328] This commenter further suggested that robust testing that mirrors production will be necessary to ensure that the Plan Processor is capable of meeting the reporting and linkage requirements outlined in the Plan.[1329]

In response to these commenters, the Participants explained that in light of their experience with testing timelines for other system changes, discussions with the Bidders, and other considerations, they continue to believe that the Plan sets forth an achievable testing timeline.[1330] The Participants also acknowledged the importance of the development process for the Technical Specifications for all CAT Reporters and noted that they have emphasized this as a high priority with the Bidders.[1331]

The Participants stated that they ''do not propose to amend the Plan to reflect an expedited schedule for the Industry Member Technical Specifications.'' [1332] In addition, the Participants indicated that while strategies to mitigate any risks in meeting the implementation milestones will be a necessary part of promoting the successful implementation of the CAT, they believe that formulating specifics regarding risk mitigation strategies will depend on the selected Plan Processor and its solution.[1333] Therefore, the Participants stated their belief that such risk mitigation strategies will be addressed as a part of the agreement between the Plan Processor and the CAT LLC, and implemented thereafter.[1334]

The Commission agrees that prompt availability of Technical Specifications that provide detailed instructions on data submission and a robust period of testing CAT reporting functionality are important factors in ensuring that Industry Members are able to timely transition to CAT reporting and accurately report data to the Central Repository. In this regard, the Commission expects the Participants to ensure that the Technical Specifications will be published with sufficient time for CAT Reporters to program their systems, and strongly encourages the Participants and the Plan Processor to provide the earliest possible release of the initial Technical Specifications for Industry Member reporting and to begin accepting Industry Member data for testing purposes as soon as practicable. In addition, the Commission is amending Appendix C, Section C.10 of the Plan to ensure that the completion dates for the Technical Specifications, testing, and other development milestones designate firm outer limits, rather than ''projected'' completion dates, for the completion of these milestones. For example, as amended, the Plan will provide that the Plan Processor will begin developing Technical Specifications for Industry Member submission of order data no later than fifteen months before Industry Members are required to begin reporting this data, and will publish the final Technical Specifications no later than one year before Industry Members are required to begin reporting. Moreover, the Commission is amending Appendix C, Section C.10 of the Plan to clarify that the CAT testing environment will be made available to Industry Members on a voluntary basis no later than six months prior to when Industry Members are required to report data to the CAT and that more coordinated, structured testing of the CAT System will begin no later than three months prior to when Industry Members are required to report data to the CAT.

The Commission acknowledges that the transition to CAT reporting will be a major initiative that should not be undertaken hastily, that Industry Members and service bureaus will need sufficient time to make the preparations necessary to comply with the reporting requirements of the Plan and the Technical Specifications, and the importance of thorough testing. However, the Commission does not believe that the Plan's Technical Specification and testing timeframes are unachievable. Therefore, the Commission believes it is premature—one year before the Technical Specifications for Industry Members will be finalized, eighteen months before testing will begin, and before any problem with achieving these milestones has actually arisen—to consider amending the CAT NMS Plan to mandate a more protracted implementation schedule.

Similarly, the Commission continues to believe that the implementation dates that are explicitly provided in Rule 613—for example, that Industry Members and Small Industry Members will begin reporting Industry Member data to the Central Repository within two or three years, respectively, of Plan approval [1335]—are reasonable. As discussed above, the Plan provides appropriate interim milestones, such as iterative drafts of the Technical Specifications and a testing period, which will help prepare Industry Members to transition to CAT reporting pursuant to the implementation schedule set forth in the CAT NMS Plan. No issues complying with these dates have actually arisen, and the Commission is not altering these dates at this time.[1336] In addition, with

---

the customer definition process and order data process is inadequate based on the commenter's experience with projects of lesser complexity than the CAT and because continuous reporting of customer and options data will be entirely new processes).

[1324] FIF Letter at 41.

[1325] *Id.* at 37–38; *see also id.* at 38–39 (highlighting other development and testing issues, noting in particular that linkage testing across multiple CAT Reporters is one of the most complex pieces of logic for the CAT System and CAT Reporters).

[1326] FIF Letter at 39.

[1327] TR Letter at 6.

[1328] *Id.*

[1329] *Id.* at 2.

[1330] Response Letter I at 39.

[1331] *Id.* at 41.

[1332] *Id.*

[1333] *Id.* at 39.

[1334] *Id.*

[1335] 17 CFR 242.613(a)(3).

[1336] *See also* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45744, 45805 (stating that phasing CAT implementation to allow broker-dealers to begin reporting to the CAT after the SROs will ''allow members additional time to, among other things, implement the systems and other changes necessary to provide the required information to the [C]entral [R]epository, including capturing customer and order information that they may not have previously been required to collect'' and that ''the Commission encourages plan sponsors to propose in the NMS plan a requirement that small broker-

Continued

respect to the comment that strategies to mitigate the risks imposed by an ''aggressive'' implementation schedule—such as delays, poorly built systems, and an inferior quality of data reporting—should be included in the Plan, the Commission agrees with the Participants that formulating detailed risk mitigation strategies will depend upon the selected Plan Processor and its specific solution and will be addressed in the agreement between the Plan Processor and CAT NMS, LLC. Therefore, the Commission is not amending the Plan to require specific risk mitigation strategies at this time.

b. Impact of Technical Specifications on Implementation Milestones

In addition, several commenters suggested that reasonable timeframes for implementing the CAT can only be established once the Plan Processor publishes—and CAT Reporters review—the Technical Specifications.[1337] Similarly, one commenter suggested that the CAT NMS Plan should establish a milestone for amending the CAT NMS Plan based on a review of the final Technical Specifications and that these amendments should set forth the CAT implementation schedule.[1338] Another commenter argued that the Plan does not currently include critical information, such as interface details and other key technical specifications, and that broker-dealers must understand these specifications in order to establish a reasonable implementation schedule.[1339]

Several commenters suggested that the implementation schedule should be designed to provide more time for iterative interactions between Industry Members and the Plan Processor in terms of developing and executing system specifications, particularly as those specifications relate to listed options transactions and customer information.[1340] In addition, one commenter suggested that a technical committee should be established to work with the Plan Processor on refining the specifications and making necessary adjustments or accommodations as the specifications are developed and implemented.[1341] Another commenter suggested including a ''Specifications Date'' in the NMS Plan, which would be the date by which final Technical Specifications are released, at which point the industry would work with the Plan Processor to assess implementation timeframes.[1342] This commenter also urged the Commission to take a data-driven approach to implementation timing, leveraging prior experience with OATS, EBS and large trader reporting to fashion an implementation plan that is achievable.[1343]

Two commenters suggested that the Participants and the Commission, prior to the creation of the Technical Specifications, should provide the Plan Processor with additional detail on how they intend to use trade and order data.[1344] These commenters argued that this will ensure that the CAT is designed to provide all the functionality of existing systems with the initial implementation of CAT.[1345]

In their response, the Participants explained that while the Technical Specifications will be important drivers of the implementation timeline, Rule 613 mandates certain compliance dates.[1346] According to the Participants, delaying the assessment and definition of implementation milestones until the availability of the Technical Specifications would jeopardize the ability of the Participants to meet their obligations under Rule 613.[1347] However, the Participants also explained that ''the steps leading up to the compliance dates set forth in SEC Rule 613 can be tailored to the Technical Specifications'' leaving room to accommodate specific developments related to the Technical Specifications.[1348] The Participants also expect the Plan Processor to provide more specific guidance as to steps toward implementation with the Technical Specifications and, to the extent that such guidance would require an amendment to the Plan's implementation timelines, the Participants will propose to amend the Plan accordingly.[1349] With respect to the comments recommending an iterative process between broker-dealers and the Plan Processor in developing final Technical Specifications, the Participants noted that the Plan, as drafted, already contemplates the publication of iterative drafts as needed before the final Technical Specifications are published.[1350]

As noted, the Commission does not believe it is necessary to tie completion dates for CAT implementation events or milestones to the release and review of Technical Specifications. The Commission believes that setting forth specific timeframes in the CAT NMS Plan for completing the various CAT implementation stages and tying these timeframes to the Effective Date rather than to subsequent events such as the release, review, or finalization of the Technical Specifications, is a reasonable approach to achieve a timely implementation of the CAT. Therefore, and the Commission is not deferring or reducing the specificity of these timeframes at this time.

In response to the comments suggesting that the Plan should provide for a more iterative process between Industry Members and the Plan Processor in the development of the Technical Specifications, as the Participants' response pointed out, the CAT NMS Plan provides that the Plan Processor will publish iterative drafts of the Technical Specifications as needed prior to the publication of the final Technical Specifications.[1351] However, the Commission recognizes the importance of workable Technical Specifications, and notes that the Plan requires the Participants and the Plan Processor to work with Industry Members in an iterative process, as necessary, to develop effective final Technical Specifications.[1352]

Regarding the comment that the Participants and the Commission should provide the Plan Processor, prior to the creation of the Technical Specifications,

---

dealers report data to the [C]entral [R]epository within three years after effectiveness of the NMS plan, as the Commission believes that providing small broker-dealers a longer implementation time should assist such broker-dealers in identifying the most cost-effective and the most efficient manner in which to procure third-party software or make any systems modifications or other changes to comply with Rule 613.'').

[1337] SIFMA Letter at 23–24; FSR Letter at 10 (stating that the release of final Technical Specifications should drive the implementation timeline and that Industry Members should be provided with the Technical Specifications and given an opportunity to review and provide feedback to the Plan Processor in an effort to determine an appropriate implementation schedule); TR Letter at 3–6 (stating that rule-making should begin once final Technical Specifications are published and noting that, in keeping with the SEC's Equity Market Structure Advisory Committee's Rule Change Implementation timing recommendation, the timing of CAT implementation should be based on a review of the Technical Specifications); FIF Letter at 6–7 (recommending that an implementation schedule be established only after publication of the Technical Specifications and that the process for SRO and Commission rulemaking should begin upon publication of the final Technical Specifications).

[1338] *See* TR Letter at 6.

[1339] SIFMA Letter at 23–24.

[1340] *Id.* at 24; *see also* FIF Letter at 7, 40–41 (noting that there should be more time for testing and iterative specification reviews for CAT reporting).

[1341] SIFMA Letter at 24.

[1342] TR Letter at 5.

[1343] *Id.* at 6.

[1344] FIF Letter at 6; TR Letter at 3.

[1345] FIF Letter at 6; TR Letter at 3–4.

[1346] Response Letter I at 39–40.

[1347] *Id.* at 40.

[1348] *Id.*

[1349] *Id.*

[1350] *Id.* at 41.

[1351] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section C.10(b).

[1352] *See also* Section IV.D.15, *infra.*

with additional details on how they use trade and order data, the Commission understands that the Participants have provided the Bidders with their use cases and those of the Commission [1353] and have indicated that they will ''work with the Plan Processor and the industry to develop detailed Technical Specifications.'' [1354] The Commission and its Staff will work with the Participants and the Plan Processor to facilitate the development and implementation of the Technical Specifications and the CAT System more broadly, including by providing the Plan Processor with appropriate information on its current and prospective use of trade and order data.

c. Phasing of Industry Member Reporting

The CAT NMS Plan provides that Small Industry Members—broker-dealers whose capital levels are below a certain limit defined by regulation—must report Industry Member Data to the Central Repository within three years of the Effective Date, as opposed to the two years provided to other Industry Members.[1355]

Several commenters noted the impact the CAT NMS Plan's implementation schedule would have on small broker-dealers, clearing firms, and service bureaus. One commenter emphasized the need for sufficient lead time to enable small firms previously exempt from OATS reporting to establish the internal structure, technical expertise, systems, and contractual arrangements necessary for CAT reporting.[1356] Other commenters suggested that only those firms that are exempt or excluded from OATS reporting obligations—rather than Small Industry Member firms based on capital levels as set forth in the CAT NMS Plan—should have an additional year to begin reporting to CAT, arguing that such a change would allow existing systems to be retired earlier at a significant cost savings.[1357] Similarly, another commenter noted the impact the phased implementation schedule would have upon third-party vendors, service bureaus, and correspondent clearing firms with both large and small clients, and suggested that dividing Industry Members based on whether or not they currently report to OATS is preferable to the capital level-based division proposed in the CAT NMS Plan.[1358]

In response to these comments, the Participants explained their understanding that the Commission permitted additional compliance time for smaller firms because ''small broker-dealers may face greater financial constraints in complying with Rule 613 as compared to larger broker-dealers'' and that the Participants have based the implementation timeline on that framework.[1359] However, the Participants explained that they believe that Rule 613 and the Plan already permit Small Industry Members to commence reporting to the CAT when large Industry Members begin reporting to the CAT on a voluntary basis.[1360] In addition, the Participants stated that accelerating the reporting requirements for all Small Industry Members that are OATS reporters to require them to begin reporting to the Central Repository two years after Plan approval, when Large Industry Members are required to report, may enable FINRA to retire OATS on a more expedited basis and that the Participants will consider including in their Compliance Rules a requirement to accelerate reporting for Small Industry Members that are OATS reporters.[1361]

The Commission acknowledges that the capital-level based definition contained in the Plan is not the only way to define Small Industry Members for the purposes of the implementation schedule. However, this definition is derived from Exchange Act Rule 0–10,[1362] which defines small entities under the Exchange Act for purposes of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and reflects an ''existing regulatory standard that is an indication of small entities for which regulators should be sensitive when imposing regulatory burdens.'' [1363] In addition, the group of firms that do not currently report to OATS is diverse, and includes some large broker-dealers and entities that—although they are not FINRA members and hence do not have regular OATS reporting obligations—nevertheless engage in a significant volume of trading activity.[1364] Therefore, the Commission continues to believe, at this time, that the definition of Small Industry Member in the Plan is a reasonable means to identify market participants for which it would be appropriate to provide, and that would benefit from, an additional year to prepare for CAT reporting due to their relatively limited resources.

In addition, the Commission encourages the Participants and the Plan Processor to work with Small Industry Members that are also OATS reporters to enable them to begin reporting to CAT, on a voluntary basis, at the same time that large Industry Members are required to begin reporting, particularly if the Participants believe that this would facilitate more expeditious retirement of OATS. Accordingly, the Commission is amending Appendix C, Section C.9 of the Plan to require the Participants to consider, in their rule change filings to retire duplicative systems,[1365] whether the availability of certain data from Small Industry Members two years after the Effective Date would facilitate a more expeditious retirement of duplicative systems. In addition, the Commission notes that FINRA is considering whether it can integrate CAT Data with OATS data in such a way that ''ensures no interruption in FINRA's surveillance capabilities,'' and that FINRA will consider ''exempting firms from the OATS Rules provided they report data to the Central Repository pursuant to the CAT NMS Plan and any implementing rules.'' [1366] The Commission encourages the other Participants to consider similar measures to exempt firms from reporting to existing systems once they are accurately reporting comparable data to the CAT and to enable the usage of CAT Data to conduct their regulatory activities.[1367] The Commission believes that this approach will reduce or eliminate the duplicative reporting costs

[1353] *See* Response Letter II at 27 (''[T]he Participants have provided the Bidders with specific use cases that describe the surveillance and investigative scenarios that the Participants and the SEC would require for the CAT.'').

[1354] *See id.* at 21.

[1355] *See* Section III.27, *supra.*

[1356] SIFMA Letter at 23.

[1357] TR Letter at 3–4 (recommending that the definition of Small Industry Member be based on FINRA Rules 7470 and 7410(o)); *see also* Wachtel Letter at 1–2 (arguing that OATS-exempt firms should be granted Small Industry Member status and that metrics other than capital level such as number of registered persons, revenue, or number of orders routed may be better ways of assessing a firm's actual activity level and market impact); FIF Letter at 49 (supporting the Plan's approach to require Participants to report to the CAT first but suggesting that CAT reporting obligations be phased in first for OATS reporters and then non-OATS reporters, or, in the alternative, phasing reporting obligations based on functionality, such as equities, options and allocations); Section V.F.2.b, *infra.*

[1358] FIF Letter at 40 (suggesting, in the alternative, that the CAT NMS Plan should permit Small Industry Members to report concurrently with Large Industry Members).

[1359] Response Letter II at 19–20 (citing Adopting Release).

[1360] *Id.*

[1361] *Id.*

[1362] 17 CFR 240.0–10.

[1363] Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45804.

[1364] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30715, 30793.

[1365] *See* Section IV.D.9.a(1), *infra.*

[1366] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section C.9.

[1367] *See* Section IV.D.9.a(1), *infra* (requiring the Participants to consider, in their rule change filings to retire duplicative systems, whether individual Industry Members can be exempted from reporting to duplicative systems once their CAT reporting meets specified accuracy and reliability standards).

of Industry Members prior to the commencement of Small Industry Member reporting.

The Commission remains open to other approaches to phasing in CAT reporting obligations that will promote the earlier retirement of reporting systems that will be rendered duplicative by the CAT. However, for the reasons discussed above, the Commission believes that, at this time, the Plan's definition of Small Industry Member is reasonable, and is therefore not amending the Plan to change this definition or to otherwise change the phased approach to CAT implementation.

9. Retirement of Existing Trade and Order Data Rules and Systems

a. SRO Rules and Systems [1368]

As discussed above, the CAT NMS Plan provides that the Participants will conduct analyses of which existing trade and order data rules and systems require the collection of information that is duplicative, partially duplicative, or non-duplicative of CAT.[1369] Among other things, the Participants, in conducting these analyses, will consider whether information collected under existing rules and systems should continue to be collected or whether that information should be incorporated into CAT, and, in the case of retiring OATS, whether the Central Repository contains complete and accurate CAT Data that is sufficient to ensure that FINRA can effectively conduct surveillance and investigations of its members for potential violations of FINRA rules and federal laws and regulations.[1370] Under the Plan, as proposed, each Participant should complete its analysis of which of its systems will be duplicative of CAT within twelve months of when Industry Members are required to report to the Central Repository, and should complete its analyses of which of its systems will be partially duplicative and non-duplicative of CAT within eighteen months of when Industry Members are required to report to the Central Repository, although these timeframes could be extended if the Participants determine that more time is needed.[1371] In addition, the Plan requires each Participant to analyze the most appropriate and expeditious timeline and manner for eliminating duplicative and partially duplicative rules and systems and to prepare rule change filings with the Commission within six months of determining that an existing system or rule should be modified or eliminated.[1372]

(1) Timing

Several commenters addressed the timeframes proposed by the Participants for retiring systems that will be rendered duplicative by CAT. One commenter noted that the CAT NMS Plan does not contain a detailed approach for retiring duplicative reporting systems and thereby fails to meet the directives of Rule 613.[1373] This commenter suggested that the CAT NMS Plan should be amended to provide a detailed framework for elimination of reporting systems that will be rendered duplicative and outdated by CAT implementation, and to set forth a prioritized timetable for retirement of such duplicative systems.[1374] Similarly, another commenter expressed disappointment regarding the plan to eliminate duplicative systems, noting that the Plan merely sets forth a ''loose commitment'' from the Participants to complete their analyses of which rules and systems may be duplicative of CAT, rather than an actual retirement schedule.[1375]

Several commenters emphasized the importance of eliminating duplicative systems as soon as possible and suggested that the current proposal to allow up to two and a half years for the Participants to consider system elimination is too long in light of the additional expenses that will be incurred during the period of duplicative reporting.[1376] One commenter noted that without a regulatory obligation driving systems retirement, the Participants lack an incentive to retire existing systems, and that the Plan should not enable the Participants to move to planning for fixed income or primary market transaction reporting prior to mapping out the elimination of redundant systems.[1377] Another commenter presented a detailed alternative schedule—with significantly more aggressive timelines—for analyzing and retiring duplicative systems.[1378]

In addition, several commenters suggested replacing or modifying the duplicative reporting period with a ''test period'' or ''trial period.'' [1379] In this regard, one commenter suggested modifying the CAT NMS Plan to include a trial period of no more than six months, after which duplicative systems are retired or firms are exempted from duplicative reporting if they have met certain error rate requirements.[1380] Similarly, another commenter recommended replacing the duplicative reporting period with a trial period mirroring production, lasting no longer than six months, and providing that the actual launch of CAT functionality be linked to the retirement of existing systems and the end of the trial period.[1381] Other commenters suggested that the launch of CAT should be linked to the retirement of existing reporting systems, noting that it is important to maintain a single audit trail of record to avoid duplicative reporting.[1382]

One commenter suggested that the Participants should provide detailed requirements regarding retirement of existing systems to the Plan Processor after the Plan Processor is selected to ensure that the Technical Specifications include all functionality necessary to retire existing systems.[1383] Similarly, other commenters noted that the CAT should be designed in the first instance to include all data field information necessary to allow prompt elimination of redundant systems.[1384] One

[1368] *See also* Section V.F.2.b, *infra* (discussing comments on the costs of duplicative reporting).

[1369] *See* Section III.20, *supra.*

[1370] *Id.*

[1371] *Id.*

[1372] *Id.*

[1373] KCG Letter at 2–3; *see also* DAG Letter at 2.

[1374] KCG Letter at 2–3.

[1375] DAG Letter at 2; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's elimination of systems recommendations).

[1376] SIFMA Letter at 5–6; Bloomberg Letter at 7; Data Boiler Letter at 16–17, 36 (noting that the timing to retire duplicative reporting systems should be ''now or never'' and that CAT should have a milestone target of sun-setting OATS on the first day CAT goes live); FSR Letter at 10; TR Letter at 2–3; FIF Letter at 4 (noting that lack of an aggressive, detailed and committed retirement plan will result in excessive costs for CAT Reporters); Fidelity Letter at 2, 4–5 (noting that the Plan should establish a fixed date for retiring regulatory compliance systems that overlap with the CAT or, in the alternative, duplicative rules should sunset automatically once the CAT reaches certain performance metrics).

[1377] SIFMA Letter at 5–6.

[1378] FIF Letter at 26, 31–34. For example, FIF suggests that the Participants should complete their analyses of duplicative and partially duplicative rules and systems upon approval of the CAT NMS Plan and that the Participants should file rule changes to implement rule modifications or deletions when the Technical Specifications are released. *Id.*

[1379] *See, e.g.,* FSR Letter at 10 (recommending the replacement of the currently contemplated duplicative reporting period with a test period of the new CAT reporting system).

[1380] FIF Letter at 6, 25–28, 39 (recommending that there should be no penalties, archiving requirements or regulatory inquiries related to CAT reporting during this trial period).

[1381] TR Letter at 2.

[1382] FSR Letter at 10; TR Letter at 2.

[1383] TR Letter at 4.

[1384] SIFMA Letter at 5–6; DAG Letter at 2 (suggesting that the Technical Specifications and functional requirements should include certain data attributes to assist in retiring duplicative systems and that the inclusion of OTC equities will more readily allow for the retirement of duplicative systems) ; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's elimination of systems recommendations).

commenter noted that the CAT should be so designed even if it means that CAT includes information, products, or functionality not necessary to meet the minimum initial CAT requirements under Rule 613.[1385] This commenter also proposed that the CAT should be designed to allow the ready addition of data fields over time to enhance the ability to retire other systems and capture additional necessary information.[1386]

One commenter outlined the steps that it believes are necessary to retire OATS and COATS.[1387] This commenter stated that these systems cannot be eliminated until FINRA and CBOE can seamlessly continue performing their current surveillance on their member firms and that the relevant data elements needed by FINRA and CBOE to perform the current surveillance would need to be retained as part of CAT's Technical Specifications.[1388]

In response to the comments recommending that the Participants accelerate the timeline to identify their existing rules and systems that are duplicative of CAT requirements and that CAT should be designed in the first instance to include all data field information necessary to allow prompt elimination of such redundant systems, the Participants explained that they recognize the importance of eliminating duplicative reporting requirements as rapidly as possible.[1389] The Participants also stated that to expedite the retirement of duplicative systems, the Participants with duplicative systems have already completed gap analyses for systems and rules identified for retirement (in full or in part), and confirmed that data that would need to be captured by the CAT to support retirement of these systems will be included in the CAT.[1390] Specifically, the relevant Participants have evaluated each of the following systems/rules: FINRA's OATS Rules (7400 Series),[1391] COATS and associated rules, NYSE Rule 410(b), PHLX Rule 1022, CBOE Rule 8.9, EBS and associated rules, C2 Rule 8.7 and CHX BrokerPlex reporting (Rule 5).[1392] In addition, the Participants stated that a broader review of the Participants' rules intended to identify any other impact that the CAT may have on the Participants' rules and systems generally is ongoing.[1393] The Participants also explained that once the Plan Processor is selected, the Participants will work with the Plan Processor and the industry to develop detailed Technical Specifications that ensure that by the time Industry Members are required to report to the CAT, the CAT will include all data elements necessary to facilitate the rapid retirement of these duplicative systems.[1394]

To reflect these efforts, the Participants recommended an acceleration of the timelines for analyzing duplicative rules and systems by recommending amendments to Appendix C of the CAT NMS Plan to change the completion dates for their analyses of: (1) Duplicative rules and systems to nine to twelve months from Plan approval (rather than 12 months from the onset of Industry Member reporting) and (2) partially duplicative and non-duplicative rules and systems to nine to twelve months from Plan approval (rather than 18 months from the onset of Industry Member reporting).[1395] However, the Participants noted that these proposed timelines are based on the Plan Processor's appropriate and timely implementation of the CAT and the CAT Data being sufficient to meet the surveillance needs of each Participant.[1396]

In response to the comments recommending that duplicative systems be retired on a fixed date, the Participants explained that they cannot commit to retiring any duplicative systems by a designated date because the retirement of a system depends on a variety of factors.[1397] For example, the Participants explained that they would need to ensure that the CAT Data is sufficiently extensive and of high quality before they could rely on it for regulatory oversight purposes and that they would be unable to retire any of their duplicative systems until any rule changes related to such systems retirements are approved by the Commission.[1398] The Participants also noted that the elimination of potentially duplicative requirements established by the Commission (*e.g.,* EBS reporting pursuant to SEC Rule 17a–25 and large trader reporting pursuant to SEC Rule 13h–1) are outside the Participants' purview.[1399] In addition, in response to the comment that the Participants lack an incentive to retire duplicative systems, the Participants explained that they are incented to eliminate systems that would be extraneous for regulatory purposes after CAT is operational due to the significant costs Participants face in running such systems.[1400]

In response to the comments suggesting the use of a trial period to transition to the CAT, the Participants stated that they recognize the concerns regarding the potential for disciplinary actions during the commencement of reporting to the CAT when, despite good faith efforts, reporting errors may develop due to the lack of experience with the CAT.[1401] Accordingly, the Participants stated that they will take into consideration the lack of experience with the CAT when evaluating any potential regulatory concerns with CAT reporting during the first months after such reporting is required.[1402] In addition, the Participants stated that they intend to work together with Industry Members to facilitate their CAT reporting; for example, the CAT's testing environments will provide an opportunity for Industry Members to gain experience with the CAT, and the Plan Processor will provide Industry Members with a variety of resources to assist them during onboarding and once CAT reporting begins, including user support and a help desk.[1403]

The Commission acknowledges that a protracted period of duplicative reporting would impose significant costs on broker-dealers and recognizes the importance of retiring duplicative rules and systems as soon as possible and of setting forth an appropriate schedule to achieve such retirement in the CAT NMS Plan. As discussed above, although a broader review of the Participants' rules intended to identify any other impact that the CAT may have on the Participants' rules and systems generally is ongoing, the Participants have completed gap analyses for

[1385] SIFMA Letter at 5–6.

[1386] *Id.* at 5–6.

[1387] *Id.* at 10–12.

[1388] *Id.*

[1389] Response Letter II at 21.

[1390] *Id.*

[1391] The Participants stated that this review also would cover the rules of other Participants that incorporate FINRA's OATS requirements. Response Letter II at 21 (citing NASDAQ Rule 7000A Series, BX Rule 6950 Series, PHLX Rule 3400 Series, NYSE Rule 7400 Series, NYSE Arca Equities Rule 7400 Series, NYSE MKT Rule 7400 Series).

[1392] Response Letter II at 21.

[1393] *Id.* (noting that descriptions of OATS and EBS gap analyses created on behalf of the Participants are available for public review on the CAT NMS Plan Web site and that Participants have worked to keep these gap analyses up-to-date by including newly-added data fields in these duplicative systems, such as the new OATS data fields related to the tick size pilot and ATS order book changes, in the gap analyses).

[1394] *Id.* at 20–21.

[1395] *Id.* at 22–26.

[1396] *Id.* at 22.

[1397] *Id.* at 20–21.

[1398] *See id.*

[1399] *Id.; see also* Section IV.D.9.b, *infra,* discussing the Commission's plans to retire certain aspects of EBS and large trader reporting and other SEC rules once CAT is operational.

[1400] Response Letter II at 20.

[1401] *Id.* at 27.

[1402] *Id.*

[1403] *Id.*

systems and rules identified for full or partial retirement, including larger systems such as OATS and COATS. The Participants have confirmed that the data needed to support the retirement of these key systems will be included in the CAT,[1404] and have proposed to accelerate the projected dates for completing these analyses of duplicative, partially duplicative, and non-duplicative rules and systems to nine to twelve months after Plan approval.

Although the Commission appreciates these efforts to accelerate the retirement of existing data reporting rules and systems that are duplicative of the CAT, the Commission believes that stronger Plan amendments than those recommended by the Participants should be made to ensure that such rules and systems are eliminated, modified, or retired as soon as practicable after the CAT is operational so that the period of duplicative reporting is kept short. Therefore, the Commission is amending Section C.9 of Appendix C of the Plan to reflect the Participants' representation that their analyses of key duplicative systems are already complete and to provide that proposed rule changes to effect the retirement of duplicative systems, effective at such time as CAT Data meets minimum standards of accuracy and reliability, shall be filed with the Commission within six months of Plan approval.

Based on the Participants' statement in their response to comments that their gap analyses are complete with respect to the major existing trade and order data reporting systems, the Commission believes that the process of assessing which systems can be retired after CAT is operational is in an advanced stage. Rather than amending the Plan to state that these analyses for duplicative systems will be complete within nine to twelve months of the Commission's approval of the CAT NMS Plan, as recommended by the Participants, the Commission believes that the milestones listed in Appendix C should include the Participants' representation that they have completed gap analyses for key rules and systems and should enumerate those specific systems because this more accurately reflects, and more prominently and clearly conveys to market participants and the public, the status of the Participants' planning for the transition from existing systems to CAT.

For these reasons, the Commission is also amending Section C.9 of Appendix C of the Plan to require the Participants to file with the Commission rule change proposals to modify or eliminate duplicative rules and systems within six months of the Effective Date. These filings will not effectuate an immediate retirement of duplicative rules and systems—the actual retirement of such rules and systems must depend upon the availability of comparable data in CAT of sufficient accuracy and reliability for regulatory oversight purposes, as specified in the Participants' rule change proposals. The Commission also is amending the Plan to require the Participants, in their rule change proposals, to discuss specific accuracy and reliability standards that will determine when duplicative systems will be retired, including, but not limited to, whether the attainment of a certain Error Rate should determine when a system duplicative of the CAT can be retired. Although these amendments were not suggested by the Participants, the Commission believes that the rule change filing milestone should be changed to six months from Plan approval given the status of the Participants' gap analyses and because the actual retirement of rules and systems will only occur once CAT Data meets minimum standards of accuracy and reliability. In addition, the Commission believes that an explicit statement in the Appendix C milestones that the retirement of systems that are duplicative of CAT shall occur once CAT Data meets minimum standards of accuracy and reliability will provide greater clarity regarding how the transition from existing reporting systems to the CAT will proceed. In addition, these amendments will better align the systems retirement schedule with the broader CAT implementation schedule. For example, requiring rule change proposals to be submitted to the Commission within six months will ensure that public comments, and Commission review of these comments, which could inform the development of the Technical Specifications, will be in progress as the Technical Specifications for Industry Member data submission are being developed (*i.e.,* at least fifteen months before Industry Members are required to report to CAT).

The Commission believes that, taken together, these amendments may facilitate an accelerated retirement of existing data reporting rules and systems that are duplicative of CAT and thus reduce the length of the duplicative reporting period as compared to the Plan as filed. Given that their requisite analytical work is already substantially complete, the Commission believes that the milestones, as amended, are achievable without a substantial increase in the burdens imposed on the Participants. Given the importance of retiring existing systems as rapidly as possible to reduce the substantial burdens on Industry Members that come with an extended period of duplicative reporting, the Commission believes that these amendments are appropriate. The CAT NMS Plan, as amended, recognizes that the Participants' requisite analytical work is already substantially complete and explicitly conditions the elimination of duplicative reporting only on the availability of accurate and reliable CAT Data that will enable the SROs to carry out their regulatory and oversight responsibilities. The amended Plan also accelerates the initiation of the formal process of retiring duplicative rules and systems by requiring that rule change filings be filed within six months of the Effective Date.

The Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan, as amended, contains an appropriate level of detail regarding the process of retiring duplicative rules and systems. However, the Commission is not amending the Plan to include fixed or mandatory dates for the retirement of existing rules and systems at this time. As the Participants noted in their response to comments, retiring a system depends upon many factors, including the availability of sufficiently extensive and high quality CAT Data.[1405] The Commission and the SROs will continue to rely on the information collected through existing regulatory reporting systems to reconstruct market events, conduct market analysis and research in support of regulatory decision-making, and conduct market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions until sufficiently complete, accurate, and reliable data is available through CAT. Therefore, precise dates for retiring these rules and systems cannot be determined prospectively. However, the Commission agrees with the Participants that they have incentives to retire extraneous systems after CAT is operational due to the desire to avoid the costs associated with maintaining such systems; the Commission believes that these incentives will mitigate any delay that would otherwise result from the difficulty of setting forth specific system retirement dates in advance.

As discussed above, the gap analyses completed by the Participants regarding the key existing trade and order data systems have confirmed that the CAT contains the data fields necessary to retire these systems, and the

[1404] *Id.* at 21.

[1405] Response Letter II at 20.

Commission has amended the Plan to ensure that any additional analysis related to duplicative rule and system retirement is completed in a timely manner. The Participants also explained that once the Plan Processor is selected, the Participants will work with the Plan Processor and Industry Members to develop detailed Technical Specifications that ensure that by the time Industry Members are required to report to the CAT, the CAT will include all data elements necessary to facilitate the rapid retirement of duplicative systems.[1406] The Commission agrees that the Participants should work with the Plan Processor and Industry Members in this manner and provide appropriate information about how they use trade and order data collected through existing rules and systems to ensure that the Technical Specifications are developed with these requirements in mind. In addition, with respect to the comment that CAT should be designed to permit the inclusion of additional data fields, the Commission notes that the Plan contains provisions regarding periodic reviews and upgrades to CAT that could lead to proposing additional data fields that are deemed important,[1407] and does not believe any changes to the Plan are necessary.

(2) Proposed Alternative Approaches to Systems Retirement

Several commenters suggested linking the retirement of duplicative systems to the error rate or quality of data reported to CAT. For example, one commenter suggested that the CAT NMS Plan should be amended to include an exemption from duplicative reporting obligations for individual broker-dealers based on meeting certain CAT reporting quality metrics.[1408] Similarly, another commenter suggested that a ''Retirement Error Rate'' should be defined as the acceptable error rate for discontinuing reporting to a duplicative system, and that the Retirement Error Rate should be based on comparable data in CAT (*e.g.,* OATS equivalent data reported to CAT should meet the reporting and quality criteria required by FINRA, but higher error rates associated with data elements that are outside the scope of existing systems should not prevent the retirement of such systems).[1409] One commenter suggested reducing the error rate as quickly as possible to facilitate the elimination of duplicative systems by including a test period to bring reporting near a 1% error rate when CAT is launched in production.[1410] This commenter also noted that disparities in error rate tolerance between CAT and other existing regulatory reporting systems should not serve as a pretext for prolonging the lifespan of those legacy systems.[1411] Several commenters suggested that the error rates used for elimination of duplicative systems should be post-correction error rates and that when a firm meets the necessary standards, the Plan should allow for individual firm exemptions from duplicative reporting.[1412]

One commenter also noted that the Participants have not adequately incorporated the 14-month milestone associated with the requirement that they enhance their surveillance systems [1413] into their milestones for the retirement of existing systems, noting that if the Participants are prepared to use CAT Data after 14 months, there should be no obstacles to retiring existing systems once the Retirement Error Rates are met.[1414] If the 14-month milestone is insufficient to obligate the Participants to use CAT Data in place of existing systems, this commenter would recommend a new milestone be created such that by the end of a trial period, the Participants must use CAT Data in place of existing systems.[1415]

Several commenters expressed support for the Plan's exemption from OATS reporting for CAT Reporters as long as there would be no interruption in FINRA's surveillance capabilities and urged the SROs to consider a similar approach for firms that meet certain error rate thresholds.[1416]

Similarly, one commenter suggested a ''principles-based framework'' for eliminating potentially duplicative systems.[1417] This framework would include: (i) A ''phased'' elimination program in which reporters that have achieved sufficient accuracy in CAT reporting can individually retire their systems; (ii) designing the Central Repository from the outset to include the ability to implement all of the surveillance methods and functions currently used by SROs; (iii) rather than relying on a simple field-mapping exercise to determine which systems can be eliminated, considering whether all the data elements currently reported under existing systems are really needed for the types of surveillance and other analyses typically undertaken by the Participants, whether the Central Repository can use alternative methods of surveillance or analysis that do not rely on those data elements, and whether data elements currently collected by an existing reporting system that are not available in the Central Repository could be derived or computed from data that is in the Central Repository; and (iv) requiring that questions to broker-dealers regarding their reported data should be directed though the process created for the Central Repository, not through previously-established channels based on legacy systems.[1418]

Several commenters suggested that the Commission should impose a moratorium on changes to existing systems to coincide with the launch of CAT to enable firms to dedicate resources to the successful launch and operation of CAT rather than the maintenance of legacy systems.[1419] In addition, several commenters suggested that the Plan should allow for elimination of individual systems as they become redundant or unnecessary once production commences in CAT.[1420]

In response to the comments recommending that exemptions be granted for individual Industry Member CAT Reporters from duplicative reporting obligations if they meet a

[1406] *Id.* at 20–21.

[1407] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30700.

[1408] KCG Letter at 2–3.

[1409] FIF Letter at 5, 24–26; *see also* Bloomberg Letter at 8 (noting that the Commission should specify an appropriate error rate for CAT NMS reporting such that, once met, CAT reporters can retire superseded systems).

[1410] SIFMA Letter at 6–7.

[1411] *Id.*

[1412] *Id.* at 7; *see also* FIF Letter at 5, 24 (corrected data should be used for error rates and individual firms should be allowed to retire duplicative systems once the Retirement Error Rate is achieved); TR Letter at 5–6; FSR Letter at 9 (stating that the error rate should only apply to post-correction data on equities). Section IV.D.11, *infra,* discusses the Commission's response to commenters suggesting the use of post-correction error rates.

[1413] 17 CFR 242.613(a)(3)(iv).

[1414] FIF Letter at 6, 24–25.

[1415] *Id.*

[1416] DAG Letter at 2; FIF Letter at 23; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's elimination of systems recommendations).

[1417] SIFMA Letter at 7–10.

[1418] *Id.* SIFMA also applied this framework to the retirement of OATS, EBS, and COATS. *See id.* at 10–12.

[1419] *Id.* at 5–6; *see also* TR Letter at 5 (calling for such a moratorium to commence once the Technical Specifications are in development to ensure that the Technical Specifications are sufficiently robust and to avoid enhancing systems that will be retired); Fidelity Letter at 2, 4–5 (noting that the Plan should call for an immediate cessation of enhancements to existing broker-dealer reporting systems which will retire once the CAT is operational); KCG Letter at 3 (noting that there should be a cessation of any changes to duplicative reporting systems during the period leading up to the CAT compliance date and once broker-dealers have to begin reporting to the CAT and any such changes should be built in to the CAT); FIF Letter at 27.

[1420] SIFMA Letter at 5–6; FSR Letter at 10 (stating that to the extent that any subset of data collected under the CAT NMS Plan is otherwise collected under a different reporting regime, the existing reporting regime should be amended as soon as possible to remove the duplicative reporting requirement).

specified data reporting quality threshold, the Participants explained that this would implicate the rules of the individual Participants and would be dependent upon the availability of extensive and high quality CAT Data, as well as Commission approval of rule change proposals by the Participants and the elimination of Commission data reporting rules such as Rules 17a–25 and 13h–1.[1421] Therefore, the Participants did not recommend an amendment to the Plan to incorporate such an exemption from the individual Participants' rules.[1422]

Nevertheless, the Participants explained that they have been exploring whether the CAT or the duplicative systems would require additional functionality to permit cross-system regulatory analyses that would minimize the duplicative reporting obligations.[1423] The Participants stated that FINRA remains committed to working with the Plan Processor to integrate CAT Data with data collected by OATS if it can be accomplished in an efficient and cost effective manner.[1424] However, the Participants stated that FINRA anticipates that CAT Reporters who are FINRA members and report to OATS will need to report to both OATS and the CAT for some period until FINRA can ensure that CAT Data is of sufficient quality for surveillance purposes and FINRA is able to integrate CAT Data with the remaining OATS data in a way that permits it to continue to perform its surveillance obligations.[1425] In addition, the Participants stated that FINRA believes that requiring all current OATS reporters to submit data to the Central Repository within two years after the Commission approves the Plan may reduce the amount of time that OATS and CAT will need to operate concurrently and may help facilitate the prompt retirement of OATS.[1426]

In response to the comment that the CAT should be designed from the outset to include the ability to implement all of the surveillance methods and functions currently used by the Participants, the Participants explained that CAT is not intended to be the sole source of surveillance for each Participant, and, therefore, would not cover all surveillance methods currently employed by the Participants.[1427] However, the Participants stated that, with the goal of using the CAT rather than duplicative systems for surveillance and other regulatory purposes, the Participants have provided the Bidders with specific use cases that describe the surveillance and investigative scenarios that the Participants and the Commission would require for the CAT, and that during the bidding process each Bidder has been required to demonstrate its ability to meet these criteria.[1428] In addition, the Participants noted that they have had multiple discussions with the Bidders regarding the query capabilities that each Bidder would provide, and the Participants believe that the selected Plan Processor will have the capability to provide the necessary surveillance methods and functions to allow for the retirement of duplicative systems.[1429] The Participants also stated that the Plan Processor will provide support, including a trained help-desk staff and a robust set of testing, validation, and error correction tools, to assist CAT Reporters as they transition to CAT reporting.[1430]

In response to comments concerning a moratorium on changes to new systems, the Participants explained that they plan to minimize the number of changes that are rolled out to duplicative systems to the extent possible.[1431] The Participants, however, cannot commit to making no changes to the duplicative systems as some changes may be necessary before these systems are retired—for example, changes to these duplicative systems may need to be made to address Commission initiatives, new order types or security-related changes.[1432]

The Commission agrees with the commenters that the accuracy of the data reported to CAT, as in part measured by CAT Reporters' Error Rate, should be a factor in determining whether and when duplicative trade and order data rules and systems should be eliminated. As discussed above, the rule change proposals regarding duplicative systems retirement that the Participants will file with the Commission within six months of the Effective Date must condition the elimination of existing data reporting systems on CAT Data meeting minimum standards of accuracy and reliability. The Commission believes that this approach may incentivize accurate CAT reporting because it could potentially allow Industry Members to retire redundant, and costly to maintain, systems sooner. The Commission believes that any such improvements in accuracy, together with the amended Plan's reduction of the period for the Participants to complete their analyses of duplicative, partially duplicative, and non-duplicative rules and its acceleration of the requirement to file system elimination rule change proposals, should facilitate an earlier retirement of duplicative systems. However, the Commission does not believe that a specific Error Rate that would automatically trigger the elimination of the collection of data through an existing, duplicative system can be set in advance, through a Plan amendment at this time. Rather, the more flexible standard set forth in the Plan, as amended—that duplicative systems will be retired as soon as possible after data of sufficient accuracy and reliability to ensure that the Participants can effectively carry out their regulatory obligations is available in CAT—recognizes the primacy of ensuring that CAT Data can be used to perform all regulatory functions before existing systems are retired, and is therefore more appropriate.

In response to the comments regarding individual exemptions from reporting to duplicative systems for Industry Members whose CAT reporting meets certain quality thresholds, the Commission supports the Participants' efforts to explore whether this can be feasibly accomplished by adding functionality to permit cross-system regulatory analyses that would minimize duplicative reporting obligations or, in the case of OATS, integrating CAT Data with data collected by OATS. Accordingly, the Commission is amending Section C.9 of Appendix C of the Plan to require that the Participants consider, in their rule filings to retire duplicative systems, whether individual Industry Members can be exempted from reporting to duplicative systems once their CAT reporting meets specified accuracy standards, including, but not limited to, ways in which establishing cross-system regulatory functionality or integrating data from existing systems and the CAT would facilitate such individual Industry Member exemptions. However, the Commission does not believe that it would be appropriate, at this time, to amend the Plan to require the Participants to grant such individual

[1421] Response Letter II at 26.

[1422] *Id.*

[1423] *Id.*

[1424] *Id.* (noting that the Plan states that FINRA would consider exempting firms from the OATS requirements if the data submitted to the CAT is of sufficient quality for surveillance purposes and FINRA is able to integrate CAT Data with the remaining OATS data in a way that permits it to continue to perform its surveillance obligations).

[1425] *Id.*

[1426] *Id.*

[1427] *Id.* at 27.

[1428] *Id.*

[1429] *Id.*

[1430] Response Letter I at 38–39.

[1431] Response Letter II at 28.

[1432] *Id.*

exemptions because, as noted by the Participants, it may not be feasible to implement the technological and organizational mechanisms that would obviate the need for duplicative reporting by ensuring that the Participants can effectively carry out their regulatory obligations using CAT Data.

In response to the comment that the CAT should be designed from the outset to include the ability to implement all of the surveillance methods and functions currently used by the Participants, the Commission notes that the Participants have indicated that they have provided the Bidders with their surveillance and investigative use cases, that each Bidder has been required to demonstrate its ability to meet these criteria, and that the selected Plan Processor will have the capability to provide the necessary surveillance methods and functions to allow for the retirement of duplicative systems. Therefore, the Commission believes that the CAT is being designed to include the ability to implement all of the surveillance methods and functions currently used by the Participants, and is not amending the Plan in response to this comment.

In response to the commenter that suggested a specific principles-based framework for retiring duplicative systems,[1433] the Commission believes that, in general, the principles outlined in the CAT NMS Plan for retiring potentially duplicative rules and systems are reasonable. The principles outlined in the Plan recognize that the Participants and the Commission will continue to rely on information collected through existing regulatory reporting systems to reconstruct market events, conduct market analysis and research in support of regulatory decision-making, and conduct market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions until analogous information is available through CAT. Some period of duplicative reporting may be necessary to ensure that regulators can obtain accurate and reliable information through CAT to carry out these functions. However, the Commission also agrees that the CAT Reporter support, testing, and validation tools created for the CAT—rather than similar tools associated with legacy reporting systems—should be used to assist Industry Members as they transition to CAT reporting.[1434]

The Commission agrees with the Participants that there cannot be a moratorium on changes to existing systems in connection with the launch of CAT. As discussed above, the Commission and the SROs use the information collected through existing regulatory reporting systems to carry out a variety of regulatory functions. Until these systems are fully retired, the Commission and the SROs will continue to rely upon these systems to obtain the information they need to perform these functions. Therefore, because changes to these systems may be necessary for the Commission or the SROs to obtain such information, the Commission does not believe a moratorium should be imposed on changes to these systems. However, the Commission supports the Participants' commitment to minimizing changes to existing systems and encourages the Participants to consider the necessity of any such changes and any additional burden such changes would impose on their members during the period in which members are transitioning to CAT reporting. Accordingly, the Commission is amending Section C.9 of Appendix C of the Plan to state that between the Effective Date and the retirement of the Participants' duplicative systems, each Participant, to the extent practicable, will attempt to minimize changes to those duplicative systems.

b. Retirement of Systems Required by SEC Rules

The CAT NMS Plan also discusses specific Commission rules that potentially can be eliminated in connection with CAT implementation. Specifically, the Plan states that, based on preliminary industry analyses, large trader reporting requirements under SEC Rule 13h–1 could be eliminated. In contrast, the Plan states that ''[l]arge trader reporting responsibilities on Form 13H and self-identification would not appear to be covered by the CAT.'' [1435]

One commenter suggested that the Commission should eliminate requirements such as Rule 13h–1 and Form 13H regarding large trader filings, noting that Commission Staff will have access to the same information that they are receiving through Form 13H through CAT.[1436] Another commenter recommended the elimination of the EBS system, under SEC Rule 17a–25,[1437] with respect to equity and option data.[1438]

In their response, the Participants noted that ''the elimination of potentially duplicative requirements established by the SEC (*e.g.,* SEC Rule 17a–25 regarding electronic submission of securities transactions [the EBS system] and SEC Rule 13h–1 regarding large traders) are outside the Participants' purview.'' [1439]

The Commission acknowledges that duplicative reporting will impose significant burdens and costs on broker-dealers, that certain SEC rules require the reporting of some information that will also be collected through CAT, and that certain SEC rules may need to be modified or eliminated in light of CAT. Specifically, the Commission believes that, going forward, CAT will provide Commission Staff with much of the equity and option data that is currently obtained through equity and option cleared reports [1440] and EBS,[1441] including the additional transaction data captured in connection with Rule 13h–1 concerning large traders.[1442] Accordingly, Commission Staff is directed to develop a proposal for Commission consideration, within six months of the Effective Date, to: (i) Amend Rule 17a–25 to eliminate the components of EBS that are redundant of CAT, and (ii) amend Rule 13h–1,[1443] the large trader Rule, to eliminate its transaction reporting requirements, in each case effective at such time as CAT Data meets minimum standards of accuracy and reliability. In addition, as part of this proposal, Commission Staff will recommend whether there will continue to be any need for the

[1433] SIFMA Letter at 7–10.

[1434] *See supra* notes 1403, 1430 and accompanying text.

[1435] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section C.9.

[1436] MFA Letter at 9.

[1437] 17 CFR 240.17a–25.

[1438] SIFMA Letter at 10–11. This commenter also explained that in order to retire EBS, the relevant data elements that are included in an EBS report need to be retained as part of CAT's Technical Specifications and the accuracy of the CAT Data reported by member firms should meet an acceptable threshold for its error/rejection rate. *Id.* The commenter also noted that fixed income data, since it will not be available initially through CAT, will still need to be requested through the EBS system and that historical equity and option data will have to be retained and archived to accommodate requests for this data through EBS. *Id.*

[1439] Response Letter II at 21.

[1440] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30660 (discussing equity and option cleared reports).

[1441] *See id.* (discussing the EBS system).

[1442] 17 CFR 240.13h–1; *see also* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45734 (''The Commission . . . note[s] . . . that . . . aspects of Rule 13h–1 may be superseded by Rule 613. Specifically, the trade reporting requirements of Rule 13h–1 are built upon the existing EBS system. To the extent that . . . data reported to the central repository under Rule 613 obviates the need for the EBS system, the Commission expects that the separate reporting requirements of Rule 13h–1 related to the EBS system would be eliminated.'')

[1443] 17 CFR 240.13h–1(e).

Commission to make requests for equity and option cleared reports, except for historical data, once CAT is fully operational and CAT Data meets minimum standards of accuracy and reliability.[1444] The Commission notes that the EBS system will still be used to collect historical equity and options data—*i.e.,* for executions occurring before CAT is fully operational—and data on asset classes not initially covered by CAT, such as fixed income, municipal, or other government securities, and that the components of the EBS system necessary to enable such usage will need to be retained. However, to the extent that CAT is expanded to include data on additional asset classes, the Commission will consider whether the components of the EBS system related to the retention and reporting of data on these asset classes can also be eliminated.[1445]

The Commission does not agree with the comment that SEC Staff will have access through CAT to the ''same information'' that it receives through Form 13H.[1446] Form 13H collects information to identify a large trader, its securities affiliates, and its operations, and does not collect audit trail data on effected transactions. The self-identification and other Form 13H filing requirements of Rule 13h–1 will not be duplicated by or redundant of CAT.

c. Record Retention

The CAT NMS Plan states that certain broker-dealer recordkeeping requirements could be eliminated once the CAT is operational.[1447] The Plan also requires that information reported to the Central Repository be retained in a convenient and usable standard electronic data format that is directly available and searchable electronically without any manual intervention by the Plan Processor for a period of not less than six years.[1448]

One commenter suggested that record retention by the CAT should be established for periods long enough to satisfy regulatory requirements associated with other regulatory systems (*e.g.,* the seven year record retention requirement for EBS) and that the Commission should consider the extent to which CAT reporting could fulfill recordkeeping obligations for a CAT Reporter.[1449]

The Participants explained that the Plan's six-year retention period exceeds the record retention period applicable to national securities exchanges and national securities associations under SEC Rules 17a–1(b) and 17a–6(a),[1450] which require that documents be kept for at least five years.[1451] The Participants further explained that they do not believe that the Plan's record retention requirements should be expanded beyond six years since such expansion would impact Bidder solutions and the maintenance costs associated with the CAT.[1452] With respect to the comment regarding CAT Reporters using the CAT to satisfy their recordkeeping obligations, the Participants maintained that it would be inappropriate for CAT Reporters to fulfill their recordkeeping obligations by relying on the Central Repository in the initial phase of CAT reporting because permitting this use of the Central Repository would impose additional regulatory and resource obligations on the Central Repository.[1453] In the longer term, the Participants recognized that the Central Repository could be a useful tool to assist CAT Reporters in satisfying their recordkeeping and record retention obligations, and stated that after the implementation of CAT, the Operating Committee will review whether it may be possible for CAT Reporters to use the CAT to assist in satisfying certain recordkeeping and record retention obligations.[1454]

The Commission disagrees with the suggestion from commenters that the CAT NMS Plan should be amended to extend its six-year record retention timeframe to satisfy the requirements of existing reporting systems. In addition to exceeding the five year retention period applicable to national securities exchanges and associations under Rules 17a–1(b) and 17a–6(a), as pointed out by the Participants, the Commission notes that the six-year timeframe set forth in the CAT NMS Plan reflects the six-year data retention requirement of Rule 17a–4(a).[1455] The Commission does not anticipate that any variation between the retention periods for existing systems and the CAT system will hinder the potential retirement of existing systems that are duplicative of CAT. In addition, while the Commission believes it is important to implement the initial phases of CAT reporting first, once CAT is fully operational, the Participants, the Plan Processor, and the Commission can consider further enhancements to the CAT system, including enhancements that could potentially enable the Central Repository to satisfy certain broker-dealer recordkeeping requirements, such as those set forth in Rules 17a–3 and 17a–4.[1456]

10. Primary Market Transactions and Futures

a. Primary Market Transactions

The CAT NMS Plan provides that the Participants jointly, within six months of the CAT NMS Plan's approval by the Commission, will provide a document (the ''Discussion Document'') to the Commission that will include a discussion of how Primary Market Transactions could be incorporated into the CAT.[1457] In Appendix C of the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants conclude that the Discussion Document should be limited to sub-account allocations for Primary Market Transactions.[1458] Moreover, the CAT NMS Plan does not require any specific timetable for Primary Market Transaction data to be reported to the CAT.

The Participants explained that for Primary Market Transactions there are generally two key phases: A ''book building'' phase and an allocation phase (which includes top-account allocations and sub-account allocations).[1459] According to the Participants, the ''book building phase involves the process by which underwriters gather and assess investor demand for an offering of securities and seek information important to their determination as to the size and pricing of an issue. Using this and other information, the underwriter will then decide how to allocate IPO shares to purchasers.'' [1460] The Participants' understanding is ''that these are so-called 'top account' allocations—allocations to institutional clients or retail broker-dealers, and that such allocations are conditional and may fluctuate until the offering

[1444] At this time, the Commission does not anticipate that there will be a need to make such requests.

[1445] In addition, the Commission does not anticipate that it will make requests for equity and option cleared reports, except for historical data, once CAT is fully operational.

[1446] To cite one example, Item 4 of Form 13H requires large traders to provide an ''Organizational Chart'' that will not be reported under CAT.

[1447] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section C.9.

[1448] *See id.* at Section 6.5(b).

[1449] SIFMA Letter at 5–6.

[1450] 17 CFR 240.17a–1(b), 17a–6(a).

[1451] Response Letter I at 27.

[1452] *Id.*

[1453] *Id.*

[1454] *Id.*

[1455] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section D.12(m).

[1456] 17 CFR 240.17(a)(3)–(4).

[1457] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.11; *see also infra* note 3059. The CAT NMS Plan specifies that the Discussion Document will include details for (i) each order and Reportable Event that may be required to be provided, (ii) which market participants may be required to provide the data, (iii) the implementation timeline, and (iv) a cost estimate.

[1458] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.6.

[1459] *Id.*

[1460] *Id.*

syndicate terminates. Sub-account allocations occur subsequently, and are made by top-account institutions and broker-dealers prior to settlement.'' [1461]

In reaching their decision to limit Primary Market Transactions data for CAT reporting to sub-account allocations, the Participants noted that sub-account allocations are ''maintained by broker-dealers in a manner that would allow for reporting to the Central Repository without unreasonable costs and could assist the Commission and the Participants in their regulatory obligations.'' [1462] The Participants argued, however, that because top-account allocations are not firm and may fluctuate, reporting this information to the Central Repository ''would involve significantly more costs which, when balanced against the marginal benefit, is not justified at this time.'' [1463]

The Commission received two comments advocating for delaying the inclusion of all Primary Market Transactions data in the CAT (and for excluding top-account allocation data),[1464] and one comment supporting the inclusion of Primary Market Transaction data in the CAT, for both top-account and sub-account allocation data.[1465] Specifically, the two commenters who advocated that Primary Market Transactions should be delayed until OATS and other regulatory reporting systems are retired cited ''mounting regulatory expenses'' and limited and different resources being required to address this element.[1466] These commenters added that regulatory and surveillance requirements should be defined before adding Primary Market Transaction data to the CAT and disputed the Commission's assessment in the Notice of the CAT NMS Plan that top-account allocation should be a CAT data element.[1467] One of these commenters noted that significant analysis and data modelling would be required to effectively and efficiently include Primary Market Transaction data.[1468] The other commenter cited a DAG recommendation that if Primary Market Transaction data were required that only sub-account allocation data should be included due to operational feasibility.[1469] The same commenter also requested clarification as to what is meant by Primary Market Transaction ''allocations,'' and described its understanding that ''allocations'' under Rule 613(a)(1)(vi) only apply to the final step in the allocation process (*i.e.,* not the preliminary book building allocations but the actual placement into a customer's account).[1470]

The third commenter, however, advocated for including Primary Market Transaction data (both top-account and sub-account) in the CAT.[1471] The commenter believed that regulators would benefit from having both sub-account and top-account Primary Market Transaction data, noting that such data would help regulators understand the economics of the offering process and could promote efficient capital formation.[1472] The commenter reviewed academic literature related to the book building allocation process and suggested that the collection and analysis of Primary Market Transaction data could address open questions as to potential capital formation inefficiencies, including potential manipulation and/or violations of Rule 105 and fund manipulation.[1473] The commenter stated that Form 13F data cannot fully capture primary market allocations because it is limited to institutional investment managers with investment discretion over $100 million, and because secondary market transactions may occur before the filing of Form 13F is required.[1474] The commenter also recommended that the SROs and the Commission require indications of interest during preliminary book building to be made available in an easily accessible format for both regulators and academics outside of CAT.[1475]

The commenter advocating for the inclusion of both top-account and sub-account allocation Primary Market Transaction data also cited and disputed a FIF estimate that it would cost broker-dealers approximately $704,200 per firm to provide initial allocation information, stating that ''manually entering top-account allocation information into CAT (if available) should cost substantially less than estimated.'' [1476] The commenter estimated costs to be $2,400 per offering for providing top-account allocation information, and argued such costs would be ''*de minimis* with respect to the overall cost of issuance.'' [1477] The commenter also contested FIF's cost estimate of $58.7 million for providing sub-account information, noting that if CAT were to replace EBS [1478] then the incremental cost of providing sub-account allocation information should also be *de minimis.*[1479]

In response to commenters, the Participants maintained their support for including in the CAT sub-account allocations but did not support reporting, or discussing in the Discussion Document, top-account allocations.[1480] The Participants reiterated that top-account allocation reporting for Primary Market Transactions would ''likely impose significant costs to CAT Reporters while only providing a marginal additional regulatory benefit over sub-account allocation data.'' [1481] The Participants further stated that they have not determined a timeline for reporting Primary Market Transaction allocations, but have committed to not require it during the initial implementation phase of CAT.[1482]

Consistent with the reasoning stated in the adoption of Rule 613, the Commission believes that the Discussion Document should discuss the potential costs and benefits of expansion of CAT to include both top-account and sub-account allocations for Primary Market Transactions. At the

[1461] *Id.*

[1462] *Id.*

[1463] *Id.*

[1464] *See* SIFMA Letter at 36; FIF Letter at 13, 118–20.

[1465] *See* Hanley Letter.

[1466] SIFMA Letter at 36; FIF Letter at 13 (noting that ''the primary market and the secondary market are inherently different . . . different rules and reporting requirements, . . . business processes, . . . vendors, . . . and systems with different technology personnel.'').

[1467] SIFMA Letter at 36; FIF Letter at 13; *see also* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30772 (''The Commission preliminarily believes that the potential benefits of including top-account information in the CAT could be significant and that the costs of including top-account information could be lower than what is described in the CAT NMS Plan and appropriate in light of significant potential benefits. For these reasons, the Commission preliminarily believes that top-account information should not be excluded from the Discussion Document.'').

[1468] FIF Letter at 13.

[1469] SIFMA Letter at 36.

[1470] *Id.*

[1471] Hanley Letter.

[1472] *Id.* at 1.

[1473] *Id.* at 2–3.

[1474] *Id.* at 1 (noting ''[t]op-account allocations refer to allocations during the book-building process to institutional clients and retail broker-dealers . . . the subsequent sub-account allocations to the actual accounts receiv[e] the shares'').

[1475] *Id.* at 5–6. The commenter, however, stated that it is not requesting that CAT include pre-offer changes in tentative allocations. Hanley Letter at 4–6 (noting that during the pre-offering stage of a book-building process, preliminary indications of interest while gathered are believed to be subject to change).

[1476] *Id.* at 4.

[1477] *Id.* at 5.

[1478] EBS are trading records requested by the Commission and SROs from broker-dealers that are used in regulatory investigations to identify buyers and sellers of specific securities.

[1479] Hanley Letter at 5.

[1480] Response Letter I at 49.

[1481] *Id.*

[1482] *Id.* at 50. In response to a commenter seeking clarification on the meaning of certain aspects of Primary Market Transactions, the Participants identified the relevant Plan provisions for the commenter. *Id.* at 50–51.

same time, the Commission acknowledges that mandating the inclusion of Primary Market Transaction data, either top-account or sub-account, would require Commission action following public notice and comment. The Commission discusses the Primary Market Transaction cost comments in its economic analysis below.[1483]

b. Futures

Rule 613 and the CAT NMS Plan do not require the reporting of audit trail data on the trading of futures. One commenter, noting that the CAT NMS Plan does not require any information about stock index futures or options on index futures, stated that incorporating futures data into CAT would ''create a more comprehensive audit trail, which would further enhance the SROs' and Commission's surveillance programs.'' [1484]

As noted above, the Participants, within six months of the CAT NMS Plan's approval by the Commission, will provide the Discussion Document that will include a discussion of how additional securities and transactions could be incorporated into CAT.[1485] In their response, the Participants recognized that ''the reporting of additional asset classes and types of transactions is important for cross-market surveillance.'' [1486] Further, the Participants stated their belief that the Commission also recognizes ''the importance of gradually expanding the scope of the CAT,'' and cited the Adopting Release, wherein the Commission directed the Commission Staff ''to work with the SROs, the CFTC staff, and other regulators and market participants to determine how other asset classes, such as futures, might be added to the consolidated audit trail.'' [1487] Accordingly, the Participants stated that they intend to assess whether it would be appropriate to expand the scope of the CAT to include futures, at a later date.

The Commission believes that the omission of futures data from the CAT NMS Plan is reasonable, particularly in light of limitations on the Commission's jurisdiction.

11. Error Rate

CAT Data reported to the Central Repository must be timely, accurate and complete.[1488] The CAT NMS Plan specifies the maximum Error Rate for CAT Reporters.[1489] As noted in Section III.19, the term Error Rate is defined as ''the percentage of [R]eportable [E]vents collected by the [C]entral [R]epository in which the data reported does not fully and accurately reflect the order event that occurred in the market.'' [1490] The Error Rate will apply to CAT Data as it is initially submitted to the Central Repository, before it has undergone the correction process.[1491]

a. Definition of Error

Some commenters sought additional information about the meaning of the term ''Error Rate'' and how Error Rates would be calculated. One commenter suggested that there should be clarification as to whether all errors would be treated equally.[1492] Another commenter questioned whether there would be a minimum number of reports submitted before Error Rate calculations would take place, and whether all data submissions would be covered.[1493] One commenter suggested that Error Rates be calculated daily on a rolling average, comparing a CAT Reporter's error rate to an aggregate Error Rate, so as to take into account daily fluctuations in Error Rates.[1494] One commenter did not believe that all errors should be treated with the same severity, noting that some errors can be auto-corrected by CAT, and some errors (such as late reporting) can be immediately resolved, while other errors, such as linkage errors, are more problematic.[1495] Three commenters suggested that the Error Rate should apply only to post-correction, not pre-correction, data.[1496] One of these commenters expressed support for the eventual goal of a *de minimis* post-correction Error Rate, but could not predict how long this would take to be achieved.[1497]

The Participants responded by explaining that the CAT NMS Plan adopted the definition of Error Rate from Rule 613, which does not distinguish among order events and focuses on cases where data ''does not fully and accurately reflect the order event that occurred in the market.'' [1498] The Participants stated that they believe this definition is appropriate.[1499] The Participants disagreed with commenters who suggested that the maximum Error Rate should be based on post-correction data,[1500] and noted that a maximum Error Rate based on pre-corrected data is intended to encourage CAT Reporters to submit accurate data initially and to reduce the need for error corrections, as well as allow regulators more timely access to accurate data.[1501]

The Commission believes that the proposed, uniform definition of Error Rate is reasonable. The Commission also agrees with the Participants that Error Rates should be calculated based on pre-correction, and not post-correction, data. The Commission believes that assessing Error Rates on a pre-correction basis is important to ensure that CAT Reporters submit CAT Data in compliance with the Plan and applicable rules of the Participants, and develop and maintain their reporting systems in a way that minimizes errors. In addition, focusing on Error Rates for pre-corrected data should reduce reliance on the error correction process, and improve the accuracy of the ''uncorrected'' CAT Data available to regulators in circumstances where immediate action is required. The Commission also believes it critical that the error correction process be effective, so that errors in post-correction CAT Data will be *de minimis,* as contemplated by the Participants.

b. Maximum Error Rate

Several commenters expressed opinions regarding the initial maximum Error Rate. Two commenters supported

[1483] *See* Section V.H.8, *infra.*

[1484] CBOE Letter at 2; *see also* Better Markets Letter at 7.

[1485] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.11.

[1486] Response Letter I at 26. The CAT NMS Plan specifies that the Discussion Document will include a discussion of debt securities and Primary Market Transactions, but does not expressly require that futures be in the Discussion Document. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.11.

[1487] Response Letter I at 26–27 (citing Adopting Release, *supra* note 14 at 45745 n.241).

[1488] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(d)(2).

[1489] *Id.* at Section 6.5(d)(i). The Participants expect that post-correction Error Rates will be *de minimis. See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(b), n.102.

[1490] *See id.* at Section 1.1; *see also* 17 CFR 242.613(j)(6).

[1491] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.3(a) (stating, ''[T]he initial step in ensuring the reliability and accuracy of data in the Central Repository is the validation checks made by the Plan Processor when data is received and before it is accepted into the Central Repository.'')

[1492] SIFMA Letter at 6.

[1493] UnaVista Letter at 4.

[1494] FIF Letter at 51.

[1495] *Id.* at 57. This commenter also stated that importance of data quality could consider whether the same data is available from multiple sources, noting that if two or more CAT Reporters are supplying the same information, regulators could effectively surveil if only one source of the data was correct. *See id.* at 58.

[1496] FSR Letter at 9; SIFMA Letter at 7; FIF Letter at 51.

[1497] FIF Letter at 52, 60. The commenter also noted that currently OATS does not have a *de minimis* error rate, and questioned how the CAT Plan Processor could detect errors that OATS cannot correct. *Id.* at 60.

[1498] Response Letter I at 45 (citing 17 CFR 242.608(j)(6)).

[1499] *Id.*

[1500] FSR Letter at 9; SIFMA Letter at 7; FIF Letter at 51.

[1501] Response Letter I at 47.

a 5% initial maximum Error Rate.[1502] One of these commenters believed that a 5% Error Rate would permit an appropriate level of flexibility for CAT Reporters while still ensuring that CAT Data would be useable for market reconstructions.[1503] Another commenter, however, disagreed and argued that, given the industry's experience with OATS, the maximum Error Rates should be lower than those proposed by the Participants.[1504]

Several commenters expressed views on how the initial maximum Error Rate should be adjusted over time.[1505] Two commenters supported the Plan's requirement to evaluate Error Rates at least annually.[1506] One of these commenters also believed that lowering the maximum Error Rate to 1% after one year of reporting was acceptable based on the current OATS error rates and the commenter's own experience with regulatory reporting.[1507] Another commenter stated that it was difficult to assess whether a maximum Error Rate of 1% after one year of reporting was appropriate, and indicated that it would prefer a more gradual rate decrease.[1508] The commenter recommended that the Operating Committee establish maximum Error Rates for the second and third years of reporting after reviewing the first year's Error Rate data.[1509] Two commenters recommended that the maximum Error Rate be reviewed whenever there are significant changes to the CAT (*e.g.,* the addition of security classes) [1510] or applicable regulations.[1511]

In response to concerns that the Participants do not have sufficient information or experience to determine the initial maximum Error Rate, [1512] the Participants explained that they established this maximum Error Rate after performing a detailed analysis of OATS error rates over time, and believed that such analysis provided a sound basis for their determination.[1513] The Participants stressed the importance of evaluating a CAT Reporter's actual experience, in setting an appropriate maximum Error Rate, and noted that the CAT NMS Plan requires the Operating Committee to review the maximum Error Rate at least annually.[1514]

With respect to the comments recommending that the maximum Error Rate also be reviewed upon significant changes to the CAT or regulations, the Participants noted that the required testing and other management processes surrounding CAT systems changes should mitigate concerns about their impact on Error Rates, and that the periodic updates on Error Rates provided to the Operating Committee should alert them if there is a need to change the maximum Error Rate.[1515]

The Commission believes that the proposed 5% initial maximum Error Rate is reasonable and strikes an appropriate balance between: (1) Ensuring that the initial submissions to the Central Repository by CAT Reporters are sufficiently accurate for regulatory use; and (2) providing CAT Reporters with time to adjust to the new more comprehensive regulatory reporting mechanism. The Commission understands that the Participants considered relevant historical information related to OATS reporting error rates, particularly when new reporting requirements were introduced, and believes this is a reasonable basis for setting the initial maximum Error Rates for CAT Data.[1516] The Commission understands that CAT Reporters who currently report to OATS report with a significantly lower Error Rate, but recognizes that more flexibility may be necessary during the transition, and notes the 1% maximum Error Rate applicable to each CAT Reporter one year after their reporting obligation has begun is comparable to current OATS reporting error rates.[1517]

The Commission also believes that the process established by the CAT NMS Plan for reducing the maximum Error Rate over time is reasonable, and emphasizes the important roles of both the Plan Processor and the Operating Committee in ensuring that Error Rates are steadily reduced over time. The Plan requires the Plan Processor regularly to provide information and recommendations regarding Error Rates to the Operating Committee,[1518] and requires the Operating Committee to review and reset the maximum Error Rate at least on an annual basis.[1519] Given the importance to regulators of audit trail information that meets high standards of accuracy, the Commission expects the Plan Processor and Participants to closely monitor Error Rates, particularly in the early stages of CAT implementation, so that steps can be taken to reduce the maximum Error Rate as promptly as possible. The Commission also encourages the Plan Processor and Participants to assess the impact of significant changes to the CAT or applicable regulations on the maximum Error Rate, at least on a transitional basis, and provide additional flexibility as warranted. As described in Section IV.H, the Commission is amending Section 6.6 of the Plan to require that, prior to the implementation of any Material Systems Change, the Participants provide the Commission with an assessment of the projected impact of any Material Systems Change on the maximum Error Rate.

c. Different Error Rates for Different Products and Data Elements

The CAT NMS Plan imposes the same Error Rate on all products and data elements. Commenters suggested differentiation in this area. One commenter recommended that the Error Rate only apply to equities.[1520] Another commenter suggested that Error Rates for equities, options and customer data should be calculated separately.[1521] A third commenter expressed the view that, as new products are covered by CAT, they should be subject to a more liberal Error Rate for an appropriate transition period.[1522] Two commenters did not believe there is enough information to set an appropriate maximum Error Rate for options market making, customer information or allocations, given that there is little or

[1502] UnaVista Letter at 3–4; FSR Letter at 9.

[1503] UnaVista Letter at 3.

[1504] Better Markets Letter at 9.

[1505] UnaVista Letter at 3–4, Better Markets Letter at 9, FIF Letter at 50–52, SIFMA Letter at 6; FSR Letter at 9; *see also* Section IV.D.9, *supra,* for a summary of comment letters that discuss how error rates impact the retirement of duplicative systems.

[1506] UnaVista Letter at 3–4; FSR Letter at 9.

[1507] UnaVista Letter at 3–4.

[1508] FIF Letter at 56, 58.

[1509] *Id.* The commenter stated the objective should be an Error Rate that meets the regulators' surveillance objectives, and is achievable by CAT Reporters at a reasonable cost. *Id.* at 57.

[1510] *Id.* at 52, 55.

[1511] UnaVista Letter at 4.

[1512] FIF Letter at 50, SIFMA Letter at 6–7.

[1513] Response Letter I, at 45–46. This analysis considered the initial error rates for reporting by market participants that were reporting audit trail information to OATS for the first time, and assumed a similar learning curve would be experienced by CAT Reporters who have not previously reported audit trail information, such as options market participants.

[1514] *Id.*

[1515] *Id.* at 46–47.

[1516] Participants have considered the industry's experience with the OATS system over the last 10 years, including three significant additions to OATS: (1) Requirement that manual orders be reported to OATS; (2) requirement that OTC Equity Securities be reported to OATS; and (3) requirement that all NMS stocks be reported to OATS. Each of these changes resulted in significant updates to the required formats which required OATS reporters to update and test their reporting systems and infrastructure. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.3(b).

[1517] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(b), n.99.

[1518] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(b).

[1519] *See id.* at Section 6.5(d)(i); Appendix C, Section A.3(b).

[1520] FSR Letter at 9.

[1521] SIFMA Letter at 6.

[1522] FIF Letter at 52.

no reporting history for them, and suggested applying the Error Rate on a post-correction basis for these products and data elements, at least for a transitional period.[1523]

In response, the Participants stated that they continue to believe that a single overall Error Rate for all products and data elements is appropriate.[1524] They acknowledged the importance of gathering more granular information about Error Rates, including differences among products, and noted that the CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to provide the Operating Committee with regular reports that show more detailed Error Rate data.[1525]

The Commission believes that it is reasonable, at this time, to apply the same maximum Error Rate to all products and data elements, in the Plan filed by the Participants. The Commission notes that the initial 5% maximum Error Rate, which substantially exceeds the OATS error rates, was established in recognition of the fact that certain products (*e.g.,* options) and data elements (*e.g.,* market maker quotes, customer information) had not previously been reported in OATS. The Commission, however, notes that the Participants may assess, as the CAT is developed and implemented, whether it is appropriate to impose Error Rates that vary depending on the product, data element, or other criteria.[1526] As discussed in Section IV.H, the Commission is amending the Plan to require that the Participants provide the Commission with an annual evaluation that addresses the application of Error Rates based on product, data elements or other criteria.

d. Compliance With Maximum Error Rate During the Initial Implementation Period

Two commenters suggested that CAT Reporters not be required to comply with the maximum Error Rate during the initial implementation period for the CAT.[1527] One of these commenters explained that this would provide CAT Reporters a window of time to better understand the types of errors that are being returned by the CAT, and adjust their processes accordingly, without incurring liability for exceeding the maximum Error Rate.[1528] Another commenter stressed the importance of receiving feedback from the Plan Processor so that CAT Reporters can identify weaknesses and improve the accuracy of their CAT reporting.[1529] This commenter recommended that the Plan Processor provide CAT Reporters with a detailed daily error report, as well as monthly report cards.[1530]

The Participants responded by noting that Rule 613(g) requires the Participants to enforce compliance by their members with the provisions of the Plan at all times it is in effect.[1531] The Participants also pointed out that the Plan provides that CAT Reporters will be provided tools to facilitate testing and error correction, as well as have access to user support. With respect to the importance of feedback from the Plan Processor,[1532] the Participants noted that the Plan requires the Plan Processor to provide CAT Reporters with error reports, including details on the reasons for rejection, as well as daily and monthly statistics from which CAT Reporters can compare their performance with their peers.[1533] As discussed in Section IV.H, the Commission is amending the Plan to require that the Participants provide the Commission with an annual evaluation of how the Plan Processor and the Participants are monitoring Error Rates.

The Commission believes that the implementation period for Error Rates is reasonable and that it is not necessary to establish a grace period, as suggested by commenters, during which Error Rates would not apply. Ensuring the accuracy of CAT Data is critical to regulators and, as noted above, the initial maximum Error Rates have been set at levels to accommodate the fact that CAT Reporters will be adjusting to a new regulatory reporting system.[1534] In addition, the Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan provides for testing periods,[1535] as well as tools and other support, to facilitate initial compliance by CAT Reporters. As noted by the Participants, the Plan Processor will provide regular feedback to CAT Reporters with respect to their reporting weaknesses to assist them in reducing their Error Rates.[1536]

e. Error Correction Timeline

The CAT NMS Plan sets forth a timeline with deadlines for providing raw data and corrected data to the CAT. CAT Reporters must submit data to the CAT by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+1.[1537] By 12:00 p.m. ET on T+1, the CAT must perform checks for initial validations and lifecycle linkages, and communicate errors to CAT Reporters.[1538] CAT Reporters must resubmit corrected data to the CAT by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+3.[1539] The Plan Processor must ensure that regulators have access to corrected and linked order and Customer data by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+5.[1540]

Two commenters believed the error correction timeline was too aggressive, and that at least initially, the CAT should use the current error correction timelines for systems such as OATS, which is T+5.[1541] One commenter specifically suggested that the timeline for error corrections should remain at T+5 for the first year of CAT reporting.[1542] This commenter also noted that, because the Plan Processor is required to communicate errors to CAT Reporters by 5:00 p.m. ET on T+1,

[1523] FIF Letter at 51, SIFMA Letter at 6–7.

[1524] Response Letter I at 47.

[1525] *Id.* (referencing CAT NMS Plan Section 6.1(o)(v)).

[1526] Section 6.5(d) of the CAT NMS Plan contemplates a single Error Rate for all data. If the Participants determine that it is appropriate to establish different Error Rates for different products, data elements, or other criteria, a Plan amendment, subject to notice and comment, would be required.

[1527] SIFMA Letter at 6–7, UnaVista Letter at 4. One commenter also stated that small broker-dealers should not be excused from error rate requirements if they begin reporting voluntarily at the same time large broker-dealers begin reporting. This commenter argued that if small broker-dealers are permitted to report to CAT with limitless errors during the phase designed for large broker-dealers to report without being subject to an error rate, the utility of CAT will be diminished. *See* Better Markets Letter at 9. The Commission believes that a maximum Error Rate would apply to anyone reporting to CAT, whether mandated to do so to be in accordance with the CAT NMS Plan or voluntarily.

[1528] SIFMA Letter at 6.

[1529] FIF Letter at 52.

[1530] FIF Letter at 54; *see also* SIFMA Letter at 7. This commenter also recommended that the CAT include a robust toolset and customer service model to assist CAT Reporters in meeting the established error rates. *See* FIF Letter at 126–127.

[1531] Response Letter I at 47–48.

[1532] FIF Letter at 52, 55, 57.

[1533] *See* Response Letter I at 48 (referencing CAT NMS Plan, Appendix D, Section 1.2).

[1534] In response to the commenter that noted that if two or more CAT Reporters are supplying the same information, regulators could effectively surveil if only one source of the data was correct, *see* FIF Letter at 58, the Commission believes that it is important that the audit trail contains consistently accurate information from all sources obligated to report data and that errors not be permitted to exist in the audit trail just because they were correctly reported by one party.

[1535] *See* Section IV.D.8, *supra,* for a description of testing periods.

[1536] The Plan requires the Plan Processor to define and design a process to efficiently and effectively communicate with CAT Reporters to identify errors, so that they can work to ensure that they get feedback to improve their reporting. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A(3)(b).

[1537] *See id.* at Sections 6.3(b)(ii), 6.4(b)(ii).

[1538] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iv).

[1539] *Id.*

[1540] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2(a).

[1541] KCG Letter at 9; FIF Letter at 52.

[1542] FIF Letter at 52. The commenter also noted that CAT Reporters do not have access to their reported data using a bulk extract format, which would facilitate error validation and correction. *Id.* The commenter also suggested that the five-day error correction timeline begin from the time the CAT Reporter receives a reject message. *Id.* at 53.

staffing adjustments may be necessary to ensure that the appropriate personnel are available after 5:00 p.m. ET to analyze and correct data, and if communications with a customer were necessary to correct an error, the CAT Reporter could not satisfy the 8:00 a.m. ET T+2 timeline for providing corrected data.[1543] This commenter also recommended that the Plan Processor identify errors in customer information data by noon on T+1, the same time as the Plan Processor identifies errors in transaction reports, instead of by 5:00 p.m. ET on T+1, to assist with prompt analysis of linking errors.[1544] Another commenter suggested that the use of ''pre-validation checks,'' prior to the formal submission of data to the CAT, could enhance the accuracy and integrity of the CAT Data.[1545]

In response to commenters who believed the timeframe for correction of CAT Data was too short, the Participants stressed the importance to regulators of the prompt availability of accurate data.[1546] The Participants stated that the three day window for correction provided in the CAT NMS Plan appropriately balances the need for regulators to have prompt access to accurate data with the burdens imposed on the industry by the shorter error correction timeframe.[1547] The Participants noted that the shorter three-day error correction timeframe would allow better regulatory surveillance and market oversight in accordance with Rule 613.[1548] In response to the commenter that requested additional time to correct errors in customer data, the Participants expressed the view that the two-day timeframe provided by the Plan is sufficient to accommodate any communications with customers that might be necessary to correct errors in customer data.[1549] With respect to the suggestion to use pre-validation checks, the Participants acknowledged their value, and stated that they have discussed with the Bidders making tools, such as pre-validation checks, available to CAT Reporters to assist with data submission.[1550]

The Commission believes that the error correction timeline set forth in the CAT NMS Plan is reasonable. Improved accuracy and timeliness of regulatory data are key goals of Rule 613 and the CAT NMS Plan.[1551] In response to commenters that suggested that the error correction timeline is too aggressive, the Commission believes that the error correction tools and processes to be established by the Plan Processor, and the accommodations to facilitate the use of existing systems by CAT Reporters, should ease the burden of complying with shorter error correction timelines than exist today in OATS.[1552] The Commission believes any incremental compliance burden in this area is offset by the benefits of faster availability to regulators of corrected CAT Data for important regulatory purposes, such as surveillance, oversight and enforcement, as well as market reconstructions, in today's high-speed electronic markets.

In response to the commenter that stated that additional staffing may be needed to assist in addressing error correction information that is received from the Plan Processor at 5:00 p.m. ET on T+1, the Commission believes, as noted above, the regulatory benefits of a shorter error correction timeframe justify the incremental compliance costs, including the potential hiring of additional staff in some cases.[1553] The Commission also believes that CAT Reporters would have sufficient time to contact customers in the event customer feedback was necessary to correct errors.[1554] In this regard, the Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan provides that corrected order data is not required to be reported until 8:00 a.m. ET on T+3, and corrected Customer data is not required to be reported until 5:00 p.m. ET on T+3.[1555]

12. Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery

The CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to implement efficient and cost-effective business continuity and disaster recovery capabilities that will ensure no loss of data and will support the data availability requirements and anticipated volumes of the Central Repository.[1556]

Commenters discussed the CAT NMS Plan's provisions regarding business continuity and disaster recovery for the CAT.[1557] One commenter noted that the Plan does not include an explanation of how the primary and the secondary sites will remain synchronized at all times to provide a seamless transition from primary site to secondary site in the event of a failure.[1558] This commenter suggested that the Plan should specify additional details regarding the expected elapsed time for the secondary site to become live if the primary site goes down due to a technical failure or a disaster.[1559] The commenter also noted that the requirement for disaster recovery plans does not address whether regulators will have uninterrupted access to the CAT Data, although the commenter acknowledged that it can be inferred that the secondary site should provide all the functionalities of the primary site in the event of primary site outage.[1560] Further, the commenter recommended that while the CAT NMS Plan states that the goal of disaster recovery is to achieve next day recovery after an event, the Plan should provide a list of scenarios and the expectation of the recovery times for each scenario.[1561]

[1543] *Id.* at 53. The Commission notes that time by which a CAT Reporter must report corrected Customer data is 5:00 p.m. ET on T+3.

[1544] *Id.* This commenter also suggested that CAT provide an ''incident'' error functionality, similar to the one available for OATS. This functionality would allow CAT Reporters that are experiencing a systematic issue with reporting to submit an incident report to CAT and receive a case number, so the CAT Reporter's data reported could be tracked and referenced when considering the Reporter's error rate compliance. *See* FIF Letter at 130.

[1545] UnaVista Letter at 4. The commenter also noted that a T+5 timeframe for regulatory access is feasible but that uniform formatting or pre-validation checks may reduce the timeframe for regulatory access. *Id.*

[1546] Response Letter I at 30.

[1547] *Id.*

[1548] *Id.*

[1549] *Id.*

[1550] *Id.*

[1551] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 13, at 45727.

[1552] The timeline in the CAT NMS Plan improves the timeliness of regulators' access to data they use for much of their surveillance by several days because the corrected and linked CAT Data would be accessible on T+5, compared to OATS Data, which is not available until T+8.

[1553] *See* Section V.F.3.a(7), *infra.*

[1554] FIF Letter at 53.

[1555] In Response Letter I, the Participants noted an inadvertent error in Appendix D relating the Error Rate correction time. Specifically, the Plan incorrectly states that the Plan Processor must validate customer data and generate error reports no later than 5:00 p.m. ET on T+3. The Plan should state that such validations and error reports must occur no later than 5:00 p.m. ET on T+1. The Commission is amending the Plan to correct this error.

[1556] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.3(f); Appendix D, Sections 5.1–5.4.

[1557] SIFMA Letter; Data Boiler Letter (also noting that, if the markets deem acceptable that exchanges experience downtime without going into a contingency mode or halting trading, then standards comparable to those required of exchanges, but not tighter, are sufficient, due to cost); FSI Letter; FIF Letter. One commenter requested clarification of the requirement for a bi-annual test of the CAT systems at the disaster recovery site. This commenter noted that ''bi-annual'' is commonly understood to mean twice a year, but can also mean once every two years. The commenter believed that clarification is necessary to ensure that the site is tested twice a year. It also believed that secondary equipment and critical personnel should be tested at least once a year. *See* FSI Letter at 5. In their response, the Participants affirmed that the bi-annual disaster recovery test of CAT operations at the secondary facility is required to be conducted twice a year. *See* Response Letter I at 51.

[1558] SIFMA Letter at 45.

[1559] *Id.*

[1560] *Id.*

[1561] *Id.*

One commenter recommended that the CAT NMS Plan state that the Plan Processor must support 24x7 production and test environments, provide test and validation tools to result in a higher quality audit trail, provide a consistent and comprehensive data security program, and provide an adequate level of help desk staffing, especially during industry testing and when Industry Members are being on-boarded.[1562] This commenter also stated that large firms that already have the staffing capability for a 24x7 operating schedule could benefit from 24x7 production support, explaining that it would permit added flexibility in error processing or recovery scenarios, as well as the use of off-shore staffing.[1563] Another commenter recommended that the CAT NMS Plan should not mandate a particular industry testing process, stating that ''appropriate management flexibilities/discretions are needed.'' [1564]

The Participants argued that the Plan provisions with respect to business continuity and disaster recovery are appropriate, but did note that they intend to discuss with the Bidders requiring test environments to be available 24x7 instead of 24x6.[1565]

The Commission has considered the business continuity and disaster recovery requirements set forth in the CAT NMS Plan, as well as the comments received addressing these requirements and believes that the Participants' approach is reasonable. The Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan's business continuity and disaster recovery provisions establish a framework that is reasonably designed to ensure that the CAT business processes can continue despite a failure or disaster scenario.[1566] In particular, the CAT will be subject to all applicable requirements of Regulation SCI, as it will be an ''SCI system'' [1567] of each of the Participants, and the Participants, as ''SCI entities,'' [1568] are required to establish, maintain and enforce written policies and procedures for their SCI systems that comply with the technology standards and other requirements of Regulation SCI, including with respect to the business continuity and disaster recovery plans for the CAT.[1569] In addition, the CAT will be subject to certain additional requirements with respect to business continuity and disaster recovery that are set forth in the CAT NMS Plan.[1570]

With respect to the commenter that noted that the Plan does not explain how the primary and the secondary sites will remain synchronized,[1571] and that additional detail should be provided regarding the failover times between primary and secondary sites,[1572] the CAT NMS Plan expressly requires recovery and restoration of services within 48 hours, but with a goal of next-day recovery. While data will not be synchronized in real time, sufficient synchronization will be maintained to support these recovery timeframes. Although, as noted above, the Commission believes the Participants' approach is reasonable, the Commission encourages the Plan Processor and Participants to strive to reduce the time it will take to restore and recover CAT Data at a backup site. As discussed in Section IV.H., the Commission is amending the Plan to require the Participants to submit to the Commission an annual evaluation of the time necessary to restore and recover CAT Data at a back-up site.

With respect to the commenter that recommended that the Plan Processor support 24x7 testing and production environments,[1573] the Commission recognizes that this could facilitate disaster recovery and other important processes by Industry Members, and believes that the Participants' commitment to discuss requiring test environments to be available 24x7 with the Bidders is reasonable.[1574]

13. Business Clock Synchronization and Timestamp Granularity

a. Business Clock Synchronization

(1) Industry Standard

Rules 613(d)(1) and (2) require CAT Reporters to synchronize their Business Clocks [1575] to the time maintained by NIST, consistent with industry standards. In the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants determined that the industry standard for the synchronization of Business Clocks is within 50 milliseconds of the time maintained by NIST, except for Manual Order Events.[1576] For Business Clocks used solely for Manual Order Events, the Participants determined that the industry standard for clock synchronization is within one second of NIST. To ensure that clock synchronization standards remain consistent with industry standards, as they evolve, the CAT NMS Plan requires the Operating Committee to annually review the clock synchronization standard to determine whether it should be shortened.

In determining the current industry standard for clock synchronization, the Participants and Industry Members reviewed their respective clock synchronization technology practices,[1577] and the results of a clock synchronization survey conducted by FIF.[1578] After completing these reviews, the Participants concluded that a 50 millisecond clock synchronization standard represented an aggressive, but achievable, standard.[1579]

The Commission received a number of comments on the CAT NMS Plan's provisions relating to clock synchronization. Several commenters agreed with the Participants that 50 milliseconds was a reasonable standard.[1580] Four commenters specifically recommended that the clock synchronization standard for OATS—also 50 milliseconds—and CAT should be aligned for regulatory reporting purposes.[1581] One commenter argued for a finer standard for Industry Members, noting that they accept data

[1562] FIF Letter at 13, 49, 125–26.

[1563] *Id.* at 123.

[1564] Data Boiler Letter at 42.

[1565] *See* Response Letter I at 51.

[1566] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 5.4.

[1567] *See supra* note 1173.

[1568] *See supra* note 1172.

[1569] 17 CFR 242.1001(a)(2). *See* Section IV.D.6.f, *supra,* for a discussion of Regulation SCI.

[1570] For example, Appendix D requires a bi-annual test of CAT operations from the secondary site; an effective telecommuting solution for all critical CAT operations staff; and a secondary site with the same level of availability, capacity, throughput and security (physical and logical) as the primary site. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 5.3 and 5.4.

[1571] SIFMA Letter at 45.

[1572] *Id.*

[1573] FIF Letter at 13, 49. In response to the commenter's suggestions that the Plan Processor provide a consistent and comprehensive data security program, and an adequate level of help desk staffing, especially during industry testing and on-boarding, the Commission notes that the Plan Processor will support industry testing and provide help desk support during industry testing, and that the same information security policies applicable to the production environment will apply to the industry test environment. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 1.2.

[1574] Response Letter I at 51.

[1575] For purposes of the CAT NMS Plan, ''Business Clock'' means a clock used to record the date and time of any Reportable Event required to be reported under SEC Rule 613. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[1576] *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21. In this Order, the Commission is also amending the Plan to allow Business Clocks used solely for the time of an allocation to synchronize to within one second of NIST. *See* Section IV.D.4.d, *supra.*

[1577] CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section D.12(p).

[1578] *Id.* at Appendix C, n.236. *See* FIF Clock Offset Survey, *supra* note 247.

[1579] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section D.12(p).

[1580] SIFMA Letter at 34–35; FIF Letter at 110–111, 115; TR Letter at 7; Data Boiler Letter at 9, 20; FSR Letter at 8–9. Three of these commenters stated that there should be a uniform clock synchronization standard for Industry Members. SIFMA Letter at 34; FIF Letter at 97–98; FSR Letter at 8.

[1581] Data Boiler Letter at 9 (noting that FINRA's current clock synchronization for Industry Members is 50 milliseconds); TR Letter at 7; SIFMA Letter at 34; FSR Letter at 8.

feeds from exchanges that have more precise clock synchronization, some to the microsecond.[1582]

Other commenters opposed mandating a standard finer than the 50 millisecond clock synchronization standard.[1583] One commenter argued that a finer synchronization standard could not be met without dramatically increasing costs,[1584] and expressed the view that the 50 millisecond standard is reasonable given the geographically dispersed market.[1585] In particular, this commenter believed that, while a finer standard may create the illusion of a more accurate time sequence of events, in practice geographically dispersed market events could still be sequenced incorrectly.[1586] This commenter stated that it is better to allow for clock synchronization standards to be tightened voluntarily, based on business needs rather than regulatory requirements.[1587] Finally, one commenter expressed the view that clock synchronization was less important for certain types of orders, and suggested that the clock synchronization standard for manual orders, orders that have both a manual and electronic component, and orders that are not time-critical (*e.g.,* post-trade events such as allocations) should be one second rather than 50 milliseconds.[1588]

One commenter noted that stricter clock synchronization standards are already in place at exchanges and ATSs.[1589] Another commenter stated that, if exchanges maintained finer clock synchronization standards than currently required by the CAT NMS Plan, the ability to sequence Reportable Events that occur across markets could be improved.[1590]

In their response, the Participants stated that they continue to believe that the clock synchronization standard for Industry Members should be within 50 milliseconds of the time maintained by NIST, except for with regard to Manual Order Events.[1591] The Participants noted that they discussed this topic with Industry Members and conducted a survey of Industry Members to better understand current clock synchronization practices.[1592] The Participants represented that they considered various clock synchronization options, which ranged from microseconds to one second, before settling on a 50 millisecond standard, which they believe represents the current industry standard for Industry Members.[1593] The Participants stated that, based on their analysis, imposing a finer clock synchronization standard for Industry Members as part of the initial implementation of the CAT would significantly increase the cost of compliance for some segments of the industry,[1594] but emphasized that the Operating Committee will be reviewing the synchronization standard annually and will reduce the standard as appropriate.[1595]

The Participants, however, represented that they all currently operate pursuant to a clock synchronization standard that is within 100 microseconds of the time maintained by NIST, at least with respect to their electronic systems. Accordingly, the Participants recommended that the Commission amend the Plan to require that Participants adhere to the 100 microsecond standard of clock synchronization with regard to their electronic systems, but not their manual systems, such as the manual systems operated on the trading floor, manual order entry devices, and certain other systems.[1596]

After reviewing the CAT NMS Plan, and considering the commenters' statements and the Participants' response thereto, the Commission believes that it is appropriate for the Participants to consider the type of CAT Reporter (*e.g.,* Participant, Industry Member), the type of Industry Member (*e.g.,* ATS, small broker-dealer), and type of system (*e.g.,* order handling, post-execution) when establishing appropriate industry standards. The Commission does not believe that one industry standard should apply across all CAT Reporters and systems. Therefore, the Commission is amending Section 6.8(c) of the Plan to state that industry standards for purposes of clock synchronization should be determined based on the type of CAT Reporter, type of Industry Member and type of system.

For the initial implementation of the CAT, however, the Commission believes a 50 millisecond clock synchronization standard for Industry Members is reasonable at this time. While the Commission believes that regulators' ability to sequence orders accurately in certain cases could improve if the clock synchronization for Industry Members were finer, the Commission is sensitive to the costs associated with requiring a finer clock synchronization for Industry Members at this time, and believes that a standard of 50 milliseconds for Industry Members will allow regulators to sequence orders and events with a level of accuracy that is acceptable for the initial phases of CAT reporting.

Although the Commission understands that certain Industry Members, such as ATSs and broker-dealers that internalize off-exchange order flow, today adhere to a finer clock synchronization standard, the Commission is not imposing a finer standard than 50 milliseconds for such Industry Members at this time. The Commission believes that it is

[1582] Better Markets Letter at 8. The commenter recommended that exchanges and Industry Members should be required to use the same—presumably finer—clock synchronization standard for CAT purposes as they use for internal or commercial purposes.

[1583] FIF Letter at 102, TR Letter at 7.

[1584] FIF Letter at 110. This commenter revisited the cost estimates for clock synchronization presented in the commenter's Clock Offset Survey, noting in particular that the industry will face increased costs with a finer clock synchronization standard as industry has already been working toward a clock synchronization standard of 50 milliseconds, and would need another two years of lead time to comply with a finer standard than 50 milliseconds. FIF Letter at 108, 114; *see also* SIFMA Letter at 34.

[1585] FIF Letter at 99, 110–111. FIF recommended a pilot study be conducted to test the boundaries of clock synchronization and its accuracies across a broad geographic region at different tolerances for the purpose of event sequencing. *Id.* at 100, 112.

[1586] *Id.* at 102. FIF also noted that timestamps together with the daisy chain approach to linking orders and events will allow sequencing of events. *Id.* at 101.

[1587] *Id.* at 104–05. This commenter also argued that Industry Member CAT Reporters that synchronize their clocks to a finer standard voluntarily should not be required to maintain that clock synchronization under CAT as it would create an uneven playing field. *Id.* at 99, 112, 115. Similarly, another commenter noted that finer standards are already in place at exchanges and ATSs that maintain an order book and since they are already in place for commercial reasons, there is no reason to mandate them. TR Letter at 7.

[1588] SIFMA Letter at 34–35.

[1589] TR Letter at 7.

[1590] FIF Letter at 97.

[1591] Response Letter II at 4.

[1592] *Id.*

[1593] *Id.* In response to the commenters that suggested that the CAT clock synchronization should be same as the OATS standard, the Participants agreed that there is value in consistency between these standards. *See* Response Letter I at 20. *See also* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 77565 (April 8, 2016), 72 FR 22136 (April 14, 2016) (approving a 50 millisecond clock synchronization requirement for FINRA members).

[1594] Response Letter II at 4 (noting CAT NMS Plan Appendix C, Section D.12(p)).

[1595] Response Letter II at 4 (noting CAT NMS Plan Section 6.8(c)).

[1596] Response Letter II at 4–5. In response to the commenters that argued that CAT Reporters would need lead time to address any changes made to the clock synchronization in the future, the Participants explained that Section 6.8(c) of the CAT NMS Plan requires that, in conjunction with Participants' and other appropriate Industry Member advisory groups, the CCO must annually evaluate and recommend to the Operating Committee whether technology has evolved such that the standard should be shortened. The Participants further explained they will take the time required for CAT Reporters to update and test their systems for any changes to the clock synchronization standard into consideration when determining when changes to the standard are necessary. Response Letter I at 21.

reasonable to expect that finer clock synchronization for Industry Members, or certain categories or systems thereof, will evolve over time. As described in Section IV.H, the Commission is amending the Plan to require that the Participants provide the Commission an assessment of clock synchronization standards, including consideration of industry standards based on the type of Industry Member or type of system, within six (6) months of effectiveness of the Plan.

With regard to the Participants, however, the Commission notes that the Participants have acknowledged that they currently synchronize their Business Clocks to within 100 microseconds of NIST, and recommended that the Commission amend the Plan to require the Participants to adhere to that finer standard for their non-manual systems.[1597] Accordingly, the Commission is amending Section 6.8(a)(i) of the Plan, consistent with this recommendation, to impose a clock synchronization standard of 100 microseconds on exchanges' electronic systems. The Commission believes that because the Participants already synchronize their clocks to this standard,[1598] any costs to comply with this standard are not likely to be substantial.[1599] In addition, the Commission believes that a finer clock synchronization requirement for exchanges generally should allow regulators to better sequence orders and order events across multiple exchanges.[1600] The Commission agrees with the Participants that it would not be appropriate to impose this finer standard with regard to Participants' manual systems, given that the timing of manual events is inherently less precise and the timestamp requirement for manual events is only to the second.[1601] Accordingly, the Commission believes the one-second clock synchronization standard set forth in the Plan with respect to Manual Order Events, whether generated by the Participants or Industry Members, is reasonable.

The Commission believes the requirement that the Participants annually review the clock synchronization standard to determine whether it should be shortened, in light of the evolution of technology, is reasonable to ensure that clock synchronization standards remain as tight as practicable in light of technological developments. In particular, as technology advances over time, the Commission believes that it will be appropriate for the Participants to consider whether some CAT Reporters should be required to maintain a finer clock synchronization than required by the Plan today. As the Participants conduct their annual reviews, the Commission expects them to consider proposing new clock synchronization standards whenever they determine the industry standard for CAT Reporters, or certain categories or systems thereof, has become more granular than required by the Plan at that time.[1602] As discussed in Section IV.H., the Commission is amending Section 6.6 of the Plan to require that the Participants provide the Commission with a copy of the annual assessment performed by the Plan Processor pursuant to Section 6.8(c) of the Plan.

Compliance with the clock synchronization standards is vital to the accuracy of the CAT. To this end, the Operating Committee is required to adopt policies and procedures, including standards, that require that the CAT Data reported be timely, accurate, and complete, and to ensure the integrity of CAT Data.[1603] The Plan Processor is responsible for implementing these policies and procedures,[1604] and the CCO is tasked with regularly monitoring them.[1605] The Participants represented that they are developing their clock synchronization compliance rules, and will keep the industry informed as their efforts progress.[1606]

(2) Documentation Requirements

The CAT NMS Plan also requires CAT Reporters to document their clock synchronization procedures, and maintain a log of each time they synchronize their clocks and the results of such synchronization. This log must specifically identify each synchronization event and note whenever the time of the CAT Reporter's Business Clock and the time maintained by the NIST differs by more than the permitted amount.[1607]

One commenter objected to the requirement that each instance of clock synchronization be logged, and took the position that doing so would be costly.[1608] This commenter instead suggested that CAT Reporters should only be required to log instances of clock synchronization exceptions, and not all clock synchronization events.[1609] In response, the Participants reaffirmed that the Plan requires each Participant and Industry Member to maintain a log of all instances of clock synchronization.[1610]

The Commission acknowledges that there could be cost savings if the Plan did not require CAT Reporters to log every clock synchronization event,[1611] but it believes that having this information at the outset of the operation of the CAT should facilitate compliance with, and oversight of, the clock synchronization standards. To the extent the Participants find that a complete log of clock synchronization events is not required to effectively surveil for compliance with these standards, they may at a later date seek to amend the Plan to reduce the logging obligation as appropriate.

b. Timestamp Granularity

The CAT NMS Plan reflects the requirements in Rule 613 regarding timestamps, as modified by an exemption for Manual Order Events granted by the Commission.[1612] Specifically, the Plan requires CAT

[1597] Response Letter II at 4–5. In the Notice, the Commission explained that, according to FIF, all exchange matching engines meet a clock synchronization standard of 50 milliseconds, and NASDAQ stated that all exchanges that trade NASDAQ securities have clock offset tolerances of 100 microseconds or less. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30760.

[1598] Response Letter II at 4–5.

[1599] *See* Section V.F.3.a(5), *infra.*

[1600] *See* Section V.E.1.b(3)B, *infra.* A commenter agreed, noting that if exchanges were required to maintain finer clock synchronization standards than what the CAT NMS Plan currently requires, sequencing of the events in the lifecycle of an order across firms could be improved. FIF Letter at 97.

[1601] *See* Section IV.D.13.b(1), *infra.*

[1602] The Participants should consider the amount of time the industry may need to implement and test a newly imposed clock synchronization standard, and notes that any change to the clock synchronization standard will need to be submitted to the Commission as a proposed amendment to the Plan pursuant to Rule 608. 17 CFR 242.608(a)(ii)(A) and (B), (b)(1). Therefore, the Commission, as well as commenters, will have an opportunity to assess any proposed change to the clock synchronization requirements, including the related implementation time frames.

[1603] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(d)(ii).

[1604] *Id.*

[1605] *Id.* at Section 6.2(a)(v)(k).

[1606] Response Letter I at 20–21.

[1607] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.3.(c).

[1608] FIF Letter at 108.

[1609] *Id.* This commenter also recommended that reasonable policies and procedures be in place to ensure compliance with the clock synchronization requirements. *See id.* at 104–05. As noted above, the Plan requires that the Operating Committee adopt policies and procedures, including standards, that require that the CAT Data reported be timely, accurate, and complete, and to ensure the integrity of CAT Data.

[1610] Response Letter I at 20.

[1611] *See* Section V.H.5, *supra.*

[1612] *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21, at 51. For purposes of the CAT NMS Plan, ''Manual Order Event'' is defined as a non-electronic communication of order-related information for which CAT Reporters must record and report the time of the event.

Reporters to record and report the time of each Reportable Event using timestamps reflecting current industry standards (which must be at least to the millisecond) or, if a CAT Reporter uses timestamps in increments finer than milliseconds, such finer increments, when reporting to the Central Repository. For Manual Order Events, the Plan provides that such events must be recorded in increments up to and including one second, provided that CAT Reporters record and report the time the event is captured electronically in an order handling and execution system (''Electronic Capture Time'') in milliseconds (''Manual Order Event Approach'').[1613] Under the CAT NMS Plan, the CCO, in conjunction with the Participants and Industry Member advisory groups, must annually review the timestamp granularity requirements of the CAT and determine whether to require finer timestamp granularity in light of the evolution of industry standards.[1614]

(1) Manual Order Event Approach

According to the Participants, the Manual Order Event Approach would not have an adverse effect on the various ways in which, and purposes for which, regulators would use, access, and analyze the CAT Data.[1615] In particular, the Participants stated that they do not believe that the Manual Order Event Approach will compromise the linking of order events, or alter the time and method by which regulators may access the data.[1616] The Participants also stated that the Manual Order Event Approach would not negatively impact the reliability and accuracy of the CAT Data.[1617] Further, the Participants represented that one second is the industry standard for reporting the time of Manual Order Events.[1618] The Participants conducted a cost-benefit analysis of the Manual Order Event Approach and concluded that this approach would impose a much smaller cost burden, if any, on market participants, than would transitioning to technology that has the capability to record timestamps for Manual Order Events to the millisecond.[1619]

Two commenters supported the CAT NMS Plan's requirement that Manual Order Events be recorded and reported with a timestamp granularity of up to and including one second.[1620] One commenter stated that the requirement to record timestamps at one-second levels for manual orders was appropriate, and that it was not logical to require a finer timestamp given that attempting to record Manual Order Events at subsecond increments would be inherently imprecise.[1621] Another commenter stated that a manual order timestamped to the second coupled with a daisy chain of other order events timestamped to the millisecond should create ''a fairly clear sequence of events with the order lifecycle for the regulator.'' [1622]

One commenter expressed the view that there would be cost savings if a less stringent timestamp requirement for manual orders was imposed.[1623] Another commenter suggested using a more relaxed timestamp initially for manual orders, and to consider tightening the standard in the future.[1624] Another commenter suggested that anti-gaming provisions should be developed to ensure that CAT Reporters do not program their systems to generate orders that imitate manual orders to take advantage of the one second timestamp requirement.[1625]

The Commission believes it is reasonable to permit Manual Order Events to be timestamped to the second, provided that CAT Reporters record and report the Electronic Capture Time in milliseconds. The Commission understands that the timing of Manual Order Events is inherently imprecise, and believes that requiring a timestamp to a level of granularity finer than one second is not likely to provide any additional information that will be useful to regulators. The Commission believes, however, that requiring the timestamp for the Electronic Capture Time to be recorded to the millisecond would not be burdensome and would help facilitate the reconstruction of Manual Order Events once the order is handled by an electronic system. While the Commission is not aware of any credible means or rationale to disguise electronic orders as manual orders to take advantage of the one second timestamp granularity, as suggested by a commenter, the Commission believes that the Participants should address potential methods of avoiding compliance generally as they develop their Compliance Rules.[1626]

(2) Millisecond (or Finer) Timestamp Requirement for All Other Order Events

Commenters generally supported the proposed requirement that the timestamps for non-Manual Order Events be recorded to the millisecond.[1627] Two commenters also agreed with the requirement to provide timestamps in increments finer than milliseconds, to the extent a CAT Reporter already uses more granular timestamps.[1628] Two other commenters disagreed, however, arguing that costly systems changes would be required for regulatory reporting of these finer timestamps used in its normal practice, and that they would not be useful for regulatory purposes.[1629] Finally, two commenters took the position that certain post-trade events should not be required to have a timestamp, or have a less granular timestamp than a millisecond, as this information is less time-sensitive than fully-electronic trading events.[1630]

In response, the Participants maintained that the Plan's timestamp requirements for non-Manual Order Events were appropriate, but also noted that as CAT Reporters incorporate finer timestamps in their systems, the quality of CAT Data will increase correspondingly.[1631]

The Commission believes that requiring that non-manual Reportable Events be reported with timestamp of at least a millisecond in granularity will help ensure that regulators can sequence

[1613] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.8(b); *see also* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21. In this Order, the Commission is amending the Plan to allow the time of an allocation reported on an Allocation Report to be timestamped to the second. *See* Section IV.D.4.d, *supra.*

[1614] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.8(c).

[1615] *See* Exemption Request, *supra* note 21, at 36.

[1616] *See id.* at 36.

[1617] *See id.* at 35.

[1618] *See id.* at 32.

[1619] *See id.* at 36–37.

[1620] DAG Letter at 2; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's Exemptive Request Letter recommendations). These commenters also supported a clock synchronization standard of one second for Manual Order Events. *See* Section IV.D.13, *supra.*

[1621] SIFMA Letter at 35.

[1622] FIF Letter at 80. The commenter supported use of a daisy chain approach for linking orders, noting that it is successfully used by OATS and its logic is well-known by the industry. *Id.* at 96–97.

[1623] *Id.* at 79, 116–117.

[1624] Data Boiler Letter at 21–22.

[1625] Better Markets Letter at 8.

[1626] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 3.11.

[1627] SIFMA Letter at 35; DAG Letter at 2; *see also* FIF Letter at 12, 80; STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's Exemptive Request Letter recommendations).

[1628] Better Markets Letter at 8; Data Boiler Letter at 21–22.

[1629] SIFMA Letter at 35; FIF Letter at 12. One commenter also requested clarification that the timestamp granularity requirement would be based on the functionality of the applicable CAT reporting system. *See* TR Letter at 7.

[1630] FIF Letter at 79, 99, 111, 116–17; SIFMA Letter at 35. FIF listed Reportable Events in a descending level of sensitivity: (1) Fully electronic trading events; (2) electronic orders requiring manual intervention; (3) manual order events; (4) post-trade events. *See* FIF Letter at 116. However, another commenter stated that no one particular reportable event is more time-sensitive than the others for surveillance purposes. *See* Data Boiler Letter at 21.

[1631] Response Letter I at 29.

events with a reasonable degree of accuracy. Given the speed with which the industry currently handles orders and executes trades, it is important that the CAT utilize a timestamp that will enable regulators to reasonably sequence the order in which Reportable Events occur.[1632] The Commission believes that timestamps in increments greater than a millisecond would undermine the improved ability to sequence events with any reasonable degree of reliability.[1633] In response to commenters' suggestions that timestamps should not be required on manual orders and other post-execution events,[1634] the Commission notes that it has provided flexibility for Manual Order Events and for post-execution allocations to be reported with one second timestamps.[1635]

In response to the commenters that stated it would be costly for CAT Reporters to report using timestamps to the same granularity they use in their normal practice,[1636] the Commission believes it is appropriate to make a clarifying change to the Plan. The CAT NMS Plan provides that to the extent that any CAT Reporter utilizes timestamps in increments finer than one millisecond such CAT Reporter must utilize such finer increment when reporting CAT Data to the Central Repository.[1637] Rule 613(d)(3), however, required that a finer increment must be used only to the extent that ''the relevant order handling and execution systems of any CAT Reporter utilizes timestamps finer that a millisecond.'' [1638] Accordingly, the Commission is amending Section 6.8(b) of the Plan to limit the circumstances in which a CAT Reporter must report using an increment finer than a millisecond to when a CAT Reporter utilizes a finer increment for its order handling and execution systems. The Commission finds that, this modification is appropriate in light of the increased burdens placed on CAT Reporters by the additional systems changes that would otherwise be required in order to report in finer increments. With this modification, reporting in a finer increment than a millisecond would not be a costly undertaking, and the Commission therefore believes that this approach will improve the accuracy of order event records, particularly those occurring rapidly across multiple markets, without imposing undue burdens on market participants.

14. Upgrades and New Functionalities

Under Article VI of the CAT NMS Plan, the Plan Processor is responsible, in consultation with the Operating Committee, for establishing policies and procedures for implementing potential changes and upgrades to the CAT System and infrastructure, including ''business as usual'' changes and the addition of new functionalities.[1639] The CAT NMS Plan also requires that the Plan Processor ensure that the technical infrastructure is scalable from a capacity standpoint, adaptable to future technology developments, and technologically current.[1640]

The Commission received two comments on the Plan provisions pertaining to upgrades and new functionalities. The first commenter expressed concern that the Plan provisions apply only to infrastructure improvements and not also to regulatory tools.[1641] The second commenter, noting the importance of scalability, suggested that the Plan Processor be required to meet certain capacity requirements recommended by Industry Members.[1642] The Participants did not respond to these comments.

The Commission believes that the Plan's provisions with respect to potential upgrades and new functionalities are reasonable. The Commission notes that the Plan Processor is responsible for overseeing the day-to-day operations of CAT and, as such, should be well-positioned and informed to consider whether and when systems changes or upgrades are necessary, subject to consultation and approval by the Operating Committee.[1643] With respect to the development of new regulatory tools, the Commission notes that the Participants, as SROs, are responsible for developing appropriate regulatory tools and, to the extent they identify necessary enhancements to the CAT, the Commission expects the Participants to direct the Plan Processor to implement them.[1644] With respect to a commenter's recommendation that the Plan Processor be required to meet certain capacity requirements to assure scalability, the Commission notes that one of the key considerations for the CAT is that it be flexible and scalable,[1645] and that the CAT NMS Plan already requires that the Plan Processor ensure that the Central Repository's infrastructure is scalable to handle increased reporting volumes and enhancements to technology over time.[1646] As discussed in Section IV.H, the Commission is amending Section 6.6 of the Plan to require the Participants to submit to the Commission an annual evaluation of potential technology upgrades based on a review of technological developments over the preceding year, drawing on internal or external technological expertise.

15. Technical Specifications

The CAT NMS Plan provides that the Plan Processor will publish Technical Specifications regarding the submission of data to the Central Repository that must be consistent with the requirements of Appendices C and D of the Plan.[1647] Under the Plan, as filed, the Plan Processor (i) will begin developing Technical Specifications for the submission of order data by Industry Members fifteen months before Industry Members are required to begin reporting to the Central Repository, (ii) will publish these Technical Specifications one year before Industry Members are required to begin reporting to the Central Repository, and (iii) will begin connectivity testing and accepting order data from Industry Members for testing purposes six months before Industry Members are required to begin reporting to the Central Repository.[1648] With respect to Customer Account Information, the Plan Processor will publish the Technical Specifications six months before Industry Members are required to report data to the Central Repository, and will begin connectivity and acceptance testing three months before Industry Members are required to report data to the Central

[1632] For example, the ability to reconstruct market activity, perform other detailed market analyses, or determine whether a series of orders rapidly entered by a particular market participant is manipulative or otherwise violates SRO rules or federal securities laws requires the audit trail to sequence each order and event accurately.

[1633] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45762.

[1634] FIF Letter at 79, 99, 111, 116–17; SIFMA Letter at 35.

[1635] *See* Section IV.D.4.d, *supra.*

[1636] SIFMA Letter at 35; FIF Letter at 12.

[1637] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.8(b).

[1638] 17 CFR 242.613(d)(3).

[1639] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 6.1(d)(iv), (h)(i), (j), and (k). Appendix D provides additional detail about the obligations of the Plan Processor with respect to CAT Functional Changes, CAT Infrastructure Changes, and Testing of New Changes. *See id.* at Appendix D, Section 11.

[1640] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.5(a).

[1641] *See* Data Boiler Letter at 34.

[1642] *See* SIFMA Letter at 45.

[1643] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.1(i)–(k), Appendix D, Section 11.

[1644] Rule 613(f) requires the Participants to develop and implement a surveillance system, or enhance existing surveillance systems that are reasonably designed to make use of the CAT Data. 17 CFR 242.613(f); *see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.9(c), Appendix D, Section 11.

[1645] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section 5.

[1646] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section A.5(a).

[1647] *See id.* at Section 6.9.

[1648] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section C.10(b).

Repository.[1649] The development of Technical Specifications for Participant submission of order data will commence ten months before Participants are required to report to the Central Repository, and will be published six months before Participants are required to report to the Central Repository.[1650] Commenters raised several concerns regarding the Technical Specifications.[1651]

a. Industry Input and Timing of Technical Specifications

One commenter emphasized the importance of having comprehensive Technical Specifications that incorporate feedback from industry.[1652] Another commenter stated that because CAT is new and complex, time should be built into the schedule to permit two iterative reviews of the Technical Specifications before they are considered final.[1653] This commenter suggested that this review period should be no less than six months, arguing that the current timeframes to develop and test the Technical Specifications for the reporting of information to identify a Customer, in particular, are insufficient.[1654] Another commenter suggested that the review process with respect to Technical Specifications for reporting order data and information to identify a Customer should begin two months after a Plan Processor is selected and continue for nine months.[1655]

One commenter recommended that the Technical Specifications for Industry Members be prepared concurrently with the Technical Specifications for Participants to provide them with more time to review and implement any necessary changes, particularly with regard to interfaces that the Participants and Industry Members will use.[1656] The commenter also recommended that the implementation schedule address allocation reporting and suggested that Technical Specifications for allocation reporting be provided at the same time as those for reporting order data and information to identify a Customer.[1657] The commenter also stated that very detailed and timely information regarding CAT interfaces, message, and file formats in the Technical Specifications are essential due to the aggressive timeline for implementation of CAT.[1658]

In response to these commenters, the Participants acknowledged the importance of the development process for the Technical Specifications for all CAT Reporters and emphasized that in their discussions with the Bidders, they have made development of Technical Specifications a high priority.[1659] Although the Participants noted that the Plan would not prohibit the Plan Processor from concurrently developing the Participant and Industry Member Technical Specifications, they explained that ''in light of various practical issues raised by the pending decisions regarding the selection of the Plan Processor, the Participants do not propose to amend the Plan to reflect an expedited schedule for the Industry Member Technical Specifications.'' [1660]

In their response to comments regarding industry input on the Technical Specifications, the Participants stated that they believe that iterative interactions regarding the Technical Specifications would be beneficial in optimizing the efficiency and quality of the final Technical Specifications.[1661] The Participants further explained that Appendix C of the Plan contemplates the publication of iterative drafts of the Technical Specifications, with respect to the submission of order data, as needed before the final Technical Specifications are published, noting that this language provides the flexibility for iterative drafts, as necessary.[1662]

In their response to comments, the Participants also recommended amendments to the Plan to better align the milestones related to the submission of order data to the Central Repository with the milestones for the submission of Customer Account Information to the Central Repository. Specifically, the Participants recommended explicitly including milestones for the beginning of the Plan Processor's development of Technical Specifications for the submission of Customer Account Information and for the publication of iterative drafts of such Technical Specifications.[1663] However, the Participants did not recommend aligning the timeframe for the publication of Technical Specifications for the submission of Customer Account Information (six months prior to when Industry Members are required to begin reporting to the Central Repository) with the timeframe for the publication of Technical Specifications for the submission of order data (one year prior to when Industry Members are required to begin reporting to the Central Repository), explaining that reporting order data to the CAT will be a significantly more complex process than reporting Customer Account Information and that therefore it is appropriate to allow Industry Members more time to review Technical Specifications and to begin testing their systems with regard to order data.[1664]

The Commission recognizes the importance of providing sufficient opportunity for CAT Reporters to provide input as the Technical Specifications are developed. As noted by the Participants, Appendix C of the CAT NMS Plan, as recommended to be amended by the Participants in their response to comments,[1665] provides that, for the submission processes for both order data and information to identify a Customer, the Plan Processor will begin developing the Technical Specifications fifteen months prior to Industry Member reporting and will publish iterative drafts of the Technical Specifications as needed prior to the publication of the final Technical Specifications.[1666] In addition, the Participants stated that they will ''work with the Plan Processor and the industry to develop detailed Technical Specifications.'' [1667]

Based on these provisions of the Plan and the Participants' statements in their response, the Commission understands that the Participants will work with and consider input from Industry Members during the Technical Specification drafting and development processes. The Commission further understands that the milestones in the Plan regarding the development of the Technical Specifications will keep Industry Members reasonably informed as to the status and content of the Technical Specifications and will permit Industry

[1649] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section C.10(a).

[1650] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section C.10(b).

[1651] FIF Letter at 36–38, 43–44; TR Letter at 4–6; UnaVista Letter at 2; Fidelity Letter at 3, 5–6.

[1652] TR Letter at 4.

[1653] FIF Letter at 37, 43–44. More specifically, the commenter recommended that the Plan Processor provide technical specifications for order processes and Customer and allocation reporting within two months after the Effective Date and allow CAT Reporters six months to review and comment on the Technical Specifications before they are finalized. FIF Letter at 37–38.

[1654] FIF Letter at 38.

[1655] TR Letter at 5. Thomson Reuters noted the review of Technical Specifications related to the expansion of OATS to all NMS equities took four months, and specifications for changes to EBS to support large trader reporting took ten months to finalize. *Id.*

[1656] FIF Letter at 36, 37–38; *see also* SIFMA Letter at 24.

[1657] FIF Letter at 37.

[1658] *Id.* at 91.

[1659] Response Letter I at 41.

[1660] *Id.*

[1661] *Id.*

[1662] *Id.*

[1663] Response Letter II at 7–8.

[1664] Response Letter III at 12–13.

[1665] *See supra* note 1663 and accompanying text.

[1666] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section C.10.

[1667] Response Letter II at 21.

Members, whether through the Advisory Committee or other, more informal mechanisms, to provide input on the Technical Specifications as they are being developed. As discussed above, the Plan requires the Participants and the Plan Processor to work with Industry Members in an iterative process, as necessary, to develop effective final Technical Specifications.[1668] However, the Commission believes that providing the Plan Processor with some flexibility regarding the mechanics of the Technical Specification development process is appropriate, and that it would be premature at this time to provide for mandatory iterative interactions or to require a specific number of iterations.

In addition, the Commission believes it will be beneficial for the milestones for the submission of order data and information to identify a Customer to be as aligned as possible so that all stakeholders can identify issues and present solutions on these related processes simultaneously. The Commission believes that the Participants' recommendations to include specific milestones for the commencement of the development of Technical Specifications for the submission of Customer Account Information and for the publication of iterative drafts of such Technical Specifications are reasonable, and is therefore amending the Plan accordingly.[1669] Although not specifically recommended in the Participant's response, the Commission is also amending the Plan to clarify that the milestones for the submission of information to identify a Customer apply to Customer Identifying Information as well as Customer Account Information.[1670] The Commission understands that the term Customer Identifying Information was inadvertently omitted from Appendix C, Section C.10(a), and therefore believes it is appropriate to amend the Plan to add this term to the milestones applicable to the development of Technical Specifications for Customer data submission.

The Commission agrees with the Participants that the reporting of order data to the Central Repository is likely to be significantly more complex than the reporting of Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information to the Central Repository because of the greater number of data elements and reporting requirements for order data.[1671] Therefore, the Commission believes it is reasonable for the milestones in Appendix C of the Plan to state that the Plan Processor will publish the Technical Specifications for the submission of order data prior to the publication of Technical Specifications for the submission of Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information to permit Industry Members to spend additional time reviewing the order data Technical Specifications and testing their order data submission systems and processes.

In response to the comments recommending that Technical Specifications for Participants and Industry Members be developed concurrently, the Commission agrees with the Participants that the completion dates associated with the development, iterative drafting, and final release of the Technical Specifications for both Participants and Industry Members set forth outer limits on when such milestones must be completed,[1672] which would not preclude the concurrent development of Participant and Industry Member Technical Specifications. The Commission further agrees that such concurrent development could be beneficial since it would permit all stakeholders to be apprised of issues and to offer solutions simultaneously and, accordingly, encourages the Participants and the Plan Processor to develop the Technical Specifications in this manner, if feasible. However, given that the Plan Processor, which will be primarily responsible for developing the Technical Specifications, will not be selected until after the Plan is approved, and that the Plan Processor has a variety of other responsibilities related to the development of the CAT, the Commission believes that providing the Plan Processor with flexibility regarding the mechanics of the Technical Specification development process is reasonable and is not amending the Plan to require concurrent development of Participant and Industry Member Technical Specifications. Moreover, the Commission believes that the sequencing of Technical Specification milestones in the Plan—for example, that development of Technical Specifications for Participant reporting of order data to the Central Repository should begin ten months before Participants are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository while development of Technical Specifications for Industry Member reporting of order data to the Central Repository should begin fifteen months before Industry Members are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository [1673]—reflects a reasonable prioritization in light of the phased implementation of Participant and Industry Member reporting.

Similarly, with respect to the period of time that Industry Members will have to review and provide input on the Technical Specifications for Industry Member data reporting, the Commission notes that, because the Plan Processor may begin developing the Technical Specifications earlier than fifteen months prior to Industry Member reporting, and because the Plan Processor may seek Industry Member comment on draft Technical Specifications, there may in effect be a period of Technical Specification review that is longer than suggested by a strict interpretation of the milestones in Appendix C. Therefore, the Commission is not amending the Plan to revise these timeframes.

However, as discussed above, the Commission expects that the Technical Specifications will be published with sufficient time for CAT Reporters to program their systems to satisfy their reporting obligations under the Plan and is amending Appendix C, Section C.10 of the Plan to ensure that the completion dates for the Technical Specification development milestones designate firm outer limits, rather than ''projected'' completion dates, for the completion of these milestones.[1674] Therefore, the Commission is amending the Plan to provide for a minimum period of three months during which the Plan Processor and Industry

[1668] *See* Section IV.D.8.b, *supra.*

[1669] Specifically, the Commission is amending Appendix C, Section C.10(a) of the Plan to state that the Plan Processor will begin developing the Technical Specifications for Industry Member reporting of Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information no later than fifteen months before Industry Members are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository. The Plan Processor will also begin developing the Technical Specifications for order data reporting at that time. In addition, the Commission is amending Appendix C, Section C.10(a) of the Plan to state that the Plan Processor will publish iterative drafts of the Technical Specifications for Industry Member reporting of Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information, as well as Industry Member reporting of order data, as needed before the final versions of these Technical Specifications are published.

[1670] The milestones listed in Appendix C, Section C.10(a) apply to the customer definition process described in Section 6.4(d)(iv), which requires Industry Members to submit both Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information. *See* Section IV.D.4.a(1), *supra.*

[1671] *See* Section III.5.d, *supra.*

[1672] *See* Section IV.D.8.a, *supra* (discussing Commission amendments to the Technical Specifications and other milestones set forth in Section C.10 of Appendix C).

[1673] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section C.10.

[1674] *See* Section IV.D.8.a, *supra.*

Members will work together to develop the Technical Specifications.[1675]

b. Impact on Industry Members

One commenter stated that changes that SROs require of their members' systems and processes can be costly in terms of both dollars and human capital.[1676] The commenter also noted that these changes are often subject to short implementation time periods and there is a lack of opportunity for discussion of concerns about the extent to which such new requirements can potentially expose the markets and investors to unnecessary risk.[1677] This commenter recommended that any new CAT requirements that will be imposed by the Participants on broker-dealers should be done through the SRO rulemaking process to afford market participants the opportunity to discuss any proposed changes with the Participants and the Commission, and to provide a sufficient lead time to implement necessary systems and coding changes.[1678]

The Participants explained in their response that they do not believe, generally, that the Technical Specifications are required to be filed with the Commission under Rule 608,[1679] and cautioned that requiring rule filings may introduce significant delays in the process of developing the Technical Specifications. The Participants stated that in the normal course they do not intend to file the Technical Specifications with the Commission, but noted that to the extent that a change to the Technical Specifications is significant enough to require a change to the Plan, then such an amendment to the Plan would be filed pursuant to Rule 608.[1680]

As discussed above, the Commission recognizes the importance of providing sufficient opportunity for all CAT Reporters to provide input as the initial Technical Specifications are developed, and believes that the Technical Specification development process outlined in the Plan, as amended—including the iterative interactions discussed above—will provide such an opportunity.[1681] The Commission believes that the completion dates for the availability of final Technical Specifications—*e.g.,* no later than one year before Industry Members are required to report data to the Central Repository for the release of Technical Specifications governing Industry Member reporting of order data—are reasonable and provide Industry Members with sufficient lead time to adjust their systems or make other preparations necessary to comply with the Technical Specifications, particularly since drafts of the Technical Specifications will likely have been available even earlier and Industry Members will have been involved in the process of developing the Technical Specifications.[1682]

The Commission recognizes that there may be costs associated with complying with technical or operational changes in reporting requirements. The Commission notes that Material Amendments to the Technical Specifications—*i.e.,* amendments that would ''require a Participant or an Industry Member to engage in significant changes to the coding necessary to submit information to the Central Repository''—must be approved by a Supermajority Vote of the Operating Committee, so the Plan provides additional controls with respect to changes to the Technical Specifications that could potentially be costly.[1683] In addition, the Advisory Committee, which includes Industry Member representation, will be able to raise Industry Member concerns regarding any unexpected or costly requirements in the Technical Specifications with the Operating Committee. Moreover, while the Commission agrees with the Participants that changes to the Technical Specifications generally will not be required to be filed with the Commission, the Participants must comply with the CAT NMS Plan as approved by the Commission,[1684] which constrains the ability of the Operating Committee to approve major changes that would alter the scope of the CAT NMS Plan through Technical Specifications. In addition, the Commission will oversee the Participants' compliance with the Plan,[1685] which provides an additional protection against the Participants or Plan Processor attempting to include changes in the Technical Specifications that properly should be filed as Plan amendments.

c. Technical Specifications Content

Several commenters noted that the Technical Specifications for CAT must be robust and comprehensive.[1686] Some commenters recommended that specific elements be included in the Technical Specifications.[1687] One commenter recommended that the Participants ensure the Technical Specifications include provisions to ensure that multiple service providers are able to connect to CAT to report CAT Data.[1688] Another commenter stressed the importance of including connectivity requirements in the Technical Specifications.[1689] This commenter also stated that achievement of the CAT NMS Plan's reporting requirement would be dependent on the details in the Technical Specifications.[1690] Another commenter stated that while it supports the reporting procedures identified in the CAT NMS Plan, ''clearly defined technical guidelines for field specifications under different trading scenarios'' are also needed.[1691] A different commenter stated that the items to be included in the Technical Specifications ''inappropriately constrain'' the design of the CAT system to ''too rigidly follow a traditional SQL database design'' to the exclusion of more sophisticated analytical approaches.[1692]

In response, the Participants explained that they believe that each of these items are more appropriately addressed in the Technical Specifications, and should not be incorporated as requirements of the Plan. Nevertheless, the Participants explained that they believe that each of

[1675] As amended, the Plan will require that the Plan Processor will begin developing Technical Specifications for Industry Member submission of order data no later than fifteen months before Industry Members are required to begin reporting this data and will publish the final Technical Specifications no later than one year before Industry Members are required to begin reporting. *Id.*

[1676] Fidelity Letter at 6.

[1677] *Id.* at 3, 5–6.

[1678] *Id.*

[1679] The Participants noted that technical specifications for other NMS plans, such as the Tick Size Pilot Plan, have not been filed with the SEC. Response Letter I at 42.

[1680] Response Letter I at 42.

[1681] *See* Section IV.D.15.a, *supra.*

[1682] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section C.10. The Commission also believes that the details regarding data reporting and recording included in the CAT NMS Plan itself are sufficient for CAT Reporters to begin the process of preparing their systems for CAT reporting.

[1683] *See id.* at Section 6.9(c).

[1684] 17 CFR 242.613(h)(1).

[1685] *See* 17 CFR 242.608(b)(2), (c), (d); 17 CFR 242.613(h).

[1686] TR Letter at 5; FIF Letter at 91; UnaVista Letter at 2.

[1687] TR Letter at 5 (recommending that the CAT Technical Specifications should include all scenarios currently covered in the OATS technical specification as well as additional scenarios on new processes related to the Customer definition process and options order reporting and that all scenarios required to meet the CAT NMS Plan Appendix D, Reporting & Linkage Requirements should be considered including step-outs, cancel-rebills, bunched orders and manual order processing); UnaVista Letter at 2.

[1688] TR Letter at 5.

[1689] FIF Letter at 124, 128.

[1690] *Id.* at 124.

[1691] UnaVista Letter at 2 (noting further that CAT certification courses, webinars, user groups and a forum for FAQs may improve knowledge transfer).

[1692] Data Boiler Letter at 9–10.

the elements identified by the commenters will be incorporated into the Technical Specifications developed by the Plan Processor.[1693]

The Commission acknowledges the importance of timely, comprehensive, and detailed Technical Specifications that will provide all CAT Reporters with effective guidance on how to report data to the Central Repository. The Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan specifies a number of parameters for what the Technical Specifications must contain, including specifications for the layout of files and records submitted to the Central Repository and the process for file submissions.[1694] The Commission believes that it may be beneficial to include the elements referenced by the commenters, such as details regarding the submission of data for the Customer definition process and options order reporting, in the Technical Specifications, but believes that it is reasonable to allow the Plan Processor, with input from Industry Members during the iterative drafting process, to have some flexibility in determining these details of the Technical Specifications. In addition, the Participants have indicated that the elements referenced by the commenters will be incorporated into the Technical Specifications, and therefore the Commission does not believe it is necessary to amend the Plan to require these elements.

In response to the comment that the Plan's parameters regarding the content of the Technical Specifications are too rigid and limit the ability of the Plan Processor to offer certain design solutions, the Commission believes that the parameters strike an appropriate balance between providing the Bidders flexibility to offer a variety of solutions on the one hand and including some baseline requirements for the Technical Specifications on the other, and does not believe these parameters will inappropriately constrain the solutions that the Plan Processor can develop.

E. Capital Accounts, Allocations of Income and Loss, and Distributions (Articles VII and VIII)

As filed, the CAT NMS Plan provides that the Operating Committee must approve by Supermajority Vote a distribution of cash and property of the Company to the Participants.[1695] To the extent a distribution is made, all Participants must participate equally in any such distribution, except as otherwise provided in the CAT NMS Plan.[1696] The CAT NMS Plan, as filed, also includes provisions relating to each Participant's Capital Account, and how net profits and net losses (and any other item allocable to the Participants) shall be allocated to the Participants.[1697]

Three commenters raised concerns about the CAT NMS Plan's proposed allocations of profit and loss, particularly concerning the ability of the Participants to profit from CAT.[1698] Two commenters argued that the CAT NMS Plan should be amended to state that any profits arising out of the CAT may not be used to fund the Participants' other operations.[1699] One of the commenters also stated that the CAT should operate at-cost [1700] and that funding related to the CAT should not create a surplus for the Participants.[1701]

Another commenter noted that the proposed funding model would allocate net profits or net losses only to Participants, even though both Participants and broker-dealers would be funding the Central Repository.[1702] The commenter deemed this inequitable and suggested that any profits should be distributed back to all entities that fund the CAT, not just the Participants.[1703] This commenter believed that the CAT should function as a non-profit industry utility, distributing profits to all entities funding the CAT and raising fees if there are any losses.[1704]

In response, the Participants stated that the Company is expected to be operated on a ''break-even'' basis, with fees imposed to cover costs and an appropriate reserve, and explained that any surpluses would be treated as an operational reserve to offset future fees and would not be distributed to the Participants as profits.[1705] In addition, the Participants stated that they received advice from counsel to CAT NMS, LLC that the Company could qualify for tax exempt status as a ''business league'' under Section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code and decided to have the Company apply for such status to allow it to establish reserves from the fees paid to the Company without incurring income taxes on those amounts.[1706] Accordingly, to ensure that the Company can qualify for the business league exemption, the Participants proposed that the Commission amend the Plan so that the Company is treated as a corporation for U.S. tax purposes, that distributions, if any, are made consistent with the purposes of Section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code, and that certain other Plan provisions related to distributions to the Participants or to the taxation of the Company as a partnership for U.S. tax purposes be eliminated.[1707] In particular, the Participants suggested that the Commission amend the Plan to delete in its entirety Article VII, which pertains to Capital Accounts maintained by the Company for each Participant, and to replace Article VIII, which pertains to allocations of income and loss and distributions, with a provision stating that the Company intends to operate in a manner such that it qualifies as a business league within the meaning of Section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code, and requiring the Operating Committee to submit an application to the Internal Revenue Service to attain such status for the Company.[1708]

The Commission believes that the Participants' stated intent to operate the CAT on a break-even basis is appropriate. Inasmuch as the CAT is a regulatory tool mandated under Rule 613, it should not be used to fund the SROs' other operations. To ensure the CAT is operated in this manner, the Commission is amending Section 11.1(c) of the CAT NMS Plan to require that any surplus of the Company's revenues over its expenses will be treated as an operational reserve to offset future fees. The Commission believes this amendment is reasonable because it formalizes the representation made by the Participants, and provides certainty that the Participants' operation of the CAT will not contribute to the funding of their other operations. The Commission notes that, under the Exchange Act, any fees proposed to be charged by the Participants to fund the CAT must be filed as proposed rule changes pursuant to Rule 19b–4(f)(2) or

[1693] Response Letter I at 40.

[1694] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.9(b).

[1695] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 8.5(a).

[1696] *Id.*

[1697] *See id.* at Article VIII.

[1698] SIFMA Letter; KCG Letter; DAG Letter.

[1699] SIFMA Letter at 19; DAG Letter at 5.

[1700] SIFMA Letter at 29.

[1701] *Id.* at 14.

[1702] KCG Letter at 5.

[1703] *Id.*

[1704] *Id.*

[1705] Participants' Letter I at 1.

[1706] *Id.*

[1707] *Id.*

[1708] *See id.* The Participants also suggested conforming amendments to: Article I, to remove the definition of Capital Account; Article II, to state that the Company's activities also shall be consistent with its tax exempt status; Articles III, IX, and XII and Appendix C to eliminate certain references to the Participants' Capital Accounts and provisions regarding the Company's potential taxation as a partnership and its distributions and allocations; and Article X, to state that certain distributions after an event of dissolution shall be made to such persons or institutions as is consistent with the purposes of the Company and with Section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code. *See id.*

filed pursuant to Rule 608(b)(3)(i) [1709] with the Commission, published for public comment, and meet statutory standards with respect to reasonableness, equitable allocation, and other matters.[1710]

The Commission believes that it is reasonable to amend the Plan as filed by the Participants to treat CAT NMS, LLC as a tax exempt business league under Section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code.[1711] The Commission believes that allowing the Company to establish reserves from the fees paid to the Company without incurring income taxes on those reserves would be more efficient and could potentially make more funding available to pay for the development and operation of the CAT or reduce fees. Further, the Commission believes that that the Company's application for Section 501(c)(6) business league status addresses issues raised by commenters about the Plan's proposed allocations of profit and loss by mitigating concerns that the Company's earnings could be used to benefit individual Participants.[1712] Accordingly, the Commission is amending the Plan as filed by the Participants to delete in its entirety Article VII, which pertains to Capital Accounts maintained by the Company for each Participant, and to replace Article VIII, which pertains to allocations of income and loss and distributions, with a provision stating that the Company intends to operate in a manner such that it qualifies as a business league and that the Operating Committee will apply to attain such status for the Company. The Commission is also amending the Plan to make the conforming amendments to Articles I–III, IX, X, and XII and Appendix C as suggested by the Participants.[1713]

F. Funding of the Company (Article XI)

The CAT NMS Plan contemplates a bifurcated funding model, where costs associated with building and operating the Central Repository would be borne by (1) Participants and Industry Members that are ''Execution Venues'' [1714] through fixed tier fees, and (2) Industry Members (other than ATSs), through fixed tier fees based on message traffic.[1715] With respect to Execution Venues, the Operating Committee will establish at least two, and no more than five, tiers of fixed fees based on the Execution Venue's NMS Stock and OTC Equity Securities market share, as calculated by share volume.[1716] Execution Venues that execute transactions in Listed Options will pay a fixed fee depending on the Listed Options market share of such Execution Venue, with the Operating Committee establishing at least two, and no more than five, tiers of fixed fees based on an Execution Venue's Listed Options market share, as calculated by contract volume.[1717] With respect to Industry Members, the Plan provides that the Operating Committee will establish fixed fees to be payable by Industry Members based on the message traffic generated by such Industry Member. In addition to the message traffic fees for the non-ATS activities of Industry Members, the Plan provides that message traffic fees will be assessed on message traffic generated by: (i) An ATS that does not execute orders and that is sponsored by such Industry Member; and (ii) routing orders to and from any ATS sponsored by such Industry Member. The Operating Committee will establish at least five, and no more than nine, tiers of fixed fees based on message traffic.[1718]

1. Funding Model Generally

Several commenters argued that the proposed funding model unfairly or inappropriately allocates costs to Industry Members and away from Participants.[1719] One commenter believed that the Commission should consider whether Industry Members should fund the costs of CAT at all.[1720]

Some commenters stated that requiring the creation and maintenance of a Participant-owned and -operated system like CAT to be partially funded by Industry Members would be a significant departure from the funding models currently used for existing regulatory systems.[1721] One of these commenters believed that the Participants should justify the need for Industry Members to fund the creation and ongoing costs of the CAT.[1722] The commenter opposed any Participant-imposed fee for the CAT,[1723] and stated that the CAT NMS Plan does not distinguish between the costs of the CAT that are associated with Industry Member data reporting and costs associated with the Participants' regulatory uses.[1724] This commenter

[1709] *See* 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii); 17 CFR 242.608(b)(3)(i). The Commission notes that, although Section 11.1(b) of the CAT NMS Plan states that the Participants will file fees for Industry Members pursuant to Section 19(b) of the Exchange Act, the Participants could choose to submit the proposed fee schedule to the Commission as individual SROs pursuant to Rule 19b–4 under the Exchange Act or jointly as Participants to an NMS plan pursuant to Rule 608 of Regulation NMS. *See* 17 CFR 240.19b–4; 17 CFR 242.608. Because the proposed fee schedule would establish fees, whether the Participants individually file it pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, or jointly file it pursuant to Rule 608(b)(3)(i) of Regulation NMS, the proposed fee filings will be eligible for immediate effectiveness. *See* 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii); 17 CFR 242.608(b)(3)(i). The Commission also notes that publication will be subject to the filing of the fee proposal by the Participants that satisfies the requirements of the Exchange Act. If the Participants file the proposed fee schedule pursuant to Rule 19b–4(f)(2) and the Commission deems such fees not to meet applicable statutory standards, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend the fees if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Exchange Act. *See* 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(C). If the Commission takes such action, the Commission shall institute proceedings under Section 19(b)(2)(B) to determine whether the proposed rule should be approved or disapproved. *See* 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A). If the Participants file the proposed fee schedule pursuant to Rule 608(b)(3)(i), the Commission may summarily abrogate the fees and require them to be refiled in accordance with Rule 608(a)(1) and reviewed in accordance with Rule 608(b)(2) if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or the maintenance of fair and orderly markets, to remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanisms of, a national market system or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Exchange Act. *See* 17 CFR 242.608(b)(3)(iii).

[1710] *Id.*

[1711] The Commission defers, however, to the Internal Revenue Service regarding whether CAT NMS, LLC meets all the necessary requirements to so qualify.

[1712] To qualify as a business league, an organization must ''not [be] organized for profit and no part of the net earnings of [the organization can] inure[ ] to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.'' 26 U.S.C. 501(c)(6).

[1713] *See supra* note 1708.

[1714] The CAT NMS Plan defines ''Execution Venue'' as ''a Participant or an alternative trading system (''ATS'') (as defined in Rule 300 of Regulation ATS) that operates pursuant to Rule 301 of Regulation ATS (excluding any such ATS that does not execute orders).'' *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1. The CAT NMS Plan categorizes FINRA as an Execution Venue because it has trades reported by its members to its trade reporting facilities (''TRFs'') for reporting transactions effected otherwise than on an exchange. *See id.* at Section 11.3(i).

[1715] *See id.* at Section 11.3(a)(i)–(ii); Section 11.3(b); Appendix C, at Section B.7(b)(iv)(B).

[1716] *See id.* at Section 11.3(a)(i).

[1717] *See id.* at Section 11.3(a)(ii).

[1718] *See id.* at Section 11.3(b); Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iv)(B).

[1719] KCG Letter at 3; DAG Letter at 4; *see also* FSR Letter at 9–10 (noting the ultimate cost of the CAT will be in the billions of dollars, ''which will be passed-down to the Industry Members and investors through new fees'').

[1720] DAG Letter at 4; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's cost and funding recommendations).

[1721] SIFMA Letter at 14 (noting that the Participants fund similar systems like OATS themselves and then a portion of those costs are borne by Industry Members through fees); DAG Letter at 5.

[1722] SIFMA Letter at 14.

[1723] *Id.*

[1724] *Id.* at 17. The commenter further noted that the Plan does not address how new costs resulting from regulatory research needs are allocated, providing as an example if the Commission requested a significant increase in the Central Repository's processing capability to facilitate a large-scale analysis related to a market structure

Continued

further stated that the funding authority of the CAT should extend only to expenses directly related to the reasonable implementation and operating costs of the CAT system, such as costs related to the management of the business of the CAT, and the direct costs of building and maintaining of the Central Repository.[1725] The commenter specifically opposed the Participants' proposal to recover the costs of the creation or development of the CAT NMS Plan, such as legal and consulting costs, and expressed the view that these costs are solely the responsibility of the Participants as part of their regulatory cost of doing business.[1726] Further, this commenter suggested that the governance structure include an audit committee to assure that the CAT's revenue is used for regulatory purposes.[1727]

Finally, two commenters believed that, to the extent the CAT generates cost savings for the Participants, that cost savings should be used first to fund the CAT before fees are imposed on Industry Members.[1728]

In response, the Participants stated that Rule 613 specifically contemplated the allocation of the costs of the creation, implementation and maintenance of the CAT among both the Participants and their members, and that the Adopting Release for Rule 613 discussed and permitted the recovery of such costs by Participants from their members.[1729] Additionally, with respect to the comments that objected to Participants using fees under the Plan to recover development costs of the Plan, and in particular legal and consulting costs, the Participants explained that Rule 613 permitted the Participants to propose to recover such costs.[1730] The Participants stated their belief that it is equitable that the Industry Members as well as Participants contribute to the funding of the CAT, including the development of the Plan governing the CAT,[1731] because both benefit from the enhanced market oversight afforded regulators by the CAT,[1732] and noted that adopting CAT-specific fees would provide greater transparency for market participants than a general regulatory fee.[1733]

In response to the commenters that suggested that the CAT be funded, at least in part, by cost savings,[1734] the Participants acknowledged that cost savings from retiring existing systems will partially offset their expenses associated with the CAT, but declined to make any specific funding commitments.[1735]

The Participants, as SROs, have traditionally recovered their regulatory costs through the collection of fees from their members, and such fees are specifically contemplated by the Exchange Act.[1736] The Participants currently collect certain regulatory and other fees, dues and assessments from their members to fund their SRO responsibilities in market and member regulation; such fees must be consistent with applicable statutory standards under the Exchange Act, including being reasonable, equitably allocated[1737] and not unfairly discriminatory.[1738]

The Commission believes that the proposed funding model reflects a reasonable exercise of the Participants' funding authority to recover the Participants' costs related to the CAT. The CAT is a regulatory facility jointly owned by the Participants and, as noted above, the Exchange Act specifically permits the Participants to charge members fees to fund their self-regulatory obligations. The Commission further believes that the proposed funding model is designed to impose fees reasonably related to the Participants' self-regulatory obligations because the fees would be directly associated with the costs of establishing and maintaining the CAT, and not unrelated SRO services. The Commission emphasizes that the CAT NMS Plan does not set forth, and the Commission is not hereby approving, the specific fees to be charged by the Participants; rather, such fee proposals later will be separately filed with the Commission by the Participants, published for public comment, and assessed by the Commission for consistency with applicable Exchange Act standards, including whether they are reasonable and equitably allocated,[1739] and not unfairly discriminatory.[1740]

2. Funding Model's Allocation of Costs

Several commenters expressed concern about the proposed allocation of CAT costs between the Participants and Industry Members.[1741] Some expressed concern that the majority of the costs of the CAT would be allocated to Industry Members, with some estimating that Industry Members would pay approximately 88% of the ongoing annual costs of the CAT.[1742] One commenter stated that the funding model is ''excessively and unjustifiably weighted to broker-dealers,'' [1743] and requested to review proposed CAT fees to ensure they are reasonable and equitable.[1744] Another commenter

study, opining that it would be inappropriate to require Industry Members to pay for Participant-specific system enhancements through the general allocation of CAT costs. *Id.* at 18.

[1725] *Id.* at 15.

[1726] *Id.; see also* DAG Letter at 4–5.

[1727] SIFMA Letter at 29.

[1728] SIFMA Letter, DAG Letter; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's cost and funding recommendations).

[1729] Response Letter II at 9–10 (citing 17 CFR 242.613(a)(1)(vii)(D) and Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45795).

[1730] Response Letter II at 13.

[1731] *Id.*

[1732] *Id.* at 10.

[1733] *Id.*

[1734] SIFMA Letter at 17–18; DAG Letter at 4.

[1735] Response Letter II at 16. Specifically, the Participants stated that they expect to realize approximately $10.6 million in cost savings associated with the retirement of existing systems when moving to the CAT. However, they also said that they will incur approximately $17.9 million in expenses associated with complying with the CAT reporting requirements, and an additional $23.2 million in expenses related to the implementation of surveillance programs.

[1736] Sections 6(b)(1) and 15A(b)(2) of the Exchange Act require that an exchange or association have the capacity to be able to carry out the purposes of the Exchange Act, the rules and regulations thereunder, and the rules of the exchange or association. 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(1); 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(2). *See e.g.,* Schedule A to the By-Laws of FINRA, Section 1(a) (stating ''FINRA shall, in accordance with this section, collect member regulatory fees that are designed to recover the costs to FINRA of the supervision and regulation of members, including performing examinations, financial monitoring, and policy, rulemaking, interpretive, and enforcement activities''). As SROs, the Participants have an obligation to be so organized and have the capacity to be able to carry out the purposes of the Exchange Act, and to enforce compliance by their members with the Exchange Act and their rules. 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(1); 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(2).

[1737] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4); 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(5).

[1738] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5); 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(6).

[1739] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4); 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(5).

[1740] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5); 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(6).

[1741] KCG Letter; SIFMA Letter; Fidelity Letter; FSR Letter; DAG Letter; Data Boiler Letter; Wachtel Letter.

[1742] *See* DAG Letter at 4 (noting that the CAT NMS Plan estimates that 88% of the annual costs of CAT would be allocated to Industry Members, and that the Participants additionally intend to require Industry Members to help fund the creation and ongoing costs of CAT, significantly increasing the burden on Industry Members); KCG Letter at 4; SIFMA Letter at 12–13 (noting that the total estimated annual cost of the CAT NMS Plan would be $1.7 billion, of which $1.5 billion, or 88% of the costs for the operation of CAT, would be borne by Industry Members). One of these commenters stated that, although not mentioned in the CAT NMS Plan, it believed the Participants anticipate allocating 75% of CAT Central Repository build and operational costs to Industry Members and 25% to Execution Venues, thereby shifting the majority of CAT costs away from the SROs and on the Industry Members, and increasing the Industry Member portion of annual CAT-related costs from approximately 88% to more than 96%. KCG Letter at 4. That commenter stated that ''[t]his methodology is inequitable and serves to underscore the inherent conflicts of interest the SROs face with respect to CAT funding and the effects of precluding broker-dealers from meaningfully participating in management of the CAT.'' KCG Letter at 4–5.

[1743] SIFMA Letter at 13.

[1744] *Id.* at 18.

expressed concern that the costs and funding of CAT might not be allocated equitably among Industry Members and Participants, given that the Participants are sole voting members of the Plan.[1745]

More generally, two commenters believed that the CAT NMS Plan's funding model lacks sufficiently detailed information.[1746] One of the commenters stated that the Plan's funding model does not adequately represent the industry feedback that the group provided to the Participants, and noted that the CAT NMS Plan lacks an analysis of how a CAT fee would fit into the existing funding model for regulation, including whether FINRA trading activity fees would be reduced after OATS is retired.[1747] Another commenter stated that the information made publicly available in the CAT NMS Plan is insufficient for it to provide meaningful analysis on the funding model.[1748]

The Participants disputed the estimate quoted by several commenters that Industry Members would bear 88% of the costs of the CAT, stating that this calculation referred to Industry Member compliance costs, and does not directly reflect CAT fees to be imposed pursuant to the Plan.[1749]

In response to the commenter that asked whether existing regulatory fees would be reduced once the CAT is implemented,[1750] the Participants stated that each SRO will consider potential revisions to its existing regulatory fees once the CAT begins operation and legacy systems are retired.[1751] The Participants also disagreed with the commenters that expressed concern that the funding model does not adequately reflect industry input,[1752] and stressed that the funding model was discussed with the DAG many times and that the funding model was developed taking into account their input.[1753]

The Commission believes that the proposed funding model is reasonably designed to allocate the costs of the CAT between the Participants and Industry Members. The Commission notes that the proposed funding model set forth in the Plan does not specify that the Participants or Industry Members would bear any particular percentage allocation of the costs associated with building and operating the Central Repository. As noted above, the Participants are permitted to recoup their regulatory costs under the Exchange Act through the collection of fees from their members, as long as such fees are reasonable, equitably allocated[1754] and not unfairly discriminatory, and otherwise are consistent with Exchange Act standards.[1755] The Commission will have the opportunity, at a later date, to review, and Industry Members and other interested persons will have the opportunity to comment upon, the specific fees the Participants intend to impose pursuant to the general funding model discussed herein.[1756]

3. Message Traffic and Market Share Distinction

Two commenters addressed the proposed allocation of costs between Execution Venues and Industry Members based on market share and message traffic, respectively.[1757] One of the commenters questioned the allocation of costs to Industry Members by message-traffic tiers, noting that market makers in exchange-traded products (''ETPs'') could incur much greater allocated costs than market makers in corporate stocks, given that market makers in ETPs may generate ten times the amount of message traffic per executed trade as market makers in corporate stocks.[1758] The commenter also noted that Industry Members that primarily take liquidity do not generate significant quote-message traffic, so that ''any mechanism that allocates costs to broker-dealers strictly based on message traffic would unfortunately disadvantage broker-dealers that typically provide liquidity compared to those that may only take liquidity,'' [1759] thereby discouraging the display of quotes. The commenter expressed concern that the Plan does not explain how much the Participants would charge per message or per market share percentage, or how they would assign the fixed-fee tiers to exchanges and Industry Members.[1760]

This commenter also noted that the CAT NMS Plan does not distinguish between costs of the CAT that are related to Industry Member data collection and processing, and costs of the CAT related to SRO surveillance and research, and expressed the view that allocating CAT costs simply based on message traffic or market share would make Industry Members subsidize Participant surveillance systems and other regulatory functions that currently are funded by the Participants through other regulatory fees imposed on Industry Members.[1761] Finally, this commenter stated that the CAT NMS Plan does not explain why the SROs propose to allocate costs by message-traffic tiers for non-ATS Industry Members and by market share for exchanges and ATSs, and expressed concern that the market share approach applicable to exchanges and ATSs is primarily driven by their ability to pay, as opposed to the actual costs they impose on the Central Repository.[1762]

Another commenter expressed the view that the proposed allocation of fees among Participants, other types of Execution Venues and Industry Members is not fair,[1763] and that assessing fees based on message traffic and market share is not appropriate or reasonable.[1764] This commenter stated that charging for message traffic would amount to a ''financial transaction tax'' that would negatively impact the financial markets, and recommended that charges instead be based on ''quarantine or red-flag of suspicious trade messages.'' [1765]

In response, the Participants explained that ''[i]n designing a funding model, the Participants have sought to ensure an equitable allocation of fees such that large broker-dealers or broker-dealer complexes and large Participants or Participant complexes pay more than small broker-dealers and small exchanges.'' [1766] The Participants believe that there is a strong correlation between message traffic and the size of an Industry Member, and that Industry Members increase their message traffic volume as they grow.[1767] The

[1745] Fidelity Letter at 5.

[1746] SIFMA Letter; DAG Letter.

[1747] DAG Letter at 5.

[1748] SIFMA Letter at 16. This commenter noted that the CAT NMS Plan provides only a high-level description of a funding model that reflects no input from broker-dealers and contains very little information on how costs will be allocated between broker-dealers and Participants. *Id.* at 13.

[1749] Response Letter II at 10. The Participants stated that the funding model provides a framework for the recovery of the costs to create, develop and maintain the CAT, and is not meant to address the cost of compliance for Industry Members and Participants with the reporting requirements of Rule 613.

[1750] DAG Letter at 5.

[1751] Response Letter II at 17–18.

[1752] SIFMA Letter at 13; DAG Letter at 4.

[1753] Response Letter II at 18.

[1754] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4); 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(5).

[1755] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5); 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(6).

[1756] *See* Section IV.F.1, *supra.*

[1757] SIFMA Letter at 16–17; Data Boiler Letter at 15; *see also* DAG Letter at 5 (urging additional transparency related to the funding model based on market share and message traffic).

[1758] SIFMA Letter at 17.

[1759] *Id.*

[1760] *Id.* at 16.

[1761] *Id.* at 17–18.

[1762] *Id.* at 16–17. The commenter urged the Participants to explain why they would not use the market share method of allocation for non-ATS Industry Members.

[1763] Data Boiler Letter at 15.

[1764] *Id.*

[1765] *Id.*

[1766] Response Letter II at 11.

[1767] *Id.*

Participants stated that message traffic is a key component of the costs of operating the CAT, so they believe that message traffic is an appropriate criterion for placing Industry Members in a certain fee tier.[1768] The Participants also expressed the view that the correlation between message traffic and size does not apply to Execution Venues, which they describe as producing similar amounts of message traffic regardless of size. They explained that charging Execution Venues based on message traffic would make large and small Execution Venues pay comparable fees, which they believe would be an inequitable result,[1769] so the Participants decided to treat Execution Venues differently from Industry Members in the funding model.[1770] The Participants estimated that the result of the funding model would be that fees for the smallest Execution Venues would be comparable to the largest Industry Members, and that aggregate fees for Participant complexes[1771] would be at least comparable to those of large Industry Members.[1772]

In response to the commenter that stated that the funding model should distinguish between the costs of Industry Member data collection and processing and the costs related to SRO surveillance and research,[1773] and to the commenter that recommended that fees be based on suspicious trade messages,[1774] the Participants noted that the Bidders cited data ingestion and processing as the primary driver of CAT costs and thus believe that data collection and processing requirements are a reasonable basis for allocating costs to CAT Reporters.[1775] As to concerns that a fee based on message traffic would discourage the display of quotes,[1776] the Participants explained that ''one of the reasons for proposing a tiered, fixed fee funding model was to limit the disincentives to providing liquidity to the market,'' as might be the case with a strictly variable funding model.[1777]

The Commission expressed concern in the Notice that the structure of the funding model could provide a competitive advantage to exchanges over ATSs.[1778] Under the proposed funding model, for an execution occurring on an exchange, the exchange would pay an Execution Venue fee based on its market share to the CAT. For an execution that occurs on an ATS, the Industry Member operating the ATS would pay an Execution Venue fee based on its market share[1779] and the national securities association also would pay an Execution Venue fee based on its market share when the ATS trade is reported to it.[1780] In the Notice, the Commission expressed concern that, under the Plan, ATS volume would effectively be charged once to the Industry Member operating the ATS and a second time to FINRA, which would result in ATS volumes contributing twice as much to CAT funding as exchange volumes. The Commission further inquired whether the funding model would disadvantage ATSs relative to registered exchanges, and whether trading volume could migrate to exchanges in response.[1781]

To address this concern, the Participants recommended modifying the proposed funding model to exclude from the charges applicable to a national securities association any market share attributable to transactions reported to it by an ATS.[1782]

The Commission finds reasonable the suggested modification to the funding model by the Participants and, accordingly, is amending Section 11.3(a)(i) of the CAT NMS Plan so that the share volume of trades in NMS Stocks or OTC Equity Securities reported by an ATS to a national securities association shall not be included in the calculation of the national securities association's market share for purposes of determining its Execution Venue fee. The Commission believes this amendment helps to mitigate concerns that this aspect of the proposed funding model, by effectively double-counting ATS transactions, would result in an inequitable allocation of fees, unfair discrimination and an unnecessary burden on competition.

With this change, the Commission believes that the funding model set forth in the CAT NMS Plan is reasonable. The Participants have offered a credible justification for using different criteria to charge Execution Venues (market share) and Industry Members (message traffic). The Participants also have offered a reasonable basis for establishing a funding model based on broad tiers, in that it may be easier to implement and less likely to have an incremental deterrent effect on liquidity provision.[1783]

In response to concerns that the funding model could make Industry Members subsidize Participant surveillance systems and functions that currently are funded through regulatory fees on Industry Members,[1784] the Commission reiterates that the Exchange Act permits the Participants to assess fees among their members to recoup their regulatory costs, as long as such fees meet the applicable Exchange Act

---

[1768] *Id.*

[1769] *Id.*

[1770] *Id.* at 12.

[1771] ''Participant complexes'' refers to Affiliated Participants, which include single entities that hold self-regulatory licenses for multiple exchanges. The Plan defines ''Affiliated Participant'' as ''any Participant controlling, controlled by, or under common control with another Participant.'' *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1.

[1772] Response Letter II at 12.

[1773] SIFMA Letter at 17–18.

[1774] Data Boiler Letter at 15.

[1775] Response Letter II at 14.

[1776] SIFMA Letter at 17.

[1777] Response Letter II at 16. As an example, the Participants stated that a firm with a large volume of quotes would likely be categorized by the proposed funding model in an upper fee tier instead of being assessed a fee for its message traffic directly as it would be under ''a more directly metered model.''

[1778] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30740.

[1779] The Commission notes that the Industry Member that operates an ATS also will be subject to message traffic fees. Section 11.3(b) of the CAT NMS Plan states: ''The Operating Committee will establish fixed fees to be payable by Industry Members, based on the message traffic generated by such Industry Member. . . . For the avoidance of doubt, the fixed fees payable by Industry Members pursuant to this paragraph shall, in addition to any other applicable message traffic, include message traffic generated by: (i) An ATS that does not execute orders that are sponsored by such Industry Member, and (ii) routing orders to and from any ATS sponsored by such Industry Member.'' *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 11.3(b).

[1780] Section 11.3(a)(i) of the CAT NMS Plan states: ''Each Execution Venue that: (A) Executes transactions; or (B) in the case of a national securities association, has trades reported by its members to its trade reporting facility or facilities for reporting transactions effected otherwise than on an exchange, in NMS Stock or OTC Equity Securities will pay a fixed fee depending on the market share of that Execution Venue in NMS Stock and OTC Equity Securities . . .'' Section 11.3(b) applies to Execution Venues transacting in Listed Options, stating: ''Each Execution Venue that executes transactions in Listed Options will pay a fixed fee depending on the Listed Options market share of that Execution Venue . . .'' *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 11.3(a)(i)–(ii).

[1781] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30740. The Commission solicited comment on two Commission-proposed alternatives pertaining to fees imposed on ATSs. In the first alternative, the Commission proposed excluding ATS volume from TRF volume. The Commission stated that this alternative would allow SROs that operate TRFs (currently only FINRA) to avoid paying Execution Venue fees for volume originating from an ATS execution and would avoid double-counting ATS volume as share volume. *See id.* at 30768. The Commission also solicited comment on not charging Industry Members for message traffic to and from their ATSs while still assessing fees to ATSs as Execution Venues or exchange Industry Members for their message traffic. The Commission explained that this alternative would mitigate incentives for Industry Members to route their orders in order to minimize costs under the proposed funding model. *Id.*

[1782] Response Letter II at 13.

[1783] Further, the Commission believes that the tiered fee structure effectively mitigates a concern expressed by a commenter that charging for message traffic would amount to a ''financial transaction tax'' that would negatively impact the financial markets. *See* Data Boiler Letter at 15.

[1784] SIFMA Letter at 17–18.

standards, including that they be reasonable and equitably allocated,[1785] and are not unfairly discriminatory.[1786] When such fee proposals are filed with the Commission, they will be published for public comment,[1787] and the Commission will have the opportunity to assess the fees.

4. Transparency and Alternatives to the Funding Model

Five commenters advocated for greater transparency into CAT funding.[1788] One commenter recommended that the CAT's costs and financing be completely transparent and that the CAT should have ''publicly disclosed annual reports, audited financial statements, and executive compensation disclosure.'' [1789] The commenter also recommended that the Participants engage an independent third party to design the funding model, determine any CAT fees to be charged by Participants,[1790] and audit their regulatory revenues and the allocation thereof. It also believed that the Commission should publish the results of the audit.[1791] Another commenter similarly recommended that the Commission require the Participants to engage an independent third party to review and make recommendations for a transparent and equitable funding model.[1792] Another commenter urged transparency in the process of calculating any fees assessed on Participants to make sure they are related to the costs to build, operate, and administer the CAT.[1793] One commenter suggested a greater role in CAT NMS Plan governance for Industry Members and institutional investors to help ensure that the costs and funding of CAT are allocated equitably among Industry Members and SROs.[1794]

Two commenters offered alternative funding models.[1795] One commenter suggested that CAT fees be set by an independent advisory committee, rather than by the Operating Committee.[1796] The other commenter recommended a centralized funding mechanism for the CAT, with the Participants collectively charging Industry Members a single CAT fee instead of each creating their own independent fees, believing it to be the most efficient and consistent way to collect CAT fees.[1797] The commenter also suggested that, before the Participants impose any CAT fees on Industry Members, they should provide a public accounting of their current revenues and how that money is spent.[1798]

Four commenters recommended imposing certain specific fees to fund the CAT.[1799] Three of the commenters suggested that the Participants and the Commission pay a user fee for the CAT, since they are direct beneficiaries of the system.[1800] Another commenter suggested that the costs of building and maintaining the CAT should be borne by CAT Reporters through a filing or technology fee,[1801] and recommended charging CAT Reporters with high cancellation rates and those that add ''noise'' to the CAT system a special usage fee.[1802]

In response, the Participants stated that they did not believe that an independent third party should be hired to evaluate CAT fees, noting that all CAT fees would be filed with the Commission pursuant to the Exchange Act, so that Industry Members and other interested persons would have an opportunity to comment, and the Commission would evaluate whether they are consistent with the statutory standards.[1803] The Participants also noted that the funding model is intended to operate the CAT on a break-even basis, without creating profits for individual Participants.[1804] In addition, the Participants stressed that they are prohibited from using regulatory fees for commercial purposes.[1805] The Participants concluded that employing an independent third party would be unnecessary in light of these provisions.[1806]

In response to the commenter that recommended a centralized funding mechanism,[1807] the Participants indicated that they intend for fees to be billed and collected centrally through the CAT LLC, so that each Industry Member will receive one invoice instead of separate invoices from each Participant.[1808] In response to the suggestion that the Participants charge a regulatory usage fee, the Participants noted that the CAT NMS Plan authorizes the imposition of such a fee, and stated that they plan to evaluate the implementation of usage fees within a year after the Participants begin using the CAT.[1809]

The Commission believes that the funding model proposed by the Participants, as amended by the Commission, is consistent with Rule 613(a)(1)(vii)(D) and is reasonable. Rule 613(a)(1)(vii)(D) requires the Participants to discuss in the CAT NMS Plan how they propose to fund the creation, implementation and maintenance of the CAT, including the proposed allocation of estimated costs among the Participants, and between the Participants and Industry Members.[1810] In the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants set forth a funding model that establishes a framework for the allocation of CAT costs across Participants and Industry Members. At this time, the Commission believes that the Exchange Act rule filing process, described above, will provide sufficient transparency into the fees charged by the Participants that are associated with CAT.[1811]

With respect to the suggested imposition of a regulatory user fee,[1812] a fee for high cancellation rates and ''noise,'' [1813] or a specific technology fee, [1814] the Commission notes that nothing in the Plan prohibits such fees from being charged and, if the Participants determine such fees to be appropriate, they may file a proposed rule change that would be subject to public comment and Commission review.[1815]

[1785] *See* 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4); 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(5).

[1786] *See* 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5); 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(6).

[1787] *See supra* note 1709.

[1788] SIFMA Letter; FSI Letter; KCG Letter; Fidelity Letter at 5; DAG Letter. One commenter generally supported additional transparency into the funding model with respect to market share and message traffic. *See* DAG Letter at 5; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's cost and funding recommendations).

[1789] SIFMA Letter at 29.

[1790] *Id.* at 14.

[1791] *Id.*

[1792] KCG Letter at 5.

[1793] FSI Letter at 6.

[1794] Fidelity Letter at 5.

[1795] Data Boiler Letter; SIFMA Letter.

[1796] Data Boiler Letter at 15.

[1797] SIFMA Letter at 18.

[1798] *Id.*

[1799] SIFMA Letter; Better Markets Letter; FSR Letter; DAG Letter; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's cost and funding recommendations).

[1800] SIFMA Letter at 18, 30 (stating that if Industry Members must pay a user fee to access their own CAT data, then there should be also be a user fee for the Participants); FSR Letter at 10; DAG Letter at 5; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's cost and funding recommendations).

[1801] Better Markets Letter at 5.

[1802] *Id.* at 6.

[1803] Response Letter II at 17.

[1804] *Id.*

[1805] *Id.* at 17 n.60.

[1806] *Id.* at 17.

[1807] SIFMA Letter at 15.

[1808] Response Letter II at 15.

[1809] *Id.*

[1810] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(a)(1)(vii)(D).

[1811] *See* 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(2); *see also* 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A); 17 CFR 242.608; *supra* note 1756.

[1812] SIFMA Letter at 18; FSR Letter at 10, DAG Letter at 5; *see also* STA Letter at 1 (supporting the DAG Letter's cost and funding recommendations).

[1813] Better Markets Letter at 6.

[1814] *Id.* at 5.

[1815] *See* Section V.F.3.b, *infra,* for additional discussion of these comments. As it relates to fees that the Operating Committee may impose for access to and use of the CAT for regulatory and

Continued

5. Miscellaneous

The Commission notes that it is amending Section 11.1(d) of the CAT NMS Plan, which currently states that the Operating Committee shall adopt policies, procedures, and practices regarding, among other matters, the assignment of fee tiers, and that, as part of its regular review of fees for the CAT, the Operating Committee shall have the right to change the tier assigned to any particular Person in accordance with Article XI, and such changes will be effective upon reasonable notice to such Person. The Commission is amending this section to provide that the Operating Committee shall have the right to change the tier assigned to any particular Person in accordance with fee schedules previously filed with the Commission by the Operating Committee that are reasonable, equitable and not unfairly discriminatory and subject to notice and comment. The Commission believes this amendment to Section 11.1(d) is appropriate because it limits the discretion of the Operating Committee to change the tier assigned to a particular Person to objective standards previously filed with the Commission that are consistent with Exchange Act standards, and provides notice of any changes to the objective standards and the opportunity for public comment.

G. Dispute Resolution

As noted above, the Plan does not include a general provision addressing the method by which disputes arising in connection with the operation of the Plan will be resolved.[1816] The Plan does, however, provide the means for resolving disputes regarding the Participation Fee in Articles III and XI of the Plan.[1817] The Commission did not receive any comments regarding these general dispute resolution provisions. However, the Commission is amending Article III to make it consistent with Article XI.

Specifically, Article III, Section 3.3(b) of the Plan states that, in the event that the Company and a prospective Participant do not agree on the amount of the Participation Fee, such amount will be subject to the review by the Commission. The Plan currently cites to Section 11A(b)(5) of the Exchange Act[1818] as the authority by which the Commission can review such disputes. However, Section 11A(b)(5) of the Exchange Act is not the appropriate authority for Commission review under these circumstances because the CAT is not a ''registered securities information processor.'' Accordingly, the Commission is making a technical amendment to the Plan (consistent with Article XI, Section 11.5) to provide that in the event that the Company and a prospective Participant do not agree on the amount of the Participation Fee, such amount will be subject to review by the Commission pursuant to SEC Rule 608[1819] or in any other appropriate forum.

H. Written Assessments, Audits and Reports

Section 6.6 of the Plan as filed, pursuant to Rule 613(b)(6), requires the Participants to provide the Commission with a written assessment of the operation of the CAT at least every two years or more frequently in connection with any review of the Plan Processor's performance.[1820] The Plan requires that such written assessment include, at a minimum: (i) An evaluation of the Plan Processor's performance; (ii) a detailed plan for any potential improvements to its performance; (iii) an estimate of the costs associated with any such potential improvements; and (iv) an estimated implementation timeline for any such potential improvements.[1821]

The Commission believes that it is important that the CAT keep pace with technological developments and changes to industry business practices, which can occur very rapidly. As such, the Commission believes that assessments more frequent than biannually of the CAT's standards and processes could ensure that the Plan Processor and the Participants remain current in their knowledge of technological and business developments and facilitate enhancements to the CAT as appropriate. The Commission believes that the preparation of reports and assessments on an annual basis, rather than a biannual basis, will help ensure that CAT technology and operations continue to provide timely, accurate, complete and accessible data, and that it is collected in a cost-effective manner. Accordingly, the Commission is amending Section 6.6 of the Plan to change the frequency of the assessment contemplated by Rule 613(b)(6) from biannual to annual.

The Commission is also amending Section 6.6 of the Plan to provide further detail regarding elements of the written assessment to be conducted by the Participants. Specifically, as amended, the Participants' annual written assessment must also include: (1) An evaluation of the information security program of the CAT to ensure that the program is consistent with the highest industry standards for protection of data; [1822] (2) an evaluation of potential technological upgrades based upon a review of technological developments over the preceding year, drawing on necessary technological expertise, whether internal or external; [1823] (3) an assessment of efforts to reduce the time to restore and recover CAT Data at a back-up site; [1824] (4) an assessment of how the Plan Processor and SROs are monitoring Error Rates and addresses the application of Error Rates based on product, data element or other criteria; [1825] (5) a copy of the evaluation required by Section 6.8(c) of the Plan as to whether industry standards have evolved such that: (i) The clock synchronization standard in Section 6.8(a) should be shortened; or (ii) the required timestamp in Section 6.8(b) should be in finer increments; and (6) an assessment of whether any data elements should be added, deleted or changed.[1826] The Commission believes that requiring these specific issues to be addressed in the Participants' annual assessment will focus the Plan Processor and Participants on critical technological and other developments, and should help ensure that CAT technology is up-to-date, resilient and secure, and provides accurate CAT Data.

Section 6.6 of the Plan as filed also requires the Participants to provide an estimate of the costs associated with any potential improvements to the performance of the CAT, including an assessment of the potential impact on competition, efficiency and capital formation. The Commission believes, however, that it is important that the Participants consider not just the costs but also the potential benefits associated with any improvements to the performance of the CAT, including the impact on investor protection. Accordingly, the Commission is also amending Section 6.6 of the Plan to

oversight purposes, the Commission interprets the provisions in the Plan relating to the collection of fees as applying only to Participants and Industry Members, and thus the Commission would not be subject to such fees.

[1816] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30635.

[1817] CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 3.3.

[1818] *See id.* at Section 3.3(b); *see also,* Exchange Act Section 11A(b)(5), 15 U.S.C. 78k–l(b)(5) (which provides that a prohibition or limitation on access to services by a registered securities information processor must be reviewed by the Commission upon application by an aggrieved person).

[1819] 17 CFR 242.608(d).

[1820] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.6.

[1821] *Id.*

[1822] *See* Section IV.D.6.a, *supra.*

[1823] *See* Section IV.D.14, *supra.*

[1824] *See* Section IV.D.12, *supra.*

[1825] *See* Section IV.D.11, *supra.*

[1826] *See* Section IV.D.13, *supra.*

require the annual assessment to consider the benefits of potential improvements to the CAT, including to investor protection.

The Commission is further amending Section 6.6 of the Plan to require that the Participants provide the Commission with certain written reports on a one-time basis. First, the Participants must provide the Commission, and make public, at least one month prior to submitting any rule filing to establish initial fees for CAT Reporters, an independent audit of the fees, costs, and expenses incurred by the Participants on behalf of the Company prior to the Effective Date of the Plan.[1827] The Commission notes that any such filing will be published for public notice and comment. As the Commission understands that the Participants intend to recover through CAT fees the amounts spent on the development of the CAT to date, to facilitate public comment and Commission review of such fee filings,[1828] the Commission believes it is appropriate for the Participants to obtain an audit of the fees, costs and expenses incurred by the Participants on behalf of the Company prior to the Effective Date.

Second, the Commission is amending the Plan to require the Participants to provide the Commission with a written assessment of the clock synchronization standards in the Plan [1829] within six months of effectiveness of the Plan. As noted above, the Commission believes that the Participants should consider the type of CAT Reporter, the type of Industry Member, and type of system when determining industry standards, and is amending the Plan to clarify this more granular approach. The Commission believes the Participants should consider the Plan's clock synchronization standards in light of this clarification promptly, and propose any appropriate amendments, and that a six-month timeframe to do so is reasonable.

Third, the Commission is amending the Plan to require the Participants to provide the Commission with a written report that discusses the Participants' assessment of implementing coordinated surveillance, whether through 17d–2 agreements, RSAs, or some other approach, within 12 months of effectiveness of the Plan.[1830] The Commission notes that the CAT is designed to facilitate the ability of regulators to conduct cross-market surveillances and to review conduct that occurs across the market. As a result, the Commission believes that it may be efficient for the Participants to coordinate to conduct cross-market surveillances.

Fourth, the Commission is amending the Plan to require the Participants to submit to the Commission a written report, within 24 months of effectiveness of the Plan, discussing the feasibility, benefits, and risks of allowing an Industry Member to bulk download the Raw Data that it has submitted to the Central Repository.[1831] Commenters expressed a desire to have bulk access to their own data for surveillance and internal compliance purposes, as well as to facilitate the error correction process. While, the Participants did not permit such access in the Plan, citing security and cost concerns, they did represent that they would consider allowing bulk access to the audit trail data reported by Industry Members once CAT is operational. The Commission believes it is important to consider the potential efficiencies of allowing Industry Members bulk access to their own CAT data, so long as such access does not impact the security of the CAT Data, and accordingly believes that requiring a report discussing this issue by the date Industry Members first begin reporting to the CAT, is appropriate.

Fifth, the Commission is amending the Plan to require the Participants to provide the Commission with a written assessment, within 36 months of effectiveness of the Plan, of the nature and extent of errors in the Customer information submitted to the Central Repository and whether the correction of certain data fields over others should be prioritized.[1832] The Commission believes that requiring such an assessment, which will coincide with the date all Industry Members are reporting to the CAT, could help ensure that the accuracy of CAT Data is achieved in the most prompt and efficient manner.

Sixth, the Commission is amending the Plan to require the Participants to provide the Commission with a written report, 36 months after effectiveness of the Plan, on the impact of tiered fees on market liquidity, including an analysis of the impact of the tiered-fee structure on Industry Members' provision of liquidity.[1833] One commenter expressed concern that use of a tiered fee structure could discourage displayed quotes and, in response, the Participants explained that one of the reasons they chose to use a tiered-fee funding model was to limit disincentives to provide liquidity. To help determine whether the Plan's funding model actually achieves the Participants' stated objective, the Commission believes it appropriate to require them to prepare such an assessment of the impact of tiered fees once the CAT becomes fully operational.

Finally, the Commission is amending the Plan to require the Participants to provide the Commission a written assessment of the projected impact of any Material Systems Change on the Maximum Error Rate, prior to the implementation of any Material Systems Change.[1834] The Commission believes that Material Systems Changes either could result in new challenges for CAT Reporters or simplify the means for reporting data. In either case, the appropriateness of the Maximum Error Rate could be impacted, and thus warrant a change. Accordingly, the Commission believes it appropriate to require the Participants to provide the Commission an assessment of the projected impact on the Maximum Error Rate, including any recommended changes thereto, prior to the implementation of any Material Systems Change.

V. Economic Analysis

A. Introduction

The Commission is sensitive to the economic effects of the CAT NMS Plan,[1835] including its costs and benefits and its impact on efficiency, competition and capital formation. In accordance with the approach articulated by the Commission in the Adopting Release, the Commission published its preliminary economic analysis of the CAT NMS Plan in the Notice, and solicited comment on its analysis and on all aspects of the proposed Plan. The Commission has considered the comments received, along with the Participants' responses, and has modified certain aspects of the Plan, as discussed above.

This Section reflects the Commission's analysis and conclusions regarding the economic effects of the creation, implementation and maintenance of the CAT pursuant to the details in the CAT NMS Plan, as amended and hereby approved by the

[1827] *See* Section III.6., *supra.*

[1828] *See supra* note 1709.

[1829] *See* Section IV.D.13, *supra.*

[1830] *See* Section IV.B.4., *supra.* This assessment can be provided in conjunction with an annual written assessment required by Rule 6.6 of the Plan.

[1831] *See* Section IV.D.6.m, *supra.* This report may be provided in conjunction with an annual written assessment required by Rule 6.6 of the Plan.

[1832] *See* Section IV.D.4.a, *supra.* This assessment may be provided in conjunction with an annual written assessment required by Rule 6.6 of the Plan.

[1833] *See* Section IV.F.3., *supra.*

[1834] *See* Section IV.D.11.b., *supra.*

[1835] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5.

Commission. The analysis is divided into seven topics: (1) A summary of the expected economic effects of approving the CAT NMS Plan; (2) a description of the economic framework for analyzing the economic effects of approving the CAT NMS Plan; (3) a discussion of the current, or ''Baseline,'' audit trail data available to regulators, and the sources of such data; (4) a discussion of the potential benefits of approving the CAT NMS Plan; (5) a discussion of the potential costs of approving the CAT NMS Plan; (6) a discussion of the CAT NMS Plan's potential impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation; and (7) a discussion of alternatives to various features of the CAT NMS Plan and to the CAT NMS Plan itself.

B. Summary of Expected Economic Effects

The Commission has analyzed the expected economic effects of the CAT NMS Plan in light of the existing shortcomings in the regulatory data infrastructure and the goal of improving the ability of SROs and the Commission to perform their regulatory activities to the benefit of investors and the markets.[1836] In general, the Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan will result in benefits by improving the quality of the data available to regulators in four areas that affect the ultimate effectiveness of core regulatory efforts—completeness, accuracy, accessibility and timeliness.[1837] The Commission believes that the improvements in these data qualities that will be realized from approval of the CAT NMS Plan will substantially improve regulators' ability to perform analysis and reconstruction of market events, market analysis and research to inform policy decisions, and other regulatory activities including market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions. Regulators depend on data for many of these activities and the improvements in the data qualities will thus improve the efficiency and effectiveness of such regulatory activities. As explained further below, these improvements could benefit investors by giving regulators more and better regulatory tools to provide investors with a more effectively regulated trading environment,[1838] which could increase capital formation, liquidity, and price efficiency. Data improvements could enhance regulators' ability to provide investors and the public with more timely and accurate analysis and reconstruction of market events, and to develop more effective responses to such events. Improved understanding of emerging market issues resulting from enhanced market analysis and research could inform regulatory policies that improve investor protection through better market quality, more transparency, and more efficient prices. Improvements in quality and quantity of order events could lead to improvements in developing and targeting policy approaches to ensure a fair and orderly market.

In terms of completeness, the Plan requires the reporting of certain additional data fields, events, and products.[1839] More importantly, the CAT NMS Plan requires data elements useful for regulatory analysis to be available from a single data source. Having relevant data elements available from a single source will simplify and expedite regulators' data collection process and facilitate more efficient analyses and surveillances that incorporate cross-market and cross-product data.

With respect to the accuracy of available data, the Commission believes that the requirements in the Plan will improve data accuracy significantly. For example, the Commission expects that the requirements to store the CAT Data in a uniform linked format and the use of consistent identifiers for customers and market participants will result in fewer inaccuracies as compared to current data sources. These accuracy improvements should significantly reduce the time regulators spend processing the data and finding solutions when faced with inaccurate data. The Commission believes that the requirements in the Plan for clock synchronization and timestamp granularity will improve the accuracy of data with respect to the timing of market events. The Commission believes that the Plan will improve regulators' ability to determine the sequence of some market events relative to all surrounding events.[1840]

The Commission also believes that the Plan will increase the accessibility of data for SROs and the Commission, because regulators will be able to access the CAT Data directly.[1841] This, coupled with the improvements in completeness, will vastly increase the scope of information readily available to regulators and significantly reduce the number of data requests from the several hundred thousand requests regulators make each year. The increased scope of readily available information should facilitate more data-driven regulatory policy decisions, broaden the potential surveillances, expand the opportunities for SRO and Commission analysis to help target broker-dealers and investment advisers for examinations and help to perform those examinations.

Finally, the Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan will improve the timeliness of available data. Because regulators will be able to access uncorrected data the day after an order event and will be able to access corrected and linked data five days after an order event,[1842] many data elements will be available to regulators more quickly than they are currently. Accordingly, the amount of time regulators would need to acquire and process data before running analyses would be reduced. For example, the corrected and linked data available on T+5 will identify the customer account

[1836] The Commission noted current SRO audit trail limitations in the Proposing Release and the Adopting Release. *See* Proposing Release, *supra* note 14, at 32563–68; Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45726–30. Rule 613 is designed to address these limitations.

[1837] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45727 (discussing four ''qualities'' of trade and order data that impact the effectiveness of core SRO and Commission regulatory efforts: Accuracy, completeness, accessibility, and timeliness); *see also* Section V.E. *infra,* for a detailed discussion of the expected benefits of the CAT NMS Plan.

[1838] *See* Section V.E.2, *infra.*

[1839] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 6.3, 6.4; *see also* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(7).

[1840] The CAT NMS Plan requires that CAT Reporters who are Industry Members synchronize their business clocks to within 50 milliseconds of the time maintained by the NIST, which will increase the precision of the timestamps provided by the 39% of broker-dealers who currently synchronize their clocks with less precision than what is called for by the Plan. *See* FIF Clock Offset Survey, *supra* note 247. Further, the Commission has amended the Plan to require exchanges to synchronize their business clocks to within 100 microseconds. While this is similar to current practice, this requirement should still provide the greater ability for regulators to sequence unrelated events in a market reconstruction by anchoring lifecycles to events at exchanges. Independent of the potential time clock synchronization benefits, the order linking data that will be captured in CAT should increase the proportion of events that could be sequenced accurately. This reflects the fact that some records pertaining to the same order could be sequenced by their placement in an order lifecycle (*e.g.,* an order submission must have occurred before its execution) without relying on timestamps. This information may also be used to partially sequence surrounding events, particularly with the Plan modifications.

[1841] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.2, Appendix D, Section 8.1; *see also* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(2).

[1842] CAT Data will be reported by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+1 and made available to regulators in raw form after it is received and passes basic formatting validations with an error correction process completed by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+5. While the Plan does not specify exactly when these validations would be complete, the requirement to link records by 12:00 p.m. ET on T+1 gives a practical upper bound on this timeline. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Sections A.2(a), A.3(a), Appendix D, Section 6.2.

associated with all order events, information that currently takes ten days or longer for regulators to obtain and then need to link to other data sources for use. These improvements in timeliness, combined with improvements in completeness, accessibility, and accuracy discussed above, will improve the efficiency of regulatory analysis and reconstruction of market events, as well as market analysis and research that informs policy decisions, and make market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions more efficient, allowing, for example, the SROs and the Commission to review tips and complaints more effectively.

The Commission notes that the Plan lacks information regarding the details of certain elements of the Plan likely to affect the costs and benefits associated with it, primarily because those details have not yet been determined, and this lack of information creates some uncertainty about the expected economic effects. As discussed further below, lack of specificity surrounding the processes for converting data formats and linking related order events creates uncertainty as to the anticipated improvements in accuracy because such processes have the potential to create new data inaccuracies. Lack of specificity surrounding the process for regulators to access the CAT Data also creates uncertainty around the expected improvements in accessibility. For example, while the Plan indicates that regulators would have an online targeted query tool and a tool for user-defined direct queries or bulk extraction,[1843] the Plan itself does not provide an indication for how user-friendly the tools would be or the particular skill set needed to use the tools for user-defined direct queries. However, the Commission has analyzed the expected economic effects of the Plan to the extent possible with the information available, noting areas of uncertainty in its analysis where applicable. The Commission has also considered whether certain provisions related to the operation and administration of the Plan could mitigate some of the uncertainties.[1844]

The Commission also believes that more effective and efficient regulation of securities markets and market participants resulting from implementation of the CAT NMS Plan could significantly benefit investors and the integrity of the market. For example, the Commission believes that more effective and efficient surveillance and enforcement should detect a higher proportion of violative market activity. This additional detection could not only reduce violative behavior through potential enforcement actions, but through deterrence if market participants believe violative activities are more likely to be detected. Because violative activity degrades market quality and imposes costs on investors and market participants, reductions in violative activity would benefit investors and market integrity. Likewise, more effective and efficient risk assessment and risk-based examinations should facilitate the selection of market participants for examination who have characteristics that elevate their risk of violating the rules. Decreasing the amount of violative activity by targeting exams in this way should provide investors with a more effectively regulated trading environment and hence better market quality. Further, access to audit trail data that is comprehensive, accurate, and timely should improve regulatory reconstruction of market events, market analysis, and research, resulting in an improved understanding of emerging market issues and regulatory policies that better encourage industry competition, thus improving investor protection through better transparency and more efficient prices.[1845] Regulatory initiatives that are based on a more thorough understanding of underlying events and their causes, and that are narrowly tailored to address any market deficiency, should improve market quality and benefit investors. Access to more complete and linked audit trail data will improve regulators' ability to analyze and reconstruct market events, allowing regulators to provide investors and the public with more accurate explanations of market events, to develop more effective responses to such events, and to use the information to assist in retrospective analyses of their rules and pilots.

The Commission has also evaluated the potential costs that will result from the approval of the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission's cost analysis is based on the preliminary analysis in the Notice, which analyzed information included in the Plan, information gathered from market participants through discussions, surveys of market participants, and other relevant information to estimate the potential costs associated with building and maintaining the Central Repository as well as the costs to report data to the Central Repository. The Commission has considered the comments received on its preliminary analysis, the Participants' response to the comments, and the impact of the Commission's modifications to the Plan and has revised its analysis and estimates accordingly.[1846] Currently, the 21 Participants spend $170.3 million annually on reporting regulatory data and performing surveillance, while the approximately 1,800 broker-dealers anticipated to have CAT reporting responsibilities spend $1.6 billion annually on regulatory data reporting, for total current industry costs of $1.7 billion annually for regulatory data reporting and surveillance by SROs. Having considered the comments, the Participants' response and the Commission's modifications to the Plan, the Commission now estimates the cost of the Plan as approximately $2.4 billion in initial aggregate implementation costs and recurring annual costs of $1.7 billion.[1847] Furthermore, the Commission acknowledges that during the period of duplicative reporting, during which CAT Reporters will report to both current regulatory data reporting systems and CAT, industry will face duplicative reporting costs that the Commission estimates at $1.7 billion per year, the cost of industry's current data reporting.

Commenters had numerous comments on individual estimates of costs, particularly as they related to requirements to report allocation timestamps in milliseconds, the costs of duplicative reporting, and generally about the uncertainty surrounding cost estimates. The primary driver of the annual costs is the data reporting cost for broker-dealers, which is estimated to be $1.5 billion per year. For both large and small broker-dealers, the primary driver of both the current $1.6 billion reporting costs and projected $1.5 billion CAT reporting costs is costs associated with staffing. Bidder estimates of the costs to build the Central Repository vary from $37.5 million to $65 million and annual operating costs range from $36.5 to $55 million. The eventual magnitude of Central Repository costs depends on the Participants' selection of the Plan Processor, and may ultimately differ from estimates discussed above if Bids are revised as the bidding process progresses. Furthermore, the Plan anticipates a period of duplicative reporting responsibilities preceding the

[1843] *Id.* at Appendix D, Sections 8.1.1, 8.1.2.

[1844] *See* Section V.E.3.d, *infra.*

[1845] *See* Section V.E.2, *infra.*

[1846] *See* Section V.F.1 and Section V.F.2, *infra* for discussion of comments received on cost estimates, and revisions the Commission made to those estimates in response.

[1847] *See* Section V.F.2, *infra.*

retirement of potentially duplicative regulatory data reporting systems; these duplicative reporting costs are likely to be significant.[1848]

Drawing from the discussion in the CAT NMS Plan, the comments received, and the Participants' response to the comments,[1849] the Commission expects that the Plan will have a number of additional economic effects, including effects on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. The Commission believes that the Plan generally promotes competition. However, the Commission recognizes that the Plan could increase barriers to entry because of the costs to comply with the Plan. Further, the Commission's analysis identifies several limiting factors to competition; however, Plan provisions and Commission oversight could mitigate such limiting factors. The Commission believes that the Plan will result in significant improvements in efficiency related to how regulatory data is collected and used. Specifically, the approval of the Plan will result in improved data becoming available to regulators, which will increase the efficiency of regulatory activities such as market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions that could enhance market efficiency by reducing violative activity that harms market efficiency. In addition, the availability of this data should improve regulatory analysis and reconstruction of market events, as well as market analysis and research that informs policy decisions. Finally, the Commission believes that the Plan could have positive effects on capital formation and allocative efficiency and that the threat of a security breach at the Central Repository is unlikely to significantly harm capital formation. The Commission recognizes that the Plan's likely effects on competition, efficiency and capital formation are dependent to some extent on the performance and decisions of the Plan Processor and the Operating Committee in implementing the Plan, and thus there is necessarily some uncertainty in the Commission's analysis. Nonetheless, the Commission believes that the Plan contains certain governance provisions, as well as provisions relating to the selection and removal of the Plan Processor, that mitigate this uncertainty by promoting decision-making that could, on balance, have positive effects on competition, efficiency, and capital formation.

As part of its economic analysis, the Commission has also considered the likely economic effects of a number of alternatives to the approaches taken in the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission has analyzed certain alternatives that could have a direct and significant impact on costs or benefits deriving from at least one of the four data qualities discussed above: Accuracy, completeness, accessibility, and timeliness. This analysis includes alternatives proposed by commenters.

C. Framework for Economic Analysis

As discussed above, the Commission has conducted an economic analysis of the CAT NMS Plan, including the modifications made by the Commission, as anticipated in the Adopting Release for Rule 613.[1850] In particular, the Commission has carefully evaluated the information in the CAT NMS Plan, including the twelve considerations required by Rule 613 [1851] and the details of the decisions left to the discretion of the SROs. The Commission has also considered information drawn from outside the Plan, but that was included in its preliminary economic analysis in the Notice and subject to public comment,[1852] in order to assess potential economic effects not addressed therein. Finally, the Commission considered comments submitted in response to its Notice. To provide context for this analysis, this Section describes the economic framework for the analysis and seeks to identify uncertainties within that framework.

The framework for the Commission's final economic analysis is largely the same as the framework set out in the economic analysis of the Notice,[1853] though the Commission has revised its discussion of uncertainty to recognize comments.[1854] This Section includes a high-level summary of those comments, which are addressed in the economic analysis to follow.

1. Economic Framework

a. Benefits

The CAT NMS Plan will create a new data source that should modernize and eventually replace the use of some disparate current data sources for many regulatory activities. As such, the economic benefits of the CAT NMS Plan will come from any expanded and more efficient regulatory activities facilitated by improvements to the data regulators use. Therefore, the framework for examining benefits in this economic analysis involves first considering whether and to what degree the CAT Data will improve on the Baseline of current trading and order data in terms of the four qualities of accuracy, completeness, accessibility, and timeliness.[1855]

Through these improvements in the data, the economic analysis then considers the degree to which the Plan will result in improvements to regulatory activities such as the analysis and reconstruction of market events, in addition to market analysis and research conducted by SROs and Commission Staff, as well as market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions. These potential improvements, based on the regulatory objectives of the CAT NMS Plan described in the Adopting Release,[1856] relate to the overall goal of substantially enhancing the ability of the SROs and the Commission to oversee securities markets and fulfill their regulatory responsibilities under the securities laws. The economic framework explores how the improvements to these regulatory activities provide economic benefits to investors and the market. Among other things, potential benefits that could result from the CAT NMS Plan include benefits rooted in changes in the behavior of market participants. For example, requirements to report certain data elements or events to the CAT could have the beneficial effect of detecting and deterring rule violations because the inclusion of certain data fields and improvements in the ability to surveil for violations could increase the perceived costs of violating rules and regulations. Potential benefits could also stem from improved investor protection, such as from more effective surveillance and more informed, data-driven rulemaking. In addition, potential benefits could stem from future reduced costs due to more targeted, data-driven policy choices.

(1) Data Qualities

In assessing the potential benefits of the CAT NMS Plan, the Commission's economic analysis compares the data that will be available under the Plan to the trading and order data currently

[1848] The economic analysis discusses duplicative reporting costs in Section V.F.2, *infra*.

[1849] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.8; *see also* Section V.G, *infra*.

[1850] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45789.

[1851] 17 CFR 242.613(a)(1).

[1852] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30651–30797.

[1853] *Id.* at 30654–30656.

[1854] *See* Data Boiler Letter at 9, 30; SIFMA Letter at 6, 13, 15–16, 23–24,32, 39, 40, 42, 44–45; FSR Letter at 9–10; Fidelity Letter at 6; TR Letter at 4; FSI Letter at 5–6; DAG Letter at 5; UnaVista Letter at 2.

[1855] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45727.

[1856] *Id.* at 45730.

available to regulators to determine whether and to what degree the Plan will improve the available data with respect to the four qualities of accuracy, completeness, accessibility, and timeliness.[1857]

(2) Regulatory Activities

Any economic benefits will derive from how such improved data will affect regulatory activities. Therefore, to analyze the potential benefits of the CAT NMS Plan, the economic analysis also evaluates the potential of the CAT NMS Plan to meet the regulatory objectives set out in the Adopting Release for Rule 613. The objectives are: Improvements in the analysis and reconstruction of broad-based market events; improvements in market analysis in support of regulatory decisions; and improvements in market surveillance, investigations, and other enforcement activities.[1858]

A. Analysis and Reconstruction of Broad-Based Market Events

The economic analysis considers whether and to what extent the CAT NMS Plan will facilitate regulators' performance of analysis and reconstruction of market events, potentially helping to better inform both regulators and investors about such market events and speeding the regulatory response following market events. Regulators perform reconstructions of market events so that they and the public can be informed by an accurate accounting of what happened (and, possibly, why it happened). As discussed in the Benefits Section,[1859] market reconstructions currently can take a significant amount of time, in large measure due to various deficiencies in the currently available trading and order data.[1860] The sooner regulators complete a reconstruction and analysis of a market event, the sooner investors can be informed and the sooner regulators can begin reviewing the event to determine what happened, who was affected and how, and whether the analysis supports potential regulatory responses.[1861] In addition, the improved ability for regulators to generate prompt and complete market reconstructions could provide improved market knowledge, which could assist regulators in conducting retrospective analysis of their rules and pilots.

B. Market Analysis in Support of Regulatory Decisions

The economic analysis considers whether and to what extent the CAT NMS Plan will enhance the ability of the SROs and the Commission to conduct market analysis and research, including analysis of market structure, and the degree to which it will improve regulators' market knowledge and facilitate consideration of policy questions of interest. The SROs and Commission Staff conduct data-driven analysis on market structure, in direct support of both rulemaking and other regulatory decisions such as SRO rule approvals. The Commission also relies on such analysis to improve understanding of market structure in ways that could inform policy. Finally, SROs conduct market analysis and research on their own regulatory initiatives. Improvements in the ability to conduct market analysis could further improve analysis related to regulatory decisions and potentially influence those regulatory decisions to the benefit of investors and the markets more generally.

C. Market Surveillance and Investigations

The economic analysis examines whether the CAT NMS Plan will improve market surveillance and investigations, potentially resulting in more effective oversight of trading, better investor protection, and deterrence of violative behavior. As described in more detail in the Baseline Section,[1862] both SROs and the Commission conduct market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions targeting illegal activities such as insider trading, wash sales, or manipulative practices. Improvements in market surveillance and investigations could come in the form of ''facilitating risk-based examinations, allowing more accurate and faster surveillance for manipulation, improving the process for evaluating tips, complaints, and referrals . . . , and promoting innovation in cross-market and principal order surveillance.'' [1863]

b. Costs

The economic analysis evaluates the costs of building and operating the Central Repository; the costs of CAT reporting for Participants, broker-dealers, and service bureaus; and other CAT-related costs. Where the CAT NMS Plan provides estimates of these costs, the economic analysis evaluates those estimates and re-estimates them when necessary. The economic analysis also discusses the drivers of these costs, and whether broker-dealers may or may not pass these costs down to their customers. As a part of its consideration of the costs of the CAT NMS Plan, the economic analysis considers costs from duplicative reporting for some period of time as well as potential cost savings from the retirement of duplicative regulatory reporting systems.[1864]

The economic analysis also considers whether the CAT NMS Plan could result in second order effects, such as changes to the behavior of market participants, that impose certain costs. For example, the CAT NMS Plan's tiered funding model could lead to efforts by market participants to try to control their tiers in order to affect their fee payments, such as reducing activity levels near the end of an activity level measuring period to avoid being classified as a higher activity level firm. In addition, Participants, their members, and investors could incur costs if their private information were accessed in the event of a security breach of the Central Repository. The economic analysis considers these and other elements of the Plan that could lead to distortions in behavior by market participants.

2. Existing Uncertainties

In the Notice, the Commission described how it analyzed the information in the CAT NMS Plan, as well as other relevant data,[1865] in order

[1857] *Id.* at 45727. Accuracy refers to whether the data about a particular order or trade is correct and reliable. Completeness refers to whether a data source represents all market activity of interest to regulators, and whether the data is sufficiently detailed to provide the information regulators require. While current data sources provide the trade and order data required by existing rules and regulations, those sources generally do not provide all of the information of interest to regulators in one consolidated audit trail. Accessibility refers to how the data is stored, how practical it is to assemble, aggregate, and process the data, and whether all appropriate regulators could acquire the data they need. Timeliness refers to when the data is available to regulators and how long it would take to process before it could be used for regulatory analysis. As explained in the Baseline, Section V.D.2, *infra,* the trading and order data currently available to regulators suffers from deficiencies in all four dimensions.

[1858] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45730.

[1859] *See* Section V.E.2.a, *infra.*

[1860] *See* Section V.D.2.b, *infra.*

[1861] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45732.

[1862] *See* Section V.D.1.c.(1) and Section V.D.1.c.(3), *infra.*

[1863] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45730.

[1864] Rule 613 requires the Plan to discuss ''[a] plan to eliminate existing rules and systems (or components thereof) that would be rendered duplicative by the consolidated audit trail.'' 17 CFR 242.613(a)(1)(ix); *see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C Section C.9.

[1865] In addition to the CAT NMS Plan, the economic analysis in the Notice analyzed, for example, the Exemptive Relief Letter (*see supra* note 21), a survey of clock synchronization

Continued

to assess the economic effects of the Plan. As discussed throughout the analysis in the Notice, in certain cases the Commission lacked information needed to evaluate all of the potential economic effects of the CAT NMS Plan, creating uncertainty in some potential benefits and costs. The primary drivers of uncertainty included the fee schedule applicable to funding the Central Repository (the ''Funding Model''), which has not yet been finalized, the deferral of decisions on certain discretionary elements including the Technical Specifications applicable to the CAT, and a lack of detailed information that would enable the Commission to assess certain economic effects with greater precision.[1866] The Notice discussed implications of each primary area of uncertainty.[1867]

First, the economic analysis in the Notice evaluated information provided in the CAT NMS Plan on the economic effects of the Plan, as well as information drawn from outside of the Plan. However, the Commission lacked detailed information regarding some of the individual costs and discretionary decisions in the Plan, including the Funding Model. Specifically, the Plan does not outline the proportion of CAT costs that will be allocated to Participants versus broker-dealers. This uncertainty limited the Commission's ability to evaluate the economic effects of the Plan in some cases. However, the Commission analyzed the expected economic effects of the Plan to the extent possible with the information available, and where the Commission identified such areas of uncertainty, the economic analysis addressed this uncertainty.

Second, the Commission pointed out that certain elements of the CAT NMS Plan will not be finalized until after the selection of a ''Plan Processor.'' [1868] Among these are the security and confidentiality procedures of the Central Repository,[1869] the precise methods by which regulators will access data in the Central Repository,[1870] and the complete Technical Specifications.[1871] The Plan also provides the Plan Processor the ''sole discretion'' to publish interpretations of the Technical Specifications, including interpretations of permitted values in data elements.[1872]

Because these and other elements of the Plan had not yet been finalized, the Commission could not assess how and to what extent the elements could affect the overall economic effects of the Plan. The Commission's economic analysis was therefore limited to the extent that the economic effects of the Plan depend on decisions that will be made after approval of the Plan. However, the Commission identified these areas of uncertainty and assessed the economic effects of the Plan to the best of its ability in light of these existing uncertainties.

Given the range of possible outcomes with respect to both the costs and benefits of the CAT NMS Plan that depend on future decisions, the Commission also recognized in the Notice the importance of provisions of the Plan related to the operation and administration of the CAT. In particular, the Commission stated that governance provisions of the Plan related to voting by the Operating Committee and the involvement of the Advisory Committee may help promote better decision-making by the relevant parties. Such provisions could mitigate concerns about potential uncertainty in the economic effects of the Plan by giving the Commission greater confidence that its expected benefits would be achieved in an efficient manner and that costs resulting from inefficiencies will be avoided. Nevertheless, commenters rightly observed that uncertainties remain, and will continue to remain until selection of the Plan Processor, the publication of Technical Specifications, and/or the implementation of CAT reporting.[1873]

The Commission has considered the comments it received relevant to the potential uncertainties in its analysis of the economic effects of the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants' response, and the effect of Plan modifications on such uncertainties and has revised its economic analysis accordingly. Throughout this economic analysis, the Commission recognizes these uncertainties, including the ones raised by commenters. In particular, the economic analysis described below recognizes uncertainties as they relate to the baseline, benefits, and costs and as they relate to the analysis of alternatives, efficiency, competition, and capital formation. In some cases, the Plan modifications and the Participants' response letters reduce the uncertainty in the Commission's analysis. However, the Commission continues to believe that governance provisions of the Plan could mitigate concerns about many of the sources of potential uncertainty in the economic effects of the Plan.[1874]

D. Baseline

To assess the overall economic impact of the CAT NMS Plan, the economic analysis in the Notice used as the Baseline the current state of regulatory activity and the current state of trade and order data.[1875] The Baseline discussed the currently available sources of data, limitations in available data that could impact regulatory activity, how regulators currently use the available data, and the burden that producing that data imposes on SROs and broker-dealers. As discussed in more detail below, the Commission has revised certain aspects of its Baseline to incorporate new information from commenters, but the Baseline remains

practices and costs (*see supra* note 247), discussions with members of the industry and service bureaus (*see* Section V.F.1.c and Section V.F.1.d, *infra*), data from FINRA (*see* Section V.F.1.c.(2).B., *infra),* and academic literature. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30655–56.

[1866] As discussed below, the Commission notes that many of the uncertainties that existed at the time of the Notice will continue upon approval of the Plan. For example, the Funding Model and Technical Specifications will be determined after a Plan Processor is selected.

[1867] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30655–56.

[1868] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Article VI. The Plan Participants have engaged in a bidding process to select a Plan Processor, and the leading candidate bidders have proposed different solutions. In certain instances, the Plan Participants have decided to adopt the solutions proposed by whichever bidder they select.

[1869] *See* Section V.F.4.b, *infra,* for additional discussion of risks and uncertainties related to data security.

[1870] Rule 613(e)(1) requires the CAT NMS Plan to create a Central Repository to collect, link, and store CAT Data and to make that data available to regulators. *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(1).

[1871] The CAT NMS Plan contains minimum standards and principles for setting many of Technical Specifications, *see* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.9, and the Commission's economic analysis reflects those minimum standards and principles. However, because the detailed Technical Specifications are not yet finalized by the Participants, the Commission cannot fully assess any corresponding costs and benefits.

[1872] *Id.* at Section 6.9.

[1873] Many commenters identified uncertainties related to the economic effects of the Plan that were consistent with those mentioned in the Notice. *See* SIFMA Letter at 6, 13, 15–16, 23, 32, 39, 40, 42, 44, 45; FIF Letter at 36, 50, 84–85, 86–90; FSI Letter at 5–6; FSR Letter at 9–10; DAG Letter at 5; UnaVista Letter at 2; TR Letter at 4; Fidelity Letter at 6; Data Boiler Letter at 9, 26, 30. Commenters also discussed several implications of the uncertainty in the Plan that were consistent with the Commission's statement in the Notice that it cannot assess how and to what extent these elements of the Plan could affect the overall economic effects of the Plan. *See* FSR Letter at 9; FSI Letter at 5–6; TR at 4. Others highlighted implications for the Commission to consider. *See, e.g.,* Fidelity Letter at 6; SIFMA Letter at 23–24, 44.

[1874] For a full discussion of the governance provisions and how they may mitigate concerns about many of the sources of potential uncertainty in the economic effects of the Plan, *see* Section V.E.3.d, *infra.*

[1875] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30656–59.

largely the same as that described in the Notice.

1. Current State of Regulatory Activities

As addressed in detail in the Notice, SROs and the Commission use data to analyze and reconstruct market events, conduct market analysis and research in support of regulatory decision-making, and conduct market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions.[1876] The trend in this area is to use more automated and data-intensive methods as regulators' activities adjust to the data and technology available. The Notice described these regulatory activities and how regulators currently use data. While the Commission did not receive any comments on its description of the current state of regulatory activities, the Participants did confirm the use of real-time surveillance and monitoring tools by SROs. The Commission continues to believe that the current state of regulatory activity, as described in detail in the Notice and as summarized below, reflects the Baseline for the CAT NMS Plan.

a. Analysis and Reconstruction of Market Events

In the Notice, the Commission discussed how regulators currently analyze and reconstruct market events.[1877] In terms of market reconstructions, currently, regulators aim to provide an accurate and factual accounting of what transpired during a market event of interest by conducting a thorough analysis of the available market data.[1878] Market events often encompass activity in many securities across multiple trading venues, and analysis and reconstruction of these market events requires linking data from multiple sources.[1879] Examples of recent market reconstructions include the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (''CFTC'') and SEC's analysis of the May 6, 2010 ''Flash Crash,'' [1880] analysis of equity market volatility on August 24, 2015,[1881] and the multi-agency report on the U.S. Treasuries market on October 15, 2014.[1882]

b. Market Analysis and Research

In the Notice, the Commission discussed how regulators currently perform market analysis and research.[1883] In terms of market analysis and research, as addressed in detail in the Notice, the Commission and SRO Staffs currently conduct data-driven analysis on market structure, in direct support of both rulemaking and other regulatory decisions such as SRO rule approvals as well as retrospective analyses of rules and pilots.[1884] The Commission relies on data analysis to inform its market structure policy, and SROs also conduct market analysis and research on their own regulatory initiatives. Examples of data-driven market analysis include reports on OTC trading,[1885] small capitalization stock trading,[1886] the Limit Up-Limit Down Pilot,[1887] short selling,[1888] and high frequency trading.[1889]

c. Market Surveillance and Investigations

As explained in detail in the Notice, regulators perform market surveillance and investigation functions that rely on access to multiple types of market data.[1890] The following Sections summarize the discussion from the Notice describing the current state of SRO surveillance and SRO and Commission examinations and enforcement investigations.

(1) Current SRO Surveillance

Rule 613(f) requires the SROs to develop and implement a surveillance system, or enhance existing surveillance systems, reasonably designed to make use of the CAT Data.[1891] For the purposes of the economic analysis in the Notice, the Commission considered surveillance to involve SROs running automated processes on routinely collected or in-house data to identify potential violations of rules or regulations.[1892] For instance, SROs use surveillance systems, developed internally or by a third party, to detect violations of trading rules, market abuse, or unusual behavior, in real time, within one day, or within a few weeks of the activity in question. As discussed in the Notice, SRO surveillance can help

[1876] *Id.*

[1877] *Id.* at 30656–57.

[1878] *Id.*

[1879] *Id.* Examples of recent market reconstructions include the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (''CFTC'') and SEC's analysis of the May 6, 2010 ''Flash Crash,'' analysis of equity market volatility on August 24, 2015, and the multi-agency report on the U.S. Treasuries market on October 15, 2014.

[1880] *See* Findings Regarding the Market Events of May 6, 2010: Report of the Staffs of the CFTC and SEC to the Joint Advisory Committee on Emerging Regulatory Issues (September 30, 2010) (''Flash Crash Analysis''), *available at http://www.sec.gov/news/studies/2010/marketevents-report.pdf.*

[1881] *See* Staff of the Office of Analytics and Research, Division of Trading and Markets, Research Note: Equity Market Volatility on August 24, 2015 (Dec. 2015), *available at http://www.sec.gov/marketstructure/research/equity_market_volatility.pdf; see also* Austin Gerig and Keegan Murphy, The Determinants of ETF Trading Pauses on August 24th, 2015, White Paper (February 2016), *available at http://www.sec.gov/marketstructure/research/determinants_eft_trading_pauses.pdf.*

[1882] *See* U.S. Department of the Treasury, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, and U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Joint Staff Report: The U.S. Treasury Market on October 15, 2014 (July 13, 2015), *available at http://www.sec.gov/reportspubs/special-studies/treasury-market-volatility-10-14-2014-joint-report.pdf.*

[1883] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30657.

[1884] *Id.*

[1885] *See* Laura Tuttle, Alternative Trading Systems: Description of ATS Trading in National Market System Stocks (October 2013) *available at http://www.sec.gov/divisions/riskfin/whitepapers/alternative-trading-systems-10-2013.pdf;* Laura Tuttle, OTC Trading: Description of Non-ATS OTC Trading in National Market System Stocks (March 2014), *available at http://www.sec.gov/dera/staff-papers/white-papers/otc-trading-white-paper-03-2014.pdf.*

[1886] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 74892, Order Approving the National Market System Plan to Implement a Tick Size Pilot Program (May 6, 2015), 80 FR 27514, 27534, 27541 (May 13, 2015); *see also* Charles Collver, A Characterization of Market Quality for Small Capitalization US Equities (September 2014), *available at http://www.sec.gov/marketstructure/research/small_cap_liquidity.pdf.*

[1887] *See* SRO Supplemental Joint Assessment, available at *http://www.sec.gov/comments/4-631/4-631.shtml;* Memo to File from the Division of Economic and Risk Analysis regarding the Cornerstone Analysis of the Impact of Straddle States on Options Market Quality (February 8, 2016), *available at http://www.sec.gov/comments/4-631/4631-42.pdf; see also* Gerig and Murphy, *supra* note 1881.

[1888] *See* Memo to Chairman Christopher Cox from Daniel Aromi and Cecilia Caglio regarding an Analysis of Short Selling Activity during the First Weeks of September 2008, (December 16, 2008), *available at http://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-08-09/s70809-369.pdf;* Memo to Chairman Christopher Cox from Daniel Aromi and Cecilia Caglio regarding an Analysis of a Short Sale Price Test Using Intraday Quote and Trade Data (December 17, 2008), *available at http://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-08-09/s70809-368.pdf;* Memo from the Office of Economic Analysis regarding an Analysis of the July Emergency Order Requiring a Pre-borrow on Short Sales (January 14, 2009) *available at http://www.sec.gov/spotlight/shortsales/oeamemo011409.pdf.*

[1889] *See* Austin Gerig, High-Frequency Trading Synchronizes Prices in Financial Markets, (January 2015), *available at http://www.sec.gov/dera/staff-papers/working-papers/dera-wp-hft-synchronizes.pdf; see also* Staff of the Office of Analytics and Research, Division of Trading and Markets, Research Note: Equity Market Volatility on August 24, 2015 (December 2015), *available at http://www.sec.gov/marketstructure/research/equity_market_volatility.pdf.*

[1890] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30657–59.

[1891] 17 CFR 242.613(f).

[1892] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30657–58.

protect investors by detecting fraudulent behavior and anomalous trading.

Currently, exchange-operating SROs use surveillance systems and are responsible for surveillance of their own market. As discussed in the Notice, FINRA conducts off-exchange and cross-market surveillance [1893] and oversees and regulates OTC trading of exchange-listed and non-exchange-listed securities, as well as trading in corporate and municipal debt instruments and other fixed income instruments. FINRA also provides surveillance services to U.S. equity and options exchanges through regulatory services agreements with nearly every equity market and all options exchanges. Additional surveillance is conducted by exchange-operating SROs and some of this additional surveillance is conducted as trading activity occurs. This surveillance can include detection of market manipulation, violations of trading rules, and other unusual behavior.

While there were no explicit comments pertaining to the current practices regarding SRO surveillance, the Participants' responses confirm that they have real-time surveillance and monitoring tools in place for their respective markets.[1894]

(2) Examinations

In the Notice, the Commission discussed how regulators currently perform examinations.[1895] As addressed in detail in the Notice, SROs currently conduct exams of broker-dealers for violations of trading-related federal laws, rules, and regulations and for violations of SRO rules and regulations.[1896] In 2015, FINRA's Member Regulation Department conducted approximately 2,400 broker-dealer examinations.[1897] Currently, the Commission conducts exams of broker-dealers, transfer agents, investment advisers, investment companies, municipal advisers, clearing agencies, the national securities exchanges, other SROs such as FINRA and the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, and the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (''PCAOB'').[1898] For example, the Commission conducted 493 broker-dealer examinations in 2014 and 484 in 2015, and 70 exams of the national securities exchanges and FINRA in 2014 and 21 in 2015. In addition, the Commission conducted 1,237 investment adviser and investment company examinations in 2014 and 1,358 in 2015. Virtually all investment adviser examinations and a significant proportion of the Commission's other examinations involve analysis of trading and order data. Examinations of broker-dealers and investment advisers involve intensive analysis of trading data. Examinations seek to determine whether the entity being examined is: Conducting its activities in accordance with the federal securities laws, rules adopted under these laws, and SRO rules; adhering to the disclosures it has made to its clients, customers, the general public, SROs and/or the Commission; and implementing supervisory systems and/or compliance policies and procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure that the entity's operations are in compliance with the applicable legal requirements.[1899] In order to select candidates for examination, the Commission and certain SROs, including FINRA,[1900] use a risk-based approach. ''Risk-based examinations'' seek to increase regulatory efficiency by using preliminary data analysis to direct examination resources towards entities and activities where risks of violative or illegal activity are the highest. The Commission uses risk and data analysis before opening an exam to identify broker-dealers and investment advisers for areas of focus such as suspicious trading, as well as during an exam to identify the particular activities of a broker-dealer or investment adviser that could trigger certain compliance and supervisory risks.

(3) Enforcement Investigations

In the Notice, the Commission discussed how regulators currently approach enforcement investigations.[1901] As explained in detail in the Notice, the Commission and SROs undertake numerous investigations to enforce the securities laws and related rules and regulations, including investigations of market manipulation, insider trading, and issuer repurchase violations.[1902] The Commission estimates that 30–50% of enforcement investigations use trade and order data. In 2015, the Commission filed 807 enforcement actions, including 39 related to insider trading, 43 related to market manipulation, 124 related to broker-dealers, 126 related to investment advisers/investment companies, and one related to exchange or SRO duties. In 2014, the Commission filed 755 enforcement actions, including 52 related to insider trading, 63 related to market manipulation, 166 related to broker-dealers, and 130 related to investment advisers/investment companies, many of which involved trade and order data.

The Commission initiates enforcement investigations when SROs or others submit reliable tips, complaints, or referrals, or when the Commission becomes aware of anomalies indicative of manipulation. After the detection of potential anomalies, a tremendous amount of time and resources are expended in gathering and interpreting trade and order data to construct an accurate picture of when trades were actually executed, what market conditions were in effect at the time of the trade, which traders participated in the trade, and which beneficial owners were affected by the trade. The Commission also explained in the Notice that SROs rely primarily on surveillance to initiate investigations based on anomalies in the trading of securities. FINRA brought 1,397 disciplinary actions in 2014 and 1,512 in 2015.

(4) Tips and Complaints

In the Notice, the Commission discussed how regulators currently analyze and investigate tips and complaints.[1903] Market participants or those with experience in analyzing market data sometimes notice atypical trading or quoting patterns in publicly available market data, and these observations sometimes result in a tip or complaint to a regulator. As the Commission discussed in the Notice, regulators investigate thousands of tips and complaints each year.[1904] In fiscal

[1893] FINRA conducts cross-market surveillance for approximately 99% of the listed equity market and approximately 70% of the listed options market. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30657.

[1894] Response Letter I at 31.

[1895] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30658.

[1896] *Id.*

[1897] *Id.* This estimate was based on Staff discussions with FINRA. *See also* FINRA Overview of Member Regulation, *available at http://www.finra.org/industry/member-regulation.*

[1898] *Id.*

[1899] *See* SEC, Examination Information for Entities Subject to Examination or Inspection by the Commission (June, 2014), *available at http://www.sec.gov/about/offices/ocie/ocie_exambrochure.pdf.*

[1900] FINRA conducts regulatory examinations by contract on behalf of all the options and equities exchanges, except for the Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc. (''CHX'') and the National Stock Exchange, Inc. (''NSX''). Accordingly most exchanges also employ a risk-based approach to examination selection and scope. CHX examines members on a cycle basis. NSX recently resumed operations in December 2015. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 76640 (December 14, 2015), 80 FR 79122 (December 18, 2015).

[1901] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30658.

[1902] *Id.* Examples of investigations of market manipulations include marking the close, order layering and spoofing, wash sales, and trading ahead. Layering and spoofing are manipulations where orders are placed close to the best buy or sell price with no intention to trade in an effort to falsely overstate the liquidity in a security.

[1903] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30659.

[1904] *Id.*

years 2014 and 2015, the Commission received around 15,000 entries in its Tips, Complaints and Referrals (''TCR'') system, approximately one third of which related to manipulation, insider trading, market events, or other trading and pricing issues. Analysis of tips and complaints generally follow three stages. First, regulators ensure that the tip or complaint contains sufficient information to facilitate analysis. Second, regulators use directly accessible data or make phone calls and other informal queries to determine if the tip or complaint is credible. Third, for tips and complaints that seem credible, regulators then perform a more in-depth investigation or examination, which follows the processes described above for examinations and enforcement investigations.

2. Current State of Trade and Order Data

To assess how and to what degree the CAT NMS Plan would affect the trade and order data available to regulators, the economic analysis in the Notice considered what data regulators use currently and the limitations in that data. The Commission did not receive any comments on its description of the current sources of trade and order data. The Commission received some comments on its description of the current limitations on trade and order data, which are discussed below. However, the Commission continues to believe that the current state of trade and order data, as described in detail in the Notice and as summarized below, reflects the relevant baseline for its economic analysis of the CAT NMS Plan.

a. Current Sources of Trade and Order Data

In the Notice, the Commission stated that SROs and the Commission currently use a range of trading and order data sources [1905] for their regulatory activities. The types of data and ease of use of these sources of data can vary widely. The Notice reviewed the primary sources of data currently available to regulators, describing the content of the data provided and examples of their specialized uses.

(1) SRO Data

As discussed in detail in the Notice, SROs maintain audit trails that contain trade and order data that they obtain from their members. Currently, regulators have access to at least three sources of audit trail data. First, the National Association of Securities Dealers (''NASD'') established its OATS in 1998, which required NASD (n/k/a FINRA) members to report certain trade and order data regarding NASDAQ-listed equity securities. OATS was later expanded to include OTC Equity Securities and all NMS stocks. Second, beginning in 2000, several of the current options exchanges implemented the Consolidated Options Audit Trail System (''COATS''). Finally, each equities and options exchange keeps an audit trail of orders and trades that occur on its market.[1906]

The Commission explained that for each of these stages in the life of an order, FINRA Rule 7440 requires the recording and reporting of the following information, as applicable, including but not limited to: For the receipt or origination of the order, the date and time the order was first originated or received by the reporting member, a unique order identifier, the market participant symbol of the receiving reporting member, and the material terms of the order; for the internal or external routing of an order, the unique order identifier, the market participant symbol of the member to which the order was transmitted, the identification and nature of the department to which the order was transmitted if transmitted internally, the date and time the order was received by the market participant or department to which the order was transmitted, the material terms of the order as transmitted, the date and time the order was transmitted, and the market participant symbol of the member who transmitted the order; for the modification or cancellation of an order, a new unique order identifier, original unique order identifier, the date and time a modification or cancellation was originated or received, and the date and time the order was first received or originated; and for the execution of an order, in whole or in part, the unique order identifier, the designation of the order as fully or partially executed, the number of shares to which a partial execution applies and the number of unexecuted shares remaining, the date and time of execution, the execution price, the capacity in which the member executed the transaction, the identification of the market where the trade was reported, and the date and time the order was originally received. FINRA Rule 7440 also requires reporting of the account type, the identification of the department or terminal where an order is received from a customer, the identification of the department or terminal where an order is originated by a reporting member, and the identification of a reporting agent if the agent has agreed to take on the responsibilities of a reporting member under Rule 7450.[1907]

The Commission also explained that a majority of options exchanges require their members to provide the following information with respect to orders entered onto their exchange: (1) The material terms of the order; (2) order receipt time; (3) account type; (4) the time a modification is received; (5) the time a cancellation is received; (6) execution time; and (7) the clearing member identifier of the parties to the transaction.[1908]

As discussed in the Notice, SRO audit trail data is used for market reconstructions and market analyses, and to inform policy decisions, both by the Commission and by SROs. Regulators also use SRO audit trail data extensively for surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions. Current SRO market surveillance relies primarily on data from the SRO audit trails, generated directly from the exchange servers and from OATS. Likewise, SRO examinations and investigations pull information from their own audit trails before seeking data from others. Commission examinations and investigations also rely heavily on SRO audit trails to start the process of tracing a particular trade from its execution to the order initiation and customer information, and the audit trails can be useful for manipulation investigations or other regulatory activities that require analyses of microcap securities trading activity.[1909]

(2) Equity and Option Cleared Reports

The SROs and the Commission also have access to equity and option cleared reports. In the Notice, the Commission noted that clearing broker-dealers report their equity and option cleared data on a daily basis and the NSCC and the OCC aggregate the data across the market and generate the reports.[1910] Equity and

[1905] *Id.* at 30659–62.

[1906] *Id.* at 30659.

[1907] *Id.* at 30659–60. The Notice provided further details on the reporting requirements of FINRA Rule 7440. *Id.* at 30659–60 nn.354–57.

[1908] *Id.* at 30660. The Notice provided further details on the reporting requirements of options exchanges. *Id.* at 30660 nn.358–59. The Notice also outlined the reporting requirements of other SRO audit trails. *Id.* at 30660 n.364.

[1909] *Id.* at 30660.

[1910] Equity and option cleared reports show ''the number of trades and daily cleared trade and share volume, by clearing member, for each equity and listed option security in which transactions took place. Regulators can query these reports directly through an internal online system that interfaces with the Depository Trust and Clearing Corporation (''DTCC'') data by security name and CUSIP number.'' A CUSIP number is a ''unique alphanumeric identifier assigned to a security and

Continued

option cleared reports provide a way for regulators to directly access a dataset to see how much trading volume is accounted for by a particular clearing broker. As such, these data are often used at the beginning of an examination or investigation to start identifying the market participants that may have additional data needed to pinpoint a particular activity.

(3) Electronic Blue Sheets

As the Commission discussed in the Notice, broker-dealers also provide detailed data to regulators in the form of Electronic Blue Sheets (''EBS''). The EBS data, provided pursuant to Rule 17a–25 under the Act, facilitate investigations by the SROs and Commission Staff, particularly in the areas of insider trading and market manipulations. The EBS system provides certain detailed execution information in its electronic format upon request by SRO or Commission Staff. This information often includes the employer of the beneficial owner of an account, which can be important to insider trading investigations, and in some cases, a tax identification number.[1911]

The EBS system also provides additional information on market participants who meet the definition of ''large traders'' and have self-identified to the Commission as required by Rule 13h–1. Large trader data provide the Commission with a way to acquire information about the activities of large traders and allow the activities of large traders to be more readily aggregated across or partitioned by multiple broker-dealers.[1912]

(4) Trade Blotters and Order Tickets

As the Commission addressed in detail in the Notice, investment advisers and broker-dealers also maintain data in the form of order tickets and trade blotters that regulators can obtain on request. Order tickets are in-house records maintained by investment advisers and broker-dealers that provide order details, including timestamps of order initiation and placement, special order types, any special instructions for the order, and plans for the allocation of shares and prices across accounts and subaccounts. Order tickets also identify account owners. Commission Staff collects order tickets regularly for examinations, and occasionally also for market manipulation investigations.[1913]

The Commission discussed the fact that broker-dealers maintain data in trade blotters that are similar to EBS. However, the trade blotters also contain more information, including the commissions paid in executing each order, timestamps of when an order is received and when it is executed (and the number of fills), and the pricing information for all executions in the order. SROs use trade blotters in examinations of their members. Commission Staff uses trade blotters frequently for examinations, including in almost every broker-dealer, investment adviser, and hedge fund examination, as well as for insider trading and market manipulation investigations. Regulators use trade blotter data to determine the order entry time and execution time for trades by a particular customer in examinations and enforcement investigations. Trade blotters are also the primary data source used in regulatory investigations for which subaccount allocation information is important for determining violative behavior, such as cherry-picking and front-running cases.[1914]

As the Commission discussed in the Notice, broker-dealers and exchanges collect and maintain records of activity in their order handling systems and internal matching systems.[1915] Some of the data that is collected and maintained in these systems exceeds the scope of information captured in EBS, SRO audit trail, trade blotter, or order ticket data and may include data on order receipt, modification or routing information not otherwise reported to SROs. Regulators use these trading and order handling system data in investigations and examinations to further analyze issues discovered during their analysis of data from other sources.[1916]

(5) Public Data

As discussed in detail in the Notice, exchanges and SROs make some data available to the public and regulators can access these data for their regulatory activities. One type of public data is ''consolidated'' data feeds that are disseminated by registered Securities Information Processors (''SIPs'') pursuant to joint SRO plans. For a fee, the SIPs distribute consolidated market data on recent equity and option transactions and the prevailing best quotes at each exchange to market data subscribers. Additionally, all exchanges also make data available through direct data feeds. These feeds contain all data included in the SIP feed, but also include depth of book information and, depending on the exchange, may include additional data, such as the submission, cancellation and execution of all displayed orders and auction imbalance information on the exchange, among other things. Furthermore, at the request of Commission Staff, most equities exchanges also produce and make public two datasets with information on short sales: A file of short selling volume by stock, which contains the short selling and total volume on that exchange by symbol, and a file of short selling transactions, which contains trade information such as time, volume, and price for each transaction involving a short sale.[1917]

The Commission and SROs use these publicly available trade and order data to conduct market analyses, market reconstructions, examinations, and investigations. Due to the accessibility and ease of use of the public data, regulators often use it as a starting point or a basis of comparison to other data sources. For example, real-time surveillance can rely on SIP data, and some insider trading surveillance relies on information from other publicly available sources such as news sources. Further, investigations into short sale market manipulation sometimes start with an analysis of the short selling data.[1918]

b. Current Limitations of Trade and Order Data

As the Commission addressed in detail in the Notice, while regulators have access to trade and order data from the sources described above,[1919] the available data are, for various reasons, limited in terms of the four qualities discussed above.[1920] In terms of completeness, current sources do not represent all of the market activity of interest in sufficient detail in one consolidated audit trail. In terms of accuracy, current sources may reflect data errors, insufficiently granular clock

facilitates the clearance and settlement of trades in the security.'' *Id.*

[1911] *Id.* at 30661. The Notice provided further details on Rule 17a–25 and its reporting requirements. *Id.* at 30661, notes 368–369.

[1912] *Id.* The Notice provided the definition of a ''large trader'' and further details on the reporting requirements of Rule 13h–1. *Id.*

[1913] *Id.*

[1914] *Id.*

[1915] ''Internal matching systems of broker-dealers may include Alternative Trading Systems (''ATSs'') or automated trading systems that provide liquidity to received orders without interacting on a registered exchange. The Commission understands that some broker-dealers rely on their clearing firms to collect and maintain records relating to routed orders on their behalf. Broker-dealers that operate their own internal matching systems are more likely to collect and maintain their own records.'' *Id.* at 30662.

[1916] *Id.*

[1917] *Id.*

[1918] *Id.*

[1919] *See* Section V.D.2(a), *supra.*

[1920] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30662–74.

synchronization and timestamps, errors introduced in the process of combining data from different sources, a lack of consistent customer and broker-dealer identifiers, and data that is too aggregated at the record level to provide the information regulators need. In terms of accessibility, the SROs and Commission lack direct access to most of the data sources described above, and with respect to timeliness, obtaining trade and order data from current sources and converting the data into a form in which they can be analyzed can involve a significant delay from the time of a particular event of interest. Due to these limitations on current data sources, as the Commission addressed in detail in the Notice, regulators are limited in their ability to perform the activities outlined in Section V.D.1, above. Table 1 summarizes the key characteristics of the currently available data sources, the limitations of which are discussed in more detail below.

TABLE 1

	Customer identifier	Broker-dealer identifier	TimeStamp [1921]	Allocation information	Order display information	Buy-to-cover indicator	Special handling instructions	Routing/ modification/ cancellation information	Entire lifecycle	Direct access for regulators	Off-exchange activity [1922]	Timeliness of data compiling [1923]
OATS	No	Yes	Yes (majority in milliseconds but some in seconds).	No	Yes (for limit orders).	No	Yes (conditional).	Yes	Yes (before order reaches exchange). No (once order reaches exchange).	No (except FINRA). Access can take several weeks.	Yes	Raw Data: T+1. Corrected Data: T+6.
COATS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No (except SROs w/r/t their own members).	No	Reported same-day, but separate file transmitted at latest T+1.
SRO Audit Trails.	No	Yes	Yes (majority in milliseconds but some in seconds).	No	No	No	No	Yes	No (only once order reaches exchange).	No (except SROs w/r/t their own trails). Access can take several weeks.	No	As soon as a trade is executed.
Equity and Option Cleared Reports.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Equity: T+3. Option: T+1.
Electronic Blue Sheets.	Yes (but not always consistent across broker-dealers) [1924].	Yes (but not always consistent across broker-dealers).	Yes	No	No	No	No	No (except for certain cancellation information).	No	No. Access can take several weeks or months.	Yes	10 business days after request is submitted.
Trade Blotters/ Order Tickets.	Yes (but not always consistent across broker-dealers).	Yes (but not always consistent across broker-dealers).	Yes (can be requested, although not always reliable).	No	No	No	No	No	No	No. Access can take several days.	Yes	Same-day.
Trading and Order Handling System Data.	Depends on the trader.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes (except allocations).	No. Regulators must request this data (SEC asks for the data within 10 days).	Yes	Same-day.
Public/Proprietary Data.	No	No	Yes (varied between seconds and microseconds).	No	No	No	No	Yes (except non-displayed orders).	No	Yes	Yes	Same-day.

(1) Completeness

''Completeness'' refers to whether the data represents all market activity of interest or just a subset, and whether the data is sufficiently detailed to provide the required information.[1925] As addressed in detail in the Notice, while current data sources provide trade and order data specified by existing rules and regulations, those sources do not contain all market activity that might be required for certain market inquiries, in sufficient detail, within one consolidated audit trail. The Commission explained in the Notice that, to obtain information regarding a particular market event, regulators may have to piece together information from different data sources and that some data is not required to be reported at all under existing regulations. Therefore, as described below, current data sources either cover only a limited number of events and products, or lack some data fields that would be useful to regulators, each of which impedes effective market surveillance.[1926]

One commenter agreed with the Commission's analysis by stating that ''[t]he fragmented nature of current data sources does pose significant challenges to regulators seeking complete data.'' [1927]

A. Events and Products

As the Commission addressed in detail in the Notice, there is currently no single data source that covers all market activities. EBS data contains executed trades but does not contain information on orders or quotes (and thus does not provide information on routes, modifications, or cancellations). Similarly, trade blotters and order tickets contain only information recorded by the particular broker-dealer or investment adviser that generated them and may contain limited information about full order lifecycles. SRO audit trail data are limited to identifying the activity of their members, can have incomplete information concerning their members, lack order lifecycle information occurring prior to receipt by an exchange, and may not contain information regarding principal trading. Furthermore, although public consolidated and direct data feeds provide data about the entire market, they lack information regarding non-displayed orders and do not provide sufficient information to identify the different lifecycle events of a single order.[1928]

The Commission also discussed individual SRO audit trails. While extensive, they contain only activity of their own members, and many SRO audit trails are incomplete in their coverage of the activities of those members. For example, FINRA's OATS data does not include proprietary orders originated by a trading desk in the ordinary course of a member's market making activities, or options data. And while OATS collects data from FINRA members with respect to orders and trades involving NMS and OTC stocks, OATS does not include trade or order activity that occurs on exchanges or at broker-dealers that are not FINRA members. In addition, while broker-dealers who are not members of FINRA must be members of an exchange SRO, an individual exchange SRO's audit trail data is generally limited to activity taking place on that exchange. The Commission noted that because broker-dealers who are not members of FINRA may engage in trading activity in off-exchange markets, a substantial portion of the trading activity that an exchange SRO supervises is not reported to the supervising SRO.[1929] The Commission also discussed the fact that not all FINRA members are obligated to report to OATS. FINRA's rules exclude from reporting certain members that engage in a non-discretionary order routing process. Additionally, FINRA has the authority to exempt the manual orders of other members who meet specific criteria from the OATS recording and reporting requirements.[1930]

The Commission also explained that some SRO audit trails do not include and are not required to include activity associated with principal trading, such as market-making activity. This may result in the exclusion of a significant amount of activity, particularly for firms with substantial market-making business activities.[1931]

Finally, the Commission discussed the fact that no single current data source integrates both equities and options, and that the lack of any combined equity and options audit trail data is a significant impediment to regulators performing cross-product surveillance.[1932]

B. Data Fields

As addressed in detail in the Notice, each of the currently available data sources discussed above is missing certain data fields that are useful for conducting a variety of regulatory activities. Furthermore, certain valuable data fields are not contained in any of the data sources discussed above.[1933]

Most notably, as the Commission explained in detail in the Notice, the identity of the customer is not available from any of the current data sources that are reported to regulators on a routine basis. As discussed in the Notice, a unique customer identifier could be useful for many types of investigations and examinations such as market manipulation investigations and examinations of investment advisers. The Commission also explained that although some data sources—specifically large trader reports, EBS, trade blotters, and order tickets—identify customers, these data sources are not reported on a routine basis, provide only one part of the order lifecycle, and have other inherent limitations.[1934]

The Commission explained that because there is currently no data source that includes customer identities

[1921] As proposed, the CAT NMS Plan also requires CAT Reporters to synchronize their time clocks to the time maintained by the NIST with an allowable drift of 50 milliseconds. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.8. According to a survey conducted by the FIF, 39% of responding broker-dealers currently synchronize their clocks with less precision than what is called for by the CAT NMS Plan. Thus, the CAT NMS Plan would also increase the accuracy of the timestamps used by certain broker-dealers. *See* FIF Clock Offset Survey, *supra* note 247.

[1922] Off-exchange activity includes currently reportable events that are not handled by a registered securities exchange.

[1923] In this instance, ''timeliness'' refers to when the data are compiled at the source in question (*e.g.,* when OATS receives data from reporting broker-dealers), *not* when they become available to regulators because that timeline can vary depending on the regulator in question. As shown in the ''Direct Access for Regulators'' column, it may still take several days, weeks, or months for regulators to be able to access the data. For example, while OATS reporters provide the data at T+1, the SEC must request OATS data in order to access it, which may take several days or weeks. This narrower definition of timeliness is not used throughout this economic analysis.

[1924] Guidance from FINRA indicates that broker-dealers must ''identify the party to the trade'' through EBS fields such as ''Primary Party Identifier,'' but that party may be another broker-dealer rather than the ultimate customer. *See* FINRA, Electronic Blue Sheet Submissions, FINRA and ISG Extend Effective Date for Certain Electronic Blue Sheet Data Elements, Regulatory Notice 12–47 (Oct. 2012), *available at https://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/NoticeDocument/p194655.pdf*. Similarly, under the large trader rule, persons exercising ''investment discretion'' are reported through EBS, but in some cases such persons are investment advisers rather than their customers. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at note 372 and accompanying text (discussing the large trader rule).

[1925] *Id.* at 30664.

[1926] *Id.*

[1927] Data Boiler Letter at 30.

[1928] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30664.

[1929] *Id.*

[1930] *Id.* (citing FINRA Rule 7470). At the time of the Notice, FINRA had granted approximately 50 such exemptions.

[1931] *Id.* at 30665.

[1932] *Id.*

[1933] *Id.*

[1934] *Id.*

across multiple parts of an order lifecycle, regulators must seek and link multiple sources of data, which can be a burdensome and imperfect process. For example, trade blotter and order ticket data that identify customers from one broker-dealer may only include customer names and thus may not be readily matched to similar data from another broker-dealer, or may require substantial time, effort, and uncertainty to reconcile across firms. Further, EBS data's limited coverage of trading activity and lack of some detailed trade information raises costs and reduces the timeliness of insider trading investigations.[1935]

As the Commission addressed in detail in the Notice, some valuable data fields, such as modifications that make an order non-displayed and other special handling instructions are consistently available on only a few data sources or require linking different data sources.[1936] The Commission explained that the lack of direct, consistent access to order display information and special handling instructions creates inefficiencies in surveillances, examinations, and investigations that examine hidden liquidity and the treatment of customer orders.[1937]

The Commission noted that data that are not directly accessible by regulators at all include buy-to-cover information and subaccount allocation information, including the allocation time. The Commission explained that regulators could use buy-to-cover information to better understand short selling and for investigations of short sale manipulation. However, no current data source allows regulators to directly identify when someone is buying to cover a short sale.[1938]

As the Commission discussed in the Notice, subaccount allocation information needed for regulatory activities can be difficult for regulators to collect and compile because SRO audit trails currently do not require allocation reports and broker-dealers may not have records of the time of a subaccount allocation. The Commission explained that when regulators require an understanding of subaccount allocations for a regulatory task, they generally request and sift through trade blotter or EBS data in an attempt to identify allocations and the details of those allocations. However, current trade blotter data contains limited customer information on allocations and is not required to contain allocation time information at the subaccount level.[1939]

The Commission explained that the difficulty in obtaining allocation information and the difficulty in reconstructing allocations with data from broker-dealers limits the efficiency of certain surveillances and examinations. In particular, allocation time at the subaccount level is critical for determining whether some customers are systematically given more favorable allocation treatment than others. For example, when a broker-dealer places an order or series of orders for multiple customer accounts that generates multiple executions at multiple prices, it is possible that different customers receive different prices in the allocation process. However, if some customers systematically receive less favorable prices than others when they should be receiving the same prices for their executions, this could indicate that the broker-dealer is handling allocations improperly.[1940]

Three commenters noted that the open/close indicator is currently not captured for equities.[1941] In their response, the Participants agreed with this assessment.[1942] In addition, the Participants indicated that, pursuant to current industry practice, the open/close indicator is also not captured for some options transactions.[1943]

The Commission has considered the comments it received regarding the current limitations of trade and order data in terms of completeness. The open/close indicator would provide information about whether a transaction is undertaken to open or increase a position in the security, or to close or reduce a position in the security, such as a buy-to-cover a short sale, which the Commission in the Notice stated was information not directly accessible to regulators today. Therefore, the commenters expressing that the open/close indicator is not currently captured for equities are consistent with the baseline discussed in the Notice; the open/close indicator is one type of a broader category of information that the Commission recognized is lacking from current audit trails.[1944] In addition, although the Commission did not discuss this issue in the Notice, the Commission now recognizes that the open/close indicator is currently not captured for certain options transactions.

(2) Accuracy

In the Notice, the Commission carefully considered the accuracy of data currently used by regulators in order to consider whether and to what degree the CAT NMS Plan would provide more accurate data.[1945] As discussed in more detail below, the Commission considered several forms of data inaccuracy, including data errors, inaccurate event sequencing, the inability to link data accurately, inconsistent identifiers, and obfuscating levels of irreversible data aggregation.

A. Data Errors

With respect to data errors,[1946] the Commission stated its preliminary belief that data errors affect most current data used by regulators and can persist even after corrections. The Commission specifically noted instances where information was inaccurately reported by broker-dealers and discussed various errors in data translated from back-office systems, errors in data from trading systems, and errors in audit trail data.[1947] Furthermore, the Commission noted that the CAT NMS Plan reports that 2.42% of order events submitted to OATS fail validation checks. Although FINRA sends these records back to its members to correct, significant error rates in event linking post-correction are common because OATS limits error correction requests to records with internal inconsistencies within a given member's submission and there is no cross-participant error resolution process. FINRA estimates that 0.5% of

[1935] *Id.* for a full discussion of the impact on insider trading investigations.

[1936] In the Notice, the Commission provided further details on the reporting of order display information (*i.e.,* whether the size of the order is displayed or non-displayed) and special handling instructions in OATS data. The Commission also noted that this data is not directly available to all regulators, and that the Commission must request this data from FINRA. *Id.* at 30666 n.412.

[1937] *Id.* at 30666.

[1938] *Id.*

[1939] While the Commission is sometimes able to acquire allocation time on trade blotters, not all broker-dealers keep records in a manner that facilitates efficient regulatory requests for allocation time information. *Id.*

[1940] *Id.*

[1941] TR Letter at 9; SIFMA Letter at 35; FIF Letter at 83.

[1942] Response Letter I at 22.

[1943] Response Letter I at 22.

[1944] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30680.

[1945] *Id.* at 30666–71.

[1946] As used herein, the term ''data errors'' refers to instances where data reflect false information or are missing information such that they do not reflect order events that occurred in the market fully and accurately. Under this definition of ''data errors,'' a trading error or an order entry error would not be a ''data error.'' For example, if a trader submitted an order to an exchange with an order size of 100,000, an accurate order record would contain an order size of 100,000. If the trader actually intended to enter the order size as 1,000, the accurate order record would still be 100,000 because that would reflect the actual state of the market at the time. In other words, the 100,000 order size is not a ''data error.'' If the trader later corrected the order size, accurate data would reflect the subsequent corrections while still preserving the accurate state of the market at the time.

[1947] *Id.* at 30666–67.

OATS routing reports directed to another FINRA member broker-dealer cannot currently be linked.[1948] Also, as stated in the Notice, the CAT NMS Plan reports that, following the rollouts of three major updates to OATS, 0.86% of Trade Reporting Facility reported trades could not be matched to OATS execution reports, 3.12% of OATS route reports could not be matched to exchange orders, and 2.44% of inter-firm routes could not be matched to a record of the receiving firm's receipt of a routed order.[1949]

The Commission received several comment letters that discussed the current state of errors in data used by regulators.[1950] One commenter did not believe that OATS data currently achieves ''*de minimis*'' errors.[1951] The commenter further stated that there are instances where errors cannot be corrected in OATS and gave true duplicates and non-reportable symbols as examples.[1952] The commenter further detailed the classification scheme currently used to categorize OATS errors. According to the commenter, these errors are currently classified as: Rejects; unmatched executions; unmatched exchange routes; inter firm received unmatched; inter firm sent unmatched; out of sequence; and late reports.[1953]

Another commenter stated in two separate letters that there are OATS reporters that are repeatedly non-compliant, both in omitting to report required data and reporting inaccurate data to FINRA.[1954] The commenter contended that the extent of this non-compliance is significant and is magnified by the lengthy period of time before the errors are discovered and corrected by FINRA. Also, there is no way to know the magnitude of noncompliance that is never detected and therefore never corrected. The non-compliance by reporters may cause the error rates reported by OATS to be higher than reported.

The Commission has considered the comments received. The Commission agrees with the commenter that stated there are instances where OATS data does not fail validation checks, but does contain errors. As mentioned in the Notice, OATS validation checks are limited to detecting errors that can be discovered by a concise set of logical rules and OATS limits error correction requests to records with internal inconsistencies within a given member's submission.[1955] The Commission also recognizes the comment that some OATS reporters fail to send and/or send inaccurate reports to FINRA and is updating its analysis to take into account that current data errors in OATS may be larger than initially considered due to this non-compliance. Finally, the Commission now considers the error classifications provided by a commenter in its baseline.

B. Event Sequencing

With respect to event sequencing, as the Commission addressed in detail in the Notice, the ability to sequence market events is crucial to the efficacy of detecting and investigating some types of manipulation, and the sequencing of order events requires both sufficient clock synchronization across market participants and timestamps that are granular enough for accurate sequencing, but the current clock synchronization standards make this process difficult.

In the Notice, the Commission discussed that current rules require most broker-dealers to synchronize their system clocks to within one second.[1956] The Commission further noted that ''in practice'' some broker-dealers currently synchronize their clocks to smaller clock offset tolerances. The Commission cited the FIF Clock Offset Survey [1957] where 29% of respondents report they currently synchronize their clock to permit a maximum clock offset of one second from NIST, 10% of respondents permit a maximum offset of 50 milliseconds to one second, 21% of respondents permit a 50 millisecond maximum offset, and 18% of respondents permit a maximum offset less than 50 milliseconds. The remaining 22% of respondents report they utilize multiple clock offset tolerances across their systems ranging from five microseconds to one second. In addition, the Commission discussed that FINRA had filed a proposed rule change that would reduce the clock offset tolerance for members' computer clocks that are used to record events in NMS securities from within one second of the NIST atomic clock to within 50 milliseconds of the NIST atomic clock.[1958] Furthermore, the Commission discussed that if the rule change was approved, more entities would record timestamps with data at a 50 millisecond clock offset tolerance regardless of whether the CAT NMS Plan is approved.[1959]

For clock synchronization on exchanges, the Commission discussed in the Notice that exchanges trading NASDAQ securities currently adhere to clock synchronization standards at or below 100 microseconds, and the Commission understands that the NYSE, the options exchanges, and the SIAC SIP have comparable clock synchronization standards. In addition, the Commission noted that Participants stated ''that absolute clock offset on exchanges averages 36 microseconds.'' [1960]

Also in the Notice, Commission Staff conducted an analysis of the frequency of order events using MIDAS data which identified whether for each order event, an event in the same security at another venue occurred within a given time range. 97.95% of order events for listed equities and 91% of order events for listed options occurred within one second of another unrelated order event in the same security. 14.44% of the unrelated order events for listed equities and 3.12% of the unrelated order events for listed options in the same security occurred within 5 microseconds of another order event in the same security. The Commission noted that the analysis underestimates the true frequency of unrelated events within the given time frames because it includes only order events that are included in the MIDAS data, and furthermore stated that the analysis illustrates how the current frequency of order events makes sequencing unrelated order events difficult. With respect to the granularity of timestamps, the Commission discussed in the Notice that regulators need sufficiently granular timestamps to sequence events across orders and within order lifecycles, and that the current lack of uniform and granular timestamps can limit the ability of regulators to sequence events accurately and link data with information from other data sources.[1961] In addition, the Commission discussed that current data sources have different timestamp granularity standards, and that many public data sources report time in seconds or milliseconds, and some, including direct data feeds, report time in microseconds or nanoseconds. As examples, the Commission stated that OPRA allows for timestamps in nanoseconds and that the other SIPs require timestamps in microseconds for equity trades and quotes, whereas the

[1948] *Id.*

[1949] *Id.*

[1950] Anonymous Letter I at 9–10; Anonymous Letter II at 1–2; FIF Letter at 55, 60.

[1951] FIF Letter at 60.

[1952] FIF Letter at 55.

[1953] FIF Letter at 54.

[1954] Anonymous Letter I at 9–10; Anonymous Letter II at 1–2.

[1955] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30667.

[1956] *Id.* at 30669.

[1957] *See* FIF Clock Offset Survey, *supra* note 247.

[1958] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30668.

[1959] *Id.* at 30683.

[1960] *Id.* at 30669.

[1961] *Id.* at 30669–70.

short sale transactional data released by exchanges contains timestamps in seconds.[1962] In addition, the Commission stated that OATS requires timestamps in milliseconds for firms that capture time in milliseconds, but does not require members to capture time in milliseconds.[1963]

One commenter discussed the Commission's analysis of the frequency of order events in the context of the Commission's baseline assessment of clock synchronization and timestamp granularity.[1964] The commenter pointed out that the Commission's analysis ''used primarily SIP data, reflecting exchange only recording of events, which is a tightly controlled, co-located and specialized environment'' and that the analysis ''does not reflect the broader broker-dealer communities' recording of events . . . in a distributed environment, a much less controlled and less precise environment.'' [1965] That commenter also stated that ''[w]ithin every order lifecycle, the events leading up to the execution can be [sequenced] due to daisy chaining.'' [1966]

As noted above, commenters recognized that lower tolerances were already mandated by some exchanges as well as ATSs that maintain an order book.[1967] One commenter noted that some firms receive direct feeds from exchanges as precise as 1 microsecond.[1968] The Participants and another commenter explained that the marketplace is segmented such that broker-dealers operate under a different business model and regulatory environment than ATSs and exchanges.[1969] While microsecond tolerances for exchanges and ATSs are already standard practice, broker-dealers have no standard practice across the industry and are precluded from using matching engines, which are capable of the lowest level of granularity.[1970]

One commenter noted the imprecise business process of handling manual orders.[1971] Another commenter noted that manual intervention can take over a second because it involves several steps, which impact timestamp capture.[1972]

The Participants' response provided new information on the current clock synchronization standards of Participants.[1973] Specifically, the response clarified that all Participants currently operate pursuant to a clock synchronization standard of 100 microseconds with regard to their electronic systems.[1974]

The Commission has considered these comments and, as discussed below, has updated its analysis of the baseline of clock synchronization as set out in the Notice.

In the Notice, the Commission explained that its analysis of the frequency of order events used MIDAS data, recognized the limitations that its use of MIDAS data could impose, and explained how the limitations reflected the Commission's assessment of the baseline.[1975] The Commission therefore agrees with the commenter that its analysis reflects a disproportionate number of exchange events relative to off-exchange events. But because the commenter did not explain how the limitations of the Commission's analysis could make the analysis less useful or what statistical biases could result from these limitations, the Commission believes that, despite its limitations, the analysis ''still provides useful insights'' and ''illustrates how the current frequency of order events makes sequencing unrelated order events difficult.'' [1976]

The Commission generally agrees that events can be sequenced due to daisy chaining, but notes that for most regulatory activities,[1977] it is crucial for the regulators to be able to accurately sequence events from *different* orders. Furthermore, the Commission believes that such sequencing requires both sufficient clock synchronization across market participants and sufficiently granular timestamps.

With respect to comments regarding manual orders, the Commission believes the new insights provided by commenters are consistent with the baseline in the Notice.

The Commission is updating its economic baseline to include the new information provided by the Participants and also to include the approval of a FINRA rule amendment. Specifically, the Commission now believes that all Participants currently operate pursuant to a clock synchronization standard of 100 microseconds. Also, the Commission approved the proposed rule change by FINRA that was discussed in the Notice that reduces the synchronization tolerance for computer clocks to 50 milliseconds for member firms that record events in NMS Securities.[1978] Accordingly, FINRA members that record events in NMS Securities currently operate, or in the near future will operate, pursuant to a clock synchronization standard of 50 milliseconds for their computer clocks.

C. Data Linking and Combining

Regarding data linking, as the Commission addressed in detail in the Notice, regulators analyzing an event or running a surveillance pattern often need to link data.[1979] As examples, the Commission stated that cross-market examinations require the cumbersome and time-consuming task of linking many different data sources; that regulators that are determining whether rule violations have occurred will combine trading data from sources such as public feeds, SRO audit trails, EBS data, and trade blotters; and that the analysis and reconstruction of market events could require linking many different data sources, such as a dozen SRO audit trails.[1980]

The Commission discussed that merging different data sources often involves translating the data sources into the same format, which can be a complex process that is prone to error.[1981] In addition, the Commission discussed that linking records within or across data sources requires the sources to share ''key fields'' that facilitate linkage, but that regulators may be unable to link some data source combinations accurately because the data sources do not have key fields in common or the key fields are not sufficiently granular; also, different data sources may have key fields in common but the relationship between the fields is not straightforward so the algorithm to link them may be necessarily complex and not entirely successful.[1982] Furthermore, the Commission discussed that within a single order lifecycle, the order number may change when a broker-dealer routes the order to another broker-dealer or exchange or even to another desk at the same broker-dealer. Finally, the Commission discussed that the inability to link all records affects

[1962] *Id.*

[1963] *Id.*

[1964] FIF Letter at 118.

[1965] FIF Letter at 118.

[1966] *Id.*

[1967] TR Letter at 7; FIF Letter at 97–99.

[1968] Better Markets Letter at 8.

[1969] Response Letter II at 4; FIF Letter 97–99, 116.

[1970] *Id.*

[1971] FIF Letter at 118.

[1972] SIFMA Letter at 35. Specifically, this commenter explained that manual order taking involves taking an order via phone, fax, or email and then manually entering the order into an electronic order management system.

[1973] Response Letter II at 4–5.

[1974] *Id.*

[1975] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30669.

[1976] *Id.*

[1977] *Id.* at 30667.

[1978] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 77565 (April 8, 2016), 81 FR 22136 (April 14, 2016).

[1979] *Id.* at 30670.

[1980] *Id.*

[1981] *Id.*

[1982] *Id.*

the accuracy of the resulting data and can force an inefficient manual linkage process that would delay the completion of the data collection and analysis portion of an examination, investigation, or reconstruction.[1983]

D. Customer and Broker-Dealer Identification

With respect to market participant identifiers (''MPIDs''), the Commission explained that trade and order data currently available to the Commission lack consistent customer and broker-dealer identifiers, which limit regulators' ability to track the activity of one client or broker-dealer across the market.[1984] In the case of broker-dealers, the Commission stated that identifiers are inconsistent and that no centralized database exists. In addition, although SROs generally identify their members using MPIDs, those MPIDS are not standardized across venues.[1985] The Commission further stated that aggregating a broker-dealer's activity across venues requires verifying the MPIDs assigned to a broker-dealer on each venue, usually referencing the broker-dealer by its Central Registration Depository (''CRD'') number. Finally, the Commission stated that in the course of manual data analysis, Commission Staff have experienced challenges in identifying broker-dealers using CRD numbers, but that the Commission and the SROs have generally overcome these challenges in the context of automated regulatory data analysis.

In the case of broker-dealer customers, the Commission stated that identifying customer account owners across multiple broker-dealers is difficult and prone to error.[1986] As an example, the Commission discussed that although the EBS system provides the names associated with each account traded, these names are drawn from separate records of each broker-dealer providing data to the EBS system, and the same party may be identified by a different name across multiple broker-dealers.

One commenter discussed the difficulty in tracking market participant activity using MPIDs, stating that ''[w]ith regard to trade identifiers used by market access providers, some clearing firms have used one or more MPIDs to conceal the identity of other participants/clients using these services to manipulate markets.'' [1987] The Commission agrees that tracking market participant activity using MPIDs can be difficult because of sponsored or direct market access arrangements whereby broker-dealers allow customers to trade electronically using the broker-dealer's MPID. In cases where the sponsored or direct market access customer is not a FINRA member, the EBS system allows regulators to observe the identity of trading parties that may be concealed by MPIDs, but, as discussed in the Notice, it is difficult to consistently identify trading parties across multiple broker-dealers because they may use different names across these broker-dealers. In addition, as discussed in the Notice, EBS data is cumbersome to use for broad analysis because of fragmentation of the data.[1988] However, in cases where the sponsored or direct market access customer is a FINRA member, OATS reporting obligations require both the customer broker-dealer and the sponsoring broker-dealer to generate reports that, when linked correctly, allow regulators to observe the identity of the trading party.[1989]

E. Aggregation

Regarding data aggregation, as addressed in detail in the Notice, the practice used in some data records of bundling together data from different orders and trades can make it difficult to distinguish the different orders and trades in a given bundle. That aggregation reduces the usefulness of equity and options cleared reports, because the reports do not have detailed trade information and do not include activity that does not require clearing.[1990] In the Notice, the Commission presented as an example the frequent use of average-price accounts by brokers to execute and aggregate multiple trades for one or more customers. The Commission discussed that for these cases, and with EBS data, the system does not reflect the details of each individual trade execution.[1991] Furthermore, the Commission discussed that information on trade allocations aggregate the trade information to such an extent that it is difficult for regulators to identify when particular clients may be afforded preferential treatment because it is challenging to link subaccount allocations to orders and trades.[1992]

In addition, as the Commission discussed in the Notice, issuer repurchase information is aggregated at the monthly and quarterly level, and this level of aggregation limits the use of such data in investigations of the timing of issuer repurchases and issuer stock price manipulation and in analysis of the use of the Rule 10b–18 issuer repurchase safe harbor.

(3) Accessibility

As addressed in detail in the Notice, the SROs and the Commission also lack direct access—*i.e.,* the ability to log into a system in a manner that would allow them to gather and analyze the data they need—to many of the data sources described above. SROs generally have direct access only to their own audit trails and the public data feeds.[1993] The Commission has direct access only to the public data feeds and the equity and option cleared data; it lacks direct access to information provided in EBS or contained in trade blotters, order tickets, order handling data, SRO audit trails, and OATS data.[1994]

The Commission explained that if a regulator does not have direct access to data it needs, the regulator would request it, and that this can result in many burdensome requests to broker-dealers, SROs, and others. The Commission recognized that data requests could impose burdens on the entities responding to the requests, in addition to the burden on the regulators making the requests. In particular, broker-dealers, investment advisers, and SROs responding to a data request must incur costs in order to produce, store, and transmit the data for the Commission or SRO.[1995]

The Commission explained that, to complete just one analysis, regulators may need to request data from many different data providers because of fragmentation in the data. The Commission discussed the fact that fragmentation in trade and order data can take many forms. First, an analysis may require the same type of data from many market participants. For example, while ATSs and dealers report order events in equities to OATS, each of the 12 equities exchanges has its own audit trail. As a result, a market reconstruction for a single security may involve data requests to multiple exchanges as well as to FINRA.[1996]

Second, the required data fields for an analysis may be reflected in different types of data. For example, for investigations that require tracing a single trade or a set of trades back to an

[1983] *Id.*

[1984] *Id.* at 30670–71.

[1985] *Id.*

[1986] *Id.*

[1987] Anonymous Letter I at 12.

[1988] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30661.

[1989] *See* OATS Compliance FAQ at C84 *available at www.finra.org/industry/faq-oats-compliance-faq.*

[1990] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30688–89.

[1991] *Id.* at 30671.

[1992] *Id.*

[1993] FINRA does receive data from certain SROs on a daily basis and subsequently has direct access to that data. *Id.* at 30671 n.453.

[1994] *Id.* at 30671–72.

[1995] *Id.* at 30672.

[1996] *Id.*

investor or investors, regulators would first need to request data from the exchanges or market participants executing trades to find out which members, subscribers, or broker-dealers sent the orders that led to the executions. Then, regulators would need to ask the members, subscribers, and broker-dealers for information on the orders and repeat that process until they get to the broker-dealer who initiated the order to see the customer behind the order.[1997]

Third, an analysis may require data on different products covered in separate data sources. For example, some regulatory activities require data on both equities and options. And because current data sources do not contain information regarding both equities and options, regulators needing data on both types of securities would need to make several data requests.[1998]

As the Commission discussed in the Notice, data fragmentation also results in disparate requirements for industry members to record and report the same information in multiple formats. Because each SRO has its own data requirements, a market participant that is a member of multiple SROs may be required to report audit trail data in numerous formats and interact with multiple regulators in response to normal data queries.[1999]

(4) Timeliness

As addressed in detail in the Notice, currently, obtaining trade and order data and converting the data into a form in which they can be analyzed can involve a significant delay from the time of a particular event of interest. In some cases the length of time from when an event occurs until regulators can use relevant data in an investigation or analysis can be weeks or months. This is especially true for trading data that includes customer information.[2000]

The Commission explained in the Notice that corrected FINRA OATS data may be available less than two weeks after an event and uncorrected data on T+1. In particular, FINRA members submit OATS data on a daily basis, submitting end-of-day files by 8:00 a.m. ET the following day or they are marked late by FINRA. FINRA acknowledges receipt of the data an hour after the member submits it, before running its validation process. FINRA then takes approximately four hours after acknowledging receipt of OATS data to determine if the data contain any syntax errors. In addition to the four hours needed to identify errors within a report, it takes another 24 hours for context checking, which identifies duplicates or secondary events without an originating event. Once a context rejection is available, the member has up to five business days to repair the rejection. Reports for files that contain internally inconsistent information about processing, linking, and routing orders may be available within two business days. FINRA attempts to match the inconsistent information against any additional data received up to T+2 for linking errors and T+3 for routing errors. The timing for surveillance programs varies depending on the type of surveillance being performed; data is assumed to be completely processed and corrected at T+8.[2001]

The Commission also explained that because market participants generally do not report or compile datasets immediately after an order event, there is a delay before regulators may access some data sources. For example, the compilation of equity and option cleared reports occurs on T+1 for options and T+3 for equities (*i.e.,* the clearing day) and the electronic query access for equities is available from the Securities Information Automation Corporation (''SIAC'') on T+3. Additionally, when broker-dealers receive a request for EBS, the firm must first fill in the EBS report and then, if it does not self-clear, pass the reports on to its clearing firm to compile and send to SIAC. The EBS submission process can take up to ten business days. More immediate requests for cleared options data can be submitted to FINRA, but even this process takes up to two days. Because EBS data do not contain order entry time and order execution time, regulators must obtain this information from firms and brokers using either data requests or subpoenas, and this process generally can take from two to four weeks depending on the size of the request.[2002]

In addition, the Commission noted that the lack of direct access to most data sources may further delay the ability of regulators to use data in certain cases. When regulators have direct access to a data source, the time needed to receive data is only the time it takes for a query to run. On the other hand, when regulators lack direct access, their data requests can consume significant time, including both the time required to put the request together and response times from the SROs, broker-dealers, and others producing the data. For example, obtaining complete responses from each broker-dealer for an EBS request can take days or weeks depending on the scope of the request. Likewise, responses from the Intermarket Surveillance Group (''ISG'') for SRO audit trail data can take days or weeks.[2003] As the Commission discussed in the Notice, once regulators receive the requested data, the data often have to be processed into a form in which they can be analyzed. The Commission explained that it can take considerable time for regulators to combine data from different sources and link records from within or across data sources. Furthermore, the lack of consistency in format adds complexity to projects involving data from multiple data sources, even when the project does not involve linking of these different data.[2004]

The Commission further discussed that those who use regulatory data also typically take time to ensure the accuracy of the data. The Commission explained that when regulators question the accuracy of data, they often check several alternative sources until they are comfortable that their data are accurate. This checking of data accuracy and augmentation process adds time to an investigation or analysis.[2005]

E. Benefits

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its belief that the economic benefits of the CAT NMS Plan would come from any expanded or more efficient regulatory activities facilitated by improvements to the data regulators use.[2006] This is because the Plan will create a new consolidated data source—CAT Data—that should replace the use of some current data sources for many regulatory activities. Therefore, the Benefits Section described how CAT Data compares to data regulators currently use for regulatory activities, how the CAT Data would improve

[1997] *Id.*

[1998] *Id.*

[1999] *Id.*

[2000] *Id.* at 30673. The Commission noted that some of the data sources described above can be accessed by SROs and the Commission without significant delay. For example, SROs and the Commission have some real-time direct access to public data and, through MIDAS, the Commission has next-day direct access to analytics that are based on public data, such as volumes over various time horizons. Furthermore, the Commission noted that FINRA receives audit trail data from exchanges pursuant to Regulatory Services Agreements at the end of each trading day. *Id.*

[2001] *Id.*

[2002] *Id.* The Commission also noted that it has been the Commission's experience that trade blotter data requests can take weeks or in excess of a month depending on the scope of the request and how accustomed the broker-dealer is with fulfilling such requests. *Id.*

[2003] *Id.*

[2004] *Id.*

[2005] *Id.* at 30674.

[2006] *Id.*

regulatory activities, and how these improvements would benefit investors, market participants, and markets in general.[2007]

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the CAT NMS Plan would produce data that would improve on current data sources because CAT Data would result in regulators having direct access to consolidated audit trail data, which would in turn improve many of the regulatory activities discussed in the Baseline Section.[2008] As summarized in Table 2, the Commission preliminarily concluded that the Plan would generate improvements in the quality of data that regulators would have access to in the areas of completeness, accuracy, accessibility, and timeliness. The Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the improvements in the quality of regulatory data within these categories would significantly improve the ability of regulators to perform a wide range of regulatory activities, which would lead to benefits for investors and markets. In addition, the Commission preliminarily believed that certain provisions in the Plan—those related to future upgrades of the Central Repository, the promotion of the accuracy of CAT Data, the promotion of the timeliness of CAT Data, and the inclusion of specific governance provisions identified by the Commission in the Adopting Release for Rule 613—would increase the likelihood that the potential benefits of the CAT NMS Plan would be realized.

In the category of completeness, the Commission discussed its belief that the ability for regulators to access more material data elements from a consolidated source would enable regulators to more efficiently carry out investigations, examinations, and analyses because regulators could acquire data from a single source that they would otherwise need to compile from many data sources. In the category of accuracy, the Commission discussed its belief that the Plan would substantially improve data accuracy by requiring CAT Data to be collected, compiled, and stored in a uniform, linked format using consistent identifiers for customers and market participants. In the category of accessibility, the Commission discussed its belief that the Plan would substantially improve the access to data for regulators because the Plan requires regulators to have direct access to CAT Data and this direct access would dramatically reduce the hundreds of thousands of requests that regulators must make each year in order to obtain data, thus reducing the burden on the industry. Finally, in the category of timeliness, the Commission discussed its belief that the Plan, if approved as noticed, would significantly improve the timeliness of data acquisition and use, which could improve the timeliness of regulatory actions that use data.

The Commission discussed its expectation that regulatory activities such as surveillance, investigations, examinations, analysis and reconstruction of market events, and analysis in support of rulemaking initiatives would benefit from improved data quality as part of CAT.[2009] The Commission explained that data is essential to all of these regulatory activities, and therefore substantial improvements in the quality of the regulatory data should result in substantial improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of these regulatory activities, which should translate into benefits to investors and markets. For example, improved data could lead to more effective and efficient surveillance that better protects investors and markets from violative behavior and facilitates more efficient and effective risk-based investigations and examinations that more effectively protect investors. The Commission stated that together, these improved activities could better deter violative behavior of market participants, which could improve market efficiency. Furthermore, this increase in directly accessible data should improve regulators' understanding of the markets, leading to more informed public policy decisions that better address market deficiencies to the benefit of investors and markets. The Commission also discussed the fact that the Plan lacked information regarding the details of certain elements of the Plan likely to affect the benefits of the Plan, primarily because many of those details had not yet been determined, which creates some uncertainty about the expected economic effects.[2010]

The Commission has considered the comments it received regarding the likely benefits of the CAT NMS Plan and continues to believe that the CAT NMS Plan would generate improvements in the quality of data that regulators would have access to in the areas of completeness, accuracy, accessibility, and timeliness. The Commission also continues to believe that improvements in the quality of regulatory data within these categories would significantly improve the ability of regulators to perform a wide range of regulatory activities, which would lead to benefits for investors and markets. In addition, the Commission continues to believe that certain provisions in the Plan—those related to future upgrades of the Central Repository, the promotion of the accuracy of CAT Data, the promotion of the timeliness of CAT Data, and the inclusion of specific governance provisions identified by the Commission in the Adopting Release for Rule 613—increase the likelihood that the potential benefits of the CAT NMS Plan described below will be realized. As set out in more detail below, the Commission has taken into account the modifications that have been made to the Plan where they are relevant to the Commission's analysis of the benefits of the Plan, and has updated its analysis accordingly.

[2007] *Id.* at 30674–30708.

[2008] *Id.* at 30674–77.

[2009] *Id.* at 30675–76.

[2010] *Id.* at 30676.

TABLE 2

	Customer identifier	Broker-dealer identifier	Timestamp [2011]	Allocation information	Order display information	Buy-to-cover indicator	Special handling instructions	Routing/ modification/ cancellation information	Entire lifecycle	Direct access for regulators	Off-exchange activity [2012]	Timeliness of data compiling [2013]
OATS	No	Yes	Yes (majority in milliseconds but some in seconds).	No	Yes (for limit orders).	No	Yes (conditional).	Yes	Yes (before order reaches exchange). No (once order reaches exchange).	No (except FINRA). Access can take several weeks.	Yes	Raw Data: T+1 Corrected Data: T+6.
COATS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No (except SROs w/r/t their own members).	No	Reported same-day, but separate file transmitted at latest T+1.
SRO Audit Trails	No	Yes	Yes (majority in milliseconds but some in seconds).	No	No	No	No	Yes	No (only once order reaches exchange).	No (except SROs w/r/t their own trails). Access can take several weeks.	No	As soon as a trade is executed.
Equity and Option Cleared Reports.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Equity: T+3 Option: T+1.
Electronic Blue Sheets.	Yes (but not always consistent across broker-dealers) [2014].	Yes (but not always consistent across broker-dealers).	Yes	No	No	No	No	No (except for certain cancellation information).	No	No. Access can take several weeks or months.	Yes	10 business days after request is submitted.
Trade Blotters/ Order Tickets.	Yes (but not always consistent across broker-dealers).	Yes (but not always consistent across broker-dealers).	Yes (can be requested, although not always reliable).	No	No	No	No	No	No	No. Access can take several days.	Yes	Same-day.
Trading and Order Handling System Data.	Depends on the trader.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes (except allocations).	No. Regulators must request this data (SEC asks for the data within 10 days).	Yes	Same-day.
Public/Proprietary Data.	No	No	Yes (varied between seconds and microseconds).	No	No	No	No	Yes (except non-displayed orders).	No	Yes	Yes	Same-day.
Data from Proposed CAT.	Yes (613(c)(7)(i)(A)).	Yes (613(c)(7)(i)(C)).	Yes (milliseconds) (613(d)).	Yes (613(c)(7)(vi)).	Yes (613(c)(7)(i)(F)).	Yes (613(c)(7)(i)(F)).	Yes (613(c)(7)(i)(F)).	Yes (613(c)(7)(ii).	Yes (613(j)(9)).	Yes (SEC and SROs) (613(e)(2)).	Yes (613(c)(2) and (3)).	Raw Data: T+1 Corrected Data: T+3.

1. Improvements in Data Qualities

Consistent with the Adopting Release, the Commission identified in the Notice four qualities of trade and order data that impact the effectiveness of core SRO and Commission regulatory efforts: Accuracy, completeness, accessibility, and timeliness.[2015] In assessing the potential benefits of the CAT NMS Plan, the Commission's economic analysis compared the data that would be available under the Plan to the trading and order data currently available to regulators.[2016] The Commission preliminarily believed that the Plan would improve data in terms of all four qualities, but that uncertainty remained as to the expected degree of improvement in some areas.[2017] The Commission has considered the comments received, the Participants' response, and the modifications to the Plan, and continues to believe that the Plan will improve accuracy, completeness, accessibility, and timeliness of trade and order data relative to the Baseline, with some uncertainty as to the degree of improvement.

a. Completeness

In the Notice, the Commission discussed how the CAT NMS Plan, if approved, would result in regulators having direct access to a single data source that would be more complete than any current data source.[2018] The Commission discussed its belief that the CAT Data [2019] would be more complete than other data sources because, compared to existing SRO audit trails and other data sources, the CAT Data would contain data from a greater number of broker-dealers on more event types, products, and data fields. While some current data sources contain many of the elements that would be included in CAT Data, the Commission explained that CAT Data would consolidate that data into one source that would be much more complete than any existing source, and that CAT Data would also include some elements that are not available from any current data source. In the Commission's view, having this data consolidated in a single source would provide numerous benefits.

(1) Events and Products

In the Notice, the Commission discussed the fact that the CAT Data would include events and products from all current SRO audit trails, combined into a single data source. In addition, it would include some off-exchange activity not captured on current SRO audit trails,[2020] as well as proprietary orders originated by a trading desk in the ordinary course of a member's market making activities (or ''principal activity''),[2021] and information on equities, options and OTC Equity Securities.[2022]

Four commenters believed that the CAT NMS Plan would result in a data source that is not complete enough and argued that CAT should be significantly expanded in scope to include additional event types, such as additional short selling information, clearing information, and ETF creation and redemption data; additional product types, such as stock index futures and options on index futures; or other types of regulatory submissions or metrics reports, such as CCAR/DFAST, TLAC, Volcker, Basel III, or BCBS–283.[2023]

The Commission recognizes that at least some of these expansions could potentially make CAT Data more complete and responds to each of the suggestions above in Section IV.D.4.f. At the same time, the Commission continues to believe that the CAT NMS Plan will result in regulators having direct access to a single data source that will be more complete than any current data source. Furthermore, the Commission continues to believe that the CAT Data will be more complete than other data sources because it will contain data from a greater number of broker-dealers on more event types and products when compared to existing SRO audit trails and other data sources.

(2) Data Fields

In the Notice, the Commission also explained that the Plan would consolidate, in a single source, fields that currently may not be available from all data sources, including some fields that are difficult for regulators to compile.[2024] It discussed its belief that, in particular, the inclusion of consistent, unique customer information in the CAT Data represents a significant improvement over current SRO audit trails in terms of completeness because very few current data sources contain customer information, and those that do are limited in terms of the completeness and accuracy of this information, which significantly limits regulatory efficiency.[2025] As proposed in the

[2011] As proposed, the CAT NMS Plan also requires CAT Reporters to synchronize their time clocks to the time maintained by the NIST with an allowable drift of 50 milliseconds. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.8. According to a survey conducted by the Financial Information Forum (FIF), 39% of responding broker-dealers currently synchronize their clocks with less precision than what is called for by the CAT NMS Plan. Thus, the CAT NMS Plan would also increase the accuracy of the timestamps used by certain broker-dealers. *See* FIF Clock Offset Survey, *supra* note 247.

[2012] Off-exchange activity includes currently reportable events that are not handled by a registered securities exchange.

[2013] In this instance, ''timeliness'' refers to when the data are compiled at the source in question (*e.g.,* when OATS receives data from reporting broker-dealers), *not* when they become available to regulators because that timeline can vary depending on the regulator in question. As shown in the ''Direct Access for Regulators'' column, it may still take several days, weeks, or months for regulators to be able to access the data. For example, while OATS reporters provide the data at T+1, the SEC must request OATS data in order to access it, which may take several days or weeks. This narrower definition of timeliness is not used throughout this economic analysis.

[2014] Guidance from FINRA indicates that broker-dealers must ''identify the party to the trade'' through EBS fields such as ''Primary Party Identifier,'' but that party may be another broker-dealer rather than the ultimate customer. *See* FINRA, Electronic Blue Sheet Submissions, FINRA and ISG Extend Effective Date for Certain Electronic Blue Sheet Data Elements, Regulatory Notice 12–47 (Oct. 2012), *available at https://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/NoticeDocument/p194655.pdf.* Similarly, under the large trader rule, persons exercising ''investment discretion'' are reported through EBS, but in some cases such persons are investment advisers rather than their customers. *See supra* note 1912 and accompanying text (discussing the large trader rule).

[2015] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45727.

[2016] Changes in all four data qualities affect certain data-driven regulatory activities. The benefits of the Plan derive from the changes to these regulatory activities.

[2017] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30678.

[2018] *Id.* at 30678–81.

[2019] *Id.* at 30678.

[2020] The Commission noted that SRO audit trails currently do not include the activity of firms that are not members of that SRO. And, currently only FINRA requires its members to report their off-exchange activity. While broker-dealers that trade off-exchange must be members of FINRA unless their activity fits the terms of the exemption in Rule 15b9–1, firms that qualify for the exemption in that rule and that are not FINRA members do not report their off-exchange activity to OATS. This exemption covers a large percentage of off-exchange activity. Broker-dealers that are not FINRA Members accounted for 48% of orders sent directly to ATSs in 2014, 40% in 2013, and 32% in 2012. Because all SROs are Participants in the Plan, under the Plan all broker-dealers with Reportable Events, including off-exchange, would be required to report the required CAT Data to the Central Repository. *Id.* at 30678–79.

[2021] *Id.* at Section IV.D.2.b(1)A.

[2022] ''OTC Equity Security'' is defined in the Plan as ''any equity security, other than an NMS Security, subject to prompt last sale reporting rules of a registered national securities association and reported to one of such association's equity trade reporting facilities.'' *Id.* at 30679.

[2023] Anonymous Letter at 6–9, 12–14, 17; Better Markets Letter at 7; Data Boiler Letter at 1,10–13, 17–18, 31; CBOE Letter at 1–2.

[2024] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30679–81.

[2025] *Id.* at Section IV.D.2.a(1) and Section IV.D.2.b.(1)b, *supra.* As discussed in the Notice, SRO audit trails typically do not provide customer information, but a recent FINRA rule change would require its members to report to OATS non-FINRA member customers who are broker-dealers.

Notice, CAT Data would also include other data fields not available from current SRO audit trails, including allocation information such as allocation time, open/close information, Quote Sent Time,[2026] and information on whether a Customer gave a modification or cancellation instruction. With respect to the rest of the data fields included in CAT Data, the Commission discussed the fact that certain of them are included in some or all current SRO audit trails but that no single current source contains all of them. For example, the inclusion of order display information (*i.e.,* whether the size of the order is displayed or non-displayed) and special handling instructions in CAT Data improve completeness because they are not always mandatory in SRO audit trail data and therefore may not be consistently available without data requests to broker-dealers.

The Commission discussed its belief that, while the costs and benefits of including particular fields can change due to technological advances and/or changes in the nature of markets, the Plan contains provisions regarding periodic reviews and upgrades to CAT that could lead to proposing additional data fields that are deemed important.[2027] In addition, the Commission noted that it had reviewed gap analyses that examine whether the CAT Data would contain all important data elements in current data sources, and that the Commission identified some potential data gaps.[2028] However, the Commission discussed the fact that the Plan provides that prior to the retirement of existing systems, CAT Data must contain data elements sufficient to ensure the same regulatory coverage provided by existing systems that are anticipated to be retired.[2029] The Commission discussed its expectation that, therefore, any missing elements that are material to regulators would be incorporated into the CAT Data prior to the retirement of the systems that currently provide those data elements to regulators.

Three commenters questioned the benefits of timestamps in the Allocation Report.[2030] One of the commenters stated that a requirement to report allocation time would be ''divorced from the goals of CAT.'' [2031] Similarly, another commenter noted that allocation time would not provide the regulatory completeness benefit that the Commission is seeking because one likely definition would not capture what regulators would want.[2032] This commenter further argued that if the main regulatory purpose of including allocation timestamps is to detect cherry-picking, there could be alternate approaches that achieve the same result using existing data fields.[2033]

Three commenters suggested that the open/close indicator for equities would be a new data field.[2034] However, these comments did not address the benefits of the open/close indicator that the Commission discussed in the Notice.

One commenter discussed possible data gaps between CAT and current data sources.[2035] The commenter indicated that the OATS–CAT Gap Analysis, published in May 2015, is out of date because it does not reflect changes that have been incorporated into OATS since 2015 including additional fields to accommodate the Tick Size Pilot and ATS Order Book Reporting. The commenter also argued that gaps between OATS and CAT may widen further if changes to OATS continue to be made without corresponding changes to the CAT Plan for the initial phase. Furthermore, the commenter noted that other regulatory systems may indirectly impact CAT reporting requirements; for example, recent NYSE changes to the Account Type Indicator will require EBS changes, which in turn impacts CAT.[2036]

In their response, the Participants agreed with the Commission's analysis in the Notice and expressed their belief that there are benefits associated with including time-stamps in the Allocation Report, including the detection of allocation fraud.[2037] With respect to the open/close indicator, the Participants noted that this data field is not captured pursuant to current industry practices for equities or some options transactions.[2038] The Participants also responded to the comment regarding the OATS–CAT Gap Analysis, stating that the gap analysis has been updated by including newly-added data fields in these duplicative systems, such as the new OATS data fields related to the Tick Size Pilot and ATS Order Book Reporting changes.[2039]

The Commission has considered the comments it received and the Participants' response regarding the potential benefits of the CAT NMS Plan in terms of data completeness. The Commission disagrees with the comments that allocation timestamps are outside the goal of CAT and that they will not provide the Commission with the regulatory benefit that it is seeking. As discussed in the Notice and below, the Commission believes that allocation time is an important data field because it is critical in investigations of violations such as market manipulation and cherry-picking, and because allocation time is currently more difficult to acquire than the other information on the Allocation Report.[2040] The inclusion of this data field will improve the efficiency and efficacy of enforcement investigations for regulators, and this benefit is one of the goals of the CAT NMS Plan. With respect to the commenter who argued that alternate approaches that do not rely upon allocation timestamps can be used to detect cherry picking, the Commission notes that the commenter's example requires an allocation time.

Regarding the possibility of data gaps between CAT and current data sources, the Commission recognizes that there may be other gaps between current regulatory data sources and the Plan, in addition to those that the Commission mentioned in the Notice. The Commission also recognizes that the number and the scope of these gaps can change over time due to new regulatory developments. However, as discussed above, the Participants have stated that they have completed the gap analysis.[2041] As set out in the Notice (and discussed above), the Plan specifically provides that, prior to the retirement of existing systems, CAT Data must contain data elements sufficient to ensure the same regulatory coverage as the coverage provided by these systems. Therefore, the Commission continues to believe that any missing elements that are important to regulators would be incorporated into

[2026] ''Quote Sent Time'' refers to the time that an Options Market Maker routes its quote, or any modification or cancellation thereof, to an exchange. *Id.* at 30755.

[2027] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.E.3.a for a discussion of adding new data fields and other requirements for upgrading the CAT Data after approval.

[2028] In the Notice, the Commission acknowledged that the Participants are continuing to study gaps between current regulatory data sources and the Plan as filed. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30680–81; *see also* SEC Rule 613—Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT) OATS–CAT Gap Analysis and SEC Rule 613—Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT) Revised EBS–CAT GAP Analysis, *available at http://www.catnmsplan.com/gapanalyses/index.html.*

[2029] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30680–81.

[2030] FSR Letter at 9; SIFMA Letter at 35; FIF Letter at 3–4, 11, 86–89.

[2031] SIFMA Letter at 35.

[2032] FIF Letter at 11.

[2033] FIF Letter at 89.

[2034] FIF Letter at 84; TR Letter at 9; SIFMA Letter at 25.

[2035] FIF Letter at 28–29.

[2036] FIF Letter at 29.

[2037] Response Letter I at 37–38.

[2038] Response Letter I at 21–22.

[2039] Response Letter II at 21.

[2040] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30679; *see also* Section V.E.2.c(3), *infra.*

[2041] *See* Section IV.D.9, *supra.*

the CAT Data prior to the retirement of the systems that currently provide these data elements.

The Commission is updating its analysis of these benefits to recognize two modifications to the Plan. First, modifications to the Plan to require the reporting of LEIs for Customers and Industry Members in certain circumstances [2042] should result in regulators having access to more complete information identifying Customers and Industry Members. Second, the Plan has been modified to eliminate the requirement to report an open/close indicator for equities and Options Market Markers. The inclusion of this indicator for equities and Options Market Makers would have assisted regulators in determining when an investor was buying to cover a short sale in equities or identifying whether options market makers engage in aggressive risk-taking trading. Such information would have been useful in detecting certain market manipulations, violations of rules such as Rule 105, short sale marking rules, and Rule 204. The Commission now notes that, due to the elimination of the requirement to report an open/close indicator for equities and Option Market Makers as part of CAT, these benefits will no longer be realized. However, the Commission is approving the Plan with this modification for the reasons discussed in Section IV.D.4.c, above.

b. Accuracy

In the Notice, the Commission analyzed the expected effect of the CAT NMS Plan on the accuracy of data available to regulators.[2043] The Commission preliminarily believed that the requirements in the CAT NMS Plan for collecting, consolidating, and storing the CAT Data in a uniform linked format, the use of consistent identifiers for Customers, and the focus on sequencing would promote data accuracy. However, in regard to certain Plan requirements, the Commission preliminary believed that improvements in data accuracy would be limited. For example, the Commission discussed its belief that the proposed clock synchronization requirements in the Plan would only lead to modest improvements in the percentage of sequenceable order events.[2044] Also, the Commission noted that the full extent of improvement that will result from the Plan was uncertain, because the Plan defers many decisions relevant to accuracy until the Plan Processor publishes the Technical Specifications and interpretations.[2045]

(1) Definitions

As previously stated, the Plan defers many decisions relevant to accuracy until the Plan Processor publishes the Technical Specifications and interpretations. In particular, the CAT NMS Plan specifies that the ''Technical Specifications shall include a detailed description of . . . each data element, including permitted values, in any type of report submitted to the Central Repository'' [2046] and ''the Plan Processor shall have sole discretion to amend and publish interpretations regarding the Technical Specifications.'' [2047] In the Notice, the Commission explained that this leaves open precise definitions and parameters for the data fields to be included in CAT Data.[2048] Nonetheless, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the Plan provides some procedural protections to mitigate this uncertainty and help promote accuracy. For example, the Plan requires that, at a minimum, the Technical Specifications be ''consistent with [considerations and minimum standards discussed in] Appendices C and D,'' and that the initial Technical Specifications and any Material Amendments thereto must be provided to the Operating Committee for approval by Supermajority Vote.[2049] Further, all non-Material Amendments and all published interpretations must be provided to the Operating Committee in writing at least ten days before publication, and shall be deemed approved unless two or more unaffiliated Participants call the matter for a vote of the full Operating Committee.[2050]

The Commission received comments about the lack of definitions for data fields in the Plan such as the open/close indicator,[2051] allocation time,[2052] account type,[2053] and customer type.[2054] Commenters argued that it is currently uncertain whether the Plan Processor will select definitions that are the most beneficial to regulators. For example, one commenter suggested that allocation time may be challenging to define, stating that ''the industry does not have a standard business flow which consistently captures time at the same point in the allocation process.'' [2055] This commenter further pointed out that if allocation time is defined as the time the allocation is booked, ''it will not provide the regulatory benefit expected by the SEC,'' and provided an example of a way to detect allocation fraud using the time ''when the allocation was submitted to move the shares into the intended subaccounts.'' [2056] The Participants responded to the comments regarding the definitions of allocation time, account type, and customer type by saying that the definitions will be addressed in the Technical Specifications.[2057]

The Commission has considered the comments and believes they are consistent with the Commission's assessment in the Notice that leaving open precise definitions, parameters, and interpretations for the data fields to be included in CAT Data creates uncertainty about the full extent of improvements in data accuracy. The Commission is cognizant of the complexity of certain data fields, such as allocation time. These complexities mean that the accuracy of the data fields depends on Plan Processor discretion, because the Plan Processor would have responsibility for defining the permitted values and interpreting when CAT Reporters would use such permitted values, and sometimes would not have guidance from previous data sources on how to define or interpret such a

[2042] *See* Section IV.D.4.a.(4) and Section IV.D.4.b.(2), *supra,* for a description of the LEI reporting requirements in the Plan.

[2043] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30681–89.

[2044] *Id.*

[2045] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.9.

[2046] *Id.* at Section 6.9(b)(v).

[2047] The CAT NMS Plan provides details regarding how the responsibility for these decisions would be shared between the Operating Committee and the Plan Processor, with the Plan Processor having responsibility for data definitions and interpretations. *Id.* at Section 6.9(c)(i).

[2048] For example, the Completeness section in the Notice noted that the open/close indicator for equities does not exist in current data sources. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30681. The accuracy of the open/close indicator for equities would have been subject to Plan Processor discretion, because the Plan Processor would have had responsibility for defining the permitted values and interpreting when CAT Reporters would use such permitted values and the Plan Processor would not have had guidance from previous data sources on how to define or interpret such a field.

[2049] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.9(a). The Commission notes that the standards in Appendices C and D do not cover all decisions that would affect the accuracy of the data.

[2050] *Id.* at Section 6.9(c)(i).

[2051] FIF Letter at 85.

[2052] TR Letter at 9; FIF Letter at 86.

[2053] TR Letter at 9.

[2054] TR Letter at 9.

[2055] FIF Letter at 86.

[2056] FIF Letter at 86, 89.

[2057] The Participants responded to the comments on open/close more generally by requesting that the Commission clarify that the open/close indicator should not apply to equities, and did not respond regarding the definition. As noted elsewhere, modifications to the Plan will remove the open/close indicator for equities. *See* Section IV.D.4.c, *supra.*

field.[2058] Although the Commission agrees that uncertainty exists in the selection of data definitions and that definitions ultimately selected may not promote accuracy as much as certain alternatives, as discussed in Section V.G.4.a.(2), the Commission continues to believe that the existing process trades off the need for certainty with the benefits of an efficient process going forward. Further, for reasons discussed above in Section IV.B. and below in Section V.E.3.d, the Commission continues to believe that the Plan provides some procedural protections to mitigate this uncertainty and help promote accuracy.

(2) Data Errors

In the Notice, the Commission discussed the fact that the CAT NMS Plan specifies a high-level process for handling errors that includes target Error Rates for data initially submitted by CAT Reporters and a correction process and timeline, but explained that it is difficult to conclude whether the Error Rates and processes in the CAT NMS Plan would constitute an accuracy improvement as compared to current data sources. Specifically, because the current OATS error rate is below 1% and the Plan states that 5% is an appropriate initial Error Rate, the Commission preliminarily believed that the initial percentage of errors in CAT would be higher than the current percentage of errors in OATS, though the OATS error rate may not be directly comparable to the Error Rate in the Plan.[2059] As discussed in the Notice, Error Rates for CAT Data may not be comparable to error rates in OATS because of the increased scope and level of linkages specified in the Plan and the new, large, and untested system.[2060]

In the Notice, the Commission also discussed that the Plan contains some uncertainty about the level of the maximum Error Rate because the initial 5% rate is subject to a quality assurance testing period and subject to change again before each new batch of CAT Reporters are brought online. The Commission noted that in time, the rate could be lowered, but it also could be raised.[2061] Finally, the Commission discussed that the Plan specifies an error correction process and indicates that practically all errors identifiable by the validations used would be corrected by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+5, but that the Plan does not provide the level of detail necessary to verify whether the CAT validation process would run the same validations as OATS, whether current validations would be relevant, and what validations, if any, would be added.[2062]

Although the Commission received several letters regarding data error rates,[2063] only a few letters discussed the effect of Error Rates on the accuracy of CAT Data.[2064] While supporting the goal of a ''*de minimis*'' post correction error rate, one commenter suggested that the errors in CAT Data would not be ''*de minimis*'' even after the error correction process because OATS currently does not achieve ''*de minimis*'' errors.[2065] For example, this commenter stated that there are instances where errors cannot be corrected in OATS and gave true duplicates and non-reportable symbols as examples.[2066] The commenter stated that it is unreasonable to expect CAT Data to be any different than OATS data, especially because the industry has no experience with reporting and error correcting the new data types required by the Plan.[2067] Another commenter expanded on this concern by questioning why accuracy problems persist in OATS today and argued that the improvements to accuracy from the Plan depend on eliminating the inaccurate/problematic reporting that exists today.[2068]

Other commenters expressed uncertainty regarding whether CAT Reporters would be able to achieve the initial Error Rate of 5%.[2069] One commenter indicated that there is not enough information at this time to assess the Error Rate and that ''Error Rate'' is not specifically defined.[2070] Another commenter echoed this sentiment saying that there is no history of reporting error rates for options, market making, customer information, or allocations and the Plan provides ''little or no information . . . regarding the types of errors that will be identified, and if and how those errors can be corrected.'' [2071] The commenter also cited uncertainties related to the inexperience of some CAT Reporters, unknown interfaces, a lack of information on test tools and correction tool kits, and an unknown linkage logic.[2072]

Finally, one commenter agreed with the Commission's analysis that OATS error rates may not be directly comparable to a CAT Error Rate.[2073] In particular, this commenter stated that OATS would be a sufficient comparison base for equities data only, but not for options, allocations, Customer Information, or market making reporting.

In response to the comments on uncertainty in the definition of Error Rate, the Participants disagreed, pointing to the current definition in the Plan and in Rule 613(j)(6).[2074] The Participants further stated that they intend to keep the definition of Error Rate the same as in Rule 613 and noted that it is the Compliance Thresholds [2075] that relate to the CAT reporting performance of individual CAT Reporters. In response to commenters expressing uncertainty about the ability to achieve the Error Rates, the Participants explained that they performed a detailed analysis that not only considered current and historical OATS error rates, but also considered the magnitude of the new reporting requirements and the fact that many CAT Reporters had never previously been obligated to report data for audit trail purposes.[2076] The Participants, however, acknowledged that actual experience with CAT itself will provide more accurate and applicable data for determining the appropriate Error Rate and pointed out that the Plan provides for various opportunities for the Error Rate to be reevaluated and reset.[2077]

The Commission has considered the comment letters received and the Participants' response and continues to believe that it is difficult to determine whether the Error Rates and processes in the Plan would constitute an accuracy improvement compared to current data. The Commission recognizes the uncertainty regarding the ability to achieve a ''*de minimis*'' post-correction Error Rate discussed by a

[2058] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at n.537. While the Commission would ultimately be able to correct such misinterpretations, regulators may not detect such a misinterpretation until the misinterpretation harms an investigation, exam, or other analysis.

[2059] *Id.* at 30681–82.

[2060] *Id.*

[2061] *Id.*

[2062] *Id.*

[2063] *See* Section IV.D.11, *supra* for a complete summary of comments and the Commission's discussion of those comments. Further, the Commission responds to comments relevant to alternatives that would reduce error rates below in Section V.H.2, *infra.*

[2064] FIF Letter at 50–60; Anonymous Letter II at 2; SIFMA Letter at 6.

[2065] FIF Letter at 60.

[2066] FIF Letter at 55.

[2067] FIF Letter at 60.

[2068] Anonymous Letter II at 2.

[2069] FIF Letter at 50; SIFMA Letter at 6.

[2070] SIFMA Letter at 6.

[2071] FIF Letter at 50.

[2072] FIF Letter at 50.

[2073] FIF Letter at 55.

[2074] Response Letter I at 45.

[2075] The Error Rate reports shall include each of the following—if the Operating Committee deems them necessary or advisable—''Error Rates by day and by delta over time, and Compliance Thresholds by CAT Reporter, by Reportable Event, by age before resolution, by symbol, by symbol type (*e.g.,* ETF and Index) and by event time (by hour and cumulative on the hour)[.]'' *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.1(o)(v).

[2076] Response Letter I at 46.

[2077] Response Letter I at 46.

commenter and notes that post-correction errors are the ones more pertinent to the accuracy of data used in regulatory activities. While the Commission is concerned with the effect of the post-correction Error Rate on accuracy, it notes that, while uncertain, the Plan does require the Plan Processor to perform validations within three specific categories: File Validations (confirmation that the file is received in the correct format); Validation of CAT Data (checks of format, data type, consistency, range/logic, data validity, completeness, and timeliness); and Linkage Validation (checking the ''daisy chain'').[2078] Specifically, in regard to Linkage Validation, the Plan seems to require validations that are more comprehensive than what FINRA runs on OATS data, where, as stated in the Notice, significant error rates in event linking are common because there is no cross-participant error resolution process.[2079] Further, the OATS error types described in the Baseline above [2080] also suggest that the Plan's validations will be more comprehensive than the validations run on OATS data.

The Commission agrees with the commenters that expressed uncertainty about whether CAT would be able to achieve the 5% initial Error Rate, but also agrees with the Participants' response. In the Participants' analysis, the Participants considered the magnitude of the new reporting requirements and the fact that many CAT Reporters had never previously been obligated to report data for an audit trail when they set the initial Error Rate. Furthermore, as mentioned in the Notice, the Plan provides for various opportunities for the Error Rate to be reevaluated and reset after CAT Reporters have more experience with CAT.[2081]

Finally, the Commission agrees with the comment that OATS error rates may not be comparable to a CAT Error Rate because there is currently no reporting regime comparable to OATS for options, allocations, Customer Information, or market making reporting. In the Notice, the Commission discussed uncertainty in comparing OATS error rates to CAT Error Rates due, in part, to the increased scope of the CAT NMS Plan.[2082]

(3) Event Sequencing

A. Timestamp Granularity

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the minimum timestamp granularity required by the Plan would result in some improvement in data accuracy, but that the level of improvement could be limited. The CAT NMS Plan requires timestamps to the millisecond.[2083] This is consistent with Rule 613, which requires timestamps to reflect current industry standards and be at least to the millisecond.[2084] Further, pursuant to Rule 613, if a CAT Reporter's system already utilizes timestamps in increments less than the minimum required by the Plan, the CAT Reporter must record timestamps in such finer increments.[2085]

As the Commission discussed in the Notice, many of the systems from which regulators currently obtain data already capture timestamps in increments of milliseconds or less, meaning that there would be no improvement in timestamp granularity as compared to those systems.[2086] However, to the extent that some current data sources report timestamps in increments coarser than a millisecond, which is the case for 12% of OATS records and all EBS records,[2087] the Commission noted that it expected the CAT millisecond timestamp requirement to improve data granularity, and thereby allow regulators to more accurately determine the sequence of market events relative to surrounding events. However, the Commission also explained that the benefits from the more granular timestamps could be limited by the level of clock synchronization required by the Plan. In particular, the Commission explained that timestamp granularity would not be the limiting factor in sequencing accuracy, because recording events with timestamps with resolutions of less than one millisecond cannot help to sequence events occurring on different venues with clocks that may be 100 milliseconds out of sync due to clock synchronization offsets.[2088] Therefore, the benefits of timestamping order events at increments finer than a millisecond would be limited without also improving the clock synchronization standards of the Plan.

The Commission discussed the benefits of the one second timestamp on manual orders and stated that it preliminarily believed that timestamp granularity of one second would be appropriate for manual orders, rather than a millisecond granularity, because recording Manual Order Events at the millisecond level would be ultimately arbitrary or imprecise due to human interaction.[2089]

Two commenters thought that a millisecond timestamp would be sufficient to achieve improvements in event sequencing.[2090] One of these commenters suggested that requiring timestamps that are more granular than one millisecond for CAT Reporters who capture timestamps more granular than a millisecond would not yield regulatory benefits as it will result in a false sense of accuracy on event sequencing.[2091] An additional commenter did not support this requirement, stating that it would be inequitable and would not serve a regulatory purpose.[2092] On the other hand, two commenters supported the requirement that CAT Reporters report sub-millisecond timestamps if they capture them.[2093] One commenter stated their belief that timestamp granularity ''should go hand-in-hand with how fast a market participant is allowed to conduct their HFT activities.'' [2094] The other commenter stated that a ''significant portion of today's trades occur at microsecond intervals,'' and that the Plan's timestamp resolution ''will be insufficient to show the precise time of the reportable activities.'' [2095] The commenter further stated that ''[f]or some practices, such as cancellations,

[2078] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 7.2.

[2079] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30667.

[2080] *See* Section V.D.2.b(2)A, *supra,* which lists error types as rejects, unmatched exchange routes, inter firm received unmatched, inter-firm sent unmatched, out of sequence, and late reports.

[2081] *Id.* at 30682.

[2082] *Id.*

[2083] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.8(b).

[2084] 17 CFR 242.613(d)(3). This requirement does not apply to certain Manual Order Events, which are exempted from the requirement and are captured at one-second increments. Timestamp granularity on Manual Order Events is discussed separately in the Alternatives section.

[2085] *Id.*

[2086] For example, OPRA allows for timestamps in nanoseconds, and the other SIPs require timestamps in microseconds for equity trades and quotes. S*ee* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.D.2.b.(2).

[2087] Current OATS rules require timestamps to be expressed to the nearest second, unless the member's system expresses time in finer increments. As of September 2014, approximately 12% of OATS records contain timestamps greater than one millisecond. EBS records either do not contain times or express timestamps in seconds. *Id.*

[2088] For example, under the requirements in the Plan, an order event at Broker-Dealer A could have a timestamp that is 1 millisecond sooner than an order event at Broker-Dealer B even if the event at Broker-Dealer B actually occurred 99 milliseconds sooner. This could occur if Broker-Dealer A's systems are recording times 50 milliseconds ahead of NIST while Broker-Dealer B's systems are recording times 50 milliseconds behind NIST. Both broker-dealers' systems would be within the Plan's allowable clock synchronization tolerance.

[2089] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30684.

[2090] FIF Letter at 112; Data Boiler Letter at 21.

[2091] FIF Letter at 12.

[2092] SIFMA Letter at 35.

[2093] Data Boiler Letter at 21; Better Markets Letter at 8.

[2094] Data Boiler Letter at 21.

[2095] Better Markets Letter at 8.

stuffing, and other ''noisy'' behaviors, the Plan should ''require a more precise granularity to more comprehensibly and accurately capture the frequency and scale of such practices.'' [2096] One commenter stated their belief that stricter tolerances for the granularity of timestamps are already in effect at exchanges and ATSs that maintain an orderbook and did not believe it necessary to mandate timestamp tolerances for these entities since they already adhere to stricter tolerances for commercial reasons.[2097]

Two commenters indicated that timestamp granularity and clock-offset tolerance for allocation timestamps should be at one second.[2098] One commenter argued that the benefits of allocation time would not require millisecond precision while three commenters argued that allocations are not time-critical.[2099]

One commenter expressed that the irregularity in manual orders made it difficult to set a tolerance applicable to all manual orders and suggested that initially a timestamp tolerance of more than one second be allowed for manual orders.[2100] However, several other commenters stated that one second is a reasonable standard for manual orders.[2101]

In their response, the Participants stated their belief that CAT Reporters should be required ''to report timestamps to the CAT at the granularity at which they are captured, even if that is more granular than that required by the Plan.'' They further stated their belief that capturing such granularity would increase the quality of data reported to the CAT.[2102] With respect to the timestamps on Allocation Reports, the Participants recognized the practical issues raised by requiring timestamps for Allocation Reports and proposed to amend the Plan to permit CAT Reporters to report allocation timestamps with a granularity of one second.[2103] With respect to manual order timestamps, the Participants stated that they continued to believe their proposed approach to Manual Order Events is appropriate.[2104]

The Commission has considered the comment letters received and the Participants' response, and as discussed in more detail above,[2105] has amended the Plan so that Participants are required to adhere to a more stringent clock synchronization standard of 100 microseconds and allocation timestamps need only be reported in seconds instead of milliseconds. The Commission is updating its economic analysis to incorporate these modifications to the Plan. The Commission agrees with the commenter who pointed out that millisecond timestamps are insufficient to show the precise timestamp of certain activities and disagrees with commenters who stated that millisecond precision is sufficient to sequence events. As stated in the Notice, the Commission believes that a 1 millisecond timestamp granularity offers benefits over the Baseline, but that a more granular timestamp requirement, coupled with a more stringent clock synchronization requirement, would be needed to completely sequence the majority of unrelated market events. In response to the commenters who questioned the benefits of reporting the sub-millisecond timestamps if CAT Reporters capture them, the Commission agrees with the Participants that such a requirement will increase the quality of data reported to the CAT.

Modifications to the Plan now require Participants to adhere to a more stringent clock synchronization standard of 100 microseconds (or less), and CAT Reporters to record timestamps in finer increments than 1 millisecond if their systems utilize timestamps in such finer increments. Because, as discussed above,[2106] Participants already operate pursuant to a clock synchronization standard of 100 microseconds with regard to their electronic systems, and because many Participants already report timestamps in microseconds and nanoseconds in their direct feeds and are currently required to report timestamps in microseconds for equity trades and quotes, the Commission does not believe the clock synchronization amendment to the Plan will result in large accuracy improvements over current standards for timestamp granularity. However, the Commission is approving the Plan without further modifications for the reasons discussed in Section IV.D.13, above.

In the Notice, the Commission did not explicitly consider timestamp granularity or clock synchronization standards for timestamps in Allocation Reports. However, in response to comments and modifications to the timestamp on Allocation Reports, the Commission now analyzes whether the modifications limit the improvements to accuracy. Based on the experience of its Staff, the Commission understands that allocations are conducted after a trade and that the allocation time can aid regulators in ways that do not require millisecond-level timestamps (or 50 millisecond clock offset tolerance). Further, the Commission agrees with the commenter's argument that allocations are not time-sensitive and the benefits from allocation timestamps do not require millisecond precision. Therefore, the Commission believes that requiring allocation times to be recorded in milliseconds (with 50 millisecond offset tolerance) compared to seconds (with one second tolerance) would provide little, if any, additional regulatory benefit. Therefore, the Commission does not believe that this modification materially reduces the improvements to accuracy.

B. Clock Synchronization

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its belief that the clock synchronization standards in the CAT NMS Plan are reasonably designed to improve the accuracy of market activity sequencing, but that the improvements to the percentage of sequenceable order events by Plan standards are modest and the requirements of the Plan may not be sufficient to completely sequence the majority of market events relative to all other events. In particular, the Commission conducted an analysis using MIDAS data that found that the current FINRA one-second clock offset tolerance allows only an estimated 1.31% of unrelated order events [2107] for listed equities and 6.97% of unrelated order events for listed options to be sequenced.[2108] By comparison, the proposed 50 millisecond clock offset tolerance could accurately sequence an estimated 7.84% of unrelated order events for listed equities and 18.83% of unrelated order events for listed options.[2109] Also, by comparison, the analysis found that a 100 microsecond clock offset tolerance, if applied to all reporters, could accurately sequence an estimated 42.47% of unrelated order events for listed equities and 78.42% of unrelated order events for listed

[2096] Better Markets Letter at 8.

[2097] TR Letter at 7

[2098] SIFMA Letter at 35; FIF Letter at 87, 89.

[2099] FSR Letter at 9; SIFMA Letter at 35; FIF Letter at 89.

[2100] Data Boiler Letter at 21–22.

[2101] FIF Letter at 115; SIFMA Letter at 34; Better Markets Letter at 8; Response Letter I at 38. However, Better Markets expressed the concern that gaming of the system could occur by writing algorithms to make automated orders appear as manual orders.

[2102] Response Letter I at 28.

[2103] Response Letter I at 37.

[2104] Response Letter I at 38.

[2105] *See* Section IV.D.13, *supra.*

[2106] *See* Section IV.D.13.a(1), *supra.*

[2107] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30669 for a definition of unrelated order events as it relates to this analysis and the analysis described there.

[2108] *Id.* at 30683. The Commission discussed that these estimates were upwardly biased.

[2109] *Id.* The Commission discussed that these estimates were upwardly biased.

options.[2110] In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the analysis suggests the standards required by the Plan do represent an improvement over the current standard but that the majority of unrelated market events would remain impossible to sequence based on the Plan's required clock synchronization standards.[2111]

The Commission also discussed in the Notice that, independent of the potential time clock synchronization benefits, order linking data captured in CAT should increase the proportion of order events that are accurately sequenced.[2112] This is because some records pertaining to the same order can be sequenced by their placement in an order lifecycle (*e.g.,* an order submission must have occurred before its execution) without relying on timestamps.

Although the Commission received several comment letters related to clock synchronization, which are discussed in detail in Section IV.D.13.a above, only two letters commented on the effects of clock synchronization standards on event sequencing.[2113] Both commenters agreed with the Commission's assessment that provisions in the CAT NMS Plan related to event sequencing would provide improvements in accuracy compared to what is currently achievable.[2114] However, one of these commenters further stated their belief that unrelated events may not be sequenceable and stated that it is unclear what the regulatory relevance is of sequencing unrelated events across market centers.[2115] The commenter went on to say that there was no evidence that lower clock synchronization tolerances would increase the accuracy of the audit trail; [2116] however, the commenter also stated that ''more precise timestamps provided by exchanges may be of benefit to the audit trail as corroborating evidence when sequencing events that terminate at an exchange.'' [2117]

The Commission has considered the comment letters received, the Participants' response, and amendments to the Plan. As explained below, the Commission continues to believe that requirements in the Plan related to event sequencing would provide improvements in accuracy compared to what is currently achievable, but that improvements are modest and the requirements to the Plan may not be sufficient to completely sequence the majority of market events relative to all other events. Orders sent from different broker-dealers to different CAT Reporters can only be sequenced in CAT Data according to their timestamp. If the clocks of CAT Reporters are not synchronized with sufficient precision, it is impossible to definitively sequence these events. The Plan acknowledges this limitation and states, ''[f]or unrelated events, *e.g.,* multiple unrelated orders from different broker-dealers, there would be no way to definitively sequence order events within the allowable clock drift as defined in Article 6.8.'' [2118] The Commission disagrees with the comment that sequencing unrelated market events has no regulatory relevance. As discussed in the Notice, the ability to sequence market events is crucial to the efficacy of detecting and investigating some types of manipulation, particularly those involving high frequency trading, those in liquid stocks in which many order events can occur within microseconds, and those involving orders spread across various markets. The Commission also disagrees with this commenter's assessment that more stringent clock synchronization standards would not increase the accuracy of the audit trail. As demonstrated by the Commission's analysis in the Notice, if clock synchronization standards were made more stringent, some of the many market events at separate market centers that occur within small time windows would become sequenceable, which would increase the accuracy of the audit trail.

As discussed in more detail above,[2119] the Commission has amended the Plan so that Participants are required to adhere to a more stringent clock synchronization standard of 100 microseconds with regard to electronic systems, excluding certain manual systems. In the Participants' response, they noted that all Participants currently operate pursuant to a clock synchronization standard of 100 microseconds with regard to their electronic systems, so that the amended requirement is already met by the Participants.[2120] In addition, as discussed in more detail above,[2121] the Commission has approved a proposed rule change by FINRA that reduces the synchronization tolerance for computer clocks of firms that record events in NMS Securities to 50 milliseconds.[2122] Because broker-dealers that are FINRA members are currently required to adhere to a clock synchronization standard of 50 milliseconds, and because Participants already adhere to a clock synchronization standard of 100 microseconds, the Commission does not believe the 50 millisecond clock synchronization requirement of CAT Reporters and the more stringent clock synchronization requirement of 100 microseconds for Participants, as specified in the amended Plan, would substantially change the ability of regulators to accurately sequence unrelated market events over what is currently achievable using timestamps alone.[2123] However, the Commission is approving the Plan without further modifications for the reasons discussed in Section IV.D.13, above. Further, to the extent CAT captures more events than are currently captured, such as CAT Reportable Events by broker-

[2110] A 100 microsecond clock offset tolerance will now be required of Participants due to an amendment to the Plan.

[2111] The Commission noted that the Plan itself states ''[f]or unrelated events, *e.g.,* multiple unrelated orders from different broker-dealers, there would be no way to definitively sequence order events within the allowable clock drift as defined in Article 6.8,'' and that this limitation ''in turn limits the benefits of CAT in regulatory activities that require event sequencing, such as the analysis and reconstruction of market events, as well as market analysis and research in support of policy decisions, in addition to examinations, enforcement investigations, cross-market surveillance, and other enforcement functions.'' *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30683.

[2112] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at n. 555.

[2113] FIF Letter at 97–111; Data Boiler Letter at 31.

[2114] FIF Letter at 101; Data Boiler Letter at 31.

[2115] FIF Letter at 101.

[2116] FIF Letter at 111.

[2117] FIF Letter at 98.

[2118] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C–25.

[2119] *See* Section IV.D.13, *supra.*

[2120] Response Letter II at 4–5.

[2121] *See* Section IV.D.13.a(1), *supra.*

[2122] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 77565 (April 8, 2016), 81 FR 22136 (April 14, 2016).

[2123] Although not currently required in the Plan, the Commission believes there would be additional benefit to event sequencing if off-exchange execution venues, including alternative trading systems and broker-dealer internalizers, were required to adhere to a more stringent clock synchronization standard. As discussed in Section IV.D.13.a, the Commission understands that certain Industry Members, such as ATSs and broker-dealers that internalize off-exchange order flow, today adhere to a finer clock synchronization standard. As the Participants conduct their annual reviews, the Commission expects them to consider proposing new clock synchronization standards whenever they determine the industry standard for CAT Reporters, or certain categories or systems thereof, has become more granular than required by the Plan at that time. In determining the appropriate industry standards for clock synchronization, the Commission has amended the Plan so that the SROs should apply industry standards based on the type of CAT Reporter or system, rather than the industry as a whole. Varied requirements would segment the broker-dealer community, and one commenter stated a desire to ''avoid unnecessary market segmentation'' with regard to clock synchronization. *See* FSR Letter at 8. *See also* Section IV.D.13.a(1), *supra.* The Commission notes, however, that these venues are already segmented with respect to their position within the broker-dealer and also with respect to other broker-dealers that do not provide these services.

dealers that are not FINRA members (*see* Section V.E.1.a.(1)), regulators will be able to accurately sequence a proportion of those events, which will increase the overall number of sequenced events.[2124] In addition, the Commission continues to believe that, independent of the potential clock synchronization benefits, the order linking data that would be captured by the CAT should increase the proportion of events that could be sequenced accurately.[2125]

(4) Linking and Combining Data

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the requirements of Rule 613 and the Plan related to data linking would result in improvements to the accuracy of the data available to regulators, but the extent of the improvement would depend on the accuracy of the linking algorithm and the reformatting process that the Plan Processor would eventually develop. Specifically, the Commission discussed its belief that the requirement that data be stored in a uniform format would eliminate the need for regulators to reformat the data, and that storing data in a linked format removes the need for regulators to link information from multiple lifecycle events of an order or orders themselves, which could further reduce errors and increase the usability of the data. Furthermore, the Commission discussed its belief that the Plan would significantly improve the ability of regulators to link order events compared to OATS, and would link this activity to specific customers, unlike current audit trail data. However, the Commission also noted that the CAT NMS Plan does not provide sufficiently detailed information for the Commission to estimate the likely error rates associated with the linking process required by the CAT NMS Plan.[2126] Accordingly, while the centralized linking should generally promote efficiencies and accuracies, the Commission stated that these uncertainties make it difficult to gauge the degree to which the process for linking orders across market participants and SROs would improve accuracy compared to existing data, including OATS.[2127]

The Commission also explained that uncertainties prevented it from determining whether the process for converting data into a uniform format at the Central Repository would improve the accuracy of the data over existing audit trail accuracy rates.[2128] The Plan includes two alternative approaches to data conversion. In the first, called Approach 1, CAT Reporters would submit data to the Central Repository in an existing industry standard protocol of their choice such as the Financial Information eXchange (''FIX'') protocol. In Approach 2, CAT Reporters would submit data to the Central Repository in single mandatory specified format, such as an augmented version of the OATS protocol. Under Approach 1, the data must be converted into a uniform format at the Central Repository in a second step. Under Approach 2, the data is already in a uniform format at the time of submission. The Plan defers the decision regarding which approach to take until the selection of a Plan Processor and the development of Technical Specifications. The Commission explained its preliminary belief that Approach 1 would likely result in a lower Error Rate than Approach 2 because of increased efficiency and accuracy due to specialization by the Plan Processor.[2129] However, because of uncertainties regarding expected Error Rates and error rates in current data, the Commission was unable to evaluate the degree to which the approach would improve data accuracy relative to currently available data.[2130]

The Commission also discussed its belief that the Plan's requirement for standardized Allocation Reports that consistently and uniquely identify Customers and CAT Reporters should improve the linkability of allocation information compared to current data, despite the limitation of direct linkage to order lifecycles, particularly in scenarios where potentially violative conduct is carried out by market participants operating through multiple broker-dealers.[2131] The Commission stated that this moderate improvement in the linkability of allocation data should improve regulators' ability to identify market participants who commit violations related to improper subaccount allocations.

The Commission received two comment letters that agreed with the Commission's assessment that Plan provisions related to data linking would increase the overall accuracy of data available to regulators. One of these commenters stated that, ''the provisions in the CAT NMS Plan (linkage requirements, daisy chains, Firm Designated ID) will result in a more complete and accurate linking of order events across market participants and SROs.'' [2132] The other commenter agreed that data accuracy would improve.[2133]

Commenters also opined on whether data should be stored in a standardized format and on the relative economic effects of different approaches to data ingestion formats. One commenter stated that the Plan's requirement to store data in a standardized format would increase accuracy within that format, but on the other hand, transformation by CAT Reporters could introduce errors during the data submission process.[2134] The commenter further stated that using original data reduces the chance of introducing noise.[2135] Several commenters indicated that existing and widely used formats or protocols for data ingestion would promote better data accuracy.[2136] Some also noted that without a uniform data ingestion format, data quality would suffer.[2137]

The Commission received one comment related to the ability to link allocations under the Plan. Specifically, the commenter stated that an allocation report is ''undeniably useful for analytic[al] purpose[s],'' but noted challenges in linking account and subaccount information to which an execution is allocated.[2138]

[2124] Note that broker-dealers that are not FINRA members are not subject to FINRA's clock synchronization requirements and do not submit reports to OATS. Currently, their activity, to the extent it is captured, is captured and timestamped by exchanges and other FINRA members that receive their orders.

[2125] As discussed in the Notice, this reflects the fact that some records pertaining to the same order could be sequenced by their placement in an order without relying on timestamps. This information may also be used to partially sequence surrounding events. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at n.555.

[2126] While the 5% Error Rate covers data from CAT Reporters, the Plan Processor could create errors as well, for example, through the linking process. Further, the Plan does not include details on how the Plan Processor would perform the linking process, identify broken linkages, and seek corrected reports from CAT Reporters to correct broken linkages. Instead, the Plan defers key decisions regarding the validation process until the selection of a Plan Processor and the development of Technical Specifications. The CAT NMS Plan describes the Plan Processor's responsibility for creating the Technical Specifications. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.9.

[2127] The Commission notes that the Plan Processor is required to create a quality assurance testing environment in which, during industry-wide testing, the Plan Processor provides linkage processing of data submitted, the results of which are reported back to Participants and to the Operating Committee for review. *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 1.2. This may help identify challenges in the linking process and allow for their early resolution.

[2128] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30686.

[2129] *Id.*

[2130] *Id.*

[2131] *Id.*

[2132] FIF Letter at 96.

[2133] Data Boiler Letter at 31.

[2134] Data Boiler Letter at 31.

[2135] Data Boiler Letter at 18.

[2136] FIF Letter at 90–91; FIX Letter at 1; ICI Letter at 13; Better Markets Letter at 7–8.

[2137] Better Markets Letter at 7–8; UnaVista Letter at 2–3.

[2138] Data Boiler Letter at 24–25.

The Commission has considered the comment letters received, and continues to believe that the requirements of the Plan related to data linking would result in improvements to the accuracy of the data available to regulators. The Commission agrees with the commenter who stated that transforming data into a uniform format can introduce errors, but the Commission believes such errors will be less common and severe than those introduced currently by multiple regulators independently linking together many different data sources with different formats.[2139] The Commission agrees with the commenters that stated requiring existing and widely used formats for data ingestion would promote the accuracy of data. Because the Plan does not mandate an ingestion format, uncertainty exists as to what ingestion format (or formats) will be required and whether the ingestion format(s) ultimately selected will promote accuracy as much as alternatives. The Commission acknowledges this uncertainty. In response to the commenters that stated that data quality would suffer without a uniform data ingestion format, as specified in Approach 2, the Commission continues to believe that the benefits to data accuracy are potentially greater using Approach 1, where data is ingested in an existing industry standard protocol of the submitter's choice and subsequently converted to a uniform format at the Central Repository. The Commission believes this approach is more likely to benefit data accuracy because, as stated by a commenter, allowing the use of original data eliminates the introduction of errors and specialization by the Plan Processor should keep to a minimum the number of errors introduced during the conversion process.

With regards to the commenter who noted the challenges in linking allocation and sub-account information with executions using the Plan's approach, the Commission agrees that this approach may result in certain drawbacks, such as having access to less accurate allocation linkages compared to the approach under Rule 613, which required a link between allocations and executions.[2140] However, the Commission continues to believe, as set out in the Notice, that the Plan's Allocation approach will provide regulators with the necessary information to detect abuses in the allocation process without placing undue burdens on broker-dealers.

(5) Customer and Reporter IDs

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the inclusion of the unique Customer and CAT Reporter Identifiers described in the CAT NMS Plan would increase the accuracy of customer and broker-dealer information in data regulators use and provide benefits to a broad range of regulatory activities that involve audit trail data.[2141] The Commission explained that it is currently difficult for regulators to identify the trading of a single customer across multiple market participants because many existing data sources use inconsistent definitions and mappings across market centers.[2142] In addition, the Commission discussed how the Customer Information Approach specified in the CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to create a unique Customer-ID that would be consistent across that Customer's activity regardless of the originating broker-dealer.[2143] The Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the Customer-ID approach constitutes a significant improvement relative to the Baseline because it would consistently identify the Customer responsible for market activity, obviating the need for regulators to collect and reconcile Customer Identifying Information from multiple broker-dealers.

Also, in the Notice, the Commission discussed the challenges that regulators face in tracking broker-dealers' activities across markets due to inconsistent identifiers and a lack of a centralized database.[2144] The CAT NMS Plan calls for the use of CAT-Reporter-IDs, which would be assigned to each CAT Reporter by the Plan Processor in the CAT Data.[2145] In the Notice, the Commission stated that it preliminarily believed that the existing identifier approach specified in the CAT NMS Plan would improve the accuracy of tracking information regarding entities with reporting obligations, namely broker-dealers and SROs.

One commenter stated that there are ''flaws to the approaches of CAT Customer and Reporter Identifiers, thus it has little benefit to improve the accuracy of information.'' [2146] The commenter, however, did not list these flaws and did not provide specific reasons why the identifiers would not improve data accuracy. Another commenter stated that assigning a unique ID to ''every person that ever trades a security'' could render the data difficult to use, and that greater difficulties could arise from allowing broker-dealers to assign their own unique customer IDs.[2147] However, the commenter did not specify in detail what difficulties would arise or why the data would be difficult to use. That commenter noted that unique IDs for every client might be unnecessary, and suggested applying them only to those with a certain threshold of trading activity.[2148] Two commenters suggested that the use of the LEI would improve the accuracy of Customer Identifying Information. One commenter suggested that using LEIs would allow market participants to be ''easily identified,'' and also suggested that the LEI should be used to identify customers in conjunction with other recognized personal identifiers, to promote accurate identification.[2149] Another stated that using the LEI would allow for ''unambiguous identification'' of entities submitting information to the CAT system and would allow the SEC ''to be clear about the identity of entities it is monitoring.'' [2150]

In their response, the Participants stated that, based on discussions with the DAG, they agreed with the commenters that it would be reasonable to require an Industry Member to provide its own LEI and the LEIs of its customers to the CAT if the Industry Member has or acquires such LEIs.[2151]

[2139] *See* Section V.D.2.b.(2).C, *supra.*

[2140] In the Notice, the Commission discussed an alternative that would require the Rule 613 approach to allocation reporting linking. The Commission stated that linking allocations to order lifecycles would improve accuracy for many situations, particularly in one-to-one, one-to-many, and many-to-one allocations. Further, the Commission explained that broker-dealers likely already maintain records that allow them to ensure that the allocations receive fair prices based on market executions, and requested comment on whether those systems could provide a key to accurately link allocations to lifecycles in many-to-many allocations. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30757–58. One commenter, however, stated that the ''many-to-many relationships [between executions and allocations] do not allow unique linkages for all situations.'' *See* FIF Letter at 90. This commenter did not refute the accuracy improvements that could come from linking allocations to order lifecycles. Another commenter opined that broker-dealers should and can track order allocation information, including in the many-to-many situation. *See* Data Boiler at 40. Therefore, the Commission continues to believe that such linking would be beneficial relative to the Plan. However, the Commission also believes that allocation linking would be costly to implement, a belief supported by the commenter who provided additional information on the source of such costs. *See* FIF Letter at 90.

[2141] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30686–88.

[2142] *Id.*

[2143] *Id.*

[2144] *Id.*

[2145] *Id.*

[2146] Data Boiler Letter at 31.

[2147] Anonymous Letter I at 3.

[2148] Anonymous Letter I at 3.

[2149] UnaVista Letter at 3.

[2150] SIFMA Letter at 37.

[2151] Response Letter II at 5.

As discussed above, the Commission agrees with the commenters and the Participants and has modified the Plan to require the reporting of LEIs for Customers and Industry Members in certain circumstances.[2152]

The Commission has considered the comment letters received, the Participants' response, and modifications to the Plan. The Commission believes that limiting unique customer IDs to clients meeting a certain threshold of trading activity would significantly limit the benefits of the Plan in terms of accuracy.[2153] As discussed in more detail below, the Commission expects consistent Customer IDs to improve the ability of regulators to identify insider trading, manipulation and other potentially violative activity.[2154] The commenter that stated that assigning a unique ID to ''every person that ever trades a security'' could render the data difficult to use [2155] did not explain in detail what difficulties might arise. Similarly, the commenter that suggested that the accuracy benefits of the Plan would be limited due to ''flaws to the approaches of CAT Customer and Reporter Identifiers'' [2156] likewise did not provide any details as to these flaws or how they would affect the accuracy of the CAT Data. In light of the lack of specificity in these comment letters, the Commission continues to believe that the inclusion of unique Customer and Reporter Identifiers as described in the CAT NMS Plan would increase the accuracy of customer and broker-dealer information in data used by regulators.

The Commission is, however, updating its economic analysis to recognize modifications to the Plan to require the reporting of LEI as part of the Customer Identifying Information if the Customer has an LEI and the Industry Member has collected it, and as a part of identifying information for Industry Members in addition to the CRD number, if the Industry Member has an LEI.[2157] Currently, none of the sources of trade and order data discussed above in the Baseline include LEIs for Customers or Industry Members. Based on information provided by commenters who suggested the inclusion of LEI,[2158] supplemented by Commission Staff experience, the Commission believes that the inclusion of an LEI in CAT Data will improve the accuracy of CAT Data by enabling the linking of the data to other data sources such as foreign jurisdictions and domestic data not included in CAT at this time (*e.g.,* futures and security-based swaps), as LEIs become more widely used by regulators and the financial industry. In addition, the Commission expects the modification to improve the accuracy of the data by providing more information about the identities of Industry Members and Customers, including—as the LEI system starts to collect parent and subsidiary information—their relationships with other entities.[2159] The Commission notes, however, that the benefits of the LEI information will be limited insofar as the reporting of an LEI is required for Industry Members only where the Members already have an LEI, and for Customers only where the Customer has an LEI and the Industry Member has or acquires the LEI.[2160]

(6) Aggregation

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its belief that most CAT Data would be disaggregated data and that therefore the CAT Data would not suffer from the limitations of the aggregated data sources that regulators must currently use.[2161] Currently, subaccount allocation data and issuer repurchase data exist in forms that are aggregated and thus these data sources are limited for use in certain regulatory activities and interests.[2162] In particular, neither data type may necessarily indicate the individual executions. The Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the CAT NMS Plan would improve the accuracy of allocation data compared to existing data available to regulators, because it would provide disaggregated information on the identity of the security, the number of shares and price allocated to each subaccount, when the allocation took place, and how each Customer subaccount is associated with the master account. This would more accurately reflect which Customer ultimately received the shares that were purchased in a particular trade. The Commission anticipated that regulators may use CAT Data for some purposes that they use cleared data for now because the CAT Data would be significantly less aggregated. Finally, the Commission discussed its belief that because the Plan would require that the Plan Processor link Customer information to the order lifecycle and the report would identify as Customers those issuers that are repurchasing their stock in the open market,[2163] CAT Data would be more accurate and more granular and there would be more data than what is available currently for open market issuer repurchases, which consists of monthly aggregations of those issuer repurchases.

The Commission did not receive any comments regarding its analysis of data aggregation in the Notice, the Participants' response did not specifically address its analysis of data aggregation, and the Commission does not believe that modifications to the Plan warrant changes to this aspect of the economic analysis. The Commission continues to believe that CAT Data would constitute an improvement over current data sources because it would be disaggregated data that would not suffer from the limitations that characterize some of the aggregated data sources that regulators must currently use. Specifically, the Commission continues to believe that the Plan would promote more effective and efficient investigation by regulators of subaccount allocation issues and issuer repurchase activity.

c. Accessibility

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its belief that the Plan, if approved, would substantially improve the accessibility [2164] of regulatory data by providing regulators with direct access to the consolidated CAT Data, including some data elements that currently take weeks or months to obtain. However, the Commission also explained that there is some uncertainty regarding the process for regulatory access under the Plan, which creates uncertainty as to the degree of the expected improvement.[2165]

(1) Direct Access to Data

The Commission recognized in the Notice that improving accessibility of regulatory data relative to the Baseline requires ensuring that enough SRO and Commission Staff members are able to

[2152] *See* Sections IV.D.4.a.(4) and IV.D.4.b.(2), *supra,* for a description of the LEI reporting requirements in the Plan.

[2153] Anonymous Letter I at 3.

[2154] *See* Section IV.E.2.c., *infra.*

[2155] Anonymous Letter I at 3.

[2156] Data Boiler Letter at 31.

[2157] *See* Sections IV.D.4.a and IV.D.4.b, *supra.*

[2158] SIFMA Letter at 36–37; DTCC Letter at 1–6; UnaVista Letter at 3; Better Markets Letter at 8; Data Boiler Letter at 22.

[2159] SIFMA Letter at 37.

[2160] *See* Sections IV.D.4.a.(4) and IV.D.4.b.(2), *supra.*

[2161] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30688–89.

[2162] *Id.* at Section IV.D.2.b.(2)E. Item 703 of Regulation S–K requires issuers to report aggregated issuer repurchase data to the Commission on an annual and quarterly basis in Forms 10–K and 10–Q. 17 CFR 229.703.

[2163] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.4(d)(iv).

[2164] Accessibility refers to ''how the data is stored, how practical it is to assemble, aggregate, and process the data, and whether all appropriate regulators could acquire the data they need.'' *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30689.

[2165] *Id.* at 30689–91.

use the direct access system supplied by the Central Repository when they need it. The Commission discussed its belief that the ability to use the direct access system depends, among other things, on how user-friendly the system is, whether it has enough capacity for the expected use of the system, and whether it contains the functionality that the SRO and Commission Staff require. However, the Commission preliminarily believed that ''the minimum requirements for the direct access system ensure that the Plan will improve on the Baseline of access to current data, including the process of requesting data.[2166]

In the Notice, the Commission discussed in detail the minimum functional and technical requirements, as set out in Appendix D of the Plan.[2167] In terms of capacity, the Commission noted, among other things, that the Central Repository must be able to support a minimum of 3,000 regulatory users within the system, 600 of which might be accessing the system concurrently (which must be possible without an unacceptable decline in system performance). In terms of functionality, the Commission noted that two types of query interfacing must be supported—an online targeting query tool and a user-defined direct query tool that allows for bulk extraction.[2168] The Commission further noted that all queries must be able to be run against raw (*i.e.,* unlinked) or processed data, or both, and that a variety of minimum performance metrics apply to those queries.

The Commission noted that the direct access facilitated by provisions of the CAT NMS Plan is reasonably designed to substantially reduce the number of ad hoc data requests and provide access to substantial data without the delays and costly time and knowledge investments associated with the need to create and respond to data requests.[2169] The Commission believed that this would dramatically reduce the hundreds of thousands of requests that regulators must make each year in order to obtain data, thus reducing the burden on the industry. For example, the Commission noted that regulators do not have direct access to EBS or trade blotter data and therefore they must request such data when needed for regulatory tasks. As a result, in 2014 the Commission made 3,722 EBS requests that generated 194,696 letters to broker-dealers for EBS data. Likewise, the Commission understood that FINRA requests generate about half this number of letters. In addition, the Commission noted that for examinations of investment advisers and investment companies, it makes approximately 1,200 data requests per year. The Commission also discussed its belief that, in addition to decreasing the amount of time currently required for regulators to access data sources, direct access to the CAT Data should decrease the costs that many regulators and market participants incur in either requesting data or fulfilling requests for data. Furthermore, the Commission discussed its belief that the Plan would also permit regulators to directly access customer information, which could improve the ability of SROs to conduct surveillance.[2170]

The Commission also discussed its belief that in some dimensions of accessibility, uncertainties exist that could affect the degree of the expected improvement to accessibility. In particular, while the Plan provides detail on the method of access and the types of queries that regulators could run, many of the decisions regarding access have been deferred until after the Plan Processor is selected and finalizes the Technical Specifications.[2171] For instance, decisions regarding exactly how regulators would access the data beyond providing them with query tools; how user-friendly these tools will be; whether the Plan Processor would host a server workspace that regulators could use; and whether regulators can perform dynamic searches, data extraction, and offline analysis have not yet been decided. Nonetheless, the Commission stated that the requirements included in the Plan describe a system that, once implemented, would result in the ability to query consolidated data sources, which represents a significant improvement over the currently available systems. This substantial reduction in data delays and costly data investments would permit regulators to complete market reconstructions, analyses, and research projects, as well as investigations and examinations, more effectively and efficiently, and would lead to improved productivity in the array of regulatory matters that rely on data, which should lead to improved investor protection.[2172]

One commenter argued that ''the online targeted query tool and user-defined direct queries and bulk extracts methods will not enable regulatory staff to use the data.'' [2173] This is because these methods do not embed real-time analytics that would allow the system to automatically red-flag suspicious trade activities.[2174] The same commenter agreed that the direct access regulators will have to CAT Data ''would help reduce the number of ad-hoc data requests.'' [2175] The commenter estimated that such a reduction in the number of data requests would result in cost savings of ''about 5%, but definitely not over 10%.'' [2176] However, the commenter did not provide any additional information or details to support that estimate.

A second commenter also agreed that the reduction in ad hoc data requests would result in cost savings, stating that the costs associated with responding to EBS requests ''will be reduced over time as regulators would no longer need to make EBS inquiries for data that already resides in CAT.'' [2177] However, that commenter did not provide any specific estimates of these savings.

Two commenters agreed with the Commission that there is some uncertainty regarding the process for regulatory access to CAT Data.[2178] In particular, one commenter stated that the Plan does not provide details of the technical or procedural mechanisms on how the regulators will access the online targeted query tool or submit user-defined direct queries.[2179] The commenter noted that the Plan does not provide any specifics on the types of technologies or systems that would be required for regulators to download the data or connect to the API to be made available by the Plan Processor.[2180] Furthermore, the commenter pointed out that although the Plan Processor is required to support a minimum of 300 simultaneous query requests with no performance degradation, the Plan does

[2166] *Id.* at 30689.

[2167] *Id.* at 30689–90, citing CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 8.

[2168] The Commission further explained that the online targeting query tool must include a date or time range, or both, and allow users to choose from a broad menu of 26 pre-defined selection criteria (*e.g.,* data type, listing market, size, price, CAT-Reporter-ID, Customer-ID, or CAT-Order-ID), with more to be defined at a later date. Results must be viewable in the tool or downloadable in a variety of formats and support at least a result size of 5,000 or 10,000 records, respectively, with a maximum result size to be determined by the Plan Processor. With the user-defined direct query or bulk extraction, CAT must be able to support at least 3,000 daily queries, including 1,800 concurrently, and up to 300 simultaneous query requests, with no performance degradation. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30689–90.

[2169] *Id.* at 30690.

[2170] *Id.*

[2171] *Id.* at 30691.

[2172] *Id.*

[2173] Data Boiler Letter at 26.

[2174] Data Boiler Letter at 10–13.

[2175] Data Boiler Letter at 31.

[2176] Data Boiler Letter at 38.

[2177] FIF Letter at 34–35.

[2178] SIFMA Letter at 32, 39–41; Data Boiler Letter at 26.

[2179] SIFMA Letter at 39.

[2180] SIFMA Letter at 41.

not define a baseline performance for dynamic search against which the performance degradation could be compared.[2181] The commenter noted that the Plan requires the Plan Processor to provide such details at least six months before the Participants begin reporting data to the Central Repository.[2182] The commenter stated that there is a risk that six months will be insufficient for regulators to implement any changes necessary in order to be able to use the tools offered by the Plan Processor, and that this could delay regulators' ability to access the CAT Data.[2183] The other commenter noted generally that there are insufficient details regarding how regulators would access, use and analyze CAT Data, and how regulators' end-use requirements would be addressed.[2184]

In their response, the Participants argued that the Plan does provide sufficient detail regarding regulatory access to CAT Data.[2185] In particular, the Participants noted that Section 8 of Appendix D of the Plan describes various tools that will be used for surveillance and analytics. In addition, the Participants noted that the Plan states that the Plan Processor will provide an open API that allows regulators to use analytic tools and will permit regulators to use ODBC/JDBC drivers to access the CAT Data.[2186]

The Commission has considered the comments it received regarding the potential benefits of the CAT NMS Plan in terms of the accessibility of regulatory data, as well as the Participants' response. Commenters did not provide any additional information or analysis that changes the Commission's conclusions as set out in the Notice, and there have been no modifications to the Plan that would warrant changes.

With respect to the comment that an online targeted query tool and a user-defined direct query tool will not enable regulatory Staff to use CAT Data,[2187] the Commission disagrees with the commenter's assertion that regulators cannot benefit from direct access to CAT Data unless CAT embeds real-time analytics. In the Notice, the Commission discussed two ways in which regulators could benefit from having direct access to CAT Data facilitated by the availability of an online targeted query tool and a user-defined direct query tool.[2188] First, direct access to CAT Data could substantially reduce the number of ad hoc data requests and decrease the costs that many regulators currently incur in requesting data. Second, the Plan would permit regulators to directly access customer information, which could improve the ability of SROs to conduct surveillance, among other benefits discussed below.[2189] Because these benefits of direct access do not depend on the ability of CAT to embed real-time analytics, the Commission continues to believe that the methods of direct access specified in the Plan will improve the accessibility of regulatory data relative to the Baseline.

With respect to the comment that the reduction in the number of data requests would result in cost savings to SROs of ''about 5%,'' but ''definitely not more than 10%,'' [2190] the Commission notes that the commenter did not explain the basis for its estimate. The Commission acknowledged in the Notice that it lacks the necessary information to estimate the magnitude of these cost savings, and this continues to be the case, as the Commission has not received any additional information it can use to estimate the savings. However, the Commission continues to believe that direct access to CAT Data should decrease the costs that many regulators and market participants incur in either requesting data or fulfilling requests for data.

With respect to the comments about uncertainties regarding the process for regulatory access to CAT Data,[2191] the Commission agrees with the commenter that, as discussed in the Notice, there is some uncertainty regarding the process for regulatory access under the Plan. The Commission notes that while the Plan provides detail on the method of access and the type of queries that regulators could run, many of the decisions regarding access have been deferred until after the Plan Processor is selected and finalizes the Technical Specifications. In particular, as discussed in the Notice, the details of functionality and performance of the final CAT System are still to be determined.[2192] The Commission continues to believe that these functionality and performance uncertainties create some uncertainty regarding the degree of improvement in regulatory access that will result from the Plan. The Commission agrees that is possible that, as one commenter noted,[2193] the deferral of these decisions could result in a delay in regulators' ability to access the CAT Data. However, the Commission continues to believe that the Plan will substantially improve the accessibility [2194] of regulatory data relative to the Baseline by providing regulators with direct access to the CAT Data.

(2) Consolidation of Data

In the Notice, the Commission stated that it preliminarily believed that the Plan would improve accessibility by consolidating various data elements into one combined source, reducing data fragmentation.[2195] Currently, audit trail data for securities that are traded on multiple venues (multiple exchanges or off-exchange venues) is fragmented across multiple data sources, with each regulator generally having direct access only to data generated on the trading venues it regulates.[2196] The Commission explained that the Plan would bring audit trail data related to trading on all venues into the Central Repository where it could be accessed by all regulators. Additionally, the Commission noted that Rule 613 requires that the Plan include both equity and options data.[2197] Because no existing regulatory audit trail data source includes both options and equities data, the Notice discussed the fact that collecting this data and providing access would allow regulators to monitor and run surveillance on the activity of market participants in related instruments, such as when a market participant has activity in both options and the options' underlying assets. The Commission noted that the Plan would also marginally increase the accessibility of historical exchange data. In particular, Section 6.5(b)(i) of the

[2181] SIFMA Letter at 40.

[2182] SIFMA Letter at 39.

[2183] *Id.*

[2184] Data Boiler Letter at 26.

[2185] Response Letter I at 42.

[2186] Response Letter I at 42, citing CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 8.2. A discussion of the types of data tools that Bidders proposed to support can be found in Appendix C, Section A.2(b) of the Plan. ODBC (Open Database Connectivity) is an open standard API (Application Programming Interface) for accessing a database. JDBC (Java Database Connectivity) is an API for the programming language Java, which defines how a client may access a database.

[2187] Data Boiler Letter at 10–13, 26.

[2188] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30690.

[2189] *See* Section V.E.2, *infra,* for a discussion of various regulatory activities that direct access to data will improve.

[2190] Data Boiler Letter at 38.

[2191] SIFMA Letter at 32, 39–41.

[2192] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30691.

[2193] SIFMA Letter at 39.

[2194] Accessibility refers to ''how the data is stored, how practical it is to assemble, aggregate, and process the data, and whether all appropriate regulators could acquire the data they need.'' *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30689.

[2195] *Id.* at 30690.

[2196] The Commission recognizes that FINRA collects data from exchanges for which it provides regulatory services. However, this data is sent to FINRA by the exchanges with a delay, and the data formats are not standardized prior to receipt at FINRA.

[2197] 17 CFR 242.613(c)(5), (c)(6).

Plan requires that the Central Repository make historical data available for not less than six years, in a manner that is directly accessible and searchable electronically without manual intervention by the Plan Processor.[2198]

The Commission did not receive any comments on this aspect of accessibility, and there have not been any modifications to the Plan related to this aspect of the Commission's analysis. The Commission therefore continues to believe that the Plan will improve accessibility relative to the Baseline by consolidating various data elements into one combined source, reducing data fragmentation.

d. Timeliness

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its belief that, if approved, the CAT NMS Plan would significantly improve the timeliness [2199] of reporting, compiling, and accessing regulatory data, which would benefit a wide array of regulatory activities that use or could use audit trail data. The Commission discussed its belief that the timeline for compiling and reporting data pursuant to the Plan would constitute an improvement over the processes currently in place for many existing data sources and that, relative to some data sources, the improvement would be dramatic. Specifically, under the Plan, CAT Data would be compiled and made ready for access faster than is the case today for some data, both in raw and in corrected form; regulators would be able to query and manipulate the CAT Data without going through a lengthy data request process; and the data would be in a format to make it more immediately useful for regulatory purposes.[2200]

In terms of initial access to the data, the Commission discussed its belief that the Plan would require CAT Reporters to report data to the Central Repository at times that are on par with current audit trails that require reporting, but the Central Repository would compile [2201] the data for initial access sooner than some other such data.[2202] For example, equity and option clearing data currently are not compiled and reported to the NSCC and the OCC until T+3, and data in EBS reports are not compiled and reported to a centralized database until a request is received.[2203] OATS data is initially reported to FINRA by 8:00 a.m. ET on the calendar day following the reportable event, and it takes approximately 24 hours for FINRA to run validation checks on the file, though SROs do not currently access OATS information for regulatory purposes until after the error correction process is complete.[2204]

Furthermore, the Commission discussed the fact that, to the extent that access to the raw (*i.e.,* uncorrected and unlinked) data would be useful for regulatory purposes, the CAT NMS Plan provides a way for SROs and the Commission to access the uncorrected and unlinked data on T+1 by 12:00 p.m. ET at the latest.[2205] Under the Plan, this access would be at least several days sooner than OATS is available to non-FINRA regulators. In the Notice, the Commission acknowledged that the Plan would not necessarily improve the timeliness of audit trail data in every case or for every regulator. For example, exchange SROs already have real-time access to their own audit trail data.[2206] However, regulators at other SROs or the Commission do not have real-time access to that audit trail data, and therefore the Commission stated that it preliminarily believed that CAT Data could be more timely for these other regulators to access and use than obtaining that exchange's audit trail data through other means.[2207]

In terms of timeliness of access to error-corrected data, the Commission stated in the Notice that it preliminarily believed that the error correction process required by the CAT NMS Plan is reasonably designed to provide additional improvements in timeliness for corrected data. The Plan specifies that the initial data validation and communication of errors to CAT Reporters must occur by noon on T+1 and that corrections of these errors must be submitted by the CAT Reporters to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+3, with the corrected data made available to the regulators by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+5.[2208] During this interim time period between initial processing and corrected data availability, ''all iterations'' of processed data must be available for regulatory use.[2209] The Central Repository must be able to receive error corrections at *any* time, even if late; [2210] if corrections are received after T+5, the Plan Processor must notify the SEC and SROs of this fact and describe how re-processing of the data (to be determined in conjunction with the Operating Committee) would be completed.[2211] Customer information (*i.e.,* information containing PII) is processed along a slightly different timeline, but the outcome—corrected data available by 8:00 a.m. ET on T+5—is the same.[2212] One exception to this timeline is if the Plan Processor has not received a significant portion of the data, as determined according to the Plan Processor's monitoring, in which case the Plan Processor could determine to halt processing pending submission of that data.[2213] The Commission noted that the error resolution process for OATS is limited to five business days from the date a rejection becomes available.[2214] The CAT NMS Plan requires a three-day repair window for the Central Repository.[2215] Accordingly, the Commission stated that if the Plan were approved, regulators would generally be able to access partially and fully corrected data earlier than they would for OATS.[2216]

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its belief that improvements

[2198] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(b)(i). Currently, broker-dealers retain data for six years, but exchanges are only required to retain data for five years. In practice, the Commission understands that most exchanges generally retain data for at least six years, but at least one exchange does not retain data for six or more years. Therefore, the CAT NMS Plan would improve the historical data available from at least one exchange.

[2199] Timeliness refers to when the data is available to regulators and how long it would take to process before it could be used for regulatory analysis. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30691.

[2200] *Id.*

[2201] Compiling data refers ''to a process that aggregates individual data records into a data set. This could occur when regulators request data and when the regulators receive data from multiple providers. This is different from the act of reporting data.'' *Id.*

[2202] *Id.* at 30691–92.

[2203] *Id.*

[2204] *Id.*

[2205] *Id.* at 30691.

[2206] Under the Plan, SROs that are exchanges would still have the same real-time access to their own audit trail data as they currently do. The Commission does not expect that all SRO audit trails will be retired on implementation of the Plan because exchanges may use such audit trails to implement their CAT reporting responsibilities. CAT reporting requirements would require that exchanges collect and report audit trail information from their systems even if they elect to replace their current audit trails. However, CAT requirements may improve the completeness of real-time exchange audit trail data if the information that exchanges collect under the Plan is more complete than what they currently collect.

[2207] As noted, the SROs are generally currently able to access their own audit trail data on the same day of an event and the Commission is currently able to access some public data, like SIP and MIDAS, on the same day as an event. Further, OATS is available to FINRA at 8 a.m. on the day following an event. The Commission preliminarily does not expect the CAT NMS Plan would affect these regulators' access to most of these respective data sources.

[2208] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.2(a), Appendix D, Section 6.1.

[2209] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 6.2.

[2210] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3.(b), Appendix D, Section 7.4.

[2211] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 6.2.

[2212] *Id.*

[2213] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 6.1.

[2214] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.D.2.b.(4) and n.465.

[2215] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.2(a).

[2216] CAT Data being available on T+5 may be later than for other current SRO audit trails.

to timeliness would also result from the ability of regulators to directly access CAT Data.[2217] The Commission discussed the fact that most current data sources do not provide direct access to most regulators and explained that data requests can take as long as weeks or even months to process. Other data sources provide direct access with queries that can sometimes generate results in minutes—for example, running a search on all MIDAS message traffic in one day can take up to 30 minutes [2218]—but only for a limited subset of the data to be available in CAT and generally only for a limited number of regulators. Accordingly, the Commission stated that it preliminarily believed that the ability of regulators to directly access and analyze the scope of audit trail data that would be stored in the Central Repository should reduce the delays that are currently associated with requesting and receiving data. Furthermore, the Commission discussed its belief that direct access to CAT Data should reduce the costs of making ad hoc data requests, including costs arising from extensive interactions with data liaisons and IT staff at broker-dealers, SROs, and vendors, developing specialized knowledge of varied formats, data structures, and systems, and reconciling data.

The Commission also stated that it preliminarily expected that the CAT NMS Plan would reduce the time required to process data before analysis.[2219] The Commission explained that currently, regulators can spend days and up to months processing data they receive into a useful format.[2220] Part of this delay is due to the need to combine data across sources that could have non-uniform formats and to link data about the same event both within and across data sources. These kinds of linking processes can require sophisticated data techniques and substantial assumptions and can result in imperfectly linked data. The Commission noted that the Plan addresses this issue by stating that the Plan Processor must store the data in a linked uniform format.[2221] Specifically, the Commission discussed how the Central Repository will use a ''daisy chain'' approach to link and reconstruct the complete lifecycle of each Reportable Event, including all related order events from all CAT Reporters involved in that lifecycle. Therefore, regulators accessing the data in a linked uniform format would no longer need to take additional time to process the data into a uniform format or to link the data.[2222] Accordingly, the Commission stated that it preliminarily believed that the Plan would reduce or eliminate the delays associated with merging and linking order events within the same lifecycle and that the Plan would improve the timeliness of FINRA's access to the data it uses for much of its surveillance by several days because the corrected and linked CAT Data would be accessible on T+5 compared to FINRA's T+8 access to its corrected and linked data combining OATS with exchange audit trails.[2223]

The Commission also discussed its belief that the expected improvements to data accuracy could result in an increase in the timeliness of data that is ready for analysis, although uncertainty exists regarding the extent of this benefit. The Commission explained that regulators currently take significant time to ensure data is accurate beyond the time that it takes data sources to validate data and that, in some cases, data users may engage in a lengthy iterative process involving a back and forth with the staff of a data provider in order to obtain accurate data necessary for a regulatory inquiry. Accordingly, the Commission stated that, to the extent that the Central Repository's validation process is sufficiently reliable and complete, the duration of the error resolution process regulators would perform with CAT Data may be shorter than for current data. Further, to the extent that the Central Repository's linking and reformatting processes are sufficiently successful, the SROs and Commission may not need a lengthy process to ensure the receipt of accurate data. However, the Commission noted that it lacked sufficient information on the validations, linking, and reformatting processes needed to draw a strong conclusion as to whether users would take less time to validate CAT Data than they take on current data. Nonetheless, the Commission preliminarily believed that the linking and reformatting processes at the Central Repository would be more accurate than the current decentralized processes such that it would reduce the time that regulators spend linking and reformatting data prior to use.

The Commission received comments on the improvements in timeliness from the Plan. Two commenters suggested that CAT Data would not be timely enough because it is reported too late.[2224] One commenter called the reporting deadline (8:00 a.m. ET on T+1) an ''extraordinarily lax reporting time frame.'' [2225] Another commenter argued that the T+5 schedule for regulatory access to corrected CAT Data is ''useless in terms of effective market surveillance in prevention of threats to the U.S. financial stability'' because a ''huge loss can be accumulated within [a] split-second'' and ''market collapse does not take more than one day.'' [2226] Furthermore, although the commenter agreed that ''CAT offers the regulators on-demand query of delayed data that saves them multiple trips to request data from the financial institutions,'' he opined that this ''does not necessarily mean timeliness improvement.'' [2227]

The Participants' response provided additional information on error correction timelines for customer information and PII. Specifically, the Participants' response identified an errant discussion of these error correction timelines in the Plan, and clarified that the Plan Processor must validate customer data and generate error reports no later than 5:00 p.m. ET on T+1, and stated that they believe the two day period for error correction is sufficient for CAT Reporters to correct errors in customer data.[2228]

The Commission has considered the comments it received regarding the potential of the Plan to improve timeliness. As discussed below, the commenters did not provide any additional information or analysis that the Commission believes would warrant changes to its analysis or conclusions as set out in the Notice.

The Commission disagrees with the commenter that characterized the next day reporting of CAT Data as an ''extraordinarily lax reporting time frame,'' and with the commenter that argued that the T+5 schedule for regulatory access to corrected CAT Data is insufficient.[2229] As discussed further above,[2230] the Commission considered whether CAT Reporters should be

[2217] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30692 (citing CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, Section 6.5(c)).

[2218] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.D.2.b.(4) and n.468.

[2219] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30693.

[2220] *See* Table 1, Section V.D.2.b, *supra.*

[2221] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(b)(i). The CAT NMS Plan does not link allocations to order events. *See also* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(1).

[2222] The daisy chain approach is used to link and reconstruct the complete lifecycle of each Reportable Event in CAT. According to this approach, CAT Reporters assign their own identifiers to each order event that the Plan Processor later replaces with a single identifier (the CAT Order-ID) for all order events pertaining to the same order. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30691.

[2223] *Id.* at 30693.

[2224] Data Boiler Letter at 18; Better Markets Letter at 6.

[2225] Better Markets Letter at 6.

[2226] Data Boiler Letter at 26.

[2227] Data Boiler Letter at 32.

[2228] Response Letter I at 30.

[2229] Data Boiler Letter at 26.

[2230] *See* Section IV.D.3, *supra.*

required to report data in real-time when it adopted Rule 613 under Regulation NMS.[2231] While the Commission acknowledged that there might be advantages to receiving data intraday, the Commission stated that the greater majority of benefits that may be realized from development of the CAT do not require real-time reporting.[2232] Furthermore, many SROs have real-time access to data generated on exchanges they operate, and can and do use this data for real-time surveillance of activity occurring on those exchanges As discussed in the Notice, the T+5 schedule improves the timeliness of regulatory access to corrected data relative to the Baseline in two ways.[2233] First, corrected OATS data is currently available to FINRA at T+8.[2234] Under the Plan, regulators will be able to access corrected CAT Data three days earlier than that (*i.e.,* T+5). Second, the ability of regulators to directly access CAT Data will improve timeliness.[2235] Most current data sources do not provide direct access to most regulators, and data requests can take as long as weeks or even months to process. Therefore, for many purposes, the T+5 schedule for regulatory access to corrected CAT Data will be up to many weeks more timely relative to the Baseline.

The Commission also disagrees with the comment that the ability of regulators to directly access CAT Data will not result in improvement in timeliness.[2236] The comment does not dispute that data requests can take time to process and it does not provide any specificity in arguing that direct access would not improve timeliness that undermines the Commission's belief that direct access will make CAT Data up to many weeks more timely. This represents an important improvement in timeliness over the Baseline.

Regarding the Participants' response, the Commission does not believe the clarification regarding the timeline for communication of errors for customer and account information would warrant changes to its analysis or conclusions regarding timeliness. The Commission notes that the Plan states that 5:00 p.m. ET on T+1 is the deadline for communication of errors for customer and account information, including PII.[2237] In separate exposition, the Plan mistakenly discussed 12:00 p.m. ET on T+3 as the deadline for validation of data and generation of error reports for CAT PII data.[2238] These two statements are in conflict because they describe different reporting deadlines for the same types of errors. However, the Commission is amending the Plan to correct that error.[2239] In the Notice, the Commission states that customer information has a separate error correction timeline with the same outcome in terms of the availability of corrected data to regulators; this analysis was not dependent on the time at which error messages were sent to CAT Reporters.[2240] Consequently, the clarification of this timeline does not affect the Commission's analysis. Furthermore, the Commission notes that commenters did not raise questions on the mistake and seem to have understood that the deadline for error reports on PII was 5:00 p.m. ET on T+1.

2. Improvements to Regulatory Activities

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that improvements in the quality of available data have the potential to result in improvements in the analysis and reconstruction of market events; market analysis and research in support of regulatory decisions; and market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions.[2241] The Commission discussed its belief that the ability of regulators to perform analyses and reconstruction of market events would likely improve if the CAT NMS Plan were approved, because it would allow regulators to provide investors and other market participants with more timely and accurate explanations of market events, and to develop more effective responses to such events. Furthermore, availability of CAT Data would benefit market analysis and research in support of regulatory decisions, by facilitating an improved understanding of markets that will inform potential policy decisions. The Commission also discussed how regulatory initiatives that are based on an accurate understanding of underlying events and are narrowly tailored to address any market deficiency should improve market quality and benefit investors.

The Commission also explained that, in its preliminary view, the Plan would substantially improve both the efficiency and effectiveness of SRO broad market surveillance, which could benefit investors and market participants by allowing SROs to more quickly and precisely identify and address a higher proportion of market violations that occur, as well as prevent violative behavior through deterrence.

The Commission discussed in the Notice its expectation that CAT Data would enhance the SROs' and the Commission's abilities to effectively target risk-based examinations of market participants who are at elevated risk of violating market rules, as well as their abilities to conduct those examinations efficiently and effectively, which could also contribute to the identification and resolution of a higher proportion of violative behavior in the markets. Accordingly, the reduction of violative behavior in the market should benefit investors by providing them with a safer environment for allocating their capital and making financial decisions, and it could also benefit market participants whose business activities are harmed by the violative behavior of other market participants. The Commission further discussed how more targeted examinations could benefit market participants by resulting in proportionately fewer burdensome examinations of compliant market participants.

The Commission also explained that a significant percentage of Commission enforcement actions involve trade and order data,[2242] and that it preliminarily believed CAT Data would significantly improve the efficiency and efficacy of enforcement investigations by the Commission and SROs, including

[2231] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 13, at 45765. Indeed, Rule 613 stated that the CAT NMS Plan may not impose a reporting deadline earlier than 8:00 a.m. ET. 17 CFR 242.613(c)(3).

[2232] *Id.*

[2233] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.E.1.d(2) and Section IV.E.1.d(3).

[2234] *Id.* at 30673.

[2235] *Id.* at 30692.

[2236] Data Boiler Letter at 32.

[2237] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 6.2.

[2238] *Id.*

[2239] *See* note 1555, *supra.*

[2240] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30692.

[2241] *Id.* at 30693–99.

[2242] In 2015, the Commission filed 807 enforcement actions, including 39 related to insider trading, 43 related to market manipulation, 124 related to broker-dealers, 126 related to investment advisers/investment companies, and one related to exchange or SRO duties, many of which involved trade and order data. In 2014, the Commission filed 755 enforcement actions, including 52 related to insider trading, 63 related to market manipulation, 166 related to broker-dealers, and 130 related to investment advisers/investment companies, many of which also involved trade and order data. *See* Year-by-Year SEC Enforcement Statistics, *available at https://www.sec.gov/news/newsroom/images/enfstats.pdf.* The total number of actions filed is not necessarily the same as the number of investigations. An investigation may result in no filings, one filing, or multiple filings. Additionally, trade and order data may be utilized in enforcement investigations that do not lead to any filings. Based on these numbers, the Commission estimates that 30–50% of its enforcement actions incorporate trading or order data. A portion of FINRA's 1,397 disciplinary actions in 2014 and 1,512 in 2015 also involved trading or order data. *See http://www.finra.org/newsroom/statistics.*

insider trading and manipulation investigations.

The Commission also stated that it as well as the SROs anticipated additional benefits associated with enhanced abilities to handle tips, complaints and referrals, and improvements in the speed with which they could be addressed, particularly in connection with the significant number of tips, complaints, and referrals that relate to manipulation, insider trading, or other trading and pricing issues.[2243] The Commission explained that the benefits to investor protection of an improved tips, complaints, and referrals system would largely mirror the benefits to investor protection that would accrue through improved surveillance and examinations efficiency.

As discussed more fully below, the Commission has considered the comments it received regarding the likely benefits to regulatory activities, the Participants' response, and modifications to the Plan, and continues to believe that the CAT NMS Plan would generate improvements to regulatory activities, particularly in the analysis and reconstruction of market events; market analysis and research in support of regulatory decisions; and market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement activities.

a. Analysis and Reconstruction of Market Events

In the Notice, the Commission discussed the reasons for its preliminary belief that the Plan would improve regulators' ability to perform analysis and reconstruction of market events.[2244] As noted in the Adopting Release, the sooner regulators can complete a market reconstruction, the sooner regulators can begin reviewing an event to determine what happened, who was affected and how, if any regulatory responses might be required to address the event, and what shape such responses should take.[2245] Furthermore, the improved ability for regulators to generate prompt and complete market reconstructions could provide improved market knowledge, which could assist regulators in conducting retrospective analysis of their rules and pilots.

The Commission discussed how the fragmented nature of current audit trail data and the lack of direct access to such data renders market reconstructions cumbersome and time-consuming.[2246] Currently, the information needed to perform these analyses is spread across multiple audit trails, with some residing in broker-dealer order systems and trade blotters. Requesting the data necessary for a reconstruction of a market event often takes weeks or months and, once received, regulators then need weeks to reconcile disparate data formats used in different data sources. Some of the most detailed data sources, including sources like EBS and trade blotters that identify customers, are impractical for broad-based reconstructions of market events. In particular, including EBS data for a reconstruction of trading in the market for even one security on one day could involve many, perhaps hundreds, of requests, and would require linking that to SRO audit trail data or public data.[2247] Further, because EBS data lacks timestamps for certain trades,[2248] the Commission discussed how the use of EBS data in market reconstructions requires supplementation with data from other sources, such as trade blotters.

The Commission stated that it expected that improvements in data completeness and accuracy from the Plan would enhance regulators' ability to perform analyses and to reach conclusions faster in the wake of a market event by reducing the time needed to collect, consolidate and link the data.[2249] Specifically, the inclusion of Customer-IDs and consistent CAT-Reporter-IDs in the CAT Data would allow regulators to more effectively and efficiently identify market participants that submit orders through several broker-dealers and execute on multiple exchanges and whose activity may warrant further analysis. The Commission discussed its belief that this would be useful if regulators were interested in determining if a particular trader or category of traders had some role in causing the market event, or how they might have adjusted their behavior in response to the event, which could amplify the effects of the root cause or causes. Furthermore, the Commission discussed how the clock synchronization requirements of the Plan would improve the ability of regulators to sequence some events that happened in different market centers to better identify the causes of market events. Overall, the Commission stated that it preliminarily believed that the CAT NMS Plan would dramatically improve the ability of regulators to identify the market participants involved in market events.

The Commission also preliminarily believed that better data accessibility from the Plan would significantly improve the ability of regulators to analyze and reconstruct market events. Because CAT Data would link Reportable Events, the Plan could allow regulators to respond to market events more rapidly because they would not need to process corrected and linked data before starting their analyses.

The Commission received one comment on the fragmented nature of current audit trail data and the potential benefits of CAT Data to improve the ability of regulators to perform analysis and reconstructions of market events. That commenter agreed with the Commission that the fragmented nature of current data sources poses challenges to regulators seeking complete data,[2250] however, the commenter also stated that the potential benefits that CAT Data would provide regulators in terms of conducting analysis and market reconstructions are minimal.[2251] The Participants did not provide responses to these concerns.

In the Commission's view, this comment did not provide any additional information or analysis that warrants

[2243] In fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the Commission received around 15,000 entries in its TCR system, approximately one third of which related to manipulation, insider trading, market events, or other trading and pricing issues.

[2244] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30694–95.

[2245] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45732.

[2246] During the financial crisis in 2008, the lack of direct access to audit trail data resulted in the Commission being unable to quickly and efficiently reconstruct market events. The state of OATS data in 2008 also limited FINRA's ability to analyze and reconstruct the market during the financial crisis because FINRA could not yet augment its OATS data with exchange data and OATS did not include market maker quotations. As a result, regulators had little information about the role of short sellers in market events and the identity of short sellers during the financial crisis, for example. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30694–95.

[2247] *Id.* at Section IV.E.2.a (noting that in 2014, the SEC made 3,722 EBS requests which generated 194,696 letters to broker-dealers requesting EBS data). The Commission understands that FINRA makes about half this number of requests.

[2248] Large traders who file Form 13H with the Commission are assigned a ''large trader identification number'' by the Commission and must provide that number to their brokers for inclusion in the EBS records that are maintained by the clearing brokers. Rule 13h–1, subject to relief granted by the Commission, requires that execution time be captured (to the second) for certain categories of large traders. *Id.* at Section IV.D.2.a(3) and Section IV.D.2.b (discussing the EBS system and large trader reports and the limitations of these data sources in performing market reconstructions).

[2249] The Commission stated that the lack of readily available trade and order data resulted in delays and gaps in the Commission's analysis of the events of the Flash Crash. It was also unable to quickly and efficiently conduct analysis and reconstruction of markets events, particularly around the financial crisis. Furthermore, the Commission and SROs have faced similar challenges when reconstructing events around the May 2012 Facebook IPO, the August 2012 Knight Securities ''glitch,'' and the August 2013 NASDAQ SIP outage. *Id.* at 30694–95.

[2250] Data Boiler Letter at 30.

[2251] Data Boiler Letter at 33.

changes to the analysis or conclusions in the Notice. The commenter stated that ''the plan is majoring in the minors (*i.e.,* overemphasis on storage, and not enough coverage of pattern recognition).'' [2252] The Commission disagrees. While the Commission has emphasized aspects of storage as in the Notice,[2253] the Commission has also emphasized that improvements in data completeness and accuracy would greatly assist regulators in performing analyses and reconstructing market events. The inclusion of Customer-IDs and CAT-Reporter-IDs would assist regulators in determining if particular traders had some role in causing a market event, and further, inclusion of these IDs could help regulators study patterns in customer-specific trading behavior. Further, enhanced clock synchronization requirements would assist regulators in sequencing events that happened in different market centers and help them to better identify the causes of market events. As such, the Commission continues to believe that the CAT NMS Plan would provide benefits in terms of performing analysis and reconstructing market events.

Changes to the Plan do affect data completeness and accuracy, as well as regulators' ability to analyze and reconstruct market events. First, the Commission has modified the Plan to require the reporting of LEIs for Customers and Industry Members in certain circumstances.[2254] These requirements will result in a greater ability of regulators to accurately identify traders that cause market events.[2255] Second, removing the open/close indicator for equities and Options Market Makers may reduce the completeness of CAT Data and may reduce the benefits that this potentially provides in terms of analysis and market reconstructions. Third, requiring exchanges to synchronize their clocks within 100 microseconds of NIST should enhance regulators' abilities to sequence events and reconstruct market events to a greater degree than initially stated in the Notice, though as discussed above in Section V.E.1.b.(3), the Commission does not expect a large improvement relative to what was described in the Notice.

b. Market Analysis and Research

In the Notice, the Commission discussed the reasons for its preliminary belief that the CAT NMS Plan would benefit the quality of market analysis and research that is produced to increase regulatory knowledge and support policy decisions and would lead to a more thorough understanding of current markets and emerging issues.[2256] The Commission discussed how improvements in regulatory market analysis and research aimed at informing regulatory decisions would benefit investors and market participants by improving regulators' understanding of the intricacies of dynamic modern markets and how different market participants behave in response to policies and information. These more nuanced and more thorough insights would help regulators to identify the need for regulation that specifically tailors policy to the diverse landscape of market participants and conditions that characterize current financial markets, as well as assist them in conducting retrospective analysis of their rules and pilots.

As described in the Notice, the lack of direct access to necessary data, along with inaccuracies in the data that are available, currently limits the types of analyses that regulators can conduct. These data limitations constrain the information available to regulators when they are considering the potential effects of regulatory decisions. The CAT NMS Plan would provide direct access to data that currently requires an often lengthy and labor-intensive effort to request, compile, and process, including data that regulators could use to more directly study issues such as high frequency trading, maker-taker pricing structures, short selling, issuer repurchases, and ETF trading. Furthermore, the Commission discussed how CAT Data would better inform SROs and the Commission in rulemakings and assist them in conducting retrospective analysis of their rules and pilots, and how it would allow SROs to examine whether a rule change on another exchange was in the interest of investors and whether to propose a similar rule on their own exchange.

The Commission received two comments regarding the potential benefits of the CAT NMS Plan to help the Commission perform market analyses and conduct research. One commenter misinterpreted what accessibility to CAT Data means for the Commission, stating that access to the CAT system and data is limited to its regulatory functions and could exclude analytical or academic needs.[2257] Another commenter disagreed with the Commission's findings and stated that the CAT Plan would provide little benefit to facilitating market analysis and research absent real-time access to intra-day feeds.[2258]

Commenters did not provide any additional information or analysis, however, and the Participants did not provide responses providing information relevant to this issue. The Commission is not changing its analysis and conclusions in light of the aforementioned comments for several reasons. First, one of the commenters assumes a narrow definition of ''regulatory functions'' but that CAT Data would serve the Commission and SROs in their analytical needs to conduct market analysis and academic research.[2259] Second, the Commission believes that even without real-time access to intra-day feeds, access to CAT Data would nonetheless benefit regulators since the quality of market analysis and research that is produced to increase regulatory knowledge would improve relative to the Baseline. Furthermore, the Commission continues to believe its statement in the Adopting Release that the majority regulatory benefits gained from the creation of a consolidated audit trail, as described in the Proposing Release,[2260] do not require real-time reporting.[2261] Specifically, the Commission notes that market analysis and research does not require contemporaneous access to CAT Data, and therefore, it is not necessarily the case that real-time access to CAT Data, as opposed to the Plan requirement of access to corrected data at T+5, would provide more benefit to market analysis and research by regulators. As such, the Commission continues to believe that CAT Data would provide significant

[2252] *Id.*

[2253] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Sections III.B.3, III.B.12.

[2254] *See* Section IV.D.4.a.(4) and Section IV.D.4.b.(2), *supra,* for a description of the LEI reporting requirements in the Plan.

[2255] *See* Section V.E.1.b(5), *supra* for a discussion of how LEIs can increase the accuracy of identifications; *see also* SIFMA Letter at 37.

[2256] For example, this includes understanding the role and impact of high-frequency trading strategies; understanding how broker-dealers route their customer orders and studying ''whether access fees and rebates drive routing decisions as much as execution quality considerations;'' understanding the nature of short selling; and more generally, understanding how entities trade and the market impact of their trading. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30695–97.

[2257] Better Markets Letter at 4.

[2258] Data Boiler Letter at 33.

[2259] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30695–97 for a list of examples of market analysis and research that could be conducted by SROs and the Commission with access to CAT Data.

[2260] *See* Proposing Release, *supra* note 14, at 45768.

[2261] *Id.*

improvements to market analysis and research conducted by regulators.

The Commission notes, however, that changes to the CAT NMS Plan do alter the analysis regarding the benefits for regulators in terms of conducting market analysis and research. In our view, the modifications to the Plan to require the reporting of LEIs for Customers and Industry Members in certain circumstances [2262] should result in a greater ability of regulators to conduct analysis and research involving individual market participants.[2263] Specifically, the reporting of LEI would also make it possible to merge CAT Data with other data sources that are currently not part of CAT (*e.g.,* futures and security-based swaps), and this could potentially help with market reconstructions involving these products. Furthermore, more granular clock synchronization requirements for exchanges would mean that regulators could sequence events with greater granularity, which could potentially benefit analysis that requires sequencing events and research surrounding high frequency traders. However, because the Plan no longer contains an open/close indicator for equities, regulators will not be able to distinguish buying activity that covers short positions from buying activity that establishes or increases long positions and, therefore, regulators would not be able to examine, for example, how long particular types of traders hold a short position, as indicated in the Notice.[2264]

c. Surveillance and Investigations

In the Notice, the Commission explained the reasons for its preliminary belief that the enhanced surveillance and investigations made possible by the implementation of the CAT NMS Plan could allow regulators to more efficiently identify and investigate violative behavior in the markets and could also lead to market participants that currently engage in violative behavior reducing or ceasing such behavior, to the extent that such behavior is not already deterred by current systems.[2265] The Commission discussed how potential violators' expected probability of being caught influences their likelihood of committing a violation.[2266] If market participants believe that the existence of CAT, and the improved regulatory activities that result from improvements in data and data processes, increase the likelihood of regulators detecting violative behavior, they could reduce or eliminate the violative activity in which they engage to avoid incurring the costs associated with detection, such as fines, legal expenses, and loss of reputation. Such a reduction in violative behavior would benefit investor protection and the market as investors would no longer bear the costs of the violative behavior that would otherwise exist in the current system. Many of the improvements that would result from CAT could also allow regulators to identify violative activity, such as market manipulation, more quickly and reliably, which could improve market efficiency by deterring market manipulation and identifying and addressing it more quickly and more often when it occurs.[2267]

The Commission received several comments on the potential benefits of the CAT NMS Plan to improve SRO surveillance, risk-based examinations, enforcement activity, and the process for evaluating tips and complaints; and the Participants also responded to some of the comments raised in the comment letters. As discussed below, the Commission is not changing its analysis and conclusions in light of these comments and the Participants' responses; however, changes to the Plan affect the analysis that the Commission laid out in the Notice.

(1) SRO Surveillance

Rule 613(f) requires SROs to implement surveillances reasonably designed to make use of the CAT Data.[2268] Further, data improvements resulting from the Plan would improve regulators' ability to perform comprehensive and efficient surveillance. As the Commission explained in detail in the Notice, these benefits would encompass a number of improvements including: detection of insider trading; surveillance of principal orders; and cross-market and cross-product surveillance; and other market surveillance activities, which are each described in more detail below.

First, the Commission noted that CAT Data would include additional fields not currently available in data used for surveillance. Since currently available data does not include customer identifiers, SROs performing insider trading and manipulation surveillance are unable to identify some suspicious trading [2269] and must undertake multiple steps to request additional information after identifying suspect trades. The inclusion of Customer-IDs in the CAT would significantly improve these surveillance capabilities. The ability to link uniquely identified customers with suspicious trading behavior would provide regulators with a better opportunity to identify the distribution of suspicious trading instances by a customer as well as improve regulators' ability to utilize customer-based risk assessment.

Second, the Commission noted that some current data sources used for SRO surveillance exclude unexecuted principal orders, limiting the surveillance for issues such as wash sales. As a result, many surveillance patterns are unable to detect certain rule violations involving principal orders. The inclusion of principal orders of Industry Members in the CAT would therefore enable regulators to better identify rule violations by broker-dealers that have not previously had to provide audit trail data on unexecuted principal orders.

Third, the Commission noted that the Plan would improve regulators' efficiency in conducting cross-market and cross-product surveillance, and enable any regulator to surveil the trading activity of market participants in both equity and options markets and

---

[2262] *See* Sections IV.D.4.a.(4) and IV.D.4.b.(2), *supra,* for a description of the LEI reporting requirements in the Plan.

[2263] *See* Section V.E.1.b(5), *supra* for a discussion of how LEIs can increase the accuracy of identifications; *see also* SIFMA Letter at 37.

[2264] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30696.

[2265] *Id.* at 30697–99.

[2266] It is well established in the economics and political science literature that common knowledge among market actors can lead to the deterrence of behaviors. *See, e.g.,* Schelling, Thomas, ''The Strategy of Conflict: Prospectus for a Reorientation of Game Theory,'' *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* Vol. 2 No.3 (1958) and Ellsberg, Daniel, ''The Crude Analysis of Strategic Choices,'' *American Economic Review,* Vol. 51, No. 2 (1961). Therefore, market participants with knowledge of improvements in the efficiency of market surveillance, investigations, and enforcement, and consequently the increased probability of incurring a costly penalty, could be deterred from participating in violative behavior.

[2267] The Plan would allow regulators to more efficiently conduct cross-market and cross-product surveillance relative to surveillance using current data sources, and the requirement that data be consolidated in a single database would assist regulators in detecting violative (but not obvious) activity. To the extent that market participants are aware of the current challenges to regulators in performing cross-market surveillance and aggregating data across venues, and to the extent that they believe that their violative behavior is more likely to be detected if regulators' ability to perform those activities improves, they may reduce or eliminate violative behavior if the CAT Plan is approved. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.E.2.c(1).

[2268] 17 CFR 242.613(f).

[2269] The Commission understands that SRO surveillances on topics such as insider trading and market manipulation do not incorporate data that identifies customers. Based on alerts from their surveillances, SROs may open a review that runs through several stages of data requests before identifying a customer. The Commission notes that SRO audit trails typically do not provide customer information but a recent FINRA rule change would require its members to report to OATS non-FINRA member customers who are broker-dealers. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30697.

across multiple trading venues without data requests. Regulators would also have access to substantially more information about market participants' activity,[2270] and the requirement that the data be consolidated in a single database would assist regulators in detecting activity that may appear permissible without evaluating data from multiple venues.[2271] The Commission explained that because market data are fragmented across many data sources and because audit trail data lacks consistent customer identifiers, regulators currently cannot run cross-market surveillance tracking particular customers.[2272] Furthermore, routine cross-product surveillance is generally not possible with current data. The Commission concluded that the potential enhancements in market surveillance enabled by the CAT NMS Plan are likely to result in more capable and efficient surveillance which could reduce violative behavior and protect investors from harm.

Two commenters stated that the Commission is overly optimistic as to the benefits that the Plan would provide to SRO surveillance activities,[2273] with one of the commenters also mentioning that the Commission is overly optimistic with respects to the benefits to surveillance.[2274] One of the commenters argued that benefits are exaggerated because the Plan lacks an analytical framework embedded in its design.[2275] The same commenter mentioned that the lack of an analytical framework embedded in the design of CAT reduces the ability to identify false positives (*i.e.,* detection of behaviors that are not violative), and false negatives (*i.e.,* not detecting behaviors that are violative).[2276] The commenter also specifically raised concerns that the current accessibility and functionality requirements of CAT Data would be rendered unusable for regulators because the methods for querying data and performing bulk extracts are ''generic'' and not fit for financial market surveillance.[2277]

Two commenters stated that CAT should encompass real-time reporting functionality, because without it, it is hard to conduct meaningful surveillance.[2278] Additionally, one commenter mentioned that the Plan does not provide details on how regulators would use CAT Data.[2279]

The Participants responded to these comments and noted that they already have real-time surveillance and monitoring tools in place for the respective markets that will not be affected by CAT.[2280] Furthermore, the Participants noted that the Plan Processor will provide sufficient data access tools as well as analytical tools in the CAT for the Participants to satisfy their obligations as set forth in Rule 613(f).[2281] But the Participants did note that surveillance methods and techniques could vary over time and across Participants,[2282] potentially yielding some degree of uncertainty in how benefits to surveillance activities would accrue to SROs, investors and market participants. The Participants also noted that CAT is not intended to be the sole source of surveillance for each Participant, and therefore, would not cover all surveillance methods currently employed by the Participants.[2283]

The Commission considered these comments and the Participants' responses and believes that they would not warrant changes to the Commission's preliminary conclusions of the benefits that the Plan would provide to SRO surveillance. But the Commission does acknowledge that there is some uncertainty particularly regarding how exactly the SROs will incorporate CAT into their surveillance activities. First, while the Commission agrees that surveillance methods differ across Participants and this could generate uncertainty in the benefits, the Commission disagrees with the commenters that stated that the Commission is overly optimistic as to the benefits. Access to CAT Data would result in substantial benefits to SRO surveillance for the reasons mentioned earlier in this Section, none of which are undermined by the comments. Second, the Commission disagrees with the commenter that stated that the benefits that would accrue to surveillance are exaggerated due to the Plan's lack of an analytical framework embedded in its design. The commenter assumes that if the Plan had an analytical framework, the benefits of CAT would be more realistic. The Commission notes that the Plan does have an analytical framework embedded in its design. The Plan states specifically that the Plan Processor will provide the following analytical framework—namely an API that allows regulators to use analytical tools (*e.g.,* R, SAS, Python, Tableau) and permit regulators to use ODBC/JDBC drivers to access CAT Data.[2284] This analytical framework would benefit SROs in conducting surveillance, which would benefit investors and market participants by allowing regulators to more quickly and precisely identify and address a higher proportion of market violations that occur, as well as prevent violative behavior through deterrence. Third, this analytical framework could allow regulators to code computer programs using CAT Data to detect trading patterns indicative of violative behavior. While there might be potential errors in detecting violative behavior using these programs, that is, false positives (detecting non-violative behavior) and false negatives (not detecting violative behavior), having access to more detailed CAT Data in a consolidated source including timestamps, principal orders, non-member activity, and subaccount allocations could minimize those errors. Fourth, the Commission disagrees with the commenter that the methods for querying data and performing bulk extracts are ''generic'' and not fit for financial market surveillance. The Commission expects these query methods, generic or not, will facilitate the direct access necessary for SROs to build improved surveillances. For instance, the Plan states that CAT will support two types of query interfacing,[2285] and specifies that all queries must be able to be run against raw (*i.e.,* unlinked) or processed data, or both.[2286] Furthermore, by using the query interfacing supported by CAT, regulators would be able to directly query Customer-IDs, which could

[2270] For example CAT Data would include Customer information, subaccount allocation information, exchange quotes, trade and order activity that occurs on exchanges, trade and order activity that occurs at broker-dealers that are not FINRA members, and trade and order activity that occurs at FINRA members who are not currently required to report to OATS. In addition CAT Data would require reporters to report data in milliseconds and would be directly available to non-FINRA regulators much faster than OATS is currently available to them. *Id.* at 30698.

[2271] *See* Section V.E.2.c(3), *infra.* The Commission notes that while this is a benefit allowed by consolidation of data in the Central Repository, linked data would not be available in the Central Repository until T+5, which may delay the completion of surveillance activities.

[2272] As noted above, SROs currently do not conduct routine surveillance that tracks particular customers because data currently used for surveillance does not include customer information.

[2273] Anonymous Letter I at 3; Data Boiler Letter at 33.

[2274] Data Boiler Letter at 33.

[2275] Data Boiler Letter at 33.

[2276] Data Boiler Letter at 33.

[2277] Data Boiler Letter at 13, 27.

[2278] Data Boiler Letter at 30; Better Markets Letter at 6–7.

[2279] SIFMA Letter at 32.

[2280] Response Letter I at 31, 43.

[2281] Response Letter I at 42.

[2282] Response Letter I at 42.

[2283] Response Letter II at 27.

[2284] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 8.2.

[2285] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 8.1.1.

[2286] *See* Section V.E.1.d(3), *supra* for additional information.

improve the ability for SROs to conduct surveillance, contrary to what the commenter stated.

The Commission considered the comments on real-time surveillance, and understands that from the Participants' response, some SROs already have real-time surveillance. Further, the Commission expects the Plan to improve on SROs' real-time surveillances because the Plan will result in exchanges receiving, even at a later date, additional fields in the Material Terms of the Order, such as special order handling instructions, and additional order events, such as principal orders, that some SROs currently do not have available for any surveillance, real-time or otherwise.[2287]

Finally, in response to the commenter that claimed the Plan did not provide enough details on how regulators would use CAT Data, the Commission acknowledges that there is uncertainty as to how the SROs will incorporate CAT Data into their surveillance activities. The Commission believes that even if there is uncertainty in this regard, the SROs nonetheless would still be able to conduct ''meaningful'' surveillance with the opportunity to improve on their current surveillances. In this regard, the Commission notes that Rule 613(f) states that national securities exchanges should create surveillances that are ''reasonably designed to make use of consolidated information in the consolidated audit trail.'' [2288] In addition, the Plan will improve the ability of regulators to perform cross-market and cross-product surveillance because regulators will have direct access to consistent data that includes comprehensive trade and order data in markets for multiple products.

The Commission also notes that the changes to the Plan to require the reporting of LEIs for Customers and Industry Members in certain circumstances [2289] should facilitate improved SRO surveillance by enabling SROs to identify traders and their clients with more accuracy.[2290] The reporting of LEIs would also make it possible to merge CAT Data with markets not included in CAT at this time (*e.g.,* futures and security-based swaps), which could potentially assist with surveillance activities involving these products. Therefore, the inclusion of LEI for Customers and Industry Members could result in greater benefits to SRO surveillance than those described in the Notice.

(2) Examinations

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the availability of CAT Data would also improve examinations by the Commission and SROs and that these improvements would benefit investor protection, and the market in general, by resulting in more effective supervision of market participants.[2291] The Commission conducted 493 broker-dealer examinations in 2014 and 484 in 2015, 70 exams of the national securities exchanges and FINRA in 2014 and 21 in 2015. In addition, the Commission conducted 1,237 investment adviser and investment company examinations in 2014 and 1,358 in 2015. Virtually all investment adviser examinations and a significant proportion of the Commission's other examinations involved analysis of trading and order data. Currently some data that would be useful to conduct risk-based selection for examinations, such as trade blotters, are not available in data sources available for pre-exam analysis.[2292] Further, the Commission explained that data available during exams often require regulatory Staff to link multiple data sources to analyze customer trading. For example, some customer identities are present in EBS data, but timestamps are not. To evaluate the execution price a customer received, it is necessary to know the time of the trade to compare the price of the customer's execution with the prevailing market prices at that time, which requires linking the EBS data with another data source that contains trades with timestamps (such as the trade blotter). These linking processes can be labor-intensive and require the use of algorithms that may not link with 100% accuracy.

The Commission explained in the Notice that the expected improvements in the data qualities discussed above would enhance the ability of regulators to select market participants for focused examinations on the basis of risk. Having direct access to consolidated data in the Central Repository would improve regulators' ability to efficiently conduct analyses in an attempt to select broker-dealers and investment advisers for more intensive examinations based on identified risk. Additionally, the Commission discussed its belief that regulators would be able to conduct certain types of exams more efficiently because of the inclusion of Customer-IDs in CAT. Moreover, the clock synchronization provisions of the Plan could aid regulators in sequencing some events more accurately, thereby facilitating more informed exams. The Commission believed that the Plan would allow the data collection portion of examinations to be completed more quickly with fewer formal data requests, and that more efficient examinations would help regulators better protect investors from the violative behavior of some market participants and could reduce examination costs for market participants who would have otherwise faced examinations that are less focused and more lengthy.

One commenter suggested that without ''red-flagging'' suspicious activities using the commenter's recommended approach (using real-time analytics),[2293] it would not be possible to facilitate the ability of regulators to conduct risk-based examinations.[2294] The same commenter stated that the Commission has an overly optimistic assessment of the economic effects to examinations, mainly due to the Plan lacking an analytical framework embedded in its design.[2295] The Participants did not provide a response to this comment.

The Commission considered these comments, but believes that they do not warrant changes to the Commission's preliminary conclusions of the benefits that the Plan would provide to performing risk-based examinations. First, the Commission disagrees with the commenter that stated ''red-flagging'' suspicious activity using their recommended approach (using real-time analytics) is the only way to facilitate risk-based examinations. As discussed above, having access to Customer-IDs would assist the Commission in flagging suspicious activity for their risk-based examinations, and assist the Commission in effectively targeting risk-based examinations of market participants who are at elevated risk of violating market rules. Furthermore, the Commission could also conduct more informed risk-based exams under the Plan because enhanced clock synchronization provisions could aid the Commission in sequencing some

[2287] As noted in Section V.D.1.c, this economic analysis considers surveillance to be SROs running processing on routinely collected or in-house data to identify potential violations of rules or regulations.

[2288] 17 CFR 242.613(f).

[2289] *See* Section IV.D.4.a.(4) and Section IV.D.4.b.(2), *supra,* for a description of the LEI reporting requirements in the Plan.

[2290] *See* Section V.E.1.b(5), *supra,* for a discussion of how LEIs can increase the accuracy of identifications; *see also* SIFMA Letter at 37.

[2291] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30698–99.

[2292] Regulators can obtain detailed equity transaction data by requesting a trade blotter from a particular firm; however, the data would only show the activity of that firm.

[2293] Part of the commenter's recommended approach to conducting surveillance involves using sensors to perform real-time analytics over streamed data. *See* Data Boiler Letter at 10–13.

[2294] Data Boiler Letter at 32.

[2295] Data Boiler Letter at 33.

events more accurately. Second, regarding the commenter who stated that the Commission's assessment of the effects to examinations are optimistic because the Plan lacks an analytical framework, the Commission disagrees with this commenter for similar reasons to those stated above.[2296]

While the commenters did not provide any additional information that would warrant changes to the Commission's analysis or conclusions as set out in the Notice, changes in the Plan do alter the Commission's preliminary analysis. Requiring CAT Reporters to report their LEI for Customers and Industry Members in certain circumstances [2297] should result in a greater ability for regulators to identify traders for the purposes of risk-based examinations.[2298] Additionally, more stringent clock synchronization requirements for exchanges should enhance regulators' abilities to sequence events, thereby facilitating more informed risk-based exams. As such, the Commission believes that changes to the Plan could generate additional benefits over and above those stated in the Notice.

(3) Enforcement Investigations

In the Notice, the Commission explained that the improvements in data qualities that would result from the CAT NMS Plan would significantly improve the efficiency and efficacy of enforcement investigations, including insider trading and manipulation investigations.[2299] The Commission discussed how more efficient and effective enforcement activity is beneficial to both investors and market participants because it deters violative behavior that degrades market quality and that imposes costs on investors and market participants.

The Commission discussed its expectation that dramatic benefits would come from improvements to the accessibility, timeliness, accuracy, and completeness of the data. First, compiling the data to support an investigation often requires a tremendous amount of time and resources, multiple requests to multiple data sources and significant data processing efforts, for both SROs and the Commission. While SROs have direct access to the data from their own markets, their investigations and investigations by the Commission often require access to the data of other SROs because firms trade across multiple venues. Some enforcement investigations, including those on insider trading and manipulation, require narrow market reconstructions that allow investigators to view actions and reactions across the market. Data fragmentation and the time it takes to receive requested data currently make these market reconstructions cumbersome and time-consuming. The Commission discussed its view that having access to CAT Data would help regulators analyze and reconstruct market events, and could in turn help them detect violative behavior during enforcement investigations.

Second, the Commission explained that it currently takes weeks or longer to process, link and make data available for analysis in an enforcement investigation. Under the CAT NMS Plan, data for an enforcement investigation initiated five days or more after an event would be processed, linked, and available for analysis within 24 hours of a query. The Commission discussed how the enhanced timeliness of data can improve the Commission's chances of preventing asset transfers from manipulation schemes, because regulators could use even uncorrected data (between T+1 and T+5) to detect the manipulation and identify the suspected manipulators.

Third, the Commission explained in the Notice that currently, identifying the activity of a single market participant across the market is cumbersome and prone to error. The inclusion and expected improvement in the accuracy of Customer Identifying Information in the CAT NMS Plan could allow regulators to review the activity of specific market participants more effectively. The Commission also explained that this information would be helpful in identifying insider trading, manipulation and other potentially violative activity that depends on the identity of market participants. Additionally, the Commission explained that improved accuracy with respect to timestamp granularity could increase the proportion of market events that could be sequenced under the CAT NMS Plan. This could yield some benefits in enforcement investigations, including investigations of insider trading, manipulation, and compliance with Rule 201 of Regulation SHO and Rule 611 of Regulation NMS.[2300]

Finally, the Commission explained that the expected improvements in completeness could also benefit investigations by allowing regulators to observe in a consolidated data source relevant data that are not available in some or all current data sources, including timestamps, principal orders, non-member activity, customer information, allocations, and an open/close indicator, which would identify whether a trade increases or decreases an existing position. This data could be important, for example, when investigating allegations of market manipulation or cherry-picking in subaccounts.

One commenter agreed that the CAT Plan would slightly improve the efficiency of regulators' enforcement activities because CAT will save them multiple trips to request data from financial institutions; [2301] however, this commenter argued that such benefits would be minimal because they do not help to identify misconduct and/or recognize patterns of market manipulation in real-time.[2302] The commenter mentioned that the CAT Plan would not effectively and efficiently deter violative behavior, thereby only resulting in marginal improvements to enforcement.[2303] The Commission also received a comment stating that the Plan is overly-focused on best execution, which requires parsing bid and offer information on a minute scale, and that this may overwhelm the system and thereby prevent the capture of relevant information and frustrate the generally stated goals of CAT.[2304] One commenter also stated that the Commission is overly optimistic with respect to the benefits of CAT to enforcement activity, mainly due to the Plan lacking an analytical framework embedded in its design.[2305] The Participants did not specifically provide a response to the commenters' concerns.

The Commission considered these comments and believes that they do not warrant changes to the Commission's preliminary conclusions of the benefits that the Plan would provide to enforcement investigations. First, while the Commission acknowledges that CAT Data will not assist the Commission in recognizing patterns of market manipulation in real-time, the Commission nonetheless believes that

[2296] *See* Section V.E.2.c(1), *supra; supra* n.2284.

[2297] *See* Sections IV.D.4.a.(4) and IV.D.4.b.(2), *supra,* for a description of the LEI reporting requirements in the Plan.

[2298] *See* Section V.E.1.b(5), *supra,* for a discussion of how LEIs can increase the accuracy of identifications; *see also* SIFMA Letter at 37.

[2299] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30699.

[2300] Benefits associated with the ability to sequence events may be limited in some cases because many order events would not be able to be sequenced completely with the standards established in the CAT NMS Plan. *See* Section V.D.2.b(2)B.i, *supra.*

[2301] Data Boiler Letter at 32.

[2302] *Id.*

[2303] *Id.* at 33.

[2304] Anonymous Letter I at 3.

[2305] Data Boiler Letter at 33.

the benefits of CAT Data to performing enforcement activities relative to the Baseline are significant. For instance, Customer Identifying Information in CAT Data would be particularly helpful in identifying a single market participant across the market, which would be useful in identifying insider trading, manipulation and other potentially violative activity that depends on the identity of market participants. Second, in light of the comment on best execution, the Commission believes that while the Plan will facilitate enforcement of best execution, including on Rule 611, this will not prevent the Plan from improving regulators' ability to investigate other types of violations, including market manipulation and insider trading. Furthermore, by parsing information on a granular scale, the Commission believes that the CAT Plan would increase the proportion of events that can be sequenced, yielding benefits in enforcement investigations. Third, regarding the commenter who stated that the Commission's assessment of the effects to enforcement investigations are optimistic because the Plan lacks an analysis framework, the Commission disagrees with this commenter for similar reasons to those stated above.[2306]

While the Commission is not altering its analysis of the benefits in response to the comments it received, the Commission is updating its analysis to recognize modifications to the Plan. Requiring CAT Reporters to report LEIs for Customers and Industry Members in certain circumstances [2307] should result in a greater ability for regulators to identify traders for the purposes of enforcement activity.[2308] This potentially improved data completeness could result in greater benefits to enforcement than stated in the Notice. Benefits to data completeness could also be potentially diminished by Plan modifications that remove the open-close indicator for equities and Options Market Makers. Such information would have been useful in detecting certain market manipulations and violations of rules such as Rule 105, short sale marking rules, and Rule 204 in equities and in identifying whether options market makers engage in aggressive risk-taking trading. The Commission now notes that due to the elimination of the requirement to report an open/close indicator for equities and Options Market Makers as part of CAT, these benefits will no longer be realized. However, the Commission is approving the Plan with this modification for the reasons discussed in Section IV.D.4.c, above. With regards to modifications to the timestamps on Allocation Reports, the Commission now understands that allocations are conducted after a trade and that the allocation time can aid regulators in ways that do not require millisecond-level timestamps. Therefore, modifications to the Plan that now require second-level timestamps would not result in a significant loss of benefits to the Commission. In spite of these modifications to the Plan, the Commission nonetheless believes that the efficiency and efficacy of enforcement investigations will be improved to a greater degree than anticipated in the Notice.

(4) Tips and Complaints

In the Notice, the Commission explained why it believed that the CAT NMS Plan, would improve the process for evaluating tips and complaints by allowing regulators to more effectively triage tips and complaints, which could focus resources on behavior that is most likely to be violative.[2309] Specifically, the availability of CAT Data would drastically increase the detail of data available to regulators for the purposes of tip assessment. This would assist the SROs and Commission in identifying which tips and complaints are credible, would help ensure that regulators open investigations or examinations on credible tips and complaints, and would limit regulatory resources spent on unreliable tips and complaints.

The Commission did not receive any comments regarding the benefits that would accrue to investors with regards to how regulators respond to tips and complaints. However, changes to the Plan affect the Commission's analysis from the Notice; namely, requiring LEI reporting; enhanced clock synchronization requirements for exchanges; less granular timestamps for allocation reports; and removing the open/close indicator for equities and for Options Market Makers. As discussed above in Sections V.E.2.c.(2) and (3), these changes could affect risk based examinations and enforcement investigations, and could thereby affect the ability of regulators to effectively triage tips and complaints. In light of these modifications to the CAT NMS Plan, the Commission continues to believe that benefits would accrue to regulators allowing them to more effectively triage tips and complaints by focusing resources on behavior that is most likely to be violative, thereby resulting in benefits that would also accrue to investors and market participants.

3. Other Provisions of the CAT NMS Plan

In the Notice, the Commission noted that there are a number of provisions of the CAT NMS Plan that provide for features that are uniquely applicable to a consolidated audit trail or otherwise lack a direct analog in existing data systems.[2310] Therefore, rather than analyze the benefits of these provisions as compared to existing NMS Plans or data systems, the Commission analyzed these provisions in comparison to a CAT NMS Plan without these features. The Commission preliminarily believed that these provisions of the CAT NMS Plan would increase the likelihood that the potential benefits of the CAT NMS Plan described above would be realized.

As discussed below, the Commission has revised its analysis in response to comments, the Participants' response, and the Commission's modifications to the Plan.

a. Future Upgrades

In the Notice, the Commission discussed several Plan provisions that seek to ensure that the CAT Data would continually be updated to keep pace with technological and regulatory developments.[2311] For example, the Plan would require that the CCO review the completeness of CAT Data periodically,[2312] that the Central Repository be scalable to efficiently adjust for new requirements and changes in regulations,[2313] and that Participants provide the Commission with a document outlining how the Participants could incorporate information on select additional products and related Reportable

[2306] *See* Section V.E.2.c(1), *supra; supra* n.2284.

[2307] *See* Sections IV.D.4.a.(4) and IV.D.4.b.(2), *supra,* for a description of the LEI reporting requirements in the Plan.

[2308] *See* Section V.E.1.b(5), *supra,* for a discussion of how LEIs can increase the accuracy of identifications; *see also* SIFMA Letter at 37.

[2309] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30699; *see also* SEC Office of the Whistleblower, What Happens to Tips, *available at https://www.sec.gov/about/offices/owb/owb-what-happens-to-tips.shtml.*

[2310] *Id.* at 30699–30708.

[2311] *Id.* at 30700. Examples of these provisions include, requiring ''the Chief Compliance Officer to review completeness of CAT Data periodically;'' requiring that ''the Central Repository be scalable to efficiently adjust for new requirements and changes in regulations;'' and requiring Participants ''to provide the Commission with a document outlining how Participants could incorporate information on selecting additional products and related Reportable Events.'' *Id.*

[2312] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 4.12(b)(ii), 6.2(a)(v)(E). The CCO would be required to perform reviews on matters including the completeness of information submitted to the Plan Processor or Central Repository and report findings periodically to the Operating Committee.

[2313] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 1.1.

Events.[2314] The Commission preliminarily believed these provisions would allow the CAT to be updated if and when the applicable technologies and regulations change.

The Commission noted that these provisions are designed to ensure that the Participants consider enhancing and expanding CAT Data shortly after initial implementation of the CAT NMS Plan and that the Participants consider improvements regularly continuing forward. The Commission preliminarily expected that, in addition to these provisions, the CCO review would further facilitate proactive expansion of CAT to account for regulatory changes or changes in how the market operates, or in response to a regulatory need for access to new order events or new information about particular order events. To the extent that the Participants determine that an expansion is necessary and it is approved by the Commission, the Plan's scalability provision promotes the efficient implementation of that expansion such that it could be completed at lower cost and/or in a timely manner.

Taken together, the Commission believed that these provisions could also provide a means for the Commission to ensure that improvements to CAT functionality are considered so as to preserve its existing benefits, or that the expansion of CAT functionality is undertaken in order to create new benefits. The Commission recognized some uncertainty with respect to how effectively these provisions would operate to ensure that improvements to CAT functionality are considered in a way that would maximize the benefits of the Plan, but noted that the Commission does retain the ability to modify the Plan, if such a step becomes necessary to ensure that future upgrades are undertaken as necessary.[2315] Moreover, the focus on scalability, adaptability, and timely maintenance and upgrades promotes a system that could be readily adapted over time. The Commission preliminarily believed that the provisions outlined above would allow the CAT Data to be continually updated to keep pace with technological and regulatory developments.

The Commission received one comment disagreeing that future upgrades would increase the likelihood that potential future benefits would be realized. The commenter stated that the provisions about future upgrades are infrastructure related, rather than quality improvements in the sense of timely insights to regulators.[2316] Another commenter stated that the proposal for the CCO to be an officer of the CAT LLC as well as an employee of the Plan Processor creates a conflict of interest that would undermine the ability of this officer to carry out his or her responsibilities effectively under the Plan because he or she would owe a fiduciary duty to the Plan Processor rather than the CAT LLC.[2317] The Commission notes that the Plan accords the CCO certain responsibilities related to future upgrades; for example, as noted above, the CCO is responsible for reviewing the completeness of CAT Data periodically and providing the SEC with a document outlining how the Participants could incorporate information on select additional products and related Reportable Events.[2318]

In response to that comment, the Participants recommended a change to the Plan that would require that the CCO have fiduciary duties to the CAT LLC in the same manner and extent as an officer of a Delaware corporation, and that, to the extent those duties conflict with duties the CCO has to the Plan Processor, the duties to the CAT LLC should control.[2319] As discussed in more detail in the Discussion Section, the Commission agrees with this suggestion and has modified the Plan to incorporate this change.

The Commission has considered the comments received, the Participants' response, and the modifications the Commission has made to the Plan. The Commission disagrees with the commenter that stated that the future upgrades would not help to provide ''timely insights to regulators'' because the provisions are ''infrastructure related.'' [2320] As discussed above, the upgrades should improve the completeness of the CAT Data by potentially allowing for its expansion to include information on select additional products and related Reportable Events, and access to more complete data should improve regulatory activities.[2321] Additionally, the required scalability of the Central Repository infrastructure and the mechanism to accept suggested changes from the Advisory Committee and regulators will permit the CAT to meet the needs of the regulators—such as enhancements benefiting their oversight of the markets—and be modifiable and adaptable to future technology changes.[2322]

In response to the comment noting that the proposal for the CCO to be an officer of the CAT LLC as well as an employee of the Plan Processor creates a conflict of interest,[2323] the Commission notes that the potential for a conflict of interest would create additional uncertainty as to whether the provisions of the Plan requiring the CCO to review the completeness of CAT Data periodically and to provide the Commission with a document outlining how the Participants could incorporate information on select additional products and related Reportable Events will be carried out in a way that will maximize the benefits of the Plan. However, the modification to the Plan requiring the CCO to have fiduciary duties to the CAT LLC in the same manner and extent as an officer of a Delaware corporation should reduce that uncertainty. Therefore, the Commission continues to believe that those provisions will allow the CAT to be updated efficiently if and when the applicable technologies and regulations change.

Furthermore, the Plan has been modified to require an annual evaluation of potential technological upgrades based upon a review of technological advancements over the preceding year, drawing on Participants' technology expertise, whether internal or external.[2324] The Plan has also been modified to require an annual assessment of whether any data elements should be added, deleted or changed to the CAT Data. Because these amendments result in more frequent evaluations (compared to biannually), and require the evaluations to review technological advancements as well as the usefulness of the data elements in CAT, these amendments should further allow the Participants to consider the appropriate time to make technological upgrades and decisions regarding the inclusion, deletion or modification of data elements.

In summary, the Commission continues to believe that the Plan provides a means for the Commission to ensure that improvements to CAT

[2314] *Id.* at Section 6.11. This document is due within six months of the Effective Date of the CAT NMS Plan.

[2315] 17 CFR 242.608.

[2316] Data Boiler Letter at 34.

[2317] FSI Letter at 3.

[2318] The Plan delegates these tasks to the CCO. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Sections 4.12(b)(ii), 6.11, 6.2(a)(v)(E).

[2319] Response Letter I at 17–18.

[2320] Data Boiler Letter at 34.

[2321] *See* Sections V.E.1.a and V.E.2, *supra,* for a discussion of how more complete data is expected to improve the analysis and reconstruction of market events, market analysis and research in support of regulatory decisions, and market surveillance, examinations, investigations, and other enforcement functions.

[2322] *See* Section IV.D.15, *supra.*

[2323] FSI Letter at 3.

[2324] *See* Section IV.D.14, *supra.*

functionality are considered so as to preserve its existing benefits, or that the expansion of CAT functionality is undertaken in order to create new benefits.

b. Promotion of Accuracy

In the Notice, the Commission discussed specific Plan provisions designed to generally promote the accuracy of information contained in the Central Repository.[2325] The CCO is required, among other responsibilities, to perform reviews related to the accuracy of information submitted to the Central Repository and report to the Operating Committee with regard thereto,[2326] and there is a special Compliance Subcommittee of the Operating Committee, which is established to aid the CCO with regard to, among other things, issues involving the accuracy of information.[2327] The Plan also contains certain other provisions intended to monitor and address Error Rates.[2328]

The Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the provisions were reasonably designed to improve the overall accuracy of CAT Data relative to the exclusion of such provisions. It noted, however, that certain procedures outlined in the Plan might not incentivize all firms to further improve the quality of the data they report. Specifically, because the Plan only discusses penalties or fines for CAT Reporters with excessive Error Rates, the Commission explained that it is not clear what incentive, if any, would be provided to firms with median Error Rates to improve their regulatory data reporting processes, and that this lack of incentive could collectively limit industry's incentives to reduce Error Rates.[2329]

In addition, the Commission noted that the Plan includes provisions requiring the establishment of a symbology database that will also foster accuracy. The Commission noted that Participants and their Industry Members will each be required to maintain a five-year running log documenting the time of each clock synchronization performed and the result of such synchronization, and that these requirements should provide a clearer foundation for evaluating the standards set in the Plan upon which future improvements could be considered.

The Commission received several comments regarding the promotion of accuracy in the Plan. One comment letter stated that there are insufficient incentives provided by the Plan for CAT Reporters to reduce Error Rates.[2330] The commenter did not provide any additional information as to why the existing incentives are insufficient or any specific suggestions to improve the incentives. Another commenter recommended a ''positive reinforcement'' approach to incentivize the reduction of Error Rates, where firms would be exempted from duplicative reporting systems if their Error Rate for ''comparable'' data in CAT reaches a certain threshold.[2331] In addition, the commenter suggested that customer information fields should be categorized based on the degree of their importance for market surveillance and market reconstruction purposes, so that CAT Reporters can focus on ensuring accuracy of the fields most important for market surveillance.[2332] That commenter seemed to agree that an annual review of error rates would promote accuracy, stating that an annual review is ''reasonable.'' [2333] The same commenter also noted that detailed error reporting statistics for CAT Reporters will assist in minimizing the error rate over time.[2334] Another commenter stated their belief that CAT Reporters should have an opportunity to reduce their error rate prior to onboarding on CAT, and furthermore, should receive a grace period before error correction rates are disseminated to regulators.[2335] The commenter stated that such provisions, ''would provide them [CAT Reporters] with a window to better understand the data being returned by the CAT, and how it is evaluating data submissions.'' [2336] An additional commenter stated that error rate monitoring is an effective way of ensuring firms put in place pre-validation checks, and that such checks can be an effective method of protecting the integrity and accuracy of the data being reported.[2337] The Commission received three comment letters that appeared to support the idea that the annual review of clock synchronization and timestamp standards would promote accuracy.[2338] One commenter noted that the annual review would permit a consideration of ''the current state and cost of clock synch technology, and what the current industry practices are regarding adoption of these technologies,'' [2339] and a second generally agreed with that observation.[2340] A third supported regular review to assess whether the standard might be introducing ''noise and/or overly distorted signals.'' [2341] In their response, the Participants stated that with respect to data accuracy, the Participants have included provisions in the Plan to take into account minor and major inconsistencies in customer information. In particular, the Participants noted that Appendix D explains that ''[t]he Plan Processor must design and implement procedures and mechanisms to handle both minor and material inconsistencies in customer information.'' [2342] They also noted that material inconsistencies must be communicated to the submitting CAT Reporter(s) and resolved within the established error correction timeframe.[2343] The Participants stated that the Central Repository also must have an audit trail showing the resolution of all errors.[2344] Finally, the Participants noted that they intend to monitor errors in the customer information fields and will consider, as appropriate, whether to prioritize the correction of certain data fields over others.

Another commenter suggested that a CAT Reporter's performance of pre-validation checks prior to submitting data to the CAT can be an effective way to preserve data integrity and accuracy.[2345] In their response, the Participants noted that, in recognition of their potential value in ensuring accurate data submissions, they have discussed with the Bidders various tools that will be made available to CAT Reporters to assist with their data submission, including pre-validation checks.[2346]

[2325] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30700–01.

[2326] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.2(a)(v)(E).

[2327] *Id.* at Section.4.12(b).

[2328] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.3(b).

[2329] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30701.

[2330] Data Boiler Letter at 34. The commenter generally suggests an alternative approach to data reporting involving a ''dynamic analytical framework'' where ''sensors directly conduct real-time analytics over streamed data where it was originated.'' *Id.*

[2331] FIF Letter at 58.

[2332] FIF Letter at 11, 93.

[2333] FIF Letter at 57.

[2334] FIF Letter at 52.

[2335] SIFMA Letter at 7.

[2336] SIFMA Letter at 7.

[2337] UnaVista Letter at 4.

[2338] FIF Letter at 106; SIFMA Letter at 34; Data Boiler Letter at 21.

[2339] FIF Letter at 106. This commenter recommended that any clock synchronization should stay in place for three years because it is costly to the industry and distributive to the industry to change the standard, and such changes could take two years to implement. *Id.*

[2340] SIFMA Letter at 34.

[2341] Data Boiler Letter at 21.

[2342] Response Letter I at 22, citing the CAT NMS Plan at Appendix D, Section 9.4.

[2343] *Id.*

[2344] *Id.*

[2345] UnaVista Letter at 4.

[2346] Response Letter I at 49.

Finally, as discussed in more detail above,[2347] another commenter stated that the proposal for the CCO to be an officer of the CAT LLC as well as an employee of the Plan Processor creates a conflict of interest.[2348] The Commission notes that the Plan accords the CCO certain responsibilities related to the promotion of accuracy; for example, as noted above, the CCO is responsible for reviews related to the accuracy of information submitted to the Central Repository and reporting to the Operating Committee with regard thereto. In response to that comment, the Participants proposed a change to the Plan which would require that the CCO have fiduciary duties to the CAT LLC in the same manner and extent as an officer of a Delaware corporation.[2349] As discussed in more detail in the Discussion Section, the Commission agrees with this suggestion and has modified the Plan to incorporate this change.

The Commission has considered the comments and the Participants' response and is revising its economic analysis as indicated below. In response to the commenter that suggested the prioritization of customer information fields, the Commission notes that it is amending the Plan to require the SROs to submit an assessment of errors in the customer information fields and whether to prioritize the correction of certain data fields over others, within 36 months of Plan Approval.[2350] The Commission agrees with the Participants, however, that the provisions of the Plan requiring the Plan Processor to design and implement procedures and mechanisms to handle both minor and material inconsistencies [2351] in customer information, requiring material inconsistencies to be resolved within the established error correction timeframe, and requiring the Central Repository to have an audit trail showing the resolution of all errors should help to promote accuracy, as well. Nonetheless, the Commission believes that, the assessment will help to identify any unanticipated issues with the accuracy of the customer information fields and, in addition to the provisions discussed in the Notice and summarized above, should promote the overall accuracy of CAT Data.

In response to the commenter that suggested CAT Reporters should have an opportunity to reduce their error rate prior to onboarding on CAT, the Commission agrees and believes that such an opportunity exists during the testing periods, particularly as specified in the amended Plan.[2352] The Commission is also amending the Plan to require that the CAT testing environment will be made available to Industry Members on a voluntary basis no later than six months prior to when Industry Members are required to report and that more coordinated, structured testing of the CAT System will begin no later than three months prior to when Industry Members are required to report data to CAT.[2353] The ability to use a testing environment prior to reporting will promote accuracy of data going forward.

In response to the comment noting that the proposal for the CCO be an officer of the CAT LLC as well as an employee of the Plan Processor creates a conflict of interest,[2354] the Commission notes that the potential for a conflict of interest would create additional uncertainty as to whether the reviews related to the accuracy of information submitted to the Central Repository and reports to the Operating Committee with regard thereto, both of which are delegated to the CCO under the Plan, will be carried out in a way that will maximize the benefits of the Plan. However, the modification to the Plan requiring the CCO to have fiduciary duties to the CAT LLC in the same manner and extent as an officer of a Delaware corporation should reduce that uncertainty.

The Commission also believes that, if they are made available to CAT Reporters, pre-validation checks could promote the accuracy of data in the Central Repository prior to T+5 by reducing errors. However, the Commission notes that the availability of these tools is uncertain.

While the Commission continues to believe that the lack of incentives for firms with median Error Rates to improve their regulatory data reporting processes could collectively limit industry's incentives to reduce Error Rates, the Commission agrees with the commenter that suggested that positive reinforcement with respect to error rates may help promote accuracy.[2355] The Commission notes that, as discussed above,[2356] the overall elimination of existing data reporting systems will be conditioned on the availability of quality data in CAT, which may incentivize accurate CAT reporting. While the Commission agrees that allowing CAT Reporters to stop reporting to existing data systems on an individual basis according to their error rates would incentivize CAT Reporters to reduce their error rates, the Commission notes that this approach may not promote the accuracy of CAT Data as a whole, because it could entail a division of market data across multiple data sources that would obligate regulators to merge multiple data sources to conduct their regulatory activities. However, as discussed above, the Commission has amended the Plan to require Participants to consider, in their rule filings to retire duplicative systems, whether individual Industry Members can be exempted from reporting to duplicative systems once their CAT reporting meets specified accuracy standards. This should provide further analysis regarding whether individual reporting exemptions based on meeting data quality standards can incentivize fewer errors while, ensuring that regulators can effectively carry out their obligations using CAT Data.[2357]

The Commission believes that three additional reports and reviews will further promote lower data error rates by focusing attention on the sources of data errors. First, the Plan has also been modified to require an annual evaluation of how the Plan Processor and SROs are monitoring Error Rates and exploring the imposition of Error Rates based on product, data element or other criteria.[2358] By increasing the frequency of the evaluation and specifically including this Error Rate information, this analysis will enable the SROs to better understand the factors that generate Error Rates. Second, the Plan has been amended to require an assessment in connection with any Material Systems Changes to the CAT of its potential impact on the

[2347] *See* Section V.E.3.a, *supra.*

[2348] FSI Letter at 3.

[2349] Response Letter I at 17–18.

[2350] *See* Section IV.D.4.a.(1), *supra.*

[2351] The Plan states that minor inconsistencies, such as variations in road name abbreviations in searches, would be resolved within the Plan Processor. Material inconsistencies, such as two different people with the same SSN, must be communicated to the submitting CAT Reporters and resolved within the error correction timeframe described in Section 2.2.4 of the Plan. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at D–35.

[2352] *Id.* at Appendix C.

[2353] *See* Section IV.D.8.a, *supra.*

[2354] FSI Letter at 3.

[2355] FIF Letter at 58.

[2356] *See* Section IV.D.9, *supra.*

[2357] *Id.* (explaining that the Commission is amending Section C.9 of Appendix C of the Plan to require that the Participants consider, in their rule filings to retire duplicative systems, whether individual Industry Members can be exempted from reporting to duplicative systems once their CAT reporting meets specified accuracy standards, including, but not limited to, ways in which establishing cross-system regulatory functionality or integrating data from existing systems and the CAT would facilitate such individual Industry Member exemptions).

[2358] *See* Section IV.D.11.c, *supra.*

maximum Error Rate.[2359] This will facilitate understanding of how a particular Material Systems Change would impact Error Rates and whether to temporarily adjust the Error Rates around that Material Systems Change. Third, the Plan has been modified to require the SROs to provide an assessment of the feasibility, benefits and risks and advisability of permitting Industry Members to have bulk access to their reported data. Such an assessment would provide further information on the tradeoffs of bulk extracts, which could allow Industry Members to more efficiently identify and correct data errors.

The Plan has also been modified to require a report detailing the SROs' consideration of engaging in coordinated surveillance (*e.g.,* entering into Rule 17d–2 agreements, RSAs or some other approach to coordinate compliance and enforcement oversight of the CAT), within 12 months of Plan Approval.[2360] This analysis will promote accuracy by focusing the SROs on ensuring that their members comply with requirements in the Plan.

Other amendments could promote accuracy by promoting finer timestamps and shorter clock offset tolerances. The Plan has been modified so that the SROs should apply industry standards related to clock synchronization based on the type of CAT Reporter, type of Industry Member, or type of system, rather than the industry as a whole. In addition, the Plan has been amended to require that the Plan Processor review clock synchronization standards by type of entity and system type six months after effectiveness of the Plan and on an annual basis thereafter. These amendments to the Plan should focus attention on areas where improvements to the clock synchronization and timestamp standards could improve the accuracy of the data at lower cost.

c. Promotion of Timeliness

In addition to the specific timeliness benefits discussed in the foregoing Sections, in the Notice the Commission discussed some Plan provisions that promote performance of the Central Repository, and that therefore could indirectly improve the timeliness of regulator access to or use of the CAT Data. These are found in capacity requirements for the Plan Processor, disaster recovery requirements to ensure the availability of the system, and in supervision and reporting of timeliness issues.

First, the Plan Processor must measure and monitor Latency within the Central Repository's systems, must establish acceptable levels of Latency with the approval of the Operating Committee, and must establish policies and procedures to ensure that data feed delays are communicated to CAT Reporters, the Commission, and Participants' regulatory Staff.[2361] Second, the Plan Processor must develop disaster recovery and business continuity plans to support the continuation of CAT business operations.[2362] Third, the Chief Compliance Officer of the Plan Processor must conduct regular monitoring of the CAT System for compliance with the Plan, including with respect to the reporting and linkage requirements in Appendix D.[2363] Moreover, the Plan Processor must provide the Operating Committee with regular reports on the CAT System's operations and maintenance, including its capacity and performance, as set out in Appendix D.[2364]

Furthermore, the Commission discussed that one caveat on the foregoing discussion is that system performance would in part be dependent on a series of SLAs to be negotiated between the Plan Participants and the eventual Plan Processor, including with respect to linkage and order event processing performance, query performance and response times, and system availability.[2365] As these have not yet actually been negotiated, some of the key timeliness benefits anticipated to accrue from implementation of the Plan could be subject to negotiation.

The Commission received several comments on the development of disaster recovery and continuity plans. One commenter stated that it is not clear that the current disaster recovery plan would provide uninterrupted access to CAT data in the case of an event that calls for the plan to be activated.[2366] Another commenter requested clarification that the bi-annual disaster recovery test of CAT operations at its secondary facility would be conducted twice a year, rather than once every two years.[2367] In their response, the Participants clarified that disaster recovery tests would be conducted twice a year.[2368]

As discussed in more detail above,[2369] another commenter stated that the proposal for the CCO to be an officer of the CAT LLC as well as an employee of the Plan Processor creates a conflict of interest.[2370] The Commission notes that the Plan accords the CCO certain responsibilities related to the promotion of timeliness; for example, as noted above, the CCO is responsible for conducting regular monitoring of the CAT System for compliance, including with respect to compliance with the timelines for reporting and linkage of the data set out in Appendix D of the Plan, which could help ensure that the CAT Data is made available to regulators in accordance with the timelines discussed in Section V.E.1.d.[2371] In response to that comment, the Participants proposed a change to the Plan which would require that the CCO have fiduciary duties to the CAT LLC in the same manner and extent as an officer of a Delaware corporation. As discussed in more detail in the Discussion Section, the Commission agrees with this suggestion and has modified the Plan to incorporate this change. The Commission has considered the comments, the Participants' response and the modification to the Plan, and continues to believe that the provisions discussed in the Notice and summarized above promote performance of the Central Repository, and therefore could indirectly improve the timeliness of regulator access to or use of the CAT Data.

In response to the comment noting that the proposal for the CCO to be an officer of the CAT LLC as well as an employee of the Plan Processor creates a conflict of interest,[2372] the Commission notes that the potential for a conflict of interest would create additional uncertainty as to whether regular monitoring of the CAT System for compliance, which is the responsibility of the CCO under the Plan, will be carried out in a way that will maximize the benefits of the Plan. However, the modification to the Plan requiring the CCO to have fiduciary duties to the CAT LLC in the same manner and extent as an officer of a Delaware corporation should reduce that uncertainty.

In response to the comment regarding the frequency of testing,[2373] the Commission notes that the Participants

[2359] *See* Section IV.D.11.b, *supra.*

[2360] *See* Section IV.B.4, *supra.*

[2361] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 8.3

[2362] *Id.* at Section 6.2(a)(v)(J).

[2363] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 6.2(a)(v)(J).

[2364] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 6.1(o)(i).

[2365] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 8.5.

[2366] SIFMA Comment Letter at 45.

[2367] FSI Letter at 5.

[2368] Response Letter I at 51.

[2369] *See* Section IV.B.3, *supra.*

[2370] FSI Letter at 3.

[2371] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 6.2(a)(v)(J).

[2372] FSI Letter at 3.

[2373] FSI Letter at 5.

have clarified that testing will take place twice a year, which will promote the effectiveness of the disaster recovery plan relative to less frequent testing. In response to the comment regarding uninterrupted access to CAT Data in the case of an event that calls for the disaster recovery plan to be activated,[2374] the Commission recognizes that regulators may not have uninterrupted access to CAT Data in the event the disaster recovery plan is activated, which may limit the extent to which the disaster recovery plan promotes timeliness relative to a plan that provided for uninterrupted access. However, the Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan states that the disaster recovery capability will ensure no loss of data and that a secondary processing site must be capable of recovery and restoration of services within 48 hours, but with the goal of next-day recovery.[2375] As noted in the Discussion Section, the Commission also expects that, given the importance of the Central Repository, the Plan Processor will strive to reduce the time it will take to restore and recover CAT Data at a backup site. Further, the Commission's amendment to the Plan to require an annual review of efforts to reduce the time to restore and recover CAT Data at a back-up site should promote timeliness. Specifically, any enhancements with respect to restoration and backup of data resulting from these reviews will help to further ensure that access to CAT Data after an outage would be timely.

d. Operation and Administration of the CAT NMS Plan

In the Notice, the Commission stated its preliminary belief that certain elements of the CAT NMS Plan's governance are uniquely applicable to a consolidated audit trail and that, as compared to a CAT NMS Plan without these features, these provisions of the CAT NMS Plan increase the likelihood that the potential benefits of the CAT NMS Plan would be realized.[2376]

(1) Introduction

In the Notice, the Commission stated that, in adopting Rule 613, the Commission established certain requirements for the governance of the CAT NMS Plan, stating that those ''requirements are important to the efficient operation and practical evolution of the [CAT] and are responsive to many commenters' concerns about governance structure, cost allocations, and the inclusion of SRO members as part of the planning process.'' [2377] Moreover, the Commission did not establish detailed parameters for the governance of the CAT NMS Plan, but rather allowed the SROs to develop specific governance arrangements, subject to a small number of requirements.[2378] For those requirements, the Commission stated that the governance provisions identified in the Adopting Release—relating to Operating Committee voting and the Advisory Committee—continue to be important to the efficient operation and practical evolution of the Plan, particularly given that there are a range of possible outcomes with respect to both the costs and benefits of the Plan that depend on future decisions.[2379] Further, the way in which the identified governance provisions have been incorporated into the Plan could help facilitate better decision-making by the relevant parties. This, in turn, means that the Commission could have greater confidence that the benefits resulting from implementation of the Plan would be achieved in an efficient manner and that costs resulting from inefficiencies would be avoided.[2380]

(2) Key Factors Relating to Governance

Two factors identified by the Commission in the Rule 613 Adopting Release as ''important to the efficient operation and practical evolution of the [CAT]'' are voting within the Operating Committee and the role and composition of the Advisory Committee.[2381] Specifically, voting thresholds that result in Operating Committee decision-making that balances the ability of minority members to have alternative views considered with the need to move forward when appropriate to implement needed policies can promote achievement of the Plan's benefits in an efficient manner. Similarly, an Advisory Committee that is balanced in terms of membership size and composition, as well as in its ability to present views to the Operating Committee, can result in better performance of its informational role, and thus more efficient achievement of the benefits of the Plan.[2382]

A. Voting

In adopting Rule 613, the Commission stated that ''an alternate approach'' to voting involving ''the possibility of a governance requirement other than unanimity, or even super-majority approval, for all but the most important decisions'' should be considered, as it ''may be appropriate to avoid a situation where a significant majority of plan sponsors—or even all but one plan sponsor—supports an initiative but, due to a unanimous voting requirement, action cannot be undertaken.'' [2383] The Notice states that the Plan generally eschews a unanimous voting threshold, except for three clearly-defined circumstances—and that by contrast ''[m]ajority approval of the Operating Committee is sufficient to approve routine matters, arising in the ordinary course of business, while non-routine matters, outside the ordinary course of business, would require a supermajority (two-thirds) vote of the Operating Committee to be approved.'' [2384] As the Notice discusses, majority voting avoids the hold-out problem of unanimity, but can result in decisions that bear less concern for the interests of the minority members—which in turn may depend on the ease with which a majority coalition can be formed, whether those coalitions are fluid or static, and whether in practice decision-making is collegial or contentious.[2385] The Notice also recognizes that ''Participant SROs that are affiliated with one another could vote as a block by designating a single individual to represent them on the Committee,'' thereby permitting those individuals to exercise more influence, but still short of control over voting outcomes.[2386] And the Notice states that the Plan's supermajority voting requirement for more important matters represents an intermediate ground between majority and unanimous voting.[2387]

One commenter stated that it supports the EMSAC recommendations regarding changes to NMS Plan governance, which include limiting NMS Plan provisions requiring a unanimous vote and instead requiring two-thirds supermajority voting for substantive changes, plan amendments, and fees, with a simple majority vote for administrative or technical matters and argued that the recommendations should be included in the CAT NMS

[2374] SIFMA Letter at 45.

[2375] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 5.4.

[2376] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30702.

[2377] *Id.* (quoting the Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45787).

[2378] *Id.*

[2379] *Id.*

[2380] *Id.*

[2381] *Id.* at 30703.

[2382] *Id.*

[2383] *Id.* at 30703.

[2384] *Id.*

[2385] *Id.* at 30703–04.

[2386] *Id.*

[2387] *Id.* at 30704.

Plan.[2388] The same commenter also supported the recommendation that would involve ''revisit[ing] allocation of voting rights among SROs'' to replace the ''one vote per exchange registration'' model with a model of one vote per exchange family (except if the exchange family has a consolidated market share of 10% or more, then two votes) and recommended that it be applied to the CAT NMS Plan.[2389]

With respect to unanimous voting, the Participants' response noted that the Plan already significantly limits the use of unanimous voting to three well-defined circumstances, and that the Plan differs from other NMS Plans in this regard.[2390] With respect to allocation of voting to exchanges or exchange families, the Participants stated that because each Participant has obligations under Rule 613, each Participant should receive a vote.[2391] The Participants also noted that this approach is consistent with other NMS Plans.

The Commission has analyzed the comments received and discusses them in turn below, focusing on the CAT NMS Plan, and specifically on the question of whether the governance structure as amended in this Notice would decrease Plan uncertainty for purposes of the Commission's approval of the CAT NMS Plan.[2392]

With respect to voting thresholds, the Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan already anticipated the need for a voting structure that differs from other NMS Plans in following the Commission's recommendation to seek an ''alternative approach.'' The CAT NMS Plan requires unanimous voting only in three specific instances and otherwise relies on supermajority or majority votes,[2393] which the Commission notes is generally consistent with the suggestions made by the commenters. With respect to allocation of votes, the Commission believes that the exchange family approach could potentially give smaller or unaffiliated exchanges a more significant voice in Operating Committee decision-making, but it is already the case under the Plan that no single exchange family or even pair of exchange families can themselves control voting outcomes, even at a majority voting threshold.[2394] Thus, the determinants of whether majority voting would result in adequate attention to the rights of minority members continues to turn on the factors set out in the economic analysis accompanying the Notice.

B. Advisory Committee

The Commission in the Notice further stated that in implementing the requirements of Rule 613—which requires that the Plan designate an Advisory Committee to advise plan sponsors on the implementation, operation, and administration of the Central Repository, and which must include representatives of member firms of the Plan sponsors (broker-dealers)—the Plan requires the Advisory Committee to have diverse membership: A minimum of six broker-dealers of diverse types and six representatives of entities that are not broker-dealers.[2395] The Notice elaborates that, given the primary purpose of the Advisory Committee as a forum to communicate important information to the Operating Committee, which the Operating Committee could then use to ensure its decisions are fully-informed, the Plan's choices in implementing Rule 613 do reflect some tradeoffs.[2396] Specifically, one factor in the ability of the Advisory Committee to collect relevant information for the Operating Committee is the quality and depth of the expertise, and the diversity of viewpoints, of the Advisory Committee's membership.[2397] The Notice states that the Plan balances these considerations by providing the Advisory Committee with sufficient membership to be able to generate useful information and advice for the Operating Committee, while being at a sufficiently low size and diversity level to permit the members to be able to work together.[2398] Moreover, another factor in the ability of the Advisory Committee to advise the Operating Committee is whether the Advisory Committee, having assembled a diverse set of views, could effectively communicate those views to the Operating Committee.[2399] The Notice states that two Plan provisions, relating to the staggering of member terms and the limits on participation of the Advisory Committee under Rule 613, bear on this communication.[2400] Finally, one other determinant bears on the effectiveness of the Advisory Committee in ensuring that the Operating Committee makes decisions in light of diverse information—whether the Operating Committee actually takes into account the facts and views of the Advisory Committee before making a decision.[2401] Here, the Notice states that the Plan does not contain a mechanism to ensure that the Operating Committee considers the views of the Advisory Committee.[2402]

A number of commenters raised concerns about the extent of input from entities other than plan sponsors into the governance of the Plan. Several of these commenters cited what they perceived to be governance shortcomings with other NMS Plans that have a governance structure similar to that of the CAT NMS Plan—*i.e.,* those that also have an Operating Committee limited to SRO members, and an Advisory Committee for generating input from a broader set of interested parties.[2403] In addition to generalized

---

[2388] Fidelity Letter at 7–8; *see also* EMSAC Recommendation, *supra* note 693, at 3. The recommendation recognizes changes in the environment with respect to exchange competition. *See* Transcript, Equity Market Structure Advisory Committee Meeting (April 26, 2016) at 106 (''EMSAC April 26 Transcript''), *available at https://www.sec.gov/spotlight/emsac/emsac-042616-transcript.txt.*

[2389] Fidelity Letter at 7–8; *see also* EMSAC Recommendation, *supra* note 693 at 3. The recommendation recognizes that the number of exchange licenses that an exchange may have is related to the flexibility to provide for different pricing arrangements, rather than relating to what is appropriate for NMS Plan voting. *See* EMSAC April 26 Transcript, *supra* note 2388, at 106–07.

[2390] Response Letter I at 7–8.

[2391] Response Letter I at 7.

[2392] The analysis therefore does not relate to whether changes at a later point to NMS Plan governance more broadly, which could include changes to CAT NMS Plan governance, would be appropriate at such time; *see also infra* note 2442 and associated text; Section IV.B, *supra.*

[2393] Unanimous voting is required for: (i) Obligating Participants to make a loan or capital contribution to the Company; (ii) dissolving the Company; and (iii) acting by written consent in lieu of a meeting. *See* Section IV.B.1, *supra.*

[2394] *See infra* note 2811.

[2395] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30704. The Notice also makes clear that the ''[t]erms of Advisory Committee members would not exceed three years, and memberships would be staggered so that a third of the Committee would be replaced each year.'' *Id.*

[2396] *Id.*

[2397] *Id.*

[2398] *Id.*

[2399] *Id.*

[2400] *Id.* at 30705. The Notice clarifies that staggering of terms could ''enhance the cohesion of the Advisory Committee, and thereby its effectiveness in communicating member viewpoints to the Operating Committee.'' But, ''the Operating Committee members may exclude Advisory Committee members from Executive Sessions.'' *Id.*

[2401] *Id.*

[2402] *Id.* Such a mechanism could include, per the Notice, ''requiring the Operating Committee to respond to the Advisory Committee's views, formally or informally, in advance of or following a decision by the Operating Committee.'' *Id.*

[2403] SIFMA Letter at 25 (''The existing governance structure for other NMS Plans, which is being imported into the Plan, is ineffective and will provide broker-dealers with no meaningful participation in the development or operation of the CAT.''); Fidelity Letter at 7 (noting that the Plan's governance structure is similar to that of other NMS Plans, which structure has largely been unchanged since the 1970s, despite significant market changes; stating that ''we do not believe that the governance structure in the Proposed Plan permits CAT Advisory Committee members an opportunity to participate meaningfully in the implementation, operation, and administration of the CAT . . . .''); KCG Letter at 7 (''Feedback related to the

concerns about Advisory Committees having a lack of ''visibility,'' ''voice,'' or ''authority,'' [2404] commenters raised a number of ways in which they believe Advisory Committees' ability to provide effective input into Operating Committees' decision-making has been limited: Executive sessions of Operating Committees are overused to exclude Advisory Committee participation; [2405] robust information-sharing was not practiced; [2406] and other similar obstacles.[2407] These and other commenters expressed the view that voting representation for certain types of entities [2408] on the Plan's Operating Committee was necessary to promote fully-informed and high-quality decision-making,[2409] to enhance transparency and mitigate plan sponsor conflicts of interest,[2410] or to ensure adequate incentives exist to drive future improvements to the CAT.[2411]

Some commenters argued for improving the effectiveness of the Advisory Committee—on its own merits, in addition to changes to the Operating Committee, or as a second-best alternative to Operating Committee changes.[2412] Along these lines, several commenters asserted that the membership of the Advisory Committee should be expanded to include more or additional types of entities.[2413] Commenters also suggested that the Advisory Committee should be involved in every aspect of CAT decision-making, with procedural protections put in place to ensure a robust role for the Advisory Committee in the operation and administration of the CAT.[2414] Finally, some commenters called for additional enhanced governance features, such as independent directors, an audit committee, or publicly-released financial and other disclosures.[2415]

One commenter objected wholesale to the governance structure of the Plan, asserting that the ''governance of the CAT must not be riddled with conflicts of interest'' and that therefore the CAT

---

administration and operation of other NMS Plans . . . indicates that Advisory Committee members have limited visibility into the actions of the Operating Committee and almost no voice in the operation [of the] NMS Plan''); ICI Letter at 10 (''[T]he governance structure . . ., similar to other NMS plans, deprives a broad range of market participants, including registered funds and their advisers, of any meaningful voice in plan operations . . . .''). *Cf.* DAG Letter at 3 (noting that Industry's experience as a part of the CAT's DAG was that ''SROs limited the Industry's participation in important aspects of the development process''); STA Letter at 1 (seconding the DAG Letter's conclusions).

[2404] SIFMA Letter at 26; KCG Letter at 7; ICI Letter at 10; Fidelity Letter at 7.

[2405] SIFMA Letter at 26 (''[T]he SROs have a long history of conducting all meaningful NMS Plan business in executive session, from which Advisory Committee members are excluded.''); Fidelity Letter at 7; KCG Letter at 7.

[2406] SIFMA Letter at 26 (''[T]he Operating Committees have refused to share even routine documents.''); *cf.* Fidelity Letter at 7.

[2407] SIFMA Letter at 26 (citing also the exclusion of Advisory Committee members from meetings of ''subcommittees'' of the Operating Committee, the circulation of agendas with limited opportunity to prepare views and the requirement that an SRO ''sponsor'' an agenda item raised by the Advisory Committee, and the absence of a mechanism for an individual member of an Advisory Committee to solicit and represent the views of broader constituencies).

[2408] SIFMA Letter at 25 (broker-dealers); DAG Letter at 3 (''Industry members''); ICI Letter at 11 (representatives of registered funds and other non-SRO participants); STA Letter at 1 (seconding the DAG Letter); KGC Letter at 6 (broker-dealers); MFA Letter at 3 (''an institutional investor, a broker-dealer with a substantial retail base, a broker-dealer with a substantial institutional base, a data management expert, and . . . a representative from a federal agency experienced with cybersecurity concerns as they relate to national security'').

[2409] SIFMA Letter at 25 (noting that (1) the CAT is complex and broker-dealer insight will bring perspectives of those who will be doing the bulk of the reporting; (2) broker-dealer participation will ensure the burden of systems changes is shared between broker-dealers and SROs; and (3) broker-dealers will, under the CAT funding model, be expected to bear the vast majority of costs); DAG Letter at 3 (''[F]iltering [Industry] input through SROs, who face a different set of reporting challenges than Industry members, has proven to be an imperfect mechanism for communicating and addressing concerns[;] . . . the Industry remains too far removed from decision-making processes.''); STA Letter at 1 (seconding the DAG Letter); ICI Letter at 11 (stating that ''[t]he perspective of other market participants—particularly given that the central repository will house their sensitive information—would help in the development and maintenance of the CAT'' and noting further that registered funds' and their advisers' views would make the Operating Committee ''far better informed'' particularly with respect to the impact of CAT on trading and order management practices of funds, and on CAT data security); MFA Letter at 3 (suggesting representation for market participants who will be most significantly impacted by the Operating Committee's decisions).

[2410] ICI Letter at 12 (stating that the SROs have an incentive to make regulatory use of and to potentially commercialize the information that they report to the CAT, whereas registered funds would be solely interested in the ''security, confidentiality, and appropriate use of all data reported to the CAT''); KCG Letter at 7; MFA Letter at 3–4.

[2411] MFA Letter at 4.

[2412] *See infra* n.161–162 & associated text; *see also* SIFMA Letter at 26 (while stating that the Advisory Committee is not a substitute for direct voting rights, offering comments ''in the alternative'' on the Plan's proposed Advisory Committee structure); FIF Letter at 135 (recommending ''defining the Advisory Committee to reflect a more participatory, active role in the formulation of decisions and directions being reviewed by the SROs''). *But cf.* KCG Letter at 7 (stating that the Advisory Committee is ''not an adequate substitute for providing non-SROs with full voting power on the CAT NMS Plan Operating Committee'').

[2413] Hanley Letter at 6 (add two financial economists); SIFMA Letter at 27 (''the makeup of the Advisory Committee should include participants with an appropriate representation of firm sizes and business models, such as: Inter-dealer brokers, agency brokers, retail brokers, institutional brokers, proprietary trading firms, smaller broker-dealers, firms with a floor presence, and trade associations''—to be selected by broker-dealer representatives, rather than SROs); DAG Letter at 3 (the ''Advisory Committee should have a strong Industry continent and [] this contingent should be formed prior to the approval of the plan''); STA Letter at 1 (seconding the DAG Letter); FIF Letter at 135–136 (''the composition of the Advisory Committee should be widened to 20 participants with a minimum of 12 broker-dealer firms represented''; ''[c]ategories of participants that should be added are trade processing and order management service bureaus, as well as the industry associations, such as FIF and SIFMA''); ICI Letter at 12 (''more investor representation, including representation from registered funds'' and clarify that existing slot for ''institutional'' investor would include ''advisers to registered funds''); Reuters at 6 (add service bureau representation; service bureaus can offer the view of multiple of their audit trail reporting clients); *see also* Fidelity Letter at 7 (recommending adoption of the EMSAC recommendations, which includes nomination of new candidates for Advisory Committee membership by the Advisory Committee, to be confirmed by a majority vote of the Operating Committee).

[2414] SIFMA Letter at 27–28 (stating that the role of the Advisory Committee must include every aspect of the CAT, including every discussion and meeting of the Operating Committee, and every key issue; procedural safeguards would include (1) establishing written criteria for, and written justifications for invoking, executive sessions, (2) written responses to or documentation for any rejection by the Operating Committee of a written recommendation of the Advisory Committee, (3) circulation of agendas and documentation with sufficient time to prepare for meetings, and (4) broad access by Advisory Committee members to information regarding the performance of the central repository); ICI Letter at 13 (stating that the CAT NMS Plan should include (1) a requirement that the Operating Committee respond in writing to Advisory Committee recommendations, (2) a right for the Advisory Committee to have broad access to documents, and (3) a right to be present in all discussions about data security, including receiving all reports from the CCO and CISO that the Operating Committee receives); Reuters at 7 (stating that the Advisory Committee should have input on Plan amendments that impact CAT Reporters, as well as on decisions on ''funding and other aspects of CAT operations''); Fidelity Letter at 7 (supporting changes to Advisory Committee structure proposed by the EMSAC). *Cf.* DAG Letter at 3 (the Advisory Committee's Industry contingent should be formed prior to the approval of the Plan to permit the Advisory Committee to provide input to the selection of the Processor and developing Operating Procedures); FIF Letter at 136–37 (an active and collaborative Advisory Committee is necessary to ensure a high-quality CAT; the scope of the Advisory Committee should include the CAT System in addition to the Central Repository; and the Advisory Committee should have input into all amendments—material and non-material (with material amendments redefined to include ''External Material Amendments'' and ''Internal Material Amendments''); NYSE Letter at 4–6.

[2415] SIFMA Letter at 29 (requesting that the CAT be operated at-cost, with fully transparent, publicly-disclosed annual reports, audited financial statements, and executive compensation disclosure; an audit committee should ensure that revenue is used for regulatory purposes—these would be appropriate to the ''regulatory undertaking'' and ''industry utility'' that the CAT should be, with SROs' regulatory decisions ''made outside the governance and operation of the CAT itself''); DAG Letter at 3 (calling for the CAT governance structure to include independent directors (with both non-Industry and Industry participants) and a majority-independent audit committee); STA Letter at 1 (seconding the DAG Letter).

should either be controlled entirely by the Commission, or that the CAT governance structure should be radically altered, in order for it to be more consistent with the public interest and the SEC's mission.[2416]

On the other hand, one commenter expressed a view that the CAT NMS Plan's governance structure, including the provision limiting Operating Committee voting membership to Plan sponsors, was appropriate, given that Rule 613 places the responsibility for creating and maintaining the CAT NMS Plan on the Plan sponsors,[2417] and that the Plan sponsors, as SROs, are subject to obligations under Rules 608 and 613, as well as Section 6(b)(1) and 15A(b)(2) of the Exchange Act—obligations to which Advisory Committee members are not subject.[2418]

In their responses, Participants responded to many of the concerns raised by the commenters. First, the Participants stated that the composition of the Operating Committee is consistent with Rule 613, and including non-SROs on the Committee could give rise to conflicts of interest as entities that are the subject of market surveillance would be given a role in determining how such market surveillance would operate.[2419] Moreover, the Advisory Committee would provide non-SROs with an ''appropriate and meaningful forum'' in which to make their views known.[2420]

With respect to the Advisory Committee, the Participants agreed with certain commenters who had called for additional entities to be added to the membership of the Advisory Committee, and therefore proposed a Plan amendment to add a service bureau representative, along with an additional institutional investor representative (while requiring one of the three institutional investor representatives to represent registered funds).[2421] However, the Participants disagreed with adding financial economists, as there is already an academic who could be a financial economist; trade groups, as there are already individual members thereof represented; or additional broker-dealers, as there are already several representatives from different segments of the industry—and adding so many additional people would ''likely hamper, rather than facilitate, discussion.'' [2422] With respect to the appointment of Advisory Committee members, the Participants rejected the suggestion that the broker-dealer members of the Advisory Committee be permitted to make appointments, but determined to amend the Plan to provide the Advisory Committee an opportunity to advise the Operating Committee on candidates before the Operating Committee makes an appointment.[2423]

With respect to the activities of the Advisory Committee, the Participants stated that the existing structure provided under Rule 613 already provides the Advisory Committee with an appropriate, active role in governance, and that no changes are needed.[2424] Similarly, the Participants did not believe that a change to provisions governing consideration of Material Amendments was necessary to provide the Advisory Committee with a more robust role.[2425]

With respect to the additional procedural protections for the effectiveness of the Advisory Committee, the Participants asserted that, first, with respect to Executive Sessions, Rule 613 and the Plan strike the right balance, as the Plan Participants need the opportunity to discuss certain matters, including certain regulatory and security issues, without the participation of the industry, and that maintaining flexibility in determining when to meet in Executive Session is important. But Participants nonetheless clarified that they intend to limit Executive Sessions to ''limited purposes requiring confidentiality.'' Second, Participants asserted that similarly the right balance has been struck with respect to the treatment of Advisory Committee requests and recommendations, as the commenters' proposed procedural protections are formulaic, and could hamper interactions.[2426] The Participants also affirmed their belief that ''as a matter of good corporate governance, the Operating Committee should take into consideration the Advisory Committee's input regarding the CAT.'' [2427]

Finally, with respect to the other governance features requested by commenters, the Participants declined to make any changes. With respect to independent directors, according to Participants, the composition of the Operating Committee as set forth in the Plan is consistent with Rule 613, and adding independent directors is unnecessary, given existing independent representation on SRO boards.[2428] Moreover, they asserted that an audit committee is unnecessary, because the CAT will operate on a break-even (versus for-profit) basis, the Operating Committee members can act objectively, and the Compliance Subcommittee can aid the CCO in much the same way as an independent audit committee would.[2429] Finally, the Participants noted that financial transparency is accomplished through Advisory Committee members' right to access information about the operation of the CAT and their receipt of minutes from meetings; also, financial information related to the CAT will be disclosed in fee filings with the Commission.[2430]

The Commission has considered the comments it received regarding governance issues but believes that the economic benefits and tradeoffs of the CAT NMS Plan governance structure examined in the Notice continue to apply. The Commission in the Notice stated that the governance provisions of the CAT could ''help promote better

[2416] Better Markets Letter at 4–6 (with respect to the latter option, the CAT would need to be a not-for-profit, led by a Board with a supermajority of independent directors (including an independent Chair), and with SEC representation, with ultimate SEC control over the access to and usage of the CAT).

[2417] NYSE Letter at 4–5 (citing the Commission's statement in the Adopting Release that the structure of the Operating Committee and the Advisory Committee, including the ability of the Operating Committee to meet in executive session, ''appropriately balances the need to provide a mechanism for industry input . . . against the regulatory imperative that the operations and decisions regarding the [CAT] be made by SROs who have a statutory obligation to regulate the securities markets, rather than by members of the SROs, who have no corresponding statutory obligation . . . .''). *But cf.* KCG Letter at 6 (stating that the SRO-only Operating Committee is ''contrary to the public interest and fails to recognize the CAT system as a core market utility meant to benefit all market participants'').

[2418] *Id.* at 6 (the latter are the obligations to comply, and enforce its members' compliance with, the Exchange Act).

[2419] Response Letter I at 6.

[2420] *Id.* at 7.

[2421] *Id.* at 9–10.

[2422] *Id.* at 10–11.

[2423] *Id.* at 13–14.

[2424] Response Letter I at 13. The Participants also declined to form the Advisory Committee prior to the approval of the Plan in response to the commenter who wanted the Industry contingent to the Advisory Committee to be formed early to have input on selection of the Plan Processor and the formation of operating procedures, stating that they have, and will continue, to engage with the DAG in order to receive the views of industry members prior to the approval of the Plan. *Id.* at 16–17.

[2425] *Id.* at 19–20.

[2426] *Id.* at 14–16. The purposes requiring confidentiality for which an Executive Session could be appropriate were further elaborated as including ''(1) matters that present an actual or potential conflict of interest for Advisory Committee members (*e.g.,* relating to Industry Members' regulatory compliance); (2) discussion of actual or potential litigation; (3) CAT security issues; and (4) personnel issues.'' *Id.* at 15.

[2427] *Id.* at 15–16. Response Letter I did not directly address the comments regarding agenda timing, or broad informational access.

[2428] *Id.* at 7.

[2429] *Id.* at 8–9. However, Participants also stated that the Operating Committee could decide to add an audit committee at a later date. *Id.* at 9.

[2430] *Id.* at 17.

decision-making by the relevant parties'' and thereby ''could mitigate concerns about potential uncertainty in the economic effects of the Plan by giving the Commission greater confidence that its expected benefits would be achieved in an efficient manner and that costs resulting from inefficiencies would be avoided.'' [2431] While commenters have not raised issues that would cause the Commission to fundamentally reconsider that assessment, commenters have called attention to ways in which they believe NMS Plan governance could be improved to increase the likelihood that the benefits of the plan would be achieved in an efficient manner and that costs resulting from inefficiencies would be avoided. These are discussed in turn below, along with the changes the Participants recommended making to the Plan, and which the Commission has made, in response to certain comments. As above, the discussion is specific to the CAT NMS Plan, and specifically, the question of whether the governance structure as amended would decrease Plan uncertainty for purposes of the Commission's approval of the CAT NMS Plan.

The Notice did not expressly address the possibility of adding non-SRO members to the Operating Committee, given that the Commission in the Adopting Release for Rule 613 cited the ''regulatory imperative'' that the operations and decisions regarding the CAT be made by SROs, who have the statutory obligation to oversee the securities markets.[2432] The Commission believes that adding non-SROs to the Operating Committee, as advocated by some commenters, could give rise to the types of tradeoffs that are similar to those the Commission identified in the Notice with respect to expanding or diversifying the Advisory Committee: A larger and more diverse Operating Committee could result in better-informed Operating Committee decision-making, but it could also decrease the ability of Operating Committee members to coordinate effectively in decision making.[2433] In particular, non-SROs may have significantly different interests than SRO members, given that non-SROs lack the statutory obligation to oversee the securities markets, and their inclusion could give rise to potential conflicts of interest or recusal issues if the Operating Committee were to discuss regulatory surveillance issues. Thus, the Commission believes that adding non-SRO members to the Operating Committee at this time would increase rather than decrease the uncertainty around achieving the benefits of the Plan.

Commenters did not challenge the nature of the tradeoffs that apply to the membership of the Advisory Committee, but rather where the particular balance was struck. A larger, more diverse committee as advocated by some commenters could provide additional views that could lead to better-informed decision-making; however, such a committee could also lack cohesion and have difficulty making decisions in a timely manner, which would impede the efficiency of the decision-making process under the CAT NMS Plan.[2434] Adding a small number of diverse voices as Participants propose to do in response to comments could enhance the quality of Advisory Committee decision-making by increasing the diversity of views that are represented, but risks decreasing the quality of decision-making by making the Advisory Committee larger and less cohesive. It is difficult to determine where the exact tipping point lies, but the changes the Participants propose making to the Plan we believe would on net increase the quality of Plan decision-making: The value of the additional diverse viewpoints appears likely to justify any additional unwieldiness the two additional members might cause. Along these same lines, the Commission further believes that adding the unique perspectives of a financial economist would also increase the quality of the Advisory Committee discussions without unduly burdening its operations, and the Commission has therefore amended the Plan to add to the Advisory Committee an academic who is a financial economist. However, adding a large number of additional members, or members whose views could be expected to largely coincide with those of existing members, as certain commenters sought, makes it more likely that the marginal benefits of expansion would be outweighed by the increase in coordination difficulties.[2435]

With respect to the Advisory Committee membership, one commenter suggested that the appointments be made by the broker-dealer members of the Advisory Committee, rather than by the Operating Committee; Participants asserted that the Operating Committee should have selection responsibility. The question of who to vest with appointment power embodies certain tradeoffs: Increasing the independence of the Advisory Committee by vesting appointment power in Advisory Committee members may promote more diverse or robust presentation of views to the Operating Committee. On the other hand, it increases the possibility that the Advisory Committee would operate in a manner adversarial to the Operating Committee, and could diminish the likelihood that the Operating Committee would be open to persuasion following consideration of the Advisory Committee's views. Moreover, vesting appointment powers solely in the broker-dealer members of the Advisory Committee, as opposed to all members of the Advisory Committee, could result in Advisory Committee membership that overweighs the views of broker-dealers. As a compromise position, the Participants propose to formalize a role for the Advisory Committee in advising the Operating Committee on membership selections. This is not the only compromise position that could balance the interests of SROs and non-SROs and ensure the representation of a diverse set of views to promote well-informed decision-making—for example, one commenter's alternative would provide slightly more power to the Advisory Committee by vesting nominating authority in the Advisory Committee, while providing a veto right to the Operating Committee through the majority vote it would take to confirm a new member. But the Plan, as amended, would promote better-informed decision-making by ensuring the views of existing Advisory Committee members are considered as part of the selection of new members.

[2431] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30705.

[2432] *Id.* at 30704.

[2433] Similarly, adding an independent board or audit committee to the Plan's governance structure could provide additional oversight of Plan decision-making and mitigate potential concerns about Plan Participants' conflicts of interest, but it could also decrease coordination in decision-making required for efficiently achieving the regulatory benefits of the Plan. Aside from the potential costs, the incremental benefits of these and other enhanced governance features (*e.g.,* additional disclosure requirements) may be narrow in light of the other provisions discussed in the Notice, including the Commission's ability to monitor whether the benefits of the CAT are being achieved and the provisions limiting the incentive and ability of Operating Committee members to serve the private interests of their employers, including rules regarding recusal of Operating Committee members from voting on matters that raise a conflict of interest. *Id.* at 30741.

[2434] *Id.* at 30705.

[2435] For example, while there are many diverse types of broker-dealers, it is not clear that increasing the number of broker-dealers representatives from 7 to 12 would add significantly to the diversity of views represented on the Advisory Committee, and by constituting a majority of Advisory Committee members, may give rise to a risk that broker-dealer voices would dominate Advisory Committee discussions, which could limit the diversity of views transmitted to the Operating Committee and thereby worsen Plan decision-making.

This should promote membership in the Advisory Committee that is more independent, rather than intellectually-aligned with either the Operating Committee or Advisory Committee (or some subset thereof), and thereby better-able to bring diverse views to the Operating Committee's attention in Plan decision-making.

While, as amended, the Plan would provide a role with respect to Advisory Committee membership selection to the Advisory Committee, the Participants did not propose an additional expansion of the activities of the Advisory Committee, as some commenters had sought. It is not clear that procedural changes such as having the Advisory Committee formally vote on matters that the Operating Committee is voting on, as opposed to a less formal way of providing the Operating Committee with the Advisory Committee's views with respect to those votes, would materially improve Plan decision-making and thereby reduce uncertainty that benefits would be achieved.[2436] Similarly, the Plan's current definition of Material Amendment seems appropriately calibrated to bring the most robust decision-making processes to bear on the matters of the greatest importance. Altering the balance to add more process under Section 6.9(c) (*i.e.,* to require affirmative approval by Supermajority Vote (Material Amendments) versus a right of objection vested solely in Participants plus a Majority Vote (non-Material Amendments)) could improve the quality of those decisions by making them better-informed—*i.e.,* by requiring debate and subjecting them to a Supermajority Vote, versus only triggering debate at the option of Participants [2437]—but the additional delay imposed on decision-making with respect to less significant matters would likely not justify any marginal gains in decisional quality.

Similarly, the Notice discussed several of the issues raised by commenters, including that the Advisory Committee members are permitted to attend Operating Committee meetings but are excluded from Executive Sessions; that the Advisory Committee's access to information is subject to scope and content determinations made by the Operating Committee; and that there is no mechanism under the Plan to ensure that the Operating Committee does in fact consider the views of the Advisory Committee when engaged in Plan decision-making.[2438] Changing any of these features as commenters suggested would pose certain economic tradeoffs. Commenters did not assert that the Advisory Committee system as currently constructed is unable to function appropriately, but rather in their experience that it does not—and therefore that additional protections are needed. Cooperation in good faith under the existing structure of the Plan could ensure that Advisory Committee members have access to the information they need to contribute meaningfully to discussions and that Advisory Committee members' recommendations are taken seriously; absent good faith cooperation, processes would be needed to promote these outcomes. While additional processes could provide protections, they would also increase inflexibility. Thus, adding formal mechanisms where informal mechanisms would have sufficed would add costs, delay, and lack of adaptability with little or no corresponding benefit.

In their response, Participants stated that they ''recognize the benefit and purpose of the Advisory Committee and intend to use the Executive Session for limited purposes requiring confidentiality'' and further that ''as a matter of good corporate governance, the Operating Committee should take into consideration the Advisory Committee's input regarding the CAT.'' [2439] The Commission agrees, and in light of the Participants' assurances, believes that the protections sought by some commenters are generally not necessary to achieve the Plan's benefits and could be counterproductive at this time.

However, the Commission is amending the Plan in two ways that respond, at least in part, to certain of commenters' concerns. First, the Commission is amending the Plan to require that SEC Staff be able to attend Executive Sessions. In addition to the direct oversight benefits that would accrue from SEC Staff attendance at Executive Sessions, SEC Staff would be able to monitor whether Participants are complying with their stated intent of limiting Executive Sessions to purposes requiring confidentiality. The direct and indirect costs of permitting SEC Staff attendance should be low, but potential indirect costs do exist. For example, it may chill the free exchange of ideas in an executive session if the presence of the Participants' regulator causes the Participants to engage in a less robust conversation, which could diminish the effectiveness of the Plan's governance. Similarly, the additional imposition on Executive Sessions may prompt the Participants to seek alternative, informal methods of communication and debate outside the formal governance mechanisms established by the Plan, which could ultimately disadvantage Advisory Committee members if decisions are made informally, without the benefit of their input.

Second, the Commission is amending the Plan to require that the Advisory Committee members receive the same materials and information as the Operating Committee receives (absent confidentiality concerns with respect to such information). This new procedural protection will put Advisory Committee members on an equal informational footing with the Operating Committee, and should thereby allow the Advisory Committee to produce recommendations that are better-informed. The procedural protection should have low direct costs: It does not require the preparation of new materials but simply the dissemination of information that is already prepared for the Operating Committee. However, there could be indirect costs and tradeoffs. Principally, Operating Committee members who are no longer able to exclude certain materials from dissemination to the Advisory Committee members (*e.g.,* materials that are sensitive in some way but do not fall within the confidentiality exception in the Plan) could choose to withhold such materials entirely, thereby making the Operating Committee's deliberations less well-informed, or they could seek to hold sensitive discussions in a less formal or less well-documented venue, which could pose the same problems as discussed above with respect to SEC presence in Executive Sessions.

With respect to the remaining requested protections for which no Plan amendment is being made, the Commission will be alert to future suggestions that cooperation between the Advisory Committee and the Operating Committee is lacking, and will assess, as appropriate, whether additional procedural protections are needed.

[2436] Similarly, constituting the industry portion of the Advisory Committee early, so that industry may have a greater voice with respect to selection of the Plan Processor and the operating procedures of the CAT, would not improve Plan decision-making where those views could be solicited from industry via the DAG.

[2437] It is not clear the extent to which the Advisory Committee would have the opportunity to have input into a non-Material Amendment during the 10 day window before the non-Material Amendment is deemed approved, but, as noted above in Section IV.B.2, the Commission amendment to the Plan would provide the Advisory Committee with the same information regarding non-Material Amendments as the Operating Committee would have.

[2438] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30705.

[2439] Response Letter I at 15–16.

With respect to the additional governance features for which some commenters advocated—an independent board, audit committee, and financial transparency—the economic analysis in the Notice did not specifically discuss these items. The Commission believes that, on balance, commenters advocating for these issues have not raised concerns that would cause the Commission to alter its economic analysis. Having an independent board or audit committee would add an additional layer of complication to Plan decision-making—triangulating among the Operating Committee, Advisory Committee, and the independent board, thereby increasing the likelihood of untimely decision-making. There do not appear to be significant offsetting benefits at this time, as alternative mechanisms already exist to advance the purposes that these governance enhancements would seek to serve. If the purpose is that there be an external check on potential conflicts of interest, the Advisory Committee can serve in that role, given its ability to receive documents.[2440] Similarly, to the extent that independent board members or an audit committee could serve a monitoring function, such a monitoring function could already be accomplished through the Compliance Subcommittee that the Plan establishes to aid the CCO.[2441] Because the functions that the additional governance features would fulfill are already performed, at least in some extent, by existing features of Plan governance, adding them does not appear necessary at this time to ensure that the Plan's governance is such that uncertainties under the Plan would be diminished.

With respect to the commenter who advocated a radically different method for Plan governance, where the CAT would be controlled by the Commission to avoid conflicts of interest, the Commission notes that SROs are entrusted with regulatory and oversight responsibilities by the Exchange Act; to the extent their commercial interests create an actual or potential conflict of interest, the Advisory Committee is able to monitor and advise the Operating Committee on Plan decision-making, acting as a counter-weight; and to the extent there are any residual unmitigated conflicts, the Commission has authority to intervene. The Commission believes that the CAT NMS Plan approach to balancing and offsetting the conflicts of interest can achieve the regulatory benefits of the CAT.

At this time, given the analysis above, the Commission believes that the governance structure in the Plan as modified increases the likelihood that the benefits of the Plan will be achieved. The Commission notes that more significant changes to NMS Plan governance structures could potentially produce better overall Plan outcomes, but could also lead to additional coordination problems or have unintended consequences. Thus, while the Commission believes that the reduction in uncertainty relating to the achievement of Plan benefits can at this time best be achieved through the Plan's approach to governance, the Commission will continue to assess the governance of NMS Plans generally and the tradeoffs between the quality and efficiency of the decision-making processes of NMS Plans.[2442]

Finally, one commenter asserted that the CAT should be administered by a single centralized body from a legal, administrative, supervisory, and enforcement perspective, rather than by nineteen separate SROs.[2443] According to that commenter, while the Plan ''contains permissive language'' that would allow the SROs to enter into agreements with one another, nothing requires the SROs to enter into 17d–2 agreements, Regulatory Services Agreements, or some combination thereof. Thus, SROs could interpret the CAT's requirements differently, or apply them to duplicative enforcement, which would be ''inefficient and unworkable for firms that are members of several of the SROs.'' Coordination, by contrast, ''will create efficiencies and avoid regulatory duplication, potential inconsistent interpretations and interpretive guidance, and unnecessary compliance costs.'' [2444] The Participants stated that they recognize the potential efficiencies to be achieved through coordination, and plan to consider a Rule 17d–2 agreement.[2445] The Commission agrees that coordination of efforts can produce efficiencies, but notes that alternative mechanisms for coordination of efforts, including the Operating Committee, also exist. Requiring delegation of authority to one SRO also would not necessarily lead to a better outcome, if such a one-size-fits-all approach were to inhibit the ability to tailor programs to a particular SRO or its members. However, in light of the potential efficiencies, the Commission believes it important that the Participants consider mechanisms for regulatory cooperation, and has therefore amended the Plan to require a report detailing the Participants' considerations. Thus, the permissive approach taken in the Plan—where SROs can execute agreements but are not required to do so, particularly where coupled with the Participants' assertion that they are exploring whether it would in fact be efficient to enter into those agreements and the Plan's requirement that they report on whether they have done so—still promotes the achievement of the Plan's regulatory benefits.

(3) Conclusion

In the Notice, the Commission concluded by stating its preliminary belief that the governance provisions discussed therein could help promote better decision-making by the relevant parties and, in turn, could mitigate concerns about potential uncertainty in the economic effects of the Plan by giving the Commission greater confidence that its expected benefits would be achieved in an efficient manner and that costs resulting from inefficiencies would be avoided.[2446] For the reasons discussed above, the Commission continues to believe that this is the case after considering the comments on its analysis, the Participants' response, and modifications to the Plan.

F. Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated current costs related to regulatory data reporting, anticipated costs associated with building and maintaining the Central Repository, and the anticipated costs to report CAT Data to the Central

[2440] In addition, as the Notice makes clear, the Commission can modify the Plan as it may deem necessary or appropriate, and has the right to attend meetings of the Operating Committee, as well as receive specified documents. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5 at 30702. The Commission can thus serve as an additional external check on potential conflicts.

[2441] Similarly, the Commission's amendment to the Plan to require that CAT LLC financial statements be prepared in compliance with GAAP and audited by an independent public accounting firm may substitute to a certain extent for the added financial transparency sought by commenters. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 9.2; *see also* Section IV.B.4; Participants' Letter II.

[2442] *See, e.g.,* Fidelity Letter at 7–8 (''We also agree that the SEC should engage in formal administrative rulemaking to revise Rule 608 of Regulation NMS to specify that NMS Plans must contain governance provisions consistent with the objectives specified in the EMSAC recommendations . . . .''). *Cf.* ICI Letter at 12 (noting that ''*every* NMS Plan . . . at least should include an advisory committee comprising a broad range of industry participants that lack operating committee representation'' (emphasis added)); *see also supra* Section IV.B.

[2443] SIFMA Letter at 29 (suggesting that a single SRO take the lead, and others execute agreements to transfer responsibility for enforcement to that SRO).

[2444] *Id.*

[2445] Response Letter I at 17.

[2446] *Id.*

Repository.[2447] These preliminary estimates were calculated from information provided in the CAT NMS Plan as amended on February 27, 2015 as well as supplemental information. The Commission discussed the Plan's estimate that the 20 Participants spend $154.1 million annually on reporting regulatory data and performing surveillance.[2448] The Notice also reported that the approximately 1,800 broker-dealers anticipated to have CAT reporting responsibilities currently spend $1.6 billion annually on regulatory data reporting. The Commission estimated that the cost of the Plan would be approximately $2.4 billion in initial aggregate implementation costs and $1.7 billion in ongoing annual costs. Furthermore, the Notice discussed that market participants would have duplicative audit trail data reporting responsibilities for a period of up to a maximum of 2.5 years preceding the retirement of potentially duplicative regulatory data reporting schemes. The Commission estimated that duplicative audit trail data reporting could cost broker-dealers $1.6 billion per year or more and could cost the Participants up to $6.9 million per year. The Notice also treated all costs of developing the Plan (estimated at $8.8 million at the time the Plan was filed) as sunk costs, excluding them from costs to industry if the Plan were adopted.

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its belief, however, that there is significant uncertainty surrounding the actual implementation costs of CAT and the actual ongoing broker-dealer data reporting costs if the Plan were approved. The Commission explained that the methodology and data limitations used to develop these cost estimates could result in imprecise estimates that may significantly differ from actual costs.

In the Notice, the Commission considered which elements of the CAT NMS Plan are likely to be among the most significant contributors to CAT costs.[2449] The Commission discussed its preliminary belief that significant sources of costs would include the requirement to report customer information, the requirement to report certain information as part of the Material Terms of the Order, the requirement to use listing exchange symbology, and possibly, the inclusion of Allocation Reports.

The Commission also recognized that a number of second-order effects could result from the approval of the Plan.[2450] These included market-participant actions designed to avoid direct costs of a security breach; changes to CAT Reporter behavior due to increased surveillance; changes in CAT Reporter behavior to switch from one funding tier to another to qualify for lower fees; and changes in broker-dealer routing practices related to fee differentials across Execution Venues. The Commission also recognized that investors and market participants could face significant costs if CAT Data security were breached.[2451]

The Commission has considered the comments received, the Participants' response, and the modifications to the Plan, and has updated and revised its analysis of costs accordingly. The Commission's updated cost estimates presented below consider a change in the number of Participants, updated cost information for the Central Repository provided by the Participants, and modifications to the Plan that include: A requirement that exchanges synchronize their clocks to within 100 microseconds of NIST; [2452] changes to the Funding Model regarding the manner in which ATSs are assessed Central Repository costs; and updated milestones regarding the retirement of duplicative systems. The updated estimates also recognize that the Participants plan to recover some portion of their Plan development costs from industry.

The Commission's revised cost estimates cover 21 Participants, rather than 19 as were covered by the Participants Study. Consequently, the Commission has increased its estimate of the Participants' aggregate implementation costs from $41.1 million to $47.7 million, and increased its estimate of the Participants' ongoing annual costs from $102.4 million to $118.9 million.[2453] Although these changes also increase the Commission's estimate of the implementation and ongoing costs of the Plan to industry, the increases do not change the rounded totals presented in the Notice. The Commission now estimates that the cost of the Plan is approximately $2.4 billion in initial aggregate implementation costs, $55 million in system retirement costs, and $1.7 billion in ongoing annual costs.

The Commission expands on the analysis of the estimated costs above by exploring individual components of the CAT NMS Plan. In general, the CAT NMS Plan does not break down its cost estimates as a function of particular CAT NMS Plan requirements. Therefore, the Commission discusses the costs of particular requirements separately from the aggregate costs and costs by Participant, and qualitatively discusses costs the Commission is unable to estimate. The Commission has revised its analysis of particular requirements from that in the Notice in three ways. First, the Commission now discusses the uncertainty in its analysis of these costs in more detail. Second, in response to information provided by commenters, the Commission now recognizes that some costs, namely costs associated with reporting Allocation Time and Quote Sent Time, were not included in the estimated costs in the Notice. The Commission now includes these costs in the total costs for broker-dealers where estimates are available or otherwise recognizes them as additional to the existing estimates.[2454] Third, the Commission no longer judges whether quantified costs attributable to specific elements of the Plan represent a significant contribution to total costs. The Commission is cognizant that some of the costs for particular elements may be significant in isolation even if they are not a large proportion of the aggregate costs of the Plan.

The Commission continues to believe that direct costs in the event of a CAT security breach could be significant, but that certain provisions of Rule 613 and the CAT NMS Plan appear reasonably designed to mitigate the risk of a security breach. Furthermore, the Commission notes that the Plan amendments and the Participants' response provide more details about the required security provisions and more clarity on the applicability of Regulation SCI standards. The Commission believes that these clarifications address some commenters' concerns by providing more assurances that the security procedures are reasonably designed to prevent security breaches and that customers will be notified in the event of a breach; nevertheless, the

[2447] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30708–30.

[2448] The number of Participants has changed since the Plan was filed. Adjustments to cost numbers to account for new Participants is discussed in Section V.F.1.b, *infra.*

[2449] *Id.* at 30730–32.

[2450] *Id.* at 30733–34.

[2451] *See* Section V.C.8, *supra* and Section VI.F.2.b, *infra.*

[2452] *See* Section V.F.3.a(5), *infra.*

[2453] *See* Section VI.1.b, *infra.*

[2454] The Commission recognizes that Allocation Time may also increase the costs of the Central Repository and that Quote Sent Time may increase the costs of the Central Repository and to Participants. However, the Commission lacks sufficient information to add these costs to the existing estimates in these categories. Consequently, the Commission discusses the modifications qualitatively.

Commission acknowledges that the costs of a breach could be quite large.

As discussed further below, the Commission's analysis of the second-order effects that could result from the approval of the Plan is largely unchanged from what was published in the Notice. However, the Commission has revised its analysis to reflect that the Plan will change so that ATS volume is not charged first to broker-dealers operating the ATS and then again to FINRA, which would pass through the fee costs to their members (which include ATSs). Further, the Commission recognizes certain second-order effects that it did not address in the Notice.

1. Analysis of Expected Costs

The Plan divided the analysis of CAT cost estimates into costs associated with: Building and operating the Central Repository; data reporting and surveillance performed by Participants; data reporting by broker-dealers; and CAT implementation costs borne by service providers. The Notice's analysis of the cost estimates of the Plan followed this approach, and the Commission's updated analysis presented here also divides the analysis of costs in this way, incorporating comments, the Participants' responses, and Plan amendments into each analysis.

There were a number of comments on the Commission's cost estimates, which are discussed below in their appropriate subsections. However, one commenter had general comments on uncertainties in cost estimates and the scope of what was covered by cost estimates presented in the Plan, stating, ''. . . the overarching theme throughout the analysis is that these estimates may not be an accurate reflection of actual costs.'' [2455] The commenter further stated, ''the Proposal does not adequately explain what is included in the calculation of ''costs'' of the system.'' The Commission continues to believe that the cost estimates it provided in the Notice were reliable,[2456] though it acknowledges that uncertainties related to the scope and magnitude of the estimated costs remain.[2457] The Commission further acknowledges that many cost estimates from the Notice reflect market participants' estimates of total costs of implementing and maintaining CAT reporting; the Commission agrees with the commenter that the Plan lacks a certain amount of detail on the cost of individual elements that contribute to the total costs of the Plan that will be borne by market participants.

The Commission attempts to address the individual components of the costs separately below in the Further Analysis of Costs Section.[2458] The Commission has also updated and revised certain cost estimates in response to comments and modifications in the Plan, and explains each of those changes below. The Commission acknowledges that, in light of the predictive nature of the analysis and limitations in the available data, uncertainties remain. The Commission believes, however, that the estimates are reliable in that the methodology used to create the estimates is representative of the costs industry will actually incur, and that the magnitude of the estimates appears to be reasonable. The Commission also notes that, while a commenter criticized the uncertainty in the estimates provided in the Notice, the commenter did not offer additional data and did not fault the Commission's analysis of the information it did have.

a. Costs of Building and Operating the Central Repository

In the Notice, the Commission's estimates of costs to build and operate the Central Repository relied on information presented in the Plan as amended on February 27, 2015. At the time of the Notice, the Plan's estimates of the costs to build the Central Repository were based on Bids that varied in a range as high as $92 million.[2459] The Plan's estimates of annual operating costs at that same time were based on Bids that varied in a range up to $135 million. To estimate the one-time total cost to build the Central Repository, the Plan used the Bids of the final six Shortlisted Bidders.[2460] The eventual magnitude of Central Repository costs is dependent on the Participants' selection of the Plan Processor, and may ultimately differ from estimates discussed in the Plan if Bids are revised as the bidding process progresses. The Plan as filed also provided information based on the Bids on the total five-year operating costs for the Central Repository because the annual costs to operate and maintain the Central Repository are not independent of the build cost. Across the six Shortlisted Bidders, the total five-year costs to build and maintain CAT, according to the Plan at the time of the Notice, ranged from $159.8 million to $538.7 million.[2461] In the Notice, the Commission stated its preliminary belief that estimating Central Repository costs using estimates from the Bids was reliable because they are the result of a competitive bidding process, although the Commission recognized that the Bids are not legally binding on Bidders.[2462]

As discussed in the Notice,[2463] the Commission believed that a range of factors will drive the ultimate costs associated with building and operating the Central Repository and who will bear those costs. Furthermore, the Commission was mindful that the cost estimates associated with building and operating the Central Repository were subject to a number of additional uncertainties. First, the Participants had not yet selected a Plan Processor, and the Shortlisted Bidders had submitted a wide range of cost estimates for building and operating the Central Repository. Second, the individual Bids submitted by the Shortlisted Bidders were not yet final, as Participants could allow Bidders to revise their Bids before the final selection of the Plan Processor. Third, neither the Bidders nor the Commission could anticipate the evolution of technology and market activity with complete prescience.

One commenter provided an alternate estimate for Central Repository ongoing costs.[2464] The commenter stated, ''[w]e estimate the on-going costs for the CAT infrastructure (inclusive of [Business Continuity Plan/Disaster Recovery] costs), to be about $28 million to $36 million annually assuming a low-latency platform running at about 50 millisecond speed.'' The commenter did not provide additional information or analysis to support this estimate, but the Commission believes it is possible it was derived based on comparisons to costs expected from the Volcker Rule because the commenter cited a study of those costs in support of estimates for costs to broker-dealers.[2465] As discussed

[2455] FSR Letter at 9.

[2456] By characterizing estimates as ''reliable,'' the Commission is stating its belief that the methodology used to create the estimates is likely to result in estimates that are representative of the costs industry will actually incur, and that the magnitude of the estimates appears to be reasonable. However, the Commission is not suggesting such estimates are free of uncertainty. Indeed, the Commission recognizes a degree of uncertainty—in some cases a large degree—surrounding estimates it is characterizing as ''reliable.''

[2457] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30708.

[2458] *See* Section V.F.3, *infra* for a discussion of some of the individual components of the costs.

[2459] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30709–11.

[2460] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(B). The Plan does not reflect any more specific cost ranges that result from narrowing the range of Bidders from six to three.

[2461] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(B).

[2462] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30709. The Notice further explains this position.

[2463] *Id.* at 30709–30710.

[2464] Data Boiler Letter at 15.

[2465] Data Boiler Letter at 15.

below,[2466] the requirements of the Plan are significantly different than the requirements of the Volcker Rule, which is primarily focused on restricting certain trading activities and investments of banking entities, rather than the centralization and standardization of regulatory data reporting. The Commission also notes that the estimates provided in the Notice and updated in the Participants' response are the result of a competitive bidding process specific to CAT and the Commission deems them reliable.

The Commission is updating and revising its economic analysis to incorporate updated estimates in the Participants' Response Letter III, a modification to the Plan to establish the Company as a 501(c)(6) non-profit entity, and a requirement that the Company's financials be in compliance with GAAP and audited by an independent public accounting firm.[2467] The Participants' Response Letter III contains estimates of the costs of building and operating the Central Repository from those discussed in the Notice to reflect the fact the that Participants have narrowed the number of Bidders to the final three and the range of potential cost estimates is therefore narrower as well. Based on this updated information, the Commission now believes that the costs to build the Central Repository range from $37.5 million to $65 million and annual operating costs range from $36.5 million to $55 million.[2468] The Participants also clarified that costs from Bids do not include additional expenses that might be incurred such as insurance, operating reserves or third-party costs such as accounting and legal expenses.[2469] The Commission further acknowledges that these cost estimates for the Central Repository do not include Quote Sent Time reporting by Option Market Makers and the capture of Allocation Time in Allocation Reports.[2470] The Commission does not have cost estimates of, and lacks sufficient information to estimate, the costs to the Central Repository of these fields and the Plan does not include this information and commenters did not offer estimates. The Commission does not believe these costs will significantly impact the costs of building or operating the Central Repository because the addition of these fields does not significantly impact the size or scope of the Central Repository. Further, the Commission notes that costs from the Company that will be passed on to Industry Members will be slightly reduced by organizing the Company as a non-profit entity because reserve funds will not be taxable as they would have been under the Plan as filed. The Commission notes, however, that CAT fees—the sole revenue source for the Company—are not expected to exceed the Company's expenses, so the Commission believes these savings will be minor.

Overall, the Commission continues to believe that estimating Central Repository costs using estimates from the Bids is reliable and is therefore updating its cost estimates to reflect updates provided in the Participants' Response Letter III.[2471]

b. Costs to Participants

In the Notice, the Commission stated its preliminary belief that the Plan's estimates of costs for Participants to report CAT Data and of surveillance costs were reasonable and explained the reasoning behind this determination.[2472] At the time, the Plan estimated costs for the Participants as an aggregate across all Participants (the five [2473] single-license Participants and the five Affiliated Participant Groups).[2474] The implementation cost estimate for Participants was $17.9 million.[2475] Annual ongoing costs were estimated to be $14.7 million.[2476]

In the Notice, the Commission estimated that the Participants that filed the Plan currently spend $6.9 million annually on data reporting, based on estimates the Participants provided in the Plan. The Notice also states that Participants currently spend approximately $154 million per year on data reporting and surveillance activities. The Participants estimate that they would incur $41 million in CAT implementation costs, and $14.7 million in annual ongoing costs to report CAT Data. In addition to data reporting costs, Participants face costs associated with developing and implementing a surveillance system reasonably designed to make use of the information contained in CAT Data as required by Rule 613(f).[2477] The Notice discussed the Plan's estimates of the costs to Participants to implement surveillance programs using data stored in the Central Repository. The Plan provided an estimate of $23.2 million to implement surveillance systems for CAT, and ongoing annual costs of $87.7 million.[2478] At the time, the Plan did not provide information on why Participants' data reporting costs would substantially increase nor did it provide information on why surveillance costs would decrease.

Finally, in the Notice, the Commission assumed that cost estimates presented in the Plan were limited to costs the Participants would incur if the Plan is approved, and that the cost estimates did not include other costs related to development of the Plan that the Participants have incurred previously, or will incur regardless of approval.[2479] The Plan separately reports that Participants have spent $8.8 million in development costs to date.[2480] Because these development costs do not depend on approval of the Plan, the Commission treated them as sunk costs in the Notice and did not include them in the costs to the Participants.[2481]

The Commission received several comments regarding the estimates of Participants' data reporting costs in the Notice. One commenter stated that estimates of current data reporting costs to Participants are ''grossly underestimated,'' but did not provide further detail or alternate estimates.[2482] The same commenter stated the implementation cost estimate of $17.9 million for Participants was ''not too far off,'' but felt the Participants' estimated

[2466] *See* Section V.F.2.a, *infra.*

[2467] *See* Participants' Letter II.

[2468] The Commission uses the upper end of cost ranges for its estimates of aggregate costs to industry, as discussed in Section V.F.2.a, *infra.*

[2469] Response Letter III at 15.

[2470] These fields were included in the Plan, but because the bidding process began before the Exemptive Requests were submitted and approved, it is possible that Bids did not include expenses related to collecting and storing these fields. *See* Section V.F.3(6), *infra* and Section V.F.3(4), *infra.*

[2471] Response Letter III at 15.

[2472] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30711.

[2473] In its discussion of Participants' costs, the Notice errantly discussed six single license Participants and five Affiliated Participant Groups. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30711. At the time of the notice, there were five single license Participants and six Affiliated Participant Groups. Because Participant costs were aggregated across all Participants in the Plan, this correction does not affect the Commission's estimate of the Participants' costs of the Plan. At this time, there are six single-license Participants and four Affiliated Participant Groups. *See infra* note V.G.1.a(1)B.

[2474] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(B)(2).

[2475] *Id.*

[2476] *Id.*

[2477] 17 CFR 242.613(f).

[2478] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(B)(2). Rule 613 requires the SROs to file updated surveillance plans within 14 months of CAT implementation. *See* 17 CFR 242.613(f). The Commission assumes that the CAT NMS Plan's estimate is limited to adapting current surveillance programs to the Central Repository.

[2479] The Participants may have incurred obligations that would generate expenses if the Plan were not approved, such as expenses to terminate contracts entered or employees hired in expectation of approval of the Plan. The Commission is not aware of the existence of or details of such obligations.

[2480] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30711, n.848.

[2481] *Id.*

[2482] Data Boiler Letter at 35.

costs for legal and consulting services and additional employees were not reliable. The Commenter stated that these costs could be far lower with different technological approaches to capturing audit trail data.

The Commission also received comments on the estimates of surveillance costs the Participants would incur to incorporate the CAT Data into their surveillance. One commenter implied that savings on surveillance were unlikely, and stated that the lack of an analytical framework did not facilitate the identification of suspicious activities.[2483] The commenter seemed to express doubt that CAT would reduce ad hoc data requests, calling this idea ''hype.'' The commenter further seemed to imply that the comparable magnitude of annual CAT reporting costs and current regulatory data reporting costs raised questions about the reliability of the Commission's analysis of costs. A second commenter, however, stated that ''[t]he consolidated nature of the CAT also should allow the SROs to conduct their market surveillance activities more efficiently, allowing for additional cost savings . . . .'' [2484] The commenter did not provide additional detail on what the source of additional efficiencies or cost savings would be. Another commenter noted that uncertainties in the manner in which regulators will access data in the Central Repository create significant cost uncertainties, especially if SROs must use bulk extraction to create copies of CAT Data for analysis within their own infrastructure.[2485]

A few commenters questioned the apparent inclusion or exclusion of certain costs related to the fee model and development costs. One commenter noted that the Participant cost estimates do not include the ''per-message toll charge in the CAT funding model.'' [2486] The Commission received several comments on the $8.8 million Participants incurred in developing the Plan. One Commenter stated that treating all costs related to the development of the Plan as sunk costs ''. . . may sound conservative'', and is a preferred approach if a broad alternative to the Plan is adopted instead of the Plan as noticed.[2487]

The Participants restated their intention to recoup implementation costs in Participants' Response Letter II.[2488] Furthermore, they cited an expectation of $10.6 million in savings from retiring existing systems. The Participants further stated that these savings would offset costs of implementing CAT.

The Commission considered the comments, the Participants' responses, and modifications to the Plan and, as explained below, is updating its analysis of Participants' CAT costs. These changes acknowledge a change in the number of Participants, the addition of Quote Sent Times for option market maker quotes, requirements to produce additional reports and add more specificity in current reports, as well as producing current reports more frequently, the requirement to conduct an independent audit of expenses for the development of the Plan, annual audit expense for the Company, and a modification to the clock synchronization requirement for exchanges. The Commission is also acknowledging system retirement costs that the Participants will incur when duplicative reporting systems are retired. Further, in response to a comment and the Participants' response, the Commission is also revising its cost estimates to change how it treats the costs already incurred by Participants to develop the Plan.

The Commission has considered the comments it received regarding cost estimates for Participants in the Plan and continues to believe that Participant cost estimates presented in the Plan are reliable. As discussed in the Notice, all 19 SROs [2489] responded to the Participants Study, and most SROs have experience collecting audit trail data, familiarity with the requirements of CAT, and expertise in their business practices. The commenter that challenged the current data reporting costs provided no reasoning or estimates to indicate that the Participants are unable to reasonably estimate their own costs. Regarding the comment that its estimates did not fully incorporate the ''per-message'' fees that Participants will face, the Commission notes that the Plan's funding model does not charge Participants for message-traffic. Further, the Commission's analysis acknowledged that Central Repository costs will be passed on to both Participants and Industry Members by an unidentified formula, thus it accounted for funding model costs separately in its analysis of total costs of the Plan.

Regarding the comment concerning the inclusion of an analytical framework in surveillance cost estimates in the Plan, the Plan does incorporate an analytical framework.[2490] Therefore, the Commission believes that Participant cost estimates already account for an analytical framework. Regarding the uncertainties in Participant costs related to bulk extraction causing SROs to host their own copies of CAT Data, while the Plan requires a bulk extraction tool, it also requires analytical tools for manipulating and analyzing data within the Central Repository.[2491] The Commission believes that the requirement for a method of bulk downloading data does not necessarily imply that multiple copies of CAT Data will be hosted on SRO systems. The Commission acknowledges that if SROs use the bulk download feature to replicate some or all CAT Data on their own systems, their costs are likely to increase because hosting large databases is costly. However, the Commission believes that SROs are likely to consider the cost implications when contemplating replicating large portions of the Central Repository within their IT infrastructure and presumably will only do so when it is efficient for them to do so.

The Commission recognizes, however, that the Plan calls for recovery of some or all of the CAT development costs from Industry Members. And, based on the Participants' response, the Commission now believes that the expectation the Participants will recoup these costs will effectively reduce the SROs' future costs while increasing future costs of Industry Members. The Commission therefore is adding the development costs for CAT to the implementation costs of broker-dealers, as indicated in the following Section, and subtracting them from Participants' implementation costs as in Table 3 below. Overall, as detailed in the Aggregate Costs Section below, the Commission also believes the recovery of these costs from Industry Members would constitute a transfer from Industry Members to Participants, but would not affect the total cost of CAT to market participants in aggregate.

The Commission is revising its Participant cost estimates to account for additional requirements that result from modifications made to the Plan by the Commission. These requirements include a number of reports, some produced one time, some produced on an ongoing basis. Each of these

[2483] Data Boiler Letter at 35.

[2484] SIFMA Letter at 18.

[2485] SIFMA Letter at 33.

[2486] Data Boiler Letter at 35.

[2487] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30737; *see also* Data Boiler Letter at 37.

[2488] Response Letter II at 13.

[2489] There were 19 participants at the time the Participants conducted the study.

[2490] *See* Section V.E.2.c.(1), *supra.*

[2491] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 8.2.

requirements is discussed briefly below. In aggregate, the Commission estimates they have a one-time cost of $1.1 million and annual, ongoing costs of $1.1 million.

First, the Plan as amended requires a written assessment of the operation of the CAT on an annual, rather than biannual basis, and requires the assessment to provide more specificity.[2492] The Commission estimates the production of this report will cost $870,000 annually.[2493]

Second, the Plan now requires an independent audit of expenses incurred prior to the Effective Date. The Commission believes that this one-time audit will cost approximately $5,000.[2494]

Third, the Plan now requires a review of clock synchronization standards, including consideration of industry standards based on the type of CAT Reporter, Industry Member and type of system within six months of the Effective Date. The Commission estimates that the production of this study will have a one-time cost of approximately $133,000.[2495]

Fourth, the Plan now requires the Participants to submit a report detailing the Participants' consideration of coordinated surveillance (*e.g.,* entering into Rule 17d–2 agreements or regulatory services agreements), within 12 months of effectiveness of the Plan. The Commission estimates this report will entail a one-time cost of $445,000.[2496]

The Plan now also requires the Participants to provide a report discussing the feasibility, benefits, and risks of allowing an Industry Member to bulk download the Raw Data it submitted to the Central Repository, within 24 months of effectiveness of the Plan. The Commission estimates this requirement will entail a total one-time cost of approximately $147,000.[2497]

The Plan now also requires the Participants to submit an assessment of errors in the customer information submitted to the Central Repository that considers whether to prioritize the correction of certain data fields over others, within 36 months of effectiveness of the Plan. The Commission estimates this requirement will entail an approximate one-time cost of $186,000.[2498]

The Plan now requires the Participants to submit a report to study the impact of tiered-fees on market liquidity, including an analysis of the impact of the tiered-fee structure on Industry Members' provision of liquidity, within 36 months of effectiveness of the Plan. The Commission estimates this requirement will have a one-time external cost of $110,000.[2499]

The Plan now requires an assessment of the impact on the maximum Error Rate in connection with any Material Systems Change to the CAT; the Commission assumes that the CAT may have four Material Systems Changes per year. The Commission estimates this requirement will entail an ongoing annual cost of $138,000.[2500]

The Plan now requires that the Advisory Committee members receive the same materials as the Operating Committee absent confidentiality concerns with respect to such information. The Commission estimates this will require an aggregate annual cost of $2,400.[2501]

The Plan now requires that the CAT LLC financials (i) be in compliance with GAAP, (ii) be audited by an independent public accounting firm, and (iii) be made publicly available.[2502] The Commission estimates these requirements to entail costs of $65,000 annually.[2503]

Finally, the Plan now requires that each Participant conduct background checks of its employees and contractors that will use the CAT System. The Commission estimates that this requirement would entail an initial cost of $60,000, with ongoing annual costs of $14,000.[2504]

The Commission is also revising its Participant cost estimates to account for the addition of two additional Participants that were not covered by the Participants Study.[2505] The Commission assumes the new Participants will have similar costs to the 19 Participants that provided cost estimates summarized in the Plan. Consequently, the Commission has increased its estimates of Participants costs by 10.53%.[2506] The Commission now estimates that the 21 Participants spend $8 million annually for data reporting, and $162.7 million for

[2492] The assessment is now required to include the following: (1) An evaluation of the information security program of the CAT to ensure that the program is consistent with the highest industry standards for protection of data; (2) an evaluation of potential technological upgrades based upon a review of technological developments over the preceding year, drawing on necessary technological expertise, whether internal or external; (3) an assessment of efforts to reduce the time to restore and recover CAT Data at a back-up site; (4) an assessment of how the Plan Processor and SROs are monitoring Error Rates and address the application of Error Rates based on product, data element or other criteria; and (5) a copy of the evaluation required by Section 6.8(c) as to whether industry standards have evolved such that: (i) the clock synchronization standard in Section 6.8(a) should be shortened; or (ii) the required timestamp in Section 6.8(b) should be in finer increments; and (6) an assessment of whether any data elements should be added, deleted or changed. *See* Section IV.H., *supra.* Although the bi-annual assessment was required under the Plan and its costs would thus have been included in the Participants' cost estimates presented in the Plan, the requirements have changed such that the report is both produced more frequently and is presented in greater detail. Consequently, the Commission assumes that the majority of the cost of this report would not be covered by cost estimates presented in the Plan as filed, and is adding the cost of this reporting to its final cost estimates. To the extent that a less detailed bi-annual report was already included in the Participants' cost estimates, the revised cost estimate overestimates this reporting cost.

[2493] Detailed cost estimates are discussed in Section VI.D.1.f.B, *infra.*

[2494] To arrive at this estimate, the Commission relied on an industry source for the costs of an audit per dollar of revenue, and assumed that the audit cost per unit of revenue would be comparable to the audit cost per unit of development costs, which were approximately $8.8 million. *See infra* note 2503. $8.8 × $479 = $4,215 ~ $5,000.

[2495] *See* Section VI.G.1.b, *infra.*

[2496] *See* Section VI.G.1.c, *infra.* The Commission assumes an hourly labor rate of $235.75 that is based on the FTE annual cost provided by the Participants in the Plan and an assumption of 1,800 hours annually. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5 at 30762 n.1243. $424,350/1800 hours = $235.75.

[2497] *See* Section VI.G.1.d, *infra.*

[2498] *See* Section VI.G.1.e, *infra.*

[2499] *See* Section VI.G.1.f, *infra.* The Commission assumes an hourly labor rate of $235.75 that is based on the FTE annual cost provided by the Participants in the Plan and an assumption of 1,800 hours annually. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5 at 30762 n.1243. $424,350/1800 hours = $235.75.

[2500] *See* Section VI.G.1.g, *infra.*

[2501] *See* Section VI.G.1.h, *infra.*

[2502] *See* Section IV.B.4, *supra; see also* Participants' Letter II.

[2503] To estimate this number, the Commission drew from a recent Commission adopting release and an industry report. Specifically, the Commission's Crowdfunding Adopting Release estimated that the audit costs for affected issuers would be $2,500 to $30,000. *See* Securities Act Release No. 9974 (October 30, 2015), 80 FR 71499 (November 16, 2015). The Commission believes this estimate could be reasonable if the Company's financials are of the same level of complexity as the larger issuers affected by the Crowdfunding rule, which is realistic because the Company is not publicly traded, is organized as a ''business league'', and has a limited and predictable revenue stream. As an alternative estimate, the Commission estimated an audit cost of approximately $65,000 using an industry estimate of $479 in audit costs per $1 million in revenue, using the assumption that Company revenue will just offset expected costs of $139 million. *See* Audit Analytics report ''Audit Fees and Non-Audit Fees: A Twelve Year Trend,'' October 9, 2014, available at *http://www.auditanalytics.com/blog/audit-fees-and-non-audit-fees-a-twelve-year-trend/.* $479 × $139 = $64,665 ~ $65,000. The Commission incorporates the higher estimate from the two methodologies ($65,000) into its cost estimates.

[2504] *See* Section VI.G.1.i, *infra.*

[2505] The Participants Study covered the 19 Participants that were operating as Participants at the time the study was conducted. The Notice acknowledged that ISE Mercury would likely become a Participant before the Plan was implemented, but cost estimates presented in the Notice did not account for costs that ISE Mercury would incur due to the Plan. Since filing the Plan, ISE Mercury and IEX have become Participants in the Plan.

[2506] 100 × (2/19) = 10.53%.

surveillance. The Commission estimates that implementation of CAT Data reporting will cost the Participants $19.8 million, and implementation of surveillance using data in the Central Repository will cost the Participants $25.6 million. The Commission estimates that Participants will spend $16.2 million annually to maintain CAT Data reporting, and $96.9 million annually on surveillance. The Commission is also recognizing that the Participants will recoup $8.8 million in Plan development costs, as discussed above. The Commission estimates that Participants will spend approximately $1.1 million to produce one-time reports required by amendments to the Plan, and $1.1 million annually to produce additional periodic reports required by amendments to the Plan. Furthermore, the Commission is recognizing $343,000 in system retirement costs, as discussed below.[2507] The Commission is unable to update cost estimates to account for the modifications to the clock synchronization standards for exchanges, but, as discussed below, the Commission does not believe that the modifications will result in substantial cost increases for exchanges.[2508] The Commission acknowledges that the addition of quote sent times to option market maker quotes may increase costs to options exchanges. Based on comments received, the Commission believes that Participant cost estimates from the Participants Study are unlikely to include the additional expense Participants will incur capturing and processing the Quote Sent Time field. The Commission lacks information to estimate these costs for Participants because the Plan does not include this information and commenters did not offer estimates. Table 3 reflects the Commission's estimates after taking these adjustments into consideration.

TABLE 3—ESTIMATES OF PARTICIPANTS' COSTS

	Current	CAT implementation	System retirement	CAT on-going
Data Reporting	$7,626,570	$19,784,870	.....	$16,247,910
Surveillance	162,700,160	25,642,960	.....	96,934,810
Development Recoup	.....	(8,800,000)	.....	.....
Additional Reporting Requirements	.....	1,085,927	.....	1,089,137
Total	170,326,730	37,713,757	$342,632	114,271,857

c. Costs to Broker-Dealers

(1) Summary of Notice and Comments and Commission's Response

In the Notice, the Commission provided an analysis of the compliance cost estimates for broker-dealers that included analyzing whether estimates provided in the Plan and based on a Reporters Study survey were reliable.[2509] The Commission preliminarily believed that the cost estimates for small broker-dealers were not reliable. The Commission described the details of the analysis supporting that conclusion. The Commission then developed and calibrated a model (''Outsourcing Cost Model'') to estimate average current data reporting costs and average Plan compliance costs for broker-dealers that the Commission expects will rely on service bureaus to perform their CAT Data reporting responsibilities (''Outsourcers''). For other broker-dealers, the ''Insourcers,'' the Commission continued to rely on the large broker-dealer estimates from the Plan. Using this framework, the Commission estimated approximate one-time implementation costs for broker-dealers of $2.1 billion, and annual ongoing costs of CAT reporting of $1.5 billion.

The Commission received comments on the reliability of its Outsourcing Cost Model and its re-estimation of costs. One commenter stated that the Commission's estimates of service bureau charges for a small firm ''sound reasonable.'' [2510] Another commenter noted that even when Outsourcers rely on their service providers (service bureaus or clearing firms) to accomplish current data reporting, the Outsourcers must expend internal resources as well.[2511] A third commenter stated that broker-dealers that clear for other broker-dealers may face higher implementation costs because they may support more broker-dealers than they did before implementation of the Plan.[2512] This commenter also stated that the Commission has not analyzed the cost implications of the phased implementation of small and large Industry Members.[2513] The Commission did not receive comments on its analysis or conclusion that the Reporters Study did not provide reliable cost estimates for small broker-dealers.

The Commission also received several comments on uncertainties in broker-dealer cost estimates. Three of these comments related to the selection of the Plan Processor. One commenter stated, ''not knowing who the CAT Processor is introduces a significant amount of uncertainty. . . . We believe the Commission discounts the importance of the choice of Plan Processor as it relates to implementation costs. While the bids to build the Processor may be within a sufficiently narrow range so as to negate those costs, the choice of Processor may have a significant impact on broker-dealer implementation costs.'' [2514] A commenter stated that the differences in Bids prevented broker-dealers from ''. . . provid[ing] more definitive cost estimates and other projections related to CAT implementation.'' [2515] Other commenters noted that the Plan's lack of specific details creates uncertainty around what costs broker-dealers will incur to implement these provisions.[2516] Other comment letters discussed the general uncertainties that result from not having the technical specifications.[2517]

The Commission has considered these comments, the Participants' response, and modifications to the Plan and is updating and revising its cost estimates. As discussed below, the Commission

[2507] *See* Section V.F.2.b, *infra.*

[2508] *See* Section V.F.3.a(5), *infra.*

[2509] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30712–26.

[2510] Data Boiler Letter at 36.

[2511] Specifically, this commenter references EBS reporting, but indicates that broker-dealers sometimes must also be involved in preparing EBS request responses. *See* FIF Letter at 34.

[2512] TR Letter at 3–4.

[2513] TR Letter at 3.

[2514] TR Letter at 4; FSI Letter at 6.

[2515] FSI Letter at 6.

[2516] SIFMA Letter at 42; FSI Letter at 6.

[2517] *See, e.g.,* FSR Letter at 10; SIFMA Letter at 23; UnaVista Letter at 2; Fidelity Letter at 6.

now acknowledges that its estimates exclude some additional costs that would be faced by Outsourcers or new reporters that clear for other broker-dealers, or that provide support for introducing broker-dealers. The Commission further acknowledges that broker-dealer costs presented in its analysis are subject to significant uncertainties and recognizes additional sources of uncertainty. The Commission is also updating its analysis of the costs to recognize the effects of modifications to the requirement to report an open/close indicator and allocation time, and is revising its analysis to indirectly account for the Participants' development costs. However, the Commission is not revising the structure of its Outsourcing Cost Model, its conclusions regarding the reliability of the Reporters Study, or estimates of the broker-dealers' current, implementation or ongoing costs.

With respect to the comment that the Outsourcing Cost Model does not account for internal expenses that support outsourced activities, the Commission notes that its cost estimates explicitly assume that Outsourcers have employee expenses that cover these activities.[2518] With respect to the commenters concerned that the Commission's estimates do not account for an increase in costs for broker-dealers that clear for other broker-dealers or provide support to introducing broker-dealers, the Commission continues to believe the analysis of broker-dealer implementation costs presented in the Notice is generally reliable, and notes that Reporters Study estimates for large broker-dealers are likely to include these expenses because survey respondents are likely to include broker-dealers that provide these services. The Commission acknowledges, however, that there are some broker-dealers—such as one of the commenters—that would be classified as Outsourcers or new reporters for which the Commission's cost estimates rely on the Outsourcing Cost Model, and the additional implementation costs that these firms face due to clearing for other broker-dealers or supporting introducing broker-dealers are not captured by the Outsourcing Cost Model. Costs that Outsourcers and new reporters that continue to clear for other broker-dealers will face include, but are likely not limited to, additional costs associated with reporting customer information to the Central Repository and costs associated with receiving customer information from their broker-dealer clients. Outsourcers and new reporters that currently clear for other broker-dealers or support introducing broker-dealers that elect to outsource their clearing or regulatory data reporting will face costs that include, but are not limited to, costs associated with establishing service provider relationships with other broker-dealers; and lost revenues from providing services for other firms if those firms cease providing clearing services or supporting introducing broker-dealers, although the Commission believes that they might be able to establish ''piggyback'' arrangements that allow them to retain their relationships with current customers.[2519] The Commission, however, cannot estimate the number of broker-dealers that would bear these costs because the Commission lacks data on the number of broker-dealers that clear for other broker-dealers that would be classified as new reporters or Outsourcers. Furthermore, the Commission lacks data to estimate the magnitude of these costs because the Plan does not provide this data and the Commission is unaware of any data available to it that it could use to estimate these costs.

In response to comment letters that identified sources of uncertainties related to the costs Industry Members will incur, the Commission acknowledges that such costs depend on the Technical Specifications, which will be published no later than one year before Industry Member reporting begins. The Commission now believes that the sources of uncertainty include both how Technical Specifications would vary across Bids, and what costs of CAT are included in cost estimates obtained from market participants and presented in the Plan and included in the Commission's analysis.[2520] However, the Commission notes that final Bids will not be submitted until after the Plan is approved, so the Commission is unable to quantify the degree of variation in broker-dealer implementation costs across Bids.

The Commission has also revised its analysis of its cost estimates to account for the following things: The clarification that Participants intend to recoup their development costs; modifications to the Plan regarding reporting the open/close indicator for equities and Options Market Makers; costs for Options Market Makers to provide Quote Sent Time; and costs related to providing allocation times on Allocation Reports. The Participants' response clarified that the Participants intend to recoup some of the more than $8.8 million they have already spent to develop the CAT NMS Plan by collecting fees from broker-dealers.[2521] In the Notice, the Commission treated such costs as sunk costs incurred by the Participants and did not include them in its analysis of the Plan, but is now recognizing that these costs will be transferred to broker-dealers.[2522] Therefore, the Commission adds the development costs to the costs to broker-dealers.[2523] The Commission recognizes that the modification that removes the open/close indicator for equities and Options Market Makers will reduce the implementation and potentially ongoing costs for Industry Members. However, as discussed in the further analysis of costs Section below,[2524] the Commission is not certain whether Industry Members included these costs in their cost survey results, and the Commission does not have sufficient information on these costs to remove them from its estimates.[2525] With regard to Quote Sent Time, the Commission is incorporating estimates discussed in the Notice but not included separately in cost estimates published in the Notice.[2526]

[2518] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30723.

[2519] Costs related to outsourcing services such as clearing are discussed in Section V.F.1.c, *supra,* and Section V.G.1.d, *infra.* ''Piggyback'' relationships are discussed in the Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30716 n.894.

[2520] For example, the analyses in the Plan and the Commission's analysis assume that respondents to cost surveys are representative of their respective groups. If broker-dealers that clear for other broker-dealers or serve as introducing broker-dealers did not respond to cost surveys, the costs such broker-dealers are likely to face might not be represented by Plan estimates, and the Commission's estimates where they rely on the Plan's estimates.

[2521] *See* Section V.F.1.b, *supra,* for further discussion.

[2522] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at n 848. This clarification to the Plan, and comments received on this clarification, which are discussed in Section IV, imply disagreement with the Commission's treatment of these costs as sunk costs in the Notice. The Commission notes that these costs have already been incurred, so are not attributable to the Approval of the Plan, but rather are costs associated with and anticipated by Rule 613. Furthermore, the recovery of these costs by the Participants does not change the cost to industry of the Plan; rather the costs comprise a transfer from one market participant type (Industry Members) to another (Participants). Consequently, the cost of the Plan to industry is unaffected. The Commission acknowledges that this transfer will increase broker-dealer costs and decrease Participant costs.

[2523] This cost is also subtracted from costs to Participants. *See* Section V.F.1.b, *supra.*

[2524] *See* Section V.F.3.a(2), *infra,* for a more detailed discussion of the effect of this modification.

[2525] The Commission believes the estimates are conservative in this dimension as they overestimate broker-dealer implementation costs due to the removal of the open/close indicator from the material terms of the order insofar as broker-dealers included that indicator in their implementation cost estimates in the Reporters Study survey.

[2526] The Notice discusses estimates of five year implementation and ongoing costs of up to $76.8

The Commission recognizes that the modifications related to including allocation times will reduce costs to Industry Members, but also recognizes that the Commission did not previously account for these costs in estimates of their costs.[2527] Therefore, the Commission is adding the estimated costs of including allocation time as required under the Plan as amended to its cost estimates. The Commission notes that this increase in broker-dealer costs is small relative to the other estimated costs of broker-dealers and therefore does not change the rounded estimates.

Therefore, in its final analysis, the Commission estimates approximate one-time implementation costs for broker-dealers of $2.2 billion, and annual ongoing costs of CAT reporting of $1.5 billion.

(2) Commission's Final Analysis

The discussion that follows provides a synopsis of the Commission's final analysis of the compliance costs of broker-dealers. Because the Commission is not revising the structure of its Outsourcing Cost Model or its conclusions regarding the reliability of the Costs to CAT Reporters Study (''Reporters Study''),[2528] the final analysis regarding these below provides a summary of the more detailed discussions in the Notice.

A. Estimates in the Plan

The Plan, as amended on February 27, 2015, estimates total costs for those broker-dealers expected to report to CAT. In particular, the Plan relies on the Reporters Study. Based on the Reporters Study survey data, the Plan estimates implementation costs of less than $740 million for small firms [2529] and approximately $2.6 billion for large firms, for a total of $3.34 billion in implementation costs for broker-dealers.[2530] For annual ongoing costs, the Plan estimates costs of $739 million for small firms and $2.3 billion for large firms, for a total of $3.04 billion in annual ongoing costs for broker-dealers.[2531]

The Commission believes, however, that the cost estimates for small broker-dealers provided in the Plan, which are based upon responses set forth in the Reporters Study, do not provide reliable estimates of smaller CAT Reporter costs for a number of reasons discussed in detail in the Notice and summarized herein.[2532] First, some respondents classified as small in the Reporters Study appear to have responded numerically with incorrect units, with such responses resulting in annual estimated cost figures that would be 1,000 times too large. Second, maximum responses in certain categories of costs suggest that some large broker-dealers may have misclassified themselves as small broker-dealers.[2533] Third, methods used to remove outliers are likely to have introduced significant biases. Finally, the response rate to the Reporters Study survey was low and is likely to have oversampled small broker-dealers who currently have no OATS reporting obligations.[2534]

Although the Commission concludes that the small broker-dealer cost estimates presented in the Plan are unreliable, the Commission also believes, for reasons discussed in detail in the Notice and summarized herein, that the cost estimates in the Plan for large broker-dealers are reliable.[2535] The Plan estimates that an OATS-reporting large broker-dealer has current data reporting costs of $8.7 million per year.[2536] A non-OATS reporting large broker-dealer is currently estimated to spend approximately $1.4 million annually.[2537] The Plan estimates that OATS-reporting large broker-dealers would spend approximately $7.2 million to implement CAT Data reporting, and $4.8 million annually for ongoing costs.[2538] For non-OATS reporting large broker-dealers, the Plan estimates $3.9 million in implementation costs and $3.2 million in annual ongoing costs.[2539]

B. Commission Cost Estimates

As discussed in detail in the Notice, the Commission believes that the small firm cost estimates presented in the Reporters Study are unreliable. Therefore, the Commission has re-estimated the costs that broker-dealers likely would incur for CAT implementation and ongoing reporting.[2540] The Commission's broker-dealer cost estimates incorporate some broker-dealer data from the Plan, but to address issues in the Plan's Reporters Study data, the Commission's cost estimates also include other data sources described in the Notice.[2541] As with the Plan's cost estimates, the Commission's re-estimation relies on classifying broker-dealers based on whether they currently report OATS data. However, the re-estimation further classifies broker-dealers based on whether the firm is likely to use a service bureau to report its regulatory data, or, alternatively, whether the firm may choose to self-report its regulatory data. In this re-estimation, the Commission estimates that the 1,800 broker-dealers expected to incur CAT reporting obligations spend approximately $1.6 billion annually to report regulatory data.[2542] The

million. The Commission notes that for other broker-dealer costs, implementation costs are 146.46% of ongoing costs and assumes that ratio of implementation to ongoing costs for Quote Sent Time. (1.4646 ongoing costs + 5 × ongoing costs = $76.8 million.) *See* Section V.F.3.a(6), *infra* for discussion of these estimates and their treatment in the Notice and this Order.

[2527] *See* Section V.F.3.a(4), *infra,* for a more detailed discussion of the costs of including allocation times on Allocation Reports.

[2528] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30712–14.

[2529] Survey respondents were instructed to classify themselves as ''small'' if their Total Capital (defined as net worth plus subordinated liabilities) was less than $500,000. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(ii)(C) n.188. This is consistent with the definition of ''small business'' or ''small organization'' used with reference to a broker or dealer for purposes of Commission rulemaking in accordance with provisions of Chapter Six of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.). *See* 17 CFR 240.0–10(c).

[2530] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iv)(A)(3).

[2531] *Id.*

[2532] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30712–14.

[2533] The Plan presents summary statistics such as average, median and maximum for each survey response. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B(7)(b)(ii)(C), Table 5. In the left most column, $14 million is the maximum response for ''Hardware/Software Current Cost.''

[2534] In reaching these conclusions, the Commission reviewed the detailed discussions of the Reporters Study survey methodology in the Plan and the survey form and instructions provided to respondents. *See* 6/23/14 entry on CAT NMS Plan website, *available at http://www.catnmsplan.com/pastevents/index.html.* The Commission Staff also discussed with the Participants potential methodology adjustments in aggregating the CAT Reporters Study data. After Commission Staff discussions with the Participants, the Commission concluded that no methodology could address these fundamental issues with the survey data.

[2535] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30714.

[2536] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.(7)(b)(ii)(C), Table 3. The $8.7 million figure was calculated by summing the average hardware/software cost, third party/outsourcing cost, and full-time employee costs using the Commission's estimated cost per employee of $424,350.

[2537] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section B.(7)(b)(ii)(C), Table 4. The $1.4 million figure was calculated by summing the average hardware/software cost, third party/outsourcing cost, and full-time employee costs using the Commission's estimated cost per employee of $424,350.

[2538] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section B.(7)(b)(iii)(C)(2)a., Table 9; Appendix C, Section B.(7)(b)(iii)(C)(2)b., Table 15.

[2539] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.(7)(b)(iii)(C)(2)a., Table 10; and at Appendix C, Section B.(7)(b)(iii)(C)(2)b., Table 16.

[2540] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30717–24.

[2541] Discussions below present information included in the Notice on data obtained from FINRA and gleaned from discussions with broker-dealers and service bureaus arranged by FIF and staff. *Id.* at 30715.

[2542] To the extent that the CAT NMS Plan underestimates the number of broker-dealers that would incur CAT reporting obligations, the

Continued

Commission believes that these broker-dealers will incur approximately $2.2 billion in implementation costs and $1.5 billion in ongoing data reporting costs.[2543] As explained in more detail in the Notice, the Commission believes classifying broker-dealers based on their manner of reporting provides a more accurate estimate of the costs firms will incur because costs differ based on whether the firm insources or outsources reporting responsibilities and insourcing/outsourcing does not necessarily correlate with firm size.[2544] The Commission maintains the Plan's approach of separating broker-dealer costs of OATS reporting firms from those that have no OATS reporting obligations, recognizing that the group of non-OATS reporting firms are diverse in size and scope of activities. As discussed in detail in the Notice, the Commission believes this is appropriate because firms that do not currently report to OATS will face a different range of costs to implement and maintain CAT reporting because firms that do not report to OATS are likely to have little to no regulatory data infrastructure in place.

The Commission's framework for estimation of broker-dealers costs, as presented in the Notice and adopted here without alteration, is based on analysis of data provided by FINRA and discussions with broker-dealers and service providers that were detailed in the Notice.[2545] Analysis of data reported by FINRA confirms that there are two primary methods by which broker-dealers accomplish data reporting: insourcing, where the firm reports data to regulators directly; and outsourcing, where a third-party service provider performs the data reporting, usually as part of a service agreement that includes other services. Based on data from FINRA and conversations with market participants discussed in the Notice, the Commission believes that the vast majority of broker-dealers outsource most of their regulatory data reporting functions to third-party firms. A broker-dealer's decision to insource/outsource these functions and services can be complex, and different broker-dealers reach different solutions based on their business characteristics. To illustrate, some broker-dealers self-clear trades but outsource regulatory data reporting functions; some broker-dealers have proprietary order handling systems, self-clear trades, and outsource regulatory data reporting functions. Other broker-dealers outsource order-handling, outsource clearing trades, and self-report regulatory data. The most common insource/outsource service configuration, however, for all but the most active-in-the-market broker-dealers is to use one or more service bureaus to handle all of these functions.

The framework for the Commission's re-estimation, which is described in more detail in the Notice, is as follows.[2546] First, the Commission identifies those OATS-reporting firms that insource (''Insourcers'') and those that outsource based on an analysis of the number of OATS Reportable Order Events (''ROEs'') combined with specific data provided by FINRA on how firms report OATS data. Furthermore, the Commission separately identifies firms that do not report to OATS but are likely to insource based on their expected activity level by identifying Options Market Makers and Electronic Liquidity Providers (''ELPs''). Based on that analysis, the Commission estimates that there are 126 OATS-reporting Insourcers and 45 non-OATS reporting Insourcers.[2547] The Commission's re-estimation classifies the remaining 1,629 broker-dealers that the Plan anticipates will have CAT Data reporting obligations as ''Outsourcers,'' based on outsourcing practices observed in data obtained from FINRA.[2548] Next, to determine costs for Insourcers, the Commission relies upon cost estimates for firms classified as ''large'' in the Reporters Study.

For Outsourcers, the Commission uses a model of ongoing outsourcing costs (''Outsourcing Cost Model'') to estimate both current regulatory data reporting costs and CAT-related data reporting costs Outsourcers will incur if the CAT NMS Plan is approved. The Commission analyzed data provided by FINRA to establish a count of CAT Reporters likely to outsource their regulatory data reporting functions. The Commission's analysis of FINRA reporting data, which is discussed in the Notice, allowed the Commission to examine how broker-dealers' current outsourcing activities varied with the number of ROEs reported to OATS. Based on this analysis, the Commission believes that the 126 broker-dealers that reported more than 350,000 OATS ROEs between June 15 and July 10, 2015 made the insourcing-outsourcing decision strategically based on the broker-dealer's characteristics and preferences, while the remaining OATS reporters were likely to utilize a service bureau to accomplish their regulatory data reporting.[2549]

The Commission estimates ongoing costs for outsourcing firms using a model which, as discussed in more detail in the Notice, was based on data gleaned from discussions with service bureaus and broker-dealers and implementation costs using information learned in conversations with industry.[2550] Based on discussions with market participants, the Commission assumes that the cost function for outsourcing is concave [2551] and applies the same assumption to its final analysis. This type of function is appropriate when costs increase as activity level increases, but the cost per unit of activity (*e.g.,* cost per report) declines as activity increases. For reasons indicated in the Notice, the Commission relies on a schedule of average charges to access liquidity and rebates to provide liquidity from four non-inverted exchanges to estimate the concavity of the exchange pricing function, which the Commission uses to approximate the concavity of the outsourcing cost model.[2552] The model's output, which the Commission relies on in its final analysis, is an estimate of a broker-dealer's cost to outsource data reporting services as part of a bundle of services from a service bureau; for smaller broker-dealers, it is assumed to include provision of an order management system and market connectivity.[2553]

Commission's estimates presented in the Notice understate the actual costs Reporters will face.

[2543] These figures cover only broker-dealer costs. Industry-wide costs are summarized below.

[2544] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30715–17.

[2545] *Id.* at 30714 n.880.

[2546] *Id.* at 30715.

[2547] *Id.*

[2548] *Id.* at 30715–16.

[2549] The Commission believes this decision is strategic and discretionary because FINRA data reveals that while many broker-dealers at these activity levels self-report most or all of their regulatory data, other broker-dealers outsource most or all of their regulatory reporting at these activity levels. At lower activity levels, most, but not all, broker-dealers outsource most if not all of their regulatory data reporting. The Commission is cognizant that some broker-dealers reporting fewer than 350,000 OATS ROEs per month can and do opt to self-report their regulatory data. However, based on conversations with broker-dealers, the Commission believes that most broker-dealers at these activity levels do not have the infrastructure and specialized staff that would be required to report directly to the Central Repository, and electing to self-report would be cost-prohibitive in most but not all cases.

[2550] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30718–24, for more information on these discussions.

[2551] *Id.* at 30719, for more information on these discussions.

[2552] The Commission's estimate of concavity relies on data from exchanges that do not feature inverted pricing. On ''inverted'' exchanges, the party with the resting order pays a fee while her counterparty that receives immediate execution earns a rebate.

[2553] In conversations with Commission Staff, service bureaus related that some very large clients provide their own order-handling system and market connectivity.

To estimate costs of CAT Data reporting by the service bureaus, the Commission assumes that the pricing function used to estimate current costs will apply for CAT Data reporting, but the costs in relation to the number of ROEs will increase because some events that are excluded from OATS (like proprietary orders originated by a trading desk in the ordinary course of a member's market making activities), will be included in CAT.[2554]

As discussed in detail in the Notice, application of the model to data provided by FINRA allows the Commission to estimate pre-CAT outsourcing costs for broker-dealers, as well as projected costs under the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission estimates that the 806 broker-dealers that each report fewer than 350,000 OATS ROEs monthly spend an aggregate $100.1 million on annual outsourcing costs. Under the CAT NMS Plan, the Commission estimates that these 806 broker-dealers will spend $100.2 million on annual outsourcing costs. As in the Notice, the Commission recognizes that the magnitude of this increase is quite small, but this is driven by the fact that the vast majority of firms that are assumed to outsource had very low regulatory data reporting levels at the time the estimates were made.[2555]

As discussed in the Notice, firms that outsource their regulatory data reporting face additional internal staffing costs associated with this activity. Based on conversations with market participants described in the Notice, the Commission estimates that these firms currently have 0.5 full-time employees devoted to regulatory data reporting activities. The Commission further estimates that these firms will need one full-time employee for one year to implement CAT reporting requirements, and 0.75 full-time employees on an ongoing basis to maintain CAT reporting.[2556]

As discussed in the Notice, in addition to broker-dealers that currently report to OATS, the Commission estimates that there are 799 broker-dealers that are excluded from OATS reporting rules due to firm size, or exempt because all of their order flow was routed to a single OATS reporter, such as a clearing broker, that will have CAT reporting responsibilities.[2557] The Commission assumes that these broker-dealers will have low levels of CAT reporting, similar to those of the typical Outsourcers that currently report to OATS.[2558] For these firms, the Commission assumes that under CAT they will incur the average estimated outsourcing cost of firms that report fewer than 350,000 OATS ROEs per month, which is $124,373 annually. Furthermore, because these firms have more limited data reporting requirements than other firms, the Commission assumes these firms have only 0.1 full-time employees dedicated to regulatory data reporting activities. The Commission assumes that these firms will require 2 full-time employees for one year to implement the CAT NMS Plan and 0.75 full-time employees annually to maintain CAT Data reporting.[2559]

The Commission, however, believes for reasons described in more detail in the Notice that there are three other categories of broker-dealers not reflected in the above detailed cost estimates that do not currently report OATS data but could be CAT Reporters. First, there are at least 14 ELPs that did not carry customer accounts; these firms are not FINRA members and thus have no regular OATS reporting obligations.[2560] The Commission believes that it is likely that these broker-dealers already have self-reporting capabilities in place because each is a member of an SRO that requires the ability to report to OATS on request. The second group of broker-dealers that are not encompassed by the cost estimates of FINRA member broker-dealers discussed above are those that make markets in options and not equities. Although not required by the CAT NMS Plan to report their option quoting activity to the Central Repository,[2561] these broker-dealers may have customer orders and other activity that will cause them to incur a CAT Data reporting obligation. As explained in the Notice, based on CBOE membership data, the Commission believes that there are 31 options market-making firms that are members of multiple SROs but not FINRA.[2562] The third group comprises 24 broker-dealers that have SRO memberships only with CBOE; the Commission believes that this group is comprised primarily of CBOE floor brokers and, further, believes these firms will incur CAT implementation and ongoing reporting costs similar in magnitude to small equity broker-dealers that currently have no OATS reporting responsibilities because they will face similar tasks to implement and maintain CAT reporting. As explained in the Notice, the Commission assumes the 31 options market-making firms and 14 ELPs are typical of the Reporters Study's large, non-OATS reporting firms because this group encompasses large broker-dealers that are not FINRA members, a category that excludes any broker-dealer that carries customer accounts and trades in equities. As in the Notice, for these 45 firms, the Commission relies on cost estimates from the Reporters Study.[2563]

As discussed in detail in the Notice, pre-CAT Data reporting cost estimates range from $167,000 annually for floor brokers and firms that are exempt from OATS reporting requirements to $8.7 million annually for firms that report more than 350,000 OATS ROEs per month (''Insourcers''). Estimates of one-time implementation costs range from $424,000 for OATS reporters that are assumed to outsource (''OATS Outsourcers'') to $7.2 million for Insourcers, and ongoing annual costs range from $443,000 annually for firms that are assumed to outsource (OATS Outsourcers, New Outsourcers and Floor Brokers) to $4.8 million for Insourcers.

[2554] Although the pricing function is assumed constant, as explained in the Notice, broker-dealer costs would increase because the number of ROEs they report through their service bureaus would increase under the Plan. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30721.

[2555] The average broker-dealer in this category reported 15,185 OATS ROEs from June 15–July 10, 2015; the median broker-dealer reported 1,251 OATS ROEs. Of these broker-dealers, 39 reported more than 100,000 OATS ROEs during the sample period. *Id.* at 30722.

[2556] Based on discussions with broker-dealers described in the Notice, the Commission believes that very small broker-dealers are unlikely to have employees entirely dedicated to regulatory data reporting. Instead, other employees generally have duties that include dealing with service bureau matters and answering regulatory inquiries. The Commission assumes a full-time employee costs $424,350 per year. *Id.* at 30714, n. 880.

[2557] In discussions with Commission Staff, FINRA has stated that there are currently 54 OATS-exempt broker-dealers and 691 OATS-excluded firms.

[2558] Exemption or exclusion from OATS may be based on firm size or type of activity. Broker-dealers with exemptions or exclusions that relate to firm size are presumably relatively inactive. However, some firms may be exempted or excluded because they route only to a single OATS-reporting broker-dealer; this could encompass large firms that would be more similar to Insourcers.

[2559] *See supra* note 2556.

[2560] The category of Insourcers that do not currently report OATS data includes firms that have multiple SRO memberships that exclude FINRA. This category includes Options Market Makers and at least 14 ELPs; these are firms that carry no customer accounts and directly route proprietary orders to Alternative Trading Systems.

[2561] *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21, at 11857–58.

[2562] The Commission identified 39 CBOE-member broker-dealers that were not FINRA members, but were members of multiple SROs; 8 of these broker-dealers were previously identified as ELPs, leaving 31 firms with multiple SRO memberships that were unlikely to be CBOE floor brokers.

[2563] The Commission recognizes that additional broker-dealers may be members of neither FINRA nor CBOE, yet may incur CAT reporting obligations if the Plan is approved. The Commission has determined that categorizing additional broker-dealers that are currently classified as exempt or excluded FINRA members as non-FINRA members would not change the cost estimates because these groups have identical estimated per-firm costs.

Table 4 summarizes the Commission's updated estimates of costs to broker-dealers expected from the approval of the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission estimates that broker-dealers spend, in aggregate, approximately $1.6 billion annually on current regulatory data reporting activities. The Commission estimates approximate one-time implementation costs of $2.2 billion, and annual ongoing costs of CAT reporting of $1.5 billion.[2564] The Commission notes that its estimate of ongoing CAT reporting costs of $1.5 billion is slightly lower than current data reporting costs of $1.6 billion. As explained in the Notice, this differential is driven by expectations of reductions in data reporting costs reported by large OATS-reporting broker-dealers in the Reporters Study survey.[2565] The Commission estimates that all other categories of broker-dealers will face significant increases in annual data reporting costs. Also, the Commission acknowledges that there are some broker-dealers that would be classified as Outsourcers or new reporters for which the Commission's cost estimates rely on the Outsourcing Cost Model, and the additional implementation costs that these firms face due to clearing for other broker-dealers or supporting introducing broker-dealers are not captured by these estimates.

TABLE 4—ESTIMATED BROKER-DEALER COSTS FOR CAT NMS PLAN[2566]

	Number	Current costs	Implementation	System retirement	Ongoing
Broker-Dealers:					
Insourcers	126	$1,097,130,000	$911,144,052	$12,600,000	$599,285,000
Outsourcers	806	271,113,000	342,026,100	8,060,000	356,764,000
New Small Firms	799	133,137,000	678,111,300	7,990,000	353,666,000
ELPs	14	20,068,000	54,257,245	1,400,000	45,160,000
Options Market Makers	31	44,437,000	120,141,043	3,100,000	99,998,000
Options Floor Brokers	24	3,999,000	20,368,800	240,000	10,623,000
Additional Costs:					
NEW: Allocation time	.....	.....	44,050,000	.....	5,035,833
NEW: Quote sent time	.....	.....	17,400,000	.....	11,880,000
NEW: Development Cost Recoup	.....	.....	8,800,000	.....	.....
Total BD	1800	1,569,884,000	2,196,298,540	33,390,000	1,482,411,833

The Commission recognizes both that there is uncertainty in these cost estimates and that these cost estimates do not include additional costs that Outsourcers and new reporters that clear for other broker-dealers or support introducing broker-dealers will incur. As explained above, because the Commission's Outsourcing Cost Model does not and cannot incorporate these costs, the cost estimates here could underestimate the costs for these firms and, as a result, the total broker-dealer costs. Because Bids are not yet final, the Commission believes that its cost estimates, while reliable in light of available data and information, could differ from actual costs the broker-dealers will incur and that broker-dealers will not know the true magnitude of their costs until they can analyze the Technical Specifications.

d. Costs to Service Bureaus

In the Notice, the Commission considered whether to include the implementation and ongoing costs to service bureaus in the aggregate costs of the Plan.[2567] The Commission preliminarily believed that costs that service bureaus would face to implement CAT should be included as part of the aggregate costs of CAT. While the CAT NMS Plan does not require the use of service bureaus to report CAT Data, the Commission recognized that the most cost effective manner to implement the Plan likely will be for most market participants to continue their current practice of outsourcing their regulatory data reporting to one or more service bureaus. By doing so, the roughly 1,600 broker-dealers predicted to outsource would avoid incurring a significant fraction of CAT implementation costs; instead, service bureaus would incur implementation costs on their behalf. Based on conversations with market participants, the Commission believed that these implementation costs are likely to pass-through to broker-dealers that outsource data reporting, because service contracts between broker-dealers and service bureaus are renegotiated periodically, and approval of the CAT NMS Plan could trigger renegotiation as the bundle of services provided would materially change.

The Commission, however, preliminarily believed that the ongoing costs of CAT Data reporting by service bureaus would be duplicative of costs incurred by broker-dealers. The aggregate fees paid by Outsourcers to service bureaus cover the service bureaus' costs of ongoing data reporting. To include ongoing service bureau costs as a cost of CAT would double-count the costs that broker-dealers incur for CAT Data reporting.

The CAT NMS Plan estimates aggregate implementation costs of $51.6 million to $118.2 million for service bureaus, depending on the particular data ingestion format.[2568] Aggregate ongoing annual cost estimates ranged from $38.6 million to $48.7 million. To provide a conservative estimate of aggregate cost estimates for CAT, the Commission included only the maximum implementation cost that vendors would likely face of $118.2 million.

One commenter provided additional information regarding service bureau

[2564] As noted in Section V.F.1.b, *supra,* the Plan as amended in February 2016 states that the Participants will recover their costs of developing the Plan (currently $8.8 million) from broker-dealers. This constitutes a transfer from broker-dealers to Participants, but does not change the aggregate cost of the Plan to market participants.

[2565] In the Reporters Study, Large OATS Reporters cite average current data reporting costs of $8.32 million and Approach 1 maintenance costs of $4.5 million annually. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7.(b)(ii)(C).

[2566] Additional Costs are discussed in Section V.F.1.c(1), *supra*. *See* additional discussion in Section V.F.3.a(4), *infra* and Section V.F.a(6), *infra*.

[2567] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30726.

[2568] The Vendor Survey asked about the costs under two different data ingestion formats, Approach 1 and Approach 2. Approach 1 would allow broker-dealers to submit data to the Central Repository using their choice of existing industry messaging protocols, while Approach 2 would specify a pre-defined format. *Id.* at Section 30726.

implementation costs.[2569] The commenter stated that these firms will face $1.3 million in implementation costs related to providing allocation timestamps, and that these costs were not covered by the Vendors Study conducted by the Participants. The Commission believes this estimate is reliable because the commenter is an industry trade group with members that can provide cost estimates to the commenter. Furthermore, the Commission believes it is possible that at the time the Vendor's Study was conducted, industry members may not have been aware that allocation timestamps would be required in CAT. Consequently, the Commission is updating its analysis to account for these costs.

The Commission continues to believe that the only relevant cost for service bureaus to include in the aggregate costs of complying with the Plan is the estimated implementation cost which as adjusted is $119.5 million.

2. Aggregate Costs to Industry

a. Estimated Costs of Compliance

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated that industry would spend $2.4 billion to implement CAT, and $1.7 billion per year in ongoing annual costs.[2570] The Commission calculated these numbers as the sum of its estimates for the Central Repository, Participants, broker-dealers, and service bureaus. These compare to Plan estimates of initial aggregate costs to industry of $3.2 billion to $3.6 billion and annual ongoing costs of $2.8 billion to $3.4 billion.[2571]

In terms of magnitudes of aggregate costs, the Notice discussed that costs to the 126 largest broker-dealers that currently report OATS data would be the largest driver of implementation costs, accounting for 38.3% of CAT implementation costs. Although these broker-dealers would face significant costs in implementing CAT, the Reporters Study survey results suggest that they anticipate lower ongoing reporting costs than they currently incur ($599 million annually in expected aggregate costs versus $1.1 billion annually in current aggregate regulatory data reporting costs). For all other categories of broker-dealers, the Commission estimated ongoing annual costs to be higher than current reporting costs. While broker-dealers are anticipated to bear the greatest share of costs associated with CAT, the Commission discussed the possibility that these costs would be passed on to investors.

The Commission received comments on its preliminary estimates of aggregate costs to the industry. One commenter provided alternative cost estimates, citing costs for financial institutions of $2 to 40 million during initial years of CAT, and ongoing costs for CAT infrastructure of $28 to 36 million annually based on an analysis released by the Office of Comptroller of the Currency related to the Volcker Rule.[2572] Another commenter noted that while aggregate costs are not certain, they will be measured in billions of dollars.[2573] The same commenter also noted that the costs of CAT would be passed on to investors.[2574]

The Commission does not believe, however, that these comments require revision of its analysis of the aggregate costs of the Plan.

With respect to the comment that suggested that the Commission use Volcker Rule cost estimates to estimate the costs of the Plan, the Commission believes that these estimates are not relevant to the Plan.[2575] The requirements of the Plan are significantly different than the requirements of the Volcker Rule, which is primarily focused on restricting certain trading activities and investments of banking entities, rather than the centralization and standardization of regulatory data reporting. Further, while the Commission acknowledges that some market participants will be subject to both the Volcker Rule and CAT, the Commission notes that market participants affected by the Plan are not necessarily comparable to banking entities affected by the Volcker Rule, and thus cost estimates for changes to their business processes would not be applicable to typical CAT reporters, which tend to be smaller institutions. The commenter's suggested estimate of $2 million per year for affected market participants that are not large financial institutions does not seem reasonable because the majority of data that must be collected under CAT is already hosted by many of these firms' service providers, and much of this data is already reported to a regulatory data reporting system (OATS) for a far lower cost than the $2 million estimate.[2576]

The Commission agrees with the comment regarding the uncertainty of the cost estimates,[2577] and notes that it recognized in the Notice the significant uncertainty surrounding the actual implementation costs of CAT and the actual ongoing broker-dealer data reporting costs if the Plan were approved and is cognizant of the magnitude of the aggregate costs.[2578] The Commission continues to recognize that the methodology and data limitations used to develop these cost estimates could result in imprecise estimates that may significantly differ from actual costs. The Commission continues to believe, however, that it is using its best judgment to assess available information and data to provide analysis and estimates of the costs of the CAT NMS Plan. With regard to the comment that CAT costs will be passed on to investors,[2579] the Commission acknowledged in the Notice and continues to believe that it is possible that some or most of the costs of CAT will be passed on to investors.

The Commission has, however, updated its aggregate cost estimates to account for the updates to Central Repository, Broker-Dealer, Participant and Service Bureau cost estimates which incorporate updates due to modifications of the Plan. In aggregate, the Commission believes that that industry will spend $2.4 billion to implement CAT, and $1.7 billion per year in ongoing annual costs. Table 5 below shows these new cost estimates and aggregate costs to industry. Some individual estimates have changed from estimates presented in the Notice for a number of reasons. First, the Commission is now recognizing system retirement costs of $55 million. Also, estimates for Participant costs have increased to account for two additional Participants that were not covered by the Participants Study, and to account for the cost of additional reporting required by amendments to the Plan. Finally, estimates for Central Repository implementation and ongoing costs have been updated to reflect the Participants' current estimates. As Table 5 shows, however, the changes to the cost estimates do not affect the rounded estimates of implementation and ongoing costs presented in the Notice. The Commission recognizes that these cost estimates do not specifically itemize the costs of certain modifications to the Plan or respond to information provided by certain

[2569] FIF Letter at 87–88.

[2570] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30726–30.

[2571] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iv)(A)(5).

[2572] Data Boiler Letter at 14–15.

[2573] FSR Letter at 9–10.

[2574] FSR Letter at 9–10.

[2575] Data Boiler Letter at 14–15.

[2576] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30722.

[2577] FSR Letter at 9–10.

[2578] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30708.

[2579] FSR Letter at 9–10.

Commenters related to the costs of individual elements of the Plan. The Commission discusses these in detail in Section VI.F.3 below.

TABLE 5—COMMISSION'S ESTIMATE

	Number	Current costs	CAT		
			Implementation	System retirement	Ongoing
Central Repository	.....	$0	$65,000,000	.....	$55,000,000
Participants (all, 21)	.....	170,326,730	37,713,757	$342,632	114,271,857
Service Bureaus (all, 13)	.....	Unknown	119,500,000	21,300,000	Excluded
Broker Dealers:					
Insourcers	126	1,097,130,000	911,144,052	12,600,000	599,285,000
Outsourcers	806	271,113,000	342,026,100	8,060,000	356,764,000
New Small Firms	799	133,137,000	678,111,300	7,990,000	353,666,000
ELPs	14	20,068,000	54,257,245	1,400,000	45,160,000
Options Market Makers	31	44,437,000	120,141,043	3,100,000	99,998,000
Options Floor Brokers	24	3,999,000	20,368,800	240,000	10,623,000
Additional Costs:					
NEW: Allocation time	.....	.....	44,050,000	.....	5,035,833
NEW: Quote sent time	.....	.....	17,400,000	.....	11,880,000
NEW: Development Cost Recoup	.....	.....	8,800,000	.....	.....
Total BD	1,800	1,569,884,000	2,196,298,540	33,390,000	1,482,411,833
Total Industry	.....	1,740,210,730	2,418,512,297	55,032,632	1,651,683,690

b. System Retirement and Duplicative Reporting Costs

In the Notice, the Commission considered whether to include in its estimates of aggregate compliance costs the costs of system retirement and the costs of duplicative reporting if Participants and broker-dealers need to maintain and report to current systems after commencing reporting to the Central Repository.

The Commission considered the costs for system retirement provided in the Plan, which discussed significant costs ($2.6 billion) for retirement of current regulatory reporting systems.[2580] The Commission did not include those costs in its estimate of the aggregate costs of the Plan, for several reasons. First, the Commission preliminarily believed that the cost estimates provided in the Plan were unlikely to accurately represent the actual costs industry would face in retiring duplicative reporting systems.[2581] In particular, for the majority of broker-dealers that outsource, system retirement would affect few in-house systems; these broker-dealers would likely adapt the systems that interface with service bureaus for current regulatory data reporting to interface for CAT Data reporting. Further, for broker-dealers that self-report regulatory data, the Commission could not determine the source of the costs of system retirement that were estimated in the Plan and the magnitude of estimated costs led the Commission to doubt that estimates included only costs of retiring systems.[2582] Second, the retirement of current regulatory reporting systems was not a requirement of the Plan and the timeline and process for their retirement was uncertain.

While the Commission's cost estimates did not recognize explicit system retirement expenses, they also did not explicitly recognize savings from elimination of these systems, though they were recognized qualitatively. In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that this approach was conservative in the sense that system retirement costs would likely be mitigated by incorporation of current reporting infrastructure into CAT reporting infrastructure, while cost savings associated with industry's need to maintain fewer regulatory data reporting systems were not explicitly recognized. While the Commission did not include explicit system retirement costs, the Commission did recognize that industry would experience a costly period of duplicative reporting if the CAT NMS Plan were approved, and the Commission stated that it believed it was possible that these costs could be conflated with actual retirement costs estimated in the Plan.

In the Notice, the Commission stated its preliminary belief that the period of duplicative reporting would likely constitute a major cost to industry for several reasons.[2583] These reasons included the length of the duplicative reporting period; constraints on the capacity of industry to implement changes to regulatory reporting infrastructure that might cause market participants to implement changes using less cost-effective resources; [2584] and the inability of some market participants to implement duplicative reporting in house, necessitating that they seek service bureau relationships to accomplish their CAT reporting requirements.

Based on data provided in the Plan, the Commission preliminarily believed that the period of duplicative reporting anticipated by the Participants would likely last for 2 to 2.5 years.[2585] This time period involved four steps. Step 1, which could take 12 to 18 months, involves the SROs identifying duplicative SRO Rules and systems and Commission rulemaking. Step 2, which would last six months, involves preparations by the SROs to file rule changes, followed by Step 3, lasting three months, for the Commission to approve such rule changes. The last

[2580] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iv)(A)(5).

[2581] At its simplest level, ceasing reporting activities would include scrapping IT hardware dedicated to the endeavor and terminating the employees responsible for such regulatory data reporting. The Commission recognized that there are costs associated with those activities, but did not preliminarily believe their magnitude (estimated in the Plan as $2.6 billion) should approach or exceed the magnitude of costs of CAT implementation (estimated in this analysis as $2.4 billion). *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30726–28.

[2582] *Id.*

[2583] *Id.* at 30728.

[2584] *Id.*

[2585] *Id.* at 30726–30.

step, Step 4, involves implementation, and the Commission estimated it could last from 90 days to six months, during which time the Plan stated that the Participants could consider when the quality of CAT Data would be sufficient to meet surveillance needs.

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the current data reporting costs of $1.7 billion per year constituted an estimate of the cost per year to industry of duplicative reporting requirements, as it represents the cost of duplicative reporting to industry if there are no efficiencies that arise when a market participant has to report a subset of already centralized regulatory data to other regulatory data reporting systems.[2586] The Commission did not believe that duplicative reporting costs should be added to the estimated aggregate costs of the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission discussed its belief that that the aggregate costs above represent the total costs of the Plan, and do not account for the differential between these costs and the costs the industry currently incurs for regulatory data reporting and maintenance. During the period of duplicative reporting, industry would incur the aggregate costs of accomplishing CAT reporting described above, plus the costs of current data reporting, which the Commission used as an estimate of duplicative reporting costs. The Commission noted that market participants would incur costs equal to current data reporting costs before system retirement and CAT implementation (because current regulatory data reporting would continue), or as duplicative reporting costs from Plan implementation until system retirement. Consequently, the Commission preliminarily believed these costs should not be considered as costs attributable to approval of the Plan, because market participants would bear these costs whether the Plan is approved or not.

The Commission received comments on the costs of duplicative reporting. Several commenters agreed with the Notice that duplicative reporting would constitute a major cost to industry,[2587] with a few of these commenters providing examples of the types of costs.[2588] Examples of burdens provided by these commenters include dual reporting complexities such as conflicting reporting requirements,[2589] varied corrections to the same errors across different systems,[2590] legal and compliance confusion,[2591] costs of maintenance of duplicative reporting systems such as infrastructure, storage, technical, and staffing resources,[2592] and costs associated with making changes to redundant systems.[2593] No commenters agreed with the Commission's preliminary belief[2594] that reporters might experience efficiencies during duplicative reporting, with one commenter claiming that its costs would double.[2595]

The Commission received comments on the measurement of the duplicative reporting period as well as the necessity and impact of the length of the duplicative reporting period. Some commenters indicated that the lengthy expected duplicative reporting period was unnecessary, redundant and/or avoidable[2596] and two commenters indicated that the length of the duplicative reporting period was a major factor in the duplicative reporting costs.[2597] A commenter suggested that it was feasible for the Commission and SROs to complete Step 1 before the milestone for the publication of Technical Specifications (one year before Industry Members other than Small Industry Members are required to begin reporting), which would speed up systems retirement by 18 to 24 months relative to the Commission's estimate.[2598] The same commenter also suggested that Step 4 was longer than necessary to achieve acceptable data quality.[2599] One commenter indicated that the length of the duplicative reporting period was actually 3 to 3.5 years instead of the Commission's estimate of 2 to 2.5 years for firms that do not meet the definition of Small Industry Member.[2600]

The Commission also received comments discussing the system retirement costs presented in the Plan and discussed by the Commission in the Notice. One Commenter disagreed with the Plan's estimate that it should cost $2.6 billion to retire redundant systems.[2601] Instead, the commenter suggested that a more accurate cost estimate would range from $10,000 to $100,000 per firm. This commenter did not provide an explanation of the how the commenter derived this estimated range and sought more information on the Plan's estimate.

The Participants' Response Letter II discussed comments related to system retirement.[2602] The Participants noted that Small Industry Members can begin reporting earlier on a voluntary basis, and stated that the Participants will consider a rule change that would accelerate reporting for small Industry Members that are OATS reporters. The Participants also discussed their commitment to eliminating duplicative reporting systems as quickly as possible.[2603] They stated that they are incented to eliminate duplicative systems because maintaining the systems is costly.

The Participants also outlined a revised timetable for system retirement that differs from the Plan as filed.[2604] Under the Participants' proposal, Step 1 would be completed within 9–12 months after the Plan's approval. Step 2, in which Participants file rule changes with the Commission, would end six months after the conclusion of Step 1. The Participants also discussed an exemption for individual CAT reporters from duplicative reporting.[2605]

The Commission has considered the comments received, the Participants' response, and the modifications to the Plan, and is revising its analysis of the costs of duplicative reporting and system retirement as described below. The Commission acknowledges additional uncertainty regarding duplicative reporting due to its revised belief that efficiencies in duplicative reporting are less likely than it believed at the time of the Notice, but continues to believe that duplicative reporting could cost up to $1.7 billion per year. However, as discussed below, the Commission now believes that the period of duplicative reporting is likely to be shorter than was anticipated in the Notice, and that the cost will therefore be reduced. Based on comments received, the Commission has revised its estimate of system retirement costs and now believes the aggregate cost to

[2586] Assuming that OATS, for example, is a subset of CAT, producing OATS data from the same database that produces CAT data might be less expensive than creating a separate infrastructure to report OATS data during the period of duplicative reporting.

[2587] FIF Letter at 5; SIFMA Letter at 5; FSR Letter at 10; Fidelity Letter at 4–5; TR Letter at 2; KCG Letter at 3; MFA Letter at 9; DAG Letter at 2.

[2588] FIF Letter at 30; SIFMA Letter at 5; Fidelity Letter at 4–5; TR Letter at 2.

[2589] FIF Letter at 30.

[2590] FIF Letter at 30.

[2591] TR Letter at 2.

[2592] FIF Letter at 30; SIFMA Letter at 5.

[2593] Fidelity Letter at 5; KCG Letter at 3.

[2594] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30729.

[2595] TR Letter at 2.

[2596] SIFMA Letter at 5; Data Boiler Letter at 36; Fidelity Letter at 4; DAG Letter at 2.

[2597] FIF Letter at 5; DAG Letter at 2.

[2598] FIF Letter at 6.

[2599] FIF Letter at 6.

[2600] TR Letter at 2.

[2601] SIFMA Letter at 7.

[2602] Response Letter II at 19–20.

[2603] Response Letter II at 20–21.

[2604] Response Letter II at 21–25.

[2605] Response Letter II at 26; *see also* Section IV.D.9, *supra.*

industry will be approximately $55 million.

Consistent with its position in the Notice, the Commission agrees with commenters that duplicative reporting will constitute a major cost to industry, and recognizes that conflicting reporting requirements, varied corrections to the same error across different systems, legal and compliance confusion will all contribute to these costs. Further, the Commission agrees that maintenance of duplicative reporting systems will entail commitment of additional resources such as infrastructure, storage, technical, and staffing resources, as well as costs associated with making changes to redundant systems. However, the Commission notes that modifications to the Plan that minimize changes to potentially duplicative systems during the period of duplicative reporting may mitigate some of these costs.[2606] Regarding the comment that some market participants will see their data reporting costs double during the period of duplicative reporting, the Commission agrees and believes that calculation is reflected in the estimates in the Notice, as its estimate of duplicative reporting costs of $1.7 billion per year is in line with the projected industry costs of ongoing CAT reporting of $1.7 billion per year.[2607]

In response to the comment that duplicative reporting does not create efficiencies, the Commission, in the Notice, explained that it expected some cost efficiencies, but expressed uncertainty about those efficiencies. Because of that uncertainty and in light of the comment, the Commission acknowledges that duplicative reporting may not result in efficiencies.

Based on the changes to the Plan, the Commission now believes that the duplicative reporting period may be shorter than estimated in the Notice. As discussed previously, the Commission has revised the milestones for system retirement, which may decrease the duplicative reporting period compared to the period anticipated at the time of the Notice.[2608] Specifically, the gap analyses for major duplicative systems (Step 1) have been substantially completed 3–3.5 years sooner [2609] than was envisioned in the Notice.[2610] Furthermore, the Plan as amended now calls for the Participants to file with the Commission within 6 months after Plan approval (Step 2) rule change proposals.[2611] Consequently, Step 3 (Commission review of rule modification filings) is expected to commence six months after Plan approval, and, as discussed in the Notice, is expected to take three months to one year. As a result, Step 4 (Participant implementation of rule changes) is the only system retirement step that the Commission expects to extend past when Large Industry Members begin reporting to the Central Repository.

The Commission recognizes that there remains significant uncertainty as to when system retirement will occur, because the actual retirement of such rules and systems will depend upon several factors. In particular, the Commission notes that the retirement of systems will not occur until the CAT Data is of sufficient quality and when the CAT system has been fully implemented for all reporters.[2612]

With respect to the quality of the CAT Data, as discussed above, in the Notice the Commission estimated that the period of duplicative reporting was likely to last for 2 to 2.5 years. At the time of the Notice, the Commission's estimate suggested that the length of the rule modification steps within the four step process discussed above would primarily determine the length of the overall duplicative reporting period, although it recognized that data quality could delay the retirement of duplicative systems.[2613] The Commission recognized in the Notice that Step 4 (implementation of system retirement plans) required not only the completion of Steps 1 through 3 but also that data quality within the Central Repository had to be adequate for the SRO's regulatory needs.

The Commission now believes that, while the revision of the system retirement milestones may decrease the length of the duplicative reporting period, this change will also increase the probability that Industry Member data quality might delay system retirement because Industry Members will have less experience reporting CAT Data when the four step process reaches the point where data quality could delay system retirement.

Additionally, the Commission believes it is possible that, as one commenter suggested,[2614] the phased implementation of CAT reporting for Small Industry Members could result in up to one year of duplicative reporting expense for Large Industry Members. Specifically, Large Industry Member data quality may reach a level that is sufficient for SRO regulatory needs prior to the commencement of reporting by Small Industry Members to the Central Repository, but retirement of systems might not occur until after those Small Industry Members begin reporting.[2615] Further, it is possible that, as a result of having commenced reporting at a later date, Small Industry Members' data may not reach an acceptable quality threshold for some period after Large Industry Members' data has reached an acceptable quality threshold. The phased implementation schedule may therefore limit the extent to which the Plan amendments accelerating the timeframe for initial rule change proposals shorten the duplicative reporting period and thereby reduce the costs of duplicative reporting. Despite this caveat, for reasons explained below, the Commission believes that the amendments could significantly shorten this period and reduce costs.

In particular, at least four amendments or other factors might mitigate the impact of phased implementation on duplicative reporting and costs. First, the Commission has amended the Plan to

[2606] *See* Section IV.D.9.a(2), *supra* (explaining that the Commission is amending Section C.9 of Appendix C of the Plan to state that between the Effective Date and the retirement of the Participants' duplicative systems, each Participant, to the extent practicable, will attempt to minimize changes to those duplicative systems.

[2607] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30729. As discussed above, the Commission estimates that market participants currently spend $1.7 billion for regulatory data reporting, and estimates that market participants will spend $1.7 billion to report regulatory data under CAT. During years of duplicative reporting, the Commission estimates market participants would spend $3.3 billion in regulatory data reporting, which is approximately double the $1.7 billion they currently spend. *See* Section V.F.2, *supra.*

[2608] *See* Section IV.D.9.a(1), *supra.*

[2609] The Plan states that Step 1 would end 1–1.5 years after large Industry Members begin reporting to the Central Repository. Large Industry Members will begin reporting 2 years after the Plan is approved.

[2610] *See* Section IV.D.9, *supra.*

[2611] These proposals must consider at least three factors: (1) Specific standards of data accuracy and reliability, including, but not limited to, whether the attainment of a certain Error Rate is reached, (2) whether the availability of Small Industry Member data two years after Plan approval would facilitate more expeditious systems retirement, and (3) whether individual Industry Members can be exempted from reporting to duplicative systems once their CAT reporting meets specified accuracy and reliability standards. *See* Section IV.D.9.a, *supra.* The Commission analyzes these amendments below.

[2612] *See* Section IV.D.9, *supra.*

[2613] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30729.

[2614] TR Letter at 2.

[2615] The Commission's analysis of costs is not based on small versus large Industry Members, but rather is based on Insourcers versus Outsourcers. It is reasonable to assume that Insourcers, ELPs and Option Market Makers are large Industry Members because these market participants can be characterized as having high activity levels that would require capital levels that exceed the upper threshold for small Industry Members. For these three groups of CAT reporters, one year of duplicative reporting is estimated to cost $1.2 billion. *See* estimates of current data reporting costs in Section V.F.1.c(2)B, *supra.*

require the Participants' to include, in their filings to retire systems, specific standards of data accuracy and reliability, including, but not limited to, whether the attainment of a certain Error Rate is reached,[2616] which should incentivize accurate data reporting by both Large and Small Industry Members and reduce the duplicative reporting period. Second, an amendment to the Plan requires Participants' rule change proposals to consider whether individual Industry Members can be exempted from reporting to duplicative systems once their CAT reporting meets specified accuracy and reliability standards.[2617] If the Participants determine to grant such individual exemptions to some Industry Members prior to all Industry Members' data reaching an acceptable quality threshold, the economic impact of the phased implementation schedule could be less. Third, the Participants have indicated that OATS-reporting Small Industry Members can begin voluntarily reporting at the same time as Large Industry Members, and the Commission encourages the Participants and the Plan Processor to work with these Small Industry Members to enable them to begin reporting to CAT, on a voluntary basis, at the same time that Large Industry Members are required to begin reporting or as soon as practicable. The Commission recognizes, however, that incentives for Small Industry Members to begin reporting voluntarily at an earlier time are limited because accelerating CAT reporting imposes costs on CAT reporters, while the benefits of earlier system retirement accrue primarily to Large Industry Members that face a longer period of duplicative reporting. As a result, the extent to which accelerating commencement of voluntary reporting mitigates the economic impact of the phased implementation schedule may be limited. Therefore, the Commission believes that the amendment to require that the Participants consider whether the availability of Small Industry Member data two years after Plan approval would facilitate more expeditious systems retirement [2618] could help to avoid an extension of the duplicative reporting period attributable to the phased implementation schedule.

The Commission has also considered the comment that proposed alternative estimates for system retirement costs [2619] and has revised its economic analysis accordingly. Specifically, the Commission believes that this commenter has the expertise to provide reliable estimates because this industry group's members can inform it of their costs; furthermore, the Commission believes the estimates this commenter provided seem more reasonable than estimates provided in the Plan because estimates provided in the Plan exceeded the Commission's estimate of costs of implementing the Plan.[2620]

To estimate the aggregate costs of system retirement, the Commission assumes that the $100,000 estimate would be appropriate for Insourcers and the $10,000 estimate would be appropriate for Outsourcers.[2621] The Commission assumes that for firms that do not currently report to OATS, firms that were considered large for cost estimates (ELPs and Options Market Makers) will have similar system retirement costs to Insourcers because they are more similar in size and scope of operations to Insourcers than Outsourcers.[2622] The Commission further assumes that non-OATS reporting firms that were considered small for cost estimates (new small firms and options floor brokers) will face similar system retirement costs to Outsourcers because they are more similar in size and scope of operations to Outsourcers than Insourcers.[2623] With these assumptions, the Commission now estimates that broker-dealer system retirement costs would be $33.4 million, as described in Table 6. The Commission draws its estimates of system retirement costs for Participants and service providers from the Plan, which estimates aggregate costs of $343,000 [2624] across all Participants, and $21.3 million across all service providers. The Commission now estimates total industry costs for system retirement will be $55 million.

TABLE 6—ESTIMATE OF SYSTEM RETIREMENT COSTS

	Number	CAT system retirement
Central Repository Participants (all)	.....	$342,632
Service Bureaus (all, 13)	.....	21,300,000
Broker-Dealers:		
Insourcers	126	12,600,000
Outsourcers	806	8,060,000
New Small Firms	799	7,990,000
ELPs	14	1,400,000
Options Market Makers	31	3,100,000

[2616] *See* Section IV.D.9.a.(2), *supra*. Note that such proposals are subject to Commission approval. In reviewing such a proposal, the Commission would consider the appropriateness, and the consistency with the Act, of the proposal.

[2617] *Id.*

[2618] *Id.*

[2619] SIFMA Letter at 7.

[2620] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30727–28.

[2621] As discussed in the Notice, the Insourcing/Outsourcing decision is correlated with firm size. Insourcers tend to be larger firms, as do ELPs and Options Market Makers. These firms are likely to have more internal systems and more complex internal systems that will likely be more expensive to retire. On the other hand, Outsourcers, new reporters and options floor brokers are likely to be smaller firms with fewer internal systems that are less complex for retirement. Furthermore, new reporters and options floor brokers are likely to have fewer internal reporting systems than other broker-dealers because they are unlikely to have current OATS reporting obligations. *Id.* at 30718.

[2622] The Commission recognizes that there is uncertainty in the system retirement costs that broker-dealers will face generally. The estimates provided by the commenter are presented as a range, and the Commission's assumptions of which firms would fall at the top and the bottom of the range have significant uncertainty. If all 1,800 broker-dealers anticipated to incur CAT reporting obligations bore $100,000 in system retirement costs, broker-dealer system retirement costs would be $180 million. The Commission believes system retirement costs will be far less than this because many broker-dealers currently have limited regulatory data reporting systems, and the majority of broker-dealers rely on service providers to perform much of their data reporting responsibilities.

[2623] The Commission recognizes that some new reporters and options floor brokers may choose to insource their CAT reporting activities, and thus may be considered similar in size and scope of operations to non-OATS reporting large firms. Because new reporters and options floor brokers do not currently report to OATS, the Commission believes that they will face lower system retirement costs than ELPs and Options Market Makers because the Commission believes many ELPs and Options Market Makers are members of an exchange that requires them to be able to report to OATS on request, while new small firms and options floor brokers are unlikely to be members of an exchange with this requirement.

[2624] The Notice estimated $310,000 for system retirement costs for Participants. The Commission is increasing this estimate by 10.53% to account for the addition of two Participants. *See* Section V.F.1.b, *supra*.

TABLE 6—ESTIMATE OF SYSTEM RETIREMENT COSTS—Continued

	Number	CAT system retirement
Options Floor Brokers	24	240,000
Total BD	1800	33,390,000
Total Industry	.....	55,032,632

3. Further Analysis of Costs

a. Costs Included in the Estimation

In the Notice, the Commission noted that, in general, the CAT NMS Plan does not break down its cost estimates as a function of particular CAT NMS Plan requirements. However, the Commission considered which elements of the CAT NMS Plan were likely to be among the most significant contributors to the estimated CAT costs.[2625] The Commission discussed its preliminary belief that significant sources of costs would include: The requirement to report customer information; [2626] the requirement to report certain information as part of the Material Terms of the Order; the requirement to use listing exchange symbology; and the inclusion of Allocation Reports.

In addition, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that while certain costs could generally be quantifiably estimated, they were unlikely to be significant contributors to the overall costs of the Plan. These factors included: Clock synchronization requirements; Plan requirements that include the requirement that Options Market Makers send quote times to the exchanges; the requirement that the Central Repository maintain six years of CAT Data; and the inclusion of OTC Equity Securities in the initial phase of the implementation of the CAT NMS Plan. Furthermore, the Commission also explained that there were other sources of costs, namely costs associated with meeting certain targets such as error rates and management of PII, that could not be quantified by the Commission.

The Commission noted that it believed that its estimates of the implementation costs and ongoing costs to industry included each of the costs discussed, because the provisions encapsulate major parts of the Plan. The Commission explained that it lacked the necessary information to estimate what portion of the costs of the Plan is attributable to some of these aforementioned elements because the Plan does not provide information on the costs attributable to reporting of this information, and the Commission had no other data from which it can independently estimate these costs.

As discussed more fully below, the Commission has considered the comments it received regarding its analysis of these aforementioned costs, the Participants' response, and modifications to the Plan, and is updating its analysis in three ways. First, the Commission's analysis fully acknowledges the uncertainty in its cost estimates. Second, several comments disagreed with the Commission's belief that certain costs were included in the Commission's cost estimates. The Commission has analyzed each of these instances below and now believes that some costs, namely costs associated with Allocation Time and Quote Sent Time, were not included in the estimated costs in the Notice. As indicated in the Costs to Broker-Dealers, Costs to Participants, and the Costs of Building and Operating the Central Repository Sections above, the Commission has added these costs to the total costs for broker-dealers where estimates are available or otherwise recognizes them as additional to the existing estimates.[2627] Third, several commenters disagreed with which costs the Commission noted as significant contributors to CAT costs. In response to comments, the Commission no longer judges whether quantified costs represent a significant contribution to total costs. Instead, it describes only the costs it cannot quantify in terms of whether the Commission believes such costs are a substantial proportion of costs of the CAT NMS Plan, and addresses those individually below. The Commission is cognizant that some of the costs for particular elements may be significant in isolation even if they are not a large proportion of the aggregate costs of the Plan. The following Sections expand on the analysis of the estimated costs above by exploring individual components of the CAT NMS Plan.

(1) Customer Information

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its belief that the requirement in the CAT NMS Plan to report customer information for each transaction represents a significant source of costs.[2628] The Commission explained that adapting systems to report customer information that is not included in current regulatory data on a routine basis could require significant and potentially difficult reprogramming because it could require gathering information from separate systems within a broker-dealer's infrastructure and consolidating it in one location, and redesigning an IT infrastructure to satisfy this requirement could interrupt other workflows within the broker-dealer, expanding the scope of systems that must be altered to accomplish CAT reporting.

The Commission received comments regarding the costs associated with reporting customer information. One commenter mentioned that the costs for providing customer information to the Central Repository represent a significant proportion of costs to the total industry.[2629] One commenter requested clarification that only active accounts are reported as part of the customer definition process, and as a result of such clarification, this could reduce costs incurred for reporting customer information.[2630] Two commenters stated that including Customer Identifying Information on the Initial Order Report would result in significant costs for the industry.[2631]

The Participants responded to the comment regarding clarification of reporting only active accounts, stating that they have proposed to add a definition of ''Active Account'', defined as an account that has had activity in Eligible Securities within the last six months. Additionally, the Participants propose amending Section 6.4(d)(iv) of

[2625] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30730–32.

[2626] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.1.a.iii.

[2627] The Commission recognizes that Allocation Time may also increase the costs of the Central Repository and that Quote Sent Time may increase the costs of the Central Repository and to Participants. However, the Commission lacks sufficient information to add these costs to the existing estimates in these categories. Consequently, the Commission discusses the modifications qualitatively.

[2628] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30730.

[2629] Data Boiler Letter at 37.

[2630] FIF Letter at 10.

[2631] TR Letter at 8–9; FIF Letter at 9–10, 86.

the Plan to clarify that each Industry Member must submit an initial set of customer information for Active Accounts at the commencement of reporting to the Central Repository, as well as any updates, additions, or other changes in customer information, including any such customer information for any new Active Accounts.[2632] In response to the comments regarding the expense associated with reporting Customer Identifying Information in the Initial Order Report, the Participants recommended modifications to the Plan to clarify that Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information does not need to be included on the Initial Order Report.[2633]

The Commission considered these comments, the Participants' response and modifications to the Plan, and continues to believe that the requirement in the CAT NMS Plan to report customer information represents a significant proportion of total costs to the industry. No commenter provided cost estimates that would allow the Commission to estimate the costs, however. Further, the economic analysis did not explicitly account for Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information on the Initial Order Report, and the modification clarifies that the Plan does not require this information on order origination.

(2) Material Terms of the Order

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily explained that the requirement to report Material Terms of the Order that include an open/close indicator for equities, order display information, and special handling instructions represent a significant source of cost. The Commission observed that not all broker-dealers are required to report these elements on every order and no market participants report an open/close indicator on orders to buy or sell equities. Thus, adapting some market participants' systems to report this information for each transaction could require significant and potentially difficult reprogramming that requires centralizing or copying information from multiple IT systems within the broker-dealer, which could dramatically increase the costs associated with implementing the changes required by CAT.

The Commission received comments on the costs of the open/close indicator, but did not receive comments on other components of the Material Terms of the Order. Three commenters agreed with the Commission's analysis that an open/close indicator represents a significant proportion of costs of the Plan.[2634] Two commenters indicated that it would require significant process changes across multiple systems,[2635] and one provided a list of the different types of systems impacted by the open/close indicator.[2636] Three commenters mentioned that currently, the open/close indicator is not populated for equities.[2637] One of these commenters mentioned the inclusion of the open/close indicator for equities represents a ''market structure change.'' [2638] Further, several commenters implied that the costs of the open/close indicator were not included in the cost estimates in the Notice.[2639] The Participants did not directly address the costs of the open/close indicator but did indicate that it is currently only captured on certain options orders, implying that including this field in the Plan would be costly.[2640] In particular, the Participants' response indicates that the open/close indicator is not captured on equities or on certain options transactions such as Options' Market Maker transactions.

The Commission considered these comments, the Participants' response, and modifications to the Plan and is updating and revising its economic analysis regarding the costs of the open/close indicator for equities and certain options transactions below.

The modifications to the Plan eliminating the requirement to report an open/close indicator for equities will reduce the compliance costs for broker-dealers, Participants, and the Central Repository, but the Commission cannot quantify the savings. While several commenters implied that the cost estimates in the Notice did not account for the open/close indicator in equities, the Commission notes that this data field was proposed in Rule 613 and discussed in the Proposing Release and Notice. Nonetheless, the commenters represent many broker-dealers and, therefore, the comments may indicate that a number of broker-dealers indeed did not include these costs when responding to the cost survey. This raises uncertainty regarding how many broker-dealers did or did not account for these costs. Because of this uncertainty and the absence of comments detailing the costs, the Commission cannot update its cost estimates to recognize the Plan modifications. However, both the Commission and commenters agree that, absent a modification, market participants would have needed to adapt their systems to report open/close information for each order because this indicator is not populated for equities today.

The Participants' statement in the response letter that open/close indicators are not reported on some options orders is consistent with Commission experience and the analysis in the Notice. While the economic analysis in the Notice did not explicitly separate the costs associated with an open/close indicator for equities and an open/close indicator for options, the Commission continues to believe that the costs of the open/close indicator for options are included in the cost estimates above because the commenters who implied that the cost estimates do not include estimates of the open/close indicator specifically mentioned equities and not options. But because the Plan will no longer require the reporting of the open/close indicator for Options Market Maker transactions, the Commission now believes there will be additional cost savings associated with not having to report this indicator as part of CAT.

(3) Listing Exchange Symbology

In the Notice, the Commission explained its preliminary belief that the requirement to use listing exchange symbology could represent a significant source of costs.[2641] The Commission explained that because broker-dealers do not necessarily use listing exchange symbology when placing orders on other exchanges or off-exchange, this requirement could require broker-dealers to perform a translation process on their data before they submit CAT Data to the Central Repository.[2642] The translation process could be costly to design and perform, and result in errors that would be costly for the broker-dealers to correct. If other elements of the Plan were to necessitate a translation, then the listing exchange

[2632] Response Letter I at 35.

[2633] Response Letter I at 34.

[2634] TR Letter at 9; SIFMA Letter at 35–36; FIF Letter at 83–86.

[2635] SIFMA Letter at 35; FIF Letter at 4, 84.

[2636] FIF Letter at 84.

[2637] TR Letter at 9, FIF Letter at 4, SIFMA Letter at 35.

[2638] FIF Letter at 85; TR Letter at 9.

[2639] Specifically, one commenter stated that the inclusion of the open/close indicator for equities was a surprise (*See* FIF Letter at 84) and two commenters wanted additional cost benefit analysis on the open/close indicator (*See* FIF Letter at 84; SIFMA Letter at 36).

[2640] Response Letter I at 21, 22.

[2641] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30730–30731.

[2642] For example, class A shares of ABC Company might be traded using ticker symbol ''ABC A'' on one exchange, ''ABC_A'' on another exchange, and ''ABC.A'' on a third. As written, the Plan would require all broker-dealers to use the listing exchange's symbol for its Central Repository reporting, regardless of the symbol in the order messages received or acted upon at the broker-dealer or exchange.

symbology could be fairly low cost because it would be just another step in the translation. However, if the Plan has no other requirement that would necessitate a translation, the Commission explained that the costs of including listing exchange symbology on all CAT reports would include the costs of designing and performing the translation as well as the costs of correcting any errors caused by the translation.

The Commission received several comments regarding costs associated with CAT Reporters using listing exchange symbology. One commenter stated that they did not expect the use of listing exchange symbology to be much more costly than the use of existing symbology.[2643] Another commenter suggested that accepting only listing exchange symbology is costly and invasive.[2644] One other commenter stated that listing exchange symbology would also be a significant source of costs for options.[2645]

The Participants' response provided information on current practices relevant to the Commission's economic analysis. In particular, the Participants stated that based on discussions with the DAG, it was their understanding that all Industry Members subject to OATS or EBS reporting requirements currently use the symbology of the listing exchange when submitting such reports.[2646] These Industry Members may use proprietary symbols when recording events internally, but the Participants stated that based on their understanding of current practices, Industry Members currently employ technical solutions and/or systems that allow them to translate symbology into the correct format of the listing exchange when submitting data to exchanges or when submitting to regulatory reporting systems such as OATS or EBS.[2647]

The Commission considered the comments and the Participants' response and is revising its analysis and conclusion. Specifically, the Commission is incorporating the information from the Participants' response into its baseline of current broker-dealer practices. Because the Commission believes that broker-dealers already translate their order messages when routing orders, they should be able to apply those translations to other types of messages before recording the events or reporting them to CAT at a relatively low cost. Therefore, the Commission now believes that the incremental cost for CAT Reporters to translate from their existing symbology to listing exchange symbology would be smaller than as discussed in the Notice and would not be a substantial contributor to aggregate costs. This revised conclusion is consistent with commenters who indicated there would be costs, but did not indicate they would be large and did not provide cost estimates.

(4) Allocation Reports

In the Notice, the Commission recognized that industry would bear certain costs associated with Allocation Reports, particularly the requirement that the reports include allocation times. The Commission understood that currently some broker-dealers already record allocation times, but that the broker-dealers that do not currently record these times will face implementation costs associated with changing their business processes to record them. The Commission explained that implementation costs for allocation reporting may include significant costs associated with incorporating additional systems into firms' regulatory data reporting infrastructure to facilitate this reporting, if such systems would not already be involved in recording or reporting order events. Furthermore, the Commission explained that Outsourcers could face significant implementation and ongoing costs associated with reporting Allocation Reports if their service bureaus do not extend their services to manage the servers that handle allocations.

Three commenters noted that there would be costs associated with reporting allocation timestamps.[2648] One of these commenters mentioned that the requirement to report allocation timestamps means that industry members would need to incur unnecessary costs to acquire additional resources, and that these resources could be better served implementing other critical requirements of the CAT Plan.[2649] One commenter also provided cost estimates for reporting allocation timestamps at a granularity of one millisecond, as would be required in the Plan, and at a granularity of one second.[2650] In particular, the commenter reported that it conducted a survey of a set of broker-dealers to estimate the additional costs of the CAT NMS Plan that would be associated with the timestamp requirement on CAT Allocation Reports. Based on the results of the survey, the commenter estimated that the currently proposed allocation timestamp requirement, with a one millisecond timestamp granularity and a 50 millisecond clock offset, would cost the industry $88,775,000 in initial implementation costs and $13,925,000 in ongoing annual costs. The commenter further estimated that a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset, would cost the industry $44,050,000 in initial implementation costs and $5,035,833 in ongoing annual costs.[2651] The commenter also indicated that neither the survey of broker-dealers used to estimate the cost estimates in the Plan nor the survey used to estimate the costs of clock synchronization requirements included the requirement of timestamps on Allocation Reports.[2652]

The Participants' response recommended a modification to the Plan that would specify a one-second timestamp for allocation time on Allocation Reports,[2653] and the Plan has been amended to reflect this recommendation.

The Commission considered these comments, the Participants' response, and modifications to the Plan and is updating its analysis stated in the Notice. The comments that acknowledged that providing allocation timestamps represents a significant proportion of costs of the Plan are consistent with the Commission's analysis in the Notice. The Commission has analyzed the cost estimates received and believes them to be reliable because they are based on a survey of industry participants who are informed of the Allocation Time requirement and the changes that broker-dealers would need to make to comply with the requirement. Further, the Commission has analyzed the public information on the dates of the CAT Reporter survey and the release of public information on the inclusion of Allocation Time. In recognition of the modification to the timestamp granularity and the realization that Allocation Time costs were not included in the cost estimates in the Notice, the Commission is now adding the commenter's estimate of $44,050,000 in implementation costs

[2643] FIF Letter at 12, 95.

[2644] Data Boiler Letter at 37–38.

[2645] Bloomberg Letter at 5.

[2646] Response Letter II at 7.

[2647] Response Letter III at 13.

[2648] FSR Letter at 9; SIFMA Letter at 35; FIF Letter at 3–4, 11, 86–89.

[2649] FSR Letter at 11.

[2650] FIF Letter at 87–89.

[2651] FIF Letter at 88, Table 6.

[2652] FIF Letter at 86.

[2653] Response Letter I at 25.

and $5,035,833 in ongoing costs to the estimates of costs to broker-dealers.[2654]

(5) Clock Synchronization

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the clock synchronization requirements represented a less significant source of costs. The CAT NMS Plan estimated industry costs associated with the original 50 millisecond clock synchronization requirement, based on the FIF Clock Offset Survey.[2655] The FIF Clock Offset Survey stated that broker-dealers currently spend $203,846 per year on clock synchronization activities, including documenting clock synchronization events.[2656] The FIF Clock Offset Survey stated that firms expected the proposed 50 millisecond requirement to increase those costs by $109,197 per firm.[2657] Based on discussions with industry, the Commission preliminarily believed that the majority of broker-dealers (Outsourcers) would not face significant direct costs for clock synchronization because timestamps for CAT Data reporting would be applied by service bureaus.[2658] However, the Commission preliminarily estimated there are 171 firms that make the insourcing-outsourcing decision on a discretionary basis;[2659] if these firms decided to insource their data reporting under CAT, they would likely face costs associated with complying with new clock synchronization requirements. The Commission preliminarily estimated that industry-wide implementation costs for the 50 millisecond clock synchronization requirement would be $268 million, with $25 million annually in ongoing costs.[2660] The Commission preliminarily believed that approximately $18.7 million in broker-dealer ongoing costs would be attributable to clock synchronization requirements.[2661] The Commission also preliminarily believed that service bureaus would face similar clock synchronization costs if the CAT NMS Plan is approved. Using 13 as an estimate of the number of service bureaus, approximately $6 million in service bureau ongoing costs would be attributable to clock synchronization requirements in the Plan.[2662]

In addition, the Commission solicited comment in the Notice on alternatives to the Plan's one-size-fits all definition of ''industry standard.'' [2663] Under these alternatives, ''industry standard'' would be defined in terms of the standard practices of different segments of the CAT Reporters. The Commission explained that these alternative approaches could result in clock offset tolerances shorter than the CAT NMS Plan's proposed 50 millisecond standard for some or all CAT Reporters, Using information from a survey,[2664] the Commission estimated broker-dealer costs under various alternative standards.

The Commission received several comments regarding costs associated with clock synchronization requirements. One commenter mentioned that managing multiple clock synchronization structures across report types would present unnecessary difficulties for broker-dealers and unnecessary reconciliation issues for the Commission and SROs.[2665] Another commenter stated that clock synchronization will cost the industry $268 million for initial implementation of a 50 millisecond clock offset and $25 million for annual monitoring/maintenance, and that this represents a significant proportion of overall industry costs of the CAT NMS Plan.[2666] Furthermore, as discussed in Section V.F.3.a.(4), the commenter also indicated that the survey of broker-dealers used to estimate the costs of clock synchronization requirements did not include the requirement of timestamps on Allocation Reports.[2667] The commenter estimated that the proposed allocation timestamp requirement would cost the industry $88,775,000 in initial implementation costs and $13,925,000 in ongoing annual costs and that a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset, would cost the industry $44,050,000 in initial implementation costs and $5,035,833 in ongoing annual costs.[2668] Finally, this commenter highlighted several limitations in the Commission's cost estimates that result in these estimates understating industry cost.[2669] First, the commenter said that the costs in the FIF survey do not represent ''insourcer'' implementation costs as the Commission assumed because the survey was skewed toward smaller broker-dealers. Second, the commenter said that the Commission stated that the FIF Clock Offset Survey underestimated the costs per firm because of the

[2654] *See* Section V.F.3.a(4), *supra.* The total cost estimates of the CAT Plan reflect these implementation and ongoing costs.

[2655] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section D.12, and note 247. In the Notice, the Commission noted that the survey has two limitations pertinent to specific cost estimates provided in the summary of survey results. First, cost estimates are likely to be significantly downward biased. Individual responses to cost data were gathered within a range; for example, a firm would quantify its expected costs as ''Between $500K and less than $1M'' or ''$2.5M and over.'' When aggregating these responses, FIF generally used the range midpoint as a point estimate; however, for the highest response, the range minimum was used (*i.e.,* ''$2.5M and over'' was summarized as $2.5M.) This is likely to have produced a significant downward bias in aggregate survey responses. Second, the survey included only broker-dealers and service bureaus, thus the data excludes exchanges. The Commission preliminarily believed this limitation would not significantly impact industry costs because all exchanges currently maintain clock synchronization standards finer than those discussed as alternatives.

[2656] *See* FIF Clock Offset Survey, *supra* note 247. This is based on the current practice of the broker-dealers who responded to the survey.

[2657] *See id.* at 16. The $109,197 figure is obtained by subtracting the cost of maintaining current clock offsets of $203,846 annually from the estimated per-firm annual cost of maintaining a 50-millisecond clock offset of $313,043. S*ee id.* at 7 (''Even where firms were at the target clock offset, many firms cited additional costs associated with compliance including logging and achieving greater degrees of reliability'').

[2658] *See* Section V.F.1.d, *infra,* for discussion of service bureau costs and the degree to which those costs might be passed on to broker-dealers.

[2659] These are the 126 current OATS reporters that report more than 350,000 OATS ROEs per month; the 31 options market-making firms; and the 14 ELPs.

[2660] *See* Section VI.H.2.a(1), *infra,* for a discussion of how these implementation costs might vary for different clock synchronization standards.

[2661] *See id.,* for discussion of costs attributable to the 50 millisecond clock synchronization tolerance proposed in the Plan, including the $109,197 estimate of per-firm implementation costs of the 50 millisecond clock synchronization requirement; *see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(A)(3). 171 broker-dealers × $109,197 = $18,672,687. Note also that the Commission erroneously reported in the Notice that costs were $19.7 million in implementation costs, but these estimated costs should have been $18.7 million in ongoing costs. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30762–63 for further information on the Commission's estimation.

[2662] The CAT NMS Plan states that the Vendor Study was distributed to 13 service bureaus or technology-providing firms identified by the DAG. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(A)(3). 13 service bureaus × $109,197 × 4.2 = $5,962,156.2. The 4.2 multiplier is the ratio between the total incremental ongoing charges to broker-dealers and the total incremental ongoing costs to service bureaus derived from the cost estimates above. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30763 n 1245. Note that the Commission erroneously reported in the Notice that costs were $1.4 million in implementation costs, but these estimated costs should have been $6 million in ongoing costs. The Commission believed clock synchronization costs are already included in cost estimates provided in the Vendor Study. In the Notice, the Commission explained its belief that these costs likely would ultimately be passed on to service bureaus' broker-dealer clients. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5 at 30726; *see also* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30762–63 for further information on the Commission's estimation.

[2663] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30759.

[2664] *See* FIF Clock Offset Survey, *supra* note 247.

[2665] SIFMA Letter at 34.

[2666] FIF Letter at 108.

[2667] FIF Letter at 86.

[2668] FIF Letter at 88, Table 6.

[2669] *Id.* at 109.

methodology used to select a ''midpoint'' for the top cost range. Finally, the commenter said that the Commission should not have assumed staffing of ¼ full time employee (''FTE'') for initial implementation because it is incorrect to assume that all of the costs would be borne by a service bureau for all broker-dealers.

The Participants' response recommended a modification to the Plan changing the clock synchronization to 100 microseconds with regards to electronic systems, excluding certain manual systems; but stated that having multiple clock synchronization standards across an order lifecycle would complicate the linking process at the Central Repository, implying an increase in costs.[2670] In addition, the Participants' response recommended a modification to the Plan that would specify a one-second timestamp for allocation time on Allocation Reports [2671] and that would permit Industry Members to synchronize their Business Clocks used solely for reporting the time of allocation on Allocation Reports to within one second.[2672] The Plan has been amended to reflect each of these recommendations. The Commission is also amending the Plan to state that the Participants should apply industry standards based on the type of CAT Reporter or system, rather than the industry as a whole.[2673]

The Commission has considered the comments received, the Participants' response, and modifications to the Plan regarding clock synchronization and is revising its analysis of the costs attributable to this element of the Plan. In response to the commenter that stated the Commission's estimate for clock synchronization costs represents a significant portion of overall costs, the Commission did not intend to imply in the Notice that the magnitude of the clock synchronization costs were trivial, but instead that these costs were less significant contributors to overall costs than other costs.

In response to the commenter that stated the Commission's cost estimates associated with clock synchronization requirements were understated, the Commission recognizes the limitations in its analysis. However, the Commission lacks sufficient information to derive a more precise estimate. Although the participants in the FIF Clock Offset Survey [2674] were skewed towards smaller firms that did not match the ''insourcer'' model, as the commenter mentioned, it is unclear that the inclusion of such firms would bias the Commission's cost estimates downward. Also, the Commission's estimate of ¼ FTE for the clock synchronization implementation costs for Outsourcers is in line with its estimate of 1 FTE for the overall implementation costs for Outsourcers whereas multiplying the estimate from the survey results by the number of Outsourcers would yield a result that would be approximately 87% of the Commission's estimates for total implementation costs for outsourcers.[2675] The Commission agrees, however, that the average cost calculated in the FIF Clock Offset Survey included an inherent downward bias due to the selection of the minimum value in the highest cost response range when calculating the average.[2676] In conclusion, while the Commission recognizes a degree of uncertainty in its clock synchronization cost estimates, which may be downward biased, the commenter does not offer an alternative cost estimate, and the Commission does not have enough information to change its estimate.

The Commission agrees with the commenter that stated cost estimates in the Plan did not include the requirement of timestamps on Allocation Reports. In recognition of the modification to the Plan regarding timestamp requirements of Allocation Reports, and in realization that Allocation Time costs were not included in the cost estimates in the Notice, the Commission is now adding the commenter's estimate of $44,050,000 in implementation costs and $5,035,833 in ongoing costs for the inclusion of timestamps on Allocation Reports to the estimated costs of broker-dealers.[2677]

The Commission is unable to update cost estimates to account for the modifications to the clock synchronization standards for exchanges, but the Commission does not believe that the modifications will result in substantial cost increases for exchanges. The Commission does not have sufficient information to estimate clock synchronization costs for exchanges. However, based on information cited in the Notice [2678] and the Participants' response,[2679] the Commission understands that exchanges already maintain clock offsets of 100 microseconds or less. While the Commission recognizes that exchanges may still incur costs in additional logging and other actions to ensure they maintain clock offsets in compliance with the Plan, the Commission does not believe these additional costs will be substantial.

The Commission does not agree with the Participants that having multiple clock synchronization standards within the same order lifecycle will complicate the linkage process at the Central Repository. As indicated in Section V.D.2.b.(2), the industry already operates with multiple clock synchronization standards. Therefore, regardless of whether the clock synchronization standards apply a one-size-fits-all definition of industry standard or apply a different standard to exchanges, the linking process is already complicated by the fact that exchanges and many broker-dealers already synchronize some or all of their business systems to less than 50 milliseconds. The Commission therefore believes that the modifications to the Plan to set the clock synchronization standard for exchanges at 100 microseconds and base industry standards on the type of CAT Reporter or system will not increase the costs of the Central Repository.

The Commission acknowledges that the requirement for the Participants to perform an assessment of clock synchronization standards, including consideration of industry standards based on the type of CAT Reporter, Industry Member and type of system, will impose additional costs on the Participants.[2680] Furthermore, it is possible that the requirement to base industry standards on the type of CAT Reporter or system will ultimately lead to additional costs from more granular clock synchronization standards for some Industry Members in the future. However, any resulting proposed amendments to the Plan regarding clock synchronization standards would be subject to notice and comment.[2681]

[2670] Response Letter II at 5.

[2671] Response Letter I at 25.

[2672] Response Letter III at 14.

[2673] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.8(c).

[2674] *See* FIF Clock Offset Survey, *supra* note 247.

[2675] Compare the implied Outsourcer clock offset implementation cost estimate of $554,348 × 1,629 = $903,032,892 ($554,348 × 1,629 outsourcers) to total Outsourcer implementation costs of $1,040,506,000 (342,026,000 + 678,111,000 + 20,369,000). *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30726.

[2676] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at n 968.

[2677] The total cost estimates of the CAT Plan reflect these implementation and ongoing costs. *See* Section V,F.2.a, *infra.*

[2678] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30669.

[2679] Response Letter II at 4.

[2680] *See* Section V.F.1.b, *supra.*

[2681] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30759–64.

(6) Quote Sent Time and OTC Equity Securities

In the Notice, the Commission stated its preliminarily belief that other Plan requirements such as the requirement that Options Market Makers report Quote Sent Time to the exchanges would cost between $36.9 million and $76.8 million over five years; [2682] and the requirement to maintain six years of data at the Central Repository would cost approximately $5.59 million.[2683] The cost to include OTC Equity Securities in the initial phase of the implementation of the Plan could not be estimated.[2684] The Commission preliminarily concluded that these requirements did not represent a significant source of costs.

The Commission received a comment regarding the costs incurred by Option Market Makers regarding reporting Quote Sent Times. According to the FIF/SIFMA/STA Cost Survey Report on CAT Reporting of Options Quotes by Market Makers, the estimated 5-year cost to Options Market Makers for adding a timestamp to the quote times was between ''$39.9'' million and $76.8 million.[2685] The commenter further stated that this is ''not a trivial cost for providing one data element to the consolidated audit trail.'' [2686] The Commission did not receive any comments on the requirement to retain an extra year of data in the Central Repository and the inclusion of OTC Equity Securities in the initial implementation phase of CAT. Furthermore, the issues were not addressed in the Participants' response and there were no changes in the Plan that would affect the Commission's conclusions.

As such, in light of the comments received, the Commission continues to believe that the estimates in the Notice are reliable estimates for the costs for Option Market Makers to send the Quote Sent Time field to exchanges. In response to the comment that the five year costs of adding a timestamp to the quotes is not trivial, the Commission notes that the implied annual costs would be much lower than the five year costs and the Commission agrees that the costs of quote sent time are large. The Commission is no longer referring to quantified costs as significant or less significant contributors to overall costs.

As noted above, in response to comments, the Commission acknowledges that the Allocation Time data field was not included in its cost estimates in the Notice.[2687] For similar reasons, the Commission now also believes that the Quote Sent Time is also not included in the cost estimates in the Notice. Therefore, the Commission now adds these costs to the total costs to be incurred by broker-dealers.[2688] The Commission recognizes that Participants and the Central Repository will also incur costs to comply with the Quote Sent Time requirements; however the Commission lacks sufficient information to quantify these costs, and therefore, does not add them to the cost estimates above for Participants or the Central Repository.

The Commission also recognizes that the modifications to the Plan to require the submission of the LEI for Customers, if an Industry Member has or acquires its Customer's LEI, and the LEI for Industry Members, if the Industry Member has one, could be an additional source of costs for broker-dealers. The Commission however does not believe that these costs will be substantial, because the Plan does not require Industry Members or others to obtain or submit an LEI if they do not already have an LEI.

(7) Other Costs

In the Notice, the Commission stated its preliminary belief that there were other categories of costs in addition to the items discussed above, but that these categories were unlikely to represent significant contributions to the overall costs of the Plan. For example, in addition to providing CAT Reporters data on their Error Rates, the Plan stated that the Participants believed that in order to meet Error Rate targets, industry would require certain resources, including a stand-alone testing environment, and time to test their reporting systems and infrastructure. There were also likely to be costs related to the Plan Processor's management of PII,[2689] as well as related compliance costs associated with minimizing the costs and risks of a security breach.

The Commission received a comment stating that the costs associated with the management of the PII included in the customer information reported could increase the costs of the CAT Plan.[2690] Another commenter mentioned that underlying customer data is PII information and moving this sensitive data requires extreme precaution, which could also increase these costs.[2691]

The Commission considered these comments, as well as modifications to the Plan's security provisions, and is updating its analysis. While the Commission cannot quantify these costs, the Commission believes that costs associated with the management of PII, and related security costs associated with minimizing the costs and risks of a security breach, would increase in light of modifications to the Plan discussed above.[2692] Specifically, the Commission believes the costs would increase in light of the requirement that the Plan Processor adhere to the NIST Cyber Security Framework in its entirety, the requirement that the CAT System be AICPA SOC 2 certified and audited by a qualified third-party auditor, the requirement that all CAT Data be encrypted, and the requirement that Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information, irrespective of whether it meets a common understanding of the definition of PII, should be considered PII for security purposes. The Commission believes these costs would represent a significant proportion of the total costs of the CAT Plan.

As discussed above,[2693] the Participants' response provided clarifying information on error correction timelines for customer information and PII, and identified an errant discussion of these error correction timelines in the Plan. The

[2682] *See* FIF, SIFMA, and Security Traders Association, Cost Survey Report on CAT Reporting of Options Quotes by Market Makers (November 5, 2013), *available at http://www.catnmsplan.com/industryfeedback/p601771.pdf*; *see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iv)(B).

[2683] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 12(m).

[2684] *See id.* at Section 12(q). The Commission does not have the information necessary to precisely estimate the costs that are incurred by including OTC Equity Securities in the initial phase of the implementation of the CAT NMS Plan, because the Plan does not separately present the costs associated with OTC Equity Securities. Because of low trading activity in the OTC equity markets, any significant costs associated with including OTC Equity Securities would be in implementation costs. Further, broker-dealers that implement CAT Data reporting for NMS securities may not incur significant additional costs to implement CAT Data reporting for OTC Equity Securities.

[2685] FIF Letter at 65.

[2686] FIF Letter at 65.

[2687] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.F.1.c(2).

[2688] *See* Section V.F.1.c.(2).B, *supra.*

[2689] The Commission also acknowledges that the costs associated with handling PII could create an incentive for service bureaus not to offer CAT Reporting services. Nonetheless, the Commission does not believe that this incentive would significantly alter the services available to broker-dealers. For further discussion, *see* Section V.G.1.e, *infra.* The Commission also notes that, pursuant to the exemptive relief granted by the Commission, the approach to the reporting of Customer information in the CAT NMS Plan could allow for the bifurcation of PII reporting from the reporting of order data. *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21, at 11858–63.

[2690] Data Boiler Letter at 37.

[2691] TR Letter at 8–9; FIF Letter at 9–10, 86.

[2692] *See* Section IV.D.6, *supra.*

[2693] *See* Section V.E.1.d., *supra.*

Commission is amending the Plan to incorporate the Participants' clarification. The Commission does not believe the clarification regarding the timeline for communication of errors for customer and account information would warrant any changes to its analysis and conclusions regarding costs.

The Commission is also amending the Plan require that the CAT testing environment will be made available to Industry Members on a voluntary basis no later than six months prior to when Industry Members are required to report and that more coordinated, structured testing of the CAT System will begin no later than three months prior to when Industry Members are required to report data to CAT.[2694] These amendments could increase the costs of the Plan as they relate to the provision of a testing environment.

b. Fees

In the Notice, the Commission discussed a source of costs due to ancillary fees on both broker-dealers reporting to, and regulators accessing, the Central Repository.[2695] The Commission preliminarily believed that ancillary fees levied on broker-dealers were unlikely to be levied broadly, because discussion in the Plan associated these fees with late and/or inaccurate reporting. The Plan also discussed ancillary fees possibly levied on regulators associated with the use of Central Repository data. The Commission recognized that costs estimated in Bids for constructing and operating the Central Repository already anticipate use of the CAT Data by regulators, and that additional fees to access the data might give regulators incentives to make less use of the data than anticipated in the Benefits Section. However, any fee schedule proposed by the Participants would be filed with the Commission. Consequently, the Commission preliminarily did not believe that the provisions for ancillary fees would likely significantly impact the costs or benefits of CAT.

Three commenters supported levying fees on regulators that access CAT Data.[2696] One commenter mentioned that any costs imposed in connection with a usage fee for the CAT will be offset by the costs that the SROs will save in retiring systems. In fact, imposing a user fee could create an incentive to eliminate those systems in a timely fashion.[2697] While the Participants agreed there are potential benefits to charging a usage fee, they also stated that it is premature to establish such a fee until the Participants gain a better understanding of how the Plan will be used by the regulators and how such usage will impact the operational costs of the Plan.[2698]

The Commission considered these comments, but does not believe that they would warrant changes to the Commission's preliminary analysis and conclusions regarding the ancillary fees under the Plan. Furthermore there were no modifications to the Plan that would warrant changes to this aspect of the economic analysis. The Commission disagrees with the comment that the usage fees would create an incentive for SROs to retire their systems earlier. In fact, the Commission notes that the usage fees could have the opposite effect—it could encourage the SROs to not use CAT for regulatory activities other than surveillance, which could incentivize them to retain these systems longer. The Commission continues to believe that ancillary costs do not represent a significant proportion of costs of the CAT NMS Plan.

4. Expected Costs of Security Breaches

In the Notice, the Commission recognized that investors and market participants could face significant costs if CAT Data security were breached.[2699] The Commission explained its belief that it is difficult to form reliable economic expectations for the costs of security breaches because there are few examples of security breaches analogous to the type that could occur under the CAT NMS Plan. However, the Commission provided a qualitative analysis of the expected costs of security breaches in the Notice by separating the expected costs of security breaches into two components: The risk of a security breach and the cost resulting from a security breach.[2700]

The Commission acknowledged in the Notice [2701] that because many of the decisions that define security measures for the Central Repository are coincident with the selection of the Plan Processor, there is a degree of uncertainty with regards to security measures that would be implemented by the Plan Processor.[2702] Consequently, there is uncertainty about the significance of the risks, the expected costs of a breach when considering the likelihood of a data breach, and the second-order effects.[2703]

a. Costs of a Security Breach

The Commission discussed its belief in the Notice [2704] that the form of the direct costs resulting from a security breach will vary across market participants and could be significant. It listed the following four types of costs. First, for broker-dealers, investment advisers, and other similar institutions, a security breach could leak highly-confidential information about trading strategies or positions,[2705] which could be deleterious for market participants' trading profits and client relationships. Second, a data breach could also expose proprietary information about the existence of a significant business relationship with either a counterparty or client, which could reduce business profits.

Third, a data breach could also potentially reveal PII of customers. Because some of the CAT Data stored in the Central Repository will contain PII such as names, addresses, and social security numbers, a security breach could raise the possibility of identity theft, which currently costs Americans billions of dollars per year.[2706] Because PII will be stored in a single, centralized location rather than stored across multiple locations, a breach in the Central Repository could leak all PII, rather than a subset of PII that could be leaked if the information were stored in

[2694] *See* Section IV.D.8.a, *supra.*

[2695] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 11.3(c).

[2696] SIFMA Letter at 18; DAG Letter at 5; STA Letter at 1.

[2697] SIFMA Letter at 18.

[2698] Response Letter II at 15.

[2699] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30732–36.

[2700] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.F.4a(2) for the risk of a security breach and Section IV.F.4a(1) for the costs resulting from a security breach.

[2701] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30733.

[2702] The Commission noted that, as discussed in the Plan, the Participants collected information from the Bidders regarding security and confidentiality during the RFP process, however, there was considerable diversity in the approaches proposed by the Bidders and the Participants chose to give the Plan Processor flexibility on many implementation details and state the requirements as a set of minimum standards. These requirements include both general security and PII treatment requirements. General security requirements are designed to address physical security, data security during transmissions, transactions, and while at-rest, confidentiality, and a cyber incident response plan. PII requirements include a separate PII-specific workflow, PII-specific authentication and access control, separate storage of PII data, and a full audit trail of PII access. *Id.*

[2703] *Id.*

[2704] *Id.* at 30732.

[2705] Although the Plan does not require reporting positions, observation of a broker-dealer's recent executions can offer information about their change in position, or, potentially, information about their actual position if the audit trail information breached contains all trading activity since the creation of the position.

[2706] According to survey data, the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported $24.7 billion in identity theft costs in 2012, *available at http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/press/vit12pr.cfm.*

multiple locations. As such, these costs associated with the risk of a security breach could be substantial in aggregate.

Fourth, a breach that reveals the activities of regulators within the Central Repository, such as data on the queries and processes run on query results, could compromise regulatory efforts or lead to speculation that could falsely harm the reputation of market participants and investors.

The Commission received several comments regarding the costs of a security breach, which are summarized in more detail in Section IV.D.6. Some commenters asserted that the potential costs of a breach exceed those described by the Commission in the Notice because a breach could negatively affect not just individual firms and investors but also the broader financial markets. One commenter wrote that a bad actor gaining access to the Central Repository ''may pose tremendous threat to the U.S. financial stability.'' [2707] Another wrote that a breach could be a ''threat to market stability or national security'' and ''would have serious impacts on the global economy.'' [2708] The same commenter stated that ''we believe the CAT Data is on par with, and meets, the standards for classified information as set in Executive Order 13526 on Classified National Security Information. . . . We think that unauthorized disclosure or use of CAT Data could destabilize the U.S. and world financial markets by causing investor panic, mass selling and runs on financial institutions. The potential extent of damage to the U.S. markets and economy would be a matter of national security.'' Another commenter cited the Government Accountability Office, stating ''the ineffective protection of cyber assets can result in the loss or unauthorized disclosure or alteration of information, [which] could lead to serious consequences and result in substantial harm to individuals and to the federal government.'' [2709]

Commenters also asserted that the potential costs of a breach exceed those described by the Commission in the Notice because the Notice did not discuss costs related to breach management. One commenter stated that ''the Proposal fails to address who is responsible for the cost of the breach that occurs at the Central Repository,'' [2710] and another commenter suggested that ''[because] the Plan Processor is responsible for constructing and operating the CAT . . . the Plan Processor should bear responsibility in the event of a data breach.'' [2711] One commenter wrote that ''the cost of complying with the notification requirements under the Privacy Laws may be exorbitant.'' [2712] Two commenters recommended the purchase of insurance by the Plan Processor or CAT NMS, LLC to cover the costs of a breach.[2713] One commenter argued that the Plan Processor must promptly notify a customer of security breaches of his data because ''a security breach of a customer's trading data could compromise the customer's investment strategies even if the customer's PII was not compromised.'' [2714] Another commenter observed that breach notification may take longer if the data breach happens at the site of a Participant, ''which could greatly harm registered funds and other victims of the breach.[2715]

The Commission acknowledges that the costs of a breach, including breach management, could be quite high, especially during periods of market stress. Furthermore, the Commission understands that a breach could seriously harm not only investors and institutions but also the broader financial markets. The Commission is unable to provide quantitative estimates of those costs because there are few examples of security breaches analogous to the type that could occur under the Plan and because the Plan Processor has some discretion in developing its breach management plan.[2716] The Commission notes, however, that the Plan Processor is responsible for CAT Data,[2717] and it will develop a breach protocol and cyber incident response plan that will include notification of breach victims such as Customers, insurance coverage and liability, and details about the distribution of costs.[2718]

b. Risk of a Security Breach

The Commission discussed in the Notice [2719] its belief that the risks of a security breach may not be significant because certain provisions of Rule 613 and the CAT NMS Plan appear reasonably designed to mitigate these risks. However, the Commission noted that the considerable diversity in the potential security approaches of the Bidders creates some uncertainty about the effectiveness of the eventual security procedures and hence, the risk of a security breach.[2720]

In the Notice,[2721] the Commission discussed the provisions of both Rule 613 and the Plan that provide safeguards designed to prevent security breaches.[2722] First, governance provisions of the CAT NMS Plan could mitigate the risk of a security breach.[2723] Second, the Plan includes specific provisions designed to ensure the security of data in-flight.[2724] Third, Section 6.7(g) of the Plan requires that the Participants establish, maintain, and enforce written policies and procedures reasonably designed to (1) ensure the confidentiality of the CAT Data obtained from the Central Repository; and (2) limit the use of CAT Data obtained from the Central Repository solely for surveillance and regulatory purposes. Finally, the Plan includes further provisions designed to provide security for PII.[2725]

Commenters made four types of comments about the Notice's economic analysis of the risk of a security breach. The first type of comment relates to protecting CAT Data that are extracted or downloaded from the Central Repository. Several commenters expressed strong concerns about allowing any entity, including

[2707] Data Boiler Letter at 26.

[2708] MFA Letter at 2, 5.

[2709] FSR Letter at 5, which references the ''High-Risk Series: An Update'' a publication issued by the Government Accountability Office, GAO–15–290 at 235 (Feb. 2015).

[2710] FSR Letter at 7.

[2711] FSI Letter at 4.

[2712] FSR Letter at 8.

[2713] FSR Letter at 8; SIFMA Letter at 22.

[2714] MFA Letter at 9.

[2715] ICI Letter at 7.

[2716] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 4.1.5.

[2717] *See* Section III.26, *supra.*

[2718] *See* Section IV.D.6.j, *supra.*

[2719] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30732–34.

[2720] The Commission notes that, at a minimum, the security of the CAT Data must be consistent with Reg SCI. 17 CFR 242.1000 to 1007.

[2721] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30733.

[2722] The Commission noted that ''Rule 613(e)(4) requires policies and procedures that are designed to ensure the rigorous protection of confidential information collected by the Central Repository, and Rule 613(iv) requires that the Plan contain a discussion of the security and confidentiality of the information reported to the Central Repository. Rule 613 also restricts access to use only for regulatory purposes, and requires certain provisions that are designed to mitigate these security risks such as the appointment of a Chief Compliance Officer and annual audits of Plan Processor operating procedures.'' *Id.*

[2723] The Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30733 lists the following three governance mechanisms: Activities of the Compliance Subcommittee that could reduce the risk that information is released to unauthorized entities; the requirement that the Plan Processor submit a comprehensive security plan to the Operating Committee and update this security plan annually; and the establishment of a Chief Information Security Officer who is responsible for monitoring and addressing data security issues for the Plan Processor.

[2724] The Commission noted that ''the Plan requires that bulk extract data be encrypted, password protected and sent via secure methods of transmission.'' *Id.*

[2725] The Commission noted that regulators authorized to access PII would be required to complete additional authentications, and PII would be masked unless users have permissions to view PII. *Id.*

regulators, to extract or download data from the Central Repository because the risk of any data breach would greatly increase as the data are maintained at more sites.[2726] One commenter suggested that allowing anyone to download the entire CAT database might threaten U.S. financial stability.[2727] Some commenters also objected to excluding the Commission or its Staff from certain security-related parts of the CAT NMS Plan.[2728]

The second type of comment relates to tailoring security requirements to the security risk of the particular data element. Several commenters argued that at-rest data and in-use data needs to have some of the same security measures that are required for in-flight data in order to keep risk at an acceptable level.[2729] Another commenter wrote that maintaining different security standards for PII data and non-PII data ''creates the misimpression that all non-PII data merits less information security protection than PII data'' and recommended more accurately matching security requirements to the underlying risk through the imposition of ''additional levels of data classification to protect adequately commercially sensitive non-PII data.'' [2730]

The third type of comment relates to the overall risks of the system due to the unique nature of the database. Several commenters suggested that the Commission impose additional security requirements beyond what appears in the Notice because the scale and scope of the Central Repository will make it a particularly attractive target for well-funded hackers, individuals, and nation-states with objectives ranging from theft to insider trading to market disruption.[2731] Additionally, a number of commenters recommended that the Plan include additional detail concerning the security of CAT Data.[2732]

The fourth type of comment relates to data governance. One commenter stated that the proposal for the CCO and CISO to be officers of the Company as well as employees of the Plan Processor creates a conflict of interest that would undermine the ability of these officers to carry out their responsibilities effectively under the Plan because they would owe a fiduciary duty to the Plan Processor rather than the CAT LLC.[2733] The same commenter noted that the Notice did not specify the entity liable in the event of a data breach.[2734] The commenter suggested that because the Plan Processor is responsible for constructing and operating the CAT, with the oversight of the Operating Committee, and will be solely in control of the system's information security, the Plan Processor should bear responsibility in the event of a data breach.[2735]

The Participants have responded to these comments. In response to the commenters that expressed concern about allowing any entity to extract or download CAT Data, the Participants noted that Rule 613 requires regulators to develop and implement a surveillance system, or enhance existing surveillance systems to make use of CAT Data.[2736] The Participants stated that ''eliminating or limiting bulk data extracts of the CAT Data may significantly and adversely impact the Participants' ability to effectively surveil their markets using CAT Data.'' [2737] The Participants further noted that the Plan also requires that Participants have appropriate policies and procedures in place to protect all of the CAT Data they extract or download.[2738] In response to the comments about excluding the Commission or its Staff from certain security requirements of the Plan, the Participants stated that they agreed that the Plan's security program must take into consideration all users with access to CAT Data, including the SEC, and they recommended removing the exclusions.[2739]

In response to the commenter that suggested adding additional levels of data classification, the Participants determined that ''it is [not] necessary to expand the categories of other CAT Data.'' [2740] In response to commenters that requested more detail regarding the security controls for CAT Data, the Participants noted that in the Adopting Release for Rule 613, the Commission stated that ''an outline or overview description of the policies and procedures that would be implemented under the NMS plan submitted to the Commission for its consideration would be sufficient to satisfy the requirement of the Rule.'' [2741] In their response, the Participants also provided additional information about security procedures, including a high level description of the security requirements for the CAT System and additional details concerning certain security controls and protocols required of the Plan Processor.[2742] The Participants also stated that they believe that ''publicly releasing too many details about the data security and information policies and procedures of the CAT System presents its own security concerns and is not advisable.'' [2743] In response to comments about governance, the Participants agreed that the Plan should explicitly state that the CCO and CISO of the LLC should have fiduciary duties to the LLC in the same manner and extent as an officer of a Delaware corporation and recommended the Plan be amended accordingly.[2744] Additionally, the Participants stated that they are ''in the process of negotiating an agreement with potential Plan Processors. This agreement will cover liability, insurance, and indemnification.'' [2745]

The Commission has considered the comment letters and the Participants' response letters. In response to the commenters that expressed concern about allowing any entity to extract or download CAT Data, the Commission notes that it believes that regulators need access to CAT Data outside the Central Repository to perform their duties effectively. As discussed above in Section IV.D.6.d, Participants that choose to extract or download CAT Data must have policies and procedures regarding CAT Data security that are equivalent to those of the Plan Processor for the Central Repository. And as discussed in Section IV.D.6.o, the rules and policies applicable to the Commission and its Staff will be different yet substantively as rigorous as those applicable to the Participants and their personnel. The Commission therefore believes that, due to these precautions, the regulatory use of CAT Data outside the Central Repository

[2726] SIFMA Letter at 20; Fidelity Letter at 4; FIF Letter at 134; ICI Letter at 7.

[2727] Data Boiler Letter at 26.

[2728] FIF Letter at 134; NYSE Letter at 2–4 (noting also that ''[i]f employees of the Commission with access to the data stored in the Central Repository or other CAT systems are subject to security standards less stringent than those applicable to other authorized users, the data obtained and held by those individuals may be subject to heightened risk of a data breach''); Garrett Letter at 1–2.

[2729] SIFMA Letter at 20; MFA Letter at 8; FSR Letter at 4–8; Data Boiler Letter at 8.

[2730] ICI Letter at 6.

[2731] ICI Letter at 3; Fidelity Letter at 3; FSI Letter at 4; SIFMA Letter at 19; MFA Letter at 5.

[2732] SIFMA Letter at 20; ICI Letter at 4; FSR Letter at 6; TR Letter at 8; FIF Letter at 131–132; Fidelity Letter at 4. The Commission responds to these comments in detail in Section IV.D.6.a, *supra.*

[2733] FSI Letter at 3. As discussed above in Section IV.D.6, the CCO and CISO each have responsibilities related the security of CAT Data.

[2734] FSI Letter at 4–5.

[2735] FSI Letter at 4–5.

[2736] Response Letter I at 56.

[2737] Response Letter III at 10.

[2738] Response Letter III at 11.

[2739] Response Letter I at 60–61.

[2740] Response Letter I at 57.

[2741] Response Letter I at 53–54.

[2742] Response Letter III at 7–8.

[2743] Response Letter I at 53–54.

[2744] Response Letter I at 17–19.

[2745] Response Letter I at 59.

should not increase the security risks to the CAT system.

In response to the commenters that expressed concern about the security requirements for particular data elements, the Commission notes that it believes that the best use of limited resources is to tailor security requirements to the security risk of the particular data element. No commenter quantified the relative risk of a breach that comes from in-flight data versus at-rest data or in-use data, and the Commission continues to believe that the largest risk of a breach comes from in-flight data. Thus, the adopted Plan will maintain higher security standards for in-flight data than for at-rest data or in-use data. The Commission also continues to believe that PII data warrants more security considerations than non-PII data, but it disagrees with the one commenter that recommended multiple levels of security for non-PII data.[2746] In this case, the Commission does not believe that the benefits justify the costs of creating additional levels of data classification within non-PII data.

In response to the commenters that expressed concern about the risks of aggregating confidential data from disparate sources into one location, the Commission notes that it agrees that the CAT Data will be a particularly attractive target for bad actors. However, the Commission believes that the extensive, robust security requirements in the adopted Plan, as outlined in Section IV.D.6, provide appropriate, adequate protection for the CAT Data.

In response to the comments regarding the lack of security details in the Plan, the Commission continues to believe that, as discussed in the Notice, there is a degree of uncertainty with respect to the security measures that would be implemented by the Plan Processor, and consequently, uncertainty about the risk of a data breach.[2747] As discussed in more detail above,[2748] the Commission notes that the Participants have provided some additional information regarding security procedures. Additionally, as discussed above, the Commission is amending the Plan to require that the Participants conduct background checks for the employees and contractors of the Participants that will use the CAT System,[2749] and to require that the Participants provide the Commission with an evaluation of the information security program to ensure that the program is consistent with the highest industry standards for the protection of data.[2750] The Commission believes that this additional information mitigates some of the uncertainty, but continues to believe that there is significant uncertainty with respect to the risk of a breach. However, the Commission also recognizes that publicly releasing too many details about security requirements could create additional risk, and as discussed in Section IV.D.6, believes a reasonable level of detail has been provided.[2751]

In response to comments about governance, the Commission notes that it has modified the Plan to address the concern regarding potential conflicts of interest on the part of the CCO and CISO. Specifically, as discussed in more detail above in Section IV.B.3, the CCO and CISO will have fiduciary duties to the CAT LLC in the same manner and extent as an officer of a Delaware corporation, and to the extent those duties conflict with duties the CCO and CISO have to the Plan Processor, the duties to the CAT LLC will control.[2752] As discussed above in Section IV.D.6, the CCO and CISO each have responsibilities related the security of CAT Data, and the potential for a conflict of interest could create uncertainty as to whether these responsibilities will be carried out in a way that will minimize the risk of a security breach. The Commission believes that the modifications to the Plan should reduce this uncertainty.

In response to the commenter who noted that the Notice did not specify the entity liable in the event of a data breach, the Commission notes that the Plan requires the Plan Processor's cyber incident response plan to address insurance issues related to security breaches, and that as part of the discussions on insurance coverage and liability, further detail about the distribution of costs will be undertaken, including details about who might bear the cost of a breach and under what specific circumstances. The Commission believes that these provisions in the Plan should provide incentives for the Plan Processor to manage security risks. However, because the cyber incident response plan will not be developed until after the Plan Processor has been selected, the Commission does not know whether or under what circumstances the Plan Processor will bear the cost of a breach. While the Commission recognizes that this creates some uncertainty with respect to the incentives on the Plan Processor to minimize the risk of a security breach, the Commission is approving the Plan without further modification for the reasons discussed in Section IV.D.6.j, above.

5. Second Order Effects

In the Notice, the Commission recognized that a number of second-order effects could result from the approval of the Plan.[2753] These included market-participant actions designed to avoid direct costs of a security breach; changes to CAT Reporter behavior due to increased surveillance; changes in CAT Reporter behavior to switch from one funding tier to another to qualify for lower fees; and changes in broker-dealer routing practices related to fee differentials across execution venues.

a. Security-Related Second Order Effects

In the Notice, the Commission recognized that the desire to avoid direct costs of a security breach could motivate actions that would cause second order effects.[2754] The Commission illustrated this in the Notice by considering two specific examples of actions that Participants might take. First, if service bureaus perceive the costs and risks of a security breach to be great enough because of the addition of PII in the data, which is not included in current data, some could decide not to provide CAT Data reporting services.[2755] Second, investors or other market participants could move their activity off-shore or cease market participation altogether to avoid having sensitive information stored in the Central Repository.[2756] The Commission stated that it did not believe that the effect of the Plan on the risk or costs of a data breach would be great enough to result in significant second order effects.[2757]

The Commission received two comments on this issue. Both comments suggested that industry members would have to purchase insurance or cease domestic operations if the Plan Processor was not required to purchase

[2746] ICI Letter at 6.

[2747] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30733.

[2748] *See* Section IV.D.6.a, *supra.*

[2749] *See* Section IV.D.6.c, *supra.*

[2750] *See* Section IV.H, *supra.*

[2751] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.1(b) (discussing the manner in which the Central Repository will receive, extract, transform, load, and retain data); Section 6.10(c) (discussing the CAT user help desk).

[2752] Response Letter I at 17–19.

[2753] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30733–34.

[2754] *Id.*

[2755] The Commission noted that this could increase the potential for a short term strain on capacity and exacerbate the costs. *Id.* at 30733.

[2756] The Commission noted that consequences of changes in investor behavior in response to the threat of a breach include: Investors holding suboptimal portfolios; lost profits to the securities industry; and higher costs of raising capital for U.S.-based securities issuers, if the public's willingness to participate in capital markets is sufficiently reduced. *Id.* at 30734.

[2757] *Id.*

an insurance policy that covers potential security breaches and extends to industry members to reimburse them for costs related to the breach.[2758] Comments on another potential second order effect related to capital formation are addressed in more detail below in Section V.G.3.b.[2759]

In their response to comments, the Participants indicated that they are working on an agreement between themselves and the potential Plan Processors to cover liability, insurance, and indemnification, which would also make it less likely that industry members would move off-shore or cease operations.[2760]

The Commission recognizes that the purchase of insurance to cover these costs is a potential second order effect. As such, the Commission is revising its economic analysis to acknowledge this additional second order effect, but otherwise continues to believe that the security-related second order effects will be as anticipated in the Notice.

b. Changes to CAT Reporter Behavior

In the Notice, the Commission also acknowledged that increased surveillance could impose some costs by altering the behavior of market participants. The Commission stated that benefits could accrue to the extent that improved surveillance, investigation, and enforcement capabilities allow for regulators to better identify and address violative behavior when it occurs, and to the extent that common knowledge of improved capabilities deters violative behavior.[2761] In particular, the Commission acknowledged that some market participants could reduce economically beneficial behavior if those market participants believe that, because of enhanced surveillance, their activities would increase the level of regulatory scrutiny that they bear. Furthermore, the Commission stated that costs could accrue to the extent that some forms of market activity, which are permissible and economically beneficial to the market and investors, could come under greater scrutiny, which could create a disincentive to engage in that activity. For example, regulators could increase the number of inspections, examinations and enforcement proceedings that they initiate. To the extent that these activities result in a reduction in violative behavior, the market benefits by avoiding the costs of this behavior. To the extent, however, the additional regulatory activity increases the number of inspections, examinations and enforcement on permissible activities, market participants would incur the increased costs of facilitating these regulatory inquiries.

Although the Commission did not receive any comments on the second order effects it discussed in the Notice, it did receive two comments on a second order effect related to the granularity of timestamps. As discussed in the Notice, the Plan requires CAT reporters to report sub-millisecond timestamps when the CAT reporter uses such timestamps internally.[2762] Two commenters noted that this requirement may discourage CAT reporters from using sub-millisecond timestamps internally, since this would require finer timestamp resolution in CAT reporting.[2763] The Commission also received a comment on a second-order effect that could result from the tiered fee structure of broker-dealers based on message traffic.[2764] The commenter suggested that the structure of the funding model might cause second-order effects related to the differential message traffic of different activities, and these effects may vary across securities based on their liquidity.

In response to comments on the granularity of timestamps, the Participants state that the quality of CAT Data would improve if the Plan required such timestamps to be reported by CAT reporters that use such timestamps internally.[2765] Furthermore, in response to the comment that the imposition of a fee on message traffic would discourage liquidity provision, the Participants note that they actively considered the market quality concerns in devising the proposed funding model, and one of the reasons for proposing a tiered, fixed fee funding model was to limit the disincentives to providing liquidity to the market. In particular, the Participants believed that a funding model based on message volume was far more likely to affect market behavior.[2766]

With regards to comments on sub-millisecond timestamps, the Commission acknowledges that this requirement may prove to be a disincentive for market participants to use sub-millisecond timestamps internally; however, the Commission believes that for many market participants, capturing timestamps at a finer resolution supports analysis of the firm's data for business purposes that provide benefits such as improvement to trading strategies and measurement of execution costs, and the benefits of these business purposes may exceed the costs of reporting regulatory data with finer timestamps. However, the Commission acknowledges that for firms that do not perform such analyses, this requirement may prove to be a disincentive to adopting technologies that capture finer resolution timestamps.

The Commission agrees with the comment about second order effects related to the tiering of broker-dealer fees based on message traffic and is adding this second-order effect to its analysis. The funding model anticipates Central Repository costs being spread across broker-dealers according to activity tiers based on message traffic. This may cause broker-dealers to alter their behavior to avoid being assigned to a higher fee tier. For example, trading strategies that involve providing liquidity might be expected to generate more message traffic than strategies that take liquidity because providing liquidity generally requires posting many quotes on many venues. Furthermore, while a broker-dealer is seeking to provide liquidity, market prices may change causing the broker-dealer to have to update its quotes on many venues multiple times as it seeks to trade. Consequently, the funding model may create an incentive to take rather than provide liquidity, which could reduce levels of market liquidity. Furthermore, these effects may vary across securities based on the liquidity of the security. As the commenter noted, ''the quote-to-trade ratio for exchange-traded-products (''ETPs'') can be ten times greater than that for corporate stocks. This implies that market makers in ETPs may generate ten times the amount of message traffic per executed trade than market makers in corporate stock.'' [2767] Consequently, the Commission also agrees that the tiered funding model for broker-dealers may create disincentives to provide liquidity in less liquid securities, possibly resulting in less liquid markets for securities that are already considered illiquid. As discussed below, the Commission recognizes the potential differential effect on those broker-dealers that engage in market making in liquid stocks versus illiquid stocks and on those broker-dealers that engage in liquidity taking strategies versus those that engage in other strategies.

[2758] FSR Letter at 2; SIFMA Letter at 22.

[2759] An analysis related to Capital Formation can be found in Section V.G.3., *infra.*

[2760] Response Letter I at 59.

[2761] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30734.

[2762] *Id.* at 30764–65.

[2763] FIF Letter at 12; SIFMA Letter at 35.

[2764] SIFMA Letter at 16–17.

[2765] Response Letter I at 28–29.

[2766] Response Letter II at 16.

[2767] SIFMA Letter at 17.

Nonetheless, as explained above in Section IV.D.13.b, the Commission believes that the timestamp requirements contained in the CAT NMS Plan, including the requirement that a CAT Reporter report timestamps in increments finer than milliseconds if they do so in other systems, are reasonable and will improve regulators' ability to sequence events.

c. Tiered Funding Model

In the Notice, the Commission stated its preliminary belief that establishing a small number of discrete fee tiers, as occurs under the Plan, could create incentives for CAT Reporters to alter their behavior to switch from one tier to another, thereby qualifying for lower fees.[2768] Specifically, the Plan states that CAT Reporters would be classified into a number of groups based on reporter type and market share of share volume or message traffic and assessed a fixed fee that is determined by this classification. The higher-activity groups would be assessed higher fees such that market participants who fall into the lower tiers have a fee advantage over the market participants that fall into the higher tiers. The Commission noted, however, that because this incentive is contingent on being near a fee-tier cutoff point, relatively few market participants will likely be affected and thus market quality effects will likely not be significant. Furthermore, for those market participants near a cutoff point, managing activity to avoid a higher fee tier would necessarily incur costs of lost business and potential loss of market share, and would possibly be difficult to implement, which should mitigate any effects on market quality.

The Commission also recognized that the tiering of fees could create calendar effects within markets. That is, the structure ultimately approved by the Operating Committee could affect market participant behavior near the end of a measuring period. For example, high levels of market activity during a measuring period might cause CAT Reporters to limit their activity near the end of a measurement period to avoid entering a higher fee tier. The Commission noted that the Operating Committee has discretion under the Plan governance structure to make the tier adjustments discussed in Section 11.1.d for individual CAT Reporters. This provision might mitigate incentives for individual market participants to alter market activities to reduce their expected CAT fees.

The Commission did not receive any comments related to its economic analysis regarding the market quality effects, calendar effects, or other effects due to the tiered structure of the funding model. While the Commission is making certain modifications to the funding model, as described in Section IV.F above, the funding model will continue to utilize a tiered structure. Consequently, the Commission continues to believe that the tiered fee structure could create incentives for CAT Reporters to alter their behavior, but that market quality effects would likely not be significant. Nonetheless, the Commission expects that the required report by the Participants to study the impact of tiered-fees on market liquidity should provide insights into whether the fee model affects liquidity provision and ultimately market quality. This will assist the Commission's oversight of the Plan and assist the Operating Committee in understanding whether it needs to make adjustments to the Funding Model. Furthermore, for those market participants near a cutoff point, managing activity to avoid a higher fee tier would necessarily incur costs of lost business and potential loss of market share, and would possibly be difficult to implement, which should mitigate any effects on market quality.

The Commission is also updating its analysis based on the amendment to the Plan to clarify that the Operating Committee may only change the tier to which a Person is assigned in accordance with a fee schedule filed with the Commission.[2769] Consequently, the Commission no longer believes that this provision would mitigate incentives for individual market participants to alter market activities to reduce their expected CAT fees. The Commission continues to recognize that CAT Reporters may have incentives to alter their behavior to switch from one tier to another.

d. Differential CAT Fees Across Market Participants

In the Notice, the Commission discussed the funding model proposed in the Plan, which is a bifurcated funding model in which costs are first allocated between the group of all broker-dealers and the group of all Execution Venues, then within these groups by market activity level.[2770] The Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the bifurcated funding model proposed in the Plan almost certainly would result in differential CAT costs between Execution Venues because it will assess fees differently on exchanges and ATSs. First, message traffic to and from an ATS would generate fee obligations on the broker-dealer that sponsors the ATS, while exchanges would incur almost no message traffic fees.[2771] Second, broker-dealers that internalize off-exchange order flow, generating off-exchange transactions outside of ATSs, would face a differential funding model compared to ATSs and exchanges.[2772] Specifically, broker-dealers internalizing orders would only pay fees based on message traffic, whereas orders routed to ATSs and exchanges would lead to broker-dealer fees based on message traffic and ATS or exchange fees based on market share. If these fees are even partially passed on to customers, then the cost differentials that result might create incentives for broker-dealers to route order flow to those broker-dealers who internalize in order to minimize costs, creating a potential conflict of interest with broker-dealers' investor customers.

In addition, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the funding model shifts broker-dealer costs associated with the Central Repository to all broker-dealers and away from Options Market Makers. The Plan provides that broker-dealers would not report their options quotations, while equity market makers would report their equity quotations to the Central Repository. This differential treatment of market making quotes would affect funding costs by (a) decreasing the number of messages that must be reported and stored by Options Market Makers, and (b) charging broker-dealers that do not quote listed options a higher share of broker-dealer-assessed CAT fees than they would if Options Market Makers' quotes were included in the allocation of fees.

Although this differential treatment would marginally increase the cost of providing other broker-dealer services relative to options market making, the Commission discussed its belief that this would not materially affect a market participant's willingness to provide broker-dealer services other than options market making because (a) many market participants participate in both equities and options markets, and (b) broker-dealers participating in equity markets have significant infrastructure in place for serving that market and switching costs to participate in options market making are high.

[2768] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30734–35.

[2769] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 11.1(d).

[2770] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30735–36.

[2771] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 11.3.

[2772] *Id.*

In the Notice, the Commission also discussed the allocation of costs between the Execution Venues and the other Industry Members (*i.e.,* broker-dealers) and solicited comment on alternative funding models.[2773] Specifically, the Commission noted that the CAT NMS Plan does not detail the proportions of fees to be borne by Execution Venues versus Industry Members. The Notice also pointed out that Execution Venues would be tiered by market share to determine their fees while Industry Members would be tiered by message traffic. In its analysis, the Commission noted that assessing CAT costs on market participants by message traffic may have the benefit of aligning market participants' incentives with the Participants' stated goal of minimizing costs. The Commission also explained that while a broker-dealer's choice of business model is likely to determine its level of message activity, the majority of an exchange's message traffic is passive receipt of quote updates.[2774] Further, because quotes must be updated on all exchanges when prices change, exchanges with low market share are likely to have more message traffic (incurring CAT fees) per executed transaction (generating revenue).[2775] The Commission further explained that bifurcated fee approaches, such as the one in the Plan, may cause one Execution Venue to be relatively cheaper if Execution Venues pass costs on to members and subscribers and may exacerbate conflicts of interest for broker-dealers routing customer orders.

The Commission received comments that inform its analysis of differential fees across market participants, particularly focusing on the allocation to Participants versus broker-dealers. One commenter questioned why Participants were tiered by market share while broker-dealers were treated differently (by message traffic), and noted this could place a larger burden on market makers of liquid securities. The commenter explicitly stated that it is not suggesting that market-share tiers are wrong, but believes there should be a reason why Participant tiers are based on one metric (market share) while broker-dealer tiers are based on another metric (message traffic).[2776] The Commission received several comments on issues related to cost differentials between Participants and broker-dealers that were not discussed in the Notice. One commenter noted that the profits from the fees would only be distributed among the Participants and suggested these should be at least partially returned to broker-dealers.[2777] Another commenter was concerned that SROs would use CAT profits to fund other SRO operations.[2778] There were comments regarding the lack of transparency over fee calculations and metrics used to determine tiers, as well as the determination of the allocation split between broker-dealers and Participants—all of which increases uncertainty in cost estimates.[2779] Finally, there were a number of comments that described the potential for a conflict of interest in the allocation of fees, and discussing the relative burden of funding on broker-dealers to SROs, estimating that at least 88% of costs will be borne by broker-dealers.[2780]

There were no comments related to the economic analysis regarding a double charging of ATSs.[2781] In addition, there were no comments regarding the economic analysis related to differences in costs between option market makers and equity market makers.[2782]

The Participants' response contains information that is relevant to the economic analysis with regards to transparency in funding and the allocation of costs. Specifically, the Participants commented that the Plan provides the Advisory Committee with the right to receive information concerning the operation of the CAT,[2783] and that the Participants plan to provide the Advisory Committee with minutes of Operating Committee meetings.[2784] The response addressed the concerns over transparency in decision making; however, the concerns regarding uncertainty in the metrics used to determine tiers and the final cost allocation split will not be resolved until the Plan Processor is chosen.

The Participants' supplemental response also contained information that is relevant to the economic analysis with respect to second order effects of the funding model. With regards to determining fees via message traffic for broker-dealers and market share for Participants, the Participants noted that message traffic is a key component of CAT operating costs, and that message traffic is strongly correlated with broker-dealer size. However, there is little correlation between message traffic and Execution Venue size, so charging large and small Execution Venues with similar message traffic would be inequitable. The Plan treats ATSs in the same manner as exchanges because their business models and anticipated burden on CAT are similar.[2785]

On this topic, the Participants proposed one modification to the plan. The Participants proposed to amend the manner in which market share will be calculated for a national securities association that has trades reported by its members to its trade reporting facility or facilities for reporting transactions effected otherwise than on an exchange in NMS Stock or OTC Equity Securities. For such an association, its market share for purposes of the funding model would not include the share volume reported to the national securities association by an ATS, as such share volume will be included in the market share calculation for that ATS.[2786]

The Participants also responded that they expect to operate the CAT on a break-even basis—that is, the fees imposed and collected would be intended to cover CAT costs and an appropriate reserve for CAT costs, and any surpluses would be treated as an operational reserve to offset fees in future payment. In addition, the Participants subsequently stated that the CAT LLC will seek to qualify for tax exempt status as a ''business league.'' [2787]

With regards to fee transparency, the Participants noted that the details regarding the tiers are important considerations and are actively developing the tiers. Once the Plan

[2773] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30766–69.

[2774] Using MIDAS data, Commission Staff analyzed the number of equity exchange proprietary feed messages and trades during the week of October 12, 2015 and provided the results in the Notice. The message per trade ratio varied across exchanges from 38.46 to 987.17, with a median of 57.21.

[2775] The Commission's data analysis as reported in the Notice confirmed this for the smallest exchanges. Except for the smallest exchanges, the trade-to-message ratios range from about 0.016 trades for every quote update to about 0.026 trades for every quote update and appear constant across market share levels. However, the smallest exchanges by market share have only about 0.001 trades for every quote update to about 0.009 trades for every quote update.

[2776] SIFMA Letter at 16–17.

[2777] KCG Letter at 5.

[2778] DAG Letter at 5.

[2779] SIFMA Letter at 16; FSI Letter at 6.

[2780] KCG Letter; SIFMA Letter; Fidelity Letter; FSR Letter; DAG Letter; Data Boiler Letter; Wachtel Letter; FSI Letter; STA Letter.

[2781] *See* Section VI.G.1.a.(1)A., *supra.*

[2782] While FIF recommends exempting equity market makers, they did not provide information that suggests revising the Commission's OMM vs equity market maker analysis. *See* FIF Letter at 65–66. Specifically, the letter says that equity market makers would get the same benefits as OMMs for the quotes that are not paired with orders.

[2783] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 4.13(d)–(e).

[2784] Response Letter I at 17.

[2785] Response Letter II at 11, 13.

[2786] Response Letter II at 12.

[2787] Participants' Letter at 1; Section IV.B.4, *supra.*

Processor is selected, the Operating Committee will work with the Processor to finalize the tiers, and broker-dealers and other participants will have the opportunity to comment on the proposal as part of the approval process for an immediately effective rule filing.[2788]

With regards to the allocation of costs between Participants and broker-dealers and the potential for a conflict of interest in determining this allocation, the Participants noted that the proposed funding model is designed to recover costs associated with creating, implementing, and operating CAT as opposed to addressing costs of compliance, which might be incurred regardless of the funding model. In addition, there are over 100 times more broker-dealers expected to report to CAT than Participants. Therefore, the 88% aggregate cost figure quoted in the comments is less than what broker-dealers would be expected to pay in aggregate on a per-CAT reporter basis.[2789] With regard to the potential conflict of interest, the Participants noted that broker-dealers and the public will have the opportunity to comment on fees, the SEC will be required to evaluate the fees for consistency with the Exchange Act, the funding proposal expects that CAT will operate on a break-even basis, and Participants are prohibited from using regulatory fees for commercial purposes.[2790]

The Commission is revising its economic analysis in light of comments, the Participants' response, and Plan modifications. First, the Commission recognizes the validity of the comment that the funding tiers would place a larger burden on market makers of liquid securities relative to illiquid securities and place a lower burden on liquidity takers relative to those who provide liquidity. This could increase the incentive to broker-dealers to transact in more illiquid securities and reduce the incentive to provide liquidity. In response to the comment seeking the rationale behind the bifurcation in the funding model, the Commission notes that the Notice provided a rationale that the Commission continues to believe makes economic sense. Specifically, as summarized above, the Commission continues to believe that because message traffic is passive for exchanges and a business decision for Broker-Dealers, the bifurcated funding model will help align the incentives of market participants with the Participants' stated goal of minimizing costs. More broadly, the Commission continues to believe that because the CAT NMS Plan does not detail the proportions of fees to be borne by Execution Venues versus Industry Members, its economic analysis contains uncertainty regarding the differential fees to be borne by Execution Venues versus Industry Members.

With regards to the distribution of profits among SROs, the Commission is revising its economic analysis to incorporate the clarification in the Plan to the effect that profits from fees will go toward funding future costs instead of being redistributed among the SROs except in the two instances described above, as well as the modification to the Plan that reflects that the CAT LLC will seek to qualify for tax exempt status as a ''business league.'' [2791] Broadly speaking, the Commission had been concerned about the competitive effects of distributing profits equally among SROs because, in profitable years, an equal distribution of profits would advantage smaller exchanges (larger exchanges in the case of losses). However, with the clarification and modification to the Plan, the Commission believes there will be little or no competitive effects resulting from distributions among SROs. The Commission also believes that this clarification and modification address commenter concerns about the distribution of CAT profits.

The Commission is updating its analysis of the differential fees on exchanges and ATSs to incorporate Plan modifications that would change the way national securities associations are treated in the Funding Model. The modified Plan would no longer double-count ATS volume as share volume for the purposes of placing both ATSs and FINRA in tiers in the Funding Model. However, because of the uncertainty in the ultimate Funding Model, the Commission recognizes that this modification may not impact the fees paid by either ATSs or FINRA and may not alleviate any fee differentials between ATSs and exchanges. As described earlier in this Section, these fee differentials may arise because message traffic to and from an ATS would generate fee obligations on the broker-dealer that sponsors the ATS, while exchanges incur almost no message traffic fees.[2792]

In addition, the Commission notes that other over-the-counter volume, such as occurs when orders are executed off-exchange against a broker-dealer's inventory, will still be assessed share volume fees while the message traffic that resulted in the executions will also be subject to fees through the broker-dealers that had order events related to the transactions. This contrasts to executions that occur on exchanges, where the venue that facilitates the execution does not pay fees for message traffic that led to the execution. This difference in treatment could still result in costs that are passed on to investors because broker-dealers have the incentive to route orders in a way that results in less order flow to those who pay higher CAT fees.

The Commission is not changing the economic analysis with respect to the allocation of costs between SROs and Broker-Dealers. As discussed in detail previously,[2793] in response to the comments that suggested that Plan allocates 88% of the costs to broker-dealers, the Commission believes that the 88% figure cited is in reference to compliance costs, which are not ''allocated'' by the Plan. Fees to pay for the maintenance and operation of the Central Repository will be allocated via the funding model, and the current allocation of fees between broker-dealers and exchanges has not been determined.

The Commission is updating the Economic Analysis to reflect some improvements in financial transparency as a result of amendments to the Plan. Specifically, the Commission's amendment to the Plan to require that CAT LLC financial statements be prepared in accordance with GAAP and audited by an independent public accounting firm may substitute to a certain extent for the added financial transparency sought by commenters.[2794] Additionally, as per the Participants' response, all meeting minutes will be made available, and in addition, the Funding Model will be filed with the Commission and subject to public comment.[2795] However, the Commission

[2788] Response Letter II at 14. *See supra* note 1709.

[2789] Response Letter II at 10–11.

[2790] Response Letter II at 17.

[2791] Participants' Letter at 1.

[2792] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5 at Section 11.3.(b): (''For the avoidance of doubt, the fixed fees payable by Industry Members pursuant to this paragraph shall, in addition to any other applicable message traffic, include message traffic generated by: (i) An ATS that does not execute orders that is sponsored by such Industry Member; and (ii) routing orders to and from any ATS sponsored by such Industry Member.'') The Commission notes that exchange broker-dealers would be subject to message traffic fees as Industry Members under the Plan. However, the Commission notes that based on its analysis of OATS data from September 15–19, 2014, these broker-dealers are minor contributors to overall message traffic, accounting for less than 0.03% of OATS ROEs.

[2793] *See* Section IV.E, *infra.*

[2794] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 9.2; *see also* Section IV.B.4; Participants' Letter II.

[2795] *See supra* note 1709 for further details on fee proposals.

continues to recognize uncertainty in the ultimate allocation of fees.

G. Efficiency, Competition, and Capital Formation

In determining whether to approve the CAT NMS Plan, and whether the Plan is in the public interest, Rule 613 requires the Commission to consider the impact of the Plan on efficiency, competition and capital formation.[2796]

In the Notice, the Commission's analysis supported the preliminary belief that the Plan generally promotes competition.[2797] However, the Commission recognized that the Plan could increase barriers to entry because of the costs to comply with the Plan. Further, the Commission's analysis in the Notice identified several limitations to competition, but stated that the Plan contains provisions to address some limitations and Commission oversight can also address the limitations.[2798]

The Commission's analysis in the Notice also supported the preliminary belief that the Plan would improve the efficiency of regulatory activities and enhance market efficiency by deterring violative activity that harms market efficiency. Further, the analysis in the Notice supported the Commission's preliminary belief that the Plan would have modest positive effects on capital formation and that the threat of a security breach at the Central Repository would be unlikely to significantly harm capital formation.[2799]

At the same time, however, the Notice stated that the significant uncertainties discussed elsewhere in its economic analysis also affect the Commission's analysis of efficiency, competition, and capital formation.[2800] Additionally, the Commission recognized that the Plan's likely effects on competition, efficiency and capital formation were dependent to some extent on the performance and decisions of the Plan Processor and the Operating Committee in implementing the Plan, and thus there was necessarily some further uncertainty in the Commission's analysis. Nonetheless, the Notice stated that the Commission preliminarily believed that the Plan contained certain governance provisions, as well as provisions relating to the selection and removal of the Plan Processor, that mitigate this concern regarding uncertainty by promoting decision-making that could, on balance, have positive effects on competition, efficiency, and capital formation.

Overall, after considering comments, the Participants' response, and modifications to the Plan, the Commission is updating and revising its economic analysis of competition, efficiency, and capital formation. However, the revisions in the analysis do not impact the Commission's broad conclusions. The Commission continues to believe that the Plan generally will promote competition, improve the efficiency of regulatory activities, promote market efficiency, and have modest positive effects on capital formation. Further, the Commission continues to recognize the significant uncertainty and that certain provisions of the Plan could promote efficient decisions and implementation and could provide competitive incentives to the Plan Processor to promote good performance.

1. Competition

a. Market for Trading Services

In the Notice, the Commission analyzed the CAT NMS Plan's likely economic effects on competition in the market for trading services, as compared to the Baseline of the competitive environment without the Plan. The Commission stated that it preliminarily believed that the Plan would not place a significant burden on competition for trading services.[2801] The Commission also examined the effect of the funding model on competition in the market for trading services, including off-exchange liquidity suppliers and ATSs. In addition, the Commission considered the effect of implementation and ongoing costs of the Plan, whether particular elements of the Plan could hinder competition, and the effect of enhanced surveillance on competition in the market for trading services. The Commission recognized the risk that the Plan would have negative effects on competition and increase the barriers to entry in this market, but discussed how the Plan provisions and Commission oversight could mitigate these risks.

The Commission discussed how the market for trading services—which is served by exchanges, ATSs, and liquidity providers (internalizers and others)—relies on competition to supply investors with execution services at efficient prices. These trading venues, which compete to match traders with counterparties, provide a framework for price negotiation and disseminating trading information. The Commission observed that, since the adoption of Regulation NMS in 2005, there has been a shift in the market share of trading volume among trading venues. From 2005 to 2013, there was an increase in the market share of newer national securities exchanges and a decline in market share on NYSE. In addition, the proportion of NMS Stocks trading off-exchange (which includes both internalization and ATS trading) increased.

The Commission noted that the Plan examines the effect of the CAT NMS Plan on the market for trading services primarily from the perspective of the exchanges. The Plan asserts that distribution of regulatory costs incurred by the Plan would be distributed according to ''the Plan's funding principles,'' calibrated to avoid placing ''undue burden on exchanges relative to their core characteristics,'' and would thus not cause any exchange to be at a relative ''competitive disadvantage in a way that would materially impact the respective Execution Venue marketplaces.'' [2802] Likewise, the Plan asserts that its method of cost allocation would avoid discouraging entry into the Participant community because a potential entrant, like an ATS, would ''be assessed exactly the same amount [of allocated CAT-related fees] for a given level of activity'' both before and after becoming an exchange.[2803]

In addition, in its final analysis described below, the Commission examines each of the issues in relation to competition in the market for trading services and revises its economic analysis in response to comments, the Participants' response, and modifications to the Plan.

(1) Funding

The Commission noted that the Operating Committee will fund the Central Repository by allocating its costs across exchanges, FINRA, ATSs (''Execution Venues'') and broker-dealers (''Industry Members''), and will decide which proportion of costs would be funded by exchanges, FINRA, and ATSs and which portion would be funded by broker-dealers. The Commission observed that the Plan does not specify how the Operating Committee would select the method of allocation. The Commission believed

[2796] 17 CFR 242.613(a)(5); *see also* 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

[2797] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30738.

[2798] *Id.* at 30738–46.

[2799] *Id.* at 30748–50.

[2800] *Id.* at 30738. As examples, the Commission recognized that the uncertainties around the improvements to data qualities could affect the conclusions on efficiency and the uncertainty regarding how the Operations Committee allocated the fees used to fund the Central Repository could affect the conclusions on competition.

[2801] *Id.* at 30739–42.

[2802] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.8(a)(i); *see also id.* at Section 11.2 (for a discussion of the Plan's funding principles).

[2803] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.8(a)(i).

that any impacts of such fees on competition in the market for trading services will manifest either through the model for the fees itself or through the later allocation of the fees across market participant types, across equity or options exchanges, or within market participant types and markets, through the levels of fees paid by each tier.

A. Funding Model

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the structure of the funding model could provide a competitive advantage to exchanges.[2804] Specifically, the Commission noted that the Plan states that an entity would be assessed exactly the same amount for a given level of activity whether it acted as an ATS or an exchange. However, FINRA would be charged fees based on the market share of off-exchange trading. ATSs, which are FINRA members, would presumably pay a portion of the FINRA fee through their broker-dealer membership fees. In addition, ATSs would pay a fee for their market share, which is a portion of the total off-exchange market share. Therefore, ATS volume would effectively be charged once to the broker-dealer operating the ATS and a second time to FINRA, which would result in ATSs paying more than exchanges for the same level of activity. Ultimately, if the funding model disadvantages ATSs relative to exchanges, trading volume could migrate to exchanges in response, and ATSs could have incentives to register as exchanges as well. Additionally, the Commission discussed its belief that the Participation Fee [2805] could discourage new exchange entrants or the registration of an ATS as an exchange, increasing the barriers to entry to becoming an exchange. However, the Commission also explained that because the funding model seems to charge ATSs more for their market share than exchanges, ATSs could pay relatively less for their market share as an exchange than as an ATS, countering this barrier to entry depending on the magnitudes of the two fee types.

As described earlier,[2806] the Participants propose to amend the manner in which market share will be calculated for a national securities association that has trades reported by its members to its trade reporting facility or facilities for reporting transactions effected otherwise than on an exchange in NMS Stock or OTC Equity Securities.[2807] For such an association, its market share for purposes of qualifying for a particular tier in the funding model would not include the share volume reported to the national securities association by an ATS, as such share volume will be included in the market share calculation for that ATS.[2808] As discussed above in Section IV.F, the Commission is modifying the Plan as the Participants suggested.

This modification reduces the potential for the Plan to charge ATSs more than similarly situated exchanges, but it may not alleviate all the fee differentials between ATSs and exchanges. As described above, [2809] these fee differentials may arise because message traffic to and from an ATS would generate fee obligations on the broker-dealer that sponsors the ATS, while exchanges incur almost no message traffic fees. Even with this modification, the Commission continues to believe that the Funding Model could provide a competitive advantage to exchanges over ATSs. However, the Commission is approving the Plan without further modification for the reasons discussed in Section IV.F, above.

B. Allocation of Voting Rights and Fees

In the Notice, the Commission recognized that the potential for a burden on competition and effects on competitors in the market for trading services could arise from provisions relating to the allocation and exercise of voting rights.[2810] The Commission noted that the potential for concentration of influence over vote outcomes arises from proposed provisions to give one vote to each Plan Participant in an environment where some Participants are Affiliated SROs. Indeed, supermajority approval could be achieved through four of the 10 groups of Affiliated SROs and individual SROs, and majority approval could be achieved with just three such groups or individual SROs.[2811] For example, the Participant groups with options exchanges could have the incentive to allocate a disproportionately low level of fees for options market share than for equity market share. The Commission noted that such an allocation could disadvantage competing Participants with only equities exchanges.

The Commission also noted that the inclusion of all exchanges on the Operating Committee could give the Plan Participants opportunities and incentives to share information and coordinate strategies in ways that could reduce the competition among exchanges or could create a competitive advantage for exchanges over venues for off-exchange trading.[2812] However, the Commission stated that it preliminarily believed that certain provisions of the Plan would limit these potential burdens on competition. In particular, the Plan includes provisions designed to limit the flow of information between the employees of the Plan Participants who serve as members of the Operating Committee and other employees of the Plan Participants.[2813]

Additionally, the Commission agreed with the Plan's assessment that some governance features of the Plan will limit adverse effects on competition in the market for trading services. These include provisions limiting the incentive and ability of Operating Committee members to serve the private interests of their employers, such as the rules regulating conflicts of interest. Moreover, the Commission explained

[2804] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30740.

[2805] The Participation Fee would be determined by the Operating Company and paid by national securities exchanges and national securities associations currently registered with the Commission (''Participants'') to fund costs incurred in creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT.

[2806] *See* Section V.F.5.d, *supra.*

[2807] Response Letter II at 12.

[2808] Response Letter II at 12.

[2809] *See* Section V.F.5.d, *supra.*

[2810] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30740–41.

[2811] At the time of the Notice, the twenty SROs that were Participants in the CAT NMS Plan included five sets of affiliated SROs (New York Stock Exchange LLC, NYSE Arca, Inc., and NYSE MKT LLC (the ''NYSE Group''); The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC, NASDAQ OMX BX, Inc., and NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC (the ''NASDAQ Group''); BATS Exchange, Inc., BATS Y-Exchange, Inc., EDGX Exchange, Inc., and EDGA Exchange, Inc. (the ''BATS Group''); Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc. and C2 Options Exchange, Inc. (the ''Chicago Options Group''); International Securities Exchange, LLC, ISE Gemini, LLC, and ISE Mercury, LLC (the ''ISE Group''); and five independent SROs (National Stock Exchange, Inc.; Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc.; BOX Options Exchange LLC; Miami International Securities Exchange LLC; and Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc.). The BATS Group would have had four votes, the NYSE Group, the NASDAQ Group and the ISE Group each would have had three votes, and the Chicago Options Group would have had two votes. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section D.11(b). A majority approval would have required eleven votes. This could have included as few as four of the SROs and sets of affiliated SROs: The affiliated SROs that would have had four votes, two sets of affiliated SROs that would have had three votes, and one other SRO or set of affiliated SROs. Supermajority approval would have required fourteen votes. This could have included as few as five SROs and sets of affiliated SROs: The affiliated SROs that would have had four votes, three sets of affiliated SROs with three votes, and any additional SRO. Note also that as few as two sets of affiliated SROs could have blocked a Supermajority approval by casting seven ''no'' votes: The affiliated SROs with four votes and any one of the affiliated SROs with three votes.

[2812] The Commission also noted that FINRA could represent the perspectives of the off-exchange portion of the market, but FINRA would have only one vote and exchanges would have twenty.

[2813] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 9.6; *see also* Section III.24, *supra.*

that it may summarily abrogate and require the filing of Plan amendments that establish or change a fee in accordance with Rule 608(a)(1) and review such amendments in accordance with Rule 608(b)(2) of Regulation NMS, if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or the maintenance of fair and orderly markets, to remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanisms of, a national market system or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.[2814] In such a case, if the Commission chooses to approve such amendment, it would be by order and with such changes or subject to such conditions as the Commission may deem necessary or appropriate.[2815]

Several commenters provided information relevant to the Commission's analysis of the potential impact of the allocation of fees on competition. In particular, three commenters suggested that there was an inherent conflict of interest as the SROs were the only ones with votes, yet will be involved in the decision to allocate funding responsibility across SROs and broker-dealers.[2816] Such comments relate to the influence of voting rights on the allocation of fees to exchanges (SROs) compared to ATSs and internalizers (broker-dealers). The Commission notes also that certain EMSAC discussions recognized conflicts in the market for trading services.[2817]

The Commission believes that the concerns expressed in the comments and the EMSAC discussions are consistent with the Commission's discussion and analysis of the potential impacts in the Notice. The Commission recognized in the Notice that bloc voting could create a competitive advantage for exchanges over trading venues for off-exchange trading. The commenters did not address the Commission's discussion in the Notice of certain provisions in the Plan that would limit potential burdens on competition or of the role of the Commission in approving NMS Plan fee filings. The Commission notes that changes in the number of exchanges and in exchange groups since the Notice [2818] affect the potential influence of bloc voting because fewer SRO groups will be needed for approval or to block an approval.[2819] Nonetheless, the Commission continues to believe that provisions in the Plan and Commission oversight of the allocation of fees could mitigate these concerns.[2820]

(2) Costs of Compliance

In the Notice, the Commission explained that because all Participants but one compete in the market for trading services, the ability of affiliates to vote as a group could in principle allow a few large Participant groups to influence the outcome of competition in the market for trading services by making various decisions that can alter the costs of one set of competitors more than another set.[2821] In addition, the Commission discussed the fact that the Plan calls for profits to be distributed equally among Participants, which could advantage smaller exchanges during profitable years and disadvantage smaller exchanges during loss years.[2822]

The Commission explained that generally, smaller competitors could have implementation and ongoing costs of compliance that are disproportionate relative to their size. It noted that, to lessen the impact of funding the Central Repository on smaller exchanges and ATSs, the Plan would apply a tiered funding model that charges the smallest exchanges and ATSs the lowest fees. Likewise, the Plan would apply a tiered funding model that would charge the smallest broker-dealers, including liquidity suppliers, the lowest fees. However, the Commission noted that the Plan does not indicate whether off-exchange liquidity providers would pay fees similar to similarly-sized ATSs and exchanges. This is important because, as described earlier, broker-dealers internalizing orders off exchanges would only be allocated fees based on message traffic, whereas orders routed to ATSs and exchanges lead to broker-dealer fees based on message traffic and ATS or exchange fees based on market share. If these fees are even partially passed on to customers, then the cost differentials that result might create incentives for broker-dealers to route order flow to those broker-dealers who internalize in order to minimize costs, creating a potential conflict of interest with broker-dealers' investor customers.[2823]

The Commission discussed the fact that the Plan provides that the Technical Specifications will not be finalized until after the selection of a Plan Processor, which will not occur until after any decision by the Commission to approve the Plan. The Commission recognized that the costs of compliance associated with future technical choices or the selection of the Plan Processor could exacerbate the relative cost differential across competitors. However, the Commission preliminarily believed that the governance provisions of the Plan and Commission oversight could help to mitigate such effects in the market for trading services.

The Commission received several comments relevant to its analysis of the

[2814] 17 CFR 242.608(a)(1); 608(b)(2); 608(b)(3)(i); and 608(b)(3)(iii). Pursuant to Rule 608(b)(2) of Regulation NMS, the Commission shall approve such amendment, with such changes or subject to such conditions as the Commission may deem necessary or appropriate, if it finds that such amendment is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors and the maintenance of fair and orderly markets, to remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanisms of, a national market system, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. Approval of the amendment shall be by Commission order.

[2815] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30741; *supra* note 1709 for further details on fee proposals.

[2816] Fidelity Letter at 5, SIFMA Letter at 27 and KCG Letter at 4.

[2817] *See* ''Recommendations Relating to Trading Venues Regulation'', Equity Market Structure Advisory Committee (''EMSAC'') Trading Venues Regulation Subcommittee, April 19, 2016, at 1, available at *https://www.sec.gov/spotlight/emsac/emsac-trading-venues-subcommittee-recommendations-041916.pdf (describing four recommendations relating to the regulation of trading venues); see also* EMSAC April 26, 2016 Transcript, *available at https://www.sec.gov/spotlight/emsac/emsac-042616-transcript.txt.*

[2818] Since the time of the Notice, the Commission approved a new exchange, the Investors' Exchange, LLC (''IEX''), which is an independent SRO, and two sets of affiliated SROs merged, the NASDAQ Group and the ISE Group.

[2819] The Plan now includes twenty-one SROs with votes on the Operating Committee, including four sets of affiliated SROs and six independent SROs. Compared to the time of the Notice (*see supra* note 2811), the number of votes required for majority or Supermajority approval remains the same, but the number of SRO blocks required for approval or to block an approval has changed. Now, the NASDAQ–ISE Group has six votes instead of separate blocs of three votes each. A majority approval still requires eleven votes. This could include as few as three of the SROs and sets of affiliated SROs instead of the former four: The affiliated SROs that have six votes, the affiliated SROs that have four votes, and one other SRO or set of affiliated SROs. Supermajority approval still requires fourteen votes. This could include as few as four SROs and sets of affiliated SROs instead of the former five: The affiliated SROs that have six votes, the affiliated SROs that have four votes, the affiliated SROs that have three votes, and any additional SRO or group of affiliated SROs. Note also that, now, as few as two sets of affiliated SROs, instead of the former three, could block a Supermajority approval by casting eight ''no'' votes: The affiliated SROs with six votes, and the affiliated SRO with two votes.

[2820] *See supra* note 1709 for further details on fee proposals.

[2821] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30741–42.

[2822] Generally, smaller exchanges will have smaller fees. So, if there are profits, and each exchange receives the same nominal reimbursement amount, then the percentage reduction in fees from the redistributed profit will be greater for smaller exchanges, as they are starting with a smaller denominator in the ratio. This does not speak to the relative burden of compliance costs, however, which may still disadvantage smaller exchanges.

[2823] *See* Section V.F.5.d, *supra.*

potential impact of the costs of compliance on competition in the market for trading services. Specifically, as described earlier,[2824] several commenters had concerns about the distribution of CAT profits among SROs, though none specifically discussed the potential differential impact on small versus large exchanges.[2825] Further, the concerns of commenters and the EMSAC discussed in the Allocation of Fees section above also have implications for the Commission's analysis.

Regarding the distribution of CAT profits among SROs, as described earlier,[2826] the Participants responded with a clarification that they expect to operate the CAT on a break-even basis and any surpluses would be treated as an operational reserve to offset fees in future payment. In addition, the Participants subsequently stated that the CAT LLC will seek to qualify for tax exempt status as a ''business league.'' [2827]

The Commission has considered the comments and the EMSAC discussion regarding voting blocs and believes that these concerns do not alter the analysis in the Notice for the same reasons as described above.[2828] Overall, the Commission continues to believe that the ability of affiliates to vote as a group could in principle allow a few large Participant groups to influence the outcome of competition in the market for trading services by making various decisions that alter the costs of one set of competitors more than another set, but that Commission oversight and the governance provisions of the Plan and could help to mitigate these effects.[2829] Also, in light of amendment to the Plan to reflect that the CAT LLC will seek to qualify for tax exempt status as a ''business league,'' [2830] the Commission now believes that neither CAT profits or losses should affect competition in the market for trading services. The Commission maintains its conclusions regarding the impact of compliance costs on competition in the market for trading services, specifically, that compliance costs may be relatively more burdensome for small SROs, but that the tiered aspect of the funding model should serve to mitigate this. However, the Commission notes that the funding model continues to have uncertainties, and depends on the decisions of the Operating Committee.

(3) Enhanced Surveillance and Deterrence

In the Notice, the Commission also discussed its preliminary belief that the CAT NMS Plan could promote competition in the market for trading services through enhanced surveillance and the deterrence of violative behavior that could inhibit competition.[2831] Should the Plan deter violative behavior, passive liquidity suppliers, such as on or off-exchange market makers could increase profits as a result of reduced losses from others' violative behavior. This increase in profits could encourage new entrants or could spark greater competition, which would reduce transaction costs for investors. For example, if the Plan facilitates surveillance improvements that deter spoofing, the Commission stated that it could increase incentives to provide liquidity and promote lower transaction costs for investors, particularly in stocks that may lack a critical mass of competing liquidity providers or that could be targets for violative trading behavior.

The Commission did not receive comments related to its economic analysis on enhanced surveillance and deterrence of violative behavior affecting competition in the market for trading services. Therefore, the Commission continues to believe that the CAT NMS Plan could promote competition in the market for trading services through enhanced surveillance and the deterrence of violative behavior that could inhibit competition.

b. Market for Broker-Dealer Services

In the Notice, the Commission analyzed the effect of the CAT NMS Plan on the market for broker-dealer services.[2832] The Commission stated that it preliminarily believed that the costs of broker-dealers' compliance, particularly the cost to report order events to the Central Repository, would differ substantially between broker-dealers and might affect competition between smaller and larger broker-dealers. The Commission also noted that broker-dealers that outsource regulatory data reporting activities are expected to see their costs of regulatory data reporting increase, while broker-dealers that insource may see a decrease in their regulatory data reporting costs.[2833] The Commission stated that it preliminarily believed this dynamic might affect competition between Outsourcers (that tend to be smaller) and Insourcers (that tend to be larger), and might increase barriers to entry in some segments of this market.

The Notice discussed the Plan's assertion that it will have little to no adverse effect on competition between large broker-dealers, and will not materially disadvantage small broker-dealers relative to large broker-dealers.[2834] Regarding small broker-dealers, the Plan states, ''. . . [the allocation of costs to broker-dealers based on their contribution to market activity] may be significant for some small firms, and may even impact their business models materially . . .'' and that the Participants were sensitive to the burdens the Plan could impose on small broker-dealers, noting that such broker-dealers could incur minimal costs under their existing regulatory reporting requirements ''because they are OATS-exempt or excluded broker-dealers or limited purpose broker-dealers.'' The Commission noted that the CAT NMS Plan attempts to mitigate its impact on these broker-dealers by proposing to follow a cost allocation formula that should charge lower fees to smaller broker-dealers; [2835] furthermore, Rule 613 provides them additional time to commence their reporting requirements.

The Commission preliminarily agreed with the Plan's general assessment of competition among broker-dealers, and also with the Plan's assessment of differential effects on small versus large broker-dealers. The Commission agreed that the Plan's funding model was an explicit source of financial obligation for broker-dealers and therefore an important feature to evaluate when considering potential differential effects of the Plan on competition in the market for broker-dealers. However, the Commission preliminarily believed that the segments of the market most likely to experience higher barriers to entry are those that currently have no data

[2824] *Id.*

[2825] SIFMA Letter at 19; KCG Letter at 5; DAG Letter at 5.

[2826] *See* Section V.F.5.d, *supra.*

[2827] Participants' Letter at 1; Section IV.B.4, *supra.*

[2828] *See* Section V.G.1.a(1)B, *supra.*

[2829] *See supra* note 2814.

[2830] Participants' Letter at 1. *See also* Section V.F.5.d, *supra.* for more detail on these modifications and the resulting economic effects.

[2831] *See* Section V.E.2.c, *supra,* for a discussion of how the CAT NMS Plan would enhance surveillance and deter violative behavior.

[2832] The market for broker-dealer services is described in the Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30742–44.

[2833] *See* Section V.E.2.c., *supra.*

[2834] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C B.8.(a)(ii).

[2835] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C B.7.(b)(iv)(C) (''The fees to be assessed at each tier are calculated so as to recoup a proportion of costs appropriate to the message traffic from firms in each tier. Therefore, larger broker-dealers, generating the majority of message traffic, will be in the higher tiers, and therefore be charged a higher fee. Smaller broker-dealers with low levels of message traffic will be in lower tiers and will be assessed a minimal fee for the CAT. The Participants estimate that up to 75% of broker-dealers will be in the lower tiers of the Funding Model.'').

reporting requirements of the type the Plan requires and those that will involve more CAT Reporting obligations, such as the part of the broker-dealer market that involves connecting to exchanges, because of the technology infrastructure requirements and the potential to have to report several types of order events. Nonetheless, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that any increases in the barriers to entry are justified because they are necessary in order for the CAT Data to include data from small broker-dealers. Specifically, the Commission noted that excluding small broker-dealers from reporting requirements would eliminate the collection of audit trail information from a segment of the broker-dealer community and would thus result in an audit trail that does not capture all orders by all participants in the securities markets.[2836]

The Commission also recognized that the Plan could affect the current relative competitive positions of broker-dealers in the market for broker-dealer services because the economic impacts resulting from the Plan could benefit some broker-dealers and adversely affect others. However, the Commission stated that there is no clear reason to expect these impacts, should they occur, to decrease the current state of overall competition in the market for broker-dealer services so as to materially burden the price or quality of services received by investors on average.

Regardless of the differential effects of the CAT NMS Plan on small versus large broker-dealers, the Commission discussed in the Notice that its preliminary view was that the CAT NMS Plan, in aggregate, will likely not reduce competition and efficiency in the overall market for broker-dealer services. The Commission explained that even if small broker-dealers potentially face a burden, this may not necessarily have an adverse effect on competition as a whole in the overall market for broker-dealer services. Under the Plan, broker-dealers could face high upfront costs to set up a processing environment to meet reporting responsibilities. As upfront, fixed costs, the burden could be greater for small broker-dealers. Instead of bearing these costs in-house, small broker-dealers could contract with outside vendors, which could lead to lower costs relative to not using a vendor for reporting services. Thus, the Commission explained that even firms that currently do not report to OATS, but will be CAT Reporters under the Plan, could face manageable upfront costs that permit them to continue in their line of business without a severe setback in their profitability.

The Commission noted that a difficulty in assessing the likely impacts of the CAT NMS Plan on competition among broker-dealers is that competition in the markets for different broker-dealer services could be affected in different ways. If CAT costs represent a significant increase in overall business costs, the Plan could disadvantage broker-dealers who are CAT Reporters in the market segments that do not require CAT reporting. For example, broker-dealers that, in addition to providing services related to market transactions that are reportable to CAT, also compete to provide fixed-income order entry as a line of business may be at a relative disadvantage to competitors in the fixed-income market who do not provide broker-dealer services that are related to market activity that is reportable to CAT.

The Commission recognized that the CAT NMS Plan could result in fewer broker-dealers providing specialized services that trigger CAT reporting obligations. The Commission also recognized, however, that fewer broker-dealers in a specialized segment of the market may not necessarily harm competition in that segment. In particular, the CAT compliance costs may be less of a relative burden for large broker-dealers who may provide a larger portfolio of specialized services to clients. This portfolio may buffer large broker-dealers from business risk associated with specialization, and so large broker-dealers are likely to maintain their presence in specialized market segments. If a sufficient number of large broker-dealers maintain their presence in specialized market segments, a net decrease in broker-dealers may not affect the competition in such market segments to a level in which the market segment offers fewer or lower quality services or higher prices.[2837] However, the Commission recognized that negative effects on competition in specialized market segments could result if broker-dealers achieve a level of market concentration necessary to adversely affect prices for investors.

The Commission received a few comment letters regarding its analysis of the effect of the Plan on the market for broker-dealer services. As previously described,[2838] the Commission received one comment that noted that message traffic tiers could place a larger burden on market makers of liquid securities and a lower burden on liquidity takers.[2839] In addition, one commenter noted that the current phased implementation schedule poses risks to clearing firms who will have to support both large and small broker-dealers during CAT implementation, incurring more CAT implementation costs than broker-dealers that do not have introducing broker-dealers.[2840] Another comment estimated that CAT reporting costs, even at a $5,000 per month minimum, could reach 15% or more of revenue for a subset of small broker-dealers that are currently OATS exempt.[2841] The commenter further stated that the Plan would have the greatest proportionate burden for those firms, which have the smallest justification for regulatory concern [2842] and expressed concern regarding the ability for certain firms to say in business, stating that the Plan would ''destroy the business model and profitability'' of such firms.

The Participants' response letter addressed comments related to the market for broker-dealer services. With regards to the funding model tiers placing a larger burden on market makers of liquid securities, the Participants did not comment on the relative burden, but argued that a fixed-fee funding model would reduce the disincentives to provide liquidity to the market and would lead to fewer market distortions than a strictly variable funding model.[2843] With regards to the phased implementation schedule, the Participants noted that small broker-dealers may voluntarily begin reporting within two years instead of the required three years,[2844] but did not address whether this poses risks for clearing firms supporting both large and small broker-dealers. The Participants also did not address the relative burden on OATS-exempt broker-dealers.

In response to these comments, the Commission has revised its economic analysis of the effect of the Plan on the market for broker-dealer services. First, the Commission now recognizes the potential differential effect on those broker-dealers that engage in market making in liquid stocks versus illiquid stocks and on those broker-dealers that engage in liquidity taking strategies versus those that engage in other

[2836] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30743 (citing Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45749).

[2837] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30742–44.

[2838] *See* Section V.F.5.d, *supra.*

[2839] SIFMA Letter at 16–17.

[2840] TR Letter at 3–4.

[2841] Wachtel Letter at 1–4.

[2842] Wachtel Letter at 2–4 (stating that customers of certain small firms are unlikely to engage in violative behavior such as market manipulation and insider trading).

[2843] Response Letter II at 16.

[2844] Response Letter II at 20.

strategies. The Commission believes that this differential effect could result in broker-dealers altering their activities, which could have the second order effects described above,[2845] and could change the level of competition in certain market segments, such as those that specialize in providing services in more liquid securities. However, the Commission believes that services in liquid securities is the most competitive segment in the broker-dealer industry and therefore, does not believe that effects on competition would be material. In particular, based on Commission Staff experience, the Commission understands that quote competition in liquid securities comes from market makers on many exchanges, over-the-counter market makers, and customers who post quotations. These securities trade on one penny spreads and have deep order books. Further, consistent with the Participants' Response Letter II, the tiered nature of the funding model effectively fixes the fees. In highly competitive markets, fixed fees should not affect prices. Therefore, the highly competitive liquid securities markets should remain liquid and highly competitive under the Plan, despite the fees related to message traffic.

The Commission also agrees with the comment that certain broker-dealers could face a disproportionately large burden of costs from reporting, even as high as 15% of revenue as the commenter noted, and already recognized this possibility in the economic analysis in the Notice. However, the Commission is not revising its conclusion that it is necessary for even the smallest broker-dealers to report to CAT. Specifically, the Commission believes that excluding certain broker-dealers from reporting requirements would result in an audit trail that does not capture all orders by all participants in the securities markets, which could incentivize prospective wrongdoers to utilize these firms to evade regulatory oversight.

With regards to competition, the Commission continues to believe that even if regulatory burdens from CAT reduce the number of small broker-dealers in specialized segments, overall competition in those segments may not be harmed.

With regards to the comment on relative costs for clearing firms supporting large and small brokers during CAT implementation, the Commission acknowledges the costs of reporting to duplicative systems, and the relatively high costs to introducing broker-dealers. However, it is not clear why the additional costs to clearing firms servicing other broker-dealers would not be passed along to small broker-dealers—the impact of which has already been discussed. As such, the Commission does not believe the impact on clearing firms due to the phased implementation schedule is sufficiently large to affect competition in this market, and is not changing the Economic Analysis as it relates to costs for clearing services.

The Commission does not believe that the modifications to the funding model described above will affect the allocation of fees or the relative compliance costs among broker-dealers.[2846] Overall, the Commission continues to believe that the CAT NMS Plan, in aggregate, would likely not reduce competition and efficiency in the overall market for broker-dealer services. Even if small broker-dealers, broker-dealers of liquid securities, or clearing firms of large and small broker-dealers potentially face a relatively high burden, this may not necessarily have an adverse effect on competition as a whole in the overall market for broker-dealer services, as the Commission explained in the Notice.

c. Market for Regulatory Services

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary conclusion that the Plan could provide opportunities for increased competition in the market to provide regulatory services.[2847] The Commission noted that SROs compete to provide regulatory services in at least two ways. First, because SROs are responsible for regulating trading within venues they operate, their regulatory services are bundled with their operation of the venue. Consequently, for a broker-dealer, selecting a trading venue also entails the selection of a provider of regulatory services surrounding the trading activity. Second, SROs could provide this supervision not only for their own trading venues, but for other SROs' trading venues as well through the use of Regulatory Service Agreements or a plan approved pursuant to Rule 17d–2 under the Exchange Act.[2848] Consequently, SROs compete to provide regulatory services to trading venues they do not operate. The market for regulatory services in the equity and options markets currently has one dominant competitor, FINRA.

In the Notice, the Commission noted that under the Plan, designated regulatory Staff from all of the SROs would have access to CAT Data, which would reduce the differences in data access across SROs.[2849] This in turn could reduce barriers to entry in providing regulatory services because data will be centralized and standardized, possibly reducing economies of scale in performing surveillance activities. Furthermore, because some types of previously infeasible surveillance will become possible with the availability of additional data, the Commission believes that SROs will have greater opportunities to innovate in the type of surveillance that is performed, and the efficiency with which it is performed. In addition, as Rule 613(a)(3)(iv) requires, SROs will implement new or updated surveillance within 14 months after effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan,[2850] and thus any SRO could reconsider its approach to outsourcing its regulatory services and whether it wants to compete to provide regulatory services to others.

While the Commission did not receive any comments addressing the effects of the CAT NMS Plan on the market for regulatory services, nor was the issue addressed in the Participants' response, the Commission believes that certain EMSAC discussions are relevant to its analysis of competition in the market for regulatory services. In particular, the discussions regarding the EMSAC draft recommendation that the Commission should formalize by Rule the centralization of common regulatory functions across SROs into a single regulator reveal other potential considerations.[2851] In particular, the EMSAC subcommittee on Trading Venues opined that some regulatory activities are duplicative and needlessly complex because they are dispersed

[2845] *See* Section V.F.5.b., *supra.*

[2846] *Id.*

[2847] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30744–45.

[2848] 17 CFR 240.17d–2.

[2849] Without a Central Repository, an SRO wishing to compete as a regulatory services provider would need to invest in the IT infrastructure and enter into the data access agreements necessary to surveil broadly beyond its exchanges' data resources. By providing access to consolidated trade and order data to all SROs, CAT may reduce barriers to entry for this market. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 74581 (March 25, 2015), 80 FR 18035 (April 2, 2015) at 18057–58 (describing the barriers to entry of potential new national securities associations).

[2850] 17 CFR 242.613(a)(3)(iv).

[2851] *See* ''Recommendations Relating to Trading Venues Regulation'', Equity Market Structure Advisory Committee (''EMSAC'') Trading Venues Regulation Subcommittee, April 19, 2016, *available at https://www.sec.gov/spotlight/emsac/emsac-trading-venues-subcommittee-recommendations-041916.pdf (describing four recommendations relating to the regulation of trading venues); see also* EMSAC April 26, 2016 Transcript, *available at https://www.sec.gov/spotlight/emsac/emsac-042616-transcript.txt.*

across SROs.[2852] Further, the subcommittee argued that CAT will increase that duplicative regulatory oversight. In response to the EMSAC discussions, one commenter pointed out benefits in having competition between regulators.[2853] This commenter explained that CAT Data could open up new frontiers for regulation that competition between multiple SROs could leverage off of.

The Commission recognizes that increased competition in the market for regulatory services could create duplication of regulations, as the EMSAC discussed. But, ultimately, the Commission's conclusions related to competition—namely, that the Plan will provide opportunities for increased competition in the market to provide regulatory services—are unchanged from the Notice. The Commission recognizes, however, the uncertainty of whether EMSAC will make a formal recommendation to the Commission and whether and how the Commission would act with respect to such a recommendation.

d. Market for Regulatory Data Reporting Services

In the Notice, the Commission analyzed the effect of the CAT NMS Plan on competition in the market for data reporting services with a focus on its impact on the costs incurred by broker-dealers to comply with the Plan.[2854] As discussed in the Costs section above, the Commission preliminarily believed that many broker-dealers, particularly smaller broker-dealers, would fulfill their CAT reporting obligations by outsourcing to service bureaus and that the fees charged by the service bureaus would be a major cost driver for these broker-dealers. Further, these fees would factor into the increase in barriers to entry in the market for broker-dealer services.[2855] Therefore, the Commission preliminarily believed that any effects on competition in the market for regulatory data reporting services could have a significant effect on the costs incurred by broker-dealers in complying with the CAT NMS Plan.

The Plan provided information on broker-dealers' use of third-party service providers to accomplish current regulatory data reporting. The Plan noted that while some broker-dealers perform their regulatory data reporting in-house, others outsource this activity. As noted in the Costs section of the Plan,[2856] the Commission understands that most firms outsource the bulk of their regulatory data reporting to third-party firms. The Commission preliminarily believed that the competition in the market to provide data reporting services is a product of firms choosing to perform this activity in-house or to outsource it based on a number of considerations including cost, with some firms choosing to outsource this activity across multiple service providers.

The market for regulatory data reporting services is currently characterized by bundling, high switching costs, and barriers to entry. First, service bureaus often bundle regulatory data reporting services with an order-handling system service that provides broker-dealers with market access and order routing capabilities.[2857] Additionally, they sometimes bundle regulatory data reporting services with trade clearing services. Second, switching costs for service bureaus may be high and involve complex onboarding processes and requirements. Furthermore, systems between service bureaus may be disparate, and switching service providers may require different or updated client documentation. Difficulty switching between service providers could limit the competition among service bureaus to provide data reporting services, and impact the costs that Outsourcers incur to secure regulatory data reporting services. Third, high information technology (''IT'') infrastructure costs also give rise to barriers to entry, which could slow the entry of new market participants into this market. Despite this, the Commission explained that based on information from broker-dealer discussions arranged by Financial Information Forum it preliminarily believed that the market for regulatory data reporting services is generally expanding and the trend is for more, not less, outsourcing.[2858]

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the Plan could alter the competitive landscape in the market for data reporting services in several ways. First, the Plan could increase the demand for data reporting services by requiring reporting by broker-dealers that may have previously been exempt due to size under individual SRO rules.[2859] Because more broker-dealers would be required to report regulatory data under the Plan, the Commission preliminarily believed there could be an opportunity for increased competition in this market which might benefit all Outsourcers by reducing costs or increasing innovation. However, the increase in demand for data reporting services could serve to entrench existing providers if they capture a large share of newly created demand; this could lead to relatively higher costs for broker-dealers than they would face in a more competitive market. The potential increase in demand for data reporting services also could impact the capacity of already existing service providers to meet this increase in demand, and this in turn could have implications for competition and pricing in the market for data reporting services. Considering the barriers to entry that characterize the market for data reporting services and this potential increase in demand, service bureaus could have less incentive to compete for broker-dealer clients because these clients are no longer scarce, and as such, the CAT NMS Plan could result in a decline in the competition for data reporting services. It is possible that broker-dealers seeking to establish relationships with service bureaus could have trouble securing them because of the need to on-board many broker-dealers at once, especially if the service bureaus have limited on-boarding capacity. In the short-run these capacity constraints and the high demand could increase the costs of reporting through a service bureau. However, the two year implementation period for large broker-dealers and three year period for small broker-dealers could alleviate the reduction in competition due to the onboarding capacity strain because current service bureaus have time to increase their on-boarding capacity and new entrants have time to build the necessary IT infrastructure and a client base.

Second, the Commission discussed in the Notice how the CAT NMS Plan could dramatically change the pool of firms demanding data reporting services, which would be skewed toward firms that are smaller and on average costlier to service, which could result in higher prices that could eventually be passed onto investors. In addition to small and medium sized broker-dealers that previously self-reported data to SROs, who now would be required to report, the CAT NMS Plan would also result in other broker-

[2852] *See* EMSAC April 26, 2016 Transcript, *available at https://www.sec.gov/spotlight/emsac/emsac-042616-transcript.txt*, at 111.

[2853] *See* NASDAQ comment on EMSAC, May 24, 2016, *available at https://www.sec.gov/comments/265–29/26529-71.pdf.*

[2854] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30745–46.

[2855] *See* Section V.G.1.b, *supra.*

[2856] *See* Section V.F.1.c.(2).A, *supra.*

[2857] *See* Section V.F.1.c.(2).A, *supra,* for more information on broker-dealer use of service bureaus.

[2858] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at n.920.

[2859] *See, e.g.,* FINRA Rule 7470.

dealers having data reporting responsibilities. The Commission preliminarily believed that these broker-dealers would predominantly be small. Because the Plan would require additional elements in regulatory data, particularly customer data, some broker-dealers that currently self-report could no longer find it economically feasible to do so.

Third, in addition to possibly increasing demand for data reporting services, the Commission discussed how the CAT NMS Plan may have a mixed effect on the number of firms offering data reporting services. This could impact the competitiveness of this market, and affect the costs broker-dealers bear in securing these services. On one hand, the number of firms offering data reporting services could decrease, because the need to secure PII might increase the likelihood of liability and litigation risks in the event of a security breach.[2860] On the other hand, it is possible that the number of service bureaus offering data reporting services would increase. New reporting requirements for broker-dealers could create opportunities for new entrants to meet this demand. This could increase capacity and result in innovation in providing these services, which could benefit broker-dealers needing data reporting services by potentially reducing reporting costs, or at least reducing the potential for cost increases. Lower reporting costs for broker-dealers could in turn benefit the investors who are serviced by these broker-dealers, through reduced costs.

Fourth, the Commission discussed how the Plan could decrease the demand for data reporting services. Many broker-dealers currently pay service bureaus to fulfill their regulatory data reporting; this may be because these broker-dealers find it would be more expensive to handle the translation of their order management system data into fixed formats, such as is required for OATS. If the Plan Processor allows broker-dealers to send data to the Central Repository in the formats that they use for normal operations, in drop copies for example, these broker-dealers may no longer see a cost advantage in engaging the services of a regulatory data reporting service provider because one of the costs associated with regulatory data reporting—having to translate data into a fixed format—will have been eliminated.[2861] These broker-dealers may then choose to insource their regulatory data reporting.

The Commission preliminarily believed that this reduction in demand would not likely be realized and, if realized, would be unlikely to offset the increase in demand that would come from CAT reporters not currently subject to OATS reporting, who would now have reporting obligations. As noted in the Costs section of the Plan, of the 1,800 expected CAT Reporters, 868 do not currently report to OATS.[2862] This meant that the Commission expected a large proportion of CAT Reporters may be broker-dealers that currently do not have a service bureau for regulatory data reporting but would choose to engage one to manage their CAT reporting responsibilities. This is more than the Commission's estimate of 806 current outsourcing broker-dealers.[2863] The Commission therefore noted that it is unlikely that the number of current Outsourcers that choose to become Insourcers would be larger than the number of non-OATS reporters that would elect to outsource. As a result, demand is more likely to increase. Further, the Commission explained that the proposed requirement for CAT reports to use listing exchange symbology could require pre-report data processing even if the Plan Processor allows for the receipt of reports in the formats that broker-dealers use for normal operations. As a result, the Commission explained that the CAT NMS Plan is unlikely to eliminate the costs of processing data prior to reporting that data to the Central Repository.

The Commission continues to believe that it is possible that the Plan would increase the demand for data reporting services by requiring regulatory data reporting by broker-dealers that may have previously been exempt due to size under individual SRO rules. Furthermore, the Commission continues to believe that the CAT NMS Plan may have a mixed effect on the number of firms offering data reporting services; this could impact the competitiveness of this market, and affect the costs broker-dealers bear in securing these services. Commenters did not provide any additional information or analysis that the Commission believes would warrant changes to its analysis or conclusions as set out in the Notice, nor does the Commission believe that the modifications to the Plan warrant changes to this aspect of the economic analysis.

2. Efficiency

In the Notice, the Commission analyzed the potential impact of the Plan on efficiency.[2864] The Plan included a discussion of certain efficiency effects anticipated if the Plan is approved; as part of its economic analysis, the Commission discussed these effects, as well as additional effects anticipated by the Commission. The Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the Plan would likely result in significant improvements in efficiency related to how regulatory data is collected and used. The Commission also explained that the Plan could result in improvements in market efficiency by deterring violative activity. However, the Commission noted that any potential gains to efficiency from the retirement of duplicative and outdated reporting systems would be delayed for up to two and a half years and the interim period of increased duplicative reporting would impose significant financial burden on Industry Members.

Overall, after considering comments, Participants' responses, and modifications to the Plan, the Commission is updating and revising its economic analysis on efficiency. However, the revisions in the analysis do not impact the Commission's broad conclusions. The Commission continues to believe that the Plan will generally improve the efficiency of regulatory activities and promote market efficiency.

a. Effect of the Plan on Efficiency

Building off the discussion in the Plan, in the Notice, the Commission analyzed the effect of the Plan on the efficiency of detecting violative behavior through examinations and enforcement, on the efficiency of surveillance, on market efficiency through deterrence of violative behavior, on operational efficiency of CAT Reporters, and on efficiencies through reduced ad hoc data requests and quicker access to data.[2865]

[2860] *See* Section V.F.4.a(3), *supra,* for a discussion of the potential exit of service bureaus from the market resulting from the risk of a security breach.

[2861] The Plan does not mandate the data ingestion format. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.1(b). In the Notice, the Commission recognized that the CAT Reporters Study found no difference in expected costs for a fixed format, but requested comment on why the costs may be similar when it would seem logical that allowing flexible data reporting formats would reduce costs for broker-dealers. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.F.5.

[2862] The Plan estimates that 1,800 broker-dealers are expected to have CAT reporting obligations. Based on data from FINRA, 932 broker-dealers currently report OATS data. 1,800 − 932= 868. *See* Section VI.F.1.c.(2)A, *supra.*

[2863] *Id.*

[2864] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30746–48.

[2865] *Id.*

The Commission explained that currently, regulators' ability to efficiently supervise and surveil market participants and carry out their enforcement responsibilities is hindered by limitations in regulatory data.[2866] Second, regulators' ability to efficiently perform cross-market surveillance is also hindered by limitations in regulatory data.[2867] Finally, there are a number of other inefficiencies associated with the current system of regulatory data collection. These include: Delays in data availability to regulators; lack of direct access to data collected by other regulators results in numerous ad-hoc data requests; and the need for regulatory Staff to invest significant time and resources to reconciling disparate data sources.[2868]

The Plan discussed a number of expected effects on efficiency such as: Monitoring for rule violations; performing surveillance; and supporting fewer reporting systems. The Commission preliminarily agreed with the Plan's assessments of the expected effects, and in addition, the Commission discussed how the Plan could also reduce violative behavior.

First, the Plan concluded that SROs would experience improved efficiency in the detection of rule violations, particularly for violations that involve trading in multiple markets.[2869] The Plan stated an expectation that SROs would need to expend fewer resources to detect violative cross-market activity, and such activity would be detected more quickly.[2870] The Commission preliminarily agreed that the Plan would result in improvements in efficiency in the performance of examinations of market participants by SROs and the Commission. Improvements to data availability and access through the Central Repository could allow SROs and the Commission to more efficiently identify market participants for examination.[2871] The Commission also agreed that the Plan would improve the efficiency of enforcement investigations. If regulatory data access improves, the quality and quantity of enforcement investigations could increase through improvements to the comprehensiveness and timeliness of data used to support investigations.

Second, the Plan stated that the Participants believe that the CAT NMS Plan could improve the efficiency of surveillance.[2872] This improvement is due to a number of factors including: Increased surveillance capacity; improved system speed, which would result in more efficient data analysis; and a reduction in surveillance system downtime.[2873] The Plan also cited reduced monitoring costs,[2874] but the Commission noted that estimates in the Costs section of the Plan predicted increased surveillance costs if the Plan is approved. The increased surveillance costs predicted in the Plan could reflect more effective surveillance. Although the Plan did not discuss the cost-benefit tradeoff of increased surveillance directly, the Commission noted that achieving the level of surveillance that would be possible if the Plan is approved would likely be more expensive using currently available data sources, if it is achievable at all, due to the inefficiencies that currently exist in delivering regulatory supervision, which are discussed previously.[2875]

Third, the Plan also discussed increased efficiency due to the reduction in redundant reporting systems,[2876] specifically increases in system standardization, which would allow consolidation of resources, including the sunsetting of legacy reporting systems and processes, as well as consolidated data processing envisioned from the Plan.[2877] However, the Commission noted that it is aware that the Plan calls for a period of years during which Industry Members would face duplicative reporting systems before older regulatory data reporting systems are retired.[2878] This period of duplicative reporting would impose a considerable financial burden on Industry Members.[2879]

The Plan also discussed two other possible efficiency improvements: A reduction in ad-hoc data requests and more fulsome access to raw data. While the Plan anticipated a decrease in ad-hoc data requests as a result of Plan-related data improvements, the Commission noted some types of ad-hoc data requests, such as, data requests for later-stage investigations might increase.[2880] The Commission recognized that these increases in data requests would partially offset the efficiency improvements from the reduction in data requests noted above, but the Commission preliminarily believed that the Plan would reduce the total number of data requests.[2881] Furthermore, the Plan anticipated more robust access to unprocessed regulatory data, which could improve the efficiency with which SROs and the Commission could respond to market events where they previously had to submit data requests and wait for data validation procedures to be completed before accessing data collected by other regulators.[2882]

In addition to the potential benefits to efficiency discussed in the Plan, the Commission also discussed that CAT may reduce violative behavior. Improvements in the efficiency of market surveillance, investigations, and enforcement could directly reduce the amount of violative behavior by identifying and penalizing market participants who violate rules and who would more easily go undetected in the current regime. Furthermore, market participants' awareness regarding improvements in the efficiency of market surveillance, investigations, and enforcement (or perceptions thereof), and the resultant increase in the probability of incurring a costly penalty for violative behavior, could deter violative behavior.[2883] Reductions in

[2866] *See* Section V.E.2.c, *supra.*

[2867] *Id.*

[2868] *See* Section V.D.2.b, *supra.* These other inefficiencies are discussed above in the Baseline and Benefits Sections.

[2869] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.8(b); *see also* Section V.E.2, *supra.*

[2870] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.8(b).

[2871] *See* Section V.E.2.c, *supra.*

[2872] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.8(b) (stating that the CAT NMS Plan could reduce monitoring costs, enable regulators to detect cross-market violative activity more quickly, provide regulators more fulsome access to unprocessed data and timely and accurate information on market activity, and provide CAT Reporters with long term efficiencies resulting from the increase in surveillance capabilities); *see also* Section V.E.2.c, *supra.*

[2873] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.8(b). The Participants surveyed the 10 exchange-operating SRO groups on surveillance downtime. In conversations with Commission staff, the Participants informed Staff that average surveillance downtime was 0.03% from August 1, 2014 to August 31, 2015, and ranged from 0 to 0.21% across SROs.

[2874] *Id.*

[2875] *See* Section VI.E.2, *supra.*

[2876] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(C) (discussing benefits of CAT to broker-dealers).

[2877] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section B.8(b).

[2878] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section B.9.

[2879] *See* Section VI.F.2, *supra,* for a discussion of duplicative reporting and whether broker-dealers would pass costs on to investors.

[2880] Examples of data requests for later-stage investigations could include commissions paid or locate identifiers.

[2881] The Commission acknowledged that this decrease in total number of data requests may be partially offset by an increase in the number of investigations in general, because enhanced surveillance is likely to detect more potentially violative activity that would need to be investigated.

[2882] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.8(b).

[2883] *See, e.g.,* Schelling, Thomas, ''The Strategy of Conflict: Prospectus for a Reorientation of Game Theory,'' *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* Vol. 2 No. 3 (1958); Ellsberg, Daniel, ''The Crude Analysis of Strategic Choices,'' *American Economic Review,* Vol. 51, No. 2 (1961).

violative behavior through both of these economic channels could improve market efficiency.[2884]

The Commission received a comment on the cost estimates of the CAT NMS Plan and its effects on increasing the efficiency of surveillance activities. The commenter agreed with the Commission's findings that the estimate of total implementation cost was accurate, however, the commenter stated that it is implausible that CAT would reduce surveillance costs by more than 40% while simultaneously improving the effectiveness of surveillance.[2885]

The Commission also received a comment on whether the CAT NMS Plan would increase the efficiency in detecting rule violations and subsequent gains to market efficiency due to the reduction in violative behavior.[2886] The commenter disagreed with the Commission's analysis of the Plan's effect on market efficiency due to the reductions in violative behavior, arguing that effectively and efficiently deterring violative behavior should be done by using a system other than the CAT, preferably the commenter's proposed system which involves the use of real-time analytics.[2887]

The Commission also received numerous comments on whether the retirement of duplicative reporting systems and the reduction in ad-hoc data requests would generate gains to efficiency. One commenter disagreed with the Commission's analysis of the effect of the Plan on the reduction in duplicative reporting and ad-hoc requests.[2888] Three commenters indicated that the period of duplicative reporting could also reduce the expected benefits of CAT.[2889] One of these commenters suggested that the Plan's timeline for the retirement of duplicative reporting does not provide the SROs with sufficient incentives to migrate surveillances to CAT, implying that there could be a reduction in the efficiency of surveillance.[2890] Another commenter emphasized the inherent complexities of dual reporting, and the impact that this would have on the efficiency and effectiveness of reporting during this period.[2891]

While the Participants did not directly respond to comments regarding efficiency, they did state that they expect cost savings as a result of moving surveillance operations from existing systems to the CAT.[2892]

The Commission considered these comments, the Participants' response, and modifications to the Plan, and is revising its analysis of the inefficiencies associated with duplicative reporting. The Commission is not revising its analysis or conclusions with regard to other aspects of efficiency.

First, the Commission disagrees with the commenter who raised concerns about the surveillance cost estimates. As discussed above, all 19 SROs [2893] responded to the Participants Study regarding cost estimates, and most SROs have experience collecting audit trail data as well as expertise in their business practices. Furthermore, the commenter provided no reasoning or estimates to indicate that the Participants are unable to reasonably estimate their current data reporting costs, and the Participants' Response Letter II confirms the anticipated cost savings described in the Notice. Therefore, the Commission continues to believe that the cost estimates in the Notice are accurate, and that the CAT NMS Plan would improve the efficiency of surveillance by fostering increased surveillance capacity; improved system speed, which would result in more efficient data analysis; and a reduction in surveillance downtime.[2894]

Second, the Commission disagrees with the commenter that stated that the CAT Plan would not improve market efficiency due to reductions in violative behavior, and that the Plan should adopt real-time analytics. The Commission continues to believe that real-time analytics are not necessarily required to reduce violative behavior. Analysis of raw data on T+1 and corrected data after T+3 can reveal violative activity nonetheless.

Third, regarding the commenter who seems to imply that the Commission attributes savings in surveillance costs solely to the reduction in ad-hoc data requests, which is not the case. As discussed in the Notice, the Commission believes that it is possible that Participants and the Commission could realize efficiencies from having data standardized and centrally hosted that could allow them to handle fewer ad hoc data requests. In addition, the Plan could allow Participants and the Commission to automate some surveillance processes that may currently be labor intensive or processed on legacy systems, which could reduce costs because the primary driver of these costs is FTE costs.[2895]

The Commission agrees with the commenters that suggested that the period of duplicative reporting could be associated with reduced benefits from the Plan. In particular, the Commission now acknowledges that in addition to involving significant costs, the period of duplicative reporting would be associated with reduced benefits in the form of potentially lower data quality and potential loss of efficiency and effectiveness of reporting in the short-term. Examples of losses in efficiency could include conflicting field definitions in CAT and OATS; differences in required corrections to the same errors across two different systems; and contention for the same reporting resources applied across two or more systems.[2896]

Regarding the comment that SROs lack incentives to retire duplicative reporting systems, the Commission notes that the requirement that SROs implement surveillance using the Central Repository within 14 months of the Effective Date limits the incentives for the SROs to delay retiring duplicative systems because they will gain the capability of performing surveillance within CAT. However, the Commission acknowledges that small Industry Members will not yet be reporting to the Central Repository when the SROs gain this capacity. Consequently, SROs will by necessity be performing surveillance on data other than CAT Data until small Industry Members are reporting to the Central Repository and their CAT Data quality allows adequate surveillance using CAT Data. As discussed in Participants' Response Letter II, as the Participants face significant costs in running duplicative systems, and to the extent that such systems are extraneous for regulatory purposes, the Participants would desire to cease their operation.[2897] Consequently, the Commission believes the SROs are incented to retire these duplicative systems and move surveillance solely to

[2884] The implicit assumption here is that violative behavior receives diminishing marginal gains and generates increasing marginal harm. *See, e.g.,* Becker, Gary and William Landes, ''Essays in the Economics of Crime and Punishment,'' Columbia University Press (1974).

[2885] Data Boiler Letter at 38.

[2886] Data Boiler Letter at 10, 35.

[2887] Data Boiler Letter at 10–13, 33, 38.

[2888] Data Boiler Letter at 38–39.

[2889] FIF Letter at 29–30; SIFMA Letter at 5; DAG Letter at 2.

[2890] SIFMA Letter at 5.

[2891] FIF Letter at 30.

[2892] Response Letter II at 16.

[2893] At the time of the Participants Study, there were 19 SROs. All responded to the study. *See* Section V.F.1.b, *supra* for discussion of the Participants Study and changes to cost estimates to account for additional Participants.

[2894] *See supra* note 2873.

[2895] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30711.

[2896] FIF Letter at 30.

[2897] Response Letter II at 20.

the Central Repository as quickly as feasible.

After considering these comments and responses from the Participants, potential changes in the Plan, the Commission has updated its analysis of the effects of duplicative reporting on efficiency. First, the Commission has updated its estimate of the expected duplicative reporting period and now believes that it is likely to be shorter than estimated in the Notice.[2898] This would potentially result in the Commission and SROs realizing gains to efficiency earlier than what was stated in the Notice. Second, as discussed previously, the Commission now acknowledges that duplicative reporting may not result in efficiencies with duplicative reporting costs of less than $1.7 billion.[2899] Furthermore, the Commission now believes that the period of duplicative reporting may create inefficiencies, such as contention for the same reporting resources to correct errors across two different systems, and that might reduce the quality of data being reporting to CAT during the period of duplicative reporting.[2900] Regardless of the loss in efficiency due to duplicative reporting, the Commission nonetheless believes that the Plan will result in long-term gains to efficiency for the reasons stated earlier in this Section.

b. Effects of Certain Costs of the Plan on Efficiency

In the Notice, the Commission discussed the fact that the Plan anticipated that the implementation of CAT will introduce new costs related to data mapping and data dictionary creation, and add new expenditures, such as staff time for compliance with encryption requirements associated with the transmission of PII.[2901] While the Commission recognized these are additional activities and costs that the Plan would require, it viewed these as additional costs rather than inefficiencies. While the Commission could not quantify the magnitude of these costs, it viewed these as having a relatively minor contribution to overall costs of the Plan because they impose technical requirements on systems that the industry will need to significantly alter to comply with other provisions in the Plan.[2902] Commenters did not provide any additional information or analysis that the Commission believes would warrant changes to its analysis or conclusions regarding these costs and therefore continues to view these as costs rather than inefficiencies

Additionally, the Commission discussed the Plan's statement that there could be a market inefficiency effect related to the funding proposal for the Plan. The Plan indicated that the Funding Model for the Plan could create disincentives for the provision of liquidity, which could impair market quality and increase the costs to investors to transact.[2903] The Commission discussed in the Notice two ways that the cost allocation methodology could negatively impact efficiency. First, data reporters could respond to the Funding Model by taking actions to limit their fee payments, such as exiting the market or reducing their activity levels. Second, the funding proposal for the CAT NMS Plan to align fees closely with the amounts that are required to cover costs could create incentives for the Plan Processor or Operating Committee to propose a cost schedule for the CAT that matches a given fee schedule, but is not the most efficient cost schedule for meeting CAT's regulatory objectives.

The Commission received a comment about the concerns the funding proposal in the Plan poses for liquidity provision.[2904] This comment echoed the concerns the Commission discussed in the Notice. The Participants responded to this comment and noted that they actively considered the market quality concerns in devising the proposed funding model, and one of the reasons for proposing a tiered, fixed fee funding model was to limit the disincentives to providing liquidity to the market. In particular, the Participants believed that a funding model based on message volume was far more likely to affect market behavior.[2905]

In response to this comment, the Commission notes that it is amending the Plan to require the Participants to provide the Commission with a report on the impact of tiered-fees on market liquidity, including an analysis of the impact of the tiered-fee structure on Industry Members' provision of liquidity 36 months after effectiveness of the Plan.[2906] While the Commission continues to recognize that negative effects on efficiency could result from the Funding Model, for the reasons discussed in Section IV.F above, the Commission is approving the Funding Model as amended by the Commission.[2907]

3. Capital Formation

a. Enhanced Investor Protection

In the Notice, the Commission examined the potential effects on capital formation discussed in the Plan in addition to other potential effects on capital formation that the Commission believed could result if the Plan is approved.[2908] The Plan's analysis regarding capital formation concluded that the Plan would generally not have a deleterious effect on capital formation and could bolster capital formation that could lead to increased investor participation in capital markets. The Commission agreed with the rationale of the Plan's analysis, but addressed some additional considerations regarding the scope of the Plan's effects on capital formation, as well as the channels through which these effects could accrue. The Commission preliminarily believed that the Plan would have a modest positive effect on capital formation.[2909]

The Plan's analysis stated that the Plan may improve capital formation by improving investor confidence in the market due to improvements in surveillance. As discussed previously,[2910] in the Notice the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the Plan would provide substantial enhancements to investor protection through improvements to surveillance, particularly for cross-market trading.[2911] Improved surveillance, as well as other regulatory activities, could decrease the rate of violative activity in the market, reducing investor losses due to violative activity. If investors expect fewer losses, this may increase capital formation by facilitating a market where investors could be more likely to mobilize capital into securities markets.

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the CAT NMS Plan could provide additional increases to capital formation in the form of improved allocative efficiency of existing capital within the industry. If investors perceive an environment of improved surveillance,

[2898] *See* Section V.F.2.b, *supra.*

[2899] *Id.*

[2900] *See supra* note 2896.

[2901] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30748.

[2902] *See* Section VI.G.2.a, *supra.*

[2903] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.8(b).

[2904] SIFMA Letter at 16–17.

[2905] Response Letter II at 16.

[2906] *See* Section IV.F.3., *supra.*

[2907] *See* Section IV.F, *supra.*

[2908] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30748–49.

[2909] *Id.* at 30748–50.

[2910] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.E.2.c(1); *see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(ii)(B)(1)–(2), B.7(b)(iii)(C).

[2911] FINRA currently provides cross-market surveillance, but limitations in the data (*e.g.,* reliable cross-market linkages, customer identification, parent order identification) limit the scope and reliability of this surveillance.

they could be willing to allocate additional capital to liquidity provision or other activities that increase market efficiency. Further, an environment of improved surveillance could result in the reduction of capital allocated to violative activities that impose costs on other market participants, because these market participants may no longer find it desirable to engage in behavior that exposes them to regulatory action.

The Commission explained, however, that market participants engaging in allowable activity that might be subject to additional regulatory scrutiny under the Plan could allocate capital to other activities to avoid this scrutiny, because even when activity is not violative, interacting with regulators can be costly for market participants.[2912] This reallocation away from allowable activity to avoid regulatory interactions could result in capital allocations that are less efficient.

The Plan stated that the costs from CAT are unlikely to deter investor participation in the capital markets.[2913] The Commission noted, however, that the final costs of the Plan and the Funding Model for CAT are not wholly certain at this time; thus, it is the Commission's view that there is uncertainty concerning the extent to which investors will bear Plan costs and consequently to what extent Plan costs could affect investors' allocation of capital. Despite these potential costs to investors, the Commission noted that investors could believe that any additional benefits they receive from the potential of a market that is more effectively regulated justify any additional costs they pay to access capital markets.

The Commission received several comments on whether the Plan would improve capital formation through investor protection against abusive behavior, and by fostering investor participation. One commenter stated that the Commission needs the CAT Plan not only to understand breakdowns in trading markets, but also to rid the markets of increasingly abusive trading practices. Doing this will protect investors, and foster investor participation, thereby fueling capital formation.[2914] Another commenter disagreed with the Commission's analysis and concluded that the Plan could adversely impact investors' trust in the markets because the Plan lacks connection with real-world problems (*i.e.,* huge investment losses can be accumulated within a split-second; market collapse does not take more than one day; abusive use of financial engineering techniques to synthetically create trades/derivatives to bypass controls).[2915]

In response to the commenter who mentioned that the Commission needs the CAT Plan to not only understand breakdowns in trading markets, but also rid the markets of abusive trading practices, the Commission has noted previously that CAT Data would help regulators with analysis and reconstruction of market events, and also help regulators identify violative behavior and abusive trading through their enforcement investigations.[2916]

The Commission also disagrees with the commenter who concluded that the Plan could adversely impact investors' trust in the markets because the Plan lacks a connection with ''real-world problems.'' The Commission believes the Plan has a connection with these ''real-world problems'' because as stated above, CAT Data would help regulators analyze and reconstruct markets,[2917] thereby helping them understand how split-second losses accumulate to investors and the underpinnings of market collapses. CAT Data would also help regulators with surveillance and investigation activities,[2918] and potentially help them to understand the abusive use of financial engineering techniques. The Commission therefore believes that the benefits that CAT Data would provide regulators would also provide benefits to investors of a safer environment for allocating their capital and making financial decisions.

Moreover, the changes to the Plan further support the Commission's preliminary conclusions. Requiring Industry Members to report their LEI to the Central Repository if they have one should result in a greater ability for regulators to identify traders based on their Customer-IDs for the purposes of SRO surveillance. Potentially improved data completeness in terms of Customer-IDs could result in greater benefits to surveillance that would spillover to capital formation than stated in the Notice.

b. Data Security

In the Notice, the Commission agreed with the Plan's assessment that data security concerns are unlikely to materially affect capital formation.[2919] In its discussion of capital formation, the Plan recognized that data security concerns could potentially impact capital formation through market participants' perception that sensitive proprietary data might be vulnerable in case of a data breach at the Central Repository. The Plan's analysis discussed the security measures that are required by Rule 613 and the manner in which they have been implemented in the Plan. It concluded that these security measures are sufficient and that it is unlikely market participants would reduce their participation in markets in a manner that would affect capital formation. The Commission agreed that concerns regarding data security are unlikely to substantially affect capital formation, but that some uncertainty about the risks exist because of the variations in the potential security solutions and their resulting effectiveness.[2920]

In the Notice, the Commission discussed how the consequences of a data breach, nonetheless, could be quite severe. A data breach could substantially harm market participants by exposing proprietary information, such as a proprietary trading strategy or the existence of a significant business relationship with either a counterparty or client. The Commission noted, however, that broker-dealers already bear such risks in transmitting regulatory data to SROs and the Commission. The Commission believed that the marginal increase in the risks to broker-dealers associated with a data breach would be unlikely to deter broker-dealers from participating in markets. Finally, the Commission noted that a data breach could potentially reveal PII of investors. To address the potential for harm to the investing public and the health of capital markets through such a breach, the Plan has enhanced requirements for security around PII. The Commission believed that the risk of a breach of PII data would not materially affect investors' willingness to participate in markets because they already face these risks with PII shared with broker-dealers, though not in one centralized location.

Several commenters wrote about data security, and the comments are summarized above in Section IV.D.6. Only one commenter discussed the

[2912] *See* Section V.E.2.c., *supra,* for a discussion of the potential for the efficiencies in surveillance, examinations, and investigations to increase the number of regulatory actions, including investigations of conduct that turns out not to violate laws or regulations.

[2913] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.8(c).

[2914] Better Markets Letter at 3.

[2915] Data Boiler Letter at 39.

[2916] *See* Section V.E.2.c(1), *supra;* Section V.E.2.c(3), *supra.*

[2917] *See* Section V.E.2.a., *supra.*

[2918] *See* Section V.E.2.c., *supra.*

[2919] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30749–50.

[2920] *Id.* at 30749.

effects of data security on capital formation. That commenter asserted that ''[i]f investors perceive that the CAT NMS plan leaves their trading strategies and position information vulnerable to discovery and predatory use, interest in equity investing may decrease to the detriment of liquidity and, ultimately, capital formation.'' [2921] The Commission agrees that investors are sensitive to the protection of their data. The Plan amendments and Participants' responses to comments provide more details about the required security provisions and more clarity on the applicability of Regulation SCI standards. The Commission believes that these changes should increase the security of CAT Data, and that concerns regarding data security are unlikely to affect capital formation substantially even though there may still be uncertainty regarding potential security solutions and their effectiveness.[2922]

4. Related Considerations Affecting Competition, Efficiency and Capital Formation

The Commission in the Notice recognized that the Plan's likely effects on competition, efficiency, and capital formation are dependent to some extent on the performance and decisions of the Plan Processor and the Operating Committee in implementing the Plan, and thus that there is necessarily some uncertainty in the Commission's analysis.[2923] The Commission noted that nonetheless, it believed that the Plan contains certain governance provisions, as well as provisions relating to the selection and removal of the Plan Processor, that mitigate this uncertainty by promoting decision-making that could, on balance, have positive effects on competition, efficiency, and capital formation.[2924]

a. The Efficiency of the Plan

(1) Plan Decision-Making Process

The Commission in the Notice stated its preliminary belief that certain governance provisions in the Plan could create inefficiencies in the decision-making process, but that these inefficiencies are limited or exist to promote better decision-making.[2925] Specifically, the Notice stated that the Plan specified three types of voting protocols and when each protocol applies: Unanimous voting (only in three circumstances), supermajority voting (in instances considered by the Participants to have a direct and significant impact on the functioning, management, and financing of the CAT system), or majority voting (other, routine matters that arise in the ordinary course of business; as a practical matter the default standard).[2926] The Commission discussed how the Plan's voting protocols balanced the efficiency of the decision-making process against the value of considering minority and dissenting opinions. Furthermore, the Commission stated its preliminary agreement with the Plan's discussion of the need to balance efficiency in the voting protocols in the Plan and the Participants' conclusion that the inefficiencies in the voting protocols in the Plan are limited enough to strike a balance between the inefficiencies of the decision-making process and the quality of the decisions.[2927]

The Commission further noted that the Plan discusses the role of industry representation as part of the governance structure.[2928] The Commission preliminarily agreed with the discussion in the Plan that including industry representation might result in a more efficiently designed CAT, but that an Advisory Committee also adds operational inefficiencies.[2929] The Commission further stated its preliminary belief that as long as the Advisory Committee adds sufficiently useful information, the benefits from the Advisory Committee would justify any operational inefficiencies from the inclusion of the Advisory Committee.[2930]

The Commission is not revising its analysis of the efficiency of the Plan's decision-making process at this time. As discussed above, commenters provided information on concerns about current NMS Plan governance and made suggestions on how to more effectively include the Advisory Committee in decisions.[2931] However, these commenters did not provide new insights into the efficiency of the decision-making process itself. As noted above, changes to plan governance to provide greater prominence to certain views could improve plan decision-making, to the extent that better-informed decisions would be superior decisions; on the other hand, larger or more diverse sets of voices could result in deadlocked or delayed decisions, which would impede the efficiency of the decision-making process under the CAT Plan. However, as noted above, the Commission is considering changes more broadly to NMS Plan governance, and any such changes may impact the CAT NMS Plan.[2932]

(2) Level of Detail in the Plan

The Commission in the Notice also considered an additional source of potential inefficiencies: Minimum standards for particular provisions or solutions in Appendix D of the Plan, rather than a specification of the solutions themselves in the Plan.[2933] The Commission stated that while this approach creates uncertainties surrounding the economic effects of the Plan in the approval process, it also means that the Operating Committee and/or Selection Committee would effectively decide upon the unspecified details when selecting the Plan Processor and when approving the Technical Specifications, and as a result could act much more quickly and at a potentially lower cost than if solutions were specified in the Plan.[2934] In addition, the Commission explained why specifying details in the Technical Specifications instead of the Plan could make the Plan more agile and efficient in its ability to upgrade and improve the CAT Systems quickly.

Several commenters sought to have certain definitions included in the Plan.[2935] Two commenters sought to have the Plan amended to specify certain of the Technical Specifications.[2936] Participants commented that incorporating Technical Specifications in the Plan itself would interfere with the development of these specifications by the Plan Processor, and that these items are better suited for the Technical Specifications than the Plan.[2937] In a similar context, Participants also stated that subjecting Technical Specifications to a full filing process with the Commission would introduce significant delays in the process of developing the Technical Specifications, but that matters that are sufficiently significant to require a

[2921] ICI Letter at 3.

[2922] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30749.

[2923] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30750; *see also* the discussion of the CAT governance structure in Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.E.4.d, *supra.*

[2924] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30750.

[2925] *Id.*

[2926] *Id.*

[2927] *Id.* at 30750–51.

[2928] *Id.* at 30751.

[2929] *Id.*

[2930] *Id.*

[2931] *See* Section V.E.3.d(2)B, *supra.*

[2932] *Id.*

[2933] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30751

[2934] *Id.*

[2935] TR Letter at 9–10; FIF Letter at 95–96; SIFMA Letter at 6.

[2936] TR Letter at 5; UnaVista Letter at 2; *see also* Bloomberg Letter at 6–7 (recommending that Section 6.3 of the Plan be amended to specify the use of a uniform, global, open, multi-asset identifier; suggesting one such identifier developed by the commenter).

[2937] Response Letter I at 40.

change to the Plan would be subjected to Commission review.[2938]

The Commission believes that commenters' requests that certain items be defined in the Plan are an implicit assertion that the Plan strikes the wrong balance with respect to the tradeoff identified in the Notice. In the Notice, the Commission was willing to accept the uncertainty created through the lack of definitions, in exchange for the benefits of permitting the relevant parties the flexibility to adopt the definitions or technical specifications at a later date, when the optimal approach to those issues might be more apparent, along with the flexibility to readily make changes to those items if challenges arise. By requesting that definitions or technical specifications be moved to the Plan, commenters advocate the opposite position: That it is acceptable to risk an inefficient definition in the Technical Specifications now, or to encounter delay or difficulty in changing it later, in exchange for added certainty in the definition or specifications as a part of the Plan approval process. The Commission disagrees. Given the technical nature of the technical specifications, and that the Plan does specify certain minimum standards that provide a floor and therefore certainty with respect to at least certain of the definitions and specifications, the Commission continues to believe that the existing process appropriately balances the need for certainty with the benefits of a flexible process going forward.

(3) Implementation Efficiency

In the Notice, the Commission recognized that provisions of the Plan should also promote efficiently implementing expansions to the CAT Data.[2939] Appendix C of the Plan notes that the Plan Processor must ensure that the Central Repository's technical infrastructure is scalable and adaptable.[2940] The Commission explained that these provisions should reduce the costs and time needed for expansions to the Central Repository.

Two commenters provided information relevant for the Commission's analysis of the efficiency of the initial implementation of the Plan more broadly.[2941] In particular, the commenters expressed concerns that the timeline for implementation, including the testing and publication and iterative reviews of the Technical Specifications, would not allow for efficient implementation, potentially affecting the quality of the data coming to CAT from the beginning of its operations.[2942] One commenter stated that building in additional capacity and flexibility to expand CAT further over time will increase the scope of efficiencies and ancillary benefits, including long-term cost reductions, even if that additional capacity and flexibility are not absolutely necessary to meet minimum Plan requirements.[2943] Other commenters asserted that the Plan Processor selection should occur before Commission approval of the Plan, because the selection could negate a significant amount of uncertainty regarding the ultimate effects of the Plan.[2944]

Participants responded to the technical specifications point by stating that they recognize the benefit of iterative interactions between broker-dealers and the Plan Processor in terms of developing and executing final system specifications, which is why Appendix C of the Plan calls for the publication of iterative drafts, as necessary.[2945] Participants responded to the comments regarding acceleration of Plan Processor selection by indicating that it would be infeasible to do so from a timing perspective; that the requirements of the CAT could change up until the point the Plan is approved, which could affect the selection process; and that selection is to be performed within two months of Plan effectiveness in any event.[2946]

The Commission considered the comments and the Participants' responses and now recognizes that the timeline for implementation can affect the efficiency of the initial implementation of the Plan. The timeline for implementation in the Plan includes a requirement for the Plan Processor to develop the Technical Specifications by publishing iterative drafts, as needed, and to publish the Technical Specifications one year before Industry Members are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository, and to commence testing of connectivity and acceptance three months before Industry Members begin reporting data to the Central Repository.[2947] The Plan has also been amended to require that the development of the Technical Specifications will begin no later than fifteen months before Industry Member reporting commences. Furthermore, the Plan has been amended to require that the CAT testing environment will be made available to Industry Members on a voluntary basis no later than six months prior to when Industry Members are required to report and that more coordinated, structured testing of the CAT system will begin no later than three months prior to when Industry Members are required to report data to CAT.[2948]

The Commission believes that the modification to the Plan requiring development of Technical Specifications at least 15 months before reporting begins will ensure more advance notice to the Participants about specific functionalities of CAT, and that this could potentially mitigate inefficiency in the implementation of the Plan. Moreover, modifications to the Plan requiring that the CAT testing environment be made available to Industry Members before they begin reporting will provide additional time for Industry Members to test their reporting procedures for the CAT System prior to implementation. They will also further mitigate inefficiencies related to the implementation of the Plan.[2949] Further, as explained below, the Commission understands that the Bids of the three remaining Bidders propose accepting existing messaging protocols (*e.g.,* FIX), rather than requiring CAT Reporters to use a new format.[2950] This reduces some of the uncertainty regarding implementation times because CAT Reporters may not

[2938] *Id.* at 42.

[2939] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30751.

[2940] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.5(a).

[2941] SIFMA Letter at 23–24; FIF Letter at 37 (requesting two iterative reviews of order data and customer information specifications before implementation; noting that the 5 months allotted between the production of the customer information specification and implementation for large industry members is similarly insufficient to permit development and testing of a complex new function).

[2942] *Id.* Per one commenter, an aggressive timeline that results in ''[r]ushing to achieve artificial milestones established without knowledge of the development effort involved, or even the full functionality to be delivered, will only result in poorly built systems, inferior quality of data reporting, missed and delayed schedules and cost overruns, for the Plan Processor, the regulators and the broker-dealer community.'' *See also* FIF Letter at 36.

[2943] SIFMA Letter at 5–6. The commenter mentioned that such additional capacity and flexibility could be in the form of information, products, or functionality.

[2944] TR Letter at 4; *see also* FSR Letter at 10 (recommending ''acceleration of the Plan Processor selection process'' in order to begin moving forward with formulation of technical specifications; ''the release of final technical specifications should drive the implementation timeline'').

[2945] Response Letter I at 41.

[2946] Response Letter I at 52.

[2947] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section C.10.

[2948] *See* Section IV.D.8.a, *supra.*

[2949] *See* Section IV.D.8, *supra,* for further discussion of the comments regarding implementation and the Commission's response.

[2950] *See* Section V.H.12.b, *supra.*

need to build new systems to report data to the Central Repository.

In response to the comment on building in additional capacity and flexibilities to expand further over time, the Commission believes that this comment is consistent with its analysis in the Notice that ensuring that the Central Repository's technical infrastructure is scalable and adaptable should reduce the costs and time needed for future expansions. Further, the Commission believes that provisions in the Plan already address this issue.[2951]

With respect to accelerating the selection of the Plan Processor, this could trade one potential inefficiency for another: Whereas there could be greater certainty about the effects of the Plan by locking in certain choices in advance, locking in those choices could result in inefficiencies if modifications to the Plan in the approval process change the Plan Processor selection. As inefficiencies in the choice of the Plan Processor could persist for the length of the Plan Processor's tenure, the Commission believes selecting the Plan Processor a short number of months after the approval of the Plan balances the need for expeditiously moving forward with implementation choices to provide sufficient time for implementation with the need to select the Plan Processor best positioned to achieve the regulatory benefits of the Plan.

b. Selection and Removal of the Plan Processor

In the Notice, the Commission discussed the CAT NMS Plan's use of an ''RFP'' to select the Plan Processor that would design, build, and operate the Central Repository.[2952] The winning bidder becomes the sole supplier of the operation of the Central Repository. The Commission stated its preliminary belief that this structure is necessary to achieve the benefits of a single consolidated source of regulatory data, but that the competitiveness of the selection process would thus influence the ultimate economic effect of the Plan.[2953] The Commission further stated its preliminary belief that the selection process generally promotes competition, but that there are also a few potential limits on competition.[2954] With respect to the Plan Processor's behavior following selection, the Commission stated its preliminary belief that the threat of replacement of the Plan Processor could incentivize it to set costs and performance competitively, but that the high cost of replacing the Plan Processor could limit these incentives.[2955] These are discussed further below.

(1) Competitiveness of the Plan Processor Selection Process

In the Notice, the Commission stated its belief that two elements determine the competitiveness of the bidding process: The voting process and the degree of transparency in the bidding process. The Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the Plan provisions relevant to these two factors could promote competition in the bidding process and limit the risk that the selection of the Plan Processor would be affected by a conflict of interest, thereby promoting better decision-making.[2956] Specifically, the Commission noted that, in the voting process, there is ''a residual risk in having an SRO among the bidders; it is possible that voting Participants would be biased for or against that SRO because they compete with that SRO in another market (and could gain a competitive advantage in that market by acting as Plan Processor) or because of repeated interactions with that SRO.'' [2957] Moreover, the Commission noted that ''to the extent the Operating Committee has specific preferred solutions as to how the Plan should be implemented, the degree to which the Committee is transparent about those preferences in the bidding process would affect the competitiveness of that process''—but that ''[t]he Commission has no reason to believe that the Operating Committee has preferred solutions beyond what is in the Plan that would significantly impact the competitiveness of the Plan Processor selection process.'' [2958]

One commenter stated that, rather than a competitive process for selection of the Plan Processor, the selection of FINRA would best promote efficiencies, as it appears to have the required technology mostly in place, or can easily adapt existing technology to CAT's requirements; it already deals with the CAT Data; and it already regulates broker-dealers and ATSs that will submit data to the CAT.[2959] The Participants responded that completing the competitive process is most likely to promote an innovative and efficient CAT solution.[2960]

In the Commission's view, a competitive process for the selection of the Plan Processor is most likely to lead to the best outcome for the CAT. The commenter has raised a number of reasons why FINRA's bid may be the most persuasive. However, different approaches embodied in different bids would be expected to embody different tradeoffs. These tradeoffs can be considered as part of a competitive bidding process, with the best bid chosen in the end. The Commission believes that completing the competitive bidding process is most likely to result in a CAT system that best balances cost, benefits, and efficiencies.

(2) Competitive Incentives of the Selected Plan Processor

In the Notice, the Commission discussed how the Plan could create competitive incentives for the selected Plan Processor by detailing strong requirements for the Plan Processor and providing an efficient mechanism to remove the selected Plan Processor and introduce an alternative Plan Processor in the event of underperformance. Here, the Commission stated its preliminary belief that the Plan provides the selected Plan Processor with competitive incentives because the Plan contains defined procedures for monitoring and removing the Plan Processor for failure to perform functions or otherwise. While removal for performance that is not ''reasonably acceptable'' is by Majority Vote of the Operating Committee, assessing the Plan Processor's performance and demonstrating failings may be difficult; if that standard is not met, then removal is by Supermajority Vote, which may be more challenging to attain. The degree of difficulty of removal thus could limit the Plan Processor's competitive incentives. Similarly, the potentially extensive costs of switching to another Plan Processor (including selection of a new Plan Processor, which could potentially require rebuilding the Central Repository and implementation of new Technical Specifications) could limit competitive incentives.[2961]

[2951] *See* Section IV.D.15, *supra,* for further discussion of scalability of the Plan.

[2952] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30751

[2953] *Id.* It would do so because the ''effects depend in large part on the efficiency and effectiveness of the Plan Processor.'' *Id.*

[2954] *Id.*

[2955] *Id.* at 30752.

[2956] *Id.*

[2957] *Id.*

[2958] *Id.*

[2959] Anonymous Letter I at 1, 19–20.

[2960] Response Letter I at 52.

[2961] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30752–53. Specifically, with regard to removal, the Commission noted that ''[t]he Plan contains several provisions that would allow the Operating Committee to remove the Plan Processor''—including in specified circumstances by ''only a Majority Vote'' which ''incentivizes the Plan Processor to perform well enough to avoid being removed'' but that it ''depend[s] significantly on strong oversight by the Operating Committee.'' *Id.* at 30753. However, the Commission also noted that it ''recognizes that the effort required to remove a

One commenter expressed a view that the continuing incentives of the Plan Processor are a legitimate concern, and that the contract with the Plan Processor should be rebid every 5 years, because it would ''prevent the stagnation of the CAT system and encourage innovation'' and ''force the SEC to re-evaluate the performance of the system and the Plan Processor at least periodically, with the benefit of public input.'' [2962] The Participants responded by asserting that the Operating Committee will be reviewing Plan Processor performance, and may remove the Plan Processor by Supermajority Vote at any time, or by a Majority Vote where the Plan Processor has failed to reasonably perform its obligations.[2963]

The Commission has considered the views of the commenter on the competitive incentives of the Plan Processor and continues to believe that the Plan provides competitive incentives to control costs and promote the performance of the Plan. The commenter did not provide any additional information or analysis that the Commission believes would warrant changes to its analysis, nor does the Commission believe that the modifications to the Plan warrant changes to this aspect of the economic analysis. With respect to the comment that suggested rebidding every 5 years, the Commission agrees that a rebidding process after some period of time could provide a focal point for determining whether other technologies or other entities could be preferable to the incumbent Plan Processor. However, the existing provisions for removing a Plan Processor in the event of underperformance, and the existing authority of the Commission to oversee the CAT NMS Plan, already provide some incentives for continuous CAT innovation and cost reductions. Moreover, a bidding process is not a costless exercise; it requires hundreds or thousands of hours of work on the part of bidders to prepare and submit bids, and Plan Participants to review bids. Additionally, it is not clear whether the rebidding process sought by the commenter would consider the costs to switch as part of the incumbent's bid (in which case it would significantly advantage the incumbent), or would consider bids without reference to incumbency (which could result in the imposition of inefficient costs if the benefits of the new Plan Processor do not exceed the costs to switch).

H. Alternatives

As part of its economic analysis, the Commission has considered the likely economic effects of a number of alternatives to the approaches taken in the CAT NMS Plan as amended. In the Notice, the Commission analyzed alternatives that could have a direct and significant impact on costs or benefits deriving from at least one of the four data qualities discussed above: Accuracy, completeness, accessibility, and timeliness.[2964]

The Commission has considered the comments received on the alternatives discussed in the Notice, and continues to believe that the likely economic effects of the alternatives will be consistent with the preliminary conclusions set out therein, except where noted below.[2965] In several instances, the Commission did not receive any comments that disagreed with its analysis of the likely costs and benefits of a particular alternative, and the approach taken in the Plan with respect to these alternatives is consistent with the Commission's analysis. Where that is the case, the Commission has not discussed the alternative in this Order, and instead relies on the analysis in the Notice. These alternatives include: Requiring both Options Market Makers and Options Exchanges to report Options Market Maker quotations to the Central Repository; requiring CAT Reporters to report a unique Customer-ID for each Customer upon the original receipt or origination of an order; requiring CAT Reporters to report a universal CAT-Reporter-ID to the Central Repository for orders and certain Reportable Events; excluding the requirement to report Customer-IDs; excluding the requirement to report CAT-Reporter-IDs when a routed order is received; alternative intake capacity levels; data accessibility standards, and the exclusion of OTC Equity Securities.

Where commenters disagreed with Commission with respect to its analysis of an alternative approach, the Commission discusses the comments below and considers whether any changes are warranted to the Commission's analysis and conclusions. Where commenters agreed with the Commission's analysis, but the Plan's approach differs in some respect from the approach discussed by the Commission and the commenters, the Commission summarizes its analysis and the comments received, below. Where a Plan modification supersedes the alternatives discussed in the Notice, the Commission considers comments on those alternatives in the discussion of the costs and benefits of the Plan, above.

The Commission notes that some commenters also raised reasonable potential alternatives not discussed by the Commission in the Notice. If the Plan modifications do not incorporate the suggestions and the comment does not provide sufficient information for a fulsome economic analysis, the Commission responds to those comments above in the Discussion Section. If Plan modifications incorporate those suggestions, the Commission discusses the updates to its economic analysis to recognize the modification in the discussion of the costs and benefits of the Plan, above, and considers the points made by commenters therein.[2966] If the Plan modifications do not incorporate the suggestions and the comment does provide sufficient information for an analysis of the economic effects of the alternative, the Commission discusses the alternative below.

1. Timestamp Granularity

In the Notice, the Commission solicited comment on the benefits and costs of an alternative timestamp granularity requirement of less than one millisecond.[2967] The Commission's preliminary analysis of alternative clock offset tolerance requirements suggested that millisecond timestamps may be inadequate to allow sequencing of the majority of unrelated Reportable Events across markets.[2968] In addition, the Commission recognized that sub-millisecond timestamp reporting would bring certain benefits, but the benefits would be limited unless the Plan were to require a clock offset tolerance far lower than is proposed in the Plan. The Commission also recognized that implementation costs of sub-millisecond timestamps would likely vary across CAT Reporters, but such a requirement is unlikely to create significant additional costs for CAT Reporters.

Four commenters addressed this alternative. Three were supportive of the Plan, and one was supportive of the

Plan Processor could be significant'' and that ''significant switching costs could influence whether removing a Plan Processor despite poor performance makes economic sense''—such that ''the Plan Processor may only need to perform well enough to keep the inefficiencies associated with their performance from exceeding the cost to switch to another Plan Processor.'' *Id.*

[2962] Better Markets Letter at 7.

[2963] Response Letter I at 52.

[2964] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30754–76.

[2965] *Id.*

[2966] *See* Section IV., *supra.*

[2967] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30764–65.

[2968] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.E.1.b(2)B.

alternative.[2969] The commenters that supported the Plan generally indicated that one millisecond timestamps should be sufficient to sequence events.[2970] One of these commenters added that it would be very difficult, costly, and disruptive to change the timestamp granularity for broker-dealers and would involve expanding database fields, expanding application interfaces, logging files and managing to a clock offset lower than 50 milliseconds.[2971] This commenter focused primarily on broker-dealers while noting that exchanges already have more granular timestamps.[2972] Another commenter that supported the millisecond standard in the Plan stated it was ''okay'' to require this standard, but added, ''if certain categories of market participants can originate, modify, cancel, route, execute[,] trade, and/or allocate an order in substantially less than one millisecond, then they should record and report the time of each reportable event using timestamps reflecting their sub-millisecond or microsecond processing capability.'' [2973] The final commenter that supported the millisecond standard disagreed that CAT Reporters should be required to report more granular timestamps when the Reporter captures that level of detail in its normal practice. The commenter stated that such reporting would require changes to all layers of servers, software and databases between the point of timestamp capture to the final CAT reporting layer, and would be unnecessarily expensive.[2974] The commenter supporting more granular timestamps stated that there would be benefits in certain circumstances, stating that the Plan's timestamp resolution ''will be insufficient to show the precise time of the reportable activities'' and ''[f]or some practices, such as cancellations, stuffing, and other ''noisy'' behaviors . . . the Commission should require a more precise granularity to more comprehensibly and accurately capture the frequency and scale of such practices.'' [2975]

In their response to the comment on the costs of requiring more granular timestamps when the Reporter captures that level of detail in its normal practice, the Participants stated their belief that as additional CAT Reporters capture timestamps that are more granular than that required by the Plan, the quality of data reported to the CAT will increase correspondingly.[2976]

The Commission considered these comments and the Participants' response and now believes that the costs of requiring sub-millisecond timestamps could be significant for some broker-dealers, and also across broker-dealers, because the broker-dealer industry does not broadly apply sub-millisecond timestamps. In response to the commenters that stated that exchanges and certain other categories of market participants already may be capable of sub-millisecond timestamps,[2977] the Commission notes that if a CAT Reporter uses timestamps in increments finer than milliseconds, that CAT Reporter must use those finer increments when reporting to the Central Repository.[2978] Therefore, the Central Repository will capture finer timestamps in those cases. In response to the commenter who stated that the reporting of finer timestamps would be unnecessarily expensive for those Reporters who choose to capture finer timestamps, the Commission agrees that some Reporters may need to update their reporting systems to report these finer timestamps and therefore may incur additional costs. However, it is unclear to the Commission, and it was left unspecified by the commenter, how many CAT Reporters would need to update their systems and furthermore whether these Reporters would already be updating their systems in response to the Plan's millisecond reporting standard, so that only incremental costs above this standard should be considered. Finally, the Commission agrees with the Participants' stated view that the Plan provides for the quality of CAT Data to improve as CAT Reporters use more granular timestamps.[2979] However, because the broker-dealer industry does not broadly apply sub-millisecond timestamps, many CAT Reporters will use timestamps to the millisecond, and the Commission continues to believe that millisecond timestamps may be inadequate to allow sequencing of the majority of unrelated Reportable Events. The commenters supporting the Plan either state that one millisecond is ''okay'' or state that it is not possible to sequence ''all'' events regardless of timestamp granularity. The Commission acknowledges that seeking to sequence ''all'' unrelated Reportable Events may not be possible, but maintains, as discussed in the Notice,[2980] that a sub-millisecond timestamp could improve the ability to sequence the majority of orders, subject to limitations from the clock synchronization standard. However, the Commission is approving the Plan without modifying the requirements for timestamp granularity for the reasons discussed in Section IV.D.13, above.

2. Error Rate

In the Notice, the Commission solicited comments on the benefits and costs of alternative maximum Error Rates.[2981] While the Commission believed that most regulatory uses would involve data after T+5, the Commission noted that regulators also have essential needs for uncorrected data prior to T+5. Therefore, a lower Error Rate in data available before T+5 could, in certain regulatory contexts, be meaningful. Additionally, because OATS currently has a lower observed error rate than the rate in the CAT NMS Plan, a reduction in CAT Error Rates may accelerate the retirement of OATS. Further, the Commission noted that reducing Error Rates could increase the implementation and ongoing costs incurred by CAT Reporters and the Central Repository as compared to costs estimated in the Plan.

The Commission received five comments on the level of the error rates.[2982] Two commenters supported the CAT NMS Plan's initial maximum Error Rate of 5% for CAT Data reported to the Central Repository.[2983] One of these commenters stated, ''the proposed initial maximum error rate provides the appropriate level [of] flexibility while ensuring the data will be capable of being used to conduct market reconstruction.'' [2984] One of the commenters that supported the Plan's error rates conditioned the support on measuring the error rate using post-correction errors, but provided no explanation for the condition.[2985] Another commenter that supported measuring the error rate post-correction stated the alignment of interests—the reporters would have an interest in the quality of the data most important to regulatory activities—but supported a ''*de minimis*'' error rate goal over time, indicating that uncertainty prevents the

[2969] FIF Letter at 112; SIFMA Letter at 34–35; Better Markets Letter at 8; Data Boiler Letter at 21.

[2970] FIF Letter at 112; SIFMA Letter at 34–35; Data Boiler Letter at 21. FIF provided additional insight into event sequencing possibilities.

[2971] FIF Letter at 112.

[2972] FIF Letter at 112.

[2973] Data Boiler Letter at 21.

[2974] SIFMA Letter at 35.

[2975] Better Markets Letter at 8.

[2976] Response Letter I at 28–29.

[2977] FIF Letter at 112; Data Boiler Letter at 21.

[2978] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.3(c).

[2979] Response Letter I at 29.

[2980] *See* Notice *supra* note 5, at 30684–85.

[2981] *Id.* at 30765–66.

[2982] FSR Letter at 9; UnaVista Letter at 3–4; SIFMA Letter at 6; FIF Letter at 50; Better Markets Letter at 9.

[2983] FSR Letter at 9; UnaVista Letter at 3–4.

[2984] UnaVista Letter at 3.

[2985] FSR Letter at 9.

ability to predict when the Plan could achieve that goal.[2986] This commenter further stated that there are cost tradeoffs that CAT Reporters face when attempting to reduce their error rates. The commenter mentioned several methods that would increase the cost of implementation but that should decrease the overall yearly reporting cost for a Reporter and stated that Reporters will choose different approaches for correcting errors.[2987]

One commenter opposed the error rates in the Plan, arguing that they are too high,[2988] while the other two commenters expressed significant uncertainty associated with assessing the appropriate error rates.[2989] The commenter opposing the error rates in the Plan cited the industry's experience with OATS, while the commenters expressing uncertainty cited a lack of experience with reporting certain types of data (options, market making, customer information, and allocations) [2990] or by certain types of reporters (those with no regulatory reporting experience),[2991] steep learning curves to new reporting,[2992] and a lack of information in the Plan about the definition of an error and how it will be corrected.[2993]

Several commenters seemed to agree with the Commission that the error rates are important to retirement of duplicative systems, but that the specific error rate that could accelerate retirement is unknown.[2994] However, another commenter did not think that error rates should have a direct impact on system retirement.[2995]

Finally, one commenter opposed having different error rates for different types of CAT Reporters, stating that the Notice provided no compelling reason for excusing Small Industry Members from error rate requirements for the first two years while expressing an expectation that these reporters will account for a ''massive amount of data.'' [2996]

The Commission has considered these comments and acknowledges the significant uncertainty associated with the determination of an appropriate Maximum Error Rate, as identified by commenters.[2997] This uncertainty arises from the fact that the Plan requires the reporting of certain types of data that are not currently reported, the Plan requires reporting by certain participants that do not have experience with such reporting requirements, and the Plan has a lack of information about the definition of an error and how it will be corrected. The Commission notes, however, that provisions of the Plan could allow adjustment of error rates as more information becomes available, particularly during testing, and that adjustments could be up or down depending on the results of this testing.

In response to the commenter that suggested that the maximum error rate in the Plan should be lower and cited the industry's experience with OATS,[2998] the Commission reiterates what was mentioned in other comment letters and discussed above, that CAT reporting involves reporting certain types of data not currently reported and requires reporting by certain market participants that do not have experience with such reporting requirements, so that experience with OATS may not be applicable for CAT reporting. Therefore, the Commission continues to believe that reducing Error Rates in the Plan could increase the implementation and ongoing costs incurred by CAT Reporters and the Central Repository as compared to costs estimated in the Plan.

The Commission agrees with commenters who indicated the need to tie error rates to retirement of duplicative systems. The Commission believes that regulators may find it advantageous to retain other systems until CAT Data is at least as accurate as those systems, and therefore continues to believe that reducing the maximum error rate could accelerate their retirement. However, the CAT NMS Plan does not require a particular target Error Rate before other systems can be retired, so the Commission continues to be unable to assess the benefits of specific maximum error rates as they relate to system retirement.

In response to the comments suggesting that the Plan focus only on post-correction error rates, the Commission agrees that the post-correction error rates, which the Plan states will be *de minimis,* are most important to data quality, but retains the belief that lower pre-correction error rates could be meaningful. This is because, as discussed in the Notice, regulators also have essential needs for uncorrected data prior to T+5, although the Commission believes that most regulatory uses would involve data after T+5.

With respect to the comment that expressed concern that if small broker-dealers voluntarily report to CAT during the first two years of CAT operations, then the utility of CAT will be diminished because they would be permitted to report with limitless errors,[2999] the Commission disagrees with this interpretation of the CAT NMS Plan, as discussed above because the Maximum Error Rate would apply to anyone reporting to CAT, whether mandated to do so in accordance with the CAT NMS Plan or voluntarily.[3000]

3. Error Correction Timeline

In the Notice, the Commission solicited comment on an alternative error correction timeline to that proposed in the CAT NMS Plan.[3001] The CAT NMS Plan includes a deadline of T+3 for submission of corrected data to the Central Repository.[3002] The CAT NMS Plan also discusses recommendations from Financial Information Forum and SIFMA to impose an alternative T+5 deadline.[3003] The Participants state in the CAT NMS Plan that they believe it is important to retain the T+3 deadline in order to make data available to regulators as soon as possible.[3004]

In the Notice, the Commission solicited comment on whether the CAT NMS Plan should impose a T+5 deadline for the submission of corrected data rather than the T+3 deadline. The Commission preliminarily believed that the delays in regulatory access from a T+5 deadline would reduce regulators' ability to conduct surveillance and slow the response to market events relative to the CAT NMS Plan. At the same time, the Commission also believed that T+5 error correction might reduce costs to industry relative to the CAT NMS Plan, although the Commission was not aware of any existing cost estimates.[3005]

Two commenters disagreed with the T+3 error correction deadline proposed

[2986] FIF Letter at 51–52.
[2987] FIF Letter at 55–56.
[2988] Better Markets Letter at 9.
[2989] SIFMA Letter at 6; FIF Letter at 50.
[2990] FIF Letter at 50.
[2991] FIF Letter at 50.
[2992] SIFMA Letter at 6.
[2993] SIFMA Letter at 6; FIF Letter at 50.
[2994] SIFMA Letter at 6; FIF Letter at 50.
[2995] UnaVista Letter at 3.
[2996] Better Markets Letter at 9.
[2997] SIFMA Letter at 6; FIF Letter at 50.
[2998] Better Markets Letter at 9.
[2999] Better Markets Letter at 9.
[3000] *See* Section IV.D.10., *supra.*
[3001] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30766.
[3002] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iv).
[3003] *Id.* In earlier comment letters submitted to the Participants, FIF and SIFMA maintained that the T+3 deadline may not be feasible and would prove costly to market participants. *See* Letter from Manisha Kimmel, Managing Director, FIF, to the Participants, dated November 19, 2014, *available at http://www.catnmsplan.com/industryfeedback/p601972.pdf;* Industry Recommendations for the Creation of a Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT), SIFMA, March 28, 2013, *available at http://www.catnmsplan.com/industryfeedback/p242319.pdf.*
[3004] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iv).
[3005] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30766.

in the Plan.[3006] One of the commenters noted that the T+3 deadline ''appears too aggressive at this time,'' because ''the fact that roll-out of the CAT will include a sharp learning curve for broker-dealers and regulators as they understand and absorb the intricacies of [a] new and complex system such as the CAT.'' The commenter further stated that ''the CAT NMS Plan should be amended to maintain current error correction timeframes until CAT reporting errors are analyzed and better understood by broker-dealers and exchanges, and regulators.'' [3007]

Likewise, the second commenter maintained that the T+3 deadline may not be achievable until ''the CAT system and its support infrastructure can be proven stable, . . . a body of supporting documentation . . . can be developed and absorbed by the CAT Reporters'', and CAT reporting errors are analyzed and better understood.[3008] The commenter suggested that the current OATS approach, under which firms have five days from the date they receive notice of the error to submit a correction, should be kept in place for the first year of CAT reporting for each group of CAT Reporters. The commenter noted that ''a less aggressive, measured approach towards reduction in the error correction timeframe over time will produce better quality results, with less overall cost to the industry than the proposed approach.'' [3009] Under this commenter's suggested approach, the deadline for the submission of corrected data would be 8:00 a.m. on T+6, with corrected data available to regulators by 8:00 a.m. on T+8, consistent with the current OATS approach.[3010] One commenter stated that the current approach was ''feasible.'' [3011]

In their response, the Participants stated that they believe that the prompt availability of corrected data is ''imperative to the utility of the Central Repository,'' and that the three-day error correction period ''appropriately balances the need for regulators to access corrected data in a timely manner while taking into consideration the industry's concerns.'' [3012] The Participants acknowledged that a five-day window for error correction is used for OATS reporting currently, but stated their belief that the window in the Plan would allow for better regulatory surveillance and market oversight.[3013] The Participants also stated that, based on a review of OATS data from August 2016, most errors reported to OATS were corrected within six business days of submission (approximately 91.26% of error corrections), with 26.46% of error corrections occurring one day after submission, and 59.45% of error corrections occurring six days after submission (*i.e.,* on the rejection repair deadline).[3014] Additionally, approximately 0.48% of error corrections were made on the day of submission, approximately 4.86% of error corrections were made two to five days after submission, and the remaining approximately 8.75% of error corrections were made seven to 36 days after submission.[3015]

The Commission has considered the comments it received on whether the CAT NMS Plan should impose a T+5 deadline for the submission of corrected data, rather than the T+3 deadline, as well as the Participants' response.

The Commission recognizes that broker-dealers and regulators may face a learning curve as they adjust from the current OATS approach, under which firms have five days from the date they receive notice of the error to submit a correction, to the T+3 error correction deadline imposed by the Plan, which will allow firms approximately two days from the date they receive notice of the error to submit the correction.[3016] The Commission also recognizes that a T+5 deadline may be easier to achieve than the T+3 deadline, and therefore may be less costly. The Commission notes that, while the data provided by the Participants indicates that approximately 26% of error corrections currently are made on T+1, approximately 59% of OATS error corrections are currently made on T+6, the last day of the OATS error correction period, indicating that many OATS reporters will likely be required to change their error correction practices to achieve the T+3 deadline in the Plan. The Commission also recognizes that keeping a deadline of T+5 for the first year of CAT reporting for each group of CAT Reporters may potentially improve the quality of CAT Data during that year. However, the Commission believes that a T+5 deadline would reduce the timeliness benefits of the Plan by delaying regulatory access to CAT Data during that year. The Commission continues to believe that the delays in regulatory access from a T+5 deadline would reduce regulators' ability to conduct surveillance and slow the response to market events relative to the CAT NMS Plan, and would largely negate the timeliness benefits discussed above in connection with the error correction timeline.[3017]

4. Requiring Listing Exchange Symbology

In the Notice, the Commission solicited comment on an alternative to the CAT NMS Plan that would allow CAT Reporters to report using their existing symbologies, rather than listing exchange symbology.[3018] The Commission discussed its preliminary belief that, in light of the requirement for the Plan Processor to maintain a complete symbology database, the requirement that CAT Reporters report using listing exchange symbology may result in unnecessary costs to CAT Reporters. Therefore, the Commission preliminarily believed that the alternative of allowing CAT Reporters to use their existing symbologies for reporting purposes could significantly reduce the costs for exchanges and broker-dealers to report order events to the Central Repository, as compared to the approach in the CAT NMS Plan, without a significant impact on the expected benefits of the Plan or the costs to operate the Central Repository.

The Commission received three comments relevant to this alternative. One commenter stated that, ''in order to minimize cost and invasiveness to the industry,'' the Central Repository should accept existing symbology ''as-is'' rather than requiring listing exchange symbology.[3019] Another commenter stated that using listing exchange symbology was costly not only for equities, as discussed in the Notice,[3020] but also for options.[3021] The final commenter stated that, ''it would be more efficient to have the Central Repository manage the mapping tables in one place, as it is less error prone . . . than to have all reporting broker-dealers mapping to their separate tables,'' [3022] and that the use of existing

[3006] FIF Letter at 3, 9, 52–53; KCG Letter at 9.

[3007] KCG Letter at 9.

[3008] FIF Letter at 52.

[3009] FIF Letter at 53.

[3010] FIF Letter at 59–60.

[3011] UnaVista Letter at 4.

[3012] Response Letter I at 30.

[3013] Response Letter I at 30.

[3014] Response Letter III at 13. The letter states that the percentages were determined by FINRA based on a review of OATS data from August 2016.

[3015] Response Letter III at 13.

[3016] Under the Plan's approach, the deadline for the Plan Processor to validate customer data and generate error reports is 5:00 p.m. on T+1, and the deadline for the submission of corrected data is 8:00 a.m. ET on T+3. *See* Appendix C, Section A.1(a)(iv).

[3017] *See* Section V.E.1.d, *supra* (noting that corrected OATS data is currently available to FINRA by T+8, and that under the Plan, regulators will be able to access corrected CAT Data three days earlier).

[3018] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30769–70.

[3019] Data Boiler Letter at 37–38.

[3020] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30730.

[3021] Bloomberg Letter at 5.

[3022] FIF Letter at 95.

symbology ''does provide a data quality advantage.'' [3023] However, the commenter also stated that it did not expect the elimination of the requirement to use existing symbology to result in a large cost savings.[3024] While the commenter did not explain why the cost savings would be minimal, as discussed in the Baseline Section above, the Participants' response notes that broker-dealers currently use listing exchange symbology to report to OATS and existing messaging protocols do not necessarily use a standard symbology. Therefore, in the absence of such a requirement, CAT reporters might use ''bespoke'' symbologies to report that would be difficult for the Central Repository to map.

In the Participants' response, the Participants stated their belief that the requirement for CAT Reporters to use listing exchange symbology ''is the most efficient, cost-effective and least error prone approach to symbology,'' and that based on discussions with the DAG, it is their understanding that ''all Industry Members subject to OATS or EBS reporting requirements currently use the symbology of the listing exchange when submitting such reports.'' [3025] They further stated that allowing CAT Reporters to determine symbology would ''require each CAT Reporter to submit regular mapping symbology information to the CAT, thereby increasing the complexity and likelihood for errors in the CAT.'' [3026] However, the Participants stated that they ''understand that some industry messaging formats, such as some exchange binary formats, require symbology other than the primary listing exchange symbology,'' and that in these and similar cases, the Participants recommended that the Plan be amended to permit the use of the required symbology.[3027] The Participants also added that, based on their understanding of current practices, Industry Members currently employ technical solutions and/or systems that allow them to translate symbology in the correct format when submitting data to exchanges.[3028]

The Commission is revising its economic analysis of this alternative in light of the comments and the Participants' response. While commenters generally agreed with the Commission's analysis in the Notice, they seemed to indicate that the cost savings from a requirement to use existing symbology would not be large. Further, the additional baseline information in the Participants' response also suggests that the cost savings might not be significant. The Commission's analysis in the Notice hinged on the necessity of running an additional process on messaging protocol data prior to submitting the data. The Commission believed the cost savings and the data quality benefits would come from avoiding this additional process, which would need to be built and maintained and could add errors to the data. However, the Participants' response indicates that existing messaging protocols may already have integrated processes that translate symbols efficiently and accurately prior to routing to an exchange. While the Participants' response does not indicate that the messaging protocols translate symbols for other types of messages, the Commission presumes that the functionality should be transferable to other message types, including order originations and routes to other broker-dealers. Because this functionality operates for business purposes, broker-dealers have a strong incentive to ensure its accuracy. Therefore, the Commission no longer believes that eliminating the requirement to translate symbols would improve accuracy and significantly reduce costs. In addition, the Commission now believes that eliminating the requirement could result in an additional cost to the Central Repository and a potential reduction in accuracy because it could involve having to map ''bespoke'' symbologies into one standardized symbology.

5. Clock Synchronization Logging Procedures

In the Notice, the Commission solicited comments on an alternative that would require logging only exceptions to the clock offset (*i.e.,* events in which a market participant checks the clock offset and applies changes to the clock).[3029] While logging every event, including clock offset checks, may be cost effective with longer clock synchronization tolerances, the Commission questioned whether logging each event is cost effective with finer clock offset tolerances, given the large number of events expected for the proposed and alternative clock synchronization standards. The Commission explained that it could not quantify the reduction in costs from this alternative because it lacked data on the proportion of clock synchronization costs that are associated with event logging and the proportion of those costs that could be avoided by alternative event logging requirements. The Commission discussed its preliminary belief that any reduction in benefits from this alternative, as compared to the CAT NMS Plan's approach for clock synchronization, would be minor because the inclusion of clock synchronization checks that required no clock adjustment would not improve regulators' ability to sequence events. The Commission noted, however, that enforcement of clock synchronization requirements could be more difficult without comprehensive logging requirements that document firms' actions to comply with requirements; consequently, relaxing the logging requirement could also reduce incentives to comply with the clock synchronization requirements.

As discussed above,[3030] one commenter supported the alternative raised by the Commission that any requirement to maintain a log of clock synchronization events should only require logging of clock synchronization exceptions, not all clock synchronization events, noting that requiring logging of all events would be costly for some broker-dealers.[3031] However, the commenter did not provide any additional information that would allow the Commission to quantify the cost savings of logging only these events. Therefore, while the Commission continues to believe that there could be cost savings from logging only exceptions to the clock offset, the Commission remains unable to quantify the reduction in costs from this alternative. The Commission continues to believe that any reduction in benefits under this alternative approach would be minor, but that enforcement of clock synchronization requirements may be more difficult, which may reduce incentives to comply with the clock synchronization requirements.

6. Data Accessibility Standards

In the Notice, the Commission solicited comment on alternative approaches to the manner in which the CAT NMS Plan provides data access to regulators.[3032] The Commission discussed the requirements for regulatory access to the Central Repository, explaining that the CAT NMS Plan could result in many improvements to regulatory activities

[3023] FIF Letter at 95.

[3024] FIF Letter at 95.

[3025] Response Letter II at 7.

[3026] Response Letter II at 7.

[3027] Response Letter II at 7.

[3028] Response Letter III at 13.

[3029] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30764. This is one of the alternatives suggested in the FIF Clock Offset Survey. *See supra* note 247.

[3030] *See* Section IV.D.13, *supra.*

[3031] FIF Letter at 108, 122.

[3032] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30770.

such as surveillance, examinations, and enforcement, but that these benefits may not be fully realized if access to data is cumbersome or inefficient. The Commission solicited comment on each of the minimum data accessibility standards required in the Plan. The Commission also discussed several examples in particular, and requested comment on alternative standards that might be adopted in each case.

In the Notice, the Commission noted that the CAT NMS Plan requires query responses for various types of queries of 5 minutes, 10 minutes, 3 hours, and 24 hours, where the simplest queries involving scanning narrow sets of data would be required to return in 5 minutes and complex queries scanning multiple days of data and returning large datasets would be required to return within 24 hours. While the benefits of direct access to CAT Data depend on reasonably fast query responses, the Commission recognized that faster query response times come at a cost. The Commission stated that it did not have detailed information on significant breakpoints in those costs to judge whether slightly longer response times than those in the Plan could significantly reduce the costs of developing, maintaining, and operating the Central Repository. The Commission recognized that the detailed information on numerous other minimum standards regarding regulator access to CAT Data is similarly unclear. Therefore, the Commission requested comment regarding all standards for regulatory access and whether technology creates natural breakpoints in costs such that a particular alternative could reduce the costs of the Plan without significantly reducing benefits or could increase benefits without significantly increasing costs.

Commenters made a number of suggestions regarding data accessibility standards. One commenter stated that it was unclear whether the CAT would be able to support various types of data analysis by regulators within the Central Repository, and noted that, without that ability, all of the analyses must be done outside of the CAT Repository and within the regulators' own infrastructure, which would require bulk extraction and could lead to increased costs and security concerns due to the need to store multiple copies of CAT Data with various SROs.[3033] The commenter recommended that the Plan clearly specify the analytical capability requirements with respect to the Central Repository.[3034] Another commenter recommended that the CAT support real-time ingestion, processing and surveillance, and that the CAT provide regulators with access to real-time analytics.[3035] One commenter believed that the proposed model and timeframe for regulatory access is consistent with the Commission's regulatory objectives, but recommended the use of pre-defined extract templates and uniform global formats such as ISO 20022 to allow for exchange of data between both national and global regulators.[3036] That commenter also suggested that there should be an ability for regulators to perform analyses within the CAT environment, and that there should be flexible search/filtering capabilities.[3037]

In their response, the Participants stated that, with respect to the analytical requirements of the Central Repository, they believe the details in the Plan are sufficient, and noted that Section 8 of Appendix D of the Plan describes various tools that will be used for surveillance and analytics. They also noted that it would be ''counterproductive from a regulatory oversight perspective to provide significant detail regarding the surveillance processes of the regulators.'' [3038] With respect to real-time ingestion, processing, surveillance, and analytics, the Participants noted that Rule 613 does not provide for real-time reporting.[3039] With respect to pre-defined extract templates and uniform global formats, the Participants noted that the Plan requires data extracts to use common industry formats.[3040] The Participants also stated that they expect that the requests from regulators other than those regulators permitted access to the CAT (such as foreign regulators and other U.S. government agencies) will be on an ad hoc basis pursuant to applicable information sharing agreements, and would be accommodated on a case-by-case basis.[3041]

The Commission has considered the comments received and the Participants' response. With respect to the suggestion that the Plan clearly specify the analytical capability requirements with respect to the Central Repository,[3042] the Commission notes that, while the Plan provides detail on the method of access and the type of queries that regulators could run, many of the decisions regarding access have been deferred until after the Plan Processor is selected and finalizes the Technical Specifications. In particular, as discussed in the Notice, the details of functionality and performance of the final system are still to be determined.[3043] The Commission believes that an alternative approach that clearly specified the required analytical capabilities of the Central Repository would reduce the uncertainty with respect to the expected benefits of the Plan in terms of accessibility. However, the Commission does not have sufficient information to estimate the costs of requiring the Central Repository to provide specific analytical capabilities, because the Commission lacks information on the costs of building those capabilities into the Central Repository as opposed to using outside servers.

The Commission does not agree with the commenter that stated that an approach requiring bulk extractions by regulators is likely to increase the Participants' costs significantly relative to an approach whereby regulators perform analyses within the Central Repository.[3044] The Commission acknowledges that hosting large databases is costly, but it believes that SROs are likely to consider the cost implications when contemplating replicating large portions of the Central Repository within their IT infrastructure, and presumably will only replicate the data when it is efficient for them to do so.[3045] In response to the commenter that stated that frequent bulk extractions of data by regulators may result in an increased security risk,[3046] the Commission notes that, as discussed above,[3047] in order to extract, remove, duplicate, or copy CAT Data into their own local server environment, the Participants will be required to have policies and procedures regarding CAT Data security that are equivalent to those implemented and maintained by the Plan Processor for the Central Repository,[3048] and that each Participant must certify and provide evidence to the CISO of the Plan Processor that its policies and procedures for the security of CAT Data meet the same security standards applicable to the CAT Data that is reported to and collected and stored by the Central Repository. This

[3033] SIFMA Letter at 33.

[3034] SIFMA Letter at 33.

[3035] Data Boiler Letter at 1, 10.

[3036] UnaVista Letter at 4.

[3037] UnaVista Letter at 4.

[3038] Response Letter I at 42.

[3039] Response Letter I at 43.

[3040] Response Letter I at 43.

[3041] Response Letter I at 43.

[3042] SIFMA Letter at 33.

[3043] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30691.

[3044] SIFMA Letter at 33.

[3045] *See* Section V.F.1, *supra,* for further discussion of the costs of bulk downloads by the Participants.

[3046] *See* Section IV.D.6.f, *supra.*

[3047] *Id.*

[3048] *See* Section IV.D.6.o, *supra.*

requirement should mitigate any increased security risk associated with bulk extractions.

In response to the suggestion that the CAT NMS Plan incorporate real-time analytics,[3049] the Commission notes that this would require real-time reporting. As discussed further above,[3050] the Commission considered whether CAT Reporters should be required to report data in real-time when it adopted Rule 613 under Regulation NMS.[3051] While the Commission acknowledged that there might be advantages to receiving data intraday, it stated that the greater majority of benefits that may be realized from development of the CAT do not require real-time reporting.[3052] Further, the Commission recognized that not requiring real-time reporting upon implementation could result in cost savings for industry participants.[3053] The Commission therefore believes that any alternative approach that required real-time reporting would increase the costs of the Plan significantly. However, the commenter did not provide sufficient information to allow the Commission to further analyze the benefits and costs of this alternative.

The Commission agrees with the commenter that suggested that using pre-defined extract templates and uniform global formats such as ISO 20022 could have some benefits in terms of facilitating the exchange of data between national and global regulators. As the Participants note, the Plan requires data extracts to use common industry formats,[3054] but it does not require a particular format.[3055] However, as explained above and in Section IV.D.2, when selecting a Plan Processor, the Participants will consider whether a Bidder has proposed a format that is easily understood and adoptable by the industry, and the Commission believes that the message format decision must be made in connection with developing the overall architecture for CAT.

7. Clock Synchronization Hours

In the Notice, the Commission solicited comment on alternative requirements for the times during which clock synchronization is required that would provide more flexibility than the requirements of the Plan.[3056] The Commission discussed its preliminary belief that an alternative that does not require synchronizing clocks when servers are not recording Reportable Events or when precise timestamps are not as important to sequencing, such as outside of normal trading hours, would not materially reduce benefits. Given the responses to the FIF Clock Offset Survey, the Commission also stated that it preliminarily believed that this alternative could reduce costs, because synchronization activities and log entries related to those events would not be as beneficial outside of normal trading hours. The Commission noted, however, that it did not have information necessary to quantify the cost reduction from this alternative because cost information available to the Commission is not broken down by time of day or server status.

One commenter supported alternative clock synchronization hours, stating off-hours clock synchronization ''isn't needed from either a business or regulator perspective'' and that ''without this provision, firms would require additional off-hours staffing, or it will prevent the off-hours support staff from focusing on more pressing issues that need to be resolved during off hours.'' [3057] However, the commenter did not provide any additional information that would allow the Commission to quantify the potential cost savings. The Commission continues to believe that an alternative that does not require synchronizing clocks when servers are not recording Reportable Events or when precise timestamps are not as important to sequencing, such as outside of normal trading hours, would not materially reduce benefits. The Commission also believes that this alternative could reduce costs, but continues to lack the information necessary to quantify the potential cost reduction.

8. Primary Market Transactions

As set out in the Notice,[3058] the CAT NMS Plan does not require the reporting of any primary market information to the Central Repository. However, as required by Rule 613(i), the CAT NMS Plan commits to incorporating a discussion of how and when to implement the inclusion of some primary market information into a document outlining how additional Eligible Securities could be reported to the Central Repository (the ''Discussion Document''), which would be jointly provided to the Commission within six months after effectiveness of the Plan.[3059] Additionally, as required by Rule 613(a)(1)(vi), the Plan includes a discussion of the feasibility, benefits, and costs of including primary market transactions in the CAT NMS Plan.[3060] As explained in the Notice,[3061] the discussion in the CAT NMS Plan divides the primary market information into two categories: Information on top-account allocations and information on subaccount allocations. Top-account allocations refer to allocations to institutional clients and retail broker-dealers during the book-building process. Top-account institutions and broker-dealers make the subsequent subaccount allocations to the actual accounts receiving the shares. The Plan concludes that including information on subaccount allocations in the CAT would provide significant benefits without unreasonable costs, while including information on top-account allocations would provide marginal benefits at significantly higher costs.[3062]

As discussed in the Notice, the Plan states that ''the Participants are supportive of considering the reporting of Primary Market Transactions, but only at the subaccount level, and would incorporate analysis of this requirement, including how and when to implement such a requirement, into their document outlining how additional Eligible Securities could be reported to the Central Repository, in accordance with SEC Rule 613(i) and Section 6.11 of the Plan.'' [3063] The Plan therefore would limit the discussion of reporting primary market transactions in the Discussion Document to the subaccount level.

In the Notice, the Commission solicited comment on the alternative approach that would broaden the required scope of the discussion of primary market allocation information in the Discussion Document to include an analysis of incorporating both top-account and subaccount allocation information for primary market transactions into the CAT.[3064] To assess this alternative, the Commission examined the benefits and costs of ultimately including top-account

[3049] Data Boiler Letter at 1, 10.

[3050] *See* Section IV.D.3, *supra.*

[3051] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45765. Indeed, Rule 613 stated that the CAT NMS Plan may not impose a reporting deadline earlier than 8:00 a.m. ET. 17 CFR 242.613(c)(3).

[3052] *See* Adopting Release, *supra* note 14, at 45768.

[3053] *Id.* at 45769.

[3054] Response Letter I at 43.

[3055] For further discussion of the alternatives related to the data ingestion format, *See* Section V.H.12, *infra.*

[3056] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30764.

[3057] FIF Letter at 122–23.

[3058] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30772.

[3059] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section C.9. Section 6.11 of the Plan satisfies a requirement in 17 CFR 242.613(i) to plan for expansion.

[3060] 17 CFR 242.613(a)(1)(vi); CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.6.

[3061] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30772.

[3062] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.6(b)–(c).

[3063] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section A.6(c).

[3064] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30772.

allocations in the CAT. The Commission preliminarily believed that the potential benefits of including top-account allocation information in the CAT could be significant and that the costs of including top-account allocation information could be lower than what is described in the CAT NMS Plan and appropriate in light of significant potential benefits. For these reasons, the Commission preliminarily believed that top-account allocation information should not be excluded from the Discussion Document.[3065]

In the Notice, the Commission discussed several benefits of including top-account allocation information, in addition to subaccount allocation information, for primary market transactions in CAT. First, the Commission noted that top-account allocation information would be necessary to surveil for prohibited activities in the book-building process and would improve the efficiency of investigations into such prohibited activities. For example, examinations of ''spinning,'' ''laddering,'' and other ''quid pro quo'' arrangements would benefit from inclusion of top-account allocation information in CAT Data. Second, the Commission noted that top-account allocation information would provide very useful insights into IPO and follow-on allocations in market analysis and that such insights would help inform rulemaking and other policy decisions.[3066]

As discussed in the Notice,[3067] the CAT NMS Plan estimates that for broker-dealers to implement a system to record and report both top-account and subaccount allocation information for primary market transactions would cost $234.8 million, whereas implementing a system with only subaccount information would cost $58.7 million.[3068] The inclusion of top-account allocation information accounts for the difference of $176.1 million.

In the Notice, the Commission discussed its preliminary belief that the implementation costs of adding top-account allocation information may be lower than those estimated in the CAT NMS Plan, for several reasons. First, the Commission noted that, in combination with an alternative that would require less granular timestamps or a larger allowable clock offset on less time-sensitive systems, including the systems for reporting top-account allocation information, the costs for including top-account allocation information would be lower than indicated in the Plan. Second, the Commission noted that the Plan's estimate was sensitive to the number of underwriters. In particular, the estimates assumed that all underwriters participating in an offering would need to implement changes for top-account allocation information. In contrast, the Commission suspected that lead underwriters could have all of the information necessary to report the top-account allocation information. If so, then only the lead underwriters would need to implement systems changes to report top-account allocation information. Estimating costs only for lead underwriters could result in a much smaller estimate.[3069]

The Commission noted that it did not have an estimate of the ongoing costs of underwriters reporting top-account allocation information. However, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the reporting of primary market transactions would generate a total of 1.2 million CAT Reportable Events per year. The Commission noted that this total was much smaller than the number of Reportable Events in the secondary market (trillions). The Commission preliminarily believed that the ongoing costs of reporting primary market transactions would be a fraction of the ongoing costs of secondary market reporting and would likely be supported by staff already engaged to maintain CAT reporting.[3070]

The Commission received three comment letters that provided information relevant to the Commission's economic analysis of this alternative, though the comments focused more on the inclusion of primary market transactions in the initial phase of the Plan as opposed to in the Discussion Document. In particular, commenters provided information relevant to the baseline, benefits, and costs of the inclusion of top-account primary market information in the Plan.[3071]

Commenters provided information relevant to the current baseline of the underwriting process and primary market transaction records. One commenter documented significant diversity across underwriters in the volume of deals and workflows and provided more precise information on that diversity than included in the Notice or Plan.[3072] The commenter further stated that the processes that handle top-account allocations are very separate from the secondary market systems. Another commenter described three stages in the offering process: (1) Preliminary indications of interest, (2) final top-account allocation, and (3) subsequent subaccount allocations.[3073] Both commenters agreed that indications of interest in top-account allocations can change numerous times,[3074] but one commenter indicates the existence of a final top-account allocation (Stage 2) while the other does not.

Two commenters provided different perspectives on the benefits of including top-account allocation information in the Discussion Document. One commenter emphasized that many benefits could only be achieved by requiring the reporting of primary market transactions at both the top-account and the subaccount allocation levels.[3075] In particular, the commenter maintained that because lead underwriters were responsible for the top-account allocations, some abuses, such as ''spinning,'' ''laddering,'' ''quid pro quo,'' Rule 105 violations, and manipulation, could only be present in these allocations.[3076] Further, this commenter also stated that top-account information would facilitate analyses of the value of discretionary allocation in book-building for issuers. This commenter also indicated that final top-account allocations should be sufficient to achieve such benefits, while also indicating that information on the indications of interest was crucial for the understanding of the capital formation process and for designing efficient regulations that would facilitate capital formation without compromising investor protection.[3077] The other commenter believed that having only subaccount primary market allocation information is less valuable from a regulatory perspective than having both subaccount and top-account allocation information.[3078]

The Commission received three comment letters relevant to the costs of including top-account allocation information in the Plan. All three commenters indicated that it would be very costly to include top-account allocations in the Plan,[3079] but one

[3065] *Id.*

[3066] *Id.* at 30773.

[3067] *Id.*

[3068] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.6(c).

[3069] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30773.

[3070] *Id.* at 30773–74.

[3071] Commenters also provided general information on primary market transactions that could inform the Discussion Document. *See* FIF Letter at 118–20; SIFMA Letter at 36; Hanley Letter at 1–6.

[3072] FIF Letter at 118–19.

[3073] Hanley Letter at 4.

[3074] FIF Letter at 118; Hanley Letter at 4.

[3075] Hanley Letter at 4.

[3076] Hanley Letter at 4.

[3077] Hanley Letter at 5–6.

[3078] FIF Letter at 120.

[3079] FIF Letter at 120; Hanley Letter at 4; SIFMA Letter at 36.

commenter limited this conclusion just to the inclusion of indications of interest.[3080] According to the commenters, these costs generally stem from added complexity and a lack of standardization in book-building processes. Another commenter noted that top-account allocations would be less feasible to report than subaccount allocations and cited to information from the DAG.[3081] One commenter disagreed with the Plan's cost estimates of $176 million for including top-account allocation information in the Plan and provided an alternative estimate of $864,000 per year.[3082] Another commenter indicated that the Plan's estimates amounted to guesswork and that the $176 million estimate in the Plan does not contemplate reporting all the events in a deal's lifecycle, but does not indicate which events it does include.[3083]

Two commenters recommended additional analysis on some or all top-account allocation information, but neither specifically mentioned the Discussion Document. One commenter noted having little information about the requirements of reporting top-account allocation information and that subaccount allocation information is a good first step toward potentially collecting complete information on primary market activities that would allow time to study the complexities and difficulties associated with reporting top-account allocations.[3084] This commenter also attempted a further study of more generally including primary market information in the Plan but noted that the 60-day comment period did not permit a larger, more in depth study.[3085] Another commenter suggested considering an alternate reporting scheme for indications of interest other than CAT that better balances the costs of producing data indications of interest but does not diminish the usefulness of such data.[3086]

In their response, the Participants reiterated their support for the inclusion in the CAT of subaccount allocations in Primary Market Transactions, but not top-account allocations, and reiterated the conclusions from the Plan that reporting top-account allocations would likely impose significant costs to CAT Reporters while only providing a marginal additional regulatory benefit over subaccount allocation data.[3087] In response to comments regarding the scope of top-account allocation information, the Participants restated the definition in the Plan that top-account allocations are allocations to institutional clients or retail broker-dealers, which are conditional and may fluctuate until the offer syndicate terminates.[3088] The Participants did not respond to the comment that the cost estimates in the Plan do not contemplate reporting all events in a deal's lifecycle and did not further discuss why top-account allocation information should not be included in the Discussion Document.

The Commission is revising its analysis of the economic effects of including top-account primary market transactions in the CAT and thus of whether top-account allocations should be included in the Discussion Document in light of comments and the Participants' response. With respect to the benefits of including top-account allocation information, in addition to subaccount allocation information, in the CAT, none of the commenters disagreed with the Commission's analysis. In fact, the Commission is expanding its analysis to include the additional benefits noted by one commenter that the Commission had not previously considered, namely better understanding the economics of the offering process and better identifying manipulative activities.[3089] Further, the Participants' response provided no new information on why Participants believe top-account allocations provide only a marginal regulatory benefit over sub-account allocation data. Therefore, the Commission continues to believe that top-account primary market allocation information would provide significant regulatory benefits.

With respect to the costs of including top-account allocation information in the CAT, the Commission notes that the estimate of $864,000 per year provided by one of the commenters may not be comparable to the estimate of $176.1 million provided in the CAT NMS Plan. This is because the latter estimate reflects the implementation costs of adding top-account allocation information, while the former estimate seems to measure the ongoing annual costs to maintain the reporting.

At the same time, the Commission believes that the commenter's analysis of costs is consistent with the Commission's analysis in the Notice in two respects. First, the commenter's analysis is consistent with the Commission's preliminary conclusion that requiring less granular timestamps for reporting top-account allocation information would result in lower costs for top-account allocation information than indicated in the Plan. Second, the commenter's estimate that reporting top-account allocation information would cost $864,000 per year in ongoing costs is consistent with the Commission's preliminary conclusion that the ongoing costs of reporting primary market transactions would be a fraction of the ongoing costs of secondary market reporting. Indeed, $864,000 per year represents a small fraction of the total ongoing annual cost of CAT, which the Commission estimates to be $1.7 billion per year.[3090]

With respect to the commenter who indicated that the cost estimates in the Plan did not contemplate indications of interest, the Commission notes that the Plan defines top-account allocations to include indications of interest—''conditional and may fluctuate until the offering syndicate terminates'' [3091]—and suggests that its cost estimates for top-account allocations therefore include indications of interest. However, because this commenter conducted the study that provides the basis for the Plan's cost estimate, the Commission believes that the commenter is correct and that the cost estimates in the Plan do not represent the costs of top-account allocations as defined in the Plan (*i.e.,* the estimates do not cover indications of interest). That said, no comments directly disagreed with the reasons that the Commission provided in the Notice for why the Commission preliminarily believed the costs estimates in the Plan overstated the costs of including top-account allocation information in the Plan.[3092] Therefore, in light of the comments, the Commission is less clear on the magnitude of the costs of including top-account allocation information in the Plan.

In response to the commenters that indicated that additional analysis or consideration of including top-account allocation information in the Plan would be beneficial, the Commission notes that including this alternative in the Discussion Document provides an opportunity for this additional analysis and consideration. The Discussion Document will provide an outline of how the Participants could incorporate top-account allocation information into

[3080] Hanley Letter at 4.
[3081] SIFMA Letter at 36.
[3082] Hanley Letter at 4–5.
[3083] FIF Letter at 120.
[3084] FIF Letter at 13, 120.
[3085] FIF Letter at 119.
[3086] Hanley Letter at 5–6.
[3087] Response Letter I at 49.
[3088] Response Letter I at 50.
[3089] Hanley Letter at 1–4.
[3090] *See* Section VI.F.2, *supra.*
[3091] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.6(a).
[3092] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30773.

the CAT Data and include details for each order and Reportable Event that may be required to be provided, which market participants may be required to provide the data, the implementation timeline, and a cost estimate. Indeed, in addition to the commenters' suggestions for more study, the Commission believes that the information from commenters regarding the benefits of the different types of top-account allocation information, and the questions surrounding the cost estimates in the Plan, suggest that investors could benefit from the additional analysis that would be included in the Discussion Document.

9. Periodic Updates to Customer Information

In the Notice, the Commission solicited comment on an alternative that would eliminate the requirement for periodic full refreshes of customer information.[3093] The Commission stated that the requirement for periodic full refreshes could be redundant if the initial list and daily updates are complete and accurate and would, therefore, provide no additional benefit. Further, not requiring these periodic refreshes could reduce the risk of a security breach of personally identifiable information. Therefore, the Commission preliminarily believed that removing the requirements for periodic full refreshes of customer information could minimally reduce the cost of the Plan without materially reducing the benefits.

The Commission received two comments relevant to this alternative. One commenter suggested ''having the functional support for a voluntary full refresh, but . . . eliminat[ing] the mandated requirement to provide full refreshes periodically,'' and stated that, ''the initial load, daily updates and standard error processing should be sufficient to maintain data integrity.'' [3094] That commenter went on to state that it ''may be easier to define all active customers to CAT, or just active customers who have transacted in NMS securities.'' The commenter stated that removing the requirement may ''only slightly reduce the burden or cost,'' although it would improve the overall security of the CAT.[3095] Another commenter stated their belief that, ''periodic refreshes of all customer information to the Central Repository is a bad idea.'' [3096] In their response, the Participants stated that they believe that a periodic refresh of customer information is beneficial because it will help to ensure that all customer information remains accurate and up to date.[3097] The Participants noted the provisions in the Plan with respect to information security.[3098] The Participants also noted that the Plan provides that the Participants will define the scope of what constitutes a ''full'' customer information refresh with the assistance of the Plan Processor to determine the extent to which inactive or other accounts would need to be reported.[3099]

The Commission has considered the comments and the Participants' response and continues to believe that removing the requirements for periodic full refreshes of customer information could minimally reduce the cost of the Plan without materially reducing the benefits. Specifically, the Commission agrees that allowing market participants to periodically refresh their customer information but dropping the requirement that they refresh it regularly would reduce costs to broker-dealers because broker-dealers could choose to do a refresh when they believe a full refresh would be more cost effective than editing individual records, while not requiring them to do a refresh when they believe their customer information stored in the Central Repository is accurate. Having a full refresh as an option would save broker-dealers the costs associated with running a refresh procedure when it is not needed, but allowing it when it is efficient for the broker-dealer to update its customer information in this manner. The Commission disagrees with the comment that periodic refreshes are a ''bad idea'' in general. As discussed above,[3100] the Commission recognizes that periodic refreshes introduce an opportunity for correct data in the Central Repository to be replaced by incorrect data due to a problem in the refresh procedure. However, the Commission also believes that periodic refreshes provide an opportunity for incorrect information in the Central Repository to be replaced with correct information. The Commission does not have information to estimate whether the former outcome is more likely than the latter, because it lacks information on the proportion of customer information records that are errant in existing databases in industry and the likelihood that data refresh procedures introduce incorrect data, and commenters did not provide this information. The Commission notes that the Participants' response does not address whether the periodic refreshes would be redundant, or why submitting the redundant information would be beneficial. However, the Commission acknowledges that, as set out in the Participants' response, the Plan provides that the Participants will work with the Plan Processor to determine the extent to which inactive or other accounts would need to be reported,[3101] which may reduce the costs of the periodic refresh by reducing the number of accounts to which it applies.

10. Bulk Data Downloads by CAT Reporters

Several commenters discussed the Plan's treatment of bulk data downloads by CAT Reporters. Specifically, some commenters suggested that CAT Reporters should be allowed to access and export the data they report to the Central Repository. The Commission has considered the potential economic effects of that alternative approach, as discussed below.

Several commenters suggested that the Plan permit CAT Reporters to access their own CAT Data through bulk data exports.[3102] Another commenter stated that permitting CAT Reporters to download their own data from the Central Repository will provide benefits such as improved CAT reporting error rates and improved ability to meet regulatory, surveillance, and compliance requirements.[3103] One commenter suggested that independent software vendors be permitted to access the CAT Data on behalf of their clients.[3104] However, several commenters expressed strong concerns about allowing any entity to extract or download data from the Central Repository, suggesting that the risk of a data breach would greatly increase as the data are maintained at more sites.[3105] Commenters also suggested that the risk increases when those entities downloading the data may have technology systems that are not subject to the same high security requirements at the Plan Processor.[3106]

In their response, the Participants stated that they believe that there may be merit to providing Industry Member CAT Reporters and their vendors with bulk access to the CAT Reporters' own unlinked CAT Data, but noted that such

[3093] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30775–76.

[3094] FIF Letter at 22.

[3095] FIF Letter at 93.

[3096] Data Boiler Letter at 41.

[3097] Response Letter I at 31–32.

[3098] Response Letter I at 31–32.

[3099] Response Letter I at 31–32.

[3100] *See* Section V.E.3.a, *supra.*

[3101] Response Letter I, at 31–32.

[3102] FIF Letter at 1, 9, 60–61; KCG Letter at 7–8.

[3103] TR Letter at 8.

[3104] Bloomberg Letter at 7.

[3105] SIFMA Letter at 20; Fidelity Letter at 4; ICI Letter at 6–7.

[3106] FSR Letter at 7.

access also raises a variety of operational, security, cost and other issues related to the CAT. The Participants stated that they will consider this issue once the CAT is operational.[3107]

Currently, the CAT NMS Plan states that, initially, CAT Reporters will not have access to their data submissions through bulk data extracts.[3108] The Commission agrees with commenters that an alternative approach that specified that CAT Reporters will be allowed to make bulk extractions of their own data from the Central Repository would help CAT Reporters correct errors and respond to regulatory inquiries. Specifically, the Commission believes that, by querying and analyzing the full set of data submitted to the CAT, as opposed to viewing only the errors, CAT Reporters may be able to better diagnose a problem that could be system-wide. This could facilitate corrections to the process that CAT reporters use to record and report order events to prevent future errors. The Commission also recognizes that there may be benefits to internal surveillance regarding compliance, tracking regulatory submissions by third parties, and CAT Reporter recordkeeping.[3109] The Commission believes this could have benefits in terms of increasing the accuracy and timeliness of the CAT Data by allowing errors to be corrected faster and more effectively, and by possibly reducing reporting costs for some entities by making the error correction process easier and more efficient and eliminating the need for CAT Reporters to store the data they submit on their own systems.

However, the Commission notes that, under the Plan, CAT Reporters will be able to view their submissions online in a read-only, non-exportable format, which will facilitate error identification and correction.[3110] Commenters did not provide sufficient information to allow the Commission to assess the magnitude of the potential benefits of allowing bulk data exports in addition to read-only access,[3111] and the Commission believes they may be modest. The Commission also notes that, to the extent CAT Reporters retain copies of their submissions, they may be able to refer to that data when correcting errors and responding to regulatory inquiries. Further, the Commission also agrees with commenters and the Participants that allowing CAT Reporters to engage in bulk data exports, even if limited to their own reported data, could increase the risk of a data breach insofar as it increases the number of systems that have access to the CAT Central Repository. As discussed above,[3112] while uncertain, the costs of a security breach could be significant. The Commission recognizes that some CAT Reporters that would be downloading bulk data might already have access to the Central Repository in order to upload their data, but it notes that many may not, because their data may be reported by one or more third parties. The Commission notes that it is difficult to determine the magnitude by which the risk of a breach would increase, because many of the decisions that define security measures for the Central Repository are coincident with the selection of the Plan Processor, and there is considerable diversity in the potential security approaches of the Bidders. The Commission notes that the Participants state that they will reconsider the issue once the CAT is operational.[3113]

11. Alternatives to the CAT NMS Plan

In the Notice, the Commission recognized that approving the CAT NMS Plan is not the only available means of improving the completeness, accuracy, accessibility and timeliness of the data used in regulatory activities.[3114] Therefore, the Commission solicited comment on the broad set of alternatives involving modifying existing systems to reduce their data limitations instead of approving the CAT NMS Plan.

The Commission discussed how, as one alternative to the CAT NMS Plan, it could require modifications to OATS. However, the Commission also noted that OATS would require significant modifications in order to provide the attributes that the Commission deems crucial for an effective audit trail. Furthermore, the Commission indicated that any OATS-based alternative to CAT that did not provide these attributes would limit the potential benefits of the alternative significantly.[3115]

The Commission acknowledged that it does not have sufficient information to estimate the potential cost savings, if any, from mandating an OATS-based approach as an alternative to the CAT NMS Plan. However, the Commission noted that Rule 613 provided flexibility to the SROs to propose an approach based on OATS and that the SROs could have utilized an OATS-based approach if that approach had represented significant cost savings relative to the Plan's approach.[3116]

In the Notice, the Commission discussed another alternative, which would be for the Commission to modify other data sources instead of, or in combination with, OATS. However, the Commission also noted that like OATS, all of the current data sources have limitations that would need to be addressed in order to provide the attributes that the Commission deems crucial to an effective audit trail. Furthermore, the Commission preliminarily believed that modifying any other single data source would be more costly than modifying OATS while adopting an alternative to the CAT NMS Plan that relied on multiple data sources . . . would eliminate the benefits associated with having a single complete consolidated source from which regulators can access trade and order data, which the Commission considers to be very significant.[3117]

Overall, the Commission preliminarily believed that mandating improvements to the completeness, accuracy, accessibility, and timeliness of current data sources without an NMS Plan that requires the consolidation of data and increased coverage across markets and broker-dealers would likely significantly limit the potential benefits relative to the Plan, possibly without providing significant cost savings.[3118]

The Commission received one comment on the possibility of requiring modifications to OATS as an alternative to the CAT NMS Plan. The commenter agreed with the Commission's analysis and the CAT NMS Plan approach, noting that ''the vision of CAT has evolved through the years to become a much more comprehensive system than OATS or any other current system'' and that ''there is an opportunity now to take advantage of new technologies and the associated cost benefits they provide.'' [3119] Another commenter suggested an alternate approach to the CAT NMS Plan where the Commission would host the system in-house, under its direct and sole control, retaining the prerogative to grant (or deny) access to the data to non-broker-dealer affiliated

[3107] Response Letter I at 43–44.

[3108] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 8.2.

[3109] FIF Letter at 60–61.

[3110] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix D, Section 10.1.

[3111] For example, the Commission does not know how many of the errors that may need to be corrected may be rooted in a problem that a CAT Reporter would require bulk-downloaded data to detect.

[3112] *See* Section V.F.4.a, *supra.*

[3113] Response Letter I at 44.

[3114] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30776.

[3115] *Id.*

[3116] *Id.*

[3117] *Id.*

[3118] *Id.*

[3119] FIF Letter at 121.

SROs.[3120] The commenter believed that collecting the data pursuant to an NMS Plan providing for SRO ownership, management and control over the data would limit the benefits of the Plan by potentially limiting the Commission's access to, and use of, CAT Data.[3121]

The Commission has considered the comments and continues to believe that mandating improvements to the completeness, accuracy, accessibility, and timeliness of current data sources without an NMS Plan that requires the consolidation of data and increased coverage across markets and broker-dealers would likely significantly limit the potential benefits, possibly without providing significant cost savings. In response to the suggestion that the Commission host the system in-house, the Commission believes that the concerns expressed by the commenter with respect to the Commission's ability to access and utilize the CAT Data are mitigated by the Commission's direct oversight authority with respect to the CAT NMS Plan, including but not limited to its ability to observe all meetings, including those conducted in Executive Session, its review and approval of rule changes, and its examination and inspection authority over the SROs. Further, as discussed above,[3122] SROs have specific obligations under the Exchange Act as front-line regulators of the securities markets, and accordingly are well-positioned to oversee the development and operation of the CAT in a manner that will best fulfill regulatory needs, subject to oversight by the Commission. The Commission therefore does not agree that an alternative to the CAT NMS Plan where the Commission hosted the system in-house would result in greater benefits as compared to the CAT NMS Plan approach.

12. Alternatives Discussed in the CAT NMS Plan

In the Notice, the Commission recognized that the Plan discussed many alternatives that the Commission did not discuss in the Alternatives Section of the Notice.[3123] Rule 613(a)(1)(xii) required the Participants to discuss in the Plan any reasonable alternative approaches that the Plan sponsors considered in developing the Plan, including a description of any such alternative approach; the relative advantages and disadvantages of each such alternative, including an assessment of the alternative's costs and benefits; and the basis upon which the Plan sponsors selected the approach reflected in the CAT NMS Plan. Such discussions appear in Section 12 of Appendix C of the Plan. The Commission reviewed these alternatives and did not include in the Alternatives Section of its Notice a discussion of all of the specific alternatives addressed in the Plan. In some cases, the Commission had no analysis to add beyond the analysis in the Plan. In other cases, the Plan did not require any specific alternative, so the Commission could not analyze the effect on the Plan of selecting a different alternative.

The Commission received sufficient comments to analyze some economic implications of alternatives related to the primary storage method, data ingestion format approaches, the process to develop the CAT, and user support and the help desk. However, the Commission still does not have sufficient information to add to the Plan's analysis of the alternatives regarding organizational structure,[3124] personally identifiable information,[3125] required reportable events,[3126] data feed connectivity,[3127] industry testing,[3128] user management,[3129] and quality assurance.[3130]

a. Primary Storage

In the Notice, the Commission solicited comment on whether the CAT NMS Plan should mandate a particular data storage method and on how a storage method could affect the costs and benefits of the Plan.[3131] The CAT NMS Plan states that bidders proposed two methods of primary data storage: Traditionally-hosted storage architecture and infrastructure-as-a-service.[3132] The CAT NMS Plan does not mandate a specific method for primary storage, but does indicate that the storage solution would meet the security, reliability, and accessibility requirements for the CAT, including storage of PII data, separately. The CAT

[3120] Better Markets Letter at 3–5.

[3121] Specifically, the commenter stated that allowing the SROs ownership, management, and control over the data, without direct SEC oversight and control, would have ''serious and unacceptable'' consequences, because there will be a limited number of user accounts allocated to the SEC; there may be limitations on the SEC's access to the data for non-regulatory purposes; the potential exists for the CAT LLC to charge the SEC for accessing the CAT system and its data; the SEC does not participate directly in the governance of the CAT Plan; the CAT Plan Participants may dismiss the Plan Processor with no notice to the SEC; and the Plan Participants may make material changes to the functions and operations of the CAT NMS system (or matters related to the CAT data).

[3122] *See supra* note 747.

[3123] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30779–82 (Request for Comment Nos. 437–50).

[3124] The Commission received one comment on its request for comment regarding the organizational structure. Better Markets opposes the for-profit nature of the CAT LLC and the fact that the Commission would not control that corporation. *See* Section IV.B.4, *supra,* discusses the Participants' and the Commission's responses to that comment. Specifically, the CAT LLC will not be for-profit.

[3125] Many commenters suggested alternative approaches to maintain the security and confidentiality of PII. *See* Section IV.D.7.b, *supra,* for a summary of these comments and the Commission's response.

[3126] Data Boiler suggested including the ''results order event'' and the ''CAT feedback order event'' as a ''way to introduce randomness for the sake of improving information security control.'' While the Commission is sensitive to security, the Commission still does not have sufficient information to distinguish these order events from the required order event types to ascertain the benefits other than the security benefits mentioned by this commenter or to analyze the costs of reporting these order types. *See* Data Boiler Letter at 42.

[3127] Data Boiler suggested receiving SIP data in real-time, but did so conditional on the Central Repository receiving the data in real-time. Because the SROs may already get SIP data in real-time for other purposes and the CAT reporting will be on T+1, the Commission still does not have sufficient information to fully analyze the alternative of receiving SIP data in real-time. *See* Data Boiler Letter at 42; *see also* Section IV.D.3, *supra,* for the Commission's response to this comment.

[3128] Data Boiler suggested not mandating an approach to industry testing because ''appropriate management flexibilities/discretions are needed,'' but did not provide further explanation that would allow the Commission to better understand the economic tradeoffs. *See* Data Boiler Letter at 42. Further, FIF suggested specific testing standards but did not provide further explanation that would allow the Commission to better understand the economic tradeoffs of specifying these standards. *See* FIF Letter at 13, 125–26; *see also* Section IV.D.12, *supra,* for the Commission's response to these comments.

[3129] FIF stated that the Plan does not need to require a specific approach to user management, but that the Plan should specify some functionality and criteria for evaluation of the approach. For example, the user management system should provide for on-boarding and support levels of entitlement. *See* FIF Letter at 129–30. The commenter did not provide further explanation that would allow the Commission to better understand the costs and benefits of specifying these functionalities or not specifying an approach. Further, SIFMA provided specific suggestions for user management but did not specifically address the relative economic effects of various alternatives. *See* SIFMA Letter at 21.

[3130] Data Boiler suggested not mandating an approach to quality assurance because appropriate management flexibilities/discretions are needed, but did not provide further explanation that would allow the Commission to better understand the economic tradeoffs. *See* Data Boiler Letter at 42.

[3131] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30780.

[3132] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section D.12(c). Traditionally-hosted storage architecture is a model in which an organization would purchase and maintain proprietary servers and other hardware to store CAT Data. Infrastructure-as-a-service is a provisioning model in which an organization outsources the equipment used to support operations, including storage, hardware, servers, and networking components, to a third party who charges for the service on a usage basis.

NMS Plan also indicates several considerations in the selection of a storage solution including maturity, cost, complexity, and reliability of the storage method.

The Commission received three comment letters in response to this alternative.[3133] All three commenters recommended not mandating a particular storage method. One commenter suggested that mandating the storage method would ''make the structure too rigid and static, hindering the flexibility for future scalability.'' [3134] Another commenter claimed too little information in that the ''eventual Plan Processor is in a better position to define the storage methods'' stating that evaluation considers ''total system design, not storage methods in isolation.'' [3135] The third commenter did not provide arguments supporting its recommendation, but did point out that the method of storage would allow the ability to return results of queries at varying time intervals.[3136] The commenters did not discuss the relative costs and benefits of the specific architectures mentioned in the Plan but one commenter indicated that its own system could enable ultrafast analysis/pattern recognition and save significant space.[3137] Based on these comments, the Commission believes that mandating a particular storage method could be costly, but Commission did not receive comments on the benefits of mandating a storage method or on the costs or benefits of particular storage methods. Therefore, the Commission has more information than at the time of the Notice regarding the costs of mandating a particular storage method but still cannot fully analyze the economic effects.

b. Data Ingestion Format

In the Notice, the Commission requested comment on whether the Plan should mandate a particular approach to data ingestion.[3138] The CAT NMS Plan does not mandate the format in which data must be reported to the Central Repository.[3139] Rather, the Plan provides that the Plan Processor will determine the electronic format in which data must be reported, and that the format will be described in the Technical Specifications.[3140] The Plan discusses the tradeoffs between requiring that the CAT Reporters report data to CAT in a uniform defined format, in existing messaging protocols, or a hybrid of both.[3141] The Plan does not require any approach, but will determine the approach in conjunction with the selection of the Plan Processor. An example of a uniform defined format includes the current process for reporting data to OATS.[3142] Several bidders proposed to leverage the OATS format and enhance it to meet the requirements of Rule 613. The Plan states that this could reduce the burden on certain CAT Reporters (*i.e.,* current OATS Reporters) and simplify the process for those CAT Reporters to implement the CAT.[3143] The other alternative, accepting existing messaging protocols, would allow CAT Reporters to submit copies of their order handling messages that are typically used across the order lifecycle and within order management processes, such as FIX.[3144] The Plan states that using existing messaging protocols could result in quicker implementation times and simplify data aggregation.[3145] The Plan further notes that surveys revealed no cost difference between the two approaches,[3146] but that FIF members prefer using the FIX protocol.[3147]

While the Plan discussed a ''uniform defined format'' as different from existing messaging protocols such as FIX, the Commission understands that the term ''uniform defined format'' can also apply to FIX. To clarify the distinction between the two approaches, the Commission refers to one approach as requiring a ''specialized delimited flat file'' approach and the other as requiring existing messaging protocols.

In addition to soliciting comment on whether the Plan should mandate an approach, the Commission also requested information on the relative costs and benefits, including implementation and ongoing costs of the data ingestion format approaches.[3148] Further, the Commission noted that the survey results that the costs of the approaches are similar did not seem intuitive and requested comment on why the costs appear similar in the survey results.[3149]

As an alternative to the Plan, four commenters seemed to support specifying an approach to data ingestion format.[3150] One commenter stated that mandating an approach in the Plan would give industry more time to prepare and would limit the chances that broker-dealers would need to make significant changes after seeing the Technical Specifications, which could seriously compromise the implementation schedule.[3151] In particular, this commenter stated that the data ingestion format approach is a critical component of the Plan and ''an optimum solution that meets the needs of industry at reasonable cost and is minimally disruptive'' would require that the approach be ''widely reviewed and vetted across the industry.'' [3152] Another commenter suggested mandating the approach for consistency and transparency.[3153] The other two commenters that supported mandating the approach in the Plan provided arguments regarding the effects of a specific approach but not the effects of mandating an approach.

Another alternative would be to specify the actual format in the Plan. Of the four commenters who supported mandating the approach, one also supported mandating the format in the Plan.[3154]

Six commenters provided information on the tradeoffs or economic effects of various approaches or formats.[3155] While some commenters addressed the alternatives of a specialized delimited flat file such as a modified OATS, existing messaging protocol such as FIX, or a hybrid of the two,[3156] others commented more generally on the impacts of non-uniform formats or standards without indicating whether they consider a messaging protocol to be non-uniform or uniform format or standard.[3157] Only one commenter specifically addressed why the costs of reporting using Plan-mandated

[3133] FIF Letter at 125; FSI Letter at 3; Data Boiler Letter at 8.

[3134] Data Boiler Letter at 8.

[3135] FIF Letter at 125.

[3136] FSI Letter at 3.

[3137] Data Boiler Letter at 8.

[3138] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30780–81.

[3139] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section D.12(f); *see also id.* at Appendix C, Section A.1(a).

[3140] *Id.* at Appendix D, Section 2.1.

[3141] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(A)(2), Section D.12(f). These are also called ''Approach 1'' and ''Approach 2'' elsewhere in this economic analysis.

[3142] This is Approach 2 in the CAT Reporters Study. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(A)(2).

[3143] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section D.12(f).

[3144] This is Approach 1 in the CAT Reporters Study. *Id.* at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(A)(2).

[3145] *Id.* at Appendix C, Section D.12(f).

[3146] *Id.*

[3147] *Id.*

[3148] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30780–81.

[3149] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30737 (Request for Comment Nos. 318 and 331).

[3150] FIF Letter at 91; FIX Trading Letter at 1; Better Markets Letter at 7; ICI Letter at 13.

[3151] FIF Letter at 90.

[3152] FIF Letter at 90.

[3153] FIX Trading Letter at 1.

[3154] Better Markets Letter at 7.

[3155] These comments are summarized in more detail in Section IV.D.2, *supra.*

[3156] FIF Letter at 90–91; FIX Trading Letter at 1. ICI provided a messaging protocol as an example, but did not recommend a messaging protocol specifically.

[3157] ICI Letter at 13; Better Markets Letter at 7–8; UnaVista Letter at 2–3.

messaging protocols would be similar to reporting in a specialized delimited flat file format, and that commenter asserted that the costs should be the same for either approach because accepting existing message protocols would require a more expensive infrastructure and the cost would likely be passed down to the CAT Reporters.[3158] The six commenters also provided mixed information on the economic effects of various considerations,[3159] such as accepting multiple formats or a single format,[3160] and accepting only widely used existing formats, new specialized delimited flat file formats, or existing bespoke broker-dealer formats.[3161]

In response to comments, the Participants explained that they continue to believe that the Plan should not mandate a specific message format.[3162] That said, the Participants understand that the message format used for reporting to the Central Repository must be easily understood and adopted by the industry, and this factor will be considered as the Participants evaluate each Bidder's solution. Moreover, the Participants also will take into consideration that the Plan Processor must be able to reliably and accurately convert data to a uniform electronic format for consolidation and storage, regardless of the message formats in which the CAT Reporters would be required to report data to the Central Repository. The message format(s) ultimately selected for reporting to the Central Repository will be described in the Technical Specifications, which will be approved by the Operating Committee. In addition, the Participants indicated that the Bids of the three remaining Bidders propose accepting existing messaging protocols (*e.g.,* FIX), rather than requiring CAT Reporters to use a new format.[3163]

The Commission has considered the comments and Participants' responses in relation to whether the Plan should mandate a specific approach and believes that there are certain costs and benefits associated with mandating the approach in the Plan and that not mandating the approach is a source of uncertainty in assessing the economic effects of the Plan. The Commission believes that the risks to the implementation schedule (and therefore an increase in implementation costs) of not mandating an approach would be lower if CAT Reporters could submit their reports to CAT in the message protocols they currently use for business purposes because such implementation would involve updating current systems rather than building new systems. The Commission understands from the Participants' response that all remaining Bidders would have within the Plan Processor the ability to accept existing message protocols. Therefore, those CAT Reporters currently using the messaging protocols accepted by the eventual Plan Processor would not need to make significant systems changes. However, the Commission recognizes that the mixed information regarding the economic effects of particular approaches or formats reflects the level of uncertainty in the range of benefits and costs associated with the selection of data ingestion formats and thus the impact of the lack of transparency in the Plan on this economic analysis.

In response to the comment that the costs of the two approaches should be similar, the Commission notes that the costs of the approaches do not seem consistent with the comment. Whereas the commenter's statements would suggest that the costs of message protocols would be lower for broker-dealers, vendors, and SROs, and higher for building and operating the Central Repository, and similar in aggregate, the costs actually appear similar for each survey group. Therefore, the Commission continues to recognize that the survey result indicating that the costs of the approaches are similar does not seem intuitive.

Finally, the Commission notes the potential for the Plan Processor to use the opportunity to select a message format that entrenches itself by increasing the costs of replacement due to underperformance.[3164] However, as explained above and in Section IV.D.2 the Participants will consider whether a Bidder has proposed a format that is easily understood and adoptable by the industry, and the Commission believes that the message format decision must be made in connection with developing the overall architecture for CAT.

c. Process To Develop CAT

In the Notice, the Commission requested comment on whether the CAT NMS Plan should mandate a particular development process and the impact on the relative costs and benefits of particular processes.[3165] Bidders proposed, and the Plan describes, several processes for development of the CAT: The agile or iterative development model, the waterfall model, and hybrid models.[3166] The CAT NMS Plan does not mandate a particular development process because any of the options could be utilized to manage the development of CAT.[3167] The CAT NMS Plan notes that the agile model is more flexible and more susceptible to the early delivery of software for testing and feedback, but that the agile model makes it more difficult to accurately estimate the effort and time required for development. The waterfall model would also facilitate longer-term planning and coordination among multiple vendors or project streams.[3168]

Two commenters suggested that the Plan not mandate a particular development method.[3169] One commenter stated that ''appropriate management flexibilities/discretions are needed.'' [3170] The other commenter cited bidder expertise and that the Plan Processor should be allowed to choose the ''methodology most appropriate for the specific development effort.'' [3171] The commenter continued on to say that ''the different development methodologies can each be equally effective in an implementation plan, depending on many factors and tradeoffs.'' While providing information on the costs of mandating a method, neither provided relative costs and benefits of specific methods.

Based on these comments, the Commission believes that mandating a specific development process in the Plan could be costly because mandating the process removes the ability for the Plan Processor to select the lowest cost or most effective methodology for a given implementation. The Commission recognizes that the Plan will involve one big implementation initially, but

[3158] Data Boiler Letter at 36.

[3159] *See* Section IV.D.2, *supra,* for a complete summary of these comments as well as the Participants' and Commission's responses.

[3160] Data Boiler Letter at 41; FIF Letter at 91; FIX Trading Letter at 1; UnaVista Letter at 2–3; ICI Letter at 13; Better Markets Letter at 7–8.

[3161] Data Boiler Letter at 41; FIF Letter at 90–91; FIX Trading Letter at 1; ICI Letter at 13; Better Markets Letter at 7.

[3162] Response Letter I at 29; *see also* Section IV.D.2, *supra,* for a complete discussion of the Participants' response.

[3163] Response Letter III at 13.

[3164] *See* Section V.I.4.b.(2), *supra,* for a discussion of how the costs of switching Plan Processors limits the competitive incentives of the selected Plan Processor and of the provisions that promote good performance by the Plan Processor.

[3165] *See* Notice *supra* note 5, at 30781.

[3166] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section D.12(g). An agile methodology is an iterative model in which development is staggered and provides for continuous evolution of requirements and solutions. A waterfall model is a sequential process of software development with dedicated phases for Conception, Initiation, Analysis, Design, Construction, Testing, Production/Implementation and Maintenance. *Id.*

[3167] *Id.*

[3168] *Id.*

[3169] FIF Letter at 49; Data Boiler Letter at 42.

[3170] Data Boiler Letter at 42.

[3171] FIF Letter at 49.

may also involve many subsequent implementations based on amendments to the Plan or changes in the technical specifications. The nature of these implementations could vary greatly and the same development methodology may not be most effective in all situations. Therefore, the Commission recognizes that mandating a specific development process would be costly.

d. User Support and Help Desk

In the Notice, the Commission requested comment on whether the CAT NMS Plan should specify the standards for user support and on the relative costs and benefits of the alternative standards.[3172] The CAT NMS Plan discusses several alternatives related to how the Plan Processor provides a CAT help desk that would be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and be able to manage 2,500 calls per month.[3173] Specifically, alternatives relate to the number of user support staff members, the degree to which the support team is dedicated to CAT, and whether the help desk is located in the United States or offshore. The CAT NMS Plan discusses the benefit and cost tradeoffs,[3174] but does not mandate any of the particular alternatives. Instead, the CAT NMS Plan commits to considering each Bidder's user support proposals in the context of the overall Bid.

Two commenters addressed alternatives regarding user support and a help desk.[3175] One commenter recommended that customer support guidelines and functionalities be specified in the Plan [3176] while the other suggested that the costs of user support and a help desk could be ''minimized or eliminated'' under different data collection and reporting methods.[3177] The commenter that supported specifying guidelines and functionalities in the Plan stated that ''the level of service provided is directly tied to the industry's ability to meet the aggressive quality goals and error rates, and directly tied to customer service costs in bidders' proposals, and ultimately in costs to be borne by the industry.'' Therefore, the commenter said they ''should be dictated by the Plan and not left to Plan Processor discretion.'' Rather than focus on the size and location of the support team and whether the team is dedicated to CAT, the commenter suggests specific standards and functionalities such as wait times, a tracking system, and the ability for web submission or ''on-line chat.''

In their response, the Participants clarified that the CAT Help Desk staff will be trained to support CAT Reporters as needed, and noted that this may include, for example, training related to data access tools, data submission requirements, and customer support.[3178]

The Commission has considered these comments and recognizes the benefits of the Plan specifying certain functionalities and standards while letting the Plan Processor select the size and location of the support team necessary to meet these functionalities and standards. In particular, the Commission agrees with the commenter that specifying guidelines and functionalities can facilitate the accomplishment of the benefits described herein and could result in lower costs to the industry relative to the Plan. However, the Commission also agrees that the Plan Processor may be in a better position to determine the size and location of the support team needed to satisfy the guidelines and functionalities.

VI. Paperwork Reduction Act

Certain provisions of Rule 613 contain ''collection of information requirements'' within the meaning of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (''PRA'').[3179] The Commission published notice requesting comment on the collection of information requirements in the Notice and submitted the proposed collection to the Office of Management and Budget (''OMB'') for review in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 3507 and 5 CFR 1320.11. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The control number for Rule 613 is OMB Control No. 3235–0671 and the title of the collection of information is ''Creation of a Consolidated Audit Trail Pursuant to Section 11A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rules Thereunder.'' The Commission is adopting this collection of information.

The Commission has amended the CAT NMS Plan, resulting in ''a new collection of information'' ''CAT NMS Plan Reporting and Disclosure Requirements.'' The new collection of information is described in Section VI.E., below. The Commission is requesting public comment on the new collection of information requirement in this Order. We are applying for an OMB control number for the proposed new collection of information in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 3507(j) and 5 CFR 1320.13, and OMB has not yet assigned a control number to the new collection. Responses to the new collection of information would be mandatory. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

This Order includes the Commission's estimates of the costs associated with the requirements of Rule 613, as imposed by the CAT NMS Plan. Similarly, the Commission is discussing below its estimates of the burden hours associated with the information collection requirements of the CAT NMS Plan, as filed by the Participants, and as subsequently amended by the Commission.[3180] These estimates are based on the requirements of Rule 613 and take into account the Exemption Order.[3181] Information and estimates contained in the CAT NMS Plan that was submitted by the Participants also informed these estimates because they provide a useful, quantified point of reference regarding potential burdens and costs. In the Notice, the Commission requested comment on the collection of information requirements associated with the CAT NMS Plan that were required by Rule 613. As noted above, the Commission received 24 comment letters on the Notice.[3182] Although the Commission did not receive any comments on the hourly burdens associated with the information collections required by Rule 613, a number of comments were submitted that addressed the Commission's cost

[3172] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30781.

[3173] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section D.12(j). The RFP specified these standards. *Id.*

[3174] *See id.* The Plan states that a larger support staff could be more effective, but would be more costly. Further, a dedicated CAT support team would have a deeper knowledge of CAT but would be more costly. Finally, a U.S.-based help desk could facilitate greater security and higher quality service, but would be more costly. *Id.*

[3175] FIF Letter at 125–29; Data Boiler Letter at 42.

[3176] FIF Letter at 125–29.

[3177] Data Boiler Letter at 42.

[3178] *See* Response Letter I at 38.

[3179] 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et. seq.*

[3180] *See* Section VI.E., *infra.*

[3181] *See* Exemption Order, *supra* note 21. The Commission acknowledges that the CAT NMS Plan as filed contains provisions in addition to those required by Rule 613 (*e.g.,* requiring the inclusion of OTC Equity Securities; the availability of historical data for not less than six years in a manner that is directly available and searchable without manual intervention from the Plan Processor; a complete symbology database to be maintained by the Plan Processor, including the historical symbology; as well as issue symbol information and data using the listing exchange symbology format). *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 1.1 (defining ''Eligible Security'' as all NMS securities and all OTC Equity Securities); Section 6.5(b)(1); Appendix C, Section A.1(a); Appendix D, Section 2.

[3182] *See supra* note 6.

estimates related to these collections.[3183]

A. Summary of Collection of Information Under Rule 613

Rule 613 requires that the CAT NMS Plan must provide for an accurate, time-sequenced record of an order's life, from receipt or origination, through the process of routing, modification, cancellation and execution.[3184] The Central Repository, created by the Participants, would be required to receive, consolidate and retain the data required under the Rule.[3185] Such data must be accessible to each Participant, as well as the Commission, for purposes of performing regulatory and oversight responsibilities.[3186]

Rule 613 provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require that all Participants that are exchanges, and their members, record and report to the Central Repository certain data for each NMS security registered or listed on a national securities exchange, or admitted to unlisted trading privileges on such exchange, and each Participant that is a national securities association, and its members, record and report for each NMS security for which transaction reports are required to be submitted to the national securities association in a uniform electronic format or in a manner that would allow the Central Repository to convert the data to a uniform electronic format for consolidation and storage. This data must be recorded contemporaneously with the Reportable Event and reported to the Central Repository in no event later than 8:00 a.m. ET on the trading day following the day such information has been recorded by the national securities exchange, national securities association, or member.[3187]

Rule 613 also provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require each member of a Participant to record and report to the Central Repository other information which may not be available until later in the clearing process no later than 8:00 a.m. ET on the trading day following the day the member receives such information.[3188] Rule 613 also requires the Participants to provide to the Commission, at least every two years after the effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan, a written assessment of the operation of the consolidated audit trail.[3189]

Rule 613 requires all Participants to make use of the consolidated information, either by each developing and implementing new surveillance systems, or by enhancing existing surveillance systems.[3190] The Rule also requires the CAT NMS Plan to require Participants to submit to the Commission a document outlining the manner in which non-NMS securities and primary market transactions in NMS and non-NMS securities can be incorporated into the consolidated audit trail.[3191]

1. Central Repository

Rule 613 provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require the creation and maintenance of a Central Repository that would be responsible for the receipt, consolidation, and retention of all data submitted by the Participants and their members.[3192] The Rule also requires that the CAT NMS Plan require the Central Repository to retain the information reported pursuant to subparagraphs (c)(7) and (e)(7) of the Rule for a period of not less than five years in a convenient and usable standard electronic data format that is directly available and searchable electronically without any manual intervention.[3193] The Plan Processor is responsible for operating the Central Repository in compliance with the Rule and the CAT NMS Plan. In addition, the Rule provides that the CAT NMS Plan must include: Policies and procedures to ensure the security and confidentiality of all information submitted to the Central Repository,[3194] including safeguards to ensure the confidentiality of data; [3195] information barriers between regulatory and non-regulatory staff with regard to access and use of data;[3196] a mechanism to confirm the identity of all persons permitted to use the data; [3197] a comprehensive information security program for the Central Repository that is subject to regular reviews by the CCO; [3198] and penalties for non-compliance with policies and procedures of the Participants or the Central Repository with respect to information security.[3199] Further, the Rule provides that the CAT NMS Plan must include policies and procedures to be used by the Plan Processor to ensure the timeliness, accuracy, integrity, and completeness of the data submitted to the Central Repository,[3200] as well as policies and procedures to ensure the accuracy of the consolidation by the Plan Processor of the data.[3201]

2. Data Collection and Reporting

Rule 613 provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require each Participant, and any member of such Participant, to record and electronically report to the Central Repository details for each order and Reportable Event documenting the life of an order through the process of original receipt or origination, routing, modification, cancellation, and execution (in whole or part) for each NMS security.[3202] Rule 613 requires the CAT NMS Plan to require each national securities exchange and its members to record and report to the Central Repository the information required by Rule 613(c)(7) for each NMS security registered or listed for trading on an exchange, or admitted to unlisted trading privileges on such exchange.[3203] Rule 613 provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require each Participant that is a national securities association, and its members, to record and report to the Central Repository the information required by Rule 613(c)(7) for each NMS security for which transaction reports are required to be submitted to the Participant.[3204] The Rule requires each Participant and any member of a Participant to record the information required by Rule 613(c)(7)(i) through (v) contemporaneously with the Reportable Event, and to report this information to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. ET on the trading day following the day such information has been recorded by the Participant or member of the Participant.[3205] The Rule requires each Participant and any member of a Participant to record and report the information required by Rule 613(c)(7)(vi) through (viii) to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. ET on the trading day following the day the

[3183] In addition to the discussion that follows, the Commission's cost estimates and responses to cost comments are discussed in detail in Section V.F., *supra.*

[3184] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(1).

[3185] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(1).

[3186] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(1), (e)(2).

[3187] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(3).

[3188] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(4).

[3189] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(b)(6).

[3190] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(a)(3)(iv).

[3191] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(i).

[3192] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(1).

[3193] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(8). The Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan proposes to require that the Central Repository retain data reported in a convenient and usable standard electronic data format that is directly available and searchable electronically without any manual intervention for six years. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(b)(i).

[3194] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(4)(i).

[3195] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(4)(i)(A).

[3196] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(4)(i)(B).

[3197] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(4)(i)(C).

[3198] *Id.*

[3199] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(4)(i)(D).

[3200] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(4)(ii).

[3201] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(4)(iii).

[3202] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(1), (c)(5), (c)(6), (c)(7).

[3203] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(1), (c)(5).

[3204] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(1), (c)(6).

[3205] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(3).

Participant or member receives such information.[3206] The Rule requires each Participant and any member of such Participant to report information required by Rule 613(c)(7) in a uniform electronic format or in a manner that would allow the Central Repository to convert the data to a uniform electronic format for consolidation and storage.[3207]

Such information must also be reported to the Central Repository with a timestamp of a granularity that is at least to the millisecond or less to the extent that the order handling and execution systems of a Participant or a member utilize timestamps in finer increments.[3208] The Commission understands that any changes to broker-dealer recording and reporting systems to comply with Rule 613 may also include changes to comply with the millisecond timestamp requirement.

3. Collection and Retention of National Best Bid and National Best Offer, Last Sale Data and Transaction Reports

Rule 613(e)(7) provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require the Central Repository to collect and retain on a current and continuing basis: (i) Information on the National Best Bid and National Best Offer (''NBBO'') for each NMS Security; (ii) transaction reports reported pursuant to a transaction reporting plan filed with the Commission pursuant to, and meeting the requirements of, Rule 601 of Regulation NMS; and (iii) Last Sale Reports reported pursuant to the OPRA Plan.[3209] The Central Repository must retain this information for no less than five years.[3210]

4. Surveillance

Rule 613(f) provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require that every Participant develop and implement a surveillance system, or enhance existing surveillance systems, reasonably designed to make use of the consolidated information contained in the consolidated audit trail. Rule 613(a)(3)(iv) provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require that the surveillance systems be implemented within fourteen months after effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan.

5. Participant Rule Filings

Rule 613(g)(1) requires each Participant to file with the Commission, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Exchange Act and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[3211] a proposed rule change to require its members to comply with the requirements of Rule 613 and the CAT NMS Plan approved by the Commission.[3212] The burden of filing such a proposed rule change is already included under the collection of information requirements contained in Rule 19b–4 under the Exchange Act.[3213]

6. Document on Expansion to Other Securities

Rule 613(i) provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require the Participants to jointly provide to the Commission, within six months after the CAT NMS Plan is effective, a document outlining how the Participants could incorporate into the CAT information regarding: (1) Equity securities that are not NMS securities; [3214] (2) debt securities; and (3) primary market transactions in equity securities that are not NMS securities and in debt securities.[3215]

7. Written Assessment of Operation of the Consolidated Audit Trail

Rule 613(b)(6) provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require the Participants to provide the Commission a written assessment of the consolidated audit trail's operation at least every two years, once the CAT NMS Plan is effective.[3216] Such written assessment shall include, at a minimum, with respect to the CAT: (i) An evaluation of its performance; (ii) a detailed plan for any potential improvements to its performance; (iii) an estimate of the costs associated with any such potential improvements; and (iv) an estimated implementation timeline for any such potential improvements, if applicable.[3217] As required by Rule 613(b)(6), the Participants submitted a CAT NMS Plan that includes these minimum requirements. The Commission is subsequently amending the requirements set forth in the CAT NMS Plan to change the reporting frequency from every two years to annual, as well as to provide additional specificity regarding the elements of the written assessment.[3218] As amended, the annual written assessment must include the following: (i) An evaluation of the information security program of the CAT to ensure that the program is consistent with the highest industry standards for protection of data; (ii) an evaluation of potential technological upgrades based upon a review of technological advancements over the preceding year, drawing on technology expertise, whether internal or external; (iii) an evaluation of the time necessary to restore and recover CAT Data at a back-up site; (iv) an evaluation of how the Plan Processor and Participants are monitoring Error Rates and to explore the imposition of Error Rates based on product, data element or other criteria; (v) a copy of the evaluation required by the CAT NMS Plan in Section 6.8(c) of the Plan that the Plan Processor evaluate whether industry standards have evolved such that: (1) The synchronization standard in Section 6.8(a) of the CAT NMS Plan should be shortened; or (2) the required timestamp in Section 6.8(b) of the CAT NMS Plan should be in finer increments; and (vi) an assessment of whether any data elements reported to the CAT should be added, deleted or changed; and (vii) an estimate of the costs and benefits associated with any potential improvements to the performance of the CAT, including an assessment of the potential impact on competition, efficiency, capital formation, and investor protection.

B. Proposed Use of Information

1. Central Repository

Rule 613 states that the Central Repository is required to receive, consolidate and retain the data required to be submitted by the Participants and their members.[3219] Participant and Commission staff would have access to the data for regulatory purposes.[3220]

2. Data Collection and Reporting

The Commission believes that the data collected and reported pursuant to the requirements of Rule 613 would be used by regulators to monitor and surveil the securities markets and detect and investigate activity, whether on one market or across markets. The data collected and reported pursuant to Rule 613 would also be used by regulators for the evaluation of tips and complaints and for complex enforcement inquiries

[3206] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(4).

[3207] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(c)(2).

[3208] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(d)(3).

[3209] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(7); 17 CFR 242.601.

[3210] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(8).

[3211] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2); 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3212] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(g)(1).

[3213] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 50486 (October 5, 2004), 69 FR 60287, 60293 (October 8, 2004) (File No. S7–18–04) (describing the collection of information requirements contained in Rule 19b–4 under the Exchange Act). The Commission has submitted revisions to the current collection of information titled ''Rule 19b–4 Filings with Respect to Proposed Rule Changes by Self-Regulatory Organizations'' (OMB Control No. 3235–0045). According to the last submitted revision, for Fiscal Year 2012 SROs submitted 1,688 Rule 19b–4 proposed rule changes.

[3214] As noted above, the CAT NMS Plan would require the inclusion of OTC Equity Securities, while Rule 613 does not include such a requirement. *See supra* note 3181.

[3215] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(i).

[3216] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(b)(6).

[3217] *See id.*

[3218] *See* Section IV.H., *supra.*

[3219] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(1).

[3220] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(2).

or investigations, as well as inspections and examinations. Further, the Commission believes that regulators would use the data collected and reported to conduct timely and accurate analysis of market activity for reconstruction of broad-based market events in support of regulatory decisions.

3. Collection and Retention of NBBO, Last Sale Data and Transaction Reports

The CAT NMS Plan must require the Central Repository to collect and retain NBBO information, transaction reports, and Last Sale Reports in a format compatible with the order and event information collected pursuant to Rule 613(c)(7).[3221] Participant and Commission staff could use this data to easily search across order, NBBO, and transaction databases. The Commission believes that having the NBBO information in a uniform electronic format compatible with order and event information would assist Participants in enforcing compliance with federal securities laws, rules, and regulations, as well as their own rules.[3222] The Commission also believes that a CAT NMS Plan requiring the Central Repository to collect and retain the transaction reports and Last Sale Reports in a format compatible with the order execution information would aid regulators in monitoring for certain market manipulations.[3223]

4. Surveillance

The requirement in Rule 613(f) that the Participants develop and implement a surveillance system, or enhance existing surveillance systems, reasonably designed to make use of the consolidated information in the consolidated audit trail,[3224] is intended to position regulators to make full use of the consolidated audit trail data in order to carry out their regulatory obligations. In addition, because trading and potentially manipulative activities could take place across multiple markets, and the consolidated audit trail data would trace the entire lifecycle of an order from origination to execution or cancellation, new or enhanced surveillance systems may also enable regulators to investigate potentially illegal activity that spans multiple markets more efficiently.

5. Document on Expansion to Other Securities

Rule 613(i) requires the CAT NMS Plan to require the Participants to jointly provide to the Commission, within six months after the CAT NMS Plan is effective, a document outlining how the Participants could incorporate into the CAT information regarding certain products that are not NMS securities.[3225] A document outlining a possible expansion of the consolidated audit trail could help inform the Commission about the Participants' strategy for potentially accomplishing such an expansion over a reasonable period of time. Moreover, such document would aid the Commission in assessing the feasibility and impact of possible future proposals by the Participants to include such additional securities and transactions in the consolidated audit trail.

6. Written Assessment of Operation of the Consolidated Audit Trail

Rule 613(b)(6) requires the CAT NMS Plan to require the Participants to provide the Commission a written assessment of the CAT's operation at least every two years, once the CAT NMS Plan is effective that includes a plan for potential improvements, an estimate of the costs associated with any such improvement, as well as the potential impact on competition, efficiency and capital formation, and a timeline.[3226] The Commission has subsequently modified this requirement as imposed by the CAT NMS Plan to change the reporting frequency to annual and require that the written assessment include the benefits of any potential improvements and the impact on investor protection, as well as to provide more specificity on what the assessment must address.[3227] The assessment is now required to include evaluations of the following: The information security program; potential technological upgrades; the time to restore and recover CAT Data at a back-up site; how the Plan Processor and the Participants are monitoring Error Rates and exploring imposing Error Rates based on other criteria; a copy of the evaluation required in Section 6.8(a) of the CAT NMS Plan that the Plan Processor evaluate whether industry standards have evolved such that: (i) The clock synchronization standard in Section 6.8(a) of the CAT NMS Plan should be shortened; (ii) the required timestamp in Section 6.8(b) of the CAT NMS Plan should be in finer increments; and an assessment of whether any data elements reported to the CAT should be added, deleted or changed. The Commission believes that requiring these specific issues to be addressed in the Participants' annual written assessment will focus the Plan Processor and the Participants on critical technological and other developments, and should help ensure that CAT technology remains up-to-date, resilient and secure, and provides accurate CAT Data. Further, the Commission believes that it is important that the Participants consider not just the costs, but also the potential benefits associated with any improvements to the performance of the CAT, including the impact on investor protection.

C. Respondents

1. National Securities Exchanges and National Securities Associations

The information collection titled ''Creation of a Consolidated Audit Trail Pursuant to Section 11A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rules Thereunder'' and the proposed information collection apply to the 21 Participants (the 20 national securities exchanges and the one national securities association (FINRA)) currently registered with the Commission.[3228]

[3221] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(7).

[3222] The Commission and Participants use the NBBO to, among other things, evaluate members for compliance with numerous regulatory requirements, such as the duty of best execution or Rule 611 of Regulation NMS. *See* 17 CFR 242.611; *see also, e.g.,* ISE Rule 1901 and Phlx Rule 1084.

[3223] Rules 613(e)(7)(ii) and (iii) require that transaction reports reported pursuant to an effective transaction reporting plan and Last Sale Reports reported pursuant to the OPRA Plan be reported to the Central Repository. This requirement should allow regulators to evaluate certain trading activity. For example, trading patterns of reported and unreported trades may cause Participant or Commission staff to make further inquiries into the nature of the trading to ensure that the public was receiving accurate and timely information regarding executions and that market participants were continuing to comply with trade reporting obligations under Participant rules. Similarly, patterns in the transactions that are reported and unreported to the consolidated tape could be indicia of market abuse, including failure to obtain best execution for customer orders or possible market manipulation. The Commission and the Participants would be able to review information on trades not reported to the tape to determine whether they should have been reported, whether Section 31 fees should have been paid, and/or whether the trades are part of a manipulative scheme.

[3224] 17 CFR 242.613(f).

[3225] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(i); *see also supra* note 439.

[3226] 17 CFR 242.613(b)(6).

[3227] *See* Section IV.H., *supra.*

[3228] The Participants are: Bats BZX Exchange, Inc., Bats BYX Exchange, Inc., BOX Options Exchange LLC, C2 Options Exchange, Incorporated, Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated, Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc., Bats EDGA Exchange, Inc., Bats EDGX Exchange, Inc., Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc., International Securities Exchange, LLC, ISE Gemini, LLC, Miami International Securities Exchange LLC, NASDAQ BX, Inc., NASDAQ PHLX LLC, The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC, National Stock Exchange, Inc., New York Stock Exchange LLC, NYSE MKT LLC, and NYSE Arca, Inc. ISE Mercury and IEX will become Participants in the CAT NMS Plan and are thus accounted for as Participants for purposes of this Order. *See supra* note 10.

2. Members of National Securities Exchanges and National Securities Association

The information collection titled ''Creation of a Consolidated Audit Trail Pursuant to Section 11A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rules Thereunder'' also applies to the Participants' broker-dealer members, that is, Industry Members. The Commission believes that Rule 613 applies to 1,800 broker-dealers. The Commission understands that there are currently 4,138 broker-dealers; however, not all broker-dealers are expected to have CAT reporting obligations. The Participants report that approximately 1,800 broker-dealers currently quote or execute transactions in NMS Securities, Listed Options or OTC Equity Securities and would likely have CAT reporting obligations.[3229]

D. Total Initial and Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden

1. Burden on National Securities Exchanges and National Securities Associations

a. Central Repository

Rule 613 requires the Participants to jointly establish a Central Repository tasked with the receipt, consolidation, and retention of the reported order and execution information. The Participants reflected this requirement in the CAT NMS Plan. The Participants issued an RFP soliciting Bids from entities to act as the consolidated audit trail's Plan Processor.[3230] Bidders were asked to provide total one-year and annual recurring cost estimates to estimate the costs to the Participants for implementing and maintaining the Central Repository.[3231] There are currently three remaining Bidders, any of which could be selected to be the Plan Processor. The Plan Processor would be responsible for building, operating, administering and maintaining the Central Repository.

The Plan's Operating Committee, which consists of one voting representative of each Participant,[3232] would be responsible for the management of the LLC, including the Central Repository, acting by Majority or Supermajority Vote, depending on the issue.[3233] In managing the Central Repository, among other things, the Operating Committee would have the responsibility to authorize the following actions of the LLC: (1) Interpreting the Plan; [3234] (2) determining appropriate funding-related policies, procedures and practices consistent with Article XI of the CAT NMS Plan; [3235] (3) terminating the Plan Processor; (4) selecting a successor Plan Processor (including establishing a Plan Processor Selection Committee to evaluate and review Bids and make a recommendation to the Operating Committee with respect to the selection of the successor Plan Processor); [3236] (5) entering into, modifying or terminating any Material Contract; [3237] (6) making any Material Systems Change; [3238] (7) approving the initial Technical Specifications or any Material Amendment to the Technical Specifications proposed by the Plan Processor; [3239] (8) amending the Technical Specifications on its own motion; [3240] (9) approving the Plan Processor's appointment or removal of the CCO, CISO, or any Independent Auditor in accordance with Section 6.1(b) of the CAT NMS Plan; [3241] (10) approving any recommendation by the CCO pursuant to Section 6.2(a)(v)(A); [3242] (11) selecting the members of the Advisory Committee; [3243] (12) selecting the Operating Committee chair; [3244] and (13) determining to hold an Executive Session of the Operating Committee.[3245]

Additionally, in managing the Central Repository, the Operating Committee would have the responsibility and authority, as appropriate, to: (1) Direct the LLC to enter into one or more agreements with the Plan Processor obligating the Plan Processor to perform the functions and duties contemplated by the Plan to be performed by the Plan Processor, as well as such other functions and duties the Operating Committee deems necessary or appropriate; [3246] (2) appoint as an Officer of the Company the individual who has direct management responsibility for the Plan Processor's performance of its obligations with respect to the CAT; [3247] (3) approve policies, procedures, and control structures related to the CAT System that are consistent with Rule 613(e)(4), Appendix C and Appendix D of the CAT NMS Plan that have been developed and will be implemented by the Plan Processor; [3248] (4) approve any policy, procedure or standard (and any material modification or amendment thereto) applicable primarily to the performance of the Plan Processor's duties as the Plan Processor; [3249] (5) for both the CCO and CISO, render their annual performance reviews and review and approve their compensation; [3250] (6) review the Plan Processor's performance under the Plan at least once each year, or more often than once each year upon the request of two or more Participants that are not Affiliated Participants; [3251] (7) in conjunction with the Plan Processor, approve and regularly review (and update as necessary) SLAs governing the performance of the Central Repository; [3252] (8) maintain a Compliance Subcommittee for the purpose of aiding the CCO as necessary; [3253] and (9) designate by resolution one or more Subcommittees it deems necessary or desirable in furtherance of the management of the business and affairs of the Company.[3254]

The CAT NMS Plan will also establish a Selection Committee comprised of one Voting Senior Officer from each

[3229] The Commission understands that the remaining 2,338 registered broker-dealers either trade in asset classes not currently included in the definition of Eligible Security or do not trade at all (*e.g.,* broker-dealers for the purposes of underwriting, advising, private placements). *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30712, n.864.

[3230] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30616.

[3231] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(B). The CAT NMS Plan listed the following as primary drivers of Bid costs: (1) Reportable volumes of data ingested into the Central Repository; (2) number of technical environments that would have to be built to report to the Central Repository; (3) likely future rate of increase of reportable volumes; (4) data archival requirements; and (5) user support and/or help desk resource requirements. *Id.*

[3232] *See id.* at Section 4.2(a).

[3233] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30702.

[3234] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 4.3(a)(iii).

[3235] *See id.* at Section 4.3(a)(vi).

[3236] *See id.* at Section 4.3(b)(i).

[3237] *See id.* at Section 4.3(b)(iv).

[3238] *See id.* at Section 4.3(b)(v).

[3239] *See id.* at Section 4.3(b)(vi).

[3240] *See id.* at Section 4.3(b)(vii).

[3241] *See id.* at Section 4.3(b)(iii).

[3242] *See id.* at Section 4.3(a)(iv).

[3243] *See id.* at Section 4.3(a)(ii). Section 4.13(e) of the CAT NMS Plan states that the members of the Advisory Committee shall have the right to receive information concerning the operation of the Central Repository; provided that the Operating Committee retains the authority to determine the scope and content of information supplied to the Advisory Committee, which shall be limited to that information that is necessary and appropriate for the Advisory Committee to fulfill its functions. The Commission is amending this section to state that the members of the Advisory Committee shall receive the same information concerning the operation of the Central Repository as the Operating Committee; provided, however, that the Operating Committee may withhold information it reasonably determines requires confidential treatment. *See* Section IV.B.2, *supra.* The Commission does not believe this amendment would change the hourly burden or external cost imposed on Participants for management of the Central Repository.

[3244] *See id.* at Section 4.3(a)(i).

[3245] *See id.* at Section 4.3(a)(v).

[3246] *See id.* at Section 6.1(a).

[3247] *See id.* at Section 4.6(b).

[3248] *See id.* at Section 6.1(c).

[3249] *See id.* at Section 6.1(e).

[3250] *See id.* at Section 6.2(a)(iv), (b)(iv).

[3251] *See id.* at Section 6.1(n).

[3252] *See id.* at Section 6.1(h).

[3253] *See id.* at Section 4.12(b).

[3254] *See id.* at Section 4.12(a).

Participant,[3255] which is tasked with the review and evaluation of Bids and the selection of the Initial Plan Processor.[3256] The Selection Committee would determine, by Majority Vote, whether Shortlisted Bidders will have the opportunity to revise their Bids.[3257] The Selection Committee would review and evaluate all Shortlisted Bids, including any permitted revisions submitted by Shortlisted Bidders, and in doing so, may consult with the Advisory Committee (or the DAG until the Advisory Committee is formed) and such other Persons as the Selection Committee deems appropriate.[3258] After receipt of any permitted revisions, the Selection Committee would select the Initial Plan Processor from the Shortlisted Bids in two rounds of voting where each Participant has one vote via its Voting Senior Officer in each round.[3259] Following the selection of the Initial Plan Processor, the Participants would file with the Commission a statement identifying the Initial Plan Processor and including the information required by Rule 608.[3260]

For its initial and ongoing internal burden and cost estimates associated with the management of the Central Repository, the Commission is relying on estimates provided in the CAT NMS Plan for the development of the CAT NMS Plan, which the Participants ''have accrued, and will continue to accrue,'' [3261] and have described in the CAT NMS Plan as ''reasonably associated with creating, implementing, and maintaining the CAT upon the Commission's adoption of the CAT NMS Plan.'' [3262]

The Commission believes that the activities of the Operating Committee and the Selection Committee overlap with those undertaken by the Participants to develop the CAT NMS Plan. The CAT NMS Plan describes the costs incurred by the Participants to develop the CAT NMS Plan as including ''staff time contributed by each Participant to, among other things, determine the technological requirements for the Central Repository, develop the RFP, evaluate Bids received, design and collect the data necessary to evaluate costs and other economic impacts, meet with Industry Members to solicit feedback, and complete the CAT NMS Plan submitted to the Commission for consideration.'' [3263] For the building and management of the Central Repository, the Selection Committee and the Operating Committee would have comparable responsibilities. The Selection Committee would be required to review and evaluate all Shortlisted Bids, including any permitted revisions submitted by Shortlisted Bidders, and then to select the Initial Plan Processor from those Bids. As part of its overall management of the Central Repository, the Operating Committee would have responsibility for decisions associated with the technical requirements of the Central Repository.[3264] Furthermore, the Operating Committee would be required to establish a Selection Committee to evaluate Bids received to select a successor Plan Processor,[3265] and would also be required to authorize the selection of the members of the Advisory Committee,[3266] comprising members of the industry, to advise the Participants on the implementation, operation, and administration of the Central Repository.[3267] Because the responsibilities of the Operating Committee and the Selection Committee are similar to those described in the CAT NMS Plan for the development of the CAT NMS Plan itself, the Commission believes that it is reasonable to use the CAT NMS Plan estimates as the basis for its burden and cost estimates for the initial and ongoing management of the Central Repository.

(1) Initial Burden and Costs To Build the Central Repository

Each Participant would contribute an employee and a substitute for the employee to serve on the Operating Committee that would oversee the Central Repository.[3268] Additionally, each Participant would select a Voting Senior Officer to represent the Participant as a member of the Selection Committee responsible for the selection of the Plan Processor of the Central Repository.[3269]

A. Notice Estimates—Initial Burden and Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated that, over the 12-month period after the effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan within which the Participants would be required to select an Initial Plan Processor [3270] and begin reporting to the Central Repository,[3271] each Participant would incur an initial internal burden of 720 burden hours associated with the management of the creation of the Central Repository and the selection of the Plan Processor (including filing with the Commission the statement identifying the Initial Plan Processor and including the information required by Rule 608), for an aggregate initial estimate of 14,407 burden hours.[3272]

[3255] *See id.* at Section 5.1(a).

[3256] *See id.* at Section 5.1.

[3257] *See id.* at Section 5.2(d)(i).

[3258] *See id.* at Section 5.2(d)(ii).

[3259] *See id.* at Section 5.1(e).

[3260] *See id.* at Section 6.7(a)(i).

[3261] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii).

[3262] *See id.*

[3263] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii).

[3264] For example, the Operating Committee would be required to authorize the following actions of the LLC: Entering into, modifying or terminating any Material Contract (*see id.* at Section 4.3(b)(iv)); making any Material Systems Change (*see id.* at Section 4.3(b)(v)); amending the Technical Specifications on its own motion (*see id.* at Section 4.3(b)(vii)); and approving the initial Technical Specifications or any Material Amendment to the Technical Specifications proposed by the Plan Processor (*see id.* at Section 4.3(b)(vi)). Further, the Operating Committee would be able to approve policies, procedures, and control structures related to the CAT System that are consistent with Rule 613(e)(4), Appendix C and Appendix D of the CAT NMS Plan that have been developed and will be implemented by the Plan Processor (*see id.* at Section 6.1(c)); and in conjunction with the Plan Processor, approve and regularly review (and update as necessary) SLAs governing the performance of the Central Repository (*see id.* at Section 6.1(h)).

[3265] *See id.* at Section 4.3(b)(i).

[3266] *See id.* at Section 4.3(a)(ii).

[3267] *See id.* at Section 4.13(d).

[3268] In the case of Affiliated Participants, one individual may be the primary representative for all or some of the Affiliated Participants, and another individual may be the substitute for all or some of the Affiliated Participants. *See id.* at Section 4.2(a).

[3269] In the case of Affiliated Participants, one individual may be (but is not required to be) the Voting Senior Officer for more than one or all of the Affiliated Participants. Where one individual serves as the Voting Senior Officer for more than one Affiliated Participant, such individual will have the right to vote on behalf of each such Affiliated Participant. *See id.* at Section 5.1(a).

[3270] Rule 613(a)(3)(i) requires the selection of the Plan Processor within 2 months after effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan. *See* 17 CFR 242.613(a)(3)(i).

[3271] Rule 613(a)(3)(iii) requires the Participants to provide to the Central Repository the data required by Rule 613(c) within one year after effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan. *See* 17 CFR 242.613(a)(3)(iii).

[3272] The Commission based this estimate on the internal burden estimate provided in the CAT NMS Plan related to the development of the CAT NMS Plan. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii) (stating ''. . . the Participants have accrued, and will continue to accrue, direct costs associated with the development of the CAT NMS Plan. These costs include staff time contributed by each Participant to, among other things, determine the technological requirements for the Central Repository, develop the RFP, evaluate Bids received, design and collect the data necessary to evaluate costs and other economic impacts, meet with Industry Members to solicit feedback, and complete the CAT NMS Plan submitted to the Commission for consideration. The Participants estimated that they have collectively contributed 20 FTEs in the first 30 months of the CAT NMS Plan development process''). The Commission believed the staff time incurred for the development of the CAT NMS Plan would be comparable to the staff time incurred for the activities required of the Operating Committee and the Selection Committee for the creation and management of the Central Repository once the Plan is effective. (20 FTEs/30 months) = 0.667 FTEs per month for all of the Participants to develop the CAT NMS Plan. Converting this into burden hours, (0.667 FTEs) × (12 months) × (1,800 burden hours

Additionally, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the Participants would collectively spend $2,400,000 on external public relations, legal and consulting costs associated with building the Central Repository and the selection of the Plan Processor for the Central Repository, or $120,000 per Participant.[3273] The Commission based this estimate on the estimate provided in the CAT NMS Plan for public relations, legal and consulting costs incurred in preparation of the CAT NMS Plan. Because the Participants described such costs as ''reasonably associated with creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT,'' [3274] the Commission preliminarily believed these external cost estimates should also be applied to the creation and implementation of the Central Repository.

Using the estimates in the CAT NMS Plan, which are based on the Bids of the six Shortlisted Bidders,[3275] the Commission preliminarily estimated that the initial one-time cost to develop the Central Repository would be an aggregate initial external cost to the Participants of $91.6 million,[3276] or $4.6 million per Participant.[3277] The Commission preliminarily estimated that each Participant would incur initial one-time external costs of $7 million [3278] to build the Central Repository, or an aggregate initial one-time external cost across all Participants of $140 million.[3279] The estimates in the CAT NMS Plan, as well as the Commission's preliminary estimate includes internal technological, operational, administrative and ''any other material costs.'' [3280]

B. Order Estimates—Initial Burden and Costs

Subsequent to the publication of the Notice, the Participants submitted revised Central Repository cost estimates to reflect the proposed development and maintenance costs of the final three Shortlisted Bidders.[3281] In addition, with the registration of IEX as a national securities exchange in June 2016,[3282] the expected number of Participants has increased from 20 to 21. As a result, the Commission is modifying its estimates of the initial burden and costs of the Central Repository.

After incorporating the revisions to the Central Repository cost estimates and the increase in the number of Participants, the Commission now estimates that, over the 12-month period after the effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan within which the Participants would be required to select an Initial Plan Processor [3283] and begin reporting to the Central Repository,[3284] each Participant would incur an initial internal burden of 686.05 burden hours associated with the management of the creation of the Central Repository and the selection of the Plan Processor (including filing with the Commission the statement identifying the Initial Plan Processor and including the information required by Rule 608), for an aggregate initial estimate of 14,407 burden hours.[3285]

The Commission has not changed its estimate that the Participants will collectively spend $2,400,000 on external public relations, legal and consulting costs associated with the building of the Central Repository. However, the individual Participant cost estimate has decreased from $120,000 per Participant (as the Commission preliminarily estimated in the Notice [3286]) to $114,285.71 per Participant, due to the increase in the number of Participants.[3287] As noted in

per year) = 14,407 initial burden hours for all of the Participants to develop the CAT NMS Plan. (14,407 burden hours for all Participants/20 Participants) = 720 initial burden hours for each Participant to develop the CAT NMS Plan.

[3273] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii) (stating ''the Participants have incurred public relations, legal and consulting costs in preparation of the CAT NMS Plan. The Participants estimated the costs of these services to be $8,800,000''). $2,400,000 for all Participants over 12 months = ($8,800,000/44 months between the adoption of Rule 613 and the filing of the CAT NMS Plan) × (12 months). ($2,400,000/20 Participants) = $120,000 per Participant over 12 months.

[3274] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii).

[3275] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(B). *See also id.* at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iv)(A)(1). The Commission noted that the cost associated with the build and maintenance of the Central Repository includes compliance with the requirement in Rule 613(e)(8) that the Central Repository retain information collected pursuant to Rule 613(c)(7) and (e)(7) in a convenient and usable standard electronic data format that is directly available and searchable electronically without any manual intervention for a period of not less than five years. *See id.* at Section 6.1(d)(i) (requiring the Plan Processor to comply with the recordkeeping requirements of Rule 613(e)(8)). *See also id.* at Appendix C, Section D.12(l) (stating that Rule 613(e)(8) requires data to be available and searchable for a period of not less than five years, that broker-dealers are currently required to retain data for six years under Rule 17a–4(a), and that the Participants are requiring CAT Data to be kept online in an easily accessible format for regulators for six years, though this may increase the cost to run the CAT). The Commission notes that changes in technology between the time the Bids were submitted and the time the Central Repository is built could result in changes to the costs to build and operate the Central Repository.

[3276] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(B) (describing the minimum, median, mean and maximum Bidder estimates for the build and maintenance costs of the Central Repository).

[3277] *Id.* The Bidders provided a range of estimates. For purposes of this Paperwork Burden Act analysis, the Commission used the build cost of the maximum Bidder estimate. $4,580,000 = $91,600,000/20 SROs.

[3278] $7 million for each Participant to build the Central Repository = ($4.6 million per Participant in initial one-time costs to compensate the Plan Processor to build the Central Repository) + ($2.4 million per Participant in initial one-time public relations, legal and consulting costs associated with the building of the Central Repository and the selection of the Initial Plan Processor).

[3279] $140 million for all of the Participants to build the Central Repository = $7 million per Participant to build the Central Repository) × (20 Participants). *Id.*

[3280] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(B).

[3281] *See* Response Letter III at 14–15.

[3282] IEX became a registered national securities exchange on June 17, 2016. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 78101 (June 17, 2016), 81 FR 41142 (June 23, 2016).

[3283] Rule 613(a)(3)(i) requires the selection of the Plan Processor within 2 months after effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan. *See* 17 CFR 242.613(a)(3)(i).

[3284] Rule 613(a)(3)(iii) requires the Participants to provide to the Central Repository the data required by Rule 613(c) within one year after effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan. *See* 17 CFR 242.613(a)(3)(iii).

[3285] The Commission based this estimate on the internal burden estimate provided in the CAT NMS Plan related to the development of the CAT NMS Plan. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii) (stating ''. . . the Participants have accrued, and will continue to accrue, direct costs associated with the development of the CAT NMS Plan. These costs include staff time contributed by each Participant to, among other things, determine the technological requirements for the Central Repository, develop the RFP, evaluate Bids received, design and collect the data necessary to evaluate costs and other economic impacts, meet with Industry Members to solicit feedback, and complete the CAT NMS Plan submitted to the Commission for consideration. The Participants estimated that they have collectively contributed 20 FTEs in the first 30 months of the CAT NMS Plan development process''). The Commission believed the staff time incurred for the development of the CAT NMS Plan would be comparable to the staff time incurred for the activities required of the Operating Committee and the Selection Committee for the creation and management of the Central Repository once the Plan is effective). (20 FTEs/30 months) = 0.667 FTEs per month for all of the Participants to develop the CAT NMS Plan. Converting this into burden hours, (0.667 FTEs) × (12 months) × (1,800 burden hours per year) = 14,407 initial burden hours for all of the Participants to develop the CAT NMS Plan. (14,407 burden hours for all Participants/21 Participants) = 686.05 initial burden hours for each Participant associated with the management of the creation of the Central Repository and the selection of the Plan Processor.

[3286] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section V.D.l.a(1).

[3287] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii) (stating ''the Participants have incurred public relations, legal and consulting costs in preparation of the CAT NMS Plan. The Participants estimate the costs of these services to be $8,800,000''). $2,400,000 for all Participants over 12 months = ($8,800,000/44 months between the adoption of Rule 613 and the filing of the CAT NMS Plan) × (12 months). ($2,400,000/21 Participants) = $114,285.71 per Participant over 12 months.

the Notice, the Commission is basing this estimate on the estimate provided in the CAT NMS Plan for public relations, legal and consulting costs incurred in preparation of the CAT NMS Plan. Because the Participants described such costs as ''reasonably associated with creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT,'' [3288] the Commission believes these external cost estimates should also be applied to the creation and implementation of the Central Repository.

As noted above, the Participants updated the Central Repository estimates to reflect the estimates of the final three Shortlisted Bidders.[3289] Using the revised estimates, the Commission estimates that the initial one-time cost to develop the Central Repository would be an aggregate initial external cost to the Participants of $65 million,[3290] or $3,095,238.09 per Participant.[3291] Therefore, the Commission now estimates that each Participant would incur initial one-time external costs of $3,209,523.80 [3292] to build the Central Repository, or an aggregate initial one-time external cost across all Participants of $67,399,999.80.[3293]

(2) Ongoing, Annual Burden Hours and Costs for the Central Repository

After the Central Repository has been developed and implemented, there would be ongoing costs for operating and maintaining the Central Repository, including the cost of systems and connectivity upgrades or changes necessary to receive and consolidate the reported order and execution information from Participants and their members; the cost to store data, and make it available to regulators, in a uniform electronic format, and in a form in which all events pertaining to the same originating order are linked together in a manner that ensures timely and accurate retrieval of the information; the cost of collecting and maintaining the NBBO and transaction data in a format compatible with the order and event information collected pursuant to the Rule; the cost of monitoring the required validation parameters, which would allow the Central Repository to automatically check the accuracy and completeness of the data submitted and reject data not conforming to these parameters consistent with the requirements of the Rule; and the cost of paying the CCO and CISO. The CAT NMS Plan provides that the Plan Processor would be responsible for the ongoing operations of the Central Repository.[3294] The Operating Committee would continue to be responsible for the management of the Central Repository. In addition, the CAT NMS Plan states that the Participants would incur costs for public relations, legal, and consulting costs associated with maintaining the CAT upon approval of the CAT NMS Plan.[3295]

A. Notice Estimates—Ongoing Burden and Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated that each Participant would incur an ongoing annual internal burden of 720 burden hours associated with the continued management of the Central Repository, for an aggregate annual estimate of 14,407 burden hours across the Participants.[3296]

Additionally, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the Participants would collectively spend $800,000 annually on external public relations, legal and consulting costs associated with the continued management of the Central Repository, or $40,000 per Participant.[3297]

The CAT NMS Plan includes the estimates the six Shortlisted Bidders provided for the annual ongoing costs to the Participants to operate the Central Repository.[3298] The CAT NMS Plan did not categorize the costs included in the ongoing costs, but the Commission believed they would comprise external technological, operational and administrative costs, as the Participants described the costs included in the initial one-time external cost to build the Central Repository.[3299] Using these estimates, the Commission preliminarily

---

[3288] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii).

[3289] *See* Response Letter III at 14–15.

[3290] *See id.*

[3291] *Id.* The Participants provided a range of Bidder estimates. For purposes of this Paperwork Burden Act analysis, the Commission is using the build cost of the maximum estimate. $3,095,238.09 = $65,000,000/21 Participants.

[3292] $3,209,523.80 for each Participant to build the Central Repository = ($3,095,238.09 per Participant in initial one-time costs to compensate the Plan Processor to build the Central Repository) + ($114,285.71 per Participant in initial one-time public relations, legal and consulting costs associated with the building of the Central Repository and the selection of the Initial Plan Processor).

Commission staff notes that the Notice for the CAT NMS Plan contained an erroneous estimate of the initial one-time external costs to the Participants to build the Central Repository, estimating that each Participant would incur a cost of $7 million. The correct estimate was $4,476,190.47 per Participant. However, the Commission has subsequently revised its estimated costs to account for updated estimates provided by the Participants. *See supra* note 3289.

[3293] $67,399,999.80 for all of the Participants to build the Central Repository = ($3,209,523.80 per Participant to build the Central Repository) × (21 Participants).

[3294] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.1.

[3295] *See id.* at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii).

[3296] The Commission based this estimate on the internal burden estimate provided in the CAT NMS Plan for the development of the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission noted that the CAT NMS Plan describes the internal burden estimate for the development of the CAT NMS Plan as a cost the Participants will continue to accrue; therefore, the Commission preliminarily believed that it is reasonable to use this burden estimate as the basis for its ongoing internal burden estimate for the maintenance of the Central Repository, particularly as the Commission believed the reasons for the staff time incurred for the development of the CAT NMS Plan would be comparable to those of the staff time to be incurred by the Operating Committee and the Selection Committee for the continued management of the Central Repository. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii) (stating ''. . . the Participants have accrued, and will continue to accrue, direct costs associated with the development of the CAT NMS Plan. These costs include staff time contributed by each Participant to, among other things, determine the technological requirements for the Central Repository, develop the RFP, evaluate Bids received, design and collect the data necessary to evaluate costs and other economic impacts, meet with Industry Members to solicit feedback, and complete the CAT NMS Plan submitted to the Commission for consideration. The Participants estimate that they have collectively contributed 20 FTEs in the first 30 months of the CAT NMS Plan development process''). (20 FTEs/30 months) = 0.667 FTEs per month for all of the Participants to continue management of the Central Repository. Converting this into burden hours, (0.667 FTEs) × (12 months) × (1,800 burden hours per year) = 14,407 ongoing annual burden hours for all of the Participants to continue management of the Central Repository. (14,407 ongoing annual burden hours for all Participants/20 Participants) = 720 ongoing annual burden hours for each Participant to continue management of the Central Repository.

[3297] The Commission based this external cost estimate on the public relations, legal and consulting external cost estimate provided in the CAT NMS Plan associated with the preparation of the CAT NMS Plan (which the Participants consider ''reasonably associated with creating, implementing, and maintaining the CAT upon the Commission's adoption of the CAT NMS Plan''). *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii) (stating ''the Participants have incurred public relations, legal and consulting costs in preparation of the CAT NMS Plan. The Participants estimated the costs of these services to be $8,800,000''). $2,400,000 for all Participants over 12 months = ($8,800,000/44 months between the adoption of Rule 613 and the filing of the CAT NMS Plan) × (12 months). Because the Central Repository will have already been created, the Commission believed it is reasonable to assume that the Participants will have a lesser need for public relations, legal and consulting services. The Commission estimated that the Participants will incur one-third of the external cost associated with development and implementation of the Central Repository to maintain the Central Repository. $800,000 = (0.333) × ($2,400,000). ($800,000/20 Participants) = $40,000 per Participant over 12 months.

[3298] *See* Section V.F.1.a, *supra,* for a discussion of the total five-year operating costs for the Central Repository presented in the CAT NMS Plan. *See also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(B).

[3299] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(B).

estimated that the annual ongoing cost to the Participants [3300] to compensate the Plan Processor for building, operating and maintaining the Central Repository would be an aggregate ongoing external cost of $93 million,[3301] or approximately $4.7 million per Participant.[3302] Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that each Participant would incur ongoing annual external costs of $4,740,000 [3303] to maintain the Central Repository, or aggregate ongoing annual external costs across all Participants of $94,800,000.[3304]

B. Comments/Responses on Ongoing Costs

One commenter provided an alternate estimate for Central Repository ongoing costs of $28 million–$36 million.[3305] The commenter did not provide additional information or analysis to support this estimate, but the Commission notes that the commenter cited a study of the costs of the Volcker Rule in support of estimates for costs to Industry Members.[3306] If the commenter is basing its estimates on the costs expected from the Volcker Rule, the Commission notes that the requirements of Rule 613 are significantly different than the requirements of the Volcker Rule. The Commission also notes that the estimates provided in the Notice are the result of a competitive bidding process specific to the CAT and the Commission deems them credible.

C. Order Estimates—Ongoing Burden and Costs

As noted above, subsequent to the publication of the Notice, the Participants submitted revised Central Repository cost estimates to reflect the proposed development and maintenance costs of the final three Shortlisted Bidders.[3307] In addition, with the registration of IEX as a national securities exchange in June 2016,[3308] the expected number of Participants has increased from 20 to 21. As a result, the Commission is modifying its estimates of the ongoing burden and costs of the Central Repository.

After incorporating the revisions to the Central Repository cost estimates and the increase in the number of Participants, the Commission now estimates that each Participant would incur an ongoing annual internal burden of 686.05 burden hours associated with the continued management of the Central Repository, for an aggregate annual estimate of 14,407 burden hours across the Participants.[3309]

The Commission has not changed its estimate that the Participants would collectively spend $800,000 annually on external public relations, legal and consulting costs associated with the continued management of the Central Repository. However, the individual Participant cost estimate has decreased from $40,000 per Participant (as the Commission preliminarily estimated in the Notice [3310]) to $38,095.24 per Participant [3311] due to the increase in the number of Participants.[3312]

As noted above, the Participants updated the Central Repository estimates to reflect the estimates of the final three Shortlisted Bidders.[3313] Using the revised estimates, the Commission now estimates that the annual ongoing cost to the Participants to compensate the Plan Processor for building, operating and maintaining the Central Repository would be an aggregate ongoing external cost of $55 million,[3314] or $2,619,047.62 per Participant.[3315] Therefore, the

[3300] *See supra* note 3276.

[3301] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(B).

[3302] The Bidders provided a range of estimates. For purposes of this Paperwork Burden Act analysis, the Commission preliminarily used the maximum operation and maintenance cost estimate. $4,650,000 = $93,000,000/20 Participants. *See also* Section V.F.1.a, *supra.* The Commission noted several uncertainties that may affect the Central Repository cost estimates, including (1) that the Participants have not yet selected a Plan Processor and the Shortlisted Bidders have submitted a wide range of cost estimates for building and operating the Central Repository; (2) the Bids submitted by the Shortlisted Bidders may not be final because they may be revised before the final selection of the CAT Processor; and (3) neither the Bidders nor the Commission can anticipate the evolution of technology and market activity with precision, as improvements in available technology may allow the Central Repository to be built and operated at a lower cost than is currently anticipated, but if levels of anticipated market activity are materially underestimated, the capacity of the Central Repository may need to be increased, resulting in an increase in costs.

[3303] $4,740,000 for each Participant to build the Central Repository = ($4.7 million per Participant in ongoing annual costs to build the Central Repository) + ($40,000 per Participant in ongoing annual public relations, legal and consulting costs associated with the maintenance of the Central Repository).

[3304] $94,800,000 for all of the Participants to maintain the Central Repository = ($4,740,000 per Participant to compensate the Plan Processor and for external public relations, legal and consulting costs associated with the maintenance of the Central Repository) × (20 Participants).

[3305] Data Boiler Letter at 15.

[3306] Data Boiler Letter at 15.

[3307] *See* Response Letter III at 14–15. The Commission continues to believe that estimating Central Repository costs using estimates from the Bids is reliable and is therefore updating its cost estimates to reflect the updates provided by the Participants.

[3308] *See supra* note 3282.

[3309] The Commission is basing this estimate on the internal burden estimate provided in the CAT NMS Plan for the development of the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan describes the internal burden estimate for the development of the CAT NMS Plan as a cost the Participants will continue to accrue; therefore, the Commission believes that it is reasonable to use this burden estimate as the basis for its ongoing internal burden estimate for the maintenance of the Central Repository, particularly as the Commission believes the reasons for the staff time incurred for the development of the CAT NMS Plan would be comparable to those of the staff time to be incurred by the Operating Committee and the Selection Committee for the continued management of the Central Repository. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii) (stating ''. . . the Participants have accrued, and will continue to accrue, direct costs associated with the development of the CAT NMS Plan. These costs include staff time contributed by each Participant to, among other things, determine the technological requirements for the Central Repository, develop the RFP, evaluate Bids received, design and collect the data necessary to evaluate costs and other economic impacts, meet with Industry Members to solicit feedback, and complete the CAT NMS Plan submitted to the Commission for consideration. The Participants estimate that they have collectively contributed 20 FTEs in the first 30 months of the CAT NMS Plan development process''). (20 FTEs/30 months) = 0.667 FTEs per month for all of the Participants to continue management of the Central Repository. Converting this into burden hours, (0.667 FTEs) × (12 months) × (1,800 burden hours per year) = 14,407 ongoing annual burden hours for all of the Participants to continue management of the Central Repository. (14,407 ongoing annual burden hours for all Participants/21 Participants) = 686.05 ongoing annual burden hours for each Participant to continue management of the Central Repository.

[3310] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section V.D.l.a(1).

[3311] The Commission is basing this external cost estimate on the public relations, legal and consulting external cost estimate provided in the CAT NMS Plan associated with the preparation of the CAT NMS Plan (which the Participants consider ''reasonably associated with creating, implementing, and maintaining the CAT upon the Commission's adoption of the CAT NMS Plan''). *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii) (stating ''the Participants have incurred public relations, legal and consulting costs in preparation of the CAT NMS Plan. The Participants estimate the costs of these services to be $8,800,000''). $2,400,000 for all Participants over 12 months = ($8,800,000/44 months between the adoption of Rule 613 and the filing of the CAT NMS Plan) × (12 months). Because the Central Repository will have already been created, the Commission believes it is reasonable to assume that the Participants will have a lesser need for public relations, legal and consulting services. The Commission is estimating that the Participants will incur one-third of the external cost associated with development and implementation of the Central Repository to maintain the Central Repository. $800,000 = (0.333) × ($2,400,000). ($800,000/21 Participants) = $38,095.24 per Participant over 12 months.

[3312] *See supra* note 3282.

[3313] *See* Response Letter III at 14–15.

[3314] *Id.*

[3315] The Participants provided a range of Bidder estimates. *See id.* For purposes of this Paperwork Burden Act analysis, the Commission is using the maximum operation and maintenance cost estimate. $2,619,047.62 = $55,000,000/21 Participants. The Commission noted several uncertainties that may affect the Central Repository cost estimates, including (1) that the Participants have not yet selected a Plan Processor and the Shortlisted Bidders have submitted a wide range of cost

Continued

Commission estimates that each Participant would incur ongoing annual external costs of $2,657,142.86 [3316] to maintain the Central Repository, or aggregate ongoing annual external costs across all Participants of $55,800,000.06.[3317]

b. Data Collection and Reporting

Rule 613(c)(1) requires the CAT NMS Plan to provide for an accurate, time-sequenced record of orders beginning with the receipt or origination of an order by a Participant, and further to document the life of the order through the process of routing, modification, cancellation and execution (in whole or in part) of the order. Rule 613(c) requires the CAT NMS Plan to impose requirements on Participants to record and report CAT information to the Central Repository in accordance with specified timelines.

Rule 613(c) would require the collection and reporting of some information that Participants already collect to operate their business and are required to maintain in compliance with Section 17(a) of the Exchange Act and Rule 17a–1 thereunder.[3318] For instance, the Commission believes that the national securities exchanges keep records pursuant to Section 17(a) of the Exchange Act and Rule 17a–1 thereunder in electronic form, of the receipt of all orders entered into their systems, as well as records of the routing, modification, cancellation, and execution of those orders. However, Rule 613 requires the Participants to collect and report additional and more detailed information, and to report the information to the Central Repository in a uniform electronic format, or in a manner that would allow the Central Repository to convert the data to a uniform electronic format for consolidation and storage.

For its estimates of the Participants' costs to report CAT Data, the Commission is relying on the cost data provided by the Participants in the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission believes that such reliance is appropriate because the estimates in the CAT NMS Plan are based on Participants' responses to the Participants Study undertaken to estimate CAT-related costs for hardware and software, FTE costs, and third-party providers, if the Commission approves the CAT NMS Plan.[3319] The Commission is providing below its paperwork burden estimates for the initial burden hours and external costs, and ongoing, annual burden hours and external costs to be incurred by the Participants to comply with the data reporting requirements of Rule 613.[3320]

(1) Initial Burden Hours and External Cost

The CAT NMS Plan provides the following average costs that the Participants would expect to incur to adopt the systems changes needed to comply with the data reporting requirements of the CAT: $10,300,000 in aggregate FTE costs for internal operational, technical/development, and compliance functions; $770,000 in aggregate third party legal and consulting costs; and $17,900,000 in aggregate total costs.[3321]

A. Notice Estimates—Initial Burden and Costs

In the Notice, based on estimates provided in the CAT NMS Plan, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the initial internal burden hours to develop and implement the needed systems changes to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository in compliance with the Rule for each Participant would be approximately 2,185 burden hours.[3322] The Commission also preliminarily estimated that each Participant would, on average, incur approximately $38,500 in initial third party legal and consulting costs [3323] for a total of $380,000 in initial external costs.[3324] Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that, for all Participants, the estimated aggregate one-time burden would be 43,690 hours [3325] and the estimated aggregate

estimates for building and operating the Central Repository; (2) the Bids submitted by the Shortlisted Bidders may not be final because they may be revised before the final selection of the CAT Processor; and (3) neither the Bidders nor the Commission can anticipate the evolution of technology and market activity with precision, as improvements in available technology may allow the Central Repository to be built and operated at a lower cost than is currently anticipated, but if levels of anticipated market activity are materially underestimated, the capacity of the Central Repository may need to be increased, resulting in an increase in costs.

[3316] $2,657,142.86 for each Participant to maintain the Central Repository = ($2,619,047.62 per Participant in ongoing annual costs to maintain the Central Repository) + ($38,095.24 per Participant in ongoing annual public relations, legal and consulting costs associated with the maintenance of the Central Repository).

[3317] $55,800,000.06 for all of the Participants to maintain the Central Repository = ($2,657,142.86 per Participant to compensate the Plan Processor and for external public relations, legal and consulting costs associated with the maintenance of the Central Repository) × (21 Participants).

[3318] 15 U.S.C. 78q(a); 17 CFR 240.17a–1.

[3319] Third-party provider costs are generally legal and consulting costs, but may include other outsourcing. The template used by respondents is *available at http://catnmsplan.com/PastEvents/* under the Section titled ''6/23/14'' at the ''Cost Study Working Template'' link.

[3320] The Commission notes that throughout this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, it is categorizing the FTE cost estimates for the Participants, as well as the broker-dealer respondents, that were provided in the CAT NMS Plan as an internal burden. To convert the FTE cost estimates into internal burden hours, the Commission: (1) Divided the FTE cost estimates by a divisor of $424,350, which is the Commission's estimated average salary for a full-time equivalent employee in the securities industry in a job category associated with regulatory data reporting; and then (2) multiplied the quotient by 1,800 (the number of hours a full-time equivalent employee is estimated to work per year). *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(ii)(C), n.192. The Participants represented that the cost per FTE is $401,440. The $401,440 figure used in the CAT NMS Plan was based on a Programmer Analyst's salary ($193 per hour) from SIFMA's *Management & Professional Earnings in the Securities Industry 2008,* multiplied by 40 hours per week, then multiplied by 52 weeks per year. The Commission has updated this number to include recent salary data for other job categories associated with regulatory data reporting in the securities industry, using the hour and multiple methodology used by the Commission in its paperwork burden analyses. The Commission is using $424,350 as its annual cost per FTE for purposes of its cost estimates. The $424,350 FTE cost = 25% Compliance Manager + 75% Programmer Analyst (0.25) × ($283 per hour × 1,800 working hours per year) + (0.75) × ($220 per hour × 1,800 working hours per year). The $283 per hour figure for a Compliance Manager and the $220 per hour figure for a Programmer Analyst are from SIFMA's *Management & Professional Earnings in the Securities Industry 2013,* modified by the Commission to account for an 1,800-hour work-year and multiplied by 5.35 to account for bonuses, firm size, employee benefits and overhead.

[3321] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(B)(2). Of the $17,900,000 in aggregate total costs, $11,070,000 is identified (subtotal of FTE costs and outsourcing), but the remaining $6,830,000 is not identified in the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission believes that the $6,830,000 may be attributed to hardware costs because the Participants have not provided any hardware costs associated with data reporting elsewhere and the Commission believes that the Participants will likely incur external costs to purchase upgraded hardware to report data to the Central Repository.

[3322] ($10,300,000 anticipated initial FTE costs)/(20 SROs) = $515,000 in anticipated initial FTE costs per Participant. ($515,000 in anticipated initial FTE costs per Participant)/($424,350 FTE costs per Participant) = 1.214 anticipated FTEs per Participant for the implementation of data reporting. (1.214 FTEs) × (1,800 working hours per year) = 2,184.5 initial burden hours per Participant to implement CAT Data reporting.

[3323] ($770,000 anticipated initial third party costs)/(20 Participants) = $38,500 in initial anticipated third party costs per Participant.

[3324] To determine the total initial external cost per Participant, the Commission subtracted the anticipated initial FTE cost estimates for the Participants as provided in the Plan from the total aggregate initial costs to the Participants and divided the remainder by 20 Participants. ($17,900,000 total aggregate initial cost to Participants) − ($10,300,000 initial FTE cost to Participants) = $7,600,000. ($7,600,000)/20 Participants = $380,000 in initial external costs per Participant. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(B)(1) for the Participants' anticipated costs associated with the implementation of regulatory reporting to the Central Repository.

[3325] 43,690 initial burden hours = (20 Participants) × (2,184.5 initial burden hours).

initial external cost would be $7,600,000.[3326]

B. Comments/Responses on Initial Costs

One commenter believed that estimates of current data reporting costs to Participants were ''grossly underestimated,'' [3327] and stated that the implementation cost estimate of $17.9 million for Participants was ''not too far off,'' but felt the Participants' estimated costs for legal and consulting services and additional employees were not reliable.[3328]

The Commission has considered the comment and continues to believe that the Participant cost estimates presented in the Plan are credible and is thus not changing its cost estimates of Participants' Data Recording and Reporting in response to the commenter. All 19 Participants [3329] responded to the Participants Study that served as the basis of the estimates, and most Participants have experience collecting audit trail data as well as expertise in the requirements of the CAT and in their business practices. The commenter did not provide an explanation for why the Participants were unable to reasonably estimate their own current data reporting costs.

C. Order Estimates—Initial Burden and Costs

As noted earlier, subsequent to the publication of the Notice, the expected number of Participants has increased from 20 to 21.[3330] As a result, the Commission is modifying its estimates of the initial burden and costs of Participants' data collection and reporting. After incorporating the increase in the number of Participants, the Commission now estimates that the initial internal burden hours to develop and implement the needed systems changes to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository in compliance with the Rule for each Participant would be approximately 2,080.80 burden hours.[3331] The Commission also now estimates that each Participant would, on average, incur approximately $36,666.67 in initial third party legal and consulting costs [3332] for a total of $361,904.76 in initial external costs.[3333] Therefore, the Commission now estimates that, for all Participants, the estimated aggregate one-time burden would be 43,696.80 hours [3334] and the estimated aggregate initial external cost would be approximately $7,600,000.[3335]

(2) Ongoing, Annual Burden Hours and External Cost

Once a Participant has established the appropriate systems and processes required for collection and transmission of the required information to the Central Repository, the Commission estimates that Rule 613 would impose on each Participant ongoing annual burdens associated with, among other things, personnel time to monitor each Participant's reporting of the required data and the maintenance of the systems to report the required data; and implementing changes to trading systems that might result in additional reports to the Central Repository. The CAT NMS Plan provides the following average aggregate costs that the Participants would expect to incur to maintain data reporting systems to be in compliance with Rule 613: $7,300,000 in anticipated annual FTE costs for operational, technical/development, and compliance functions related to data reporting; $720,000 in annual third party legal, consulting, and other costs; [3336] and $14,700,000 total annual costs.[3337]

A. Notice Estimates—Ongoing Burden and Costs

In the Notice, based on estimates provided in the CAT NMS Plan, the Commission believed that it would take each Participant 1,548 ongoing burden hours per year [3338] to continue compliance with Rule 613. The Commission preliminarily estimated that it would cost, on average, approximately $36,000 in ongoing third party legal and consulting and other costs [3339] and $370,000 in total ongoing external costs per Participant.[3340] Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the estimated aggregate ongoing burden for all Participants would be approximately 30,966 hours [3341] and an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost of $7,400,000.[3342]

B. Comments/Responses on Ongoing Costs

One commenter noted that the Participants' ongoing data reporting cost estimates do not include a ''per-message toll charge in the CAT funding model.'' [3343] The Commission considered this comment, but notes that the Participants are not charged for message traffic according to the Plan's funding model.

One commenter noted that the Participants' ongoing data reporting cost estimates do not include a ''per-message toll charge in the CAT funding model.'' [3344] The Commission

[3326] $7,600,000 = ($380,000 in initial external costs) × (20 Participants).

[3327] Data Boiler Letter at 35.

[3328] Data Boiler Letter at 35.

[3329] There were 19 Participants at the time the Participants conducted the study.

[3330] *See supra* note 3282.

[3331] ($10,300,000 anticipated initial FTE costs)/(21 Participants) = $490,476.19 in anticipated initial FTE costs per Participant. ($490,476.19 in anticipated initial FTE costs per Participant)/($424,350 FTE costs per Participant) = 1.156 anticipated FTEs per Participant for the implementation of data reporting. (1.156 FTEs) × (1,800 working hours per year) = 2,080.8 initial burden hours per Participant to implement CAT Data reporting.

[3332] ($770,000 anticipated initial third party costs)/(21 Participants) = $36,666.67 in initial anticipated third party costs per Participant.

[3333] To determine the total initial external cost per Participant, the Commission subtracted the anticipated initial FTE cost estimates for the Participants as provided in the Plan from the total aggregate initial costs to the Participants and divided the remainder by 21 Participants. ($17,900,000 total aggregate initial cost to Participants) − ($10,300,000 initial FTE cost to Participants) = $7,600,000. ($7,600,000)/21 Participants = $361,904.76 in initial external costs per Participant. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(B)(1) for the Participants' anticipated costs associated with the implementation of regulatory reporting to the Central Repository.

[3334] 43,696.80 initial burden hours = (21 Participants) × (2,080.80 initial burden hours).

[3335] $7,599,999.96 = ($361,904.76 in initial external costs) × (21 Participants).

[3336] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(B)(2). The CAT NMS Plan did not identify the other costs.

[3337] Of the $14,700,000 in aggregate total annual costs, $8,020,000 is identified (subtotal of FTE costs and outsourcing), but the remaining $6,680,000 is not identified in the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission believes that this amount may be attributed to hardware costs because the Participants have not provided any hardware costs associated with data reporting elsewhere and the Commission believes that the Participants will likely incur costs to upgrade their hardware to report data to the Central Repository.

[3338] ($7,300,000 in anticipated Participant annual FTE costs)/(20 Participants) = $365,000 in anticipated per Participant annual FTE costs. ($365,000 in anticipated per Participant FTE costs)/($424,350 FTE cost per Participant) = 0.86 anticipated FTEs per Participant. (0.86 FTEs) × (1,800 working hours per year) = 1,548.3 burden hours per Participant to maintain CAT Data reporting.

[3339] ($720,000 in annual third party costs)/(20 Participants) = $36,000 per Participant in anticipated annual third party costs.

[3340] To determine the total external annual cost per Participant, the Commission subtracted the anticipated annual FTE cost estimates for the Participants as provided in the Plan from the total aggregate annual costs to the Participants and divided the remainder by 20 Participants. ($14,700,000 total aggregate annual cost to Participants) − ($7,300,000 annual FTE cost to Participants) = $7,400,000. ($7,400,000)/20 Participants = $370,000 in annual external costs per Participant. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(B)(1) for the Participants' anticipated maintenance costs associated with regulatory reporting to the Central Repository.

[3341] 30,966 annual burden hours = (20 Participants) × (1,548.3 annual burden hours).

[3342] $7,400,000 = ($370,000 in total annual external costs) × (20 Participants).

[3343] Data Boiler Letter at 35.

[3344] Data Boiler Letter at 35.

considered this comment, but notes that the Participants are not charged for message traffic according to the Plan's funding model.

C. Order Estimates—Ongoing Burden and Costs

As noted earlier, subsequent to the publication of the Notice, the expected number of Participants has increased from 20 to 21.[3345] As a result, the Commission is modifying its estimates of the ongoing burden and costs of Participants' data reporting. After incorporating the increase in the number of Participants, the Commission now estimates that it would take each Participant 1,474.20 ongoing burden hours per year [3346] to continue compliance with Rule 613. The Commission now estimates that it would cost, on average, approximately $34,285.71 in ongoing third party legal and consulting and other costs [3347] and $352,380.95 in total ongoing external costs per Participant.[3348] Therefore, the Commission now estimates that the estimated aggregate ongoing burden for all Participants would be approximately 30,958.20 hours [3349] and an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost of approximately $7,400,000.[3350]

c. Collection and Retention of NBBO, Last Sale Data and Transaction Reports

Rule 613(e)(7) provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require the Central Repository to collect and retain on a current and continuous basis NBBO information for each NMS security, transaction reports reported pursuant to an effective transaction reporting plan, and Last Sale Reports reported pursuant to the OPRA Plan.[3351] Additionally, the CAT NMS Plan must require the Central Repository to maintain this data in a format compatible with the order and event information consolidated and stored pursuant to Rule 613(c)(7).[3352] Further, the CAT NMS Plan must require the Central Repository to retain the information collected pursuant to paragraphs (c)(7) and (e)(7) of Rule 613 for a period of not less than five years in a convenient and usable uniform electronic format that is directly available and searchable electronically without any manual intervention.[3353] The Commission notes that the CAT NMS Plan includes these data as ''SIP Data'' to be collected by the Central Repository.[3354] As it concluded in the Notice Paperwork Reduction Act analysis,[3355] the Commission believes the burden associated with SIP Data is included in the burden to the Participants associated with the implementation and maintenance of the Central Repository.

d. Surveillance

Rule 613(f) provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require that every national securities exchange and national securities association develop and implement a surveillance system, or enhance existing surveillance systems, reasonably designed to make use of the consolidated information contained in the consolidated audit trail. Rule 613(a)(3)(iv) provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require that the surveillance systems be implemented within fourteen months after effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan.

(1) Initial Burden Hours and External Cost

The CAT NMS Plan states that the estimated total cost to the Participants to implement surveillance programs within the Central Repository is $23,200,000.[3356] This amount includes legal, consulting, and other costs of $560,000, as well as $17,500,000 in FTE costs for operational, technical/development, and compliance staff to be engaged in the creation of surveillance programs.[3357]

A. Notice Estimates—Initial Burden and Costs

In the Notice, based on the estimates provided in the CAT NMS Plan, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the initial internal burden hours to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems reasonably designed to make use of the consolidated audit trail data for each Participant would be approximately 3,711.6 burden hours,[3358] for an aggregate initial burden hour amount of 74,232 burden hours.[3359] The Commission also preliminarily estimated that each Participant would, on average, incur an initial external cost of approximately $28,000 [3360] for outsourced legal, consulting and other costs in order to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems, for a total of $285,000 in initial external costs,[3361] for an aggregate one-time initial external cost of $5,700,000 to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems.[3362]

B. Comments/Responses on Initial Burden and Costs

One commenter implied that savings on surveillance were unlikely, and stated that the lack of an analytical framework did not facilitate the identification of suspicious activities.[3363] Another commenter noted that uncertainties in the manner in which regulators will access data in the Central Repository create significant cost uncertainties.[3364] On the other hand, the commenter asserted that the CAT could permit more efficient market surveillance activity by the Participants, which would allow for cost savings.[3365]

[3345] *See supra* note 3282.

[3346] ($7,300,000 in anticipated Participant annual FTE costs)/(21 Participants) = $347,619.08 in anticipated per Participant annual FTE costs. ($347,619.05 in anticipated per Participant FTE costs)/($424,350 FTE cost per Participant) = 0.819 anticipated FTEs per Participant. (0.819 FTEs) × (1,800 working hours per year) = 1,474.20 burden hours per Participant to maintain CAT Data reporting.

[3347] ($720,000 in annual third party costs)/(21 Participants) = $34,285.71 per Participant in anticipated annual third party costs.

[3348] To determine the total external annual cost per Participant, the Commission subtracted the anticipated annual FTE cost estimates for the Participants as provided in the Plan from the total aggregate annual costs to the Participants and divided the remainder by 21 Participants. ($14,700,000 total aggregate annual cost to Participants) − ($7,300,000 annual FTE cost to Participants) = $7,400,000. ($7,400,000)/21 Participants = $352,380.95 in annual external costs per Participant. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(B)(1) for the Participants' anticipated maintenance costs associated with regulatory reporting to the Central Repository.

[3349] 30,958.20 annual burden hours = (21 Participants) × (1,474.20 annual burden hours).

[3350] $7,399,999.95 = ($352,380.95 in total annual external costs) × (21 Participants).

[3351] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(7).

[3352] *Id.*

[3353] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(e)(8).

[3354] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.5(a)(ii).

[3355] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section V.D.1.c.

[3356] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(B)(2).

[3357] *Id.* The Commission also notes that based upon the data provided by the Participants, the source of the remaining $5,140,000 in initial costs to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems is unspecified. The Commission believes that this amount may be attributed to hardware costs because the Participants have not provided any hardware costs associated with surveillance elsewhere and the Commission believes that the Participants will likely incur costs to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems reasonably designed to make use of the consolidated audit trail data.

[3358] ($17,500,000 in anticipated initial FTE costs)/(20 Participants) = $875,000 in anticipated FTE costs per Participant. ($875,000 in anticipated initial FTE costs per Participant)/($424,350 FTE cost per Participant) = 2.06 anticipated initial FTEs per Participant. (2.06 FTEs) × (1,800 working hours per year) = 3,711.6 initial burden hours per Participant to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems.

[3359] (3,711.6 initial burden hours per Participant to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems) × (20 Participants) = 74,232 aggregate initial burden hours.

[3360] $28,000 = $560,000/20 Participants.

[3361] $285,000 = ($23,200,000 in total initial surveillance costs − $17,500,000 in FTE costs)/(20 Participants).

[3362] $5,700,000 = $285,000 × 20 Participants.

[3363] Data Boiler Letter at 33.

[3364] SIFMA Letter at 33.

[3365] SIFMA Letter at 18.

The Commission has considered these comments and continues to believe that Participant cost estimates presented in the Plan are credible. As noted above, all 19 Participants [3366] responded to the Participants Study, and most Participants have experience collecting audit trail data as well as expertise in the requirements of CAT as well as in their business practices. Regarding the comment about the inclusion of an analytical framework in surveillance cost estimates in the Plan, the Plan does incorporate an analytical framework; [3367] therefore, the Commission believes that Participant cost estimates already account for such a framework.

C. Order Estimates—Initial Burden and Costs

As noted earlier, subsequent to the publication of the CAT NMS Plan Notice, the expected number of Participants has increased from 20 to 21.[3368] As a result, the Commission is modifying its estimates of the initial burden and costs to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems reasonably designed to make use of the consolidated audit trail data. After incorporating the increase in the number of Participants, the Commission now estimates that the initial internal burden hours to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems for each Participant would be approximately 3,535.20 burden hours,[3369] for an aggregate initial burden hour amount of 74,239.20 burden hours.[3370] The Commission also now estimates that each Participant would, on average, incur an initial external cost of approximately $26,666.67 [3371] for outsourced legal, consulting and other costs in order to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems, for a total of $271,428.57 in initial external costs,[3372] for an aggregate one-time initial external cost of approximately $5,700,000 to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems.[3373]

(2) Ongoing, Annual Burden Hours and External Cost

The CAT NMS Plan states that the estimated total annual cost associated with the maintenance of surveillance programs for the Participants is $87,700,000.[3374] This amount includes annual legal, consulting, and other costs of $1,000,000, as well as $66,700,000 in annual FTE costs for internal operational, technical/development, and compliance staff to be engaged in the maintenance of surveillance programs.[3375]

A. Notice Estimates—Ongoing Burden and Costs

In the Notice, based on the estimates provided in the CAT NMS Plan,[3376] the Commission preliminarily estimated that the ongoing internal burden hours to maintain the new or enhanced surveillance systems reasonably designed to make use of the consolidated audit trail data for each Participant would be approximately 14,146 annual burden hours,[3377] for an aggregate annual burden hour amount of 282,920 burden hours.[3378] The Commission also preliminarily estimated that each Participant would, on average, incur an annual external cost of approximately $50,000 [3379] for outsourced legal, consulting and other costs in order to maintain the new or enhanced surveillance systems, for a total estimated ongoing external cost of $1,050,000,[3380] for an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost of $21,000,000 to maintain the surveillance systems.[3381]

B. Order Estimates—Ongoing Burden and Costs

As noted earlier, subsequent to the publication of the Notice, the expected number of Participants has increased from 20 to 21.[3382] As a result, the Commission is modifying its estimates of the ongoing burden and costs to maintain the new or enhanced surveillance systems reasonably designed to make use of the consolidated audit trail data. After incorporating the increase in the number of Participants, the Commission now estimates that the ongoing internal burden hours for each Participant would be approximately 13,473 annual burden hours,[3383] for an aggregate annual burden hour amount of 282,933 burden hours.[3384] The Commission also now estimates that each Participant would, on average, incur an annual external cost of approximately $47,619.05 [3385] for outsourced legal, consulting and other costs in order to maintain the new or enhanced surveillance systems, for a total estimated ongoing external cost of $1,000,000,[3386] for an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost of $21,000,000 across the 21 Participants to maintain the surveillance systems.[3387]

e. Document on Expansion to Other Securities

Rule 613(i) provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require the Participants to jointly provide to the Commission, within six months after the CAT NMS

[3366] There were 19 Participants at the time the Participants conducted the study.

[3367] *See* Section V.E.2.c(1), *supra*.

[3368] *See supra* note 3282.

[3369] ($17,500,000 in anticipated initial FTE costs)/(21 Participants) = $833,333.33 in anticipated FTE costs per Participant. ($833,333.33 in anticipated initial FTE costs per Participant)/($424,350 FTE cost per Participant) = 1.964 anticipated initial FTEs per Participant. (1.964 FTEs) × (1,800 working hours per year) = 3,535.20 initial burden hours per Participant to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems.

[3370] (3,535.20 initial burden hours per Participant to implement new or enhanced surveillance systems) × (21 Participants) = 74,239.20 aggregate initial burden hours.

[3371] $26,666.67 = $560,000/21 Participants.

[3372] $271,428.57 = ($23,200,000 in total initial surveillance costs − $17,500,000 in FTE costs)/(21 Participants).

[3373] $5,699,999.97 = ($271,428.57 in initial external costs) × (21 Participants).

[3374] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(B)(2).

[3375] *Id.* The Commission also notes that based upon the data provided by the Participants, the source of the remaining $21,000,000 in ongoing costs to maintain the new or enhanced surveillance systems is unspecified. The Commission believes that this amount may be attributed to hardware costs because the Participants have not provided any hardware costs associated with surveillance elsewhere and the Commission believes that the Participants would likely incur costs associated with maintaining the new or enhanced surveillance systems.

[3376] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(B)(2).

[3377] ($66,700,000 in anticipated ongoing FTE costs)/(20 Participants) = $3,335,000 in anticipated ongoing FTE costs per Participant. ($3,335,000 in anticipated ongoing FTE costs per Participant)/($424,350 FTE cost per Participant) = 7.86 anticipated FTEs per Participant. (7.86 FTEs) × (1,800 working hours per year) = 14,146 ongoing burden hours per Participant to maintain the new or enhanced surveillance systems.

[3378] (14,146 annual burden hours per Participant to maintain new or enhanced surveillance systems) × (20 Participants) = 282,920 aggregate annual burden hours.

[3379] $50,000 = $1,000,000 for ongoing legal, consulting and other costs associated with maintenance of surveillance programs/20 Participants.

[3380] $1,050,000 = ($87,700,000 in total ongoing surveillance costs − $66,700,000 in ongoing FTE costs)/20 Participants

[3381] $21,000,000 = $1,050,000 × 20 Participants.

[3382] *See supra* note 3282.

[3383] ($66,700,000 in anticipated ongoing FTE costs)/(21 Participants) = $3,176,190.48 in anticipated ongoing FTE costs per Participant. ($3,176,190.48 in anticipated ongoing FTE costs per Participant)/($424,350 FTE cost per Participant) = 7.485 anticipated FTEs per Participant. (7.485 FTEs) × (1,800 working hours per year) = 13,473 ongoing burden hours per Participant to maintain the new or enhanced surveillance systems.

[3384] (13,473 annual burden hours per Participant to maintain new or enhanced surveillance systems) × (21 Participants) = 282,933 aggregate annual burden hours.

[3385] $47,619.05 = ($1,000,000 for ongoing legal, consulting and other costs associated with maintenance of surveillance programs)/(21 Participants).

[3386] $1,000,000 = ($87,700,000 in total ongoing surveillance costs − $66,700,000 in ongoing FTE costs)/(21 Participants).

[3387] $21,000,000 = ($1,000,000) × (21 Participants).

Plan is effective, a document outlining how the Participants could incorporate into the CAT information regarding: (1) Equity securities that are not NMS securities; [3388] (2) debt securities; and (3) primary market transactions in equity securities that are not NMS securities and debt securities.[3389] The document must also detail the order and Reportable Event data that each market participant may be required to provide, which market participants may be required to provide such data, an implementation timeline, and a cost estimate. Thus, the Participants must, among other things, undertake an analysis of technological and computer system acquisitions and upgrades that would be required to achieve such an expansion.

A. Notice Estimates—Initial Burden and Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated that it would take each Participant approximately 180 burden hours of internal legal, compliance, business operations and information technology staff time to create a document addressing expansion of the consolidated audit trail to additional securities as required by Rule 613(i).[3390] The Commission preliminarily estimated that on average, each Participant would outsource 25 hours of external legal time to create the document, for an aggregate one-time external cost of approximately $10,000.[3391] Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the one-time initial burden of drafting the document required by Rule 613 would be 180 initial burden hours plus $10,000 in initial external costs for outsourced legal counsel per Participant, for an estimated aggregate initial burden of 3,600 hours and an estimated aggregate initial external cost of $200,000.[3392]

B. Order Estimates—Initial Burden and Costs

As noted earlier, subsequent to the publication of the Notice, the expected number of Participants has increased from 20 to 21.[3393] As a result, the Commission is modifying its estimates of the initial burden and costs of the document on expansion to additional securities. After incorporating the increase in the number of Participants, the Commission now estimates that it would take each Participant approximately 171.43 burden hours of internal legal, compliance, business operations and information technology staff time to create a document addressing expansion of the CAT to additional securities as required by Rule 613(i).[3394] The Commission now estimates that on average, each Participant would outsource 25 hours of external legal time to create the document, for an aggregate one-time external cost of approximately $10,000.[3395] Therefore, the Commission now estimates that the one-time initial burden of drafting the document required by Rule 613 would be 171.43 initial burden hours plus $10,000 in initial external costs for outsourced legal counsel per Participant, for an estimated aggregate initial burden of 3,600.3 hours and an estimated aggregate initial external cost of $210,000.[3396]

f. Written Assessment of Operation of the Consolidated Audit Trail

Rule 613(b)(6) provides that the CAT NMS Plan must require the Participants to provide the Commission a written assessment of the CAT's operation at least every two years, once the CAT NMS Plan is effective.[3397] The assessment must address, at a minimum, with respect to the CAT: (i) An evaluation of its performance; (ii) a detailed plan for any potential improvements to its performance; (iii) an estimate of the costs associated with any such potential improvements; and (iv) an estimated implementation timeline for any such potential improvements, if applicable.[3398] Thus, the Participants must, among other things, undertake an analysis of the CAT's technological and computer system performance.

The CAT NMS Plan states that the CCO would oversee the assessment required by Rule 613(b)(6), and would allow the Participants to review and comment on the assessment before it is submitted to the Commission.[3399] The CCO would be an employee of the Plan Processor and would be compensated by the Plan Processor.[3400] The Commission

[3388] As noted above, the CAT NMS Plan would require the inclusion of OTC Equity Securities, while Rule 613 does not include such a requirement. *See supra* note 439.

[3389] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(i).

[3390] The Commission based this estimate on the internal burden provided in the CAT NMS Plan related to the development of the CAT NMS Plan. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii) (stating ''[t]he Participants estimate that they have collectively contributed 20 FTEs in the first 30 months of the CAT NMS Plan development process''). Because this document is much more limited in scope than the CAT NMS Plan, and because the Commission assumes that in drafting the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants have already contributed time toward considering how the CAT can be expected to be expanded in accordance with Rule 613(i), the Commission applied the CAT NMS Plan development internal burden over a 6-month period (Rule 613(i) requires this document to be submitted to the Commission within six months after effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan), divided by half. 0.667 FTEs required for all Participants per month to develop the CAT NMS Plan = (20 FTEs/30 months). 0.667 FTEs × 6 months = 4 FTEs. 4 FTEs/2 = 2 FTEs needed for all of the Participants to create and submit the document. 2 FTEs × 1,800 working hours per year = 3,600 burden hours. 3,600 burden hours/20 Participants = 180 burden hours per Participant to create and file the document.

[3391] $10,000 = (25 hours of outsourced legal time per Participant) × ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services). The Commission derived the total estimated cost for outsourced legal counsel based on the assumption that the report required by Rule 613 would require approximately fifteen percent of the Commission's approximated burden of drafting and filing the CAT NMS Plan. This assumption is based on the Participants leveraging their knowledge gained from their drafting and filing of the CAT NMS Plan and applying it to efficiently preparing the report required by Rule 613 with respect to other securities' order and Reportable Events, implementation timeline and cost estimates.

[3392] The initial burden hour estimate is based on: (20 Participants) × (180 initial burden hours to draft the report). The initial external cost estimate is based on: (20 Participants) × ($10,000 for outsourced legal counsel).

[3393] *See supra* note 3282.

[3394] The Commission is basing this estimate on the internal burden provided in the CAT NMS Plan related to the development of the CAT NMS Plan. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii) (stating ''[t]he Participants estimate that they have collectively contributed 20 FTEs in the first 30 months of the CAT NMS Plan development process''). Because the expansion document is much more limited in scope than the CAT NMS Plan, and because the Commission assumes that in drafting the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants have already contributed time toward considering how the CAT can be expected to be expanded in accordance with Rule 613(i), the Commission is applying the CAT NMS Plan development internal burden over a 6-month period (Rule 613(i) requires this document to be submitted to the Commission within six months after effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan), divided by half. 0.667 FTEs required for all Participants per month to develop the CAT NMS Plan = (20 FTEs/30 months). 0.667 FTEs × 6 months = 4 FTEs. 4 FTEs/2 = 2 FTEs needed for all of the Participants to create and submit the document. 2 FTEs × 1,800 working hours per year = 3,600 burden hours. (3,600 burden hours)/(21 Participants) = 171.43 burden hours per Participant to create and file the document.

[3395] $10,000 = (25 hours of outsourced legal time per Participant) × ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services). The Commission derived the total estimated cost for outsourced legal counsel based on the assumption that the report required by Rule 613 would require approximately fifteen percent of the Commission's approximated burden of drafting and filing the CAT NMS Plan. This assumption is based on the Participants leveraging their knowledge gained from their drafting and filing of the CAT NMS Plan and applying it to efficiently preparing the report required by Rule 613 with respect to other securities' order and Reportable Events, implementation timeline and cost estimates.

[3396] The initial burden hour estimate is based on: (21 Participants) × (171.43 initial burden hours to draft the report). The initial external cost estimate is based on: (21 Participants) × ($10,000 for outsourced legal counsel).

[3397] 17 CFR 242.613(b)(6); *see also* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30700.

[3398] *See* 17 CFR 242.613(b)(6).

[3399] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.6.

[3400] *Id.* at Section 6.2(a).

assumes that the overall cost and associated burden on the Participants to implement and maintain the Central Repository includes both the compensation for the Plan Processor as well as its employees for the implementation and maintenance of the Central Repository.

A. Notice Estimates—Ongoing Burden and Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated that it would take each Participant approximately 45 annual burden hours of internal legal, compliance, business operations, and information technology staff time to review and comment on the assessment prepared by the CCO of the operation of the consolidated audit trail as required by Rule 613(b)(6).[3401] The Commission preliminarily estimated that on average, each Participant would outsource 1.25 hours of legal time annually to assist in the review of the assessment, for an ongoing annual external cost of approximately $500.[3402] Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the ongoing annual burden of submitting a written assessment at least every two years, as required by Rule 613(b)(6), would be 45 ongoing burden hours per SRO plus $500 of external costs for outsourced legal counsel per Participant per year, for an estimated aggregate annual ongoing burden of 900 hours [3403] and an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost of $10,000.[3404]

B. Order Estimates—Ongoing Burden and Costs

As noted above,[3405] the Commission has subsequently amended this requirement as imposed by the CAT NMS Plan to change the reporting frequency from every two years to annual, to require that the benefits of potential improvements, and their impact on investor protection, be discussed, as well as to provide additional specificity regarding the content of the report.[3406] As amended, the content of the report must include the following: (i) An evaluation of the information security program of the CAT to ensure that the program is consistent with the highest industry standards for protection of data; (ii) an evaluation of potential technological upgrades based upon a review of technological advancements over the preceding year, drawing on technological expertise, whether internal or external; (iii) an evaluation of the time necessary to restore and recover CAT Data at a back-up site; (iv) an evaluation of how the Plan Processor and Participants are monitoring Error Rates and addressing the application of Error Rates based on product, data element or other criteria; (v) a copy of the evaluation required by the CAT NMS Plan in Section 6.8(c) that the Plan Processor evaluate whether industry standards have evolved such that: (1) The synchronization standard in Section 6.8(a) of the CAT NMS Plan should be shortened; or (2) the required timestamp in Section 6.8(b) of the CAT NMS Plan should be in finer increments.

The CAT NMS Plan states that the CCO would oversee the assessment required by Rule 613(b)(6), and would allow the Participants to review and comment on the assessment before it is submitted to the Commission.[3407] The Commission believes the responsibility to oversee the assessment as amended should continue to belong to the CCO and is not amending the CAT NMS Plan to require a different process.

As a result, the Commission is modifying its estimates of the ongoing burden and costs related to the written assessment of the operation of the CAT, as well as to account for an increase in the expected number of Participants from 20 to 21, subsequent to the publication of the Notice.[3408] The Commission now estimates that it would take each Participant approximately 171.43 annual burden hours of internal legal, compliance, business operations, and information technology staff time to review and comment on the assessment prepared by the CCO of the operation of the CAT.[3409] The Commission now estimates that on average, each Participant would outsource 2.5 hours of legal time annually to assist in the review of the assessment, for an ongoing annual external cost of approximately $1,000.[3410] Therefore, the Commission

[3401] The Commission calculated the total estimated burden hours based on a similar formulation used for calculating the total estimated burden hours of Rule 613(i)'s requirement for a document addressing expansion of the CAT to other securities. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section V.D.1.f. The Commission assumed that the review and potential revision of the written assessment required by Rule 613(b)(6) would be approximately one-half as burdensome as the document required by Rule 613(i) as the Participants are delegating the responsibility to prepare the written assessment required by Rule 613(b)(6) to the CCO and the Participants would only need to review the written assessment and revise it as necessary. As noted in note 3394, *supra,* to estimate the Rule 613(i) burden, the Commission is applying the internal burden estimate provided in the CAT NMS Plan for Plan development over a 6-month period, and dividing the result in half. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii). To estimate the Rule 613(b)(6) written assessment burden, the Commission is dividing the result further by half. 0.667 FTEs required for all Participants per month to develop the CAT NMS Plan = (20 FTEs/30 months). 0.667 FTEs × 6 months = 4 FTEs. 4 FTEs/2 = 2 FTEs needed for all of the Participants to create and submit the Rule 613(i) document. 2 FTEs/2 = 1 FTE needed for all of the Participants to review and comment on the written assessment. (1 FTE × 1,800 working hours per year) = 1,800 ongoing annual burden hours per year for all of the Participants to review and comment on the written assessment. (1,800 burden hours/20 Participants) = 90 ongoing annual burden hours per Participant to review and comment on the written assessment prepared by the CCO. The Commission noted that this assessment must be filed with the Commission every two years and is providing an annualized estimate of the burden associated with the assessment as required for its Paperwork Reduction Act analysis. To provide an estimate of the annual burden associated with the assessment as required for its Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, Commission divided the 90 ongoing burden hours in half (over two years) = 45 ongoing annual burden hours per Participant to review and comment on the written assessment prepared by the CCO.

[3402] $500 = ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (1.25 hours). Because the written assessment was a biennial requirement, the Commission divided the cost of the written assessment in half (over two years) to estimate the annual ongoing external cost per Participant for outside legal services to review and comment on the written assessment prepared by the CCO.

[3403] 900 ongoing annual burden hours = (45 ongoing annual burden hours) × (20 Participants).

[3404] $10,000 = 20 Participants × ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (1.25 hours).

[3405] *See* Section VI.A.7., *supra.*

[3406] *See* Section IV.H., *supra.*

[3407] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section 6.6.

[3408] *See supra* note 3282.

[3409] As it did when making its preliminary estimate, the Commission calculated the total estimated burden hours based on a similar formulation used for calculating the total estimated burden hours of Rule 613(i)'s requirement for a document addressing expansion of the CAT to other securities. *See* Section VI.D.1.e., *supra.* Specifically, as noted above, the Commission assumed that the review and potential revision of the written assessment would be approximately one-half as burdensome as the document required by Rule 613(i) when making its preliminary estimate. The Commission then further divided the burden by half because this report is required to be furnished every two years.

The Commission has amended the CAT NMS Plan to add more specificity to the requirement to provide the written assessment. As a result, the Commission now estimates that the written assessment would now be as burdensome (instead of half as burdensome) as the document addressing expansion required by Rule 613(i). 2 FTEs needed for all of the Participants to create and submit the document required by Rule 613(i) (and now for all of the Participants to review and comment on the written assessment). (2 FTEs) × (1,800 working hours per year) = 3,600 ongoing annual burden hours per year for all of the Participants to review and comment on the written assessment. (3,600 burden hours per year)/(21 Participants) = 171.43 ongoing annual burden hours per Participant to review and comment on the written assessment prepared by the CCO.

The Commission also has amended the CAT NMS Plan to require this assessment to be provided annually instead of once every two years. To account for this change, the Commission is no longer dividing the ongoing burden hours for providing the written assessment in half to determine the annualized estimate of the burden.

[3410] $1,000 = ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (2.5 hours). The Commission has

Continued

now estimates that the ongoing annual burden of submitting a written assessment annually would be 171.43 ongoing burden hours per SRO plus $1,000 of external costs for outsourced legal counsel per Participant per year, for an estimated aggregate annual ongoing burden of approximately 3,600.03 hours [3411] and an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost of $21,000.[3412]

2. Burden on Members of National Securities Exchanges and National Securities Associations

a. Data Collection and Reporting

Rule 613(c)(1) requires the CAT NMS Plan to provide for an accurate, time-sequenced record of orders beginning with the receipt or origination of an order by a broker-dealer member of a Participant, and further documenting the life of the order through the process of routing, modification, cancellation and execution (in whole or in part) of the order. Rule 613(c) requires the CAT NMS Plan to impose requirements on broker-dealer members to record and report CAT Data to the Central Repository in accordance with specified timelines.

In calculating the burden on members of national securities exchanges and national securities associations, the Commission categorized broker-dealer firms by whether they insource or outsource, or are likely to insource or outsource, CAT Data reporting obligations.[3413] The Commission believes that firms that currently report high numbers of OATS ROEs strategically would decide to either self-report their CAT Data or outsource their CAT Data reporting functions (Insourcers), while the firms with the lowest levels of activity would be unlikely to have the infrastructure and specialized employees necessary to insource CAT Data reporting and would almost certainly outsource their CAT Data reporting functions (Outsourcers).[3414] The Commission recognizes that more active firms that will likely be CAT Reporters and insource regulatory data reporting functions may not have current OATS reporting obligations because they either are not FINRA members, or because they do not trade in NMS equity securities.[3415]

The Commission estimates that there are 126 OATS-reporting Insourcers and 45 non-OATS reporting Insourcers (14 ELPs and 31 Options Market Makers).[3416] The Commission's estimation categorizes the remaining 1,629 broker-dealers that the Plan anticipates would have CAT Data reporting obligations as Outsourcers.[3417]

(1) Notice Estimates

A. Insourcers

i. Large Non-OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers

In the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants, based on the Reporters Study's large broker-dealer cost estimates, estimated the following average initial external cost and FTE count figures that a large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer would expect to incur to adopt the systems changes needed to comply with the data reporting requirements of Rule 613 under Approach 1: $450,000 in external hardware and software costs; 8.05 internal FTEs; [3418] and $9,500 in external third party/outsourcing costs.[3419] The Participants also estimated the following average ongoing external cost and internal FTE count figures that a large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer would expect to incur to maintain data reporting systems to be in compliance with Rule 613: $80,000 in external hardware and software costs; 7.41 internal FTEs; [3420] and $1,300 in external third party/outsourcing costs.[3421]

In the Notice, the Commission discussed the Participants' estimates and explained that the Commission also relied on the Reporters Study's large broker-dealer cost estimates in estimating costs for large broker-dealers that can practicably decide between insourcing or outsourcing their regulatory data reporting functions. In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated that there are 14 large broker-dealers that are not OATS reporters currently in the business of electronic liquidity provision that would be classified as Insourcers.[3422] Additionally, the Commission estimated that there are 31 broker-dealers that may transact in options but not in equities that can be classified as Insourcers.[3423] The Commission assumed the 31 Options Market Makers and 14 ELPs would be typical of the Reporters Study's large, non-OATS reporting firms; for these firms, the Commission relied on the cost estimates provided under Approach 1[3424] for large, non-OATS reporting firms in the CAT NMS Plan.

The Notice explained that once a large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer has established the appropriate systems and processes required for collection and

amended the CAT NMS Plan to add more specificity to the requirement to provide the written assessment and is now requiring this assessment to be provided annually instead of once every two years. Because the written assessment is no longer a biennial requirement, the Commission is no longer dividing the cost of the written assessment in half (over two years) to estimate the annual ongoing external cost per Participant for outside legal services to review and comment on the written assessment prepared by the CCO.

[3411] 3,600.03 ongoing annual burden hours = (171.43 ongoing annual burden hours) × (21 Participants).

[3412] $21,000 = (21 Participants) × ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (2.5 hours).

[3413] The Commission acknowledges the inherent difficulty in establishing precise burden estimates because the Commission does not know the exact method of data reporting the Participants would decide for broker-dealers. For these estimates, the Commission is relying, in part, on the cost data provided by the Participants in the CAT NMS Plan, and, as noted earlier, on its own estimates of the costs that broker-dealers are likely to face for CAT implementation and ongoing reporting in compliance with Rule 613. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b); *see* Section V.F.1.c.(2)B., *supra.*

[3414] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30718.

[3415] The Commission also recognizes as discussed above that some broker-dealer firms may strategically choose to outsource despite the Plan's working assumption that these broker-dealers would insource their regulatory data reporting functions.

[3416] *See* Section V.F.1.c(2)B., *supra.*

[3417] *Id.*

[3418] Approach 1 also provided $3,200,000 in initial internal FTE costs. The Commission believed the $3,200,000 in internal FTE costs is the Participants' estimated cost of the 8.05 FTEs. (8.05 FTEs) × ($401,440 Participants' assumed annual cost per FTE provided in the CAT NMS Plan) = $3,231,592. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at n. 192. *See also supra* note 3320.

[3419] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section B.7(b)(iii)(c)(2)(a). The Commission believed that the third party/outsourcing costs may be attributed to the use of service bureaus (potentially), technology consulting, and legal services.

[3420] Approach 1 also provided $3,000,000 in internal FTE costs related to maintenance. The Commission believes the $3,000,000 in ongoing internal FTE costs is the Participants' estimated cost of the 7.41 FTEs. (7.41 FTEs) × ($401,440 Participants' assumed annual cost per FTE provided in the CAT NMS Plan) = $2,974,670. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at n.192.

[3421] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2)(b). The CAT NMS Plan did not break down these third party costs into categories.

[3422] These broker-dealers are not FINRA members and thus have no regular OATS reporting obligations. *See supra* note 2560.

[3423] *See supra* note 2562.

[3424] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(A)(2). The Reporters Study requested broker-dealer respondents to provide estimates to report to the Central Repository under two approaches. Approach 1 assumes CAT Reporters would submit CAT Data using their choice of industry protocols. Approach 2 assumes CAT Reporters would submit data using a pre-specified format. Approach 1's aggregate costs are higher than those for Approach 2 for all market participants except in one case where service bureaus have lower Approach 1 costs. *See supra* note 2568. For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission did not rely on the cost estimates for Approach 2 because overall the Approach 1 aggregate estimates represent the higher of the proposed approaches. The Commission believed it would be more comprehensive to use the higher of the two estimates for its Paperwork Reduction Act analysis estimates.

transmission of the required information to the Central Repository, such broker-dealers would be subject to ongoing annual burdens associated with, among other things, personnel time to monitor each large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer's reporting of the required data and the maintenance of the systems to report the required data; and implementing changes to trading systems that might result in additional reports to the Central Repository.

(a) Large, Non-OATS Reporting Broker-Dealers—Initial Burden and Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the average initial burden associated with implementing regulatory data reporting to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository in compliance with the Rule for each large, non-OATS reporting broker-dealer would be approximately 14,490 initial burden hours.[3425]

The Commission also preliminarily estimated that these broker-dealers would, on average, would incur approximately $450,000 in initial costs for hardware and software to implement the systems changes needed to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository, and an additional $9,500 in initial third party/outsourcing costs.[3426]

Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the average one-time initial burden per ELP and Options Market Maker would be 14,490 internal burden hours and external costs of $459,500,[3427] for an estimated aggregate initial burden of 652,050 hours[3428] and an estimated aggregate initial external cost of $20,677,500.[3429]

(b) Large, Non-OATS Reporting Broker-Dealers—Ongoing Burden and Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated that it would take a large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer 13,338 burden hours per year[3430] to continue to comply with the Rule. The Commission also preliminarily estimated that it would cost, on average, approximately $80,000 per year per large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer to maintain systems connectivity to the Central Repository and purchase any necessary hardware, software, and other materials, and an additional $1,300 in third party/outsourcing costs.[3431]

Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the average ongoing annual burden per large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer would be approximately 13,338 hours, plus $81,300 in external costs[3432] to maintain the systems necessary to collect and transmit information to the Central Repository, for an estimated aggregate ongoing burden of 600,210 hours[3433] and an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost of $3,658,500.[3434]

ii. Large OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers

In the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants, based on the Reporters Study's large broker-dealer cost estimates, estimated the following average initial external cost and internal FTE count figures that a large OATS-reporting broker-dealer would expect to incur as a result of the implementation of the consolidated audit trail under Approach 1: $750,000 in hardware and software costs; 14.92 internal FTEs;[3435] and $150,000 in external third party/outsourcing costs.[3436] The Participants also estimated the following average ongoing external cost and internal FTE count figures that a large OATS-reporting broker-dealer would expect to incur to maintain data reporting systems to be in compliance with Rule 613: $380,000 in ongoing external hardware and software costs; 10.03 internal FTEs;[3437] and $120,000 in ongoing external third party/outsourcing costs.[3438]

In the Notice, the Commission discussed the Participants' estimates and explained that the Commission also relied on the Reporters Study's large broker-dealer cost estimates in estimating costs for large broker-dealers that can practicably decide between insourcing or outsourcing their regulatory reporting functions. In the Notice, based on the Commission's analysis of data provided by FINRA and discussions with market participants, the Commission estimated that 126 broker-dealers, which reported more than 350,000 OATS ROEs between June 15 and July 10, 2015, would strategically decide to either self-report CAT Data or outsource their CAT data reporting functions.[3439]

The Notice explained that once a large OATS-reporting broker-dealer has established the appropriate systems and processes required for collection and transmission of the required information to the Central Repository, such broker-dealers would be subject to ongoing annual burdens and costs associated with, among other things, personnel time to monitor each broker-dealer's reporting of the required data and the maintenance of the systems to report the required data; and implementing changes to trading systems which might result in additional reports to the Central Repository.

(a) Large OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers—Initial Burden and Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the average initial burden to develop and

[3425] 14,490 initial burden hours = (8.05 FTEs for implementing CAT Data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3426] *See supra* note 3421.

[3427] ($450,000 in initial hardware and software costs) + ($9,500 initial third party/outsourcing costs) = $459,500 in initial external costs to implement data reporting systems.

[3428] The Commission preliminarily estimates that 45 large non-OATS reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (45 large non-OATS reporting broker-dealers) × (14,490 burden hours) = 652,050 initial burden hours to implement data reporting systems.

[3429] ($450,000 in hardware and software costs) + ($9,500 third party/outsourcing costs) × 45 large, non-OATS reporting broker-dealers = $20,677,500 in initial external costs to implement data reporting systems.

[3430] 13,338 ongoing burden hours = (7.41 ongoing FTEs to maintain CAT data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3431] *See supra* note 3421.

[3432] ($80,000 in ongoing external hardware and software costs) + ($1,300 ongoing external third party/outsourcing costs) = $81,300 in ongoing external costs per large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer.

[3433] The Commission estimated that 45 large non-OATS reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (45 large non-OATS reporting broker-dealers) × (13,338 burden hours) = 600,210 aggregate ongoing burden hours.

[3434] ($80,000 in ongoing external hardware and software costs) + ($1,300 ongoing external third party/outsourcing costs) × (45 large non-OATS reporting broker-dealers) = $3,658,500 in aggregate ongoing external costs.

[3435] Approach 1 also provided $6,000,000 in initial internal FTE costs. The Commission believes the $6,000,000 in initial internal FTE costs is the Participants' estimated cost of the 14.92 FTEs. (14.92 FTEs) × ($401,440 Participants' assumed annual cost per FTE provided in the CAT NMS Plan) = $5,989,485. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(ii)(C), n.192; *see also supra* note 3320.

[3436] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2)(a). The CAT NMS Plan did not break down these third party costs into categories. The Commission believes that these costs may be attributed to the use of service bureaus, technology consulting, and legal services.

[3437] Approach 1 also provided $4,000,000 in internal FTE costs related to maintenance. The Commission believes the $4,000,000 in ongoing internal FTE costs is the Participants' estimated cost of the 10.03 FTEs. (10.03 FTEs) × ($401,440 Participants' assumed annual cost per FTE provided in the CAT NMS Plan) = $4,026,443. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(ii)(C), n.192; *see also supra* note 3320.

[3438] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2)(b). The CAT NMS Plan did not categorize these third party costs. The Commission believes that these costs may be attributed to the use of service bureaus, technology consulting, and legal services.

[3439] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30718; *see also id.,* at n.901 (stating that the Commission believes that broker-dealers that report fewer than 350,000 OATS ROEs per month are unlikely to be large enough to support the infrastructure required for insourcing data reporting activities).

implement the needed systems changes to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository in compliance with the Rule for large OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be approximately 26,856 internal burden hours.[3440]

The Commission also preliminarily estimated that these large OATS-reporting broker-dealers would, on average, incur approximately $750,000 in initial external costs for hardware and software to implement the systems changes needed to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository, and an additional $150,000 in initial external third party/outsourcing costs.[3441]

Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the average one-time initial burden per large OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be 26,856 burden hours and external costs of $900,000,[3442] for an estimated aggregate initial burden of 3,383,856 hours [3443] and an estimated aggregate initial external cost of $113,400,000.[3444]

(b) Large OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers—Ongoing Burden and Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated that it would take a large OATS-reporting broker-dealer 18,054 ongoing burden hours per year [3445] to continue compliance with the Rule. The Commission preliminarily estimated that it would cost, on average, approximately $380,000 per year per large OATS-reporting broker-dealer to maintain systems connectivity to the Central Repository and purchase any necessary hardware, software, and other materials, and an additional $120,000 in external ongoing third party/outsourcing costs.[3446]

Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the average ongoing annual burden per large OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be approximately 18,054 burden hours, plus $500,000 in external costs [3447] to maintain the systems necessary to collect and transmit information to the Central Repository, for an estimated aggregate burden of 2,274,804 hours [3448] and an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost of $63,000,000.[3449]

B. Outsourcers

i. Small OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers

Based on data provided by FINRA, the Commission estimates that there are 806 broker-dealers that report fewer than 350,000 OATS ROEs monthly. The Commission believes that these broker-dealers generally outsource their regulatory reporting obligations because during the period June 15-July 10, 2015, approximately 88.9% of their 350,000 OATS ROEs were reported through service bureaus, with 730 of these broker-dealers reporting more than 99% of their OATS ROEs through one or more service bureaus.[3450] The Commission estimates that these firms currently spend an aggregate of $100.1 million on annual outsourcing costs.[3451] The Commission estimates these 806 broker-dealers would spend $100.2 million in aggregate to outsource their regulatory data reporting to service bureaus to report in accordance with Rule 613,[3452] or $124,373 per broker-dealer.[3453] These external outsourcing cost estimates are calculated using the information from staff discussions with service bureaus and other market participants, as applied to data provided by FINRA.[3454]

Firms that outsource their regulatory data reporting would still face internal staffing burdens associated with this activity. These employees would perform activities such as answering inquiries from their service bureaus, and investigating reporting exceptions. Based on conversations with market participants, the Commission estimates that these firms currently have 0.5 full-time employees devoted to these activities.[3455] The Commission estimates that these firms would need to hire one additional full-time employee for one year to implement CAT reporting requirements.[3456]

Small OATS-reporting broker-dealers that outsource their regulatory data reporting would likely face internal staffing burdens and external costs associated with ongoing activity, such as maintaining any systems that transmit data to their service providers. Based on conversations with market participants, the Commission estimates these firms would need 0.75 FTEs on an ongoing basis to perform or monitor CAT reporting.[3457]

(a) Small OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers—Initial Burden and Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the average initial burden to implement the needed systems changes to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository in compliance with the CAT NMS Plan for small OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be approximately 1,800 burden hours.[3458] The Commission believed the burden hours would be associated with work performed by internal technology, compliance and legal staff in connection with the implementation of CAT data reporting. The Commission also preliminarily estimated that each small OATS-reporting broker-dealer would incur approximately $124,373 in initial external outsourcing costs.[3459]

[3440] 26,856 initial burden hours per large OATS-reporting broker-dealer = (14.92 FTEs for implementation of CAT data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3441] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2)(a).

[3442] ($750,000 in initial external hardware and software costs) + ($150,000 initial external third party/outsourcing costs) = $900,000 in initial external costs per large OATS-reporting broker-dealer to implement CAT data reporting systems.

[3443] The Commission preliminarily estimates that 126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. 126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealers × 26,856 burden hours = 3,383,856 initial burden hours to implement data reporting systems.

[3444] ($750,000 in initial external hardware and software costs) + ($150,000 initial external third party/outsourcing costs) × 126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealers = $113,400,000 in initial external costs to implement data reporting systems.

[3445] 18,054 ongoing burden hours = (10.03 ongoing FTEs for maintenance of CAT data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3446] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2)(b).

[3447] ($380,000 in ongoing external hardware and software costs + $120,000 in ongoing external third party/outsourcing costs) = $500,000 in ongoing external costs per large OATS-reporting broker-dealer.

[3448] The Commission preliminarily estimates that 126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealers) × (18,054 burden hours) = 2,274,804 aggregate ongoing burden hours.

[3449] ($380,000 in ongoing external hardware and software costs + $120,000 in ongoing external third party/outsourcing costs) × 126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealers = $63,000,000 in aggregate ongoing external costs.

[3450] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30718. Because of the extensive use of service bureaus in these categories of broker-dealers, the Commission assumes that these broker-dealers are likely to use service bureaus to accomplish their CAT data reporting.

[3451] The average broker-dealer in this category reported 15,185 OATS ROEs from June 15–July 10, 2015; the median reported 1,251 OATS ROEs. Of these broker-dealers, 39 reported more than 100,000 OATS ROEs during the sample period. *See* Section V.F.1.c.(2)B., *supra.*

[3452] *Id.*

[3453] $124,373 = $100,200,000/806 broker-dealers. This amount is the average estimated annual outsourcing cost to firms that currently report fewer than 350,000 OATS ROEs per month. *Id.*

[3454] *See* Section V.F.1.c.(2)B., *supra.*

[3455] *Id.*

[3456] *Id.*

[3457] *See* Section IV.F.1.c.(2)B., *supra.*

[3458] This estimate assumed that, based on the expected FTE count provided, a small OATS-reporting broker-dealer would have to hire 1 new FTE for implementation. The salary attributed to the 1 FTE would be (1 × $424,350 FTE cost) = $424,350 per year. To determine the number of burden hours to be incurred by the current 0.5 FTE for implementation, multiply 0.5 FTE by 1,800 hours per year = 900 initial burden hours.

[3459] The Commission preliminarily believed the outsourcing cost would be the cost of the service bureau, which would include the compliance and legal costs associated with changing to CAT Data reporting. The Commission assumes these costs of

Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the average one-time initial burden per small OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be 1,800 burden hours and external costs of $124,373, for an estimated aggregate initial burden of 1,450,800 hours [3460] and an estimated aggregate initial external cost of $100,244,638.[3461]

(b) Small OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers—Ongoing Burden and Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily believed that it would take a small OATS-reporting broker-dealer 1,350 ongoing burden hours per year [3462] to continue compliance with the Rule. The Commission preliminarily believed the burden hours would be associated with work performed by internal technology, compliance and legal staff in connection with the ongoing operation of CAT Data reporting. The Commission preliminarily estimated that it would cost, on average, approximately $124,373 in ongoing external outsourcing costs [3463] to ensure ongoing compliance with Rule 613.

Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the average ongoing annual burden per small OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be approximately 1,350 hours, plus $124,373 in external costs, for an estimated aggregate ongoing burden of 1,088,100 hours [3464] and an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost of $100,244,638.[3465]

ii. Small Non-OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers

In addition to firms that currently report to OATS, the Commission estimates there are 799 broker-dealers that are currently exempt from OATS reporting rules due to firm size, or excluded because all of their order flow is routed to a single OATS reporter, such as a clearing firm, that would incur CAT reporting obligations.[3466] A further 24 broker-dealers have SRO memberships only with one Participant; [3467] the Commission believes this group is comprised mostly of floor brokers and further believes these firms would experience CAT implementation and ongoing reporting costs similar in magnitude to small equity broker-dealers that currently have no OATS reporting responsibilities.[3468]

The Commission assumes these broker-dealers would have very low levels of CAT reporting, similar to those of the lowest activity firms that currently report to OATS. For these firms, the Commission assumes that under CAT they would incur the average estimated service bureau cost of broker-dealers that currently report fewer than 350,000 OATS ROEs per month, which is $124,373 annually.[3469] Furthermore, because these firms have more limited data reporting requirements than other firms, the Commission assumes these firms currently have only 0.1 full-time employees currently dedicated to regulatory data reporting activities.[3470] The Commission assumes these firms would require 2 full-time employees for one year to implement CAT.[3471]

Small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers that outsource their regulatory data reporting would likely face internal staffing burdens and costs associated with ongoing activity, such as maintaining any systems that transmit data to their service providers. Based on conversations with market participants, the Commission estimates these firms would need 0.75 full-time employees annually to perform or monitor CAT reporting.

(a) Small Non-OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers—Initial Burden and Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the average initial burden to develop and implement the needed systems changes to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository in compliance with the Rule for small, non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be approximately 3,600 initial burden hours.[3472] The Commission believed the burden hours would be associated with work performed by internal technology, compliance and legal staff in connection with the implementation of CAT Data reporting. The Commission also preliminarily estimated that each small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealer would incur approximately $124,373 in initial external outsourcing costs.[3473]

Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the average one-time initial burden per small OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be 3,600 burden hours and external costs of $124,373 for an estimated aggregate initial burden of 2,962,800 hours [3474] and an estimated aggregate initial external cost of $102,358,979.[3475]

(b) Small Non-OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers—Ongoing Burden and Costs

In the Notice, the Commission preliminarily believed that it would take a small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealer 1,350 ongoing burden hours per year [3476] to continue compliance with the Rule. The Commission preliminarily estimated that it would cost, on average, approximately $124,373 in ongoing external outsourcing costs [3477] to ensure ongoing compliance with Rule 613.

Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimated that the average ongoing annual burden per small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be approximately 1,350 hours, plus $124,373 in external costs, for an estimated aggregate ongoing burden of 1,111,050 hours [3478] and an estimated

changing to CAT Data reporting would be included in the cost of the service bureau because the broker-dealers would be relying on the expertise of the service bureau to report their data to CAT on their behalf. *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.F.1.C(2), n. 941.

[3460] The Commission preliminarily estimates that 806 small OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (806 small OATS-reporting broker-dealers × 1,800 burden hours) = 1,450,800 aggregate initial burden hours.

[3461] ($124,373 in outsourcing costs) × (806 small OATS-reporting broker-dealers) = $100,244,638 in aggregate initial external costs.

[3462] 1,350 ongoing burden hours = (0.75 FTE for maintenance of CAT Data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3463] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.F.1.c(2)B.ii. *See supra* note 3459.

[3464] The Commission preliminarily estimates that 806 small OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (806 small OATS-reporting broker-dealers × 1,350 burden hours) = 1,088,100 aggregate ongoing burden hours to ensure ongoing compliance with Rule 613.

[3465] $100,244,638 = $124,373 in ongoing outsourcing costs × 806 broker-dealers.

[3466] *See* Section V.F.1.c.(2)B., *supra.* Rule 613 does not exclude from data reporting obligations SRO members that quote or execute transactions in NMS Securities and Listed Options that route to a single market participant; *see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(ii)(B)(2).

[3467] *See* Section V.F.1.c.(2)B., *supra.*

[3468] *Id.*

[3469] *Id.*

[3470] *Id.*

[3471] *Id.*

[3472] 3,600 initial burden hours = (2 FTEs for implementation of CAT Data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3473] *See* Section V.F.1.c.(2)B., *supra.*

[3474] The Commission preliminarily estimates that 823 small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (823 small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers × 3,600 burden hours) = 2,962,800 aggregate initial burden hours.

[3475] ($124,373 in outsourcing costs) × (823 small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers) = $102,358,979 in aggregate initial external costs.

[3476] 1,350 ongoing burden hours = (0.75 FTEs for maintenance of CAT data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3477] The Commission assumed these firms would have very low levels of CAT reporting, similar to those of the lowest activity firms that currently report to OATS. For these firms, the Commission assumes that under CAT they would incur the average estimated service bureau cost of firms that currently OATS report fewer than 350,000 OATS ROEs per month of $124,373 annually.

[3478] The Commission preliminarily estimated that 823 small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (823 small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers ×

Continued

aggregate ongoing external cost of $102,358,979.[3479]

(2) Comments/Responses on Broker-Dealer Data Collection and Reporting Costs

As noted above, the Commission's estimates are based on whether broker-dealers currently insource or outsource, or are likely to insource or outsource, their CAT Data reporting obligations. The Commission provided in the Notice an analysis of the compliance cost estimates for broker-dealers that included analyzing whether estimates provided in the Plan and based on a Reporters Study survey were reliable.[3480] The Commission preliminarily believed that the cost estimates for small broker-dealers were not reliable. The Commission then developed and calibrated its Outsourcing Cost Model to estimate average current data reporting costs and average Plan compliance costs for broker-dealers that the Commission expects will rely on service bureaus to perform their CAT Data reporting responsibilities (Outsourcers).[3481] For the Insourcers, the Commission continued to rely on the large broker-dealer estimates from the Plan.[3482] The Commission's preliminary initial and ongoing burden hour and cost estimates, as well as the Plan's estimates, are aggregate estimates for a broker-dealer's compliance with the data collection and reporting requirement under Rule 613; they do not quantify the burden hours or external cost estimates for each individual component comprising the broker-dealer's data collection and reporting responsibility.

The Commission received comments on the reliability of its Outsourcing Cost Model for small broker-dealers and its re-estimation of costs. One commenter believed that the Commission's estimates of service bureau charges for a small firm were reasonable.[3483] Another commenter noted that Outsourcers must expend internal resources even when relying on their service providers to accomplish current data reporting.[3484] A third commenter stated that broker-dealers that clear for others may have higher implementation costs since they may have to support more broker-dealers as a result of the CAT.[3485]

With respect to the comment that the Outsourcing Cost Model does not account for internal expenses, the Commission notes that its cost estimates explicitly assume that Outsourcers have employee expenses that cover these activities.[3486] In response to the commenters concerned that the Commission's estimates do not account for an increase in costs for broker-dealers that clear for other broker-dealers or provide support to introducing broker-dealers, the Commission continues to believe in the reliability of the analysis of broker-dealers implementation costs presented in the Notice, and notes that the Reporters Study estimates for large broker-dealers are likely to include these expenses because respondents are likely to include broker-dealers that provide these services. The Commission acknowledges, however, that there are some broker-dealers that would be classified as Outsourcers or new reporters and the additional implementation costs that these firms face due to clearing for other broker-dealers or supporting introducing broker-dealers are not captured by the Outsourcing Cost Model. The Commission cannot estimate the number of broker-dealers that would bear these costs because the Commission lacks data on the number of broker-dealers that clear for other broker-dealers that would be classified as new reporters or Outsourcers. Furthermore, the Commission lacks data to estimate the magnitude of these costs because the Plan does not provide this data and the Commission is unaware of any data available to it that it could use to estimate these costs.

The Commission also received several comments on uncertainties in the cost estimates for broker-dealers arising from not knowing the choice of Plan Processor,[3487] not having Technical Specifications,[3488] differences in bids preventing broker-dealers from providing more definitive cost estimates,[3489] and a lack of detail in the CAT NMS Plan.[3490]

In response to comment letters that identified these sources of uncertainties related to the costs broker-dealers will incur, the Commission acknowledges that such costs depend on the technical specifications, which are likely to remain unknown until the Plan Processor is selected. The Commission also notes that final Bids will not be submitted until after the Plan is approved, so the Commission is unable to quantify the degree of variation in broker-dealer implementation costs across Bids.

Additionally, the Commission received a number of comments relating to the costs of the individual components comprising the broker-dealer data collection and reporting requirement, such as customer information, the open/close indicator for equities, listing exchange symbology, allocation report timestamp, and quote sent time. In the Notice, as noted above, the Commission provided aggregate burden hour and external cost estimates for the broker-dealer data collection and reporting requirement of Rule 613. Although the costs of these specific data elements were not discussed in the Notice Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission has considered these comments because they relate to the overall data collection and reporting information collection.

A. Customer Information

In the Notice, the Commission stated that it believed the requirement in the CAT NMS Plan to report customer information for each transaction represents a significant source of costs.[3491] One commenter believed that the costs for providing customer information to the Central Repository would comprise a significant proportion of costs to the total industry and that the costs associated with the management of sensitive information could increase costs.[3492]

Two commenters stated that including Customer Identifying Information on new order reports would result in significant costs for the industry.[3493] In Response Letter I, the Participants suggested that the Commission amend (and the Commission has accordingly amended) the CAT NMS Plan to clarify that Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information would not be reported with the original receipt or origination of an order.[3494]

One commenter requested clarification that only active accounts would be reported as part of the

1,350 burden hours) = 1,111,050 aggregate ongoing burden hours to ensure ongoing compliance with Rule 613.

[3479] ($124,373 in ongoing external outsourcing costs) × 823 = $102,358,979 in aggregate ongoing external costs to ensure ongoing compliance with Rule 613.

[3480] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30712–26.

[3481] *See* Section V.F.1.c(1), *supra.*

[3482] *Id.*

[3483] *See* Data Boiler Letter at 36.

[3484] Specifically, this commenter references EBS reporting, but indicates that Industry Members sometimes must also be involved in preparing EBS request responses. *See* FIF Letter at 34.

[3485] *See* TR Letter, at 3–4.

[3486] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30723.

[3487] TR Letter at 4; FSI Letter at 6.

[3488] *See, e.g.,* FSR Letter at 10; and Fidelity Letter at 6.

[3489] FSI Letter at 6.

[3490] SIFMA Letter at 42 and FSI Letter at 6.

[3491] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at Section IV.F.3.a.

[3492] Data Boiler Letter at 37.

[3493] TR Letter at 8–9; FIF Letter at 9–10, 86.

[3494] Response Letter I at 34.

customer definition process, which could reduce costs incurred for reporting customer information.[3495] In Response Letter I, the Participants suggested that the Commission amend the Plan to add a definition of ''Active Account,'' defined as an account that has had activity in Eligible Securities within the last six months. Additionally, the Participants suggested that the Commission amend (and the Commission has amended) Section 6.4(d)(iv) of the Plan by clarifying that each broker-dealer must submit an initial set of customer information for Active Accounts at the commencement of reporting to the Central Repository, as well as any updates, additions, or other changes in customer information, including any such customer information for any new Active Accounts.[3496]

The Commission considered these comments and the Participants' responses and continues to believe that the requirement in the CAT NMS Plan to report customer information represents a significant proportion of total costs to the industry. The Commission is not amending its broker-dealer data collection and reporting external cost estimates in response to commenters. Commenters did not provide cost estimates that would allow the Commission to estimate such costs, and the amendments to the Plan clarify that the Plan does not require customer information to be reported on order origination.

B. Open/Close Indicator for Equities

The Commission received comments on the costs to report an open/close indicator on orders to buy or sell equities. Several commenters agreed with the Commission's analysis that an open/close indicator represents a significant proportion of costs to the Plan.[3497] Two commenters indicated that it would require significant process changes across multiple systems,[3498] and one provided a list of the different types of systems impacted by the open/close indicator.[3499] Some commenters mentioned that the open/close indicator is currently not populated for equities.[3500] Further, several commenters implied that the costs of the open/close indicator were not included in the cost estimates in the Notice.[3501] In Response Letter I, the Participants indicated that the open/close indicator is not captured on equities or on certain options transactions such as Options' Market Maker transactions.[3502]

The Commission considered these comments and is modifying the Plan to eliminate the requirement to report an open/close indicator for equities and on Options Market Maker quotations. Although the Commission believes this will reduce the compliance costs for broker-dealers, Participants, and the Central Repository, the Commission cannot quantify the savings and is thus not amending its external cost estimates in response to commenters.

The Participants' statement that open/close indicators are not reported on some options orders is consistent with the Commission's experience and the analysis in the Notice. While the economic analysis in the Notice did not explicitly separate the costs associated with an open/close indicator for equities and an open/close indicator for options, the Commission believes that the costs of the open/close indicator for options are included in the cost estimates of the Notice. However, because the Plan will no longer require the reporting of the open/close indicator for Options Market Maker quotations, the Commission now believes there will be an additional cost savings associated with not having to report this indicator as part of CAT.

C. Listing Exchange Symbology

In the Notice, the Commission explained its belief that the requirement to use listing exchange symbology could represent a significant source of costs,[3503] because broker-dealers do not necessarily use listing exchange symbology when placing orders on other exchanges or off-exchange. One commenter stated that it did not expect the use of listing exchange symbology to be much more costly than the use of existing symbology.[3504] However, another commenter suggested that accepting only listing exchange symbology is costly and invasive.[3505] One other commenter stated that listing exchange symbology would also be a significant source of costs to options.[3506] The Participants responded in Response Letter II that it was their understanding that all broker-dealers subject to OATS or EBS reporting requirements currently use the listing exchange symbology when submitting such reports.[3507] Further, they stated in Response Letter III that broker-dealers currently use symbology translation solutions when submitting data to exchanges or when submitting to regulatory reporting systems such as OATS or EBS.[3508]

The Commission considered the comments and now believes that the incremental cost for CAT Reporters to translate from their existing symbology to listing exchange symbology would be less than as discussed in the Notice and would not be a substantial contributor to aggregate costs. The Commission is not amending its external cost estimates for broker-dealer data collection and reporting in response to commenters.

D. Allocation Report Timestamp

Several commenters noted that there would be costs associated with reporting timestamps on allocation reports.[3509] One of these commenters mentioned that the requirement to report allocation timestamps would mean that broker-dealers would incur unnecessary costs to acquire additional resources.[3510] One commenter estimated that the currently proposed allocation timestamp requirement, with a one millisecond timestamp granularity and a 50 millisecond clock offset, would cost the industry $88,775,000 in initial implementation costs and $13,925,000 in ongoing annual costs.[3511] The commenter further estimated that a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset, would cost the industry $44,050,000 in initial implementation costs and $5,035,833 in ongoing annual costs.[3512] In Response Letter I, the Participants recommended an amendment to the Plan that would specify a one-second timestamp for allocation time on Allocation Reports,[3513] and the Commission is amending the Plan to reflect this recommendation.

The Commission considered these comments and is increasing its external cost estimates for broker-dealer data collection and reporting in response to the comments. The Commission is now

[3495] FIF Letter at 10.

[3496] Response Letter I at 35.

[3497] TR Letter at 9; SIFMA Letter at 35–36; FIF Letter at 83–86.

[3498] SIFMA Letter at 35; FIF Letter at 4, 84.

[3499] FIF Letter at 84.

[3500] TR Letter at 9, FIF Letter at 4, 83–85, SIFMA Letter at 35.

[3501] Specifically, one commenter stated that the inclusion of the open/close indicator for equities was a surprise (FIF Letter at 84) and two commenters wanted additional cost benefit analysis on the open/close indicator (FIF Letter at 84; SIFMA Letter at 36).

[3502] Response Letter I at 21, 22.

[3503] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30730–30731.

[3504] FIF Letter at 12, 95.

[3505] Data Boiler Letter at 37–38.

[3506] Bloomberg Letter at 5.

[3507] Response Letter II at 7.

[3508] Response Letter III at 13.

[3509] FSR Letter, at 9; SIFMA Letter, at 35; FIF Letter, at 3–4, 11, 86–89.

[3510] FSR Letter at 9.

[3511] FIF Letter at 87–89.

[3512] FIF Letter at 88, Table 6.

[3513] Response Letter I at 25.

adding one commenter's estimate of $44,050,000 in implementation costs and $5,035,833 in ongoing costs to the estimates of costs to broker-dealers.[3514] The Commission believes the cost estimates received to be credible because they are based on a survey of industry participants who are informed of the Allocation Time requirement and the changes that broker-dealers would need to make to comply with the requirement.

E. Quote Sent Time

In the Notice, the Commission estimated that the requirement that Options Market Makers submit quote sent times to the exchanges would cost between $36.9 million and $76.8 million over five years.[3515] The Commission concluded that this requirement did not represent a significant source of costs. The Commission received a comment stating that the estimated 5-year cost to Options Market Makers for adding a timestamp to the quote times was between the range of $39.9 million and $76.8 million. The commenter further stated that this is ''not a trivial cost for providing one data element to the consolidated audit trail.'' [3516] The Commission continues to believe that the estimates in the Notice are credible estimates for the costs for Options Market Makers to send the Quote Sent Time field to exchanges. In response to the comment, the Commission notes that the implied annual costs would be much lower than the five year costs and the Commission agrees that the costs of quote sent time are significant.

The Quote Sent Time cost estimate was not included in the cost estimates in the Notice, therefore the Commission is now adding this cost to its estimates for Options Market Maker data collection and reporting.[3517] The Commission is using the maximum 5-year cost estimate to Options Market Makers provided by the commenter ($76.8 million) and has divided it into $17,400,000 in aggregate implementation external costs, and $11,880,000 in aggregate ongoing external costs,[3518] as provided in the burden hours and external cost estimates discussion for Options Market Makers in Section VI.D.2.a.(3)A.i.(b), below.

(3) Order Estimates

A. Insourcers

i. Large Non-OATS Reporting Broker-Dealers

The Commission notes that, in this Order Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission has divided the discussion of the burden hours and cost estimates associated with large non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers into two separate categories: ELPs and Options Market Makers. The Commission believes that it is necessary to discuss these categories separately to account for the addition of the Quote Sent Time cost to the external costs to be incurred solely by Options Market Makers.

(a) Electronic Liquidity Providers

As noted above,[3519] in the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants, based on the Reporters Study's large broker-dealer cost estimates, estimated the following average initial external cost and FTE count figures that a large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer would expect to incur to adopt the systems changes needed to comply with the data reporting requirements of Rule 613 under Approach 1: $450,000 in external hardware and software costs; 8.05 internal FTEs; [3520] and $9,500 in external third party/outsourcing costs.[3521] The Participants also estimated the following average ongoing external cost and internal FTE count figures that a large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer would expect to incur to maintain data reporting systems to be in compliance with Rule 613: $80,000 in external hardware and software costs; 7.41 internal FTEs; [3522] and $1,300 in external third party/outsourcing costs.[3523] The Participants also estimated the following average ongoing external cost and internal FTE count figures that a large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer would expect to incur to maintain data reporting systems to be in compliance with Rule 613: $80,000 in external hardware and software costs; 7.41 internal FTEs; [3524] and $1,300 in external third party/outsourcing costs.[3525]

As it did in the Notice, the Commission relies on the Reporters Study's large broker-dealer cost estimates in estimating costs for large broker-dealers that can practicably decide between insourcing or outsourcing their regulatory data reporting functions. The Commission estimates that there are 14 large broker-dealers that are not OATS reporters currently in the business of electronic liquidity provision that would be classified as Insourcers.[3526] The Commission assumes the 14 ELPs would be typical of the Reporters Study's large, non-OATS reporting firms; for these firms, the Commission relies on the cost estimates provided under Approach 1[3527] for large, non-

---

[3514] *See* Section V.F.3.a(4), *supra.* The total cost estimates of the CAT Plan reflect these implementation and ongoing costs.

[3515] *See* FIF, SIFMA, and Security Traders Association, Cost Survey Report on CAT Reporting of Options Quotes by Market Makers (November 5, 2013), *available at http://www.catnmsplan.com/industryfeedback/p601771.pdf*; *see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iv)(B).

[3516] FIF Letter at 65.

[3517] *See* Section V.F.1.c(2)B, *supra.*

[3518] The Commission assumes that the ratio of ongoing to implementation costs for Quote Sent Time would be the same as the ratio of ongoing to implementation costs for the other costs incurred by broker-dealers for data collection and reporting to CAT. *See supra* note 2526; *see also* Section V.F.3.a(6), *supra.*

[3519] *See* Section VI.D.2.a.(1)A.i., *supra.*

[3520] Approach 1 also provided $3,200,000 in initial internal FTE costs. The Commission believed the $3,200,000 in internal FTE costs is the Participants' estimated cost of the 8.05 FTEs. (8.05 FTEs) × ($401,440 Participants' assumed annual cost per FTE provided in the CAT NMS Plan) = $3,231,592. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at n. 192. *See also supra* note 3320.

[3521] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section B.7(b)(iii)(c)(2)(a). The Commission believed that the third party/outsourcing costs may be attributed to the use of service bureaus (potentially), technology consulting, and legal services.

[3522] Approach 1 also provided $3,000,000 in internal FTE costs related to maintenance. The Commission believes the $3,000,000 in ongoing internal FTE costs is the Participants' estimated cost of the 7.41 FTEs. (7.41 FTEs) × ($401,440 Participants' assumed annual cost per FTE provided in the CAT NMS Plan) = $2,974,670. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at n.192. *See also supra* note 3320 .

[3523] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2)(b). The CAT NMS Plan did not break down these third party costs into categories.

[3524] Approach 1 also provided $3,000,000 in internal FTE costs related to maintenance. The Commission believes the $3,000,000 in ongoing internal FTE costs is the Participants' estimated cost of the 7.41 FTEs. (7.41 FTEs) × ($401,440 Participants' assumed annual cost per FTE provided in the CAT NMS Plan) = $2,974,670. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(ii)(C), n.192; *see also supra* note 3320.

[3525] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2)(b). The CAT NMS Plan did not break down these third party costs into categories.

[3526] These broker-dealers are not FINRA members and thus have no regular OATS reporting obligations. *See supra* note 2560.

[3527] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(A)(2). The Reporters Study requested broker-dealer respondents to provide estimates to report to the Central Repository under two approaches. Approach 1 assumes CAT Reporters would submit CAT Data using their choice of industry protocols. Approach 2 assumes CAT Reporters would submit data using a pre-specified format. Approach 1's aggregate costs are higher than those for Approach 2 for all market participants except in one case where service bureaus have lower Approach 1 costs. *Id.* at Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2). For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission is not relying on the cost estimates for Approach 2 because overall the Approach 1 aggregate estimates represent the higher of the proposed approaches. The Commission believes it would be more comprehensive to use the higher of the two estimates for its Paperwork Reduction Act analysis estimates.

OATS reporting firms in the CAT NMS Plan.

Once an ELP has established the appropriate systems and processes required for collection and transmission of the required information to the Central Repository, such broker-dealers would be subject to ongoing annual burdens associated with, among other things, personnel time to monitor each ELP's reporting of the required data and the maintenance of the systems to report the required data; and implementing changes to trading systems that might result in additional reports to the Central Repository.

(i) Electronic Liquidity Providers—Initial Burden and Costs

Based on the comment that provided estimates for a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset,[3528] the Commission now estimates that the initial cost to an ELP to implement the modified allocation timestamp requirement would be $250,000.[3529] The Commission believes that this cost would be an external hardware and software cost related to adding this functionality to servers. The Commission is adding the cost of the modified allocation timestamp requirement to the external costs to be incurred by ELPs.

Based on this information, the Commission estimates that the average initial burden associated with implementing regulatory data reporting to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository in compliance with the Rule for each ELP would be approximately 14,490 initial burden hours.[3530]

The Commission also now estimates that these broker-dealers would, on average, incur approximately $700,000 in initial costs for hardware and software to implement the systems changes needed to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository,[3531] and an additional $9,500 in initial third party/outsourcing costs.[3532] Therefore, the Commission now estimates that the average one-time initial burden per ELP would be 14,490 internal burden hours, and the initial external cost per ELP would be $709,500,[3533] for an estimated aggregate initial burden of 202,860 hours [3534] and an estimated aggregate initial external cost of $9,933,000.[3535]

(ii) Electronic Liquidity Providers—Ongoing Burden and Costs

Based on the comment that provided estimates for a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset,[3536] the Commission now estimates that the ongoing cost to an ELP to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement would be $29,166.67.[3537] The Commission believes that this cost would be an external hardware and software cost related to maintenance of the modified allocation timestamp. The Commission is adding the cost of the modified allocation timestamp requirement to the external costs to be incurred by ELPs.

Based on this information, the Commission believes that it would take an ELP 13,338 burden hours per year [3538] to continue to comply with the Rule. The Commission also now estimates that it would cost, on average, approximately $109,166.67 per year per ELP to maintain systems connectivity to the Central Repository and purchase any necessary hardware, software, and other materials,[3539] and an additional $1,300 in third party/outsourcing costs.[3540]

Therefore, the Commission now estimates that the average ongoing annual burden per ELP would be approximately 13,338 hours, and the ongoing external cost per ELP would be $110,466.67 [3541] to maintain the systems necessary to collect and transmit information to the Central Repository, for an estimated aggregate ongoing burden of 186,732 hours [3542] and an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost for the ELPs of $1,546,533.38.[3543]

(b) Options Market Makers

As noted above,[3544] in the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants, based on the Reporters Study's large broker-dealer cost estimates, estimated the following average initial external cost and FTE count figures that a large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer would expect to incur to adopt the systems changes needed to comply with the data reporting requirements of Rule 613 under Approach 1: $450,000 in external hardware and software costs; 8.05 internal FTEs; [3545] and $9,500 in external third party/outsourcing

[3528] FIF Letter at 88, Table 6. The commenter based its implementation and ongoing estimates on a survey it conducted of broker-dealers to estimate the costs associated with the allocation report timestamp requirement. The commenter noted that the estimates do not account for all Insourcers (the cost estimates cover the 126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealer Insourcers, but not the 14 ELPs or 31 Options Market Makers), nor do they cover Outsourcing broker-dealers. The Commission believes those categories may not have been included in the estimates due to a lack of participation by such broker-dealers in the survey. The Commission is assuming, for its Paperwork Reduction Act cost estimates, that the portion of the estimates attributed by the commenter to service bureaus will be passed-through to their Outsourcing broker-dealer clients that rely on service bureaus to perform their regulatory data reporting. The Commission is thus applying the portion of the commenter's cost estimates attributed to the 126 Insourcers to all 171 Insourcers, as well as the portion of the cost estimates attributed to the 13 service bureaus across the 1,629 broker-dealers that are categorized as Outsourcing broker-dealers.

[3529] The commenter stated that this requirement would cost the industry $44,050,000 in initial implementation costs. The commenter attributed $42,750,000 of the implementation cost estimate to 126 Insourcers. For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission is applying the portion of the cost estimates attributed to the 126 Insourcers to all 171 Insourcers. $42,750,000/171 Insourcers = $250,000 in initial costs to implement the modified allocation timestamp requirement per Insourcer.

[3530] 14,490 initial burden hours = (8.05 FTEs for implementing CAT Data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3531] $700,000 = ($450,000 in initial hardware and software costs) + ($250,000 in initial hardware and software costs to implement the modified allocation timestamp requirement).

[3532] *See supra* note 3436.

[3533] ($700,000 in initial hardware and software costs) + ($9,500 initial third party/outsourcing costs) = $709,500 in initial external costs to implement data reporting systems.

[3534] The Commission estimates that 14 ELPs would be impacted by this information collection. (14 ELPs) × (14,490 burden hours) = 202,860 initial burden hours to implement data reporting systems.

[3535] ($709,500 in initial hardware and software costs) + ($9,500 initial third party/outsourcing costs) × 14 ELPs = $9,933,000 in initial external costs to implement data reporting systems.

[3536] *See supra* note 3528.

[3537] The commenter stated that this requirement would cost the industry $5,035,833 in ongoing costs. The commenter attributed $4,987,500 of the ongoing cost estimate to 126 Insourcers. For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission is applying the portion of the cost estimates attributed to the 126 Insourcers to all 171 Insourcers. $4,987,500/171 Insourcers = $29,166.67 in ongoing costs to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement per Insourcer.

[3538] 13,338 ongoing burden hours = (7.41 ongoing FTEs to maintain CAT data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3539] $109,166.67 = ($80,000 in ongoing external hardware and software costs) + ($29,166.67 to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement).

[3540] *See supra* note 3421.

[3541] ($109,166.67 in ongoing external hardware and software costs) + ($1,300 ongoing external third party/outsourcing costs) = $110,466.6769 in ongoing external costs per ELP.

[3542] The Commission estimates that 14 ELPs would be impacted by this information collection. (14 ELPs) × (13,338 burden hours) = 186,732 aggregate ongoing burden hours.

[3543] ($109,166.67 in ongoing external hardware and software costs) + ($1,300 ongoing external third party/outsourcing costs) × (14 ELPs) = $1,546,533.38 in aggregate ongoing external costs.

[3544] *See* Section VI.D.2.a.(1)A.i., *supra.*

[3545] Approach 1 also provided $3,200,000 in initial internal FTE costs. The Commission believed the $3,200,000 in internal FTE costs is the Participants' estimated cost of the 8.05 FTEs. (8.05 FTEs) × ($401,440 Participants' assumed annual cost per FTE provided in the CAT NMS Plan) = $3,231,592. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at n. 192. *See also supra* note 3320.

costs.[3546] The Participants also estimated the following average ongoing external cost and internal FTE count figures that a large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer would expect to incur to maintain data reporting systems to be in compliance with Rule 613: $80,000 in external hardware and software costs; 7.41 internal FTEs; [3547] and $1,300 in external third party/outsourcing costs.[3548] The Participants also estimated the following average ongoing external cost and internal FTE count figures that a large non-OATS reporting broker-dealer would expect to incur to maintain data reporting systems to be in compliance with Rule 613: $80,000 in external hardware and software costs; 7.41 internal FTEs; [3549] and $1,300 in external third party/outsourcing costs.[3550] As it did in the Notice, the Commission relies on the Reporters Study's large broker-dealer cost estimates in estimating costs for large broker-dealers that can practicably decide between insourcing or outsourcing their regulatory data reporting functions.[3551] The Commission estimates that there are 31 broker-dealers that may transact in options but not in equities that can be classified as Insourcers.[3552] Although the exemptive relief may relieve these firms of the obligation to report their options quoting activity to the Central Repository, these firms may have customer orders and other activity off-exchange that would cause them to incur a CAT reporting obligation. The Commission assumes the 31 Options Market Makers would be typical of the Reporters Study's large, non-OATS reporting firms; for these firms, the Commission relies on the cost estimates provided under Approach 1 [3553] for large, non-OATS reporting firms in the CAT NMS Plan.

Once an Options Market Maker has established the appropriate systems and processes required for collection and transmission of the required information to the Central Repository, such broker-dealers would be subject to ongoing annual burdens associated with, among other things, personnel time to monitor each Options Market Maker's reporting of the required data and the maintenance of the systems to report the required data; and implementing changes to trading systems that might result in additional reports to the Central Repository.

(i) Options Market Makers—Initial Burden and Costs

Based on this information, the Commission estimates that the average initial burden associated with implementing regulatory data reporting to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository in compliance with the Rule for each Options Market Maker would be approximately 14,490 initial burden hours.[3554]

The Commission also estimates that these options firm would, on average, incur approximately $450,000 in initial costs for hardware and software to implement the systems changes needed to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository, and an additional $9,500 in initial third party/outsourcing costs.[3555] Additionally, based on the comment that provided estimates for a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset,[3556] the Commission now estimates that the initial cost to an Options Market Maker to implement the modified allocation timestamp requirement would be $250,000.[3557] The Commission believes that this cost would be an external hardware and software cost related to adding this functionality to servers. The Commission is adding the cost of the modified allocation timestamp requirement to the external costs to be incurred by Options Market Makers.

The Commission also is adding a cost estimate for the requirement that an Options Market Maker submit a Quote Sent Time to an exchange.[3558] The Commission is using the maximum 5-year cost estimate to Options Market Makers provided by a commenter ($76.8 million) [3559] and has divided it into $17,400,000 in aggregate implementation external costs, and $11,880,000 in aggregate ongoing external costs.[3560]

The Commission estimates that that this requirement will impose an additional initial hardware and software cost per Options Market Maker of $561,290.32.[3561] Based on this information, the Commission now estimates that Options Market Makers would, on average, incur approximately $1,261,290.32 in initial costs for hardware and software to implement the systems changes needed to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository,[3562] and an additional $9,500 in initial third party/outsourcing costs. Therefore, the

[3546] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Section B.7(b)(iii)(c)(2)(a). The Commission believed that the third party/outsourcing costs may be attributed to the use of service bureaus (potentially), technology consulting, and legal services.

[3547] Approach 1 also provided $3,000,000 in internal FTE costs related to maintenance. The Commission believes the $3,000,000 in ongoing internal FTE costs is the Participants' estimated cost of the 7.41 FTEs. (7.41 FTEs) × ($401,440 Participants' assumed annual cost per FTE provided in the CAT NMS Plan) = $2,974,670. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at n.192. *See also supra* note 3320.

[3548] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2)(b). The CAT NMS Plan did not break down these third party costs into categories.

[3549] Approach 1 also provided $3,000,000 in internal FTE costs related to maintenance. The Commission believes the $3,000,000 in ongoing internal FTE costs is the Participants' estimated cost of the 7.41 FTEs. (7.41 FTEs) × ($401,440 Participants' assumed annual cost per FTE provided in the CAT NMS Plan) = $2,974,670. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(ii)(C), n.192; *see also supra* note 3320.

[3550] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2)(b). The CAT NMS Plan did not break down these third party costs into categories.

[3551] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section A.6(c).

[3552] *See supra* note 2562.

[3553] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(i)(A)(2). The Reporters Study requested broker-dealer respondents to provide estimates to report to the Central Repository under two approaches. Approach 1 assumes CAT Reporters would submit CAT Data using their choice of industry protocols. Approach 2 assumes CAT Reporters would submit data using a pre-specified format. Approach 1's aggregate costs are higher than those for Approach 2 for all market participants except in one case where service bureaus have lower Approach 1 costs. *Id.* at Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2). For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission is not relying on the cost estimates for Approach 2 because overall the Approach 1 aggregate estimates represent the higher of the proposed approaches. The Commission believes it would be more comprehensive to use the higher of the two estimates for its Paperwork Reduction Act analysis estimates.

[3554] 14,490 initial burden hours = (8.05 FTEs for implementing CAT Data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3555] *See supra* note 3436.

[3556] *See supra* note 3528.

[3557] The commenter stated that this requirement would cost the industry $44,050,000 in initial implementation costs. The commenter attributed $42,750,000 of the implementation cost estimate to 126 Insourcers. For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission is applying the portion of the cost estimates attributed to the 126 Insourcers to all 171 Insourcers. $42,750,000/171 Insourcers = $250,000 in initial costs to implement the modified allocation timestamp requirement per Insourcer.

[3558] *See* Section VI.D.2.a.(1)E., *supra; see also supra* note 2526; Section V.F.3.a(6), *supra;* Section V.F.1.c(2)B., *supra.*

[3559] FIF Letter at 65.

[3560] *See supra* note 2526.

[3561] The Commission estimates that the implementation cost of the Quote Sent Time requirement is approximately $17,400,000. *See* Section V.F.1.c(2)B., *supra.* ($17,400,000 in implementation costs)/(31 Options Market Makers) = $561,290.21 in initial external costs to implement the Quote Sent Time requirement per Options Market Maker.

[3562] $1,261,290.32 = ($450,000 in initial hardware and software costs) + ($250,000 in initial hardware and software costs to implement the modified allocation timestamp requirement) + ($561,290.32 in initial hardware and software costs to implement the requirement that an Options Market Maker submit a Quote Sent Time).

Commission now estimates that the average one-time initial burden per options firm would be 14,490 internal burden hours, and the initial external cost per Options Market Maker would be $1,270,790.32,[3563] for an estimated aggregate initial burden of 449,190 hours [3564] and an estimated aggregate initial external cost of $39,394,499.92.[3565]

(ii) Options Market Makers—Ongoing Burden and Costs

Based on the comment that provided estimates for a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset,[3566] the Commission estimates that the ongoing cost to an Options Market Maker to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement would be $29,166.67.[3567] The Commission believes that this cost would be an external hardware and software cost related to maintenance of the modified allocation timestamp. The Commission is adding the cost of the modified allocation timestamp requirement to the external costs to be incurred by Options Market Makers.

The Commission also is adding a cost estimate for the requirement that an Options Market Maker submit a Quote Sent Time to an exchange.[3568] The Commission is using the maximum 5-year cost estimate to Options Market Makers provided by a commenter ($76.8 million) [3569] and has divided it into $17,400,000 in aggregate implementation external costs, and $11,880,000 in aggregate ongoing external costs.[3570] The Commission estimates that this requirement will impose an additional ongoing hardware and software cost per Options Market Maker of $383,255.81.[3571] Based on this information, the Commission now believes that it would take an Options Market Maker 13,338 burden hours per year [3572] to continue to comply with the Rule. The Commission also now estimates that it would cost, on average, approximately $492,422.48 per year per Options Market Maker to maintain systems connectivity to the Central Repository and purchase any necessary hardware, software, and other materials,[3573] and an additional $1,300 in third party/outsourcing costs.[3574]

Therefore, the Commission now estimates that the average ongoing annual burden per Options Market Maker would be approximately 13,338 hours, and the ongoing external cost per Options Market Maker would be $493,722.48 [3575] to maintain the systems necessary to collect and transmit information to the Central Repository, for an estimated aggregate ongoing burden of 413,478 hours [3576] and an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost to Options Market Makers of $15,305,396.88.[3577]

ii. *Large OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers*

As noted above,[3578] in the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants, based on the Reporters Study's large broker-dealer cost estimates, estimated the following average initial external cost and internal FTE count figures that a large OATS-reporting broker-dealer would expect to incur as a result of the implementation of the consolidated audit trail under Approach 1: $750,000 in hardware and software costs; 14.92 internal FTEs; [3579] and $150,000 in external third party/outsourcing costs.[3580] The Participants also estimated the following average ongoing external cost and internal FTE count figures that a large OATS-reporting broker-dealer would expect to incur to maintain data reporting systems to be in compliance with Rule 613: $380,000 in ongoing external hardware and software costs; 10.03 internal FTEs; [3581] and $120,000 in ongoing external third party/outsourcing costs.[3582]

As it did in the Notice, based on the Commission's analysis of data provided by FINRA and discussions with market participants, the Commission estimates that 126 broker-dealers, which reported more than 350,000 OATS ROEs between June 15 and July 10, 2015, would strategically decide to either self-report CAT Data or outsource their CAT data reporting functions.[3583] To conduct its Paperwork Burden Analysis for the 126 broker-dealers, the Commission is relying on the Reporters Study estimates used by the CAT NMS Plan of expected costs that a large OATS-reporting broker-dealer would incur as a result of the implementation of the consolidated audit trail under Approach 1.

Once a large OATS-reporting broker-dealer has established the appropriate systems and processes required for collection and transmission of the required information to the Central Repository, such broker-dealers would

[3563] ($1,261,290.32 in initial hardware and software costs) + ($9,500 initial third party/outsourcing costs) = $1,270,790.32 in initial external costs to implement data reporting systems.

[3564] The Commission estimates that 31 Options Market Makers would be impacted by this information collection. (31 Options Market Makers) × (14,490 burden hours) = 449,190 initial burden hours to implement data reporting systems.

[3565] ($1,270,790.32 in initial hardware and software costs) + ($9,500 initial third party/outsourcing costs) × (31 Options Market Makers) = $39,394,499.92 in initial external costs to implement data reporting systems.

[3566] *See supra* note 3528.

[3567] The commenter stated that this requirement would cost the industry $5,035,833 in ongoing costs. The commenter attributed $4,987,500 of the ongoing cost estimate to 126 Insourcers. For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission is applying the portion of the cost estimates attributed to the 126 Insourcers to all 171 Insourcers. $4,987,500/171 Insourcers = $29,166.67 in ongoing costs to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement per Insourcer.

[3568] *See* Section VI.D.2.a.(1)E., *supra; see also supra* note 2526; Section V.F.3.a(6), *supra;* Section V.F.1.c(2)B., *supra.*

[3569] FIF Letter at 65.

[3570] *See supra* note 2526.

[3571] The Commission estimates that the ongoing cost of the Quote Sent Time requirement is approximately $11,880,000. *See* Section V.F.1.c(2)B., *supra.* ($11,880,000 in ongoing costs)/(31 Options Market Maker) = $383,255.81 in ongoing external costs to maintain the Quote Sent Time requirement per Options Market Maker.

[3572] 13,338 ongoing burden hours = (7.41 ongoing FTEs to maintain CAT data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3573] $492,422.48 = ($80,000 in ongoing external hardware and software costs) + ($29,166.67 to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement) + ($383,255.81 in ongoing external costs to maintain the Quote Sent Time requirement per options firm).

[3574] *See supra* note 3548.

[3575] ($492,422.48 in ongoing external hardware and software costs) + ($1,300 ongoing external third party/outsourcing costs) = $493,722.48 in ongoing external costs per options firm.

[3576] The Commission estimates that 31 options firms would be impacted by this information collection. (31 options firms) × (13,338 burden hours) = 413,478 aggregate ongoing burden hours.

[3577] ($492,422.48 in ongoing external hardware and software costs) + ($1,300 ongoing external third party/outsourcing costs) × (31 options firms) = $15,305,396.88 in aggregate ongoing external costs.

[3578] *See* Section VI.D.2.a.(1)(A)ii., *supra.*

[3579] Approach 1 also provided $6,000,000 in initial internal FTE costs. The Commission believes the $6,000,000 in initial internal FTE costs is the Participants' estimated cost of the 14.92 FTEs. (14.92 FTEs) × ($401,440 Participants' assumed annual cost per FTE provided in the CAT NMS Plan) = $5,989,485. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(ii)(C), n.192; *see also supra* note 3320.

[3580] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2)(a). The CAT NMS Plan did not break down these third party costs into categories. T*he Commission believes that these costs may be attributed to the use of service bureaus, technology consulting, and legal services.*

[3581] Approach 1 also provided $4,000,000 in internal FTE costs related to maintenance. The Commission believes the $4,000,000 in ongoing internal FTE costs is the Participants' estimated cost of the 10.03 FTEs. (10.03 FTEs) × ($401,440 Participants' assumed annual cost per FTE provided in the CAT NMS Plan) = $4,026,443. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(ii)(C), n.192; *see also supra* note 3320.

[3582] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2)(b). The CAT NMS Plan did not categorize these third party costs. The Commission believes that these costs may be attributed to the use of service bureaus, technology consulting, and legal services.

[3583] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30718; *see also id.,* at n.901 (stating that the Commission believes that broker-dealers that report fewer than 350,000 OATS ROEs per month are unlikely to be large enough to support the infrastructure required for insourcing data reporting activities).

be subject to ongoing annual burdens and costs associated with, among other things, personnel time to monitor each broker-dealer's reporting of the required data and the maintenance of the systems to report the required data; and implementing changes to trading systems which might result in additional reports to the Central Repository.

(a) Large OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers—Initial Burden and Costs

In this Order, based on the comment that provided estimates for a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset,[3584] the Commission is estimating that the initial cost to a large OATS-reporting broker-dealer to implement the modified allocation timestamp requirement would be $250,000.[3585] The Commission believes that this cost would be an external hardware and software cost related to adding this functionality to servers. The Commission is adding the cost of the modified allocation timestamp requirement to the external costs to be incurred by large-OATS-reporting broker-dealers.

Based on this information the Commission now estimates that these large OATS-reporting broker-dealers would, on average, incur approximately $1,000,000 in initial external costs for hardware and software to implement the systems changes needed to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository,[3586] and an additional $150,000 in initial external third party/outsourcing costs.[3587] Therefore, the Commission now estimates that the average one-time initial burden per large OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be 26,856 burden hours and external costs of $1,150,000 to implement CAT data reporting systems,[3588] for an estimated aggregate initial burden of 3,383,856 hours [3589] and an estimated aggregate initial external cost of $189,000,000.[3590]

(b) Large OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers—Ongoing Burden and Costs

In this Order, additionally, based on the comment that provided estimates for a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset,[3591] the Commission estimates that the ongoing cost to a large OATS-reporting broker-dealer to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement would be $29,166.67.[3592] The Commission believes that this cost would be an external hardware and software cost related to maintenance of the modified allocation timestamp. The Commission is adding the cost of the modified allocation timestamp requirement to the external costs to be incurred by large OATS-reporting broker-dealers.

Based on this information the Commission believes that it would take a large OATS-reporting broker-dealer 18,054 ongoing burden hours per year [3593] to continue compliance with the Rule. The Commission now estimates that it would cost, on average, approximately $409,166.67 per year per large OATS-reporting broker-dealer to maintain systems connectivity to the Central Repository and purchase any necessary hardware, software, and other materials,[3594] and an additional $120,000 in external ongoing third party/outsourcing costs.[3595]

Therefore, the Commission now estimates that the average ongoing annual burden per large OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be approximately 18,054 burden hours, plus $529,166.67 [3596] to maintain the systems necessary to collect and transmit information to the Central Repository, for an estimated aggregate burden of 2,274,804 hours [3597] and an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost of $66,675,000.42.[3598]

B. Outsourcers

i. Small OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers

As it did in the Notice, based on data provided by FINRA, the Commission estimates that there are 806 broker-dealers that report fewer than 350,000 OATS ROEs monthly. The Commission believes that these broker-dealers generally outsource their regulatory reporting obligations because during the period June 15–July 10, 2015, approximately 88.9% of their 350,000 OATS ROEs were reported through service bureaus, with 730 of these broker-dealers reporting more than 99% of their OATS ROEs through one or more service bureaus.[3599] The Commission estimates that these firms currently spend an aggregate of $100.1 million on annual outsourcing costs.[3600] The Commission estimates these 806 broker-dealers would spend $100.2 million in aggregate to outsource their regulatory data reporting to service bureaus to report in accordance with Rule 613,[3601] or $124,373 per broker-dealer.[3602] These external outsourcing cost estimates are calculated using the information from staff discussions with service bureaus and other market

[3584] *See supra* note 3528.

[3585] The commenter stated that this requirement would cost the industry $44,050,000 in initial implementation costs. The commenter attributed $42,750,000 of the implementation cost estimate to 126 Insourcers. For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission is applying the portion of the cost estimates attributed to the 126 Insourcers to all 171 Insourcers. $42,750,000/171 Insourcers = $250,000 in initial costs to implement the modified allocation timestamp requirement per Insourcer.

[3586] $1,000,000 = ($750,000 in initial external hardware and software costs) + ($250,000 to implement the modified allocation timestamp).

[3587] *See supra* note 3421.

[3588] ($1,000,000 in initial external hardware and software costs) + ($150,000 initial external third party/outsourcing costs) = $1,150,000 in initial external costs per large OATS-reporting broker-dealer to implement CAT data reporting systems.

[3589] The Commission estimates that 126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealers) × (26,856 initial burden hours) = 3,383,856 initial burden hours to implement data reporting systems.

[3590] ($1,000,000 in initial external hardware and software costs) + ($150,000 initial external third party/outsourcing costs) × (126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealers) = $189,000,000 in initial external costs to implement data reporting systems.

[3591] *See supra* note 3528.

[3592] The commenter stated that this requirement would cost the industry $5,035,833 in ongoing costs. The commenter attributed $4,987,500 of the ongoing cost estimate to 126 Insourcers. For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission is applying the portion of the cost estimates attributed to the 126 Insourcers to all 171 Insourcers. $4,987,500/171 Insourcers = $29,166.67 in ongoing costs to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement per Insourcer.

[3593] 18,054 ongoing burden hours = (10.03 ongoing FTEs for maintenance of CAT data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3594] $409,166.67 = ($380,000 in ongoing external hardware and software costs) + ($29,166.67 to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement).

[3595] *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii)(C)(2)(b).

[3596] ($409,166.67 in ongoing external hardware and software costs) + ($120,000 in ongoing external third party/outsourcing costs) = $529,166.67 in ongoing external costs per large OATS-reporting broker-dealer.

[3597] The Commission estimates that 126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealers) × (18,054 burden hours) = 2,274,804 aggregate ongoing burden hours.

[3598] ($409,166.67 in ongoing external hardware and software costs) + ($120,000 in ongoing external third party/outsourcing costs) × (126 large OATS-reporting broker-dealers) = $66,675,000.42 in aggregate ongoing external costs.

[3599] *See* Notice, *supra* note 5, at 30718. Because of the extensive use of service bureaus in these categories of broker-dealers, the Commission assumes that these broker-dealers are likely to use service bureaus to accomplish their CAT data reporting.

[3600] The average broker-dealer in this category reported 15,185 OATS ROEs from June 15–July 10, 2015; the median reported 1,251 OATS ROEs. Of these broker-dealers, 39 reported more than 100,000 OATS ROEs during the sample period. *See* Section V.F.1.c.(2)B., *supra*.

[3601] *Id.*

[3602] $124,373 = $100,200,000/806 broker-dealers. This amount is the average estimated annual outsourcing cost to firms that currently report fewer than 350,000 OATS ROEs per month. *Id.*

participants, as applied to data provided by FINRA.[3603]

Firms that outsource their regulatory data reporting still face internal staffing burdens associated with this activity. These employees perform activities such as answering inquiries from their service bureaus, and investigating reporting exceptions. Based on conversations with market participants, the Commission estimates that these firms currently have 0.5 full-time employees devoted to these activities.[3604] The Commission estimates that these firms would need to hire one additional full-time employee for one year to implement CAT reporting requirements.[3605]

Small OATS-reporting broker-dealers that outsource their regulatory data reporting would likely face internal staffing burdens and external costs associated with ongoing activity, such as maintaining any systems that transmit data to their service providers. Based on conversations with market participants, the Commission estimates these firms would need 0.75 FTEs on an ongoing basis to perform or monitor CAT reporting.[3606]

(a) Small OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers—Initial Burden and Costs

In this Order, additionally, based on the comment that provided estimates for a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset,[3607] the Commission estimates that the initial cost to a small OATS-reporting broker-dealer to implement this requirement would be $798.04.[3608] The Commission believes that this cost would be an external hardware and software cost related to adding this functionality to servers. The Commission is adding the cost of the modified allocation timestamp requirement to the external costs to be incurred by small OATS-reporting broker-dealers.

Based on this information, the Commission estimates that the average initial burden to implement the needed systems changes to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository in compliance with the CAT NMS Plan for small OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be approximately 1,800 burden hours.[3609] The Commission believes the burden hours would be associated with work performed by internal technology, compliance and legal staff in connection with the implementation of CAT data reporting. The Commission also now estimates that each small OATS-reporting broker-dealer would incur approximately $125,171.04 in initial external costs.[3610] Therefore, the Commission now estimates that the average one-time initial burden per small OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be 1,800 burden hours and external costs of $125,171.04, for an estimated aggregate initial burden of 1,450,800 hours [3611] and an estimated aggregate initial external cost of $100,887,858.24.[3612]

(b) Small OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers—Ongoing Burden and Costs

In this Order, the Commission estimates that it would cost, on average, approximately $124,373 in ongoing external outsourcing costs [3613] to ensure ongoing compliance with Rule 613. Additionally, based on the comment that provided estimates for a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset,[3614] the Commission estimates that the ongoing cost to a small OATS-reporting broker-dealer to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement would be $66.50.[3615] The Commission believes that this cost would be an external hardware and software cost related to maintenance of the modified allocation timestamp. The Commission is adding the cost of the modified allocation timestamp requirement to the external costs to be incurred by small OATS-reporting broker-dealers

Therefore, the Commission now estimverage ongoing annual burden per small OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be approximately 1,350 hours, plus $124,439.50,[3616] in external costs, for an estimated aggregate ongoing burden of 1,088,100 hours [3617] and an estimated aggregate ongoinates that the ag external cost of $100,298,237.[3618]

ii. Small Non-OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers

In addition to firms that currently report to OATS, as it did in the Notice, the Commission estimates there are 799 broker-dealers that are currently exempt from OATS reporting rules due to firm size, or excluded because all of their order flow is routed to a single OATS reporter, such as a clearing firm, that would incur CAT reporting obligations.[3619] A further 24 broker-dealers have SRO memberships only with one Participant; [3620] the Commission believes this group is comprised mostly of floor brokers and further believes these firms would experience CAT implementation and

[3603] *See* Section V.F.1.c.(2)B., *supra.*

[3604] *Id.*

[3605] *Id.*

[3606] *See* Section IV.F.1.c.(2)B., *supra.*

[3607] *See supra* note 3528.

[3608] The commenter stated that this requirement would cost the industry $44,050,000 in initial implementation costs. The commenter attributed $1,300,000 of the implementation cost estimate to 13 service bureaus. For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission is assuming that the portion of the estimates attributed by the commenter to service bureaus will be passed-through to their Outsourcing broker-dealer clients that rely on service bureaus to perform their regulatory data reporting. The Commission is thus applying the portion of the commenter's cost estimates attributed to the 13 service bureaus across the 1,629 broker-dealers that are categorized as Outsourcing broker-dealers. $1,300,000/1,629 Outsourcing broker-dealers = $798.04 in initial costs to implement the modified allocation timestamp requirement per Outsourcing broker-dealer.

[3609] This estimate assumes that, based on the expected FTE count provided, a small OATS-reporting broker-dealer would have to hire 1 new FTE for implementation. The salary attributed to the 1 FTE would be (1 FTE) × ($424,350 FTE cost) = $424,350 per year. To determine the number of burden hours to be incurred by the current 0.5 FTE for implementation, multiply 0.5 FTE by 1,800 hours per year = 900 initial burden hours.

[3610] $125,171.04 = ($124,373 in initial outsourcing costs) + ($798.04 to implement the allocation timestamp).

[3611] The Commission estimates that 806 small OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (806 small OATS-reporting broker-dealers) × (1,800 burden hours) = 1,450,800 aggregate initial burden hours.

[3612] ($124,373 in initial outsourcing costs) + ($798.04 to implement the allocation timestamp) × (806 small OATS-reporting broker-dealers) = $100,887,858.24 in aggregate initial external costs.

[3613] *See supra* note 3610.

[3614] *See supra* note 3528.

[3615] The commenter stated that this requirement would cost the industry $5,035,833 in ongoing costs. The commenter attributed $108,333 of the ongoing cost estimate to 13 service bureaus. For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission is assuming that the portion of the estimates attributed by the commenter to service bureaus will be passed-through to their Outsourcing broker-dealer clients that rely on service bureaus to perform their regulatory data reporting. The Commission is thus applying the portion of the commenter's cost estimates attributed to the 13 service bureaus across the 1,629 broker-dealers that are categorized as Outsourcing broker-dealers. $108,333/1,629 Outsourcing broker-dealers = $66.50 in ongoing costs to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement per Outsourcing broker-dealer.

[3616] $124,439.50 = ($124,373 in ongoing outsourcing costs) + ($66.50 to maintain the allocation timestamp)

[3617] The Commission estimates that 806 small OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (806 small OATS-reporting broker-dealers) × (1,350 burden hours) = 1,088,100 aggregate ongoing burden hours to ensure ongoing compliance with Rule 613.

[3618] $100,298,237 = ($124,373 in ongoing outsourcing costs) + ($66.50 to maintain the allocation timestamp) × (806 broker-dealers).

[3619] *See* Section V.F.1.c.(2)B., *supra.* Rule 613 does not exclude from data reporting obligations SRO members that quote or execute transactions in NMS Securities and Listed Options that route to a single market participant; *see also* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(ii)(B)(2).

[3620] *See* Section V.F.1.c.(2)B., *supra.*

ongoing reporting costs similar in magnitude to small equity broker-dealers that currently have no OATS reporting responsibilities.[3621]

The Commission assumes these broker-dealers would have very low levels of CAT reporting, similar to those of the lowest activity firms that currently report to OATS. For these firms, the Commission assumes that under CAT they would incur the average estimated service bureau cost of broker-dealers that currently report fewer than 350,000 OATS ROEs per month, which is $124,373 annually.[3622] Furthermore, because these firms have more limited data reporting requirements than other firms, the Commission assumes these firms currently have only 0.1 full-time employees currently dedicated to regulatory data reporting activities.[3623] The Commission assumes these firms would require 2 full-time employees for one year to implement CAT.[3624]

Small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers that outsource their regulatory data reporting would likely face internal staffing burdens and costs associated with ongoing activity, such as maintaining any systems that transmit data to their service providers. Based on conversations with market participants, the Commission estimates these firms would need 0.75 full-time employees annually to perform or monitor CAT reporting.

(a) Small Non-OATS Reporting Broker-Dealers—Initial Burden and Costs

In this Order, additionally, based on the comment that provided estimates for a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset,[3625] the Commission estimates that the initial cost to a small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be $798.04.[3626] The Commission believes that this cost would be an external hardware and software cost related to adding this functionality to servers. The Commission is adding the cost of the modified allocation timestamp requirement to the external costs to be incurred by small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers.

Based on this information, the Commission now estimates that the average initial burden to develop and implement the needed systems changes to capture the required information and transmit it to the Central Repository in compliance with the Rule for small, non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be approximately 3,600 initial burden hours.[3627] The Commission believes the burden hours would be associated with work performed by internal technology, compliance and legal staff in connection with the implementation of CAT Data reporting. The Commission also now estimates that each small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealer would incur approximately $125,171.04 in initial external outsourcing costs.[3628] Therefore, the Commission now estimates that the average one-time initial burden per small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be 3,600 burden hours and external costs of $125,171.04 for an estimated aggregate initial burden of 2,962,800 hours [3629] and an estimated aggregate initial external cost of $103,015,765.92.[3630]

(b) Small Non-OATS-Reporting Broker-Dealers—Ongoing Burden and Costs

In this Order, additionally, based on the comment that provided estimates for a modified allocation timestamp requirement, with a one second timestamp granularity and a one second clock offset,[3631] the Commission estimates that the ongoing cost to a small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealer to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement would be $66.50.[3632] The Commission believes that this cost would be an external hardware and software cost related to maintenance of the modified allocation timestamp. The Commission is adding the cost of the modified allocation timestamp requirement to the external costs to be incurred by small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers

Therefore, the Commission now estimates that the average ongoing annual burden per small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealer would be approximately 1,350 hours, plus $124,439.50 [3633] in external costs, for an estimated aggregate ongoing burden of 1,111,050 hours [3634] and an estimated aggregate ongoing external cost of $102,413,708.50.[3635]

E. Summary of Collection of Information Under the CAT NMS Plan, as Amended by the Commission

As noted above,[3636] the Commission is amending the CAT NMS Plan, resulting in a new information collection requirement, ''CAT NMS Plan Reporting and Disclosure Requirements.'' The Commission is requesting public comment on the new collection of information requirement in this Order. The Commission is applying for an OMB control number for the proposed new collection of information in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 3507(j) and 5 CFR 1320.13, and OMB has not yet assigned a control number to the new collection. Responses to the new collection of information would be mandatory. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of

[3621] *Id.*

[3622] *Id.*

[3623] *Id.*

[3624] *Id.*

[3625] *See supra* note 3528.

[3626] The commenter stated that this requirement would cost the industry $44,050,000 in initial implementation costs. The commenter attributed $1,300,000 of the implementation cost estimate to 13 service bureaus. For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission is assuming that the portion of the estimates attributed by the commenter to service bureaus will be passed-through to their Outsourcing broker-dealer clients that rely on service bureaus to perform their regulatory data reporting. The Commission is thus applying the portion of the commenter's cost estimates attributed to the 13 service bureaus across the 1,629 broker-dealers that are categorized as Outsourcing broker-dealers. $1,300,000/1,629 Outsourcing broker-dealers = $798.04 in initial costs to implement the modified allocation timestamp requirement per Outsourcing broker-dealer.

[3627] 3,600 initial burden hours = (2 FTEs for implementation of CAT Data reporting systems) × (1,800 working hours per year).

[3628] $125,171.04 = ($124,373 in initial outsourcing costs) + ($798.04 to implement the allocation timestamp).

[3629] The Commission estimates that 823 small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (823 small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers) × (3,600 burden hours) = 2,962,800 aggregate initial burden hours.

[3630] $103,015,765.92 = ($124,373 in initial outsourcing costs) + ($798.04 to implement the allocation timestamp) × (823 small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers).

[3631] *See supra* note 3528.

[3632] The commenter stated that this requirement would cost the industry $5,035,833 in ongoing costs. The commenter attributed $108,333 of the ongoing cost estimate to 13 service bureaus. For purposes of this Paperwork Reduction Act analysis, the Commission is assuming that the portion of the estimates attributed by the commenter to service bureaus will be passed-through to their Outsourcing broker-dealer clients that rely on service bureaus to perform their regulatory data reporting. The Commission is thus applying the portion of the commenter's cost estimates attributed to the 13 service bureaus across the 1,629 broker-dealers that are categorized as Outsourcing broker-dealers. $108,333/1,629 Outsourcing broker-dealers = $66.50 in ongoing costs to maintain the modified allocation timestamp requirement per Outsourcing broker-dealer.

[3633] $124,439.50 = ($124,373 in ongoing outsourcing costs) + ($66.50 to maintain the allocation timestamp)

[3634] The Commission estimates that 823 small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers would be impacted by this information collection. (823 small non-OATS-reporting broker-dealers × 1,350 burden hours) = 1,111,050 aggregate ongoing burden hours to ensure ongoing compliance with Rule 613.

[3635] $102,413,708.50 = ($124,373 in ongoing outsourcing costs) + ($66.50 to maintain the allocation timestamp) × (823 small non-OATS reporting broker-dealers).

[3636] *See* Section VI.

information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

1. One-Time Reports

a. Independent Audit of Expenses Incurred Prior to the Effective Date

Section 6.6(a)(i) of the CAT NMS Plan requires the Participants to provide to the Commission, and make public, an independent audit of fees, costs and expenses incurred by the Participants on behalf of the Company, prior to the Effective Date, in connection with the creation and implementation of the CAT, at least one month prior to submitting any rule filing to establish initial fees to the Commission.

b. Review of Clock Synchronization Standards

Section 6.6(a)(ii) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires a written assessment of clock synchronization standards, including consideration of industry standards based on the type of CAT Reporter, Industry Member and type of system, within six months of effectiveness of the Plan.

c. Coordinated Surveillance Report

Section 6.6(a)(iii) of the CAT NMS Plan requires the Participants to submit a written report detailing the Participants' consideration of coordinated surveillance (*e.g.,* entering into a Rule 17d–2 agreements or regulatory services agreements), within 12 months of effectiveness of the Plan.

d. Assessment of Industry Member Bulk Access to Reported Data

Section 6.6(a)(iv) of the CAT NMS Plan requires the Participants to provide a written report discussing the feasibility, benefits, and risks of allowing an Industry Member to bulk download the Raw Data it submitted to the Central Repository, within 24 months of effectiveness of the Plan.

e. Assessment of Errors in Customer Information Fields

Section 6.6(a)(v) of the CAT NMS Plan requires the Participants to submit a written assessment of the nature and extent of errors in the Customer information submitted to the Central Repository and whether to prioritize the correction of certain data fields over others, within 36 months of effectiveness of the Plan.

f. Report on Impact of Tiered Fees on Market Liquidity

Section 6.6(a)(vi) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires the Participants to submit a written report to study the impact of tiered-fees on market liquidity, including an analysis of the impact of the tiered-fee structure on Industry Members' provision of liquidity, within 36 months of effectiveness of the Plan.

g. Assessment of Material Systems Change on Error Rate

Section 6.6(a)(vii) of the CAT NMS Plan requires a written assessment of the projected impact of any Material Systems Change on the Maximum Error Rate, prior to the implementation of any Material Systems Change.

2. Non-Report Commission-Created Information Collections

a. Financial Statements

Section 9.2 of the CAT NMS Plan now requires that the CAT LLC financials be (i) in compliance with GAAP, (ii) be audited by an independent public accounting firm, and (iii) be made publicly available.

b. Background Checks

Section 6.1(g) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires each Participant to conduct background checks of its employees and contractors that will use the CAT System.

F. Proposed Use of Information Under the CAT NMS Plan, as Amended by the Commission

1. Independent Audit of Expenses Incurred Prior to the Effective Date

Section 6.6(a)(i) of the CAT NMS Plan requires the Participants to provide to the Commission, and make public, an independent audit of fees, costs and expenses incurred by the Participants on behalf of the Company, prior to the Effective Date, in connection with the creation and implementation of the CAT, at least one month prior to submitting any rule filing to establish initial fees to the Commission. The Commission notes that any such filing will be published for notice and comment, and that such an audit would facilitate public comment and the Commission's review of these filings to ensure the fees imposed on Industry Members are reasonable, equitable and not unfairly discriminatory.

2. Review of Clock Synchronization Standards

Section 6.6(a)(ii) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires a written assessment of clock synchronization standards, including consideration of industry standards based on the type of CAT Reporter, Industry Member and type of system. The Commission believes that the Participants should consider the Plan's clock synchronization standards based on the diversity of the CAT Reporter, Industry Member, and type of system promptly and propose any appropriate amendments for Commission consideration, within six months of effectiveness of the Plan.

3. Coordinated Surveillance Report

Section 6.6(a)(iii) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires the Participants to submit a written report detailing the Participants' consideration of coordinated surveillance (*e.g.,* entering into a Rule 17d–2 agreements or regulatory services agreements), within 12 months of effectiveness of the Plan. The Commission notes that the CAT will allow regulators to conduct cross-market surveillances and to review conduct that occurs across the markets. As a result, the Commission believes that it may be efficient for the Participants to coordinate to conduct cross market surveillances.

4. Assessment of Industry Member Bulk Access to Reported Data

Section 6.6(a)(iv) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires the Participants to provide a written report discussing the feasibility, benefits and risks of allowing an Industry Member to bulk download the Raw Data it submitted to the Central Repository, within 24 months of effectiveness of the Plan. Commenters expressed a desire for bulk access to their own data for surveillance and internal compliance purposes, as well as possible error correction purposes. While the Participants did not permit such access in the Plan citing security and cost concerns, they did represent that they would consider allowing bulk access to the audit trail data reported by Industry Members once CAT is operational. The Commission believes a report discussing the feasibility of this type of access will ensure the Participants consider the issue and are responsive to Industry requests.

5. Assessment of Errors in Customer Information Fields

Section 6.6(a)(v) of the CAT NMS Plan requires the Participants to submit a written assessment of the nature and extent of errors in the Customer information submitted to the Central Repository and whether the correction of certain data fields should be prioritized. The Commission believes that requiring such an assessment of errors could help ensure that the accuracy of CAT Data is achieved in the most prompt and efficient manner.

6. Report on Impact of Tiered Fees on Market Liquidity

Section 6.6(a)(vi) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires the Participants to

submit a written report to study the impact of tiered-fees on market liquidity, including an analysis of the impact of the tiered-fee structure on Industry Members' provision of liquidity, within 36 months of effectiveness of the Plan. One commenter expressed concern that use of a tiered-fees structure could discourage the display of quotes. In response the Participants explained that one of the reasons they chose to use a tiered-fee funding model was to limit disincentives to providing liquidity. To help determine whether the Plan's funding model actually achieves the Participants' stated objective, the Commission believes it is appropriate to require them to provide this assessment. The Commission believes that a report that explains the observed impact on liquidity after reporting begins will allow the Commission and the Participants to determine whether or not the tier-fee structure discourages Industry Member from providing liquidity.

7. Assessment of Material Systems Change on Error Rate

The Commission is amending the Plan to require Participants to provide the Commission a written assessment of the projected impact of any Material Systems Change on the Maximum Error Rate, prior to the implementation of any Material Systems Change. The Commission believes that Material Systems Changes either could result in new challenges for CAT Reporters or simplify the means for reporting data. In either case, the appropriateness of the Maximum Error Rate could be impacted, and thus warrant a change. Accordingly, the Commission believes it appropriate to require the Participants to provide the Commission an assessment of the projected impact on the Maximum Error Rate, including any recommended changes thereto, prior to the implementation of any Material Systems Change.

8. Financial Statements

Section 9.2 of the CAT NMS Plan now requires that the CAT LLC financials be (i) in compliance with GAAP, (ii) be audited by an independent public accounting firm, and (iii) be made publicly available. The Commission believes that this requirement will promote greater transparency with respect to the Company's financial accounting.

9. Background Checks

Section 6.1(g) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires each Participant to conduct background checks of its employees and contractors that will use the CAT System. The Commission believes that such a requirement generally should extend to Participants with respect to all of their users that have access to CAT Data and therefore has amended the Plan to require that each Participant conduct background checks for its employees and contractors that will use the CAT System. The Commission believes that this amendment to the Plan is appropriate in order to better manage the risk of bad actors accessing to the CAT System.

G. Total Initial and Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden of Information Collection Under the CAT NMS Plan, as Amended by the Commission

1. Burden on National Securities Exchanges and National Securities Associations

a. Independent Audit of Expenses Incurred Prior to the Effective Date

Section 6.6(a)(i) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires the Participants to provide to the Commission an independent audit of fees, costs and expenses incurred by the Participants on behalf of the Company, prior to the Effective Date, in connection with the creation and implementation of the CAT, at least one month prior to submitting any rule filing to establish initial fees to the Commission.

The Commission preliminarily estimates that each Participant would incur an initial, one-time external cost of the audit of $238.09.[3637] The Commission preliminarily estimates that the aggregate initial, one-time external cost of the audit is $5,000.[3638]

b. Review of Clock Synchronization Standards

Section 6.6(a)(ii) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires a written assessment of clock synchronization standards, including consideration of industry standards based on the type of CAT Reporter, Industry Member and type of system, within six months of effectiveness of the Plan.

The Commission preliminarily estimates that it would take each Participant approximately 19 initial, one-time burden hours of internal legal and information technology staff time to prepare and submit the assessment of clock synchronization standards.[3639] The Commission believes that this burden would mostly be comprised of information technology staff time to conduct the assessment, with less time allocated to internal legal staff for review of the assessment. Additionally, the Commission now preliminarily estimates that on average, each Participant would outsource 0.5 hours of legal time to assist in the review of the assessment, for an initial, one-time external cost of approximately $200.[3640] Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimates that the initial, one-time burden of preparing and submitting the assessment would be 19 initial, one-time burden hours per Participant plus $200 of external costs for outsourced legal counsel per Participant, for an estimated aggregate initial, one-time burden of approximately 399 hours [3641] and an estimated aggregate initial, one-time external cost of $4,200.[3642]

c. Coordinated Surveillance Report

Section 6.6(a)(iii) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires the Participants to submit a written report detailing the Participants' consideration of coordinated surveillance (*e.g.,* entering into Rule 17d–2 agreements or regulatory services agreements), within 12 months of effectiveness of the Plan.

The Commission preliminarily estimates that it would take each Participant approximately 85.71 initial burden hours of internal legal, compliance, business operations, and information technology staff time to prepare and submit the report.[3643] The

[3637] The Commission estimates that the cost of the audit would be an aggregate, external cost of $5,000. $5,000/21 Participants = $238.09 per Participant. *See* Section V.F.1.b., *supra.*

[3638] *Id.*

[3639] The Commission estimates that 19 internal burden hours = (Computer Operations Department Manager at 5 hours) + (Senior Systems Analyst at 5 hours) + (Systems Analyst at 5 hours) + (Attorney at 2 hours) + (Assistant General Counsel at 2 hours).

[3640] $200 = ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (0.5 hours). The Commission based this estimate on the assumption that the assessment would require approximately one-fifth the effort of review by outside counsel as the document required by Rule 613(i) regarding the expansion of the CAT to other securities because the Commission believes the assessment is not as comprehensive as the expansion document since it is limited to clock synchronization standards. *See* Section VI.D.1.e., *supra.*

[3641] 399 initial internal burden hours = (19 initial, one-time burden hours) × (21 Participants).

[3642] $4,200 = (21 Participants) × ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (0.5 hours).

[3643] The Commission calculates the total estimated burden hours based on a similar formulation used for calculating the total estimated burden hours of Rule 613(i)'s requirement for a document addressing expansion of the CAT to other securities. *See* Section VI.D.1.e., *supra.* The Commission assumes that the preparation of the report would be approximately one-half as burdensome as the document required by Rule 613(i). Because the Commission believes that the report would be half as burdensome as the document required by Rule 613(i), the Commission believes that all of the Participants would need 1 FTE for the report. (1 FTE) × (1,800 working hours per year) = 1,800 initial, one-time burden hours per

Commission preliminarily estimates that on average, each Participant would outsource 2.5 hours of legal time to assist in the drafting and review of the report, for an initial, one-time external cost of approximately $1,000.[3644] Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimates that the initial, one-time burden of preparing and submitting the report would be 85.71 initial, one-time burden hours per Participant plus $1,000 of external costs for outsourced legal counsel per Participant, for an estimated aggregate initial, one-time burden of 1,799.91 hours [3645] and an estimated aggregate initial, one-time external cost of $21,000.[3646]

d. Assessment of Industry Member Bulk Access to Reported Data

Section 6.6(a)(iv) of the CAT NMS Plan requires the Participants to provide a written report discussing the feasibility, benefits, and risks of allowing an Industry Member to bulk download the Raw Data it submitted to the Central Repository, within 24 months of effectiveness of the Plan.

The Commission preliminarily estimates that it would take each Participant approximately 15 initial, one-time burden hours of internal legal, compliance, business operations, and information technology staff time to prepare and submit the assessment.[3647] The Commission preliminarily estimates that on average, each Participant would outsource five hours of legal time to assist in the preparation and review of the assessment, for an initial, one-time external cost of approximately $2,000.[3648] Therefore, the Commission preliminarily estimates that the initial one-time burden of submitting a written assessment would be 15 initial burden hours per SRO plus $2,000 of external costs for outsourced legal counsel per Participant, for an estimated aggregate initial burden of approximately 315 hours [3649] and an estimated aggregate initial external cost of $42,000.[3650]

e. Assessment of Errors in Customer Information Fields

Section 6.6(a)(v) of the CAT NMS Plan requires the Participants to submit a written assessment of errors in the customer information submitted to the Central Repository and whether to prioritize the correction of certain data fields over others, within 36 months of effectiveness of the Plan.

The Commission preliminarily estimates that it would take each Participant approximately 24 initial, one-time burden hours of internal legal, compliance, and information technology staff time to prepare and submit the assessment of errors.[3651] The Commission estimates that on average, each Participant would outsource 1.25 hours of legal time to assist in the review of the assessment, for an initial, one-time external cost of approximately $500.[3652] Therefore, the Commission now preliminarily estimates that the initial, one-time burden of preparing and submitting a written assessment would be 24 initial, one-time burden hours per SRO plus $500 of external costs for outsourced legal counsel per Participant, for an estimated aggregate initial, one-time burden of approximately 504 hours [3653] and an estimated aggregate initial, one-time external cost of $10,500.[3654]

f. Report on Impact of Tiered Fees on Market Liquidity

Section 6.6(a)(vi) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires the Participants to submit a written report to study the impact of tiered-fees on market liquidity, including an analysis of the impact of the tiered-fee structure on Industry Members' provision of liquidity, within 36 months of effectiveness of the Plan.

The Commission preliminarily estimates that it would take each Participant approximately 21.43 initial, one-time burden hours of internal legal and business operations staff time to prepare and submit the report studying the impact of tiered fees on market liquidity.[3655] The Commission also preliminarily estimates that on average, each Participant would outsource 0.5 hours of legal time to assist in drafting the report, for an initial, one-time external cost of approximately $200.[3656] Therefore, the Commission now preliminarily estimates that the initial, one-time burden of preparing and submitting the report studying the impact of tiered fees on market liquidity would be 21.43 initial, one-time burden hours per Participant plus $200 of external costs for outsourced legal counsel per Participant, for an estimated

year for all of the Participants. (1,800 burden hours per year)/(21 Participants) = 85.71 initial, one-time burden hours per Participant for preparation and submission of the report.

[3644] $1,000 = ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (2.5 hours). The Commission based this estimate on the assumption that the report would require approximately one-tenth the effort of drafting by outside counsel as the document required by Rule 613(i) regarding the expansion of the CAT to other securities. *See* Section VI.D.1.e., *supra.*

[3645] 1,799.91 initial, one-time burden hours = (85.71 initial, one-time burden hours) × (21 Participants).

[3646] $21,000 = (21 Participants) × ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (2.5 hours).

[3647] The Commission estimates that 15 internal burden hours = (Computer Operations Department Manager at 2 hours) + (Senior Database Administrator at 5 hours) + (Senior Systems Analyst at 2 hours) + (Systems Analyst at 2 hours) + (Attorney at 2 hours) + (Assistant General Counsel at 2 hours).

[3648] $2,000 = ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (5 hours). The Commission is basing this estimate on the assumption that the assessment would require approximately twice the effort of drafting by outside counsel as the document required by Rule 613(i) regarding the expansion of the CAT to other securities. The Commission attributes this difference to ensuring that any potential security issues regarding industry bulk access of data are sufficiently reviewed and addressed. *See* Section VI.D.1.e., *supra.*

[3649] 315 initial one-time internal burden hours = (15 initial, one-time burden hours per Participant) × (21 Participants).

[3650] $42,000 = (21 Participants) × ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (5 hours).

[3651] The Commission estimates that 24 internal burden hours = (Computer Operations Department Manager at 3 hours) + (Senior Database Administrator at 4 hours) + (Senior Systems Analyst at 2 hours) + (Systems Analyst at 2 hours) + (Compliance Attorney at 5 hours) + (Attorney at 4 hours) + (Assistant General Counsel at 4 hours).

[3652] The Commission calculated the total estimated external cost based on the revised burden hour estimate for the written assessment of the operation of the CAT. *See* Section VI.D.1.f.b, *supra.* The Commission assumes that the preparation and submission of the error assessment would cost approximately half as much as the revised written assessment. The revised written assessment estimate provides that each Participant would outsource 2.5 hours of legal time to assist in the review of the assessment, for an external cost of approximately $1,000. The Commission estimates that each Participant would outsource approximately 1.25 hours of legal time, for an initial, one-time external cost of $500 (1.25 hours × $400 per hour rate for outside legal services) to assist in drafting the error assessment.

[3653] 504 initial, one-time burden hours = (24 initial, one-time burden hours per Participant) × (21 Participants).

[3654] $10,500 = (21 Participants) × ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (1.25 hours).

[3655] The Commission calculated the total estimated burden hours based on a similar formulation used for calculating the total estimated burden hours of Rule 613(i)'s requirement for a document addressing expansion of the CAT to other securities. *See* Section VI.D.1.e., *supra.* The Commission assumes that the preparation of the assessment would be approximately one-eighth as burdensome as the document required by Rule 613(i). As noted in note 3394, to estimate the Rule 613(i) burden, the Commission is applying the internal burden estimate provided in the CAT NMS Plan for Plan development over a 6-month period, and dividing the result in half. *See* CAT NMS Plan, *supra* note 5, at Appendix C, Section B.7(b)(iii). 0.667 FTEs required for all Participants per month to develop the CAT NMS Plan = (20 FTEs/30 months). 0.667 FTEs × 6 months = 4 FTEs. 4 FTEs/2 = 2 FTEs needed for all of the Participants to create and submit the Rule 613(i) document. (2 FTEs) × (1/8) = 0.25 FTE to prepare and submit the report studying the impact of tiered fees on market liquidity. (0.25 FTE × 1,800 working hours per year) = 450 initial, one-time burden hours for all of the Participants to review and comment on the written assessment. (450 burden hours/21 Participants) = 21.43 initial, one-time burden hours per Participant to prepare and submit the report.

[3656] $200 = ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (0. 5 hours).

aggregate initial, one-time burden of approximately 450 hours [3657] and an estimated aggregate initial, one-time external cost of $4,200.[3658]

g. Assessment of Material Systems Change on Error Rate

Section 6.6(a)(vii) of the CAT NMS Plan requires a written assessment of the projected impact of any Material Systems Change on the Maximum Error Rate, prior to the implementation of any Material Systems Change.

The Commission preliminarily estimates that the CAT may have four Material Systems Changes per year. Based on this estimate, the Commission preliminarily estimates that each Participant would incur 5.95 [3659] burden hours to prepare and submit each assessment, or 23.8 annual burden hours per year,[3660] for an aggregate, ongoing estimate of 125 burden hours per report,[3661] or an aggregate ongoing estimate of 500 burden hours per year.[3662]

h. Financial Statements

Section 9.2 of the CAT NMS Plan now requires that the CAT LLC financials be (i) in compliance with GAAP, (ii) be audited by an independent public accounting firm, and (iii) be made publicly available. The Commission preliminarily estimates that each Participant would incur an annual external cost of $3,095.24 [3663] associated with this requirement, for an aggregate annual, ongoing external cost of $65,000 to the Participants.[3664]

i. Background Checks

Section 6.1(g) of the CAT NMS Plan now requires each Participant to conduct background checks of its employees and contractors that will use the CAT System.[3665] The Commission preliminarily estimates that this requirement will impact approximately 1,500 users.[3666] The Commission preliminarily estimates that each Participant would need to have background checks of approximately 71 users.[3667] For its estimates, the Commission is assuming that these would be background checks using fingerprints submitted to the Attorney General of the United States for identification and processing.[3668] The Commission preliminarily estimates that it would take approximately 15 minutes [3669] to create and submit each fingerprint card.[3670] The total reporting burden per Participant is therefore preliminarily estimated to be 17.75 initial, one-time burden hours,[3671] for an aggregate, initial burden of 374.01 hours.[3672] The Commission preliminarily estimates that the total initial external cost per Participant would be $2,603.04,[3673] for an aggregate, initial external cost of $54,987.45.[3674]

The Commission preliminarily estimates that the ongoing internal burden hours for each Participant would be approximately 4.26 annual burden hours,[3675] for an aggregate annual burden hour amount of 89.51 burden hours.[3676] The Commission also preliminarily estimates that the ongoing external cost to be incurred by each Participant would be approximately $625.07,[3677] for an aggregate annual external cost of $13,126.37.[3678]

2. Request for Comment

Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A), the Commission solicits comments on the ''CAT NMS Plan Reporting and Disclosure Requirements'' collection of information to:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection is necessary for the proper performance of our functions, including whether the information shall have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the collection of information;

(3) Determine whether there are ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

[3657] 450 initial, one-time burden hours = (21.43 initial, one-time burden hours) × (21 Participants).

[3658] $4,200 = (21 Participants) × ($400 per hour rate for outside legal services) × (0.5 hours).

[3659] This estimate is based on the quarterly material system change reports required under Rule 1003(a)(1) of Regulation SCI. The Commission estimated that each SCI entity would incur a burden of 125 hours to comply with the quarterly report on material changes to SCI systems required under Rule 1003(a)(1) (7.5 hours by an Attorney, 7.5 hours by a Compliance Manager, 5 hours by a Chief Compliance Officer, 30 hours by a Senior Business Analyst, and 75 hours by a Senior Systems Analyst). *See* Regulation Systems Compliance and Integrity, Securities Exchange Act Release No. 73639 (December 5, 2014), 79 FR 72251, at 72390, n.1656. Because the CAT is an SCI System of the Participants, the Commission is assuming for its estimates that each Participant would incur an equal portion of the 125 burden hours per report.

[3660] The Commission estimates that there would be four Material System Changes per year. 5.95 burden hours per report × 4 reports per year = 23.8 annual burden hours per year.

[3661] (5.95 burden hours per report) × 21 Participants = 125 burden hours per report.

[3662] (125 burden hours) × (4 reports per year) = 500 annual burden hours.

[3663] ($65,000 annual, external cost)/(21 Participants) = $3,095.24 per Participant. *See supra* note 2503 (explaining the source of the $65,000 estimate, stating that the Commission drew this estimate from a recent Commission adopting release and an industry report); *see also* Section V.F.1.b., *supra.*

[3664] *See supra* note 2503 (explaining the source of the $65,000 estimate); *see also* Section V.F.1.b., *supra.*

[3665] The Commission notes that Section 17(f)(2) of the Exchange Act already mandates that each national securities exchange and national securities association require each of its partners, directors, officers and employees be fingerprinted and such fingerprints to be submitted to the Attorney General of the United States for identification and appropriate processing. 15 U.S.C. 78q(f)(2).

[3666] This number is based on conversations with Participants.

[3667] 71.42 users per Participant = (1,500 users)/(21 Participants).

[3668] The Commission is basing this assumption on the requirements of Section 17(f)(2). 15 U.S.C. 78q(f)(2).

[3669] This is based on the per respondent burden in Extension of Rule 17f–2, SEC File No. 270–35, OMB Control No. 3235–0029, 79 FR 42563 (July 22, 2014).

[3670] The Commission is assuming that this would be a burden of 15 minutes for a Compliance Manager per fingerprint card.

[3671] 17.81 burden hours = (Compliance Manager at 15 minutes) × (71.42 users).

[3672] 374.01 = (17.75 initial one-time burden hours) × (21 Participants).

[3673] 71.42 × 45% hard copy fingerprinting = 32.14 users. 71 × 55% electronic fingerprinting = 39.28 users. (32.14 hard copy fingerprinting users) × ($44.50 per hard copy fingerprint) = $1,430.23 for hard copy fingerprinting users per Participant. (39.28 electronic fingerprinting users) × ($30.25 per electronic fingerprint) = $1,188.22 for electronic fingerprint users per Participant. $1,430.23 + $1,188.22 = $2,618.45 per Participant in initial external costs for fingerprinting.

[3674] $54,987.45 = ($2,618.45 per Participant) × (21 Participants).

[3675] The Commission assumes that the finance industry has a rate of 23.87% turnover per year, based on a monthly rate for both employment separations and hires of 1.8% for the finance and insurance industry in September 2016. *See http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/jolts.pdf* (news release from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, dated November 8, 2016). The Commission preliminarily estimates that the Participants will have to annually conduct background checks of 23.87% of the 1,500 users, or 358.05 users per year. (358.05 users)/(21 Participants) = 17.05 users that will need to be subject to background checks on an annual basis. Based on this estimate, the Commission estimates that each Participant would incur a burden of 4.26 ongoing annual burden hours = (Compliance Manager at 15 minutes) × (17.05 users).

[3676] 89.51 annual ongoing burden hours = (4.26 ongoing annual burden hours per Participant) × (21 Participants).

[3677] *See supra* note 3675. Based on the Commission's estimate that 17.05 users will need to be subject to background checks annually, the Commission estimates that 45% of the 17.05 users would submit hard copy fingerprints and 55% of the 17.05 users would submit electronic fingerprints to conduct their background checks. 45% of 17.05 = 7.67 users that would submit hard copy fingerprints. 55% of 17.05 = 9.38 users that would submit electronic fingerprints. (7.67 hard copy fingerprinting users) × ($44.50 per hard copy fingerprint) = $341.32 for hard copy fingerprinting users per Participant. (9.38 electronic fingerprinting users) × ($30.25 per electronic fingerprint) = $283.75 for electronic fingerprint users per Participant. $341.32 + $283.75 = $625.07 per Participant in initial external costs for fingerprinting.

[3678] ($625.07 per Participant in annual, ongoing external costs) × (21 Participants) = $13,126.37 to conduct a fingerprint-based background check of the users.

(4) Evaluate whether there are ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Persons submitting comments on the collection of information requirement should direct them to the Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Washington, DC 20503, and should also send a copy of their comments to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090, with reference to File No. S7–11–10. Requests for materials submitted to OMB by the Commission with regard to the collection of information should be in writing, with reference to File No. S7–11–10, and be submitted to the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of FOIA/PA Services, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–2736. As OMB is required to make a decision concerning the collection of information between 30 and 60 days after publication in the **Federal Register**, a comment to OMB is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

H. Collection of Information Is Mandatory

Each collection of information discussed above would be a mandatory collection of information.

I. Confidentiality

Rule 613 requires that the information to be collected and electronically provided to the Central Repository would only be available to the national securities exchanges, national securities association, and the Commission for the purpose of performing their respective regulatory and oversight responsibilities pursuant to the federal securities laws, rules and regulations. Further, the CAT NMS Plan is required to include policies and procedures to ensure the security and confidentiality of all information submitted to the Central Repository, and to ensure that all SROs and their employees, as well as all employees of the Central Repository, shall use appropriate safeguards to ensure the confidentiality of such data. The Commission will receive confidential information. To the extent that the Commission does receive confidential information pursuant to this collection of information, such information will be kept confidential, subject to the provisions of applicable law.

J. Recordkeeping Requirements

National securities exchanges and national securities associations would be required to retain records and information pursuant to Rule 17a–1 under the Exchange Act.[3679] Broker-dealers would be required to retain records and information in accordance with Rule 17a–4 under the Exchange Act.[3680] The Plan Processor would be required to retain the information reported to Rule 613(c)(7) and (e)(6) for a period of not less than five years.[3681]

VII. Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, the Commission finds that the CAT NMS Plan as amended is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors and the maintenance of fair and orderly markets, to remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a national market system, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

It is Therefore Ordered, that pursuant to Section 11A of the Act, and the rules and regulations thereunder, that the CAT NMS Plan (File No. 4–698), as modified, be and it hereby is approved and declared effective, and the Participants are authorized to act jointly to implement the CAT NMS Plan as a means of facilitating a national market system.

By the Commission.

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

EXHIBIT A

CAT NMS PLAN

LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY AGREEMENT OF CAT NMS, LLC a Delaware Limited Liability Company

(As modified by the Commission; additions are italicized; deletions are [bracketed])

Table of Contents

[3679] 17 CFR 240.17a–1.

[3680] 17 CFR 240.17a–4.

[3681] 17 CFR 242.613(c)(7) and (e)(6).

LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY AGREEMENT OF CAT NMS, LLC a Delaware Limited Liability Company

This Limited Liability Company Agreement (including its Recitals and the Exhibits, Appendices, Attachments, and Schedules identified herein, this ''*Agreement*'') of CAT NMS, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company (the ''*Company*''), dated as of the__day of_____, ____, is made and entered into by and among the Participants.

RECITALS

A. Prior to the formation of the Company, in response to SEC Rule 613 requiring national securities exchanges and national securities associations to submit a national market system plan to the Securities and Exchange Commission (''*Commission*'' or ''*SEC*'') to create, implement and maintain a consolidated audit trail, such national securities exchanges and national securities associations, pursuant to SEC Rule 608(a)(3), which authorizes them to act jointly in preparing, filing and implementing national market system plans, developed the National Market System Plan Governing the Process for Selecting a Plan Processor and Developing a Plan for the Consolidated Audit Trail (the ''*Selection Plan*''). The Selection Plan was approved by the Commission on February 21, 2014, amended on June 17, 2015 and September 24, 2015, and, by its terms, shall automatically terminate upon the Commission's approval of this Agreement.

B. The Participants have now determined that it is advantageous and desirable to conduct in a limited liability company the activities they have heretofore conducted as parties to the Selection Plan, and have formed the Company for this purpose. This Agreement, which takes the place of the Selection Plan, is a National Market System Plan as defined in SEC Rule 600(b)(43), and serves as the National Market System Plan required by SEC Rule 613. The Participants shall jointly own the Company, which shall create, implement, and maintain the CAT and the Central Repository pursuant to SEC Rule 608 and SEC Rule 613.

C. This Agreement incorporates the exemptive relief from certain provisions of SEC Rule 613 requested in the original and supplemental request letters submitted by the Participants to the Commission, as described further in Appendix C (''*Exemptive Request Letters*'').

ARTICLE I

DEFINITIONS

Section 1.1. *Definitions.* As used throughout this Agreement (including, for the avoidance of doubt, the Exhibits, Appendices, Attachments, Recitals and Schedules identified in this Agreement):

''Account Effective Date'' means: (a) with regard to those circumstances in which an Industry Member has established a trading relationship with an institution but has not established an account with that institution, (i) when the trading relationship was established prior to the implementation date of the CAT NMS Plan applicable to the relevant CAT Reporter (as set forth in Rule 613(a)(3)(v) and (vi)), either (A) the date the relationship identifier was established within the Industry Member, (B) the date when trading began (i.e., the date the first order was received) using the relevant relationship identifier, or (C) if both dates are available, the earlier date will be used to the extent that the dates differ; or (ii) when the trading relationship was established on or after the implementation date of the CAT NMS Plan applicable to the relevant CAT Reporter (as set forth in Rule 613(a)(3)(v) and (vi)), the date the Industry Member established the relationship identifier, which would be no later than the date the first order was received; (b) where an Industry Member changes back office providers or clearing firms prior to the implementation date of the CAT NMS Plan applicable to the relevant CAT Reporter (as set forth in Rule 613(a)(3)(v) and (vi)), the date an account was established at the relevant Industry Member, either directly or via transfer; (c) where an Industry Member acquires another Industry Member prior to the implementation date of the CAT NMS Plan applicable to the relevant CAT Reporter (as set forth in Rule 613(a)(3)(v) and (vi)), the date an account was established at the relevant Industry Member, either directly or via transfer; (d) where there are multiple dates associated with an account established prior to the implementation date of the CAT NMS Plan applicable to the relevant CAT Reporter (as set forth in Rule 613(a)(3)(v) and (vi)), the earliest available date; (e) with regard to Industry Member proprietary accounts established prior to the implementation date of the CAT NMS Plan applicable to the relevant CAT Reporter (as set forth in Rule 613(a)(3)(v) and (vi)), (i) the date established for the account in the Industry Member or in a system of the Industry Member or (ii) the date when proprietary trading began in the account (i.e., the date on which the first orders were submitted from the account). With regard to paragraphs (b)–(e), the Account Effective Date will be no later than the date trading occurs at the Industry Member or in the Industry Member's system.

''*Active Accounts*'' *means an account that has had activity in Eligible Securities within the last six months.*

''*Advisory Committee*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 4.13(a).

''*Affiliate*'' of a Person means any Person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with such Person.

''*Affiliated Participant*'' means any Participant controlling, controlled by, or under common control with another Participant.

''*Agreement*'' has the meaning set forth in the preamble to this Agreement.

''*Allocation Report*'' means a report made to the Central Repository by an Industry Member that identifies the Firm Designated ID for any account(s), including subaccount(s), to which executed shares are allocated and provides the security that has been allocated, the identifier of the firm reporting the allocation, the price per share of shares allocated, the side of shares allocated, the number of shares allocated to each account, and the time of the allocation; provided, for the avoidance of doubt, any such Allocation Report shall not be required to be linked to particular orders or executions.

''*Bid*'' means a proposal submitted by a Bidder in response to the RFP or subsequent request for proposal (or similar request).

''*Bidder*'' means any entity, or any combination of separate entities, submitting a Bid.

''*Bidding Participant*'' means a Participant that: (a) submits a Bid; (b) is an Affiliate of an entity that submits a Bid; or (c) is included, or is an Affiliate of an entity that is included, as a Material Subcontractor as part of a Bid.

''*Business Clock*'' means a clock used to record the date and time of any Reportable Event required to be reported under SEC Rule 613.

[''*Capital Account*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 7.1(a).]

''*CAT*'' means the consolidated audit trail contemplated by SEC Rule 613.

''*CAT Data*'' means data derived from Participant Data, Industry Member Data, SIP Data, and such other data as the Operating Committee may designate as ''CAT Data'' from time to time.

''*CAT NMS Plan*'' means the plan set forth in this Agreement, as amended from time to time.

''*CAT-Order-ID*'' has the same meaning provided in SEC Rule 613(j)(1).

''*CAT Reporter*'' means each national securities exchange, national securities association and Industry Member that is required to record and report information to the Central Repository pursuant to SEC Rule 613(c).

''*CAT-Reporter-ID*'' has the same meaning provided in SEC Rule 613(j)(2).

''*CAT System*'' means all data processing equipment, communications facilities, and other facilities, including equipment, utilized by the Company or any third parties acting on the Company's behalf in connection with operation of the CAT and any related information or relevant systems pursuant to this Agreement.

''*Central Repository*'' means the repository responsible for the receipt, consolidation, and retention of all information reported to the CAT pursuant to SEC Rule 613 and this Agreement.

''*Certificate*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 2.2.

''*Chair*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 4.2(b).

''*Chief Compliance Officer*'' means the individual then serving (even on a temporary basis) as the Chief Compliance Officer pursuant to Section 4.6, Section 6.1(b), and Section 6.2(a).

''*Chief Information Security Officer*'' means the individual then serving (even on a temporary basis) as the Chief Information Security Officer pursuant to Section 4.6, Section 6.1(b), and Section 6.2(b).

''*Code*'' means the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''*Company*'' has the meaning set forth in the preamble to this Agreement.

''*Company Interest*'' means any membership interest in the Company at any particular time, including the right to any and all benefits to which a Participant may be entitled under this Agreement and the Delaware Act, together with the obligations of such Participant to comply with this Agreement.

''*Commission*'' or ''*SEC*'' means the United States Securities and Exchange Commission.

''*Compliance Rule*'' means, with respect to a Participant, the rule(s) promulgated by such Participant as contemplated by Section 3.11.

''*Compliance Subcommittee*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 4.12(b).

''*Compliance Threshold*'' has the meaning set forth in Appendix C.

''*Conflict of Interest*'' means that the interest of a Participant (e.g., commercial, reputational, regulatory or otherwise) in the matter that is subject to a vote: (a) interferes, or would be reasonably likely to interfere, with that Participant's objective consideration of the matter; or (b) is, or would be reasonably likely to be, inconsistent with the purpose and objectives of the Company and the CAT, taking into account all relevant considerations including whether a Participant that may otherwise have a conflict of interest has established appropriate safeguards to eliminate such conflict of interest and taking into account the other guiding principles set forth in this Agreement. If a Participant has a ''Conflict of Interest'' in a particular matter, then each of its Affiliated Participants shall be deemed to have a ''Conflict of Interest'' in such matter. A ''Conflict of Interest'' with respect to a Participant includes the situations set forth in Sections 4.3(b)(iv), 4.3(d)(i) and 4.3(d)(ii).

''*Customer*'' has the same meaning provided in SEC Rule 613(j)(3).

''*Customer Account Information*'' shall include, but not be limited to, account number, account type, customer type, date account opened, and large trader identifier (if applicable); except, however, that (a) in those circumstances in which an Industry Member has established a trading relationship with an institution but has not established an account with that institution, the Industry Member will (i) provide the Account Effective Date in lieu of the ''date account opened''; (ii) provide the relationship identifier in lieu of the ''account number''; and (iii) identify the ''account type'' as a ''relationship''; (b) in those circumstances in which the relevant account was established prior to the implementation date of the CAT NMS Plan applicable to the relevant CAT Reporter (as set forth in Rule 613(a)(3)(v) and (vi)), and no ''date account opened'' is available for the account, the Industry Member will provide the Account Effective Date in the following

circumstances: (i) where an Industry Member changes back office providers or clearing firms and the date account opened is changed to the date the account was opened on the new back office/clearing firm system; (ii) where an Industry Member acquires another Industry Member and the date account opened is changed to the date the account was opened on the post-merger back office/clearing firm system; (iii) where there are multiple dates associated with an account in an Industry Member's system, and the parameters of each date are determined by the individual Industry Member; and (iv) where the relevant account is an Industry Member proprietary account.

''*Customer-ID*'' has the same meaning provided in SEC Rule 613(j)(5).

''*Customer Identifying Information*'' means information of sufficient detail to identify a Customer, including, but not limited to, (a) with respect to individuals: name, address, date of birth, individual tax payer identification number (''ITIN'')/social security number (''SSN''), individual's role in the account (e.g., primary holder, joint holder, guardian, trustee, person with the power of attorney); and (b) with respect to legal entities: name, address, Employer Identification Number (''EIN'')/Legal Entity Identifier (''LEI'') or other comparable common entity identifier, if applicable; provided, however, *that an Industry Member that has an LEI for a Customer must submit the Customer's LEI in addition to other information of sufficient detail to identify a Customer.*

''*Delaware Act*'' means the Delaware Limited Liability Company Act.

''*Disclosing Party*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 9.6(a).

''*Effective Date*'' means the date of approval of this Agreement by the Commission.

''*Eligible Security*'' includes (a) all NMS Securities and (b) all OTC Equity Securities.

''*Error Rate*'' has the meaning provided in SEC Rule 613(j)(6).

''*Exchange Act*'' means the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

''*Execution Venue*'' means a Participant or an alternative trading system (''*ATS*'') (as defined in Rule 300 of Regulation ATS) that operates pursuant to Rule 301 of Regulation ATS (excluding any such ATS that does not execute orders).

''*Exemptive Request Letters*'' has the meaning set forth in Recital C.

''*FINRA*'' means Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc.

''*Firm Designated ID*'' means a unique identifier for each trading account designated by Industry Members for purposes of providing data to the Central Repository, where each such identifier is unique among all identifiers from any given Industry Member for each business date.

''*Fiscal Year*'' means the fiscal year of the Company determined pursuant to Section 9.2(a).

''*FS–ISAC*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 6.2(b)(vi).

''*GAAP*'' means United States generally accepted accounting principles.

''*Independent Auditor*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 6.2(a)(v)(B).

''*Industry Member*'' means a member of a national securities exchange or a member of a national securities association.

''*Industry Member Data*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 6.4(d)(ii).

''*Information*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 9.6(a).

''*Initial Plan Processor*'' means the first Plan Processor selected by the Operating Committee in accordance with SEC Rule 613, Section 6.1 and the Selection Plan.

''*Last Sale Report*'' means any last sale report reported pursuant to the Plan for Reporting of Consolidated Options Last Sale Reports and Quotation Information filed with the SEC pursuant to, and meeting the requirements of, SEC Rule 608.

''*Latency*'' means the delay between input into a system and the outcome based upon that input. In computer networks, latency refers to the delay between a source system sending a packet or message, and the destination system receiving such packet or message.

''*Listed Option*'' or ''*Option*'' have the meaning set forth in Rule 600(b)(35) of Regulation NMS.

''*Majority Vote*'' means the affirmative vote of at least a majority of all of the members of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, as applicable, authorized to cast a vote with respect to a matter presented for a vote (whether or not such a member is present at any meeting at which a vote is taken) by the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, as applicable (excluding, for the avoidance of doubt, any member of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, as applicable, that is recused or subject to a vote to recuse from such matter pursuant to Section 4.3(d)).

''*Manual Order Event*'' means a non-electronic communication of order-related information for which CAT Reporters must record and report the time of the event.

''*Material Amendment*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 6.9(c).

''*Material Contract*'' means any: (a) contract between the Company and the Plan Processor; (b) contract between the Company and any Officer; (c) contract, or group of related contracts, resulting in a total cost or liability to the Company of more than $900,000; (d) contract between the Company, on the one hand, and a Participant or an Affiliate of a Participant, on the other; (e) contract containing other than reasonable arms-length terms; (f) contract imposing, or purporting to impose, non-customary restrictions (including non-competition, non-solicitation or confidentiality (other than customary confidentiality agreements entered into in the ordinary course of business that do not restrict, or purport to restrict, any Participant or any Affiliate of any Participant)) or obligations (including indemnity, most-favored nation requirements, exclusivity, or guaranteed minimum purchase commitments) on the Company or any Participant or any Affiliate of a Participant; (g) contract containing terms that would reasonably be expected to unduly interfere with or negatively impact the ability of the Company, any Participant or any Affiliate of any Participant to perform its regulatory functions (including disciplinary matters), to carry out its responsibilities under the Exchange Act or to perform its obligations under this Agreement; (h) contract providing for a term longer than twelve (12) months or the termination of which would reasonably be expected to materially and adversely affect the Company, any Participant or any Affiliate of a Participant; (i) contract for indebtedness, the disposition or acquisition of assets or equity, or the lease or license of assets or properties; or (j) joint venture or similar contract for cost or profit sharing.

''*Material Subcontractor*'' means any entity that is known to the Participant to be included as part of a Bid as a vendor, subcontractor, service provider, or in any other similar capacity and, excluding products or services offered by the Participant to one or more Bidders on terms subject to a fee filing approved by the SEC: (a) is anticipated to derive 5% or more of its annual revenue in any given year from services provided in such capacity; or (b) accounts for 5% or more of the total estimated annual cost of the Bid for any given year. An entity shall not be considered a ''Material Subcontractor'' solely due to the entity providing services associated with any of the entity's regulatory functions as a self-regulatory organization registered with the SEC.

''*Material Systems Change*'' means any change or update to the CAT System made by the Plan Processor which will cause a significant change to the functionality of the Central Repository.

''*Material Terms of the Order*'' includes: the NMS Security or OTC Equity Security symbol; security type; price (if applicable); size (displayed and non-displayed); side (buy/sell); order type; if a sell order, whether the order is long, short, short exempt; open/close indicator *(except on transactions in equities);* time in force (if applicable); if the order is for a Listed Option, option type (put/call), option symbol or root symbol, underlying symbol, strike price, expiration date, and open/close *(except on market maker quotations);* and any special handling instructions.

''*National Best Bid*'' and ''*National Best Offer*'' have the same meaning provided in SEC Rule 600(b)(42).

''*NMS Plan*'' has the same meaning as ''National Market System Plan'' provided in SEC Rule 613(a)(1) and SEC Rule 600(b)(43).

''*NMS Security*'' means any security or class of securities for which transaction reports are collected, processed, and made available pursuant to an effective transaction reporting plan, or an effective national market system plan for reporting transactions in Listed Options.

''*Non-SRO Bid*'' means a Bid that does not include a Bidding Participant.

''*Officer*'' means an officer of the Company, in his or her capacity as such, as set forth in Section 4.6.

''*Operating Committee*'' means the governing body of the Company designated as such and described in Article IV.

''*Options Exchange*'' means a registered national securities exchange or automated trading facility of a registered securities association that trades Listed Options.

''*Options Market Maker*'' means a broker-dealer registered with an exchange for the purpose of making markets in options contracts traded on the exchange.

''*Order*'' or ''*order*'' has, with respect to Eligible Securities, the meaning set forth in SEC Rule 613(j)(8).

''*OTC Equity Security*'' means any equity security, other than an NMS Security, subject to prompt last sale reporting rules of a registered national securities association and reported to one of such association's equity trade reporting facilities.

''*Other SLAs*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 6.1(h).

''*Participant*'' means each Person identified as such on *Exhibit A* hereto, and any Person that becomes a Participant as permitted by this Agreement, in such Person's capacity as a Participant in the Company (it being understood that the Participants shall comprise the ''members'' of the Company (as the term ''member'' is defined in Section 18–101(11) of the Delaware Act)).

''*Participant Data*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 6.3(d).

''*Participation Fee*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 3.3(a).

''*Payment Date*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 3.7(b).

''*Permitted Legal Basis*'' means the Participant has become exempt from, or otherwise has ceased to be subject to, SEC Rule 613 or has arranged to comply with SEC Rule 613 in some manner other than through participation in this Agreement, in each instance subject to the approval of the Commission.

''*Permitted Person*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 4.9.

''*Permitted Transferee*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 3.4(c).

''*Person*'' means any individual, partnership, limited liability company, corporation, joint venture, trust, business trust, cooperative or association and any heirs, executors, administrators, legal representatives, successors and assigns of such Person where the context so permits.

''*PII*'' means personally identifiable information, including a social security number or tax identifier number or similar information*; Customer Identifying Information and Customer Account Information.*

''*Plan Processor*'' means the Initial Plan Processor or any other Person selected by the Operating Committee pursuant to SEC Rule 613 and Sections 4.3(b)(i) and 6.1, and with regard to the Initial Plan Processor, the Selection Plan, to perform the CAT processing functions required by SEC Rule 613 and set forth in this Agreement.

''*Pledge*'' and any grammatical variation thereof means, with respect to an interest, asset, or right, any pledge, security interest, hypothecation, deed of trust, lien or other similar encumbrance granted with respect to the affected interest, asset or right to secure payment or performance of an obligation.

''*Primary Market Transaction*'' means any transaction other than a secondary market transaction and refers to any transaction where a Person purchases securities in an offering.

''*Prime Rate*'' means the prime rate published in The Wall Street Journal (or any successor publication) on the last day of each month (or, if not a publication day, the prime rate last published prior to such last day).

''*Proceeding*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 4.8(b).

''*Qualified Bid*'' means a Bid that is deemed by the Selection Committee to include sufficient information regarding the Bidder's ability to provide the necessary capabilities to create, implement, and maintain the CAT so that such Bid can be effectively evaluated by the Selection Committee. When evaluating whether a Bid is a Qualified Bid, each member of the Selection Committee shall consider whether the Bid adequately addresses the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP, and apply such weighting and priority to the factors as such member of the Selection Committee deems appropriate in his or her professional judgment. The determination of whether a Bid is a Qualified Bid shall be determined pursuant to the process set forth in Section 5.2.

''*Qualified Bidder*'' means a Bidder that has submitted a Qualified Bid.

''*Quotation Information*'' means all bids (as defined under SEC Rule 600(b)(8)), offers (as defined under SEC Rule 600(b)(8)), all bids and offers of OTC Equity Securities, displayed quotation sizes in Eligible Securities, market center identifiers (including, in the case of FINRA, the FINRA member that is registered as a market maker or electronic communications network or otherwise utilizes the facilities of FINRA pursuant to applicable FINRA rules, that entered the quotation), withdrawals and other information pertaining to quotations in Eligible Securities required to be reported to the Plan Processor pursuant to this Agreement and SEC Rule 613.

''*Raw Data*'' means Participant Data and Industry Member Data that has not been through any validation or otherwise checked by the CAT System.

''*Received Industry Member Data*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 6.4(d)(ii).

''*Receiving Party*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 9.6(a).

''*Recorded Industry Member Data*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 6.4(d)(i).

''*Registered Person*'' means any member, principal, executive, registered representative, or other person registered or required to be registered under a Participant's rules.

''*Reportable Event*'' includes, but is not limited to, the original receipt or origination, modification, cancellation, routing, execution (in whole or in part) and allocation of an order, and receipt of a routed order.

''*Representatives*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 9.6(a).

''*RFP*'' means the ''Consolidated Audit Trail National Market System Plan Request for Proposal'' published by the Participants on February 26, 2013 attached as Appendix A, as amended from time to time.

''*Securities Information Processor*'' or ''*SIP*'' has the same meaning provided in Section 3(a)(22)(A) of the Exchange Act.

''*Selection Committee*'' means the committee formed pursuant to Section 5.1.

''*Selection Plan*'' has the meaning set forth in Recital A.

''*Shortlisted Bid*'' means a Bid submitted by a Qualified Bidder and selected as a Shortlisted Bid by the Selection Committee pursuant to Section 5.2(b) and, if applicable, pursuant to Section 5.2(c)(iii).

''*Shortlisted Bidder*'' means a Qualified Bidder that has submitted a Bid selected as a Shortlisted Bid.

''*SIP Data*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 6.5(a)(ii).

''*SLA*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 6.1(h).

''*Small Industry Member*'' means an Industry Member that qualifies as a small broker-dealer as defined in SEC Rule 613.

''*SRO*'' means any self-regulatory organization within the meaning of Section 3(a)(26) of the Exchange Act.

''*SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier*'' means an identifier assigned to an Industry Member by an SRO or an identifier used by a Participant.

''*Subcommittee*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 4.12(a).

''*Supermajority Vote*'' means the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all of the members of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, as applicable, authorized to cast a vote with respect to a matter presented for a vote (whether or not such a member is present at any meeting at which a vote is taken) by the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, as applicable (excluding, for the avoidance of doubt, any member of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, as applicable, that is recused or subject to a vote to recuse from such matter pursuant to Section 4.3(d)); *provided* that if two-thirds of all of such members authorized to cast a vote is not a whole number then that number shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number.

''*Tax Matters Partner*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 9.5(a).

''*Transfer*'' and any grammatical variation thereof means any sale, exchange, issuance, redemption, assignment, distribution or other transfer, disposition or alienation in any way (whether voluntarily, involuntarily or by operation of law). Transfer shall specifically include any: (a) assignment or distribution resulting from bankruptcy, liquidation, or dissolution; or (b) Pledge.

''*Technical Specifications*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 6.9(a).

''*Trading Day*'' shall have such meaning as is determined by the Operating Committee. For the avoidance of doubt, the Operating Committee may establish different Trading Days for NMS Stocks (as defined in SEC Rule 600(b)(47), Listed Options, OTC Equity Securities, and any other securities that are included as Eligible Securities from time to time.

''*Voting Senior Officer*'' has the meaning set forth in Section 5.1(a).

Section 1.2. *Principles of Interpretation.* In this Agreement (including, for the avoidance of doubt, the Exhibits, Appendices, Attachments, Recitals and Schedules identified in this Agreement), unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) words denoting the singular include the plural and vice versa;

(b) words denoting a gender include all genders;

(c) all exhibits, appendices, attachments, recitals, and schedules to the document in which the reference thereto is contained shall, unless the context otherwise requires, constitute an integral part of such document for all purposes;

(d) a reference to a particular clause, section, article, exhibit, appendix, attachment, recital, or schedule shall be a reference to a clause, section or article of, or an exhibit, appendix, attachment, recital, or schedule to, this Agreement;

(e) a reference to any statute, regulation, amendment, ordinance or law includes all statutes, regulations, proclamations, amendments or laws varying, consolidating or replacing the same from time to time, and a reference to a statute includes all regulations, policies, protocols, codes, proclamations, interpretations and ordinances issued or otherwise applicable under that statute unless, in any such case, otherwise expressly provided in any such statute or in the document in which the reference is contained;

(f) a reference to a ''SEC Rule'' refers to the correspondingly numbered Rule promulgated under the Exchange Act;

(g) a definition of or reference to any document, instrument or agreement includes an amendment or supplement to, or restatement, replacement, modification or novation of, any such document, instrument or agreement unless otherwise specified in such definition or in the context in which such reference is used;

(h) a reference to any Person includes such Person's permitted successors and assigns in that designated capacity;

(i) a reference to ''$'', ''Dollars'' or ''US $'' refers to currency of the United States of America;

(j) unless otherwise expressly provided in this Agreement, wherever the consent of any Person is required or permitted herein, such consent may be withheld in such Person's sole and absolute discretion;

(k) words such as ''hereunder'', ''hereto'', ''hereof'' and ''herein'' and other words of similar import shall refer to the whole of the applicable document and not to any particular article, section, subsection or clause thereof; and

(l) a reference to ''including'' (and grammatical variations thereof) means ''including without limitation'' (and grammatical variations thereof).

ARTICLE II

EFFECTIVENESS OF AGREEMENT; ORGANIZATION

Section 2.1. ***Effectiveness.*** This Agreement shall become effective upon approval by the Commission and execution by all Participants identified on *Exhibit A* and shall continue until terminated. Notwithstanding any provision in this Agreement to the contrary and without the consent of any Person being required, the Company's execution, delivery and performance of this Agreement are hereby authorized, approved and ratified in all respects.

Section 2.2. ***Formation.*** The Company was formed as a limited liability company under the Delaware Act by filing a certificate of formation (the ''*Certificate*'') with the Delaware Secretary of State.

Section 2.3. ***Name.*** The name of the Company is ''CAT NMS, LLC.'' The name of the Company may be changed at any time or from time to time with the approval of the Operating Committee. All Company business shall be conducted in that name or such other names that comply with applicable law as the Operating Committee may select from time to time.

Section 2.4. ***Registered Office; Registered Agent; Principal Office; Other Offices.*** The registered office of the Company required by the Delaware Act to be maintained in the State of Delaware shall be the office of the initial registered agent named in the Certificate or such other office (which need not be a place of business of the Company) as the Operating Committee may designate from time to time in the manner provided by law. The registered agent of the Company in the State of Delaware shall be the initial registered agent named in the Certificate or such other Person or Persons as the Operating Committee may designate from time to time in the manner provided by law. The principal office of the Company shall be at such place as the Operating Committee may designate from time to time, which need not be in the State of Delaware. The Company may have such other offices as the Operating Committee may designate from time to time.

Section 2.5. ***Certain Filings.*** The Company shall cause to be filed such certificates and documents as may be necessary or appropriate to comply with the Delaware Act and any other applicable requirements for the organization, continuation and operation of a limited liability company in accordance with the laws of the State of Delaware and any other jurisdiction in which the Company shall conduct business, and shall continue to do so for so long as the Company conducts business therein. Each member of the Operating Committee is hereby designated as an ''authorized person'' within the meaning of the Delaware Act.

Section 2.6. ***Purposes and Powers.*** The Company may engage in: (a) the creation, implementation, and maintenance of the CAT pursuant to SEC Rule 608 and SEC Rule 613; and (b) any other business or activity that now or hereafter may be necessary, incidental, proper, advisable or convenient to accomplish the foregoing purpose and that is not prohibited by the Delaware Act, the Exchange Act or other applicable law *and is consistent with tax exempt status under Section 501(c)(6) of the Code.* The Company shall have and *may* exercise all of the powers and rights conferred upon limited liability companies formed pursuant to the Delaware Act.

Section 2.7. ***Term.*** The term of the Company commenced on the date the Certificate was filed with the office of the Secretary of State of Delaware, and shall be perpetual unless dissolved as provided in this Agreement.

ARTICLE III

PARTICIPATION

Section 3.1. ***Participants.*** The name and address of each Participant are set forth on *Exhibit A.* New Participants may only be admitted to the Company in accordance with Section 3.5. No Participant shall have the right or power to resign or withdraw from the Company, except: (a) upon a Transfer of record ownership of all of such Participant's Company Interest in compliance with, and subject to, the provisions of Section 3.4; or (b) as permitted by Section 3.6. No Participant may be expelled or required to resign or withdraw from the Company except upon a Transfer of record ownership of all of such Participant's Company Interest in compliance with, and subject to, the provisions of Section 3.4, or as provided by Section 3.7(a)(ii) or Section 3.7(a)(iii).

Section 3.2. ***Company Interests Generally.***

(a) All Company Interests shall have the same rights, powers, preferences and privileges, and shall be subject to the same restrictions, qualifications and limitations. Additional Company Interests may be issued only as permitted by Section 3.3.

(b) Without limiting Section 3.2(a), each Participant shall be entitled to[: (i)] one vote on any matter presented to the Participants for their consideration at any meeting of the Participants (or by written action of the Participants in lieu of a meeting)[; and (ii) participate equally in any distribution made by the Company (other than a distribution made pursuant to Section 10.2, which shall be distributed as provided therein)].

(c) Company Interests shall not be evidenced by certificates.

(d) Each Participant shall have an equal Company Interest as each other Participant.

Section 3.3. ***New Participants.***

(a) Any Person approved by the Commission as a national securities exchange or national securities association under the Exchange Act after the Effective Date may become a Participant by submitting to the Company a completed application in the form provided by the Company. As a condition to admission as a Participant, said Person shall: (i) execute a counterpart of this Agreement, at which time *Exhibit A* shall be amended to reflect the status of said Person as a Participant (including said Person's address for purposes of notices delivered pursuant to this Agreement); and (ii) pay a fee to the Company in an amount determined by a Majority Vote of the Operating Committee as fairly and reasonably compensating the Company and the Participants for costs incurred in creating, implementing, and maintaining the CAT, including such costs incurred in evaluating and selecting the Initial Plan Processor and any subsequent Plan Processor and for costs the Company incurs in providing for the prospective Participant's participation in the Company, including after consideration of the factors identified in Section 3.3(b) (the ''*Participation Fee*''). The amendment to this Agreement reflecting the admission of a new Participant shall be effective only when: (x) it is approved by the Commission in accordance with SEC Rule 608 or otherwise becomes effective pursuant to SEC Rule 608; and (y) the prospective Participant pays the Participation Fee. Neither a prospective Participant nor any Affiliate of such prospective Participant that is already a

Participant shall vote on the determination of the amount of the Participation Fee to be paid by such prospective Participant. Participation Fees paid to the Company shall be added to the general revenues of the Company[and shall be allocated as provided in Article VIII].

(b) In determining the amount of the Participation Fee to be paid by any prospective Participant, the Operating Committee shall consider the following factors:

(i) the portion of costs previously paid by the Company for the development, expansion and maintenance of the CAT which, under GAAP, would have been treated as capital expenditures and would have been amortized over the five (5) years preceding the admission of the prospective Participant;

(ii) an assessment of costs incurred and to be incurred by the Company for modifying the CAT or any part thereof to accommodate the prospective Participant, which are not otherwise required to be paid or reimbursed by the prospective Participant;

(iii) Participation Fees paid by other Participants admitted as such after the Effective Date;

(iv) elapsed time from the Effective Date to the anticipated date of admittance of the prospective Participant; and

(v) such other reasonable, equitable and not unfairly discriminatory factors, if any, as may be determined to be appropriate by the Operating Committee and approved by the Commission.

In the event the Company (following the vote of the Operating Committee contemplated by Section 3.3(a)) and a prospective Participant do not agree on the amount of the Participation Fee, such amount shall be subject to review by the Commission pursuant to *Rule 608* [§ 11A(b)(5)] of the Exchange Act.

(c) An applicant for participation in the Company may apply for limited access to the CAT System for planning and testing purposes pending its admission as a Participant by submitting to the Company a completed Application for Limited Access to the CAT System in a form provided by the Company, accompanied by payment of a deposit in the amount established by the Company, which shall be applied or refunded as described in such application. To be eligible to apply for such limited access, the applicant must have been approved by the SEC as a national securities exchange or national securities association under the Exchange Act but the applicant has not yet become a Participant, or the SEC must have published such applicant's Form 1 application or Form X–15AA–1 application to become a national securities exchange or a national securities association, respectively.

Section 3.4. ***Transfer of Company Interest.***

(a) No Participant may Transfer any Company Interest except in compliance with this Section 3.4. Any Transfer or attempted Transfer in contravention of the foregoing sentence or any other provision of this Agreement shall be null and void *ab initio* and ineffective to Transfer any Company Interest and shall not bind or be recognized by or on the books of the Company, and any transferee in such transaction shall not, to the maximum extent permitted by applicable law, be or be treated as or deemed to be a Participant (or an assignee within the meaning of § 18–702 of the Delaware Act) for any purpose.

(b) No Participant may Transfer any Company Interest except to a national securities exchange or national securities association that succeeds to the business of such Participant as a result of a merger or consolidation with such Participant or the Transfer of all or substantially all of the assets or equity of such Participant.

(c) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this Agreement, no Participant may Transfer any Company Interest to any transferee as permitted by Section 3.4(b) (a ''*Permitted Transferee*'') unless: (i) such Permitted Transferee executes a counterpart of this Agreement, at which time *Exhibit A* shall be amended to reflect the status of said Permitted Transferee as a Participant (including said Permitted Transferee's address for purposes of notices delivered pursuant to this Agreement); and (ii) the amendment to this Agreement reflecting the Transfer of a Company Interest to a Permitted Transferee is approved by the Commission in accordance with SEC Rule 608 or otherwise becomes effective pursuant to SEC Rule 608. Subject to compliance with this Section 3.4, such amendment and such Transfer shall be effective only when it is approved by the SEC in accordance with SEC Rule 608 or otherwise becomes effective pursuant to SEC Rule 608, as applicable.

(d) The Company shall not be required to recognize any Transfer of any Company Interest until the instrument conveying such Company Interest, in form and substance satisfactory to the Company, has been delivered to the Company at its principal office for recordation on the books of the Company and the transferring Participant or Permitted Transferee has paid all costs and expenses of the Company in connection with such Transfer. The Company shall be entitled to treat the record owner of any Company Interest as the absolute owner thereof in all respects, and neither the Company nor any Participant shall incur liability for distributions of cash or other property made in good faith to such owner until such time as the instrument conveying such Company Interest, in form and substance satisfactory to the Company, has been received and accepted by the Company and recorded on the books of the Company.

(e) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this Agreement, without prior approval thereof by the Operating Committee, no Transfer of any Company Interest shall be made if the Company is advised by its counsel that such Transfer: (i) may not be effected without registration under the Securities Act of 1933; (ii) would result in the violation of any applicable state securities laws; (iii) would require the Company to register as an investment company under the Investment Company Act of 1940 or modify the exemption from such registration upon which the Company has chosen to rely; *or* (iv) would require the Company to register as an investment adviser under state or federal securities laws[; or (v) if the Company is taxed as a partnership for U.S. federal income tax purposes, (A) would result in a termination of the Company under § 708 of the Code, or (B) would result in the treatment of the Company as an association taxable as a corporation or as a ''publicly-traded limited partnership'' for tax purposes].

Section 3.5. ***Admission of New Participants.*** Any Person acquiring a Company Interest pursuant to Section 3.3, or any Permitted Transferee acquiring a Participant's Company Interest pursuant to Section 3.4, shall, unless such acquiring Permitted Transferee is a Participant as of immediately prior to such acquisition, be deemed to have been admitted to the Company as a Participant, automatically and with no further action being necessary by the Operating Committee, the Participants or any other Person, by virtue of, and upon the consummation of, such acquisition of a Company Interest and compliance with Section 3.3 or Section 3.4, as applicable.

Section 3.6. ***Voluntary Resignation from Participation.*** Any Participant may voluntarily resign from the Company, and thereby withdraw from and terminate its right to any Company Interest, only if (a) a Permitted Legal Basis for such action exists and (b) such Participant provides to the Company and each other Participant no less than thirty (30) days prior to the effective date of such action written notice specifying such Permitted Legal Basis, including appropriate documentation evidencing the existence of such Permitted Legal Basis, and, to the extent applicable, evidence reasonably satisfactory to the Company and other Participants that any orders or approvals required from the Commission in connection with such action have been obtained. A validly withdrawing Participant shall have the rights and obligations provided in Section 3.7.

Section 3.7. ***Termination of Participation.***

(a) The participation in the Company of a Participant, and its right to any Company Interest, shall terminate as of the earliest of: (i) the effective date specified in a valid notice delivered pursuant to Section 3.6 (which date, for the avoidance of doubt, shall be no earlier than the date that is thirty (30) days after the delivery of such notice); (ii) such time as such Participant is no longer registered as a national securities exchange or national securities association; or (iii) the date of termination pursuant to Section 3.7(b).

(b) Each Participant shall pay all fees or other amounts required to be paid under this Agreement within thirty (30) days after receipt of an invoice or other notice indicating payment is due (unless a longer payment period is otherwise indicated) (the ''*Payment Date*''). [If a Participant fails to make such a required payment by the Payment Date, any balance in the Participant's Capital Account shall be applied to the outstanding balance. If a balance still remains with respect to any such required payment, the] *The* Participant shall pay interest on the outstanding balance from the Payment Date until such fee or amount is paid at a per annum rate equal to the lesser

of: (i) the Prime Rate plus 300 basis points; or (ii) the maximum rate permitted by applicable law. If any such remaining outstanding balance is not paid within thirty (30) days after the Payment Date, the Participants shall file an amendment to this Agreement requesting the termination of the participation in the Company of such Participant, and its right to any Company Interest, with the SEC. Such amendment shall be effective only when it is approved by the SEC in accordance with SEC Rule 608 or otherwise becomes effective pursuant to SEC Rule 608.

(c) In the event a Participant becomes subject to one or more of the events of bankruptcy enumerated in § 18–304 of the Delaware Act, that event by itself shall not cause the termination of the participation in the Company of the Participant so long as the Participant continues to be registered as a national securities exchange or national securities association. [From and after the effective date of termination of a Participant's participation in the Company, profits and losses of the Company shall cease to be allocated to the Capital Account of the Participant in accordance with Article VIII below.] A terminated Participant shall [be entitled to receive the balance in its Capital Account as of the effective date of termination adjusted for profits and losses through that date, payable within ninety (90) days of the effective date of termination, and shall] remain liable for its proportionate share of costs and expenses allocated to it [pursuant to Article VIII] for the period during which it was a Participant, for obligations under Section 3.8(c), for its indemnification obligations pursuant to Section 4.1, and for obligations under Section 9.6, but it shall have no other obligations under this Agreement following the effective date of termination. This Agreement shall be amended to reflect any termination of participation in the Company of a Participant pursuant to this Section 3.7; *provided* that such amendment shall be effective only when it is approved by the Commission in accordance with SEC Rule 608 or otherwise becomes effective pursuant to SEC Rule 608.

Section 3.8. ***Obligations and Liability of Participants.***

(a) Except as may be determined by the unanimous vote of all the Participants or as may be required by applicable law, no Participant shall be obligated to contribute capital or make loans to the Company[, and the opening balance in the Capital Account of each Participant that is established in accordance with Section 7.1(a) shall be zero]. No Participant shall have the right to withdraw or to be repaid any capital contributed by it or to receive any other payment in respect of any Company Interest, including as a result of the withdrawal or resignation of such Participant from the Company, except as specifically provided in this Agreement.

(b) Except as provided in this Agreement and except as otherwise required by applicable law, no Participant shall have any personal liability whatsoever in its capacity as a Participant, whether to the Company, to any Participant or any Affiliate of any Participant, to the creditors of the Company or to any other Person, for the debts, liabilities, commitments or any other obligations of the Company or for any losses of the Company. Without limiting the foregoing, the failure of the Company to observe any formalities or requirements relating to exercise of its powers or management of its business or affairs under this Agreement or the Delaware Act shall not be grounds for imposing personal liability on any Participant or any Affiliate of a Participant for any liability of the Company.

(c) In accordance with the Delaware Act, a member of a limited liability company may, under certain circumstances, be required to return amounts previously distributed to such member. It is the intent of the Participants that no distribution to any Participant [pursuant to Article VIII] shall be deemed a return of money or other property paid or distributed in violation of the Delaware Act. The payment of any such money or distribution of any such property to a Participant shall be deemed to be a compromise within the meaning of the Delaware Act, and the Participant receiving any such money or property shall not be required to return any such money or property to any Person. However, if any court of competent jurisdiction holds that, notwithstanding the provisions of this Agreement, any Participant is obligated to make any such payment, such obligation shall be the obligation of such Participant and not of the Operating Committee, the Company or any other Participant.

[(d) A negative balance in a Participant's Capital Account, in and of itself, shall not require such Participant to make any payment to the Company or any other Participant.]

Section 3.9. ***Loans.*** If the Company requires additional funds to carry out its purposes, to conduct its business, to meet its obligations, or to make any expenditure authorized by this Agreement, the Company may borrow funds from such one or more of the Participants, or from such third party lender(s), and on such terms and conditions, as may be approved by a Supermajority Vote of the Operating Committee.

Section 3.10. ***No Partnership.*** The Company is not intended to be a general partnership, limited partnership or joint venture for any purpose, and no Participant shall be considered to be a partner or joint venturer of any other Participant, for any purpose, and this Agreement shall not be construed to suggest otherwise.

Section 3.11. ***Compliance Undertaking.*** Each Participant shall comply with and enforce compliance, as required by SEC Rule 608(c), by its Industry Members with the provisions of SEC Rule 613 and of this Agreement, as applicable, to the Participant and its Industry Members. The Participants shall endeavor to promulgate consistent rules (after taking into account circumstances and considerations that may impact Participants differently) requiring compliance by their respective Industry Members with the provisions of SEC Rule 613 and this Agreement.

ARTICLE IV

MANAGEMENT OF THE COMPANY

Section 4.1. ***Operating Committee.*** Except for situations in which the approval of the Participants is required by this Agreement or by non-waivable provisions of applicable law, the Company shall be managed by the Operating Committee, which shall have general charge and supervision of the business of the Company and shall be constituted as provided in Section 4.2. The Operating Committee: (a) acting collectively in accordance with this Agreement, shall be the sole ''manager'' of the Company within the meaning of § 18–101(10) of the Delaware Act (and no individual member of the Operating Committee shall (i) be a ''manager'' of the Company within the meaning of Section 18–101(10) of the Delaware Act or (ii) have any right, power or authority to act for or on behalf of the Company, to do any act that would be binding on the Company, or to incur any expenditures on behalf of the Company); (b) shall have the right, power and authority to exercise all of the powers of the Company except as otherwise provided by applicable law or this Agreement; and (c) except as otherwise expressly provided herein, shall make all decisions and authorize or otherwise approve all actions taken or to be taken by the Company. Decisions or actions relating to the Company that are made or approved by the Operating Committee, or by any Subcommittee within the scope of authority granted to such Subcommittee in accordance with this Agreement (or, with respect to matters requiring a vote, approval, consent or other action of the Participants hereunder or pursuant to non-waivable provisions of applicable law, by the Participants) in accordance with this Agreement shall constitute decisions or actions by the Company and shall be binding on the Company and each Participant. Except to the extent otherwise expressly provided to the contrary in this Agreement, no Participant shall have authority to act for, or to assume any obligation or responsibility on behalf of, the Company, without the prior approval of the Operating Committee, and each Participant shall indemnify and hold harmless the Company and each other Participant for any breach of the provisions of this sentence by such breaching Participant. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, except as otherwise expressly provided in this Agreement, the Operating Committee shall make all policy decisions on behalf of the Company in furtherance of the functions and objectives of the Company under the Exchange Act, any rules thereunder, including SEC Rule 613, and under this Agreement. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary, the Operating Committee may delegate all or part of its administrative functions under this Agreement, but not its policy making (except to the extent determinations are delegated as specifically set forth in this Agreement) authority, to one or more Subcommittees, and any other Person. A Person to which administrative functions are so delegated shall perform the same as agent for the Company, in the name of the Company. Each

Person who performs administrative functions on behalf of the Company (including the Plan Processor) shall be required to: (i) agree to be bound by the confidentiality obligations in Section 9.6(a) as a ''Receiving Party''; and (ii) agree that any nonpublic business information pertaining to any Participant or any Affiliate of such Participant that becomes known to such Person shall be held in confidence and not shared with the other Participants or any other Person, except for information that may be shared in connection with joint activities permitted under this Agreement.

Section 4.2. ***Composition and Selection of Operating Committee; Chair.***

(a) The Operating Committee shall consist of one voting member representing each Participant and one alternate voting member representing each Participant who shall have a right to vote only in the absence of that Participant's voting member of the Operating Committee. Each of the voting and alternate voting members of the Operating Committee shall be appointed by the Participant that he or she represents, shall serve at the will of the Participant appointing such member and shall be subject to the confidentiality obligations of the Participant that he or she represents as set forth in Section 9.6. One individual may serve as the voting member of the Operating Committee for multiple Affiliated Participants, and such individual shall have the right to vote on behalf of each such Affiliated Participant.

(b) No later than the date the CAT System commences operations, the Operating Committee shall elect, by Majority Vote, one member thereof to act as the initial chair of the Operating Committee (the ''*Chair*''). Such initial Chair, and each successor thereto, shall serve in such capacity for a two (2)-year term or until the earliest of his death, resignation or removal in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement. The Operating Committee shall elect, from the members thereof, a successor to the then serving Chair (which successor, subject to the last sentence of this Section 4.2(b), may be the Person then serving in such capacity) no later than three (3) months prior to the expiration of the then current term of the Person then serving as Chair. The Operating Committee, by Supermajority Vote, may remove the Chair from such position. In the case of any death, removal, resignation, or other vacancy of the Chair, a successor Chair shall be promptly elected by the Operating Committee, by Majority Vote, from among the members thereof who shall serve until the end of the then current term. The Chair shall preside at all meetings of the Operating Committee, shall designate a Person to act as Secretary to record the minutes of each such meeting, and shall perform such other duties and possess such other powers as the Operating Committee may from time to time prescribe. The Chair shall not be entitled to a tie-breaking vote at any meeting of the Operating Committee. Notwithstanding anything in this Agreement to the contrary: (i) no Person shall serve as Chair for more than two successive full terms; and (ii) no Person then appointed to the Operating Committee by a Participant that then serves, or whose Affiliate then serves, as the Plan Processor shall be eligible to serve as the Chair.

Section 4.3. ***Action of Operating Committee.***

(a) Except as otherwise provided herein, each of the members of the Operating Committee, including the Chair, shall be authorized to cast one (1) vote for each Participant that he or she represents on all matters voted upon by the Operating Committee, and action of the Operating Committee shall be authorized by Majority Vote, subject to the approval of the SEC whenever such approval is required under applicable provisions of the Exchange Act and the rules of the SEC adopted thereunder. Action of the Operating Committee authorized in accordance with this Agreement shall be without prejudice to the rights of any Participant to present contrary views to any regulatory body or in any other appropriate forum. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Company shall not take any of the following actions unless the Operating Committee, by Majority Vote, authorizes such action:

(i) select the Chair pursuant to Section 4.2(b);

(ii) select the members of the Advisory Committee pursuant to Section 4.13;

(iii) interpret this Agreement (unless otherwise noted herein);

(iv) approve any recommendation by the Chief Compliance Officer pursuant to Section 6.2(a)(v)(A);

(v) determine to hold an Executive Session of the Operating Committee pursuant to Section 4.4(a);

(vi) determine the appropriate funding-related policies, procedures and practices consistent with Article XI; or

(vii) any other matter specified elsewhere in this Agreement (which includes, as stated in the definition of ''Agreement,'' the Appendices to this Agreement) as requiring a vote, approval or other action of the Operating Committee (other than those matters expressly requiring a Supermajority Vote or a different vote of the Operating Committee).

(b) Notwithstanding Section 4.3(a) or anything else to the contrary in this Agreement, the Company shall not take any of the following actions unless such action shall have been authorized by the Supermajority Vote of the Operating Committee, subject to the approval of the SEC whenever such approval is required under applicable provisions of the Exchange Act and the rules of the SEC adopted thereunder:

(i) select a Plan Processor, other than the Initial Plan Processor selected in accordance with Article V;

(ii) terminate a Plan Processor without cause in accordance with Section 6.1(q);

(iii) approve the Plan Processor's appointment or removal of the Chief Information Security Officer, the Chief Compliance Officer, or any Independent Auditor in accordance with Section 6.1(b);

(iv) enter into, modify or terminate any Material Contract (if the Material Contract is with a Participant or an Affiliate of a Participant, such Participant and Affiliated Participant shall be recused from any vote under this Section 4.3(b)(iv));

(v) make any Material Systems Change;

(vi) approve the initial Technical Specifications pursuant to Section 6.9 or any Material Amendment to the Technical Specifications proposed by the Plan Processor in accordance with Section 6.9;

(vii) amend the Technical Specifications on its own motion; or

(viii) any other matter specified elsewhere in this Agreement (which includes, as stated in the definition of ''Agreement,'' the Appendices to this Agreement) as requiring a vote, approval or other action of the Operating Committee by a Supermajority Vote.

(c) Any action required or permitted to be taken at any meeting of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee may be taken without a meeting, if all of the members of the Operating Committee or Subcommittee, as the case may be, then serving consent to the action in writing or by electronic transmission. Such written consents and hard copies of the electronic transmissions shall be filed with the minutes of proceedings of the Operating Committee or Subcommittee, as applicable.

(d) If a member of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee determines that voting on a matter under consideration by the Operating Committee or such Subcommittee raises a Conflict of Interest, such member shall recuse himself or herself from voting on such matter. If the members of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee (excluding the member thereof proposed to be recused) determine by Supermajority Vote that any member voting on a matter under consideration by the Operating Committee or such Subcommittee raises a Conflict of Interest, such member shall be recused from voting on such matter. No member of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee shall be automatically recused from voting on any matter, except as provided in Section 4.3(b)(iv) or as otherwise specified elsewhere in this Agreement, and except as provided below:

(i) if a Participant is a Bidding Participant whose Bid remains under consideration, members appointed to the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee by such Participant or any of its Affiliated Participants shall be recused from any vote concerning: (A) whether another Bidder may revise its Bid; (B) the selection of a Bidder; or (C) any contract to which such Participant or any of its Affiliates would be a party in its capacity as Plan Processor; and

(ii) if a Participant is (A) then serving as Plan Processor, (B) is an Affiliate of the Person then serving as Plan Processor, or (C) is an Affiliate of an entity that is a Material Subcontractor to the Plan Processor, then in each case members appointed to the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee by such Participant or any of its Affiliated Participants shall be recused from any vote concerning: (1) the proposed removal of such Plan Processor; or (2) any contract between the Company and such Plan Processor.

Section 4.4. ***Meetings of the Operating Committee.***

(a) Meetings of the Operating Committee may be attended by each Participant's voting Representative and its alternate voting

Representative and by a maximum of two (2) nonvoting Representatives of each Participant, by members of the Advisory Committee, by the Chief Compliance Officer, by other Representatives of the Company and the Plan Processor, by Representatives of the SEC, and by such other Persons that the Operating Committee may invite to attend; *provided* that the Operating Committee may, where appropriate, determine to meet in an Executive Session, during which only voting members of the Operating Committee *and Representatives of the SEC* shall be present; provided, that the Operating Committee may invite other Representatives of the Participants, of the Company, of the Plan Processor (including the Chief Compliance Officer and the Chief Information Security Officer), [or the SEC,] or such other Persons that the Operating Committee may invite to attend, to be present during an Executive Session. Any determination of the Operating Committee to meet in an Executive Session shall be made upon a Majority Vote and shall be reflected in the minutes of the meeting. Regular meetings of the Operating Committee shall be held not less than once each calendar quarter at such times as shall from time to time be determined by the Operating Committee, on not less than ten (10) days' notice. Special meetings of the Operating Committee may be called upon the request of two or more Participants on not less than two (2) days' notice; *provided* that each Participant, collectively with all of such Participant's Affiliated Participants, shall be deemed a single Participant for purposes of this sentence. Emergency meetings of the Operating Committee may be called upon the request of two (2) or more Participants and may occur as soon as practical after calling for such meeting; *provided* that each Participant, collectively with all of such Participant's Affiliated Participants, shall be deemed a single Participant for purposes of this sentence. In the case of an emergency meeting of the Operating Committee, in addition to those Persons otherwise entitled to attend such meeting: (i) each Participant shall have the right to designate a reasonable number of its employees or other Representatives with substantial knowledge or expertise relevant to the subject matter of such meeting to attend such meeting; and (ii) each Participant shall use commercially reasonable efforts to designate an employee or other Representative of such Participant with substantial knowledge or expertise relevant to the subject matter of such meeting to attend such meeting; *provided,* for the avoidance of doubt, that no Person attending any such meeting solely by virtue of this sentence shall have the right to vote on any matter submitted for a vote at any such meeting. The Chair, or in his or her absence, a member of the Operating Committee designated by the Chair or by members of the Operating Committee in attendance, shall preside at each meeting of the Operating Committee, and a Person in attendance designated by the Chair (or the member of the Operating Committee presiding in the Chair's absence) shall act as Secretary to record the minutes thereof. The location of the regular and special meetings of the Operating Committee shall be fixed by the Operating Committee, *provided* that in general the location of meetings shall be rotated among the locations of the principal offices of the Participants. Members of the Operating Committee may be present at a meeting by conference telephone or other electronic means that enables each of them to hear and be heard by all others present at the meeting. Whenever notice of any meeting of the Operating Committee is required to be given by law or this Agreement, a written waiver, signed by the Person entitled to notice, or a waiver by electronic transmission by the Person entitled to notice, whether before, at or after the time stated in such notice, shall be deemed equivalent to notice. Attendance at a meeting of the Operating Committee by a member thereof shall constitute a waiver of notice of such meeting, except when such member of the Operating Committee attends any such meeting for the express purpose of objecting, at the beginning of the meeting, to the transaction of any business because the meeting is not lawfully called or convened.

(b) Any Person that is not a Participant, but for which the SEC has published a Form 1 Application or Form X–15AA–1 Application to become a national securities exchange or a national securities association, respectively, shall be permitted to appoint one primary Representative and one alternate Representative to attend regularly scheduled Operating Committee meetings in the capacity of a non-voting observer but shall not be permitted to have any Representative attend a special meeting, emergency meeting or meeting held in Executive Session of the Operating Committee. If such Person's Form 1 Application or Form X–15AA–1 Application is withdrawn or returned for any reason, then such Person shall no longer be eligible to be represented in regularly scheduled Operating Committee meetings. The Operating Committee shall have the discretion, in limited instances, to deviate from this policy if it determines, by Majority Vote, that circumstances so warrant*; provided, however, that the exercise of such discretion is reasonable and does not impose any unnecessary or inappropriate burden on competition.*

Section 4.5. ***Interpretation of Other Regulations.*** Interpretive questions arising during the operation or maintenance of the Central Repository with respect to applicable laws, rules or regulations shall be presented to the Operating Committee, which shall determine whether to seek interpretive guidance from the SEC or other appropriate regulatory body and, if so, in what form.

Section 4.6. ***Officers of the Company.***

(a) Each of the Chief Compliance Officer and the Chief Information Security Officer (each of whom shall be employed solely by the Plan Processor and neither of whom shall be deemed or construed in any way to be an employee of the Company) shall be an Officer with the same respective title, as applicable, as the Chief Compliance Officer of the Company and the Chief Information Security Officer of the Company. Neither such Officer shall receive or be entitled to any compensation from the Company or any Participant by virtue of his or her service in such capacity (other than, if a Participant is then serving as the Plan Processor, compensation paid to such Officer as an employee of such Participant). Each such Officer shall report directly to the Operating Committee. The Chief Compliance Officer shall work on a regular and frequent basis with the Compliance Subcommittee and/or other Subcommittees as may be determined by the Operating Committee. Except to the extent otherwise provided herein, including Section 6.2, each such Officer shall have such fiduciary and other duties with regard to the Plan Processor as imposed by the Plan Processor on such individual by virtue of his or her employment by the Plan Processor. *Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Company shall require the Plan Processor, in a written agreement with the Company, to acknowledge that the Officers of the Company owe fiduciary duties to the Company (set forth in Section 4.7(c) of this Agreement), and that, to the extent that the duties owed to the Company by the Officers of the Company, including the Chief Compliance Officer or Chief Information Security Officer, conflict with any duties owed to the Plan Processor, the duties to the Company will control.*

(b) The Plan Processor shall inform the Operating Committee of the individual who has direct management responsibility for the Plan Processor's performance of its obligations with respect to the CAT. Subject to approval by the Operating Committee of such individual, the Operating Committee shall appoint such individual as an Officer. In addition, the Operating Committee by Supermajority Vote may appoint other Officers as it shall from time to time deem necessary, and may assign any title to any such Officer as it deems appropriate. Any Officer appointed pursuant to this Section 4.6(b) shall have only such duties and responsibilities as set forth in this Agreement or as the Operating Committee shall from time to time expressly determine, but no such Officer shall have any authority to bind the Company (which authority is vested solely in the Operating Committee) or be an employee of the Company, unless in each case the Operating Committee, by Supermajority Vote, expressly determines otherwise. No person subject to a ''statutory disqualification'' (as defined in Section 3(a)(39) of the Exchange Act) may serve as an Officer. It is the intent of the Participants that the Company have no employees.

Section 4.7. ***Interpretation of Certain Rights and Duties of Participants, Members of the Operating Committee and Officers.*** To the fullest extent permitted by the Delaware Act and other applicable law:

(a) the respective obligations of the Participants, Officers, and the members of the Operating Committee, to each other and to the Company are limited to the express obligations set forth in this Agreement;

(b) the Participants hereby expressly acknowledge and agree that each member of the Operating Committee, individually, is serving hereunder solely as, and shall act in all respects hereunder solely as, an agent of the Participant appointing such member of the Operating Committee;

(c) no Participant[, Officer,] or member of the Operating Committee, in such Person's

capacity as such, shall have any fiduciary or similar duties or obligations to the Company or any other Participant[, Officer,] or member of the Operating Committee, whether express or implied by the Delaware Act or any other law, in each case subject only to the implied contractual covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and each Participant[, Officer,] and the Company, to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, waives any claim or cause of action against any Participant[, Officer,] or member of the Operating Committee that might otherwise arise in respect of any such fiduciary duty or similar duty or obligation; *provided,* however, that the provisions of this Section 4.7(c) shall have no effect on the terms of any relationship, agreement or arrangement between any member of the Operating Committee and the Participant appointing such member of the Operating Committee or between any Participant (other than solely in its capacity as a Participant) and the Company such as a contract between such Participant and the Company pursuant to which such Participant serves as the Plan Processor[or between an Officer and the Plan Processor]. *Each Officer shall have the same fiduciary duties and obligations to the Company as a comparable officer of a Delaware corporation and in all cases shall conduct the business of the Company and execute his or her duties and obligations in good faith and in the manner that the Officer reasonably believes to be in the best interests of the Company;*

(d) subject to Section 4.7(c), each Participant and each member of the Operating Committee may, with respect to any vote, consent or approval that such Person is entitled to grant or withhold pursuant to this Agreement, grant or withhold such vote, consent or approval in its sole and absolute discretion, with or without cause; and

(e) for the avoidance of doubt, no Participant shall be entitled to appraisal or dissenter rights for any reason with respect to any Company Interest.

Section 4.8. ***Exculpation and Indemnification.***

(a) Except for the indemnification obligations of Participants under Section 4.1, no Participant or member of the Operating Committee shall be liable to the Company or to any Participant for any loss suffered by the Company or by any other Participant unless such loss is caused by: (i) the fraud, gross negligence, willful misconduct or willful violation of law on the part of such Participant or member of the Operating Committee; or (ii) in the case of a Participant, a material breach of this Agreement by such Participant. The provisions of this Section 4.8(a) shall have no effect on the terms of any relationship, agreement or arrangement between any member of the Operating Committee and the Participant appointing such member to the Operating Committee or between any Participant (other than solely in its capacity as a Participant) and the Company such as a contract between such Participant and the Company pursuant to which such Participant serves as the Plan Processor.

(b) Subject to the limitations and conditions as provided in this Section 4.8(b), the Company shall indemnify any Participant and any member of the Operating Committee (and may, upon approval of the Operating Committee, indemnify any employee or agent of the Company) who was or is made a party or is threatened to be made a party to or is involved in any threatened, pending or completed action, suit or proceeding, whether civil, criminal, administrative, arbitrative (hereinafter a ''*Proceeding*''), or any appeal in such a Proceeding or any inquiry or investigation that could lead to such a Proceeding, by reason of the fact that such Person is or was a Participant, a member of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, or an employee or agent of the Company against judgments, penalties (including excise and similar taxes and punitive damages), fines, settlements and reasonable expenses (including attorneys' fees) actually incurred by such Person in connection with such Proceeding, if and only if the Person seeking indemnification is entitled to exculpation pursuant to Section 4.8(a). Indemnification under this Section 4.8(b) shall continue as to a Person who has ceased to serve in the capacity which initially entitled such Person to indemnification hereunder. As a condition precedent to an indemnified Person's right to be indemnified pursuant to this Section 4.8(b), such indemnified Person must notify the Company in writing as soon as practicable of any Proceeding for which such indemnified Person will or could seek indemnification. With respect to any Proceeding of which the Company is so notified, the Company shall be entitled to participate therein at its own expense and/or to assume the defense thereof at its own expense, with legal counsel reasonably acceptable to the indemnified Person. If the Company does not assume the defense of any such Proceeding of which the Company receives notice under this Section 4.8(b), reasonable expenses incurred by an indemnified Person in connection with any such Proceeding shall be paid or reimbursed by the Company in advance of the final disposition of such Proceeding upon receipt by the Company of: (i) written affirmation by the indemnified Person of such Person's good faith belief that such Person has met the standard of conduct necessary for such Person to be entitled to indemnification by the Company (which, in the case of a Person other than a Participant or a member of the Operating Committee, shall be, unless otherwise determined by the Operating Committee, that (A) such Person determined, in good faith, that such conduct was in, or was not opposed to, the best interests of the Company and (B) such conduct did not constitute gross negligence or willful misconduct); and (ii) a written undertaking by such Person to repay such expenses if it shall ultimately be determined by a court of competent jurisdiction that such Person has not met such standard of conduct or is otherwise not entitled to indemnification by the Company. The Company shall not indemnify an indemnified Person to the extent such Person is reimbursed from the proceeds of insurance, and in the event the Company makes any indemnification payments to an indemnified Person and such Person is subsequently reimbursed from the proceeds of insurance, such Person shall promptly refund such indemnification payments to the Company to the extent of such insurance reimbursement. The rights granted pursuant to this Section 4.8(b) shall be deemed contract rights, and no amendment, modification or repeal of this Section 4.8(b) shall have the effect of limiting or denying any such rights with respect to actions taken or Proceedings arising prior to any amendment, modification or repeal. It is expressly acknowledged that the indemnification provided in this Section 4.8(b) could involve indemnification for negligence or under theories of strict liability. For Persons other than Participants or members of the Operating Committee, indemnification shall only be made upon the approval of the Operating Committee. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Section 4.8 or elsewhere in this Agreement, no Person shall be indemnified hereunder for any losses, liabilities or expenses arising from or out of a violation of federal or state securities laws or any other intentional or criminal wrongdoing. Any indemnification under this Section 4.8 shall be paid from, and only to the extent of, Company assets, and no Participant shall have any personal liability on account thereof in the absence of a separate written agreement to the contrary.

Section 4.9. ***Freedom of Action.*** Each Participant and such Participant's Affiliates, and their respective Representatives (individually, ''*Permitted Person*'' and collectively, the ''*Permitted Persons*'') may have other business interests and may engage in any business or trade, profession, employment, or activity whatsoever (regardless of whether any such activity competes, directly or indirectly, with the Company's business or activities), for its own account, or in partnership with, or as a Representative of, any other Person. No Permitted Person (other than, if a Participant is then serving as the Plan Processor, any Officer then employed by the Plan Processor) shall be required to devote its entire time (business or otherwise), or any particular portion of its time (business or otherwise) to the business of the Company. Neither the Company nor any Participant nor any Affiliate thereof, by virtue of this Agreement, shall have any rights in and to any such independent venture or the income or profits derived therefrom, regardless of whether or not such venture was initially presented to a Permitted Person as a direct or indirect result of such Permitted Person's relationship with the Company. No Permitted Person shall have any obligation hereunder to present any business opportunity to the Company, even if the opportunity is one that the Company might reasonably have pursued or had the ability or desire to pursue, in each case, if granted the opportunity to do so, and no Permitted Person shall be liable to the Company or any Participant (or any Affiliate thereof) for breach of any fiduciary or other duty relating to the Company (whether imposed by applicable law or otherwise), by reason of the fact that the Permitted Person pursues or acquires such business opportunity, directs such business

opportunity to another Person or fails to present such business opportunity, or information regarding such business opportunity, to the Company. Each Participant and the Company, to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, waives any claim or cause of action against any Permitted Person for breach of any fiduciary duty or other duty (contractual or otherwise) by reason of the fact that the Permitted Person pursues or acquires any opportunity for itself, directs such opportunity to another Person, or does not present such opportunity to the Company. This Section 4.9 shall have no effect on the terms of any relationship, agreement or arrangement between any Participant (other than solely in its capacity as a Participant) and the Company such as a contract between such Participant and the Company pursuant to which such Participant serves as the Plan Processor.

Section 4.10. ***Arrangements with Participants and Members of the Operating Committee.*** Subject to the terms of this Agreement, including Section 4.3(b)(iv) and Section 4.3(d), and any limitations imposed on the Company and the Participants under applicable law, rules, or regulations, the Company may engage in business with, or enter into one or more agreements, leases, contracts or other arrangements for the furnishing to or by it of goods, services, technology or space with, any Participant, any member of the Operating Committee or any Affiliate of any Participant or member of the Operating Committee, and may pay compensation in connection with such business, goods, services, technology or space.

Section 4.11. ***Participant Action Without a Meeting.*** Any action required or permitted to be taken by Participants pursuant to this Agreement (including pursuant to any provision of this Agreement that requires the consent or approval of Participants) may be taken without a meeting, by unanimous consent in writing, setting forth the action so taken, which consent shall be signed by all Participants entitled to consent.

Section 4.12. ***Subcommittees.***

(a) The Operating Committee may, by Majority Vote, designate by resolution one (1) or more subcommittees (each, a ''*Subcommittee*'') it deems necessary or desirable in furtherance of the management of the business and affairs of the Company. For any Subcommittee, any member of the Operating Committee who wants to serve thereon may so serve, and if Affiliated Participants have collectively appointed one member to the Operating Committee to represent them, then such Affiliated Participants may have only that member serve on the Subcommittee or may decide not to have only that collectively appointed member serve on the Subcommittee. Such member may designate an individual other than himself or herself who is also an employee of the Participant or Affiliated Participants that appointed such member to serve on a Subcommittee in lieu of the particular member. Any Subcommittee, to the extent provided in the resolution of the Operating Committee designating it and subject to Section 4.1 and non-waivable provisions of the Delaware Act, shall have and may exercise all the powers and authority of the Operating Committee in the management of the business and affairs of the Company as so specified in the resolution of the Operating Committee. Each Subcommittee shall keep minutes and make such reports as the Operating Committee may from time to time request. Except as the Operating Committee may otherwise determine, any Subcommittee may make rules for the conduct of its business, but unless otherwise provided by the Operating Committee or in such rules, its business shall be conducted as nearly as possible in the same manner as is provided in this Agreement for the Operating Committee.

(b) The Operating Committee shall maintain a compliance Subcommittee (the ''*Compliance Subcommittee*''). The Compliance Subcommittee's purpose shall be to aid the Chief Compliance Officer (who shall directly report to the Operating Committee in accordance with Section 6.2(a)(iii)) as necessary, including with respect to issues involving:

(i) the maintenance of the confidentiality of information submitted to the Plan Processor or Central Repository pursuant to SEC Rule 613, applicable law, or this Agreement by Participants and Industry Members;

(ii) the timeliness, accuracy, and completeness of information submitted pursuant to SEC Rule 613, applicable law, or this Agreement by Participants and Industry Members; and

(iii) the manner in and extent to which each Participant is meeting its obligations under SEC Rule 613, Section 3.11, and as set fofth elsewhere in this Agreement and ensuring the consistency of this Agreement's enforcement as to al Participants.

Section 4.13. ***Advisory Committee.***

(a) An advisory committee to the Company (the ''*Advisory Committee*'') shall be formed and shall function in accordance with SEC Rule 613(b)(7) and this Section 4.13.

(b) No member of the Advisory Committee may be employed by or affiliated with any Participant or any of its Affiliates or facilities. *A Representative of the SEC* [The SEC's Chief Technology Officer (or the individual then currently employed in a comparable position providing equivalent services)] shall serve as an observer of the Advisory Committee (but shall not be a member thereof). The Operating Committee shall select one (1) member to serve on the Advisory Committee from representatives of each category identified in Sections 4.13(b)(i) through 4.13(b)(xii) to serve on the Advisory Committee on behalf of himself or herself individually and not on behalf of the entity for which the individual is then currently employed; *provided* that the members so selected pursuant to Sections 4.13(b)(i) through 4.13(b)(xii) must include, in the aggregate, representatives of no fewer than three (3) broker-dealers that are active in the options business and representatives of no fewer than three (3) broker-dealers that are active in the equities business; and *provided further* that upon a change in employment of any such member so selected pursuant to Sections 4.13(b)(i) through 4.13(b)(xii) a Majority Vote of the Operating Committee shall be required for such member to be eligible to continue to serve on the Advisory Committee:

(i) a broker-dealer with no more than 150 Registered Persons;

(ii) a broker-dealer with at least 151 and no more than 499 Registered Persons;

(iii) a broker-dealer with 500 or more Registered Persons;

(iv) a broker-dealer with a substantial wholesale customer base;

(v) a broker-dealer that is approved by a national securities exchange (A) to effect transactions on an exchange as a specialist, market maker, or floor broker; or (B) to act as an institutional broker on an exchange;

(vi) a proprietary-trading broker-dealer;

(vii) a clearing firm;

(viii) an individual who maintains a securities account with a registered broker or dealer but who otherwise has no material business relationship with a broker or dealer or with a Participant;

(ix) a member of academia *who is a financial economist* [with expertise in the securities industry or any other industry relevant to the operation of the CAT System];

(x) [an]*three* institutional investor*s, including an individual trading on behalf of an investment company or group of investment companies registered pursuant to the Investment Company Act of 1940*[trading on behalf of a public entity or entities];

(xi) [an institutional investor trading on behalf of a private entity or entities; and

(xii)]an individual with significant and reputable regulatory expertise*; and*[.]

(xii) *a service bureau that provides reporting services to one or more CAT Reporters.*

(c) Four of the [twelve] *fourteen* initial members of the Advisory Committee, as determined by the Operating Committee, shall have an initial term of one (1) year. [Four]*Five* of the [twelve] *fourteen* initial members of the Advisory Committee, as determined by the Operating Committee, shall have an initial term of two (2) years. All other members of the Advisory Committee shall have a term of three (3) years. No member of the Advisory Committee may serve thereon for more than two consecutive terms.

(d) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Participants on the implementation, operation, and administration of the Central Repository, including possible expansion of the Central Repository to other securities and other types of transactions. Members of the Advisory Committee shall have the right to attend meetings of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, to receive information concerning the operation of the Central Repository (subject to Section 4.13(e)), and to submit their views to the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee on matters pursuant to this Agreement prior to a decision by the Operating Committee on such matters; *provided* that members of the Advisory Committee shall have no right to vote on any matter considered by the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee and that the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee may meet in Executive Session if, by Majority Vote, the Operating Committee or Subcommittee determines that

such an Executive Session is advisable. *The Advisory Committee may provide the Operating Committee with recommendations of one or more candidates for the Operating Committee to consider when selecting members of the Advisory Committee pursuant to Section 4.3(a)(ii); provided, however, that the Operating Committee, at its sole discretion, will select the members of the Advisory Committee pursuant to Section 4.3(a)(ii) from the candidates recommended to the Operating Committee by the Advisory Committee, the Operating Committee itself, Participants or other persons.* The Operating Committee may solicit and consider views on the operation of the Central Repository in addition to those of the Advisory Committee.

(e) Members of the Advisory Committee shall [have the right to] receive *the same* information concerning the operation of the Central Repository *as the Operating Committee; provided, however, that the Operating Committee may withhold information it reasonably determines requires confidential treatment.* [; *provided* that the Operating Committee retains the authority to determine the scope and content of information supplied to the Advisory Committee, which shall be limited to that information that is necessary and appropriate for the Advisory Committee to fulfill its functions.] Any information received by members of the Advisory Committee in furtherance of the performance of their functions pursuant to this Agreement shall remain confidential unless otherwise specified by the Operating Committee.

ARTICLE V

INITIAL PLAN PROCESSOR SELECTION

Section 5.1. ***Selection Committee.*** The Participants shall establish a Selection Committee in accordance with this Article V to evaluate and review Bids and select the Initial Plan Processor.

(a) *Composition.* Each Participant shall select from its staff one (1) senior officer (''*Voting Senior Officer*'') to represent the Participant as a member of the Selection Committee. In the case of Affiliated Participants, one (1) individual may be (but is not required to be) the Voting Senior Officer for more than one or all of the Affiliated Participants. Where one (1) individual serves as the Voting Senior Officer for more than one Affiliated Participant, such individual shall have the right to vote on behalf of each such Affiliated Participant.

(b) *Voting.*

(i) Unless recused pursuant to Sections 5.1(b)(ii), 5.1(b)(iii), or 5.1(b)(iv), each Participant shall have one vote on all matters considered by the Selection Committee.

(ii) No Bidding Participant shall vote on whether a Shortlisted Bidder shall be permitted to revise its Bid pursuant to Section 5.2(c)(ii) or 5.2(d)(i) below if a Bid submitted by or including the Participant or an Affiliate of the Participant is a Shortlisted Bid.

(iii) No Bidding Participant shall vote in the process narrowing the set of Shortlisted Bidders as set forth in Section 5.2(c)(iii) if a Bid submitted by or including the Participant or an Affiliate of the Participant is a Shortlisted Bid.

(iv) No Bidding Participant shall vote in any round if a Bid submitted by or including the Participant or an Affiliate of the Participant is a part of such round.

(v) All votes by the Selection Committee shall be confidential and non-public. All such votes shall be tabulated by an independent third party approved by the Operating Committee, and a Participant's individual votes shall not be disclosed to other Participants or to the public.

(c) *Quorum.*

(i) Any action requiring a vote by the Selection Committee can only be taken at a meeting in which all Participants entitled to vote are present. Meetings of the Selection Committee shall be held as needed at such times and locations as shall from time to time be determined by the Selection Committee. Meetings may be held by conference telephone or other acceptable electronic means if all Participants entitled to vote consent thereto in writing or by other means the Selection Committee deems acceptable.

(ii) For purposes of establishing a quorum, a Participant is considered present at a meeting only if the Participant's Voting Senior Officer is either in physical attendance at the meeting or is participating by conference telephone or other acceptable electronic means.

(iii) Any Participant recused from voting on a particular action pursuant to Section 5.1(b) above shall not be considered ''entitled to vote'' for purposes of establishing whether a quorum is present for a vote to be taken on that action.

(d) *Qualifications for Voting Senior Officer of Bidding Participants.* The following criteria must be met before a Voting Senior Officer is eligible to represent a Bidding Participant and serve on the Selection Committee:

(i) the Voting Senior Officer is not responsible for the Bidding Participant's market operations, and is responsible primarily for the Bidding Participant's legal and/or regulatory functions, including functions related to the formulation and implementation of the Bidding Participant's legal and/or regulatory program;

(ii) the Bidding Participant has established functional separation of its legal and/or regulatory functions from its market operations and other business or commercial objectives;

(iii) the Voting Senior Officer ultimately reports (including through the Bidding Participant's CEO or Chief Legal Officer/General Counsel) to an independent governing body that determines or oversees the Voting Senior Officer's compensation, and the Voting Senior Officer does not receive any compensation (other than what is determined or overseen by the independent governing body) that is based on achieving business or commercial objectives;

(iv) the Voting Senior Officer does not have responsibility for any non-regulatory functions of the Bidding Participant, other than the legal aspects of the organization performed by the Chief Legal Officer/General Counsel or the Office of the General Counsel;

(v) the ultimate decision making of the Voting Senior Officer position is tied to the regulatory effectiveness of the Bidding Participant, as opposed to other business or commercial objectives;

(vi) promotion or termination of the Voting Senior Officer is not based on achieving business or commercial objectives;

(vii) the Voting Senior Officer has no decision-making authority with respect to the development or formulation of the Bid submitted by or including the Participant or an Affiliate of the Participant; however, the staff assigned to developing and formulating such Bid may consult with the Voting Senior Officer, provided such staff members cannot share information concerning the Bid with the Voting Senior Officer;

(viii) the Voting Senior Officer does not report to any senior officers responsible for the development or formulation of the Bid submitted by or including the Participant or by an Affiliate of the Participant; however, joint reporting to the Bidding Participant's CEO or similar executive officer by the Voting Senior Officer and senior staff developing and formulating such Bid is permissible, but the Bidding Participant's CEO or similar executive officer cannot share information concerning such Bid with the Voting Senior Officer;

(ix) the compensation of the Voting Senior Officer is not separately tied to income earned if the Bid submitted by or including the Participant or an Affiliate of the Participant is selected; and

(x) the Voting Senior Officer, any staff advising the Voting Senior Officer, and any similar executive officer or member of an independent governing body to which the Voting Senior Officer reports may not disclose to any Person any non-public information gained during the review of Bids, presentation by Qualified Bidders, and selection process. Staff advising the Voting Senior Officer during the Bid review, presentation, and selection process may not include the staff, contractors, or subcontractors that are developing or formulating the Bid submitted by or including a Participant or an Affiliate of the Participant.

Section 5.2. ***Bid Evaluation and Initial Plan Processor Selection.***

(a) *Initial Bid Review to Determine Qualified Bids.*

(i) The Selection Committee shall review all Bids in accordance with the process developed by the Selection Committee.

(ii) After review, the Selection Committee shall vote on each Bid to determine whether such Bid is a Qualified Bid. A Bid that is deemed unqualified by at least a two-thirds (⅔rds) vote of the Selection Committee shall not be deemed a Qualified Bid and shall be eliminated individually from further consideration.

(b) *Selection of Shortlisted Bids.*

(i) Each Qualified Bidder shall be given the opportunity to present its Bid to the Selection Committee. Following the presentations by Qualified Bidders, the Selection Committee shall review and evaluate the Qualified Bids to select the Shortlisted Bids in accordance with the process in this Section 5.1(b).

(ii) If there are six (6) or fewer Qualified Bids, all such Qualified Bids shall be Shortlisted Bids.

(iii) If there are more than six (6) Qualified Bids but fewer than eleven (11) Qualified Bids, the Selection Committee shall select five (5) Qualified Bids as Shortlisted Bids, subject to the requirement in Section 5.2(d) below. Each Voting Senior Officer shall select a first, second, third, fourth, and fifth choice from among the Qualified Bids.

(A) A weighted score shall be assigned to each choice as follows:

(1) First choice receives five (5) points;

(2) Second choice receives four (4) points;

(3) Third choice receives three (3) points;

(4) Fourth choice receives two (2) points; and

(5) Fifth choice receives one (1) point.

(B) The five (5) Qualified Bids receiving the highest cumulative scores shall be Shortlisted Bids.

(C) In the event of a tie to select the five Shortlisted Bids, all such tied Qualified Bids shall be Shortlisted Bids.

(D) To the extent there are Non-SRO Bids that are Qualified Bids, the Shortlisted Bids selected pursuant to this Section 5.2(b)(iii) must, if possible, include at least two Non-SRO Bids. If, following the vote set forth in this Section 5.2(b)(iii), no Non-SRO Bid was selected as a Shortlisted Bid, the two Non-SRO Bids receiving the highest cumulative votes (or one Non-SRO Bid if a single Non-SRO Bid is a Qualified Bid) shall be added as Shortlisted Bids. If one Non-SRO Bid was selected as a Shortlisted Bid, the Non-SRO Bid receiving the next highest cumulative vote shall be added as a Shortlisted Bid.

(iv) If there are eleven (11) or more Qualified Bids, the Selection Committee shall select fifty percent (50%) of the Qualified Bids as Shortlisted Bids, subject to the requirement in Section 5.2(d) below. If there is an odd number of Qualified Bids, the number of Shortlisted Bids chosen shall be rounded up to the next whole number (e.g., if there are thirteen Qualified Bids, then seven Shortlisted Bids shall be selected). Each Voting Senior Officer shall select as many choices as Shortlisted Bids to be chosen.

(A) A weighted score shall be assigned to each choice in single point increments as follows:

(1) Last receives one (1) point;

(2) Next-to-last choice receives two (2) points;

(3) Second-from-last choice receives three (3) points;

(4) Third-from-last choice receives four (4) points;

(5) Fourth-from-last choice receives five (5) points; and

(6) Fifth-from-last choice receives six (6) points.

For each additional Shortlisted Bid that must be chosen, the points assigned shall increase in single point increments.

(B) The fifty percent (50%) of Qualified Bids (or, if there is an odd number of Qualified Bids, the next whole number above fifty percent (50%) of Qualified Bids) receiving the highest cumulative scores shall be Shortlisted Bids.

(C) In the event of a tie to select the Shortlisted Bids, all such tied Qualified Bids shall be Shortlisted Bids.

(D) To the extent there are Non-SRO Bids that are Qualified Bids, the Shortlisted Bids selected pursuant to this Section 5.2(b)(iv) must, if possible, include at least two Non-SRO Bids. If, following the vote set forth in this Section 5.2(b)(iv), no Non-SRO Bid was selected as a Shortlisted Bid, the two Non-SRO Bids receiving the highest cumulative votes (or one Non-SRO Bid if a single Non-SRO Bid is a Qualified Bid) shall be added as Shortlisted Bids. If one Non-SRO Bid was selected as a Shortlisted Bid, the Non-SRO Bid receiving the next highest cumulative vote shall be added as a Shortlisted Bid.

(c) *Formulation of the CAT NMS Plan.*

(i) The Selection Committee shall review the Shortlisted Bids to identify optimal proposed solutions for the CAT and provide descriptions of such proposed solutions for inclusion in this Agreement. This process may, but is not required to, include iterative discussions with Shortlisted Bidders to address any aspects of an optimal proposed solution that were not fully addressed in a particular Bid.

(ii) Prior to the approval of the CAT NMS Plan, all Shortlisted Bidders will be permitted to revise their Bids one or more times if the Selection Committee determines, by majority vote, that such revision(s) are necessary or appropriate.

(iii) Prior to approval of the CAT NMS Plan, and either before or after any revisions to Shortlisted Bids are accepted, the Selection Committee may determine, by at least a two-thirds vote, to narrow the number of Shortlisted Bids to three Bids, in accordance with the process in this Section 5.2(c)(iii).

(A) Each Voting Senior Officer shall select a first, second, and third choice from among the Shortlisted Bids.

(B) A weighted score shall be assigned to each choice as follows:

(1) First receives three (3) points;

(2) Second receives two (2) points; and

(3) Third receives one (1) point.

(C) The three Shortlisted Bids receiving the highest cumulative scores will be the new set of Shortlisted Bids.

(D) In the event of a tie that would result in more than three final Shortlisted Bids, the votes shall be recounted, omitting each Voting Senior Officer's third choice, in order to break the tie. If this recount produces a tie that would result in a number of final Shortlisted Bids larger than or equal to that from the initial count, the results of the initial count shall constitute the final set of Shortlisted Bids.

(E) To the extent there are Non-SRO Bids that are Shortlisted Bids, the final Shortlisted Bids selected pursuant to this Section 5.2(c)(iii) must, if possible, include at least one Non-SRO Bid. If following the vote set forth in this Section 5.2(c)(iii), no Non-SRO Bid was selected as a final Shortlisted Bid, the Non-SRO Bid receiving the highest cumulative votes shall be retained as a Shortlisted Bid.

(F) The third party tabulating votes, as specified in Section 5.1(b)(5), shall identify to the Selection Committee the new set of Shortlisted Bids, but shall keep confidential the individual scores and rankings of the Shortlisted Bids from the process in this Section 5.2(c)(iii).

(iv) The Participants shall incorporate information on optimal proposed solutions in this Agreement, including cost-benefit information as required by SEC Rule 613.

(d) *Review of Shortlisted Bids Under the CAT NMS Plan.*

(i) A Shortlisted Bidder shall be permitted to revise its Bid only upon approval by a majority of the Selection Committee, subject to the recusal provision in Section 5.1(b)(ii) above, that revisions are necessary or appropriate in light of the content of the Shortlisted Bidder's initial Bid and the provisions in this Agreement. A Shortlisted Bidder may not revise its Bid unless approved to do so by the Selection Committee pursuant to this Section 5.2(d)(i).

(ii) The Selection Committee shall review and evaluate all Shortlisted Bids, including any permitted revisions thereto submitted by Shortlisted Bidders. In performing the review and evaluation, the Selection Committee may consult with the Advisory Committee established pursuant to paragraph (b)(7) of SEC Rule 613 and Section 4.13, and such other Persons as the Selection Committee deems appropriate.

(e) *Selection of Plan Processor Under this Agreement.*

(i) There shall be two rounds of voting by the Selection Committee to select the Initial Plan Processor from among the Shortlisted Bidders. Each round shall be scored independently of prior rounds of voting, including the scoring to determine the Shortlisted Bids under Section 5.2(b).

(ii) Each Participant shall have one vote in each round, except that no Bidding Participant shall be entitled to vote in any round if the Participant's Bid, a Bid submitted by an Affiliate of the Participant, or a Bid including the Participant or an Affiliate of the Participant is considered in such round.

(iii) First Round Voting by the Selection Committee.

(A) In the first round of voting, each Voting Senior Officer, subject to the recusal provisions in Section 5.2(e)(ii), shall select a first and second choice from among the Shortlisted Bids.

(B) A weighted score shall be assigned to each choice as follows:

(1) First choice receives two (2) points; and

(2) Second choice receives one (1) point.

(C) The two Shortlisted Bids receiving the highest cumulative scores in the first round shall advance to the second round.

(D) In the event of a tie that would result in more than two Shortlisted Bids advancing to the second round, the tie shall be broken by assigning one point per vote, with the Shortlisted Bid(s) receiving the highest number of votes advancing to the second round. If, at this point, the Shortlisted Bids remain tied, a revote shall be taken with each vote receiving one point. If the revote results in a tie, the Participants shall identify areas for further discussion and, following any such discussion, voting shall continue until two Shortlisted Bids are selected to advance to the second round.

(iv) Second Round Voting by the Selection Committee.

(A) In the second round of voting, each Voting Senior Officer, subject to the recusal provisions in Section 5.2(e)(ii) above, shall vote for one Shortlisted Bid.

(B) The Shortlisted Bid receiving the most votes in the second round shall be selected, and the proposed entity included in the Shortlisted Bid to serve as the Plan Processor shall be selected as the Plan Processor.

(C) In the event of a tie, a revote shall be taken. If the revote results in a tie, the Participants shall identify areas for further discussions with the two Shortlisted Bidders. Following any such discussions, voting shall continue until one Shortlisted Bid is selected.

ARTICLE VI

FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF CAT SYSTEM

Section 6.1. *Plan Processor*.

(a) The Initial Plan Processor shall be selected in accordance with Article V and shall serve as the Plan Processor until its resignation or removal from such position in accordance with this Section 6.1. The Company, under the direction of the Operating Committee shall enter into one or more agreements with the Plan Processor obligating the Plan Processor to perform the functions and duties contemplated by this Agreement to be performed by the Plan Processor, as well as such other functions and duties the Operating Committee deems necessary or appropriate.

(b) The Plan Processor may appoint such officers of the Plan Processor as it deems necessary and appropriate to perform its functions under this Agreement and SEC Rule 613; *provided* that the Plan Processor shall, at a minimum, appoint, in accordance with Section 6.2: (i) the Chief Compliance Officer; (ii) the Chief Information Security Officer; and (iii) the Independent Auditor. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary, the Operating Committee, by Supermajority Vote, shall approve any appointment or removal of the Chief Compliance Officer, the Chief Information Security Officer, or the Independent Auditor.

(c) The Plan Processor shall develop and, with the prior approval of the Operating Committee, implement policies, procedures, and control structures related to the CAT System that are consistent with SEC Rule 613(e)(4), Appendix C, and Appendix D.

(d) The Plan Processor shall:

(i) comply with applicable provisions of 15 U.S.C. § 78u–6 (Securities Whistleblower Incentives and Protection) and the recordkeeping requirements of SEC Rule 613(e)(8);

(ii) consistent with Appendix D, Central Repository Requirements, ensure the effective management and operation of the Central Repository;

(iii) consistent with Appendix D, Data Management, ensure the accuracy of the consolidation of the CAT Data reported to the Central Repository pursuant to Section 6.3 and Section 6.4; and

(iv) consistent with Appendix D, Upgrade Process and Development of New Functionality, design and implement appropriate policies and procedures governing the determination to develop new functionality for the CAT including, among other requirements, a mechanism by which changes can be suggested by Advisory Committee members, Participants, or the SEC. Such policies and procedures also shall: (A) provide for the escalation of reviews of proposed technological changes and upgrades (including as required by Section 6.1(i) and Section 6.1(j) or as otherwise appropriate) to the Operating Committee; and (B) address the handling of surveillance, including coordinated, SEC Rule 17d–2 or Regulatory Service Agreement(s) (''*RSA*'') surveillance queries and requests for data.

(e) Any policy, procedure or standard (and any material modification or amendment thereto) applicable primarily to the performance of the Plan Processor's duties as the Plan Processor (excluding, for the avoidance of doubt, any policies, procedures or standards generally applicable to the Plan Processor's operations and employees) shall become effective only upon approval thereof by the Operating Committee.

(f) The Plan Processor shall, subject to the prior approval of the Operating Committee, establish appropriate procedures for escalation of matters to the Operating Committee.

(g) In addition to other policies, procedures and standards generally applicable to the Plan Processor's employees and contractors, the Plan Processor shall have hiring standards and shall conduct and enforce background checks (e.g., fingerprint-based) for all of its employees and contractors to ensure the protection, safeguarding and security of the facilities, systems, networks, equipment and data of the CAT System, and shall have an insider and external threat policy to detect, monitor and remedy cyber and other threats. *Each Participant will also conduct background checks of its employees and contractors that will use the CAT System.*

(h) The Plan Processor shall enter into appropriate Service Level Agreements (''SLAs'') governing the performance of the Central Repository, as generally described in Appendix D, Functionality of the CAT System, with the prior approval of the Operating Committee. The Plan Processor in conjunction with the Operating Committee shall regularly review and, as necessary, update the SLAs, in accordance with the terms of the SLAs. As further contemplated in Appendix C, System Service Level Agreements (SLAs), and in Appendix D, System SLAs, the Plan Processor may enter into appropriate service level agreements with third parties applicable to the Plan Processor's functions related to the CAT System (''*Other SLAs*''), with the prior approval of the Operating Committee. The Chief Compliance Officer and/or the Independent Auditor shall, in conjunction with the Plan Processor and, as necessary, the Operating Committee, regularly review and, as necessary, update the Other SLAs, in accordance with the terms of the applicable Other SLA.

(i) The Plan Processor shall, on an ongoing basis and consistent with any applicable policies and procedures, evaluate and implement potential system changes and upgrades to maintain and improve the normal day-to-day operating function of the CAT System.

(j) In consultation with the Operating Committee, the Plan Processor shall, on an as needed basis and consistent with any applicable operational and escalation policies and procedures, implement such material system changes and upgrades as may be required to ensure effective functioning of the CAT System (i.e., those system changes and upgrades beyond the scope contemplated by Section 6.1(i)).

(k) In consultation with the Operating Committee, the Plan Processor shall, on an as needed basis, implement system changes and upgrades to the CAT System to ensure compliance with any applicable laws, regulations or rules (including those promulgated by the SEC or any Participant).

(l) The Plan Processor shall develop and, with the prior approval of the Operating Committee, implement a securities trading policy, as well as necessary procedures, control structures and tools to enforce this policy. The securities trading policy shall include:

(i) the category(ies) of employees, and as appropriate, contractors, of the Plan Processor to whom the policy will apply;

(ii) the scope of securities that are allowed or not allowed for trading;

(iii) the creation and maintenance of restricted trading lists;

(iv) a mechanism for declaring new or open account activity;

(v) a comprehensive list of any exclusions to the policy (e.g., blind trust, non-discretionary accounts);

(vi) requirements for duplicative records to be received by the Plan Processor for periodic review; and

(vii) a mechanism to review employee trading accounts.

(m) The Plan Processor shall develop and, with the prior approval of the Operating Committee, implement a training program that addresses the security and confidentiality of all information accessible from the CAT, as well as the operational risks associated with accessing the Central Repository. The training program will be made available to all individuals who have access to the Central Repository on behalf of the Participants or the SEC, prior to such individuals being granted access to the Central Repository.

(n) The Operating Committee will review the Plan Processor's performance under this Agreement at least once each year, or more often than once each year upon the request of two Participants that are not Affiliated Participants. The Operating Committee shall notify the SEC of any determination made by the Operating Committee concerning the continuing engagement of the Plan Processor as a result of the Operating Committee's review of the Plan Processor and shall provide the SEC with a copy of any reports that may be prepared in connection therewith.

(o) The Plan Processor shall provide the Operating Committee regular reports on the CAT System's operation and maintenance. The reports shall address:

(i) operational performance management information regarding the capacity and performance of the CAT System as specified by the Operating Committee. Such reports shall at a minimum address:

(A) the capacity and performance of the Central Repository, including at a minimum

the requirements set forth in Appendix D, Central Repository Requirements;

(B) the basic functionality of the CAT System, including the functions set forth in Appendix D, Functionality of the CAT System.

(ii) data security issues for the Plan Processor and the Central Repository taking into account the data security requirements set forth in Appendix D, Data Security;

(iii) Participant usage statistics for the Plan Processor and the Central Repository, including capacity planning studies and daily reports called for by Appendix D, Capacity Requirements, as well as business continuity planning and disaster recovery issues for the Plan Processor and the Central Repository, taking into account the business continuity planning and disaster recovery requirements set forth in Appendix D, BCP/DR Process;

(iv) system improvement issues with the Plan Processor and the Central Repository as contemplated by Appendix D, Upgrade Process and Development of New Functionality;

(v) Error Rates relating to the Central Repository,[3682] including, in each case to the extent the Operating Committee determines necessary or advisable, Error Rates by day and by delta over time, and Compliance Thresholds by CAT Reporter, by Reportable Event, by age before resolution, by symbol, by symbol type (e.g., ETF and Index) and by event time (by hour and cumulative on the hour) as set forth in Appendix C, Error Communication, Correction, and Processing;

(vi) financial statements of the Plan Processor prepared in accordance with GAAP (A) audited by an independent public accounting firm or (B) certified by the Plan Processor's Chief Financial Officer (which financial statements contemplated by this Section 6.1(o)(vi) shall be provided no later than [90] *180* days after the Plan Processor's fiscal year end);

(vii) continued solvency of the Plan Processor;

(viii) budgetary status of any items subject to Section 6.2(a)(ii);

(ix) internal audit analysis and the status of any internal audit related deliverables; and

(x) additional items as requested by the Operating Committee, any Officer of the Company, or the Independent Auditor.

(p) Upon the request of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee, the Plan Processor shall attend any meeting of the Operating Committee or such Subcommittee.

(q) The Operating Committee, by Supermajority Vote, may remove the Plan Processor from such position at any time.

(r) The Operating Committee may, by Majority Vote, remove the Plan Processor from such position at any time if it determines that the Plan Processor has failed to perform its functions in a reasonably acceptable manner in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement or that the Plan Processor's expenses have become excessive and are not justified. In making such determination, the Operating Committee shall consider, among other factors: (i) the reasonableness of the Plan Processor's response to requests from Participants or the Company for technological changes or enhancements; (ii) results of any assessments performed pursuant to Section 6.6; (iii) the timeliness of conducting preventative and corrective information technology system maintenance for reliable and secure operations; (iv) compliance with requirements of Appendix D; and (v) such other factors related to experience, technological capability, quality and reliability of service, costs, back-up facilities, failure to meet service level agreement(s) and regulatory considerations as the Operating Committee may determine to be appropriate.

(s) The Plan Processor may resign from such position; *provided* that no such resignation shall be effective earlier than two (2) years (or such other shorter period as may be determined by the Operating Committee by Supermajority Vote) after the Plan Processor provides written notice of such resignation to the Company.

(t) The Operating Committee, by Supermajority Vote, shall fill any vacancy in the Plan Processor position, and shall establish a Plan Processor Selection Subcommittee in accordance with Section 4.12 to evaluate and review Bids and make a recommendation to the Operating Committee with respect to the selection of the successor Plan Processor. Any successor Plan Processor appointed pursuant to this Section 6.1(t) shall be subject to all the terms and conditions of this Agreement applicable to the Plan Processor commencing from such appointment effective date.

(u) The Plan Processor shall afford to Participants and the Commission such access to the Representatives of the Plan Processor as any Participant or the Commission may [reasonably] request solely for the purpose of performing such Person's regulatory and oversight responsibilities pursuant to the federal securities laws, rules, and regulations or any contractual obligations, and shall direct such Representatives to [reasonably] cooperate with any inquiry, investigation, or proceeding conducted by or on behalf of any Participant or the Commission related to such purpose.

Section 6.2. ***Chief Compliance Officer and Chief Information Security Officer.***

(a) *Chief Compliance Officer.*

(i) The Plan Processor shall designate an employee of the Plan Processor to serve, subject to the approval of the Operating Committee by Supermajority Vote, as the Chief Compliance Officer. The Plan Processor shall also designate at least one other employee (in addition to the person then serving as Chief Compliance Officer), which employee the Operating Committee has previously approved, to serve temporarily as the Chief Compliance Officer if the employee then serving as the Chief Compliance Officer becomes unavailable or unable to serve in such capacity (including by reason of injury or illness). Any person designated to serve as the Chief Compliance Officer (including to serve temporarily) shall be appropriately qualified to serve in such capacity based on the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Chief Compliance Officer under this Agreement and shall dedicate such person's entire working time to such service (or temporary service) (except for any time required to attend to any incidental administrative matters related to such person's employment with the Plan Processor that do not detract in any material respect from such person's service as the Chief Compliance Officer). The Plan Processor may, at its discretion: (A) designate another employee previously approved by the Operating Committee by Supermajority Vote to serve in such capacity to temporarily serve as the Chief Compliance Officer if the employee then serving as the Chief Compliance Officer becomes unavailable or unable to serve as the Chief Compliance Officer (including by reason of injury or illness) for a period not in excess of thirty (30) days; or (B) designate another employee of the Plan Processor to replace, subject to approval of the Operating Committee by a Supermajority Vote, the Chief Compliance Officer. The Plan Processor shall promptly designate another employee of the Plan Processor to replace, subject to the approval of the Operating Committee by Supermajority Vote, the Chief Compliance Officer if the Chief Compliance Officer's employment with the Plan Processor terminates or the Chief Compliance Officer is otherwise unavailable or unable to serve as the Chief Compliance Officer (including by reason of injury or illness) for a period in excess of thirty (30) days. The Operating Committee shall report any action taken pursuant to Section 6.2(a)(i) to the SEC.

(ii) The Plan Processor, subject to the oversight of the Operating Committee, shall ensure that the Chief Compliance Officer has appropriate resources to fulfill the obligations of the Chief Compliance Officer set forth in SEC Rule 613 and in this Agreement.

(iii) In respect of all duties and responsibilities of the Chief Compliance Officer in such capacity (including those set forth in this Agreement), the Chief Compliance Officer shall be directly responsible and shall directly report to the Operating Committee, notwithstanding that he or she is employed by the Plan Processor.

(iv) The compensation (including base salary and bonus) of the Chief Compliance Officer shall be payable by the Plan Processor, but subject to review and approval by the Operating Committee, and the Operating Committee shall render the Chief Compliance Officer's annual performance review.

(v) The Chief Compliance Officer shall:

(A) regularly review the operation of the Central Repository to ensure its continued effectiveness based on market and technological developments and consistent with Appendix D, Upgrade Process and Development of New Functionality, and make any appropriate recommendations for enhancements to the nature of the information collected and the manner in which it is processed;

(B) identify and assist the Company in retaining an appropriately qualified independent auditor of national recognition (subject to the approval of the Operating

[3682] This Error Rate includes errors by CAT Reporters and linkage validation errors. In addition, errors attributable to the Plan Processor will be memorialized and reported to the Operating Committee.

Committee by Supermajority Vote, the ''*Independent Auditor*'') and, in collaboration with such Independent Auditor, create and implement an annual audit plan (subject to the approval of the Operating Committee) which shall at a minimum include a review of all Plan Processor policies, procedures and control structures;

(C) in collaboration with the Chief Information Security Officer, and consistent with Appendix D, Data Security, and any other applicable requirements related to data security, Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information, identify and assist the Company in retaining an appropriately qualified independent auditor (based on specialized technical expertise, which may be the Independent Auditor or subject to the approval of the Operating Company by Supermajority Vote, another appropriately qualified independent auditor), and in collaboration with such independent auditor, create and implement an annual audit plan (subject to the approval of the Operating Committee), which shall at a minimum include a review of all Plan Processor policies, procedures and control structures, and real time tools that monitor and address data security issues for the Plan Processor and the Central Repository;

(D) have the ability to hire or retain adequate resources as needed (e.g., advisors and counsel) to fulfill its obligations;

(E) perform reviews with respect to the matters referenced in Section 4.12(b) and report periodically, and on an as needed basis, to the Operating Committee concerning the findings of any such reviews;

(F) report to the Operating Committee and conduct any relevant review of the Plan Processor or the Central Repository requested by the Operating Committee, including directing internal or external auditors, as appropriate, to support any such review;

(G) perform and provide the regular written assessment to the SEC required by Section 6.6 and SEC Rule 613;

(H) regularly review the information security program developed and maintained by the Plan Processor pursuant to Section 6.12 and determine the frequency of such reviews;

(I) report in a timely manner to the Operating Committee any instances of non-compliance by the Plan Processor with any of the Central Repository's policies or procedures with respect to information security;

(J) conduct regular monitoring of the CAT System for compliance by each Participant and each Industry Member with SEC Rule 613, this Agreement and Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements, and provide the results: (1) with regard to Industry Members, to each Participant with oversight of such Industry Member or to such Participant's agent pursuant to a regulatory services agreement, or to the Participant responsible for enforcing compliance by such Industry Member pursuant to an agreement entered into by the applicable Participant pursuant to SEC Rule 17d–2; and (2) with regard to each Participant, to the chief regulatory officer or equivalent of such Participant;

(K) develop a mechanism to conduct regular monitoring of the CAT System for compliance by each Participant with SEC Rule 613, this Agreement, and Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements;

(L) develop and implement a notification and escalation process to resolve and remediate any alleged noncompliance by a Participant or Industry Member with the rules of the CAT, which process will include appropriate notification and order of escalation to a Participant, the Operating Committee, or the Commission;

(M) develop and conduct an annual assessment of Business Clock synchronization as specified in Section 6.8(c);

(N) have access to Plan Processor staff and documentation as appropriate to fulfill its obligations;

(O) have access to the Operating Committee, including attending all regular, special and emergency meetings of the Operating Committee as a non-voting observer; provided, however, that the Chief Compliance Officer shall not have the right to attend any Executive Session that the Operating Committee may hold;

(P) work on a more regular and frequent basis with the Compliance Subcommittee or other Subcommittee as may be determined by the Operating Committee; and

(Q) oversee the Plan Processor's compliance with applicable laws, rules and regulations related to the CAT System, in its capacity as Plan Processor.

(b) Chief Information Security Officer.

(i) The Plan Processor shall designate an employee of the Plan Processor to serve, subject to the approval of the Operating Committee by Supermajority Vote, as the Chief Information Security Officer. The Plan Processor shall also designate at least one other employee (in addition to the person then serving as Chief Information Security Officer), which employee the Operating Committee has previously approved, to serve temporarily as the Chief Information Security Officer if the employee then serving as the Chief Information Security Officer becomes unavailable or unable to serve in such capacity (including by reason of injury or illness). Any person designated to serve as the Chief Information Security Officer (including to serve temporarily) shall be appropriately qualified to serve in such capacity based on the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Chief Information Security Officer under this Agreement and shall dedicate such person's entire working time to such service (or temporary service) (except for any time required to attend to any incidental administrative matters related to such person's employment with the Plan Processor that do not detract in any material respect from such person's service as the Chief Information Security Officer). The Plan Processor may, at its discretion: (A) designate another employee previously approved by the Operating Committee by Supermajority Vote to serve in such capacity to temporarily serve as the Chief Information Security Officer if the employee then serving as Chief Information Security Officer becomes unavailable or unable to serve as Chief Information Security Officer (including by reason of injury or illness) for a period not in excess of thirty (30) days; or (B) designate another employee of the Plan Processor to replace, subject to approval of the Operating Committee by a Supermajority Vote, the Chief Information Security Officer. The Plan Processor shall promptly designate another employee of the Plan Processor to replace, subject to the approval of the Operating Committee by Supermajority Vote, the Chief Information Security Officer if the Chief Information Security Officer's employment with the Plan Processor terminates or the Chief Information Security Officer is otherwise unavailable or unable to serve as Chief Information Security Officer (including by reason of injury or illness) for a period in excess of thirty (30) days. The Operating Committee shall report any action taken pursuant to Section 6.2(b)(i) to the SEC.

(ii) The Plan Processor, subject to the oversight of the Operating Committee, shall ensure that the Chief Information Security Officer has appropriate resources to fulfill the obligations of the Chief Information Security Officer set forth in SEC Rule 613 and in this Agreement, including providing appropriate responses to questions posed by the Participants and the SEC.

(iii) In respect of all duties and responsibilities of the Chief Information Security Officer in such capacity (including those set forth in this Agreement), the Chief Information Security Officer shall be directly responsible and directly report to the Operating Committee, notwithstanding that he or she is employed by the Plan Processor.

(iv) The compensation (including base salary and bonus) of the Chief Information Security Officer shall be payable by the Plan Processor, but subject to review and approval by the Operating Committee, and the Operating Committee shall render the Chief Information Security Officer's annual performance review.

(v) Consistent with Appendices C and D, the Chief Information Security Officer shall be responsible for creating and enforcing appropriate policies, procedures, and control structures to monitor and address data security issues for the Plan Processor and the Central Repository including:

(A) data security, including the standards set forth in Appendix D, Data Security;

(B) connectivity and data transfer, including the standards set forth in Appendix D, Connectivity and Data Transfer;

(C) data encryption, including the standards set forth in Appendix D, Data Encryption;

(D) data storage and environment, including the standards set forth in Appendix D, Data Storage and Environment;

(E) data access and breach management, including the standards set forth in Appendix D, Data Access, and Appendix D, Breach Management;

(F) PII data requirements, including the standards set forth in Appendix D, PII Data Requirements;

(G) industry standards, including the standards set forth in Appendix D, Industry Standards; and

(H) penetration test reviews, which shall occur at least every year or earlier, or at the request of the Operating Committee, set forth in Appendix D, Data Storage and Environment.

(vi) At regular intervals, to the extent that such information is available to the Company, the Chief Information Security Officer shall report to the Operating Committee the activities of the Financial Services Information Sharing and Analysis Center (''*FS–ISAC*'') or other comparable body.

(*vii) The Chief Information Security Officer shall review the information security policies and procedures of the Participants that are related to the CAT to ensure that such policies and procedures are comparable to the information security policies and procedures applicable to the Central Repository. If the Chief Information Security Officer, in consultation with the Chief Compliance Officer, finds that any such policies and procedures are not comparable to the policies and procedures applicable to the CAT System, and the issue is not promptly addressed by the applicable Participant, the Chief Information Security Officer, in consultation with the Chief Compliance Officer, will be required to notify the Operating Committee of such deficiencies.*

Section 6.3. ***Data Recording and Reporting by Participants.*** This Section 6.3 shall become effective on the first anniversary of the Effective Date and shall remain effective thereafter until modified or amended in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement and applicable law.

(a) *Format.* As contemplated in Appendix D, Data Types and Sources, each Participant shall report Participant Data to the Central Repository for consolidation and storage in a format or formats specified by the Plan Processor, approved by the Operating Committee and compliant with SEC Rule 613.

(b) *Timing of Recording and Reporting.*

(i) As further described in Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements, each Participant shall record Participant Data contemporaneously with the applicable Reportable Event.

(ii) Each Participant shall report Participant Data to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time on the Trading Day following the day the Participant records such Participant Data. A Participant may voluntarily report Participant Data prior to the 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time deadline.

(c) *Applicable Securities.*

(i) Each Participant that is a national securities exchange shall report Participant Data for each NMS Security registered or listed for trading on such exchange or admitted to unlisted trading privileges on such exchange.

(ii) Each Participant that is a national securities association shall report Participant Data for each Eligible Security for which transaction reports are required to be submitted to such association.

(d) *Participant Data.* Subject to Section 6.3(c), and Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements, and in accordance with the Technical Specifications, each Participant shall record and electronically report to the Central Repository the following details for each order and each Reportable Event, as applicable (''*Participant Data*''):

(i) for original receipt or origination of an order:

(A) Firm Designated ID(s) for each Customer;

(B) CAT-Order-ID;

(C) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member receiving or originating the order;

(D) date of order receipt or origination;

(E) time of order receipt or origination (using timestamps pursuant to Section 6.8); and

(F) Material Terms of the Order;

(ii) for the routing of an order:

(A) CAT-Order-ID;

(B) date on which the order is routed;

(C) time at which the order is routed (using timestamps pursuant to Section 6.8);

(D) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member or Participant routing the order;

(E) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member or Participant to which the order is being routed;

(F) if routed internally at the Industry Member, the identity and nature of the department or desk to which the order is routed; and

(G) Material Terms of the Order;

(iii) for the receipt of an order that has been routed, the following information:

(A) CAT-Order-ID;

(B) date on which the order is received;

(C) time at which the order is received (using timestamps pursuant to Section 6.8);

(D) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member or Participant receiving the order;

(E) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Industry Member or Participant routing the order; and

(F) Material Terms of the Order;

(iv) if the order is modified or cancelled:

(A) CAT-Order-ID;

(B) date the modification or cancellation is received or originated;

(C) time at which the modification or cancellation is received or originated (using timestamps pursuant to Section 6.8);

(D) price and remaining size of the order, if modified;

(E) other changes in the Material Terms of the Order, if modified; and

(F) whether the modification or cancellation instruction was given by the Customer or was initiated by the Industry Member or Participant;

(v) if the order is executed, in whole or in part:

(A) CAT-Order-ID;

(B) date of execution;

(C) time of execution (using timestamps pursuant to Section 6.8);

(D) execution capacity (principal, agency or riskless principal);

(E) execution price and size;

(F) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the Participant or Industry Member executing the order;

(G) whether the execution was reported pursuant to an effective transaction reporting plan or the Plan for Reporting of Consolidated Options Last Sale Reports and Quotation Information; and

(vi) other information or additional events as may be prescribed in Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements.

(e) *CAT-Reporter-ID.*

(i) Each Participant must submit *to the Central Repository,* on a daily basis,

(A) all SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers used by its Industry Members or itself*; and*[as well as]

(B) information to identify *(1) each such Industry Member, including CRD number and LEI* [the corresponding market participant (*e.g.,* CRD number, or LEI) to the Central Repository] *if such LEI has been obtained, and itself, including LEI, if such LEI has been obtained.*

(ii) The Plan Processor will use the SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifiers and identifying information to assign a CAT-Reporter-ID to each Industry Member or Participant for internal use across all CAT Data in the Central Repository.

(f) *Means of Transmission.* As contemplated in Appendix D, each Participant may utilize such methods as may be provided by the Plan Processor and approved by the Operating Committee to transmit Participant Data to the Central Repository.

Section 6.4. ***Data Reporting and Recording by Industry Members.*** The requirements for Industry Members under this Section 6.4 shall become effective on the second anniversary of the Effective Date in the case of Industry Members other than Small Industry Members, or the third anniversary of the Effective Date in the case of Small Industry Members, and shall remain effective thereafter until modified or amended in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement and applicable law.

(a) *Format.* As contemplated in Appendix D, Data Types and Sources, each Participant shall, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to report Industry Member Data to the Central Repository for consolidation and storage in a format or formats specified by the Plan Processor, approved by the Operating Committee and compliant with SEC Rule 613.

(b) *Timing of Recording and Reporting.*

(i) As further described in Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements, each Participant shall, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to record Recorded Industry Member Data contemporaneously with the applicable Reportable Event.

(ii) Consistent with Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements, each Participant shall, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to report: (A) Recorded Industry Member Data to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time on the Trading Day following the day the Industry Member records such Recorded Industry Member Data; and (B) Received Industry Member Data to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time on the Trading Day following the day the Industry Member receives such Received Industry Member Data. Each Participant shall, through its Compliance Rule, permit its Industry Members to voluntarily report Industry Member Data prior to the applicable 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time deadline.

(c) *Applicable Securities.*

(i) Each Participant that is a national securities exchange shall, through its

Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to report Industry Member Data for each NMS Security registered or listed for trading on such exchange or admitted to unlisted trading privileges on such exchange.

(ii) Each Participant that is a national securities association shall, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to report Industry Member Data for each Eligible Security for which transaction reports are required to be submitted to such association.

(d) *Required Industry Member Data.*

(i) Subject to Section 6.4(c) and Section 6.4(d)(iii) with respect to Options Market Makers, and consistent with Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements, and the Technical Specifications, each Participant shall, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to record and electronically report to the Central Repository for each order and each Reportable Event the information referred to in Section 6.3(d), as applicable (''*Recorded Industry Member Data*'').

(ii) Subject to Section 6.4(c) and Section 6.4(d)(iii) with respect to Options Market Makers, and consistent with Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements, and the Technical Specifications, each Participant shall, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to record and report to the Central Repository the following, as applicable (''*Received Industry Member Data*'' and collectively with the information referred to in Section 6.4(d)(i) ''*Industry Member Data*''):

(A) if the order is executed, in whole or in part:

(1) An Allocation Report;

(2) SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier of the clearing broker or prime broker, if applicable; and

(3) CAT-Order-ID of any contra-side order(s);

(B) if the trade is cancelled, a cancelled trade indicator; and

(C) for original receipt or origination of an order, the Firm Designated *ID for the relevant Customer, and in accordance with Section 6.4(d)(iv),* Customer Account Information[,] and Customer Identifying Information for the relevant Customer.

(iii) With respect to the reporting obligations of an Options Market Maker with regard to its quotes in Listed Options, Reportable Events required pursuant to Section 6.3(d)(ii) and (iv) shall be reported to the Central Repository by an Options Exchange in lieu of the reporting of such information by the Options Market Maker. Each Participant that is an Options Exchange shall, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members that are Options Market Makers to report to the Options Exchange the time at which a quote in a Listed Option is sent to the Options Exchange (and, if applicable, any subsequent quote modifications and/or cancellation time when such modification or cancellation is originated by the Options Market Maker). Such time information also shall be reported to the Central Repository by the Options Exchange in lieu of reporting by the Options Market Maker.

(iv) Each Industry Member must submit an initial set of the Customer information required in Section 6.4(d)(ii)(C) *for Active Accounts* to the Central Repository upon the Industry Member's commencement of reporting to the Central Repository. Each Industry Member must submit to the Central Repository any updates, additions or other changes to the Customer information required in Section 6.4(d)(ii)(C) on a daily basis *for all Active Accounts* [thereafter]. In addition, on a periodic basis as designated by the Plan Processor and approved by the Operating Committee, each Industry Member will be required to submit to the Central Repository a complete set of all Customer information required in Section 6.4(d)(ii)(C). The Plan Processor will correlate such Customer information across all Industry Members, use it to assign a Customer-ID for each Customer, and use the Customer-ID to link all Reportable Events associated with an order for a Customer.

(v) Each Participant shall, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to record and report to the Central Repository other information or additional events as may be prescribed in Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements.

(vi) Each Industry Member must submit to the Central Repository information sufficient to identify such Industry Member, *including CRD number and LEI, if such LEI has been obtained* [(e.g., CRD, or LEI)].

(e) *Means of Transmission.* As contemplated in Appendix D, Data Types and Sources, each Industry Member may utilize such methods as may be provided by the Plan Processor and approved by the Operating Committee to transmit Industry Member Data to the Central Repository.

Section 6.5. *Central Repository.*

(a) *Collection of Data.*

(i) The Central Repository, under the oversight of the Plan Processor, and consistent with Appendix D, Central Repository Requirements, shall receive, consolidate, and retain all CAT Data.

(ii) The Central Repository shall collect (from a SIP or pursuant to an NMS Plan) and retain on a current and continuing basis, in a format compatible with the Participant Data and Industry Member Data, all data, including the following (collectively, ''*SIP Data*''):

(A) information, including the size and quote condition, on quotes including the National Best Bid and National Best Offer for each NMS Security;

(B) Last Sale Reports and transaction reports reported pursuant to an effective transaction reporting plan filed with the SEC pursuant to, and meeting the requirements of, SEC Rules 601 and 608;

(C) trading halts, Limit Up/Limit Down price bands, and Limit Up/Limit Down indicators; and

(D) summary data or reports described in the specifications for each of the SIPs and disseminated by the respective SIP.

(b) *Retention of Data.*

(i) Consistent with Appendix D, Data Retention Requirements, the Central Repository shall retain the information collected pursuant to paragraphs (c)(7) and (e)(7) of SEC Rule 613 in a convenient and usable standard electronic data format that is directly available and searchable electronically without any manual intervention by the Plan Processor for a period of not less than six (6) years. Such data when available to the Participant regulatory staff and the SEC shall be linked.

(ii) The Plan Processor shall implement and comply with the records retention policy contemplated by Section 6.1(d)(i) (as such policy is reviewed and updated periodically in accordance with Section 6.1(d)(i)).

(c) *Access to the Central Repository*

(i) Consistent with Appendix D, Data Access, the Plan Processor shall provide Participants and the SEC access to the Central Repository (including all systems operated by the Central Repository), and access to and use of the CAT Data stored in the Central Repository, solely for the purpose of performing their respective regulatory and oversight responsibilities pursuant to the federal securities laws, rules and regulations or any contractual obligations.

(ii) The Plan Processor shall create and maintain a method of access to CAT Data stored in the Central Repository that includes the ability to run searches and generate reports. The method in which the CAT Data is stored in the Central Repository shall allow the ability to return results of queries that are complex in nature, including market reconstruction and the status of order books at varying time intervals.

(iii) The Plan Processor shall, at least annually and at such earlier time promptly following a request by the Operating Committee, certify to the Operating Committee that only Participants and the SEC have access to the Central Repository (other than access provided to any Industry Member for the purpose of correcting CAT Data previously reported to the Central Repository by such Industry Member).

(iv) Appendix C, The Security and Confidentiality of Information Reported to the Central Repository, and Appendix D, Data Security, describes the security and confidentiality of the CAT Data, including how access to the Central Repository is controlled.

(d) *Data Accuracy*

(i) The Operating Committee shall set and periodically review a maximum Error Rate for data reported to the Central Repository. The initial maximum Error Rate shall be set to 5%.

(ii) Consistent with Appendix D, Reporting and Linkage Requirements and Data Security, the Operating Committee shall adopt policies and procedures, including standards, requiring CAT Data reported to the Central Repository be timely, accurate, and complete, and to ensure the integrity of such CAT Data (e.g., that such CAT Data has not been altered and remains reliable). The Plan Processor shall be responsible for implementing such policies and procedures.

(iii) Appendix D, Receipt of Data from Reporters, describes the mechanisms and protocols for Participant Data and Industry Member Data submission for all key phases, including:

(A) file transmission and receipt validation;

(B) validation of CAT Data; and

(C) validation of linkages.

(e) Appendix D, Receipt of Data from Reporters, also describes the mechanisms

and protocols for managing and handling corrections of CAT Data. The Plan Processor shall require an audit trail for corrected CAT Data in accordance with mechanisms and protocols approved by the Operating Committee.

(f) *Data Confidentiality*

(i) The Plan Processor shall, without limiting the obligations imposed on Participants by this Agreement and in accordance with the framework set forth in, Appendix D, Data Security, and Functionality of the CAT System, be responsible for the security and confidentiality of all CAT Data received and reported to the Central Repository. Without limiting the foregoing, the Plan Processor shall:

(A) require all individuals who have access to the Central Repository (including the respective employees and consultants of the Participants and the Plan Processor, but excluding employees and Commissioners of the SEC) to agree: (1) to use appropriate safeguards to ensure the confidentiality of CAT Data stored in the Central Repository; and (2) not to use CAT Data stored in the Central Repository for purposes other than surveillance and regulation in accordance with such individual's employment duties; provided that a Participant will be permitted to use the [CAT] *Raw* Data it reports to the Central Repository for regulatory, surveillance, commercial or other purposes as permitted by applicable law, rule, or regulation;

(B) require all individuals who have access to the Central Repository (including the respective employees and consultants of the Participants and the Plan Processor, but excluding employees and Commissioners of the SEC) to execute a personal ''Safeguard of Information Affidavit'' in a form approved by the Operating Committee providing for personal liability for misuse of data;

(C) develop and maintain a comprehensive information security program with a dedicated staff for the Central Repository, consistent with Appendix D, Data Security, that employs state of the art technology, which program will be regularly reviewed by the Chief Compliance Officer and Chief Information Security Officer;

(D) implement and maintain a mechanism to confirm the identity of all individuals permitted to access the CAT Data stored in the Central Repository and maintain a record of all instances where such CAT Data was accessed; and

(E) implement and maintain appropriate policies regarding limitations on trading activities of its employees and independent contractors involved with all CAT Data consistent with Section 6.1(n).

(ii) Each Participant shall adopt and enforce policies and procedures that:

(A) implement effective information barriers between such Participant's regulatory and non-regulatory staff with regard to access and use of CAT Data stored in the Central Repository;

(B) permit only persons designated by Participants to have access to the CAT Data stored in the Central Repository; and

(C) impose penalties for staff non-compliance with any of its or the Plan Processor's policies or procedures with respect to information security.

(iii) Each Participant [and the Commission, as applicable,] shall as promptly as reasonably practicable, and in any event within 24 hours, report to the Chief Compliance Officer, in accordance with the guidance provided by the Operating Committee, any instance of which such Participant becomes aware of: (A) noncompliance with the policies and procedures adopted by such Participant pursuant to Section 6.5(e)(ii); or (B) a breach of the security of the CAT.

(iv) The Plan Processor shall:

(A) ensure data confidentiality and security during all communications between CAT Reporters and the Plan Processor, data extractions, manipulation and transformation, loading to and from the Central Repository and data maintenance by the Central Repository;

(B) require the establishment of secure controls for data retrieval and query reports by Participant regulatory staff [and the Commission]; and

(C) otherwise provide appropriate database security for the Central Repository.

(v) The Company shall endeavor to join the FS–ISAC and comparable bodies as the Operating Committee may determine.

(g) *Participants Confidentiality Policies and Procedures.* The Participants shall establish, maintain and enforce written policies and procedures reasonably designed to (1) ensure the confidentiality of the CAT Data obtained from the Central Repository; and (2) limit the use of CAT Data obtained from the Central Repository solely for surveillance and regulatory purposes. Each Participant shall periodically review the effectiveness of the policies and procedures required by this paragraph, and take prompt action to remedy deficiencies in such policies and procedures.

(h) A Participant may use the Raw Data it reports to the Central Repository for regulatory, surveillance, commercial or other purposes as otherwise not prohibited by applicable law, rule or regulation.

Section 6.6. *[Regular] Written Assessments, Audits and Reports.*

(a) One-Time Written Assessments and Reports. The Participants shall provide the SEC with the following written assessments, audits and reports:

(i) at least one (1) month prior to submitting a rule filing to establish initial fees for CAT Reporters, an independent audit of fees, costs, and expenses incurred by the Participants on behalf of the Company prior to the Effective Date of the Plan that will be publicly available;

(ii) within six (6) months of effectiveness of the Plan, an assessment of the clock synchronization standard, including consideration of industry standards based on the type of CAT Reporter, Industry Member and type of system, and propose any appropriate amendment based on this assessment;

(iii) within twelve (12) months of effectiveness of the Plan, a report detailing the Participants' consideration of coordinated surveillance (e.g., entering into 17d–2 agreements or regulatory services agreements);

(iv) within 24 months of effectiveness of the Plan, a report discussing the feasibility, benefits, and risks of allowing an Industry Member to bulk download the Raw Data it submitted to the Central Repository;

(v) within 36 months of effectiveness of the Plan, an assessment of errors in the customer information submitted to the Central Repository and whether to prioritize the correction of certain data fields over others;

(vi) within 36 months of effectiveness of the Plan, a report on the impact of tiered-fees on market liquidity, including an analysis of the impact of the tiered-fee structure on Industry Members' provision of liquidity; and

(vii) prior to the implementation of any Material Systems Change, an assessment of the projected impact of such Material Systems Change on the maximum Error Rate.

(b) Regular Written Assessment of the Plan Processor's Performance.

[(a)] *(i) Requirement.*

[(i)] *(A) Annually* [At least every two (2) years], or more frequently in connection with any review of the Plan Processor's performance under this Agreement pursuant to Section 6.1(n), the Participants shall provide the SEC with a written assessment of the operation of the CAT that meets the requirements of SEC Rule 613, Appendix D, and this Agreement.

[(ii)] *(B)* The Chief Compliance Officer shall oversee the assessment contemplated by Section 6.6*(b)(i)(A)* [(a)(i)] and shall provide the Participants a reasonable time to review and comment upon such assessment prior to its submission to the SEC. In no case shall the written assessment be changed or amended in response to a comment by a Participant; rather, any comment by a Participant shall be provided to the SEC at the same time as the written assessment.

[(b)] *(ii) Contents of Written Assessment.* The *annual* written assessment required by this Section 6.6 shall include:

[(i)] *(A)* an evaluation of the performance of the CAT, including the items specified in SEC Rule 613(b)(6)(i) and other performance metrics identified by the Chief Compliance Officer, and a description of such metrics;

[(ii)] *(B)* a detailed plan, based on the evaluation conducted pursuant to Section 6.6(b)(i), for any potential improvements to the performance of the CAT with respect to the items specified in SEC Rule 613(b)(6)(ii), *as well as:*

(1) an evaluation of potential technology upgrades based on a review of technological advancements over the preceding year, drawing on technological expertise whether internal or external;

(2) an evaluation of the time necessary to restore and recover CAT Data at a back-up site;

(3) an evaluation of the information security program to ensure that the program is consistent with the highest industry standards for the protection of data;

(4) an evaluation of how the Plan Processor and the Participants are monitoring Error Rates and to explore the imposition of Error Rates based on product, data elements or other criteria;

(5) a copy of the evaluation required by Section 6.8(c) as to whether industry standards have evolved such that: (i) the

synchronization standard in Section 6.8(a) should be shortened; or (ii) the required time stamp in Section 6.8(b) should be in finer increments;

(6) an assessment of whether any data elements should be added, deleted or changed; and

(7) any other items identified and described by the Chief Compliance Officer;

[(iii)] *(C)* an estimate of the costs *and benefits* associated with any potential improvements to the performance of the CAT, including an assessment of the potential impact on competition, efficiency, [and] capital formation*, and investor protection*; and

[(iv)] *(D)* an estimated implementation timeline for any potential improvements to the performance of the CAT, if applicable.

Section 6.7. ***Implementation.***

(a) Unless otherwise ordered by the SEC:

(i) within two (2) months after the Effective Date, the Participants shall jointly select the winning Shortlisted Bid and the Plan Processor pursuant to the process set forth in Article V. Following the selection of the Initial Plan Processor, the Participants shall file with the Commission a statement identifying the Plan Processor and including the information required by SEC Rule 608;

(ii) within four (4) months after the Effective Date, each Participant shall, and through its Compliance Rule shall require its Industry Members to, synchronize its or their Business Clocks as required by Section 6.8 and certify to the Chief Compliance Officer (in the case of Participants) or the applicable Participant (in the case of Industry Members) that such Participant has met this requirement;

(iii) within one (1) year after the Effective Date, each Participant shall report to the Central Repository Participant Data;

(iv) within fourteen (14) months after the Effective Date, each Participant shall implement a new or enhanced surveillance system(s) in accordance with Section 6.10;

(v) within two (2) years after the Effective Date, each Participant shall, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) to report to the Central Repository Industry Member Data; and

(vi) within three (3) years after the Effective Date, each Participant shall, through its Compliance Rule, require its Small Industry Members to report to the Central Repository Industry Member Data.

(b) The Chief Compliance Officer shall appropriately document objective milestones to assess progress toward the implementation of this Agreement.

(c) Industry Members and Participants shall be required to participate in testing with the Central Repository on a schedule to be determined by the Operating Committee.

(d) Appendix C, A Plan to Eliminate Existing Rules and Systems (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(ix)), and Appendix D, Data Types and Sources, set forth additional implementation details concerning the elimination of rules and systems.

Section 6.8. ***Timestamps and Synchronization of Business Clocks.***

(a) Each Participant shall:

(i) other than such Business Clocks used solely for Manual Order Events, synchronize its Business Clocks at a minimum to within [50 milliseconds] *100 microseconds* of the time maintained by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, consistent with industry standards;

(ii) other than such Business Clocks used solely for Manual Order Events *or the time of allocation on Allocation Reports,* through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to:

(A) synchronize their respective Business Clocks at a minimum to within fifty (50) milliseconds of the time maintained by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and maintain such a synchronization;

(B) certify periodically (according to a schedule to be defined by the Operating Committee) that their Business Clocks meet the requirements of the Compliance Rule;

(C) and report to the Plan Processor and the Participant any violation of the Compliance Rule pursuant to the thresholds set by the Operating Committee; and

(iii) synchronize its Business Clocks and, through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to synchronize their Business Clocks used solely for Manual Order Events at a minimum to within one second of the time maintained by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (''*NIST*''), consistent with industry standards, and maintain such synchronization. Each Participant shall require its Industry Members to certify periodically (according to a schedule defined by the Operating Committee) that their Business Clocks used solely for Manual Order Events meet the requirements of the Compliance Rule. The Compliance Rule of a Participant shall require its Industry Members using Business Clocks solely for Manual Order Events to report to the Plan Processor any violation of the Compliance Rule pursuant to the thresholds set by the Operating Committee.

(iv) through its Compliance Rule, require its Industry Members to synchronize their Business Clocks used solely for the time of allocation on Allocation Reports at a minimum to within one second of the time maintained by NIST, consistent with industry standards, and maintain such synchronization. Each Participant shall require its Industry Members to certify periodically (according to a schedule defined by the Operating Committee) that their Business Clocks used solely for the time of allocation on Allocation Reports meet the requirements of the Compliance Rule. The Compliance Rule of a Participant shall require its Industry Members using Business Clocks solely for the time of allocation on Allocation Reports to report to the Plan Processor any violation of the Compliance Rule pursuant to the thresholds set by the Operating Committee.

(b) Each Participant shall, and through its Compliance Rule shall require its Industry Members to, report information required by SEC Rule 613 and this Agreement to the Central Repository in milliseconds. To the extent that any Participant*'s order handling or execution systems* utilize[s] timestamps in increments finer than the minimum required in this Agreement, such Participant shall utilize such finer increment when reporting CAT Data to the Central Repository so that all Reportable Events reported to the Central Repository can be adequately sequenced. Each Participant shall, through its Compliance Rule: (i) require that, to the extent that its Industry Members utilize timestamps in increments finer than the minimum required in this Agreement *in their order handling or execution systems,* such Industry Members shall utilize such finer increment when reporting CAT Data to the Central Repository; and (ii) provide that a pattern or practice of reporting events outside of the required clock synchronization time period without reasonable justification or exceptional circumstances may be considered a violation of SEC Rule 613 and the CAT NMS Plan. Notwithstanding the preceding sentences, each Participant and Industry Member shall be permitted to record and report*: (i)* Manual Order Events to the Central Repository in increments up to and including one second, provided that Participants and Industry Members shall be required to record and report the time when a Manual Order Event has been captured electronically in an order handling and execution system of such Participant or Industry Member (''*Electronic Capture Time*'') in milliseconds*; and (ii) the time of allocation on Allocation Reports in increments up to and including one second.*

(c) In conjunction with Participants' and other appropriate Industry Member advisory groups, the Chief Compliance Officer shall annually evaluate and make a recommendation to the Operating Committee as to whether industry standards have evolved such that: (i) the synchronization standard in Section 6.8(a) should be shortened; or (ii) the required time stamp in Section 6.8(b) should be in finer increments. *Industry standards should be determined based on the type of CAT Reporter, Industry Member and type of system.*

Section 6.9. ***Technical Specifications.***

(a) *Publication.* The Plan Processor shall publish technical specifications that are at a minimum consistent with Appendices C and D, and updates thereto as needed, providing detailed instructions regarding the submission of CAT Data by Participants and Industry Members to the Plan Processor for entry into the Central Repository (collectively, the ''*Technical Specifications*''). The Technical Specifications shall be made available on a publicly available web site to be developed and maintained by the Plan Processor. The initial Technical Specifications and any Material Amendments thereto shall be provided to the Operating Committee for approval by Supermajority Vote.

(b) *Content.* The Technical Specifications shall include a detailed description of the following:

(i) the specifications for the layout of files and records submitted to the Central Repository;

(ii) the process for the release of new data format specification changes;

(iii) the process for industry testing for any changes to data format specifications;

(iv) the procedures for obtaining feedback about and submitting corrections to

information submitted to the Central Repository;

(v) each data element, including permitted values, in any type of report submitted to the Central Repository;

(vi) any error messages generated by the Plan Processor in the course of validating the data;

(vii) the process for file submissions (and re-submissions for corrected files);

(viii) the storage and access requirements for all files submitted;

(ix) metadata requirements for all files submitted to the CAT System;

(x) any required secure network connectivity;

(xi) data security standards, which shall, at a minimum: (A) satisfy all applicable regulations regarding database security, including provisions of Regulation Systems Compliance and Integrity under the Exchange Act (''*Reg SCI*''); (B) to the extent not otherwise provided for under this Agreement (including Appendix C hereto), set forth such provisions as may be necessary or appropriate to comply with SEC Rule 613(e)(4); and (C) comply with industry best practices; and

(xii) any other items reasonably deemed appropriate by the Plan Processor and approved by the Operating Committee.

(c) *Amendments.* Amendments to the Technical Specifications may be made only in accordance with this Section 6.9(c). For purposes of this Section 6.9(c), an amendment to the Technical Specifications shall be deemed ''material'' if it would require a Participant or an Industry Member to engage in significant changes to the coding necessary to submit information to the Central Repository pursuant to this Agreement or if it is required to safeguard the security or confidentiality of the CAT Data (''*Material Amendment*'').

(i) Except for Material Amendments to the Technical Specifications, the Plan Processor shall have the sole discretion to amend and publish interpretations regarding the Technical Specifications as needed in furtherance of the purposes and requirements of this Agreement. All non-Material Amendments made to the Technical Specifications and all published interpretations shall be provided to the Operating Committee in writing at least ten (10) days before being published. Such non-Material Amendments and published interpretations shall be deemed approved ten (10) days following provision to the Operating Committee unless two (2) unaffiliated Participants call for a vote to be taken on the proposed amendment or interpretation. If an amendment or interpretation is called out for a vote by two or more unaffiliated Participants, the proposed amendment must be approved by Majority Vote of the Operating Committee. Once a non-Material amendment has been approved, or deemed approved, by the Operating Committee, the Plan Processor shall be responsible for determining the specific changes to the Central Repository and providing technical documentation of those changes, including an implementation timeline.

(ii) The Operating Committee, by Supermajority Vote, shall approve any Material Amendments to the Technical Specifications.

(iii) The Operating Committee, by Supermajority Vote, may amend the Technical Specifications on its own motion.

Section 6.10. ***Surveillance.***

(a) *Surveillance Systems.* Using the tools provided for in Appendix D, Functionality of the CAT System, each Participant shall develop and implement a surveillance system, or enhance existing surveillance systems, reasonably designed to make use of the consolidated information contained in the Central Repository. Unless otherwise ordered by the SEC, within fourteen (14) months after the Effective Date, each Participant shall initially implement a new or enhanced surveillance system(s) as required by SEC Rule 613 and the preceding sentence.

(b) *Coordinated Surveillance.* Participants may, but are not required to, coordinate or share surveillance efforts through the use of regulatory services agreements and agreements adopted pursuant to SEC Rule 17d–2.

(c) *Use of CAT Data by Regulators.*

(i) Consistent with Appendix D, Functionality of the CAT System, the Plan Processor shall provide Participants and the SEC with access to all CAT Data stored in the Central Repository. Regulators will have access to processed CAT Data through two different methods; an online targeted query tool, and user-defined direct queries and bulk extracts.

(A) The online targeted query tool will provide authorized users with the ability to retrieve CAT Data via an online query screen that includes the ability to choose from a variety of pre-defined selection criteria. Targeted queries must include date(s) and/or time range(s), as well as one or more of a variety of fields.

(B) The user-defined direct queries and bulk extracts will provide authorized users with the ability to retrieve CAT Data via a query tool or language that allows users to query all available attributes and data sources.

(ii) Extraction of CAT Data shall be consistent with all permission rights granted by the Plan Processor. All CAT Data returned shall be encrypted, and PII data shall be masked unless users have permission to view the CAT Data that has been requested.

(iii) The Plan Processor shall implement an automated mechanism to monitor direct query usage. Such monitoring shall include automated alerts to notify the Plan Processor of potential issues with bottlenecks or excessively long queues for queries or CAT Data extractions. The Plan Processor shall provide the Operating Committee or its designee(s) details as to how the monitoring will be accomplished and the metrics that will be used to trigger alerts.

(iv) The Plan Processor shall reasonably assist regulatory staff (including those of Participants) with creating queries.

(v) Without limiting the manner in which regulatory staff (including those of Participants) may submit queries, the Plan Processor shall submit queries on behalf of a regulatory staff (including those of Participants) as reasonably requested.

(vi) The Plan Processor shall staff a CAT help desk, as described in Appendix D, CAT Help Desk, to provide technical expertise to assist regulatory staff (including those of Participants) with questions about the content and structure of the CAT Data.

Section 6.11. ***Debt Securities and Primary Market Transactions.*** Unless otherwise ordered by the Commission, within six (6) months after the Effective Date, the Participants shall jointly provide to the SEC a document outlining how the Participants could incorporate into the CAT information with respect to equity securities that are not NMS Securities or OTC Equity Securities, including Primary Market Transactions in securities that are not NMS Securities or OTC Equity Securities and in debt securities, which document shall include details for each order and Reportable Event that may be required to be provided, which market participants may be required to provide the data, the implementation timeline, and a cost estimate.

Section 6.12. ***Information Security Program.*** The Plan Processor shall develop and maintain a comprehensive information security program for the Central Repository, to be approved and reviewed at least annually by the Operating Committee, and which contains at a minimum the specific requirements detailed in Appendix D, Data Security.

ARTICLE VII

INTENTIONALLY OMITTED

[CAPITAL ACCOUNTS]

[**Section 7.1** ***Capital Accounts.***]

[(a) A separate capital account (''*Capital Account*'') shall be established and maintained by the Company for each Participant in accordance with § 704(b) of the Code and Treasury Regulation § 1.704–1 (b)(2)(iv). There shall be credited to each Participant's Capital Account the capital contributions (at fair market value in the case of contributed property) made by such Participant (which shall be deemed to be zero for the initial Participants), and allocations of Company profits and gain (or items thereof) to such Participant pursuant to Article VIII (excluding those allocated in Section 8.3). Each Participant's Capital Account shall be decreased by the amount of distributions (at fair market value in the case of property distributed in kind) to such Participant, and allocations of Company losses to such Participant pursuant to Article VIII (including expenditures which can neither be capitalized nor deducted for tax purposes, organization and syndication expenses not subject to amortization and loss on sale or disposition of Company property, whether or not disallowed under §§ 267 or 707 of the Code). Capital Accounts shall not be adjusted to reflect a Participant's share of liabilities under § 752 of the Code.]

[(b) If, following the date hereof, money or property is contributed to the Company in other than a de minimis amount in exchange for an equity interest in the Company (which shall not include the Participation Fee paid by a new Participant pursuant to Section 3.3, which is not treated as a contribution to capital), or money or property is distributed to a Participant in exchange for an interest in the Company but the Company is not

liquidated, the Capital Accounts of the Participants shall be adjusted based on the fair market value of Company property at the time of such contribution or distribution and the unrealized income, gain, loss, or deduction inherent in the Company property which has not previously been reflected in the Capital Accounts shall be allocated among the Participants as if there had been a taxable disposition of the Company property at its fair market value on such date. The fair market value of contributed, distributed, or revalued property shall be approved by the Operating Committee or, if there is no such agreement, by an appraisal by an independent third party valuation firm selected by the Operating Committee by Majority Vote.]

[(c) The foregoing provisions and the other provisions of this Agreement relating to the maintenance of Capital Accounts are intended to comply with Treasury Regulation § 1.704–1(b) promulgated under § 704(b) of the Code, and shall be interpreted and applied in a manner consistent with such Regulations.]

[**Section 7.2** ***Interest.*** Except as otherwise provided herein, no Participant shall be entitled to receive interest on amounts in its Capital Account.]

ARTICLE VIII

TAX STATUS

[ALLOCATIONS OF INCOME AND LOSS; DISTRIBUTIONS]

[**Section 8.1** ***Periodic Allocations.*** As of the end of each calendar quarter or such other period selected by the Operating Committee, the net profit or net loss of the Company (and each item of income, gain, loss, deduction, and credit for federal income tax purposes) for the period shall be determined, and in the event the book value of any Company property is adjusted pursuant to Treasury Regulation § 1.704–1(b)(2)(iv)(f), net profit, net losses and items thereof shall be determined as provided in Treasury Regulation § 1.704–1(b)(2)(iv)(g). Except as provided in Section 8.2, such net profit or net loss (and each item of income, gain, loss, deduction, and credit) shall be allocated equally among the Participants.]

[**Section 8.2** ***Special Allocations.*** Notwithstanding Section 8.1, this Agreement shall be deemed to contain, and the allocations of net profit and net loss as set forth in Section 8.1 shall be subject to, each of the following: (a) a ''qualified income offset'' as described in Treasury Regulation § 1.704–1(b)(2)(ii)(d); (b) a ''partnership minimum gain chargeback'' as described in Treasury Regulation § 1.704–2(f); and (c) a ''partner non-recourse debt minimum gain chargeback'' as described in Treasury Regulation § 1.704–2(i)(4). The Participants intend that the allocations required to be made pursuant to Section 8.1 and this Section 8.2 shall satisfy the requirements of § 704(b) of the Code and the Treasury Regulations promulgated thereunder. Without the consent of the Participants, the Operating Committee shall have the power to interpret and amend the provisions of Section 8.1 and this Section 8.2 in the manner necessary to ensure such compliance; *provided* that such amendments shall not change the amounts distributable to a Participant pursuant to this Agreement.]

[**Section 8.3** ***Allocations Pursuant to § 704(c) of the Code.*** In accordance with § 704(c) of the Code and the Treasury Regulations promulgated thereunder, income, gain, loss, and deduction with respect to any property contributed to the capital of the Company shall, solely for tax purposes, be allocated among the Participants so as to take account of any variation between the adjusted basis of such property to the Company for federal income tax purposes and its initial fair market value. In the event the book value of any Company property is adjusted pursuant to Treasury Regulation § 1.704–1(b)(2)(iv)(f), allocations of income, gain, loss, and deduction with respect to such asset shall take account of any variation between the adjusted basis of such asset for federal income tax purposes and its adjusted book value in the same manner as under § 704(c) of the Code and the Treasury Regulations promulgated thereunder. Such allocations shall be made by the Operating Committee using the ''traditional method'' set forth in Treasury Regulation § 1.704–3(b). Allocations pursuant to this Section 8.3 are solely for purposes of federal, state, and local taxes and shall not affect, or in any way be taken into account in computing, any Participant's share of distributions pursuant to any provision of this Agreement.]

[**Section 8.4** ***Changes in Participants' Interests.*** If during any fiscal period of the Company there is a change in any Participant's Company Interest as a result of the admission or withdrawal of one or more Participants, the net profit, net loss or any other item allocable to the Participants under this Article VIII for the period shall be allocated among the Participants so as to reflect their varying interests in the Company during the period. In the event that the change in the Company Interests of the Participants results from the admission or withdrawal of a Participant, the allocation of net profit, net loss, or any other item allocable among the Participants under this Article VIII shall be made on the basis of an interim closing of the Company's books as of each date on which a Participant is admitted to or withdraws from the Company; *provided* that the Company may use interim closings of the books as of the end of the month preceding and the month of the admission or withdrawal, and prorate the items for the month of withdrawal on a daily basis, unless the Operating Committee determines that such an allocation would be materially unfair to any Participant. In the event that the change in the Company Interests of the Participants results from a Transfer of all or any portion of a Company Interest by a Participant, the net profit, net loss, or any other items allocable among the Participants under this Article VIII shall be determined on a daily, monthly, or other basis, as determined by the Operating Committee using any permissible method under § 706 of the Code and the Treasury Regulations promulgated thereunder.]

[**Section 8.5** ***Distributions.***]

[(a) Subject to Section 10.2, cash and property of the Company shall not be distributed to the Participants unless the Operating Committee approves by Supermajority Vote (subject to § 18–607 of the Delaware Act) a distribution after fully considering the reason that such distribution must or should be made to the Participants, including the circumstances contemplated under Section 8.3, Section 8.6, and Section 9.3. To the extent a distribution is made, all Participants shall participate equally in any such distribution except as otherwise provided in Section 10.2.]

[(b) No Participant shall have the right to require any distribution of any assets of the Company in kind. If any assets of the Company are distributed in kind, such assets shall be distributed on the basis of their fair market value net of any liabilities as reasonably determined by the Operating Committee. Any Participant entitled to any interest in such assets shall, unless otherwise determined by the Operating Committee, receive separate assets of the Company and not an interest as a tenant-in-common with other Participants so entitled in any asset being distributed.]

[**Section 8.6** ***Tax Status.***]

[(a)] *The Company intends to operate in a manner such that it qualifies as a ''business league'' within the meaning of Section 501(c)(6) of the Code.* The Operating Committee [by Supermajority Vote, without the consent of any Participant, may] *shall* cause the Company to: (i) make an election to be treated as a corporation for U.S. federal income tax purposes by filing Form 8832 with the Internal Revenue Service *effective as of the date of formation and (ii) file with the Internal Revenue Service, Form 1024, Application for Recognition of Exemption under Section 501(a) to*[; or (ii)] be treated *as* a [''trade association''] ''*business league*'' as described in [§] *Section* 501(c)(6) of the Code.

[(b) If the Company so elects to be taxed as a corporation or is treated as a ''trade association'' as described in § 501(c)(6) of the Code, it shall continue to maintain Capital Accounts in the manner provided in this Agreement, consistent with provisions of § 704 of the Code, to determine the economic rights of the Participants under this Agreement, notwithstanding that it is not taxed as a partnership for U.S. federal income tax purposes, as interpreted by the Operating Committee and the Company's counsel in a manner to preserve the economic rights and obligations of the Participants under this Agreement. Sections 8.2, 8.3 and 9.5 shall not be applicable with respect to any period during with the Company is treated as a corporation for U.S. federal income tax purposes; provided, however, if the Company is initially treated as a partnership for U.S. federal income tax purposes and has made allocations under Section 8.2, it shall adjust the Capital Accounts to reflect the amount the Capital Accounts would have been had all allocations been made pursuant to Section 8.1.]

ARTICLE IX

RECORDS AND ACCOUNTING; REPORTS

Section 9.1. ***Books and Records.*** The Company shall maintain complete and accurate books and records of the Company

in accordance with SEC Rule 17a–1, which shall be maintained and be available, in addition to any documents and information required to be furnished to the Participants under the Act, at the office of the Plan Processor and/or such other location(s) as may be designated by the Company for examination and copying by any Participant or its duly authorized representative, at such Participant's reasonable request and at its expense during ordinary business hours for any purpose reasonably related to such Participant's involvement with the CAT NMS Plan, including for compliance and other regulatory purposes, and in compliance with such other conditions as may be reasonably established by the Operating Committee. For the avoidance of doubt, all CAT Data and other books and records of the Company shall be the property of the Company, rather than the Plan Processor, and, to the extent in the possession or control of the Plan Processor, shall be made available by the Plan Processor to the Commission upon [reasonable] request. Except as provided in this Section 9.1 or required by non-waivable provisions of applicable law, no Participant shall have any right to examine or copy any of the books and records of the Company.

Section 9.2. ***Accounting.***

(a) Except as provided in [Section 9.2(b) and] Section 9.3, the Operating Committee shall maintain a system of accounting established and administered in accordance with GAAP [(or other standard if determined appropriate by the Operating Committee)], and all financial statements or information that may be supplied to the Participants shall be prepared in accordance with GAAP (except that unaudited statements shall be subject to year-end adjustments and need not include footnotes) [(or other standard if determined appropriate by the Operating Committee)]. [To the extent the Operating Committee determines it advisable, the] *The* Company shall prepare and provide to each Participant (1) within 30 days after the end of each calendar month, an unaudited balance sheet, income statement, statement of cash flows and statement of changes in [each Participant's Capital Account] *equity* for, or as of the end of, (x) such month and (y) the portion of the then current Fiscal Year ending at the end of such month*;* and (2) as soon as practicable after the end of each Fiscal Year, a[n audited] balance sheet, income statement, statement of cash flows and statement of changes in [each Participant's Capital Account] *equity* for, or as of the end of, such year*, audited by an independent public accounting firm (which audited balance sheet, income statement, statement of cash flows and statement of changes in equity contemplated by this Section 9.2(a) shall be made publicly available).* The Fiscal Year shall be the calendar year unless otherwise determined by the Operating Committee.

[(b) Assets received by the Company as capital contributions shall be recorded at their fair market values, and the Capital Account maintained for each Participant shall comply with Treasury Regulations § 1.704–1(b)(2)(iv) promulgated under § 704(b) of the Code. In the event fair market values for certain assets of the Company are not determined by appraisals, the fair market value for such assets shall be reasonably agreed to among the Participants as if in arm's-length negotiations.]

[(c)] *(b) In all other respects,* [All] matters concerning accounting procedures shall be determined by the Operating Committee.

Section 9.3. ***Tax Returns.*** The Operating Committee shall cause federal, state, provincial, and local income tax returns for the Company to be prepared and timely filed with the appropriate authorities. [If the Company is taxed as a partnership, it shall arrange for the timely delivery to the Participants of such information as is necessary for such Participants to prepare their federal, state and local tax returns.]

Section 9.4. ***Company Funds.*** Pending use in the business of the Company or distribution to the Participants, the funds of the Company shall be held and/or invested in accordance with the then effective cash management and investment policy adopted by the Operating Committee.

Section 9.5 [***Tax Matters Partner.***] ***Intentionally Omitted.***

[(a) A Participant designated by the Operating Committee shall serve as the ''*Tax Matters Partner*'' of the Company for all purposes pursuant to §§ 6221–6231 of the Code. As Tax Matters Partner, the Tax Matters Partner shall: (i) furnish to each Participant affected by an audit of the Company income tax returns a copy of each notice or other communication received from the Internal Revenue Service or applicable state authority (except such notices or communications as are sent directly to the Participant); (ii) keep such Participant informed of any administrative or judicial proceeding, as required by § 6623(g) of the Code; (iii) allow each such Participant an opportunity to participate in all such administrative and judicial proceedings; and (iv) advise and consult with each such Participant as to proposed adjustments to the federal or state income tax returns of the Company.]

[(b) The Tax Matters Partner, as such, shall not have the authority to: (i) enter into a settlement agreement with the Internal Revenue Service that purports to bind any Participant, without the written consent of such Participant; or (ii) enter into an agreement extending the period of limitations as contemplated in § 6229(b)(1)(B) of the Code without the prior approval of the Operating Committee.]

[(c) The Company shall not be obligated to pay any fees or other compensation to the Tax Matters Partner in its capacity as such, but may pay compensation to the Tax Matters Partner for services rendered to the Company in any other capacity. However, the Company shall reimburse the Tax Matters Partner for any and all out-of-pocket costs and expenses (including reasonable attorneys and other professional fees) incurred by it in its capacity as Tax Matters Partner. The Company shall indemnify, defend and hold the Tax Matters Partner harmless from and against any loss, liability, damage, costs or expense (including reasonable attorneys' fees) sustained or incurred as a result of any act or decision concerning Company tax matters and within the scope of such Participant's responsibilities as Tax Matters Partner, so long as such act or decision does not constitute gross negligence or willful misconduct.]

Section 9.6. ***Confidentiality.***

(a) For purposes of this Agreement, ''*Information*'' means information disclosed by or on behalf of the Company or a Participant (the ''*Disclosing Party*'') to the Company or any other Participant (the ''*Receiving Party*'') in connection with this Agreement or the CAT System, but excludes any CAT Data or information otherwise disclosed pursuant to the requirements of SEC Rule 613. The Receiving Party agrees to maintain the Information in confidence with the same degree of care it holds its own confidential information (but in any event not less than reasonable care). A Receiving Party may only disclose Information to its Representatives (as defined below) on a need-to-know basis, and only to those of such Representatives whom shall have agreed to abide by the non-disclosure and non-use provisions in this Section 9.6. Each Receiving Party that is a Participant agrees that he, she or it shall not use for any purpose, other than in connection with the operation of the Company, and the Company agrees not to use for any purpose not expressly authorized by the Disclosing Party, any Information. The ''*Representatives*'' of a Person are such Person's Affiliates and the respective directors, managers, officers, employees, consultants, advisors and agents of such Person and such Person's Affiliates; *provided,* however, that a Participant is not a Representative of the Company. The obligations set forth in this Section 9.6(a) shall survive indefinitely (including after a Participant ceases to hold any Company Interest) but shall not apply to: (i) any Information that was already lawfully in the Receiving Party's possession and, to the knowledge of the Receiving Party, free from any confidentiality obligation to the Disclosing Party at the time of receipt from the Disclosing Party; (ii) any Information that is, now or in the future, public knowledge through no act or omission in breach of this Agreement by the Receiving Party; (iii) any Information that was lawfully obtained from a third party having, to the knowledge of the Receiving Party, the right to disclose it free from any obligation of confidentiality; or (iv) any Information that was independently developed by the Receiving Party prior to disclosure to it pursuant hereto and without recourse to or reliance upon Information disclosed to it pursuant hereto as established by its written records or other competent evidence. The obligations set forth in this Section 9.6(a) shall not restrict: (x) disclosures that are, in the opinion of the Receiving Party after consultation with counsel; required to be made by applicable laws and regulations, stock market or exchange requirements or the rules of any self-regulatory organization having jurisdiction; (y) disclosures required to be made pursuant to an order, subpoena or legal process; or (z) disclosures reasonably necessary for the conduct of any litigation or arbitral proceeding among the Participants (and their respective Representatives) and/or the Company; *provided* that the Receiving

Party shall, to the extent not prohibited by applicable law, notify the Disclosing Party prior to making any disclosure permitted by the foregoing clause (x) or clause (y), and, in the case of a disclosure permitted by the foregoing clause (y), shall consult with the Disclosing Party with respect to such disclosure, and prior to making such disclosure, to the extent not prohibited by applicable law, shall permit the Disclosing Party, at such Disclosing Party's cost and expense, to seek a protective order or similar relief protecting the confidentiality of such Information.

(b) The Company shall not, and shall cause its Representatives not to, disclose any Information of a Participant to any other Participant without the prior written approval of the disclosing Participant.

(c) A Participant shall be free, in its own discretion, to share Information of such Participant to other Participants without the approval of the Company.

ARTICLE X

DISSOLUTION AND TERMINATION

Section 10.1. ***Dissolution of Company.*** The Company shall, subject to the SEC's approval, dissolve and its assets and business shall be wound up upon the occurrence of any of the following events:

(a) unanimous written consent of the Participants to dissolve the Company;

(b) an event that makes it unlawful or impossible for the Company business to be continued;

(c) the termination of one or more Participants such that there is only one remaining Participant; or

(d) the entry of a decree of judicial dissolution under Section 18–802 of the Delaware Act.

Section 10.2. ***Liquidation and Distribution.*** Following the occurrence of an event described in Section 10.1, the Operating Committee shall act as liquidating trustee and shall wind up the affairs of the Company by: (a) selling its assets in an orderly manner (so as to avoid the loss normally associated with forced sales); and (b) applying and distributing the proceeds of such sale, together with other funds held by the Company: (i) first, to the payment of all debts and liabilities of the Company; (ii) second, to the establishments of any reserves reasonably necessary to provide for any contingent recourse liabilities and obligations; and (iii) third, to [the Participants in proportion to the balances in their positive Capital Accounts (after such Capital Accounts have been adjusted for all items of income, gain, deduction, loss and items thereof in accordance with Article VII through the date of the such distribution) at the date of such distribution] *such persons or institutions as is consistent with the purposes of the Company and consistent with Section 501(c)(6) of the Code.*

Section 10.3. ***Termination.*** Each of the Participants shall be furnished with a statement prepared by the Company's independent accountants, which shall set forth the assets and liabilities of the Company as of the date of the final distribution of the Company's assets under Section 10.2 and the net profit or net loss for the fiscal period ending on such date. Upon compliance with the distribution plan set forth in Section 10.2, the Participants shall cease to be such, and the liquidating trustee shall execute, acknowledge, and cause to be filed a certificate of cancellation of the Company. Upon completion of the dissolution, winding up, liquidation and distribution of the liquidation proceeds, the Company shall terminate.

ARTICLE XI

FUNDING OF THE COMPANY

Section 11.1. ***Funding Authority.***

(a) On an annual basis the Operating Committee shall approve an operating budget for the Company. The budget shall include the projected costs of the Company, including the costs of developing and operating the CAT for the upcoming year, and the sources of all revenues to cover such costs, as well as the funding of any reserve that the Operating Committee reasonably deems appropriate for prudent operation of the Company.

(b) Subject to Section 11.2, the Operating Committee shall have discretion to establish funding for the Company, including: (i) establishing fees that the Participants shall pay; and (ii) establishing fees for Industry Members that shall be implemented by Participants. The Participants shall file with the SEC under Section 19(b) of the Exchange Act any such fees on Industry Members that the Operating Committee approves, and such fees shall be labeled as ''Consolidated Audit Trail Funding Fees.''

(c) To fund the development and implementation of the CAT, the Company shall time the imposition and collection of all fees on Participants and Industry Members in a manner reasonably related to the timing when the Company expects to incur such development and implementation costs. In determining fees on Participants and Industry Members the Operating Committee shall take into account fees, costs and expenses (including legal and consulting fees and expenses) incurred by the Participants on behalf of the Company prior to the Effective Date in connection with the creation and implementation of the CAT, and such fees, costs and expenses shall be fairly and reasonably shared among the Participants and Industry Members. *Any surplus of the Company's revenues over its expenses shall be treated as an operational reserve to offset future fees.*

(d) Consistent with this Article XI, the Operating Committee shall adopt policies, procedures, and practices regarding the budget and budgeting process, assignment of tiers, resolution of disputes, billing and collection of fees, and other related matters. For the avoidance of doubt, as part of its regular review of fees for the CAT, the Operating Committee shall have the right to change the tier assigned to any particular Person *in accordance with fee schedules previously filed with the Commission that are reasonable, equitable and not unfairly discriminatory and subject to public notice and comment,* pursuant to this Article XI. Any such changes will be effective upon reasonable notice to such Person.

Section 11.2. ***Funding Principles.*** In establishing the funding of the Company, the Operating Committee shall seek:

(a) to create transparent, predictable revenue streams for the Company that are aligned with the anticipated costs to build, operate and administer the CAT and the other costs of the Company;

(b) to establish an allocation of the Company's related costs among Participants and Industry Members that is consistent with the Exchange Act, taking into account the timeline for implementation of the CAT and distinctions in the securities trading operations of Participants and Industry Members and their relative impact upon Company resources and operations;

(c) to establish a tiered fee structure in which the fees charged to: (i) CAT Reporters that are Execution Venues, including ATSs, are based upon the level of market share; (ii) Industry Members' non-ATS activities are based upon message traffic; and (iii) the CAT Reporters with the most CAT-related activity (measured by market share and/or message traffic, as applicable) are generally comparable (where, for these comparability purposes, the tiered fee structure takes into consideration affiliations between or among CAT Reporters, whether Execution Venues and/or Industry Members).

(d) to provide for ease of billing and other administrative functions;

(e) to avoid any disincentives such as placing an inappropriate burden on competition and a reduction in market quality; and

(f) to build financial stability to support the Company as a going concern.

Section 11.3. ***Recovery.***

(a) The Operating Committee will establish fixed fees to be payable by Execution Venues as provided in this Section 11.3(a):

(i) Each Execution Venue that: (A) executes transactions; or (B) in the case of a national securities association, has trades reported by its members to its trade reporting facility or facilities for reporting transactions effected otherwise than on an exchange, in NMS Stock*s* or OTC Equity Securities will pay a fixed fee depending on the market share of that Execution Venue in NMS Stock*s* and OTC Equity Securities, with the Operating Committee establishing at least two and no more than five tiers of fixed fees, based on an Execution Venue's NMS Stock*s* and OTC Equity Securities market share. For these purposes, market share *for Execution Venues that execute transactions* will be calculated by share volume*, and market share for a national securities association that has trades reported by its members to its trade reporting facility or facilities for reporting transactions effected otherwise than on an exchange in NMS Stocks or OTC Equity Securities will be calculated based on share volume of trades reported, provided, however, that the share volume reported to such national securities association by an Execution Venue shall not be included in the calculation of such national security association's market share.*

(ii) Each Execution Venue that executes transactions in Listed Options will pay a fixed fee depending on the Listed Options market share of that Execution Venue, with

the Operating Committee establishing at least two and no more than five tiers of fixed fees, based on an Execution Venue's Listed Options market share. For these purposes, market share will be calculated by contract volume.

(b) The Operating Committee will establish fixed fees to be payable by Industry Members, based on the message traffic generated by such Industry Member, with the Operating Committee establishing at least five and no more than nine tiers of fixed fees, based on message traffic. For the avoidance of doubt, the fixed fees payable by Industry Members pursuant to this paragraph shall, in addition to any other applicable message traffic, include message traffic generated by: (i) an ATS that does not execute orders that is sponsored by such Industry Member; and (ii) routing orders to and from any ATS sponsored by such Industry Member.

(c) The Operating Committee may establish any other fees ancillary to the operation of the CAT that it reasonably determines appropriate, including fees: (i) for the late or inaccurate reporting of information to the CAT; (ii) for correcting submitted information; and (iii) based on access and use of the CAT for regulatory and oversight purposes (and not including any reporting obligations).

(d) The Company shall make publicly available a schedule of effective fees and charges adopted pursuant to this Agreement as in effect from time to time. The Operating Committee shall review such fee schedule on at least an annual basis and shall make any changes to such fee schedule that it deems appropriate. The Operating Committee is authorized to review such fee schedule on a more regular basis, but shall not make any changes on more than a semi-annual basis unless, pursuant to a Supermajority Vote, the Operating Committee concludes that such change is necessary for the adequate funding of the Company.

Section 11.4. ***Collection of Fees.*** The Operating Committee shall establish a system for the collection of fees authorized under this Article XI. The Operating Committee may include such collection responsibility as a function of the Plan Processor or another administrator. Alternatively, the Operating Committee may use the facilities of a clearing agency registered under Section 17A of the Exchange Act to provide for the collection of such fees. Participants shall require each Industry Member to pay all applicable fees authorized under this Article XI within thirty (30) days after receipt of an invoice or other notice indicating payment is due (unless a longer payment period is otherwise indicated). If an Industry Member fails to pay any such fee when due (as determined in accordance with the preceding sentence), such Industry Member shall pay interest on the outstanding balance from such due date until such fee is paid at a per annum rate equal to the lesser of: (a) the Prime Rate plus 300 basis points; or (b) the maximum rate permitted by applicable law. Each Participant shall pay all applicable fees authorized under this Article XI as required by Section 3.7(b).

Section 11.5. ***Fee Disputes.*** Disputes with respect to fees the Company charges Participants pursuant to this Article XI shall be determined by the Operating Committee or a Subcommittee designated by the Operating Committee. Decisions by the Operating Committee or such designated Subcommittee on such matters shall be binding on Participants, without prejudice to the rights of any Participant to seek redress from the SEC pursuant to SEC Rule 608 or in any other appropriate forum. The Participants shall adopt rules requiring that disputes with respect to fees charged to Industry Members pursuant to this Article XI be determined by the Operating Committee or a Subcommittee. Decisions by the Operating Committee or Subcommittee on such matters shall be binding on Industry Members, without prejudice to the rights of any Industry Member to seek redress from the SEC pursuant to SEC Rule 608 or in any other appropriate forum.

ARTICLE XII

MISCELLANEOUS

Section 12.1. ***Notices and Addresses.*** All notices required to be given under this Agreement shall be in writing and may be delivered by certified or registered mail, postage prepaid, by hand, or by any private overnight courier service. Such notices shall be mailed or delivered to the Participants at the addresses set forth on *Exhibit A* to this Agreement or such other address as a Participant may notify the other Participants of in writing. Any notices to be sent to the Company shall be delivered to the principal place of business of the Company or at such other address as the Operating Committee may specify in a notice sent to all of the Participants. Notices shall be effective: (i) if mailed, on the date three (3) days after the date of mailing; or (ii) if hand delivered or delivered by private courier, on the date of delivery.

Section 12.2. ***Governing Law; Submission to Jurisdiction.*** This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the Delaware Act and internal laws and decisions of the State of Delaware without giving effect to any choice or conflict of law provision or rule (whether of the State of Delaware or any other jurisdiction) that would cause the application of laws of any jurisdictions other than those of the State of Delaware; *provided* that the rights and obligations of the Participants, Industry Members and other Persons contracting with the Company in respect of the matters covered by this Agreement shall at all times also be subject to any applicable provisions of the Exchange Act and any rules and regulations promulgated thereunder. Each of the Company and the Participants: (a) consents to submit itself to the exclusive personal jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery of the State of Delaware, New Castle County, or, if that court does not have jurisdiction, a federal court sitting in Wilmington, Delaware in any action or proceeding arising out of or relating to this Agreement or any of the transactions contemplated by this Agreement; (b) agrees that all claims in respect of such action or proceeding shall be heard and determined only in any such court; (c) agrees that it shall not attempt to deny or defeat such personal jurisdiction by motion or other request for leave from any such court; and (d) agrees not to bring any action or proceeding arising out of or relating to this Agreement or any of the transaction contemplated by this Agreement in any other court. Each of the Company and the Participants waives any defense of inconvenient forum to the maintenance of any action or proceeding so brought and waives any bond, surety or other security that might be required of any other Person with respect thereto. The Company or any Participant may make service on the Company or any other Participant by sending or delivering a copy of the process to the party to be served at the address and in the manner provided for the giving of notices in Section 12.1. Nothing in this Section 12.2, however, shall affect the right of any Person to serve legal process in any other manner permitted by law.

Section 12.3. ***Amendments.*** Except as provided by Section 3.3, Section 3.4, Section 3.7, *and* Section 5.3, [and Section 8.2,] this Agreement may be amended from time to time only by a written amendment authorized by the affirmative vote of not less than two-thirds of all of the Participants or with respect to Section 3.8 by the affirmative vote of all of the Participants, in each case that has been approved by the SEC pursuant to SEC Rule 608 or has otherwise become effective under SEC Rule 608. Notwithstanding the foregoing or anything else to the contrary, to the extent the SEC grants exemptive relief applicable to any provision of this Agreement, Participants and Industry Members shall be entitled to comply with such provision pursuant to the terms of the exemptive relief so granted at the time such relief is granted irrespective of whether this Agreement has been amended.

Section 12.4. ***Successors and Assigns.*** Subject to the restrictions on Transfers set forth herein, this Agreement: (a) shall be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the Company and the Participants, and their respective successors and permitted assigns; and (b) may not be assigned except in connection with a Transfer of Company Interests permitted hereunder.

Section 12.5. ***Counterparts.*** This Agreement may be executed in multiple counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which shall constitute one instrument. Any counterpart may be delivered by facsimile transmission or by electronic communication in portable document format (.pdf) or tagged image format (.tif), and the parties hereto agree that their electronically transmitted signatures shall have the same effect as manually transmitted signatures.

Section 12.6. ***Modifications to be in Writing; Waivers.*** This Agreement constitutes the entire understanding of the parties hereto with respect to the subject matter hereof, and no amendment, modification or alteration shall be binding unless the same is in writing and adopted in accordance with Section 12.3. No waiver of any provision of this Agreement shall be valid unless the same shall be in writing and signed by each Person granting the waiver. No waiver by any Person of any default or breach hereunder, whether intentional or not,

shall be deemed to extend to any prior or subsequent default or breach or affect in any way any rights arising by virtue of any prior or subsequent such occurrence.

Section 12.7. ***Captions.*** The captions are inserted for convenience of reference only and shall not affect the construction of this Agreement.

Section 12.8. ***Validity and Severability.*** If any provision of this Agreement shall be held invalid or unenforceable, that shall not affect the validity or enforceability of any other provisions of this Agreement, all of which shall remain in full force and effect. If the final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction declares that any term or provision hereof is invalid or unenforceable, each of the Company and the Participants agrees that the body making the determination of invalidity or unenforceability shall have the power to reduce the scope, duration or area of the term or provision, to delete specific words or phrases, or to replace any invalid or unenforceable term or provision with a term or provision that is valid and enforceable and that comes closest to expressing the intention of the invalid or unenforceable term or provision, and this Agreement shall be enforceable as so modified.

Section 12.9. ***Third Party Beneficiaries.*** Except to the extent provided in any separate written agreement between the Company and another Person, the provisions of this Agreement are not intended to be for the benefit of any creditor or other Person (other than a Participant in its capacity as such) to whom any debts, liabilities or obligations are owed by (or who otherwise has any claim against) the Company or any Participants. Moreover, notwithstanding anything contained in this Agreement (but subject to the immediately following sentence), no such creditor or other Person shall obtain any rights under this Agreement or shall, by reason of this Agreement, make any claim in respect of any debt, liability or obligation (or otherwise) against the Company or any Participant. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Section 12.9, each Person entitled to indemnification under Section 4.8 that is not a party to this Agreement shall be deemed to be an express third party beneficiary of this Agreement for all purposes relating to such Person's indemnification and exculpation rights hereunder.

Section 12.10. ***Expenses.*** Except as may be otherwise specifically provided to the contrary in this Agreement, including in Article XI, or as may be otherwise determined by the Operating Committee, each of the Company and the Participants shall bear its own internal costs and expenses incurred in connection with this Agreement, including those incurred in connection with all periodic meetings of the Participants or the Operating Committee, and the transactions contemplated hereby.

Section 12.11. ***Specific Performance.*** Each of the Company and the Participants acknowledges and agrees that one or more of them would be damaged irreparably in the event any of the provisions of this Agreement are not performed in accordance with their specific terms or otherwise are breached. Accordingly, each such Person agrees that each other such Person may be entitled to an injunction or injunctions to prevent breaches of the provisions of this Agreement and to enforce specifically this Agreement and the terms and provisions hereof in any action instituted in any court having jurisdiction over the Parties and the matter, in each case with no need to post bond or other security.

Section 12.12. ***Waiver of Partition.*** Each Participant agrees that irreparable damage would be done to the Company if any Participant brought an action in court to partition the assets or properties of the Company. Accordingly, each Participant agrees that such Person shall not, either directly or indirectly, take any action to require partition or appraisal of the Company or of any of the assets or properties of the Company, and notwithstanding any provisions of this Agreement to the contrary, each Participant (and such Participant's successors and permitted assigns) accepts the provisions of this Agreement as such Person's sole entitlement on termination, dissolution and/or liquidation of the Company and hereby irrevocably waives any and all right to maintain any action for partition or to compel any sale or other liquidation with respect to such Person's interest, in or with respect to, any assets or properties of the Company. Each Participant agrees not to petition a court for the dissolution, termination or liquidation of the Company.

Section 12.13. ***Construction.*** The Company and all Participants have participated jointly in negotiating and drafting this Agreement. If an ambiguity or a question of intent or interpretation arises, this Agreement shall be construed as if drafted jointly by the Company and all Participants, and no presumption or burden of proof shall arise favoring or disfavoring any Person by virtue of the authorship of any provision of this Agreement.

Section 12.14. ***Incorporation of Exhibits, Appendices, Attachments, Recitals and Schedules.*** The Exhibits, Appendices, Attachments, Recitals and Schedules identified in this Agreement are incorporated herein by reference and made a part hereof.

[SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Participants have executed this Limited Liability Company Agreement as of the day and year first above written.

PARTICIPANTS:

[BATS EXCHANGE, INC.]

BATS BZX EXCHANGE, INC.

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

[BATS Y–EXCHANGE, INC.]

BATS BYX EXCHANGE, INC.

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

BOX OPTIONS EXCHANGE LLC

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

C2 OPTIONS EXCHANGE, INCORPORATED

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

CHICAGO BOARD OPTIONS EXCHANGE, INCORPORATED

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

CHICAGO STOCK EXCHANGE, INC.

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

[EDGA EXCHANGE, INC.]

BATS EDGA EXCHANGE, INC.

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

[EDGX EXCHANGE, INC.]

BATS EDGX EXCHANGE, INC.

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

FINANCIAL INDUSTRY REGULATORY AUTHORITY, INC.

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

ISE GEMINI, LLC

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

ISE MERCURY, LLC

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

INTERNATIONAL SECURITIES EXCHANGE, LLC

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

INVESTORS' EXCHANGE, LLC

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

MIAMI INTERNATIONAL SECURITIES EXCHANGE LLC

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

[NASDAQ OMX BX, INC.]

NASDAQ BX, INC.

By: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

[NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC]

NASDAQ PHLX LLC

By: _____

Name: _____
Title: _____

THE NASDAQ STOCK MARKET LLC

By: _____
Name: _____
Title: _____

NATIONAL STOCK EXCHANGE, INC.

By: _____

Name: _____
Title: _____

NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE LLC

By: _____
Name: _____
Title: _____

NYSE MKT LLC

By: _____

Name: _____
Title: _____

NYSE ARCA, INC.

By: _____
Name: _____
Title: _____

EXHIBIT A

PARTICIPANTS IN CAT NMS, LLC

[BATS Exchange, Inc.] *Bats BZX Exchange, Inc.,* 8050 Marshall Drive, Lenexa, KS 66214.

C2 Options Exchange, Incorporated, 400 South LaSalle St., Chicago, IL 60605.

[EDGA Exchange, Inc.] *Bats EDGA Exchange, Inc.,* 8050 Marshall Drive Lenexa, KS 66214.

ISE Gemini, LLC, 60 Broad Street, New York, New York 10004.

[NASDAQ OMX BX, Inc.] *NASDAQ BX, Inc.,* One Liberty Plaza, 165 Broadway, New York, NY 10006.

National Stock Exchange, Inc., 101 Hudson Street Suite 1200, Jersey City, NJ 07302.

NYSE Arca, Inc., 11 Wall St., New York, NY 10005.

[BATS Y–Exchange, Inc.] *Bats BYX Exchange, Inc.,* 8050 Marshall Drive, Lenexa, KS 66214.

Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated, 400 South LaSalle St., Chicago, IL 60605.

[EDGX Exchange, Inc.] *Bats EDGX Exchange, Inc.,* 8050 Marshall Drive, Lenexa, KS 66214.

International Securities Exchange, LLC, 60 Broad Street, New York, New York 10004.

[NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC] *NASDAQ PHLX LLC.,* 1900 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

New York Stock Exchange LLC, 11 Wall St., New York, NY 10005.

ISE Mercury, LLC, 60 Broad Street, New York, NY 10004.

BOX Options Exchange LLC, 101 Arch St., Suite 610, Boston, MA 02110.

Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc., 440 South LaSalle St., Suite 800, Chicago, IL 60605.

Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington DC, 20006.

Miami International Securities Exchange LLC, 7 Roszel Road, 5th floor, Princeton, NJ 08540.

The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC, One Liberty Plaza, 165 Broadway, New York, NY 10006.

NYSE MKT LLC, 11 Wall St., New York, NY 10005.

Investors' Exchange, LLC, 4 World Trade Center 44th Floor, New York, NY 10007.

APPENDIX A

Consolidated Audit Trail National Market System Plan Request for Proposal, issued February 26, 2013, version 3.0 updated March 3, 2014

(The Request for Proposal is available at Securities Exchange Act Release No. 77724 (CAT NMS Plan published for comment on May 17, 2016))

Certain provisions of Articles I–XII have been modified as noted on the cover page of this CAT NMS Plan. To the extent text in the following Appendices conflicts with any such modifications, the modified language of Articles I–XII shall control

APPENDIX B

[Reserved]

APPENDIX C

DISCUSSION OF CONSIDERATIONS

SEC Rule 613(a)(1) Considerations

SEC Rule 613(a) requires the Participants to discuss various ''considerations'' related to how the Participants propose to implement the requirements of the CAT NMS Plan, cost estimates for the proposed solution, and a discussion of the costs and benefits of alternate solutions considered but not proposed.[3683] This Appendix C discusses the considerations identified in SEC Rule 613(a). The first section below provides a background of the process the Participants have undertaken to develop and draft the CAT NMS Plan. *Section A* below addresses the requirements, set forth in SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(i) through (a)(1)(vi), that the ''Participants specify and explain the choices they made to meet the requirements specified in [SEC Rule 613] for the [CAT].'' [3684] In many instances, details of the requirements (*i.e.,* the specific technical requirements that the Plan Processor must meet) will be set forth in the Plan Processor Requirements document (''*PPR*''). Relevant portions of the PPR are outlined and described throughout this Appendix C, as well as included as Appendix D.

Section B below discusses the requirements in SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(vii) and SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(viii) that the CAT NMS Plan include detailed estimates of the costs, and the impact on competition, efficiency, and capital formation, for creating, implementing, and maintaining the CAT. The information in *Section B* below is intended to aid the Commission in its economic analysis of the CAT and the CAT NMS Plan.[3685]

Section C below, in accordance with SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(x), establishes objective milestones to assess the Participants' progress toward the implementation of the CAT in accordance with the CAT NMS Plan. This section includes a plan to eliminate existing rules and systems (or components thereof) that will be rendered duplicative by the CAT, as required by SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(ix).

Section D below addresses how the Participants solicited the input of their Industry Members and other appropriate parties in designing the CAT NMS Plan as required by SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(xi).

Capitalized terms used and not otherwise defined in this Appendix C have the respective meanings ascribed to such terms in the Agreement to which this Appendix C is attached.

Background

SEC Rule 613 requires the Participants to jointly file a national market system plan to govern the creation, implementation, and maintenance of the CAT, and the Central Repository. Early in the process, the Participants concluded that the publication of a request for proposal soliciting Bids from interested parties to serve as the Plan Processor for the CAT was necessary prior to filing the CAT NMS Plan to ensure that potential alternative solutions to creating the CAT could be presented and considered by the Participants and that a detailed and meaningful cost/benefit analysis could be performed, both of which are required considerations to be addressed in the CAT NMS Plan. To that end, the Participants published the RFP on February 26, 2013,[3686] and 31 firms formally notified the Participants of their intent to bid.

On September 3, 2013, the Participants filed with the Commission the Selection Plan, a national market system plan to govern the process for Participant review of the Bids submitted in response to the RFP, the procedure for evaluating the Bids, and,

[3683] Securities Exchange Act Release No. 67457 (July 18, 2012), 77 Fed. Reg. 45722, 45789 (Aug. 1, 2012) (''*Adopting Release*'').

[3684] *See* Adopting Release at 45790. *Section B* below includes discussions of reasonable alternatives to approaching the creation, implementation, and maintenance of the CAT that the Participants considered. *See* SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(xii).

[3685] *See* Adopting Release at 45793.

[3686] The initial RFP was amended in March 2014. *See* Consolidated Audit Trail National Market System Plan Request for Proposal (last updated Mar. 3, 2014), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/web/groups/catnms/documents/catnms/p213400.zip* (the ''*RFP*'').

ultimately, selection of the Plan Processor. Several critical components of the Participants' process for formulating and drafting the CAT NMS Plan were contingent upon approval of the Selection Plan, which occurred on February 21, 2014.[3687] Bids in response to the RFP were due four weeks following approval of the Selection Plan, on March 21, 2014. Ten Bids were submitted in response to the RFP.

The Participants considered each Bid in great detail to ensure that the Participants can address the considerations enumerated in SEC Rule 613, including analysis of the costs and benefits of the proposed solution(s), as well as alternative solutions considered but not proposed, so that the Commission and the public will have sufficiently detailed information to carefully consider all aspects of the CAT NMS Plan the Participants ultimately submit. Soon after receiving the Bids, and pursuant to the Selection Plan, the Participants determined that all ten Bids were ''qualified'' pursuant to the Selection Plan.[3688] On July 1, 2014, after the Participants had hosted Bidder presentations to learn additional details regarding the Bids and conducted an analysis and comparison of the Bids, the Participants voted to select six Shortlisted Bidders.

Under the terms of the Selection Plan, and as incorporated into the CAT NMS Plan, the Plan Processor for the CAT has not been selected and will not be selected until after approval of the CAT NMS Plan.[3689] Any one of the six remaining Shortlisted Bidders could be selected as the Plan Processor, and because each Shortlisted Bidder has proposed different approaches to various issues, the CAT NMS Plan does not generally mandate specific technical approaches; rather, it mandates specific requirements that the Plan Processor must meet, regardless of approach. Where possible, this Appendix C discusses specific technical requirements the Participants have deemed necessary for the CAT; however, in some instances, provided the Plan Processor meets certain general obligations, the specific approach taken in implementing aspects of the CAT NMS Plan will be dependent upon the Bidder ultimately selected as the Plan Processor.

SEC Rule 613 also includes provisions to facilitate input on the implementation, operation, and administration of the Central Repository from the broker-dealer industry.[3690] To this end, the Participants formed a Development Advisory Group (''*DAG*'') to solicit industry feedback. Following multiple discussions between the Participants and both the DAG and the Bidders, as well as among the Participants themselves, the Participants recognized that some provisions of SEC Rule 613 would not permit certain solutions to be included in the CAT NMS Plan that the Participants determined advisable to effectuate the most efficient and cost-effective CAT. Consequently, the Participants submitted their original Exemptive Request Letter seeking exemptive relief from the Commission with respect to certain provisions of SEC Rule 613 regarding (1) options market maker quotes; (2) Customer-IDs; (3) CAT-Reporter-IDs; (4) linking of executions to specific subaccount allocations on allocation reports; and (5) timestamp granularity for Manual Order Events.[3691] Specifically, the Participants requested that the Commission grant an exemption from:

- Rule 613(c)(7)(ii) and (iv) for options market makers with regard to their options quotes.
- Rule 613(c)(7)(i)(A), (c)(7)(iv)(F), (c)(7)(viii)(B)and (c)(8) which relate to the requirements for Customer-IDs.[3692]
- Rule 613(c)(7)(i)(C), (c)(7)(ii)(D), (c)(7)(ii)(E), (c)(7)(iii)(D), (c)(7)(iii)(E), (c)(7)(iv)(F), (c)(7)(v)(F), (c)(7)(vi)(B) and (c)(8) which relate to the requirements for CAT-Reporter-IDs.
- Rule 613(c)(7)(vi)(A), which requires CAT Reporters to record and report the account number of any subaccounts to which the execution is allocated.
- The millisecond timestamp granularity requirement in Rule 613(d)(3) for certain Manual Order Events subject to timestamp reporting under Rules 613(c)(7)(i)(E), 613(c)(7)(ii)(C), 613(c)(7)(iii)(C), and 613(c)(7)(iv)(C).

The Participants supplemented their original Exemptive Request Letter with a supplemental Exemptive Request Letter (together, the ''*Exemptive Request Letters*''), clarifying its original requested exemption from the requirement in Rule 613(c)(7)(viii)(B) (including, in some instances, requesting an exemption from the requirement to provide an account number, account type and date account opened under Rule 613(c)(7)(viii)(B)).[3693] The Participants believe that the requested relief is critical to the development of a cost-effective approach to the CAT.

The Participants also will seek to comply with their obligations related to the CAT under Reg SCI as efficiently as possible. When it adopted Reg SCI, the Commission expressed its belief that the CAT ''will be an SCI system of each SCI SRO that is a member of an approved NMS plan under Rule 613, because it will be a facility of each SCI SRO that is a member of such plan.'' [3694] The Participants intend to work together and with the Plan Processor, in consultation with the Commission, to determine a way to effectively and efficiently meet the requirements of Reg SCI without unnecessarily duplicating efforts.

A. Features and Details of the CAT NMS Plan

1. *Reporting Data to the CAT*

As required by SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(i), this section describes the reporting of data to the Central Repository, including the sources of such data and the manner in which the Central Repository will receive, extract, transform, load, and retain such data. As a general matter, the data reported to the Central Repository is of two distinct types: (1) Reference data (e.g., data concerning CAT Reporters and customer information, issue symbology information, and data from the SIPs); and (2) order and trade data submitted by CAT Reporters, including national securities exchanges, national securities associations and broker-dealers. Each of these types of data is discussed separately below.

▪ **Sources of Data**

In general, data will be reported to the Central Repository by national securities exchanges, national securities associations, broker-dealers, the SIPs for the CQS, CTA, UTP and Plan for Reporting of Consolidated Options Last Sale Reports and Quotation Information(''*OPRA*'') Plans, and certain other vendors or appropriate third parties (''*Data Submitters*'').[3695] Specifically, in accordance with SEC Rule 613(c)(5) and Sections 6.3 and 6.4 of the CAT NMS Plan, each national securities exchange and its members must report to the Central Repository the information required by SEC

[3687] The SEC has approved two amendments to the Selection Plan. *See* Securities Exchange Act Rel. No. 75192 (June 17, 2015), 80 Fed. Reg. 36028 (June 23, 2015); and Securities Exchange Act Rel. No.75980 (Sept. 24, 2015), 80 Fed. Reg. 58796 (Sept. 30, 2015).

[3688] *See* Selection Plan, 78 Fed. Reg. 69910, Ex. A §§ I(Q) (defining ''Qualified Bid''), VI(A) (providing the process for determining whether Bids are determined to be ''Qualified Bids'').

[3689] *See* Selection Plan § 6; *see also id.* Article V.

[3690] *See* SEC Rules 613(a)(1)(xi) and 613(b)(7).

[3691] *See* original Exemptive Request Letter, *available at http://catnmsplan.com/web/groups/catnms/@catnms/documents/appsupportdocs/p602383.pdf.*

[3692] *See* Participants' Proposed RFP Concepts Document (last updated Jan. 16, 2013) (the ''*Proposed RFP Concepts Document*''). The Proposed RFP Concepts Document was posted on the Consolidated Audit Trail NMS Plan website, *http://catnmsplan.com* (the ''*CAT NMS Plan Website*'').

[3693] *See* Letter from the Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, SEC re: Supplement to Request for Exemptive Relief from Certain Provisions of SEC Rule 613 of Regulation NMS under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Sept. 2, 2015), available at the CAT NMS Plan Website. Separately, on April 3, 2015, the Participants filed with the Commission examples demonstrating how the proposed request for exemptive relief related to allocations would operate; this filing did not substantively update or amend the Exemptive Request Letter. *See* Letter from the Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, SEC re: Supplement to Request for Exemptive Relief from Certain Provisions of SEC Rule 613 of Regulation NMS under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Apr. 3, 2015), available at the CAT NMS Plan Website.

[3694] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 73639 (Nov. 19, 2014), 79 Fed. Reg. 72252, 72275 n. 246 (Dec. 5, 2014) (adopting Reg SCI and citing the Adopting Release at 45774).

[3695] *See* Adopting Release at 45748 n.278 (noting that ''the Rule does not preclude the NMS plan from allowing broker-dealers to use a third party to report the data required to the central repository on their behalf''). The Participants note that CAT Reporters using third party service providers to submit information on their behalf would still be responsible for all the data submitted on their behalf. The term ''CAT Reporters'' is generally used to refer to those parties that are required by SEC Rule 613 and the CAT NMS Plan to submit data to the CAT (i.e., national securities exchanges, national securities associations, and members thereof). The term ''Data Submitters'' includes those third-parties that may submit data to the CAT on behalf of CAT Reporters as well as outside parties that are not required to submit data to the CAT but from which the CAT may receive data (e.g., SIPs). Thus, all CAT Reporters are Data Submitters, but not all Data Submitters are CAT Reporters.

Rule 613(c)(7) for each NMS Security registered or listed for trading on such exchange or admitted to unlisted trading privileged on such exchange (subject to relief pursuant to the Exemptive Request Letters).[3696] Similarly, in accordance with SEC Rule 613(c)(6), each national securities association and its members must report to the Central Repository the information required by SEC Rule 613(c)(7) for each NMS Security for which transaction reports are required to be submitted to the association (subject to relief pursuant to the Exemptive Request Letters). Additionally, the Participants, in consultation with the DAG and with industry support, have determined to include OTC Equity Securities in the initial phase-in of the CAT; thus, CAT Reporters must also include order and trade information regarding orders for OTC Equity Securities in addition to those involving NMS Securities.[3697]

In addition to order and execution data, SEC Rule 613 requires Industry Members to report customer information, including Customer-IDs, to the CAT so that order and execution data can be associated with particular Customers. However, in the Exemptive Request Letters, the Participants request relief that would permit CAT Reporters to provide information to the Central Repository using Firm Designated IDs instead of Customer-IDs. In addition, Industry Members are permitted to use Data Submitters that are not national securities exchanges, national securities associations, or members thereof to report the required data to the Central Repository on their behalf. The approach proposed in the Exemptive Request Letters also would permit Data Submitters to provide information to the Central Repository using Firm Designated ID for purposes of reporting information to the CAT.

The Central Repository also is required to collect National Best Bid and National Best Offer information, transaction reports reported to an effective transaction reporting plan filed with the SEC pursuant to SEC Rule 601, and Last Sale Reports reported pursuant to the OPRA Plan.[3698] Consequently, the Plan Processor must receive information from the SIPs for those plans and incorporate that information into the CAT. Lastly, as set forth in Appendix D, the Plan Processor must maintain a complete symbology database, including historical symbology. CAT Reporters will submit data to the CAT with the listing exchange symbology format, and the CAT must use the listing exchange symbology format in the display of linked data. The Participants will be responsible for providing the Plan Processor with issue symbol information, and issue symbol validation must be included in the processing of data submitted by CAT Reporters.

After reviewing the Bids and receiving industry input, the Participants do not believe there is a need to dictate that the Plan Processor adopt a particular format for the submission of data to the Central Repository. Rather, regardless of the format(s) adopted, the CAT must be able to monitor incoming and outgoing data feeds and be capable of performing the following functions:

Support daily files from each CAT Reporter;

Support files that cover multiple days (for re-transmission);

Support error correction files;

Capture operational logs of transmissions, success, failure reasons, etc.; and

Support real-time and batch feeds.

The Plan Processor will be required to ensure that each CAT Reporter is able to access its submissions for error correction purposes and transmit their data to the Central Repository on a daily basis. The Plan Processer must have a robust file management tool that is commercially available, including key management. In addition, at a minimum, the Plan Processor must be able to accept data from CAT Reporters and other Data Submitters via automated means (e.g., Secure File Transfer Protocol (''*SFTP*'')) as well as manual entry means (e.g., GUI interface).

The Plan Processor will be required to ensure that all file processing stages are handled correctly. This will include the start and stop of data reception, the recovery of data that is transmitted, the retransmission of data from CAT Reporters, and the resynchronization of data after any data loss. At a minimum, this will require the Plan Processor to have logic that identifies duplication of files. If transmission is interrupted, the Plan Processor must specify:

data recovery process for partial submissions;
operational logs/reporting;
operational controls for receipt of data; and
managing/handling failures.

The Plan Processor is required to establish a method for developing an audit trail of data submitted to and received by the Central Repository. This must include a validation of files to identify file corruption and incomplete transmissions. As discussed more fully below, an acknowledgement of data receipt and information on rejected data must be transmitted to CAT Reporters.

1. *Data Submission for Orders and Reportable Events, including Manual Submission*

Sections 6.3 and 6.4 of the CAT NMS Plan require CAT Reporters to provide details for each order and each Reportable Event to the Central Repository.[3699] In the RFP, the Participants requested that the Bidders describe the following:

system interfaces, including data submission, data access and user interfaces; [3700]
the proposed messaging and communication protocol(s) used in data submission and retrieval and the advantage(s) of such protocol(s); [3701]
the process and associated protocols for accepting batch submissions; [3702] and
the process and any associated protocols for supporting manual data submissions.[3703]

2. *The Timing of Reporting Data*

Pursuant to SEC Rule 613(c)(3), Sections 6.3 and 6.4 of the CAT NMS Plan require that CAT Reporters report certain order and transaction information recorded pursuant to SEC Rule 613 or the CAT NMS Plan to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time on the Trading Day following the day such information is recorded.[3704] SEC Rule 613(c)(3) notes, however, that the CAT NMS Plan ''may accommodate voluntary reporting prior to 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time, but shall not impose an earlier deadline on the reporting parties.'' Sections 6.3 and 6.4 of the CAT NMS Plan explicitly permit, but do not require, CAT Reporters to submit information to the CAT throughout the day. Because of the amount of data that will ultimately be reported to the CAT, the Participants have decided to permit Data Submitters to report data to the CAT as end of day files (submitted by 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time the following Trading Day) or throughout the day. The Participants believe that permitting Data Submitters to report data throughout the day may reduce the total amount of bandwidth used by the Plan Processor to receive data files and will allow CAT Reporters and other Data Submitters to determine which method is most efficient and cost-effective for them. However, the Plan Processor will still be required to have the capacity to handle two times the historical peak daily volume to ensure that, if CAT Reporters choose to submit data on an end-of-day basis, the Plan Processor can handle the influx of data.[3705]

3. *Customer and Customer Account Information*

In addition to the submission of order and trade data, broker-dealer CAT Reporters must also submit customer information to the CAT so that the order and trade data can be matched to the specific customer.[3706] SEC

[3696] As noted, the Participants submitted the Exemptive Request Letters to facilitate compliance with the goals and purposes of the rule while minimizing the impact on existing market practices and reducing burdens on both Participants and broker-dealers.

[3697] *See* SIFMA Industry Recommendations for the Creation of the Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT) at 70 (Mar. 28, 2013) (''*SIFMA Recommendations*''), *available at http://www.sifma.org/workarea/downloadasset.aspx?id=8589942773.* Section 1.1 of the CAT NMS Plan includes OTC Equity Securities as ''Eligible Securities.'' As discussed in Appendix C, Plan to Eliminate Existing Rules and Systems (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(ix)), inclusion of OTC Equity Securities in the initial phase of the CAT should facilitate the retirement of FINRA's Order Audit Trail System (''*OATS*'') and reduce costs to the industry.

[3698] SEC Rule 613(e)(7).

[3699] *See* SEC Rule 613(c)(7).

[3700] RFP Question 49.

[3701] RFP Questions 59–60.

[3702] RFP Question 62.

[3703] RFP Question 63.

[3704] SEC Rule 613 and Sections 6.3 and 6.4 of the CAT NMS Plan permit certain other information to be reported by 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time on the Trading Day following the day the CAT Reporter receives the information. *See* SEC Rule 613(c)(4), (c)(7)(vi)–(viii).

[3705] SIFMA's recommendations to the Participants regarding the CAT indicates support for the ability of Data Submitters to submit data in batch or near-real-time reporting. *See* SIFMA Recommendations, at 55.

[3706] As noted above, the term ''customer'' means ''(i) [t]he account holder(s) of the account at a broker-dealer originating an order, and (ii) [a]ny person from whom the broker-dealer is authorized to accept trading instructions for such account, if

Rule 613(c)(7) sets forth data recording and reporting requirements that must be included in the CAT NMS Plan. Under SEC Rule 613(c)(7)(i)(A), the CAT NMS Plan must require each CAT Reporter to record and report ''Customer-ID(s) for each customer'' when reporting to the CAT order receipt or origination information.[3707] When reporting the modification or cancellation of an order, the rule further requires the reporting of ''the Customer-ID of the Person giving the modification or cancellation instruction.''[3708] In addition, SEC Rule 613(c)(8) mandates that all CAT Reporters ''use the same Customer-ID . . . for each customer and broker-dealer.''[3709] For purposes of SEC Rule 613, ''Customer-ID'' means, ''with respect to a customer, a code that uniquely identifies such customer for purposes of providing data to the central repository.''[3710] Also, SEC Rule 613(c)(7)(viii) requires that, for original receipt or origination of an order, CAT Reporters report ''customer account information,'' which is defined as including ''account number, account type, customer type, date account opened, and large trader identifier (if applicable).''[3711]

After considering the requirements of SEC Rule 613 with respect to recording and reporting Customer-IDs, Customer Account Information, and information of sufficient detail to identify the Customer as well as industry input and the Commission's reasons for adopting these requirements, the Participants requested that Industry Members and other industry participants provide ideas on implementing the Customer-ID requirement. After careful consideration, including numerous discussions with the DAG, the Participants concluded that the CAT NMS Plan should use a reporting model that requires broker-dealers to provide detailed account and Customer information to the Central Repository, including the specific identities of all Customers associated with each account, and have the Central Repository correlate the Customer information across broker-dealers, assign a unique customer identifier to each Customer (i.e., the Customer-ID), and use that unique customer identifier consistently across all CAT Data (hereinafter, the ''Customer Information Approach'').

Under the Customer Information Approach, the CAT NMS Plan would require each broker-dealer to assign a unique Firm Designated ID to each customer, as that term is defined in SEC Rule 613. For the Firm Designated ID, broker-dealers would be permitted to use an account number or any other identifier defined by the firm, provided each identifier is unique across the firm for each business date (i.e., a single firm may not have multiple separate customers with the same identifier on any given date). Under the Customer Information Approach, broker-dealers must submit an initial set of customer information to the Central Repository, including, as applicable, the Firm Designated ID for the customer, name, address, date of birth, Individual Tax ID (''*ITIN*'')/social security number (''*SSN*''), individual's role in the account (e.g., primary holder, joint holder, guardian, trustee, person with the power of attorney) and Legal Entity Identifier (''*LEI*''),[3712] and/or Large Trader ID (''*LTID*''), if applicable.[3713] Under the Customer Information Approach, broker-dealers would be required to submit to the Central Repository daily updates for reactivated accounts, newly established or revised Firm Designated IDs, or associated reportable Customer information.[3714]

Within the Central Repository, each Customer would be uniquely identified by identifiers or a combination of identifiers such as TIN/SSN, date of birth, and, as applicable, LEI and LTID. The Plan Processor would be required to use these unique identifiers to map orders to specific customers across all broker-dealers. Broker-dealers would therefore be required to report only Firm Designated ID information on each new order submitted to the Central Repository rather than the ''Customer-ID'' as set forth in SEC Rule 613(c)(7), and the Plan Processor would associate specific customers and their Customer-IDs with individual order events based on the reported Firm Designated ID.

The Customer-ID approach is strongly supported by the industry as it believes that to do otherwise would interfere with existing business practices and risk leaking proprietary order and customer information into the market.[3715] To adopt such an approach, however, requires certain exemptions from the requirements of SEC Rule 613. Therefore, the Participants included the Customer Information Approach in the Exemptive Request Letters so that this approach could be included in the CAT NMS Plan.

In addition to the approach described above, the CAT NMS Plan details a number of requirements which the Plan Processor must meet regarding Customer and Customer Account Information.

The Plan Processor must maintain information of sufficient detail to uniquely and consistently identify each Customer across all CAT Reporters, and associated accounts from each CAT Reporter. The Plan Processor must document and publish, with the approval of the Operating Committee, the minimum list of attributes to be captured to maintain this association.

The CAT Processor must maintain valid Customer and Customer Account Information for each Trading Day and provide a method for Participants and the SEC to easily obtain historical changes to that information (e.g., name changes, address changes).

The CAT Processor will design and implement a robust data validation process for submitted Firm Designated ID, Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information.

The Plan Processor must be able to link accounts that move from one CAT Reporter to another due to mergers and acquisitions, divestitures, and other events. Under the approach proposed by the Participants, broker-dealers will initially submit full account lists for all active accounts to the Plan Processor and subsequently submit updates and changes on a daily basis.[3716] In addition, the Plan Processor must have a process to periodically receive full account lists to ensure the completeness and accuracy of the account database.

In the RFP, the Participants asked for a description of how Customer and Customer Account Information will be captured, updated and stored with associated detail sufficient to identify each Customer.[3717] All Bidders anticipated Customer and Customer Account Information to be captured in an initial download of data. The precise method(s) by which CAT Reporters submit Customer data to the Central Repository will be set out in the Technical Specifications provided by the Plan Processor in accordance with Section 6.9 of the CAT NMS Plan. Data capture would occur using both file-based and entry screen methods. Data validation would check for potential duplicates with error messages being generated for follow-up by CAT Reporters. Data Reporters can update data as needed or on a predetermined schedule.

4. *Error Reporting*

SEC Rule 613(e)(6) requires the prompt correction of errors in data submitted to the Central Repository. As discussed in Appendix C, Time and Method by which CAT Data will be Available to Regulators, initial validation, lifecycle linkages, and communications of errors to CAT Reporters will be required to occur by 12:00 p.m. Eastern Time T+1 and corrected data will be required to be resubmitted to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time on T+3.

different than the account holder(s).'' SEC Rule 613(j)(3).

[3707] SEC Rule 613(c)(7)(i)(A).

[3708] SEC Rule 613(c)(7)(iv)(F).

[3709] SEC Rule 613(c)(8).

[3710] SEC Rule 613(j)(5).

[3711] SEC Rule 613(j)(4).

[3712] Where a validated LEI is available for a Customer or entity, it may obviate the need to report other identifier information (e.g., Customer name, address).

[3713] The Participants anticipate that Customer information that is initially reported to the CAT could be limited to only customer accounts that have, or are expected to have, CAT-reportable activity. For example, accounts that are considered open, but have not traded Eligible Securities in a given timeframe may not need to be pre-established in the CAT, but rather could be reported as part of daily updates after they have CAT-reportable activity.

[3714] Because reporting to the CAT is on an end-of-day basis, intra-day changes to information could be captured as part of the daily updates to the information. *See* SEC Rule 613(c)(3). To ensure the completeness and accuracy of Customer information and associations, in addition to daily updates, broker-dealers would be required to submit periodic full refreshes of Customer information to the CAT. The scope of the ''full'' Customer information refresh would need to be further defined, with the assistance of the Plan Processor, to determine the extent to which inactive or otherwise terminated accounts would need to be reported.

[3715] SIFMA Recommendations at 30–31; Financial Industry Forum (FIF) Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT) Working Group Response to Proposed RFP Concepts Document at 12 (Jan. 18, 2013), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/industryFeedback/P197808* (''*FIF Response*'').

[3716] ''Active accounts'' are defined as accounts that have had activity within the last six months.

[3717] RFP Question 1.

Each of the Bidders indicated that it was able to meet these timeframes.

However, the industry expressed concern that reducing the error repair window will constitute a significant burden to Data Submitters and also question whether the proposed error correction timeframe is possible.[3718] Financial Information Forum (''*FIF*'') supports maintaining the current OATS Error Handling timelines, which allows for error correction within five OATS business days from the date of original submission.[3719] Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (''*SIFMA*'') also recommends a five-day window for error correction.[3720] Nevertheless, the Participants believe that it is imperative to the utility of the Central Repository that corrected data be available to regulators as soon as possible and recommend the three-day window for corrections to balance the need for regulators to access corrected data in a timely manner while considering the industry's concerns.

▪ The Manner in which the Central Repository will Receive, Extract, Transform, Load, and Retain Data

The Central Repository must receive, extract, transform, load, and retain the data submitted by CAT Reporters and other Data Submitters. In addition, the Plan Processor is responsible for ensuring that the CAT contains all versions of data submitted by a CAT Reporter or other Data Submitter (i.e., the Central Repository must include different versions of the same information, including such things as errors and corrected data).[3721]

In the RFP, the Participants requested that each Bidder perform a detailed analysis of current industry systems and interface specifications to propose and develop their own format for collecting data from the various data sources relevant under SEC Rule 613, as outlined in the RFP. Bidders also were requested to perform an analysis on their ability to develop, test and integrate this interface with the CAT.[3722] In addition, the Participants sought input from the industry regarding different data submission mechanisms and whether there needs to be a method to allow broker-dealers with very small order volumes to submit their data in a non-automated manner.[3723]

As noted above, since the Central Repository is required to collect and transform customer, order and trade information from multiple sources, the RFP requested that Bidders describe:

how Customer and Customer Account Information will be captured, updated and stored with associated detail sufficient to identify each customer;[3724]

the system interfaces, including data submission, data access and user interfaces;[3725]

the proposed messaging and communication protocol(s) used in data submission and retrieval and the advantage(s) of such protocol(s);[3726]

the process and associated protocols for accepting batch submissions;[3727] and

the process and any associated protocols for supporting manual data submissions.[3728]

Various Bidders proposed multiple methods by which Data Reporters could report information to the Central Repository. Bidders proposed secure VPN, direct line access through TCP/IP or at co-location centers, and web-based manual data entry.

The RFP also requested that Bidders describe:

the overall technical architecture;[3729] and

the network architecture and describe how the solution will handle the necessary throughput, processing timeline and resubmissions.[3730]

There are two general approaches by which the Central Repository could receive information. Approach 1 described a scenario in which broker-dealers would submit relevant data to the Central Repository using their choice of existing industry messaging protocols, such as the Financial Information eXchange (''*FIX*'') protocol. Approach 2 provided a scenario in which broker-dealers would submit relevant data to the Central Repository using a defined or specified format, such as an augmented version of OATS.

Following receipt of data files, the Plan Processor will be required to send an acknowledgement of data received to CAT Reporters and third party Data Submitters. This acknowledgement will enable CAT Reporters to create an audit trail of their data submissions and allow for tracing of data breakdowns if data is not received. The minimum requirements for receipt acknowledgement are detailed in Appendix D, Receipt of Data from Reporters.

Once the Central Repository has received the data from the CAT Reporters, it will extract individual records from the data, and validate the data through a review process that must be described in the Technical Specifications involving context, syntax, and matching validations. The Plan Processor will need to validate data and report back to any CAT Reporter any data that has not passed validation checks according to the requirements in Appendix D, Receipt of Data from Reporters. To ensure the accuracy and integrity of the data in the Central Repository, data that does not pass the basic validation checks performed by the Plan Processor must be rejected until it has been corrected by the CAT Reporter responsible for submitting the data/file. After the Plan Processor has processed the data, it must provide daily statistics regarding the number of records accepted and rejected to each CAT Reporter.

The Plan Processor also will be required to capture rejected records for each CAT Reporter and make them available to the CAT Reporter. The ''rejects'' file must be accessible via an electronic file format, and the rejections and daily statistics must also be available via a web interface. The Plan Processor must provide functionality for CAT Reporters to amend records that contain exceptions. The Plan Processor must also support bulk error correction so that rejected records can be resubmitted as a new file with appropriate indicators for rejection repairs. The Plan Processor must, in these instances, reprocess repaired records. In addition, a web GUI must be available for CAT Reporters to make updates, including corrections, to individual records or attributes. The Plan Processor must maintain a detailed audit trail capturing corrections to and replacements of records.

The Plan Processor must provide CAT Reporters with documentation that details how to amend/upload records that fail the required validations, and if a record does not pass basic validations, such as syntax rejections, then it must be rejected and sent back to the CAT Reporter as soon as possible, so it can be repaired and resubmitted.[3731] In order for regulators to have access to accurate and complete data as expeditiously as practicable, the Plan Processor will provide CAT Reporters with their error reports as they become available, and daily statistics must be provided after data has been uploaded and validated. The reports will include descriptive details as to why each data record was rejected by the Plan Processor.

In addition, on a monthly basis, the Plan Processor should produce and publish reports detailing CAT Reporter performance and comparison statistics, similar to the report cards published for OATS presently. These reports should include data to enable CAT Reporters to assess their performance in comparison to the rest of their industry peers and to help them assess the risk related to their reporting of transmitted data.

CAT Reporters will report data to the Central Repository either in a uniform electronic format, or in a manner that would allow the Central Repository to convert the data to a uniform electronic format, for consolidation and storage. The Technical Specifications will describe the required format for data reported to the Central Repository. Results of a study conducted of broker-dealers showed average implementation and maintenance costs for use of a new file format to be lower than those for use of an existing file format (e.g., FIX)[3732], although an FIF ''Response to Proposed RFP Concepts Document'' dated January 18, 2013 did indicate a preference

[3718] FIF Response at 35.

[3719] *Id.*

[3720] SIFMA Recommendations at 62.

[3721] Data retention requirements by the Central Repository are discussed more fully in Appendix D, Functionality of the CAT System.

[3722] RFP § 2.3 at 19.

[3723] SEC Rule 613: Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT), Questions for Industry Consideration, *available at http://catnmsplan.com/QuestionsforIndustryConsideration.*

[3724] RFP Question 1.

[3725] RFP Question 49.

[3726] RFP Questions 59–60.

[3727] RFP Question 62.

[3728] RFP Question 63.

[3729] RFP Question 43.

[3730] RFP Question 50.

[3731] The industry supports receiving information on reporting errors as soon as possible to enable CAT Reporters to address errors in a timely manner. *See* FIF Response at 36.

[3732] *See* Appendix C, Analysis of Expected Benefits and Estimated Costs for Creating, Implementing, and Maintaining the Consolidated Audit Trail (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(vii)), for additional details on cost studies.

among its members for use of the FIX protocol.

As noted above, the specific formats of data submission and loading will depend upon the Bidder chosen as the Plan Processor. Regardless of the ultimate Plan Processor, however, data submitted to the CAT will be loaded into the Central Repository in accordance with procedures that are subject to approval by the Operating Committee.[3733] The Central Repository will retain data, including the Raw Data, linked data, and corrected data, for at least six years. Data submitted to the Central Repository, including rejections and corrections, must be stored in repositories designed to hold information based on the classification of the Data Submitter (e.g., whether the Data Submitter is a Participant, a broker-dealer, or a third party Data Submitter). After ingestion by the Central Repository, the Raw Data must be transformed into a format appropriate for data querying and regulatory output.

SEC Rule 613 reflects the fact that the Participants can choose from alternative methods to link order information to create an order lifecycle from origination or receipt to cancellation or execution.[3734] After review of the Bids and discussions with Industry Members, the CAT NMS Plan reflects the fact that the Participants have determined that the ''daisy chain'' approach to CAT-Order-ID that requires linking of order events rather than the repeated transmission of an order ID throughout an order's lifecycle is appropriate. This approach is widely supported by the industry, and using the daisy chain approach should minimize impact on existing OATS reporters, since OATS already uses this type of linking.[3735] The RFP asked Bidders to propose any additional alternatives to order lifecycle creation; however, all of the Bidders indicated that they would use the daisy chain approach to link order events.[3736]

In the daisy chain approach, a series of unique order identifiers assigned by CAT Reporters to individual order events are linked together by the CAT and assigned a single CAT-generated CAT-Order-ID that is associated with each individual order event and used to create the complete lifecycle of an order. Under this approach, each CAT Reporter generates its own unique order ID but can pass a different identifier as the order is routed to another CAT Reporter, and the CAT will link related order events from all CAT Reporters involved in the life of the order.[3737]

The Participants believe that the daisy chain approach can handle anticipated order handling scenarios, including aggregation and disaggregation, and generally apply to both equities and options. The Participants created a subcommittee of DAG members and Participants to walk through multiple complex order-handling scenarios to ensure that the daisy chain approach can handle even the most complex of order handling methods.[3738]

Additionally, the daisy chain approach can handle representative order reporting scenarios[3739] and order handling scenarios sometimes referred to as ''complex orders'' that are specific to options and may include an equity component and multiple option components (e.g., buy-write, straddle, strangle, ratio spread, butterfly and qualified contingent transactions). Typically, these orders are referenced by exchange systems on a net credit/debit basis, which can cover between two and twelve different components. Such ''complex orders'' must also be handled and referenced within the CAT. The Bidder must develop, in close consultation with Industry Members, a linking mechanism that will allow the CAT to link the option leg(s) to the related equity leg or the individual options components to each other in a multi-leg strategy scenario.

Once a lifecycle is assembled by the CAT, individual lifecycle events must be stored so that each unique event (e.g., origination, route, execution, modification) can be quickly and easily associated with the originating customer(s) for both targeted queries and comprehensive data scans. For example, an execution on an exchange must be linked to the originating customer(s) regardless of how the order may have been aggregated, disaggregated, and routed through multiple broker-dealers before being sent to the exchange for execution.

The Plan Processor must transform and load the data in a way that provides the Participants with the ability to build and generate targeted queries against data in the Central Repository across product classes submitted to the Central Repository. The Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC must be able to create, adjust, and save ad-hoc queries to provide data to the regulators that can then be used for their market surveillance purposes. All data fields may be included in the result set from targeted queries. Because of the size of the Central Repository and its use by multiple parties simultaneously, online queries will require a minimum set of criteria, including data or time range as well as one or more of the parameters specified in Appendix D, Functionality of the CAT System.[3740]

Because of the potential size of the possible result sets, the Plan Processor must have functionality to create an intermediate result count of records before running the full query so that the query can be refined if warranted. The Plan Processor must include a notification process that informs users when reports are available, and there should be multiple methods by which query results can be obtained (e.g., web download, batch feed). Regulatory staff also must have the ability to create interim tables for access/further investigation. In addition, the Plan Processor must provide a way to limit the number of rows from a result set on screen with full results being created as a file to be delivered via a file transfer protocol.

The Plan Processor will be reasonably required to work with the regulatory staff at the Participants and other regulators[3741] to design report generation screens that will allow them to request on-demand pre-determined report queries. These would be standard queries that would enable regulators quick access to frequently-used information and could include standard queries that will be used to advance the retirement of existing reports, such as Large Trader reporting.

The Central Repository must, at a minimum, be able to support approximately 3,000 active users, including Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC, authorized to access data representing market activity (excluding the PII associated with customers and accounts).[3742]

Time and Method by which CAT Data will be Available to Regulators (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(ii))

SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(ii) requires the Participants to discuss the ''time and method by which the data in the Central Repository will be made available to regulators to perform surveillance or analyses, or for other purposes as part of their regulatory and oversight responsibilities.''[3743] As the Commission noted, ''[t]he time and method by which data will be available to regulators are fundamental to the utility of the Central Repository because the purpose of the repository is to assist regulators in fulfilling their responsibilities to oversee the securities markets and market participants.''[3744]

▪ Time Data will be Made Available to Regulators

At any point after data is received by the Central Repository and passes basic format validations, it will be available to the Participants and the SEC. The Plan Processor must ensure that regulators have access to corrected and linked order and Customer data by 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time on T+5.

As noted above, SEC Rule 613(e)(6) requires the prompt correction of data reported to the Central Repository, and the

---

[3733] *See* Section 6.1(c) of the CAT NMS Plan.

[3734] *See* SEC Rule 613(j)(1).

[3735] *See* SIFMA Recommendations at 13, 39–42; FIF Response at 19.

[3736] *See* RFP Questions 11 and 12.

[3737] A detailed example of the application of the daisy chain approach to an order routed to an exchange on an agency basis can be found in the Proposed RFP Concepts Document at 26.

[3738] This subcommittee included 21 Industry Members and 16 Participants. It met 11 times over the course of 13 months to discuss order handling and CAT reporting requirements. Examples of order handling scenarios that must be addressed include, in addition to the agency scenario referenced above: orders handled on a riskless principal basis, orders routed out of a national securities exchange through a broker-dealer router to another national securities exchange, orders executed on an average price basis and orders aggregated for further routing and execution. Detailed examples of these types of scenarios can be found in the Proposed RFP Concepts Document at 27–30.

[3739] These scenarios, and how the daisy chain approach could be applied, can be found in the Representative Order Proposal (Feb. 2013), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/web/idcplg?IdcService=SS_GET_PAGE&ssDocName=P197815.*

[3740] Although the Plan Processor must account for multiple simultaneous queries, the Central Repository must also support the ability to schedule when jobs are run.

[3741] Initially, only the SEC and Participants will have access to data stored in the Central Repository.

[3742] The RFP required support for a minimum of 3,000 users. The actual number of users may be higher based upon regulator and Participant usage of the system.

[3743] SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(ii).

[3744] Adopting Release at 45790.

Participants believe that the timeframes established in Appendix D, Data Availability, meet this requirement. Additionally, each of the Bidders indicated that it would be able to process the reported data within these timeframes. However, the FIF, an industry trade group, expressed concern that the error repair window will constitute a significant burden to CAT Reporters and questioned whether the error repair window ''can be reasonably met.'' [3745] FIF supports maintaining the current OATS Error Handling timelines, which allow for error correction within five OATS-business days from the date of original submission.[3746] SIFMA also recommends a five-day window for error correction.[3747] Nevertheless, the Participants believe that it is imperative to the utility of the Central Repository that corrected data be available to regulators as soon as possible, and therefore the Participants do not support adopting the five-day repair window permitted under OATS, but instead are providing a three-day repair window for the Central Repository.[3748]

▪ Method by which Data will be Available to Regulators

As required by SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(ii), this section describes the ability of regulators to use data stored in the Central Repository for investigations, examinations and surveillance, including the ability to search and extract such data.[3749] The utility of the Central Repository is dependent on regulators being able to have access to data for use in market reconstruction, market analysis, surveillance and investigations.[3750] The Participants anticipate that the Plan Processor will adopt policies and procedures with respect to the handling of surveillance (including coordinated, SEC Rule 17d–2 or RSA surveillance) queries and requests for data. In the RFP, the Participants asked that the Bidders describe:

- the tools and reports that would allow for the extraction of data search criteria; [3751]
- how the system will accommodate simultaneous users from Participants and the SEC submitting queries; [3752]
- the expected response time for query results, the manner in which simultaneous queries will be managed and the maximum number of concurrent queries and users that can be supported by the system; [3753]
- the format in which the results of targeted queries will be provided to users; [3754]
- the methods of data delivery that would be made available to Participant regulatory staff and the Commission; [3755]
- any limitations on the size of data that can be delivered at one time, such as number of days or number of terabytes; [3756] and
- how simultaneous bulk data requests will be managed to ensure fair and equitable access.[3757]

All Bidders provide means for off-line analysis [3758] and dynamic search and extraction. The Bids described a variety of tools that could be used for providing access and reports to the Participants and the SEC, including: Oracle Business Intelligence Experience Edition, SAS Enterprises Business Intelligence, and IBM Cognos. The Bids proposed data access via direct access portals and via web-based applications. In addition, the Bids proposed various options for addressing concurrent users and ensuring fair access to the data, including: processing queries on a first in, first out (FIFO) basis; monitoring to determine if any particular user is using more systems resources than others and prioritizing other users' queries; or evaluating each users' demands on the systems over a predetermined timeframe and, if there is an imbalance, working with users to provide more resources needed to operate the system more efficiently.

The Bids included a multitude of options for formatting the data provided to regulators in response to their queries, including but not limited to FIX, Excel, Binary, SAS data sets, PDF, XML, XBRL, CSV, and .TXT. Some Bidders would provide Participants and the SEC with a ''sandbox'' in which the user could store data and upload its own analytical tools and software to analyze the data within the Central Repository, in lieu of performing off-line analyses.

The Participants anticipate that they will be able to utilize Central Repository data to enhance their existing regulatory schemes. The Participants do not endorse any particular technology or approach, but rather set forth standards which the Plan Processor must meet. By doing so, the Participants are seeking to maximize the utility of the data from the Central Repository without burdening the Plan Processor to comply with specific format or application requirements which will need to be updated over time. In addition, the Participants wanted to ensure that the Bidders have the ability to put forth the ideas they believe are the most effective.

▪ Report Building—Analysis Related to Usage of Data by Regulators

It is anticipated that the Central Repository will provide regulators with the ability to, for example, more efficiently conduct investigations, examinations, conduct market analyses, and to inform policy-making decisions. The Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC will frequently need to be able to perform queries on large amounts of data. The Plan Processor must provide the Participants and other regulators the access to build and generate targeted queries against data in the Central Repository. The Plan Processor must provide the regulatory staff at the Participants and regulators with the ability to create, adjust, and save any ad-hoc queries they run for their surveillance purposes via online or direct access to the Central Repository.[3759] Queries will require a minimum set of criteria that are detailed in Appendix D.[3760] The Plan Processor will have controls to manage load, cancel queries, if needed, and create a request process for complex queries to be run.[3761] The Plan Processor must have a notification process to inform users when reports are available, provide such reports in multiple formats, and have the ability to schedule when queries are run.[3762]

In addition, the Plan Processor will be required to reasonably work with the regulatory staff at the Participants and other regulators to design report generation screens that will allow them to request on-demand pre-determined report queries.[3763] These would be standard queries that would enable regulators quick access to frequently-used information. This could include standard queries that will be used to advance the retirement of existing reports, such as Large Trader.[3764]

The Plan Processor should meet the following response times for different query types. For targeted search criteria, the minimum acceptable response times would be measured in time increments of less than one minute. For the complex queries that either scan large volumes of data (*e.g.,* multiple trade dates) or return large result sets (>1M records), the response time should generally be available within 24 hours of the submission of the request.

The Central Repository will support a permission mechanism to assign data access rights to all users so that CAT Reporters will only have access to their own reported data, the regulatory staff at the Participants and other regulators will have access to data; except for PII.[3765] Regulators that are authorized to access PII will be required to complete additional authentications. The Central Repository will be able to provide access to the data at the working locations of both the Participants' and SEC's regulatory staff as well as other non-office locations. The Central Repository must be built with operational controls to control access to make requests and to track data requests to support an event-based and time-based scheduler for queries that allows Participants to rely on the data generated.

In addition to targeted analysis of data from the Central Repository, regulators will also need access to bulk data for analysis. The Participants and other regulators will need the ability to do bulk extraction and download of data, based on a specified date

[3745] FIF Response at 35.

[3746] FIF Response at 35.

[3747] SIFMA Recommendations at 62.

[3748] One example of why the Participants believe a five day repair window is too long is that regulators may need access to the data as quickly as possible in order to conduct market reconstruction.

[3749] SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(ii).

[3750] Adopting Release at 45790.

[3751] RFP Question 81.

[3752] RFP Question 82.

[3753] RFP Question 83.

[3754] RFP Question 84.

[3755] RFP Question 85.

[3756] RFP Question 86.

[3757] RFP Question 87.

[3758] The SEC defined ''off-line'' analysis as ''any analysis performed by a regulator based on data that is extracted from the [CAT] database, but that uses the regulator's own analytical tools, software, and hardware.'' Adopting Release at 45798 n.853.

[3759] *Id.*

[3760] *Id.*

[3761] *Id.*

[3762] *Id.*

[3763] *Id.*

[3764] *Id.*

[3765] As documented in Appendix D, each CAT Reporter will be issued a public key pair (''*PKI*'') that it can use to submit data, and access confirmation that their data has been received.

or time range, market, security, and Customer-ID. The size of the resulting data set may require the ability to feed data from the Central Repository into analytical ''alert'' programs designed to detect potentially illegal activity.[3766] ''For example, the Commission is likely to use data from the Central Repository to calculate detailed statistics on order flow, order sizes, market depth and rates of cancellation, to monitor trends and inform Participant and SEC rulemaking.'' [3767]

The Plan Processor must provide for bulk extraction and download of data in industry standard formats. In addition, the Plan Processor is required to generate data sets based on market event data to the Participants and other regulators. The Central Repository must provide the ability to define the logic, frequency, format, and distribution method of the data. It must be built with operational controls to track data requests to oversee the bulk usage environment and support an event-based and time-based scheduler for queries that allows Participants to rely on the data generated. Extracted data should be encrypted, and PII data should be masked unless users have permission to view the data that has been requested.

The Plan Processor must have the capability and capacity to provide bulk data necessary for the Participants and the other regulators to run and operate their surveillance processing. Such data requests can be very large; therefore, the Plan Processor must have the ability to split large requests into smaller data sets for data processing and handling. All reports should be generated by a configurable workload manager that is cost based, while also ensuring that no single user is using a disproportionate amount of resources for query generation.

- **System Service Level Agreements (SLAs)**

As further described in Appendix D, Functionality of CAT Systems, the Participants and the Plan Processor will enter into appropriate SLAs in order to establish system and operational performance requirements for the Plan Processor and help ensure timely Regulator access to Central Repository data. Among the items to be included in the SLA(s) will be specific requirements regarding query performance, linkage and order event processing performance of the Central Repository (*e.g.,* linkage and data availability timelines, linkage errors not related to invalid data, and data retention) as well as system availability requirements (*e.g.,* system uptime and DR/BCP performance). The Operating Committee will periodically review the SLAs according to the terms to be established in negotiation with the Plan Processor.

The Reliability and Accuracy of the Data (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(iii))

As required by SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(iii), this section discusses the reliability and accuracy of the data reported to and maintained by the Central Repository throughout its lifecycle, including: transmission and receipt from CAT Reporters; data extraction, transformation and loading at the Central Repository; data maintenance at the Central Repository; and data access by the Participants and other regulators. In the Adopting Release, the Commission noted that the usefulness of the data to regulators would be significantly impaired if it is unreliable or inaccurate and as such, the Commission requested that the Participants discuss in detail how the Central Repository will be designed, tested and monitored to ensure the reliability and accuracy of the data collected and maintained in it.[3768]

- **Transmission, Receipt, and Transformation**

The initial step in ensuring the reliability and accuracy of data in the Central Repository is the validation checks made by the Plan Processor when data is received and before it is accepted into the Central Repository. In the RFP, the Participants stated that validations must include checks to ensure that data is submitted in the required formats and that lifecycle events can be accurately linked by 12:00 p.m. Eastern Time on T+1, four hours following the submission deadline for CAT Reporters.[3769] Once errors are identified, they must be efficiently and effectively communicated to CAT Reporters on a daily basis. CAT Reporters will be required to correct and resubmit identified errors within established timeframes (as discussed in Appendix D, Data Availability).

The Plan Processor must develop specific data validations in conjunction with development of the Central Repository which must be published in the Technical Specifications. The objective of the data validation process is to ensure that data is accurate, timely and complete at or near the time of submission, rather than to identify submission errors at a later time after data has been processed and made available to regulators. To achieve this objective, a comprehensive set of data validations must be developed that addresses both data quality and completeness. For any data that fails to pass these validations, the Plan Processor will be required to handle data correction and resubmission within established timeframes both in a batch process format and via manual web-based entry.

To assess different validation mechanisms and integrity checks, the RFP required Bidders to provide information on the following:

- how data format and context validations for order and quote events submitted by CAT Reporters will be performed and how rejections or errors will be communicated to CAT Reporters; [3770]
- a system flow diagram reflecting the overall data format, syntax and context validation process that includes when each types of validation will be completed and errors communicated to CAT Reporters, highlighting any dependencies between the different validations and impacts of such dependencies on providing errors back to CAT Reporters; [3771]
- how related order lifecycle events submitted by separate CAT Reporters will be linked and how unlinked events will be identified and communicated to CAT Reporters for correction and resubmission, including a description of how unlinked records will be provided to CAT Reporters for correction (*e.g.,* specific transmission methods and/or web-based downloads); [3772]
- how Customer and Customer Account Information submitted by broker-dealers will be validated and how rejections or errors will be communicated to CAT Reporters; [3773] and
- the mechanisms that will be provided to CAT Reporters for the correction of both market data (*e.g.,* order, quotes, and trades) errors, and Customer and account data errors, including batch resubmissions and manual web-based submissions.[3774]

Most Bidders indicated that Customer Account Information including SSN, TIN or LEI will be validated in the initial onboarding processing. Additional validation of Customer Account Information, such as full name, street address, etc., would occur across CAT Reporters and potential duplications or other errors would be flagged for follow-up by the CAT Reporters.

All Bidders recommended that order data validation be performed via rules engines, which allow rules to be created and modified over time in order to meet future market data needs. Additionally, all Bidders indicated that data validations will be real-time and begin in the data ingestion component of the system. Standard data validation techniques include format checks, data type checks, consistency checks, limit and logic checks, or data validity checks. Some Bidders mentioned the ability to schedule the data validation at a time other than submission, because there may be a need to have rules engines perform validation in a batch mode or customized schedule during a different time. All Bidders indicated that when errors are found, the Raw Data will be stored in an error database and notifications would be sent to the CAT Reporters. Most Bidders permitted error correction to be submitted by CAT Reporters at any time.

Section 6.3(b) of the CAT NMS Plan sets forth the policies and procedures for ensuring the timeliness, accuracy and completeness of the data provided to the Central Repository as required by SEC Rule 613(e)(4)(ii) and the accuracy of the data consolidated by the Plan Processor pursuant to SEC Rule 613(e)(4)(iii).[3775] It also mandates that each Participant and its Industry Members that are CAT Reporters must ensure that its data reported to the Central Repository is accurate, timely, and complete. Each Participant and its Industry Members that are CAT Reporters must correct and resubmit such errors within established timeframes. In furtherance thereof, data

[3766] Adopting Release at 45799. *See also* RFP § 2.8.2.

[3767] Adopting Release at 45799.

[3768] Adopting Release at 45790–91, 45799.

[3769] RFP Section 2.2.4.

[3770] RFP Question 14.

[3771] RFP Question 15.

[3772] RFP Question 16.

[3773] RFP Question 17.

[3774] RFP Question 18.

[3775] SEC Rule 613(e)(4)(ii) and (iii).

related to a particular order will be reported accurately and sequenced from receipt or origination, to routing, modification, cancellation and/or execution. Additionally each Participant and its Industry Members that are CAT Reporters must test their reporting systems thoroughly before beginning to report data to the Central Repository and Appendix D sets forth that the Plan Processor must make testing facilities available for such testing.

Pursuant to SEC Rule 613(e)(4)(iii), the Plan Processor will design, implement and maintain (1) data accuracy and reliability controls for data reported to the Central Repository and (2) procedures for testing data accuracy and reliability during any system release or upgrade affecting the Central Repository and the CAT Reporters.[3776] The Operating Committee will, as needed, but at least annually, review policies and procedures to ensure the timeliness, accuracy, and completeness of data reported to the Central Repository.

In order to validate data receipt, the Plan Processor will be required to send an acknowledgement to each CAT Reporter notifying them of receipt of data submitted to the Central Repository to enable CAT Reporters to create an audit trail of their own submissions and allow for tracking of data breakdowns when data is not received. The data received by the Plan Processor must be validated at both the file and individual record level if appropriate. The required data validations may be amended based on input from the Operating Committee and the Advisory Committee. Records that do not pass basic validations, such as syntax rejections, will be rejected and sent back to the CAT Reporter as soon as possible, so it can repair and resubmit the data.

▪ Error Communication, Correction, and Processing

The Plan Processor will define and design a process to efficiently and effectively communicate to CAT Reporters identified errors. All identified errors will be reported back to the CAT Reporter and other Data Submitters who submitted the data to the Central Repository on behalf of the CAT Reporter, if necessary. The Central Repository must be able to receive error corrections and process them at any time, including timeframes after the standard repair window. The industry supports a continuous validation process for the Central Repository, continuous feedback to CAT Reporters on error identification and the ability to provide error correction at any time even if beyond the error correction timeframe.[3777] The industry believes that this will better align with the reporting of complex transactions and allocations and is more efficient for CAT Reporters.[3778] CAT Reporters will be able to submit error corrections through a web-interface or via bulk uploads or file submissions. The Plan Processor must support bulk replacement of records, subject to approval by the Operating Committee, and reprocess such replaced records. A GUI must be available for CAT Reporters to make updates to individual records or attributes. Additionally, the Plan Processor will provide a mechanism to provide auto-correction of identified errors and be able to support group repairs (*i.e.,* the wrong issue symbol affecting multiple reports).

SEC Rule 613(e)(6) also requires the Participants to specify a maximum Error Rate for data reported to the Central Repository pursuant to SEC Rule 613(c)(3) and (4).[3779] The Participants understand that the Central Repository will require new reporting elements and methods for CAT Reporters and there will be a learning curve when CAT Reporters begin to submit data to the Central Repository.[3780] However, the utility of the CAT is dependent on it providing a timely, accurate and complete audit trail for the Participants and other regulators.[3781] Therefore, the Participants are proposing an initial maximum Error Rate of 5%, subject to quality assurance testing performed prior to launch, and it is anticipated that it will be reset when Industry Members, excluding Small Industry Members, begin to report to the Central Repository and again when Small Industry Members begin to report to the Central Repository. The Participants believe that this rate strikes the balance of making allowances for adapting to a new reporting regime, while ensuring that the data provided to regulators will be capable of being used to conduct surveillance and market reconstruction. Periodically, the Plan Processor will analyze reporting statistics and Error Rates and make recommendations to the Operating Committee for proposed changes to the maximum Error Rate. Changes to the maximum Error Rate will be approved by the Operating Committee. The maximum Error Rate will be reviewed and reset at least on an annual basis.

In order to help reduce the maximum Error Rate, the Plan Processor will measure the Error Rate on each business day and must take the following steps in connection with error reporting: (1) the Plan Processor will provide CAT Reporters with their error reports as they become available and daily statistics will be provided after data has been uploaded and validated by the Central Repository; (2) error reports provided to CAT Reporters will include descriptive details as to why each data record was rejected by the Central Repository; and (3) on a monthly basis, the Plan Processor will produce and publish reports detailing performance and comparison statistics, similar to the Report Cards published for OATS presently, which will enable CAT Reporters to identify how they compare to the rest of their industry peers and help them assess the risk related to their reporting of transmitted data.

All CAT Reporters exceeding the Error Rate will be notified each time that they have exceeded the maximum allowable Error Rate and will be informed of the specific reporting requirements that they did not fully meet (*e.g.,* timeliness or rejections). Upon request from the Participants or other regulators, the Plan Processor will produce and provide reports containing Error Rates and other metrics as needed on each CAT Reporter's Compliance Thresholds so that the Participants as Participants or the SEC may take appropriate action for failing to comply with the reporting obligations under the CAT NMS Plan and SEC Rule 613.

SEC Rule 613(e)(6) requires the prompt correction of data to the Central Repository. As discussed in the NMS Plan, there are a minimum of three validation processes that will be performed on data submitted to the Central Repository. The Plan Processor will be required to identify specific validations and metrics to define the Data Quality Governance requirements, as defined in Appendix D, Receipt of Data from Reporters.

The Plan Processor will identify errors on CAT file submissions that do not pass the defined validation checks above and conform to the Data Quality Governance requirements. Error Rates will be calculated during the CAT Data and linkage validation processes. As a result, the Participants propose an initial maximum overall Error Rate of 5% [3782] on initially submitted data, subject to quality assurance testing period performed prior to launch.[3783] It is anticipated that this Error

[3776] SEC Rule 613(e)(4)(iii).

[3777] FIF Consolidated Audit Trail Working Group Processor Proposed Optimal Solution Recommendations at 6 (Sep. 15, 2014), *available at http://www.sec.gov/comments/4-668/4668-16.pdf* (the ''*FIF Optimal Solution Recommendations*'').

[3778] FIF Response at 36.

[3779] SEC Rule 613(e)(6)(i) defines ''Error Rate'' to mean ''[t]he percentage of reportable events collected by the central repository for which the data reported does not fully and accurately reflect the order event that occurred in the market.'' All CAT Reporters, including the Participants, will be included in the Error Rate. CAT Reporters will be required to meet separate compliance thresholds, which will be a CAT Reporter-specific rate that may be used as the basis for further review or investigation into CAT Reporter performance (the ''*Compliance Thresholds*''). Compliance Thresholds will compare a CAT Reporter's error rate to the aggregate Error Rate over a period of time to be defined by the Operating Committee. *See infra* note 3790 and accompanying text (discussing Compliance Thresholds). A CAT Reporter's performance with respect to the Compliance Threshold will not signify, as a matter of law, that such CAT Reporter has violated SEC Rule 613 or the rules of any Participant concerning the CAT.

[3780] As indicated by FINRA in its comment to the Adopting Release, OATS compliance rates have steadily improved as reporters have become more familiar with the system. When OATS was first adopted compliance rates were 76%, but current compliance rates are 99%. *See* Letter from Marcia E. Asquith, Senior Vice President and Corporate Secretary, FINRA, to Elizabeth M. Murphy, Secretary, Commission (Aug. 9, 2010).

[3781] Adopting Release at 45790–91.

[3782] As required by SEC Rule 613(e)(6)(ii), the Error Rate will be calculated on a daily basis as the number of erroneous records divided by the total number of records received on any given day and will be inclusive of validation of CAT Data and linkage validations. Error Rates are calculated for reporting groups as a whole, not for individual firms. Individual firms within a reporting group may have higher or lower Error Rates, though they would still be subject to any penalties or fines for excessive Error Rates to be defined by the Operating Committee. Additionally, this Error Rate will be considered for the purpose of reporting metrics to the SEC and the Operating Committee and individual firms will need to maintain Compliance Thresholds as described below.

[3783] The Participants expect that error rates after reprocessing of error corrections will be *de minimis.*

Rate will be evaluated when Industry Members, excluding Small Industry Members, begin to report to the Central Repository and then again when Small Industry Members begin to report to the Central Repository.

In determining the initial maximum Error Rate of 5%, the Participants have considered the current and historical OATS Error Rates, the magnitude of new reporting requirements on the CAT Reporters and the fact that many CAT Reporters may have never been obligated to report data to an audit trail.

The Participants considered industry experience with FINRA's OATS system over the last 10 years. During that timeframe there have been three major industry impacting releases. These three releases are known as (1) OATS Phase III, which required manual orders to be reported to OATS; [3784] (2) OATS for OTC Securities which required OTC equity securities to be reported to OATS; [3785] and (3) OATS for NMS which required all NMS stocks to be reported to OATS.[3786] Each of these releases was accompanied by significant updates to the required formats which required OATS reporters to update and test their reporting systems and infrastructure.

The combined average error rates for the time periods immediately following release across five significant categories for these three releases follow. The average rejection percentage rate, representing order events that did not pass systemic validations, was 2.42%. The average late percentage rate, representing order events not submitted in a timely manner, was 0.36%. The average order/trade matching error rate, representing OATS Execution Reports unsuccessfully matched to a TRF trade report was 0.86%. The average Exchange/Route matching error rate, representing OATS Route Reports unsuccessfully matched to an exchange order was 3.12%. Finally, the average Interfirm Route matching error rate, representing OATS Route Reports unsuccessfully matched to a report representing the receipt of the route by another reporting entity was 2.44%. Although the error rates for the 1999 initial OATS implementation were significantly higher than those laid out above, the Participants believe that technical innovation and institutional knowledge of audit trail creation over the past 15 years makes the more recent statistics a better standard for the initial Error Rate.[3787] Based upon these historical error rates, and given that reporting to the Central Repository will involve reporting on new products (*i.e.,* options) and reporting by new reporters (including both broker-dealers and Participants who have not previously been required to report to OATS), the Participants believe that the initial Error Rate will be higher than the recent rates associated with OATS releases and that an initial Error Rate of 5% is an appropriate standard.

The Participants believe that to achieve this Error Rate, however, the Participants and the industry must be provided with ample resources, including a stand-alone test environment functionally equivalent to the production environment, and time to test their reporting systems and infrastructure. Additionally, the Technical Specifications must be well written and effectively communicated to the reporting community with sufficient time to allow proper technical updates, as necessary. The Participants believe that the Error Rate strikes the balance of adapting to a new reporting regime, while ensuring that the data provided to regulators will be capable of being used to conduct surveillance and market reconstruction, as well as having a sufficient level of accuracy to facilitate the retirement of existing regulatory reports and systems where possible.

The Participants are proposing a phased approach to lowering the maximum Error Rate. Under the proposed approach, one year after a CAT Reporter's respective filing obligation has begun, their maximum Error Rate would become 1%.[3788] Maximum Error Rates under the proposed approach would thus be as follows:

	One year [3789]	Two years	Three years	Four years
Participants	5%	1%	1%	1%
Large broker-dealers	N/A	5%	1%	1%
Small broker-dealers	N/A	N/A	5%	1%

In addition to the above mentioned daily Error Rate, CAT Reporters will be required to meet separate Compliance Thresholds,[3790] which rather than the Error Rate, will be a CAT Reporter-specific rate that may be used as the basis for further review or investigation into CAT Reporter performance. Although Compliance Thresholds will not be calculated on a daily basis, this does not: (1) relieve CAT Reporters from their obligation to meet daily reporting requirements set forth in SEC Rule 613; or (2) prohibit disciplinary action against a CAT Reporter for failure to meet its daily reporting requirements set forth in SEC Rule 613. The Operating Committee may consider other exceptions to this reporting obligation based on demonstrated legal or regulatory requirements or other mitigating circumstances.

In order to reduce the maximum Error Rate and help CAT Reporters to meet their Compliance Thresholds, the Plan Processor must provide support for CAT Reporter ''go-live'' dates, as specified in Appendix D, User Support.

▪ Sequencing Orders and Clock Synchronization

SEC Rule 613(c)(1) requires the Central Repository to provide ''an accurate, time-sequenced record of orders,'' and SEC Rule 613(d)(1) requires the CAT NMS Plan to require each CAT Reporter ''to synchronize its business clocks that are used for the purposes of recording the date and time of any reportable event . . . to the time maintained by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), consistent with industry standards.'' As an initial matter, because of the drift between clocks, an accurately-sequenced record of orders cannot be based solely on the time stamps provided by CAT Reporters. As discussed above, the CAT NMS Plan requires that CAT Reporters synchronize their clocks to within 50 milliseconds of the NIST. Because of this permitted drift, any two separate clocks can vary by 100 milliseconds: one clock can drift forward 50 milliseconds while another can drift back 50 milliseconds. Thus, it is possible to have, for example, one firm report the route of an order at 10:40:00.005 while the firm receiving the routed order reports a receipt time of 10:39:59.983 (*i.e.,* the time stamps alone indicate that the routed order was received before it was sent). For this reason, the Participants plan to require that the Plan Processor develop a way to accurately track the sequence of order events without relying entirely on time stamps.[3791]

There were several different approaches suggested by the Bidders to accomplish the accurate sequencing of order events. Some Bidders suggested using time stamp-based sequencing; however, most Bidders recognized that, while all CAT Reporters should have their time stamp clocks synchronized, in practice this

[3784] *See* FINRA, OATS Phase III, *http://www.finra.org/Industry/Compliance/MarketTransparency/OATS/PhaseIII/.*

[3785] *See* FINRA, OATS Reporting Requirements to OTC Equity Securities, *http://www.finra.org/Industry/Compliance/MarketTransparency/OATS/OTCEquitySecurities/.*

[3786] *See* FINRA, OATS Expansion to all NMS Stocks, *https://www.finra.org/Industry/Compliance/MarketTransparency/OATS/NMS/.*

[3787] The initial rejection rates for OATS were 23% and a late reporting rate of 2.79%.

[3788] Error rate reporting will be bifurcated by reporter group (*e.g.,* Large Broker/Dealers) rather than product type to minimize the complexity of Error Rate calculations.

[3789] As used in this table, ''years'' refer to years after effectiveness of the NMS Plan.

[3790] Compliance Thresholds will be set by the Operating Committee. Compliance Thresholds for CAT Reporters will be calculated at intervals to be set by the Operating Committee. All CAT Reporters, including the Participants, will be subject to Compliance Thresholds. Compliance Thresholds will include, among other items, compliance with clock synchronization requirements.

[3791] Events occurring within a single system that uses the same clock to time stamp those events should be able to be accurately sequenced based on the time stamp. For unrelated events, *e.g.,* multiple unrelated orders from different broker-dealers, there would be no way to definitively sequence order events within the allowable clock drift as defined in Article 6.8.

synchronization cannot be wholly relied upon due to variations in computer systems. These Bidders rely on linkage logic to derive the event sequencing chain, such as parent/child orders. To help resolve time stamp issues, one Bidder proposed adding unique sequence ID numbers as well to the event information to help with time clock issues and a few others would analyze the variations on clock time and notify those CAT Reporters that need to resynchronize their clocks.

The Participants believe that using a linking logic not dependent on time stamps would enable proper sequencing of an order. This decision is supported by the industry since time stamps across disparate systems cannot be guaranteed and are likely to be error-prone.[3792] The Participants believe that this type of sequencing can be successfully used for both simple and complex orders that will be reported to the Central Repository. The industry supports using event sequencing that is already built into the exchange protocols, which imposes sequencing and determines the true market environment.[3793]

As required by Section 6.8(a) of the CAT NMS Plan, each Participant will synchronize its Business Clocks (other than Business Clocks used solely for Manual Order Events, which will be required to be synchronized to within one second of the time maintained by the NIST) used for the purposes of recording the date and time of any Reportable Event that must be reported under SEC Rule 613 to within 50 milliseconds of the time maintained by the NIST, and will adopt a Compliance Rule requiring its Industry Members to do the same. Furthermore, in order to ensure the accuracy of time stamps for Reportable Events, the Participants anticipate that Participants and Industry Members will adopt policies and procedures to verify such required synchronization each Trading Day (1) before the market opens and (2) periodically throughout the Trading Day.

As noted above, Rule 613(d)(1) requires the CAT NMS Plan to impose a clock synchronization requirement ''consistent with industry standards.'' The Participants believe that the 50 millisecond clock synchronization drift tolerance included in Section 6.8(a) represents the current industry clock synchronization standard and therefore satisfies the Rule. To determine the current industry standard, the Participants relied on survey feedback provided by industry members, as further discussed in Appendix C, D.12.

Importantly, Section 6.8 requires, pursuant to Rule 613(c)(2), that Participants, together with the Plan Processor's Chief Compliance Officer, evaluate the clock synchronization standard on an annual basis to reflect changes in industry standards. Accordingly, to the extent existing technology that synchronizes business clocks with a lower tolerance (*i.e.,* within less than 50 milliseconds drift from NIST) becomes widespread enough throughout the industry to constitute a new standard, the clock synchronization requirement of the CAT NMS Plan would be revised to take account of the new standard.

In accordance with SEC Rule 613(d), Section 6.8(c) of the CAT NMS Plan states that ''[i]n conjunction with Participants and other appropriate Industry Member advisory groups, the Chief Compliance Officer shall annually evaluate whether industry standards have evolved such that: (i) the synchronization standard in Section 6.8(a) should be shortened; or (ii) the required time stamp in Section 6.8(b) should be in finer increments.''

The Participants anticipate that compliance with this provision will require Participants and Industry Members to perform the following or comparable procedures. The Participants and their Industry Members will document their clock synchronization procedures and maintain a log recording the time of each clock synchronization performed, and the result of such synchronization, specifically identifying any synchronization revealing that the discrepancy between its Business Clock and the time maintained by the NIST exceeded 50 milliseconds. At all times such log will include results for a period of not less than five years ending on the then current date.

In addition to clock synchronization requirements, the Participants considered the appropriate level of time granularity to be required in the CAT NMS Plan. Although millisecond increments are generally the industry standard for trading systems, there is a wide range of time stamp granularity across the industry commonly ranging from seconds to milliseconds to micro-seconds for Latency sensitive applications.[3794] The disparity is largely attributed to the age of the system being utilized for reporting, as older systems cannot cost effectively support, finer time stamp granularity.[3795] To comply with a millisecond time stamp requirement, the Participants understand that firms may face significant costs in both time and resources to implement a consistent time stamp across multiple systems.[3796] This may include a need to upgrade databases, internal messaging applications/protocols, data warehouses, and reporting applications to enable the reporting of such time stamps to the Central Repository.[3797] Because of this, FIF recommended to the Participants a two year grace period for time stamp compliance.[3798] FIF and SIFMA also supported an exception for millisecond reporting for order events that are manually processed, which is discussed below.[3799]

To the extent that any CAT Reporter uses time stamps in increments finer than the minimum required by the CAT NMS Plan, each Participant will, and will adopt a rule requiring its Industry Members that are CAT Reporters to, use such finer increments when providing data to the Central Repository.

With respect to the requirement under SEC Rule 613(c) and (d)(3) that time stamps ''reflect current industry standards and be at least to the millisecond,'' the Participants believe that time stamp granularity to the millisecond reflects current industry standards. However, after careful consideration, including numerous discussions with the DAG, the Participants have determined that time stamp granularity at the level of a millisecond is not practical for order events that involve non-electronic communication of information (''Manual Order Events''). In particular, it is the Participants' understanding that recording Manual Order Events to the millisecond would be both very costly, requiring specialized software configurations and expensive hardware, and inherently imprecise due to the manner in which human interaction is required. The industry feedback that the Participants received through the DAG suggests that the established business practice with respect to Manual Order Events is to manually capture time stamps with granularity at the level of a second because finer increments cannot be accurately captured when dealing with manual processes which, by their nature, take longer to perform than a time increment of under one second. The Participants agree that, due to the nature of transactions originated over the phone, it is not practical to attempt granularity finer than one second, as any such finer increment would be inherently unreliable. Further, the Participants do not believe that recording Manual Order Events to the second will hinder the ability of regulators to determine the sequence in which Reportable Events occur.

As a result of these discussions, the Exemptive Request Letter requested exemptive relief from the Commission to allow the CAT NMS Plan to require Manual Order Events to be captured with granularity of up to and including one second or better, but also require CAT Reporters to report the time stamp of when a Manual Order Event was captured electronically in the relevant order handling and execution system of the party to the event. Granularity of the Electronic Capture Time will be consistent with the SEC Rule 613(d)(3) requirement that time stamps be at least to the millisecond.

Thus, the Participants have determined that adding the Electronic Capture Time would be beneficial for successful reconstruction of the order handling process and would add important information about how the Manual Order Events are processed once they are entered into an electronic system. Additionally, Manual Order Events, when reported, must be clearly identified as such.

- **Data Maintenance and Management**

Data Maintenance and Management of the Central Repository ''refers to the process for storing data at the [C]entral [R]epository, indexing the data for linkages, searches, and

[3792] *See* Letter from Manisha Kimmel, Executive Director, Financial Information Forum, to Participant Representatives of the CAT (June 12, 2013), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/industryFeedback/P284394* (''*FIF Letter*'').

[3793] FIF Letter at 11.

[3794] Letter from T.R. Lazo, Managing Director, SIFMA, and Thomas Price, Managing Director, SIFMA (June 11, 2013), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/industryFeedback/P284395* (''*SIFMA Letter*''); FIF Letter at 10.

[3795] FIF Letter at 10.

[3796] FIF Letter at 10; SIFMA Comments on Selected Topics at 11.

[3797] FIF Letter at 10.

[3798] FIF Letter at 10.

[3799] FIF Letter at 10; SIFMA Letter at 11.

retrieval, dividing the data into logical partitions when necessary to optimize access and retrieval, and the creation and storage of data backups.'' [3800]

The Plan Processor must create a formal records retention policy to be approved by the Operating Committee. All of the data (including both corrected and uncorrected or rejected data) in the Central Repository must be kept online for a rolling six year period, which would create a six year historical audit trail. This data must be directly available and searchable by regulators electronically without any manual intervention. Additionally, the Plan Processor is required to create and maintain for a minimum of six years a symbol history and mapping table, as well as to provide a tool that will display a complete issue symbol history that will be accessible to CAT Reporters, Participants and the SEC.

Assembled lifecycles of order events must be stored in a linked manner so that each unique event (e.g., origination, route, execution, modification) can be quickly and easily associated with the originating customer(s) for both targeted queries and comprehensive data scans. For example, an execution on an exchange must be linked to the originating customer(s) regardless of how the order may have been aggregated, disaggregated, or routed through multiple broker-dealers before being sent to the exchange for execution.

Most Bidders recommended dividing data in the Central Repository into nodes based on symbol, date or a combination thereof in order to speed query response times. The Participants are not specifying how the data is divided, but will require that it be partitioned in a logical manner in order to optimize access and retrieval.

All of the Bidders addressed data loss through data replication and redundancy. Some of the Bidders proposed a hot-hot design for replication for primary and secondary data, so both sites are fully operational at all times and there would be no recovery time necessary in the case of fall-over to the secondary site. However, this is a more costly solution, and many Bidders therefore proposed data loss prevention by operating in a hot-warm design for replication to a secondary site. The Participants are requiring that the Plan Processor implement a disaster recover capability that will ensure no loss of data and will support the data availability requirements for the Central Repository and a secondary processing site will need to be capable of recovery and restoration of services at the secondary site within 48 hours of a disaster event.

- **Data Access by Regulators**

As detailed in Appendix C, Time and Method by which CAT Data will be Available to Regulators, the Participants and other regulators will have access to raw unprocessed data that has been ingested by the Central Repository prior to Noon Eastern Time on T+1.[3801] Between Noon Eastern Time on T+1 and T+5, the Participants and other regulators should have access to all iterations of processed data.[3802] At T+5, the Participants and other regulators should have access to corrected data.[3803] The Plan Processor must adopt policies and procedures to reasonably inform Participants and the SEC of material data corrections made after T+5. The Participants and other regulators will be able to build and generate targeted queries against data in the Central Repository. More information about the report, query, and extraction capabilities can be found in Appendix D, Functionality of the CAT System.

- **Data Recovery and Business Continuity**

As noted above, in addition to describing data security and confidentiality, all of the Bidders were required to set forth an approach to data loss recovery and business continuity in the event of data loss. All of the Bidders addressed data loss through data replication and redundancy. Some of the Bidders proposed a hot-hot design for replication for primary and secondary data, so both sites are fully operational at all times and there would be no recovery time necessary in the case of fall-over to the secondary site. However, this is a more costly solution, and many Bidders therefore proposed data loss prevention by operating in a hot-warm design for replication to a secondary site.

The Plan Processor must comply with industry best practices for disaster recovery and business continuity planning, including the standards and requirements set forth in Appendix D, BCP/DR Process.

With respect to business continuity, the Participants have developed the following requirements that the Plan Processor must meet. In general, the Plan Processor will implement efficient and cost-effective backup and disaster recovery capability that will ensure no loss of data and will support the data availability requirements and anticipated volumes of the Central Repository. The disaster recovery site must have the same level of availability/capacity/throughput and data as the primary site. In addition, the Plan Processor will be required to design a Business Continuity Plan that is inclusive of the technical and business activities of the Central Repository, including the items specified in Appendix D, BCP/DR Process (e.g., bi-annual DR testing and an annual Business Continuity Audit).

The Security and Confidentiality of the Information Reported to the Central Repository (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(iv))

As required by SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(iv), this section describes the security and confidentiality of the information reported to the Central Repository. As the Commission noted in the Adopting Release, keeping the data secure and confidential is critical to the efficacy of the Central Repository and the confidence of market participants. There are two separate categories for purposes of treating data security and confidentiality: (1) PII; and (2) other data related to orders and trades reported to the CAT.[3804]

Because of the importance of data security, the Participants included in the RFP numerous questions to Bidders requesting detailed information on their data security approaches. In the RFP, the Participants requested general information regarding the following:

- how the Bidder's solution protects data during transmission, processing, and at rest (i.e., when stored in the Central Repository); [3805]
- the specific security governance/compliance methodologies utilized in the proposed solution; [3806]
- how access to the data is controlled and how the system(s) confirms the identity of persons (e.g., username/password), monitors who is permitted to access the data and logs every instance of user access; [3807]
- what system controls for users are in place to grant different levels of access depending on their role or function; [3808]
- the strategy, tools and techniques, and operational and management practices that will be used to maintain security of the system; [3809]
- the proposed system controls and operational practices; [3810]
- the organization's security auditing practices, including internal audit, external audit, third-party independent penetration testing, and all other forms of audit and testing; [3811]
- how security practices may differ across system development lifecycles and environments that support them (e.g., development, testing, and production); [3812]
- experiences in developing policies and procedures for a robust security environment, including the protection of PII; [3813]
- the use of monitoring and incident handling tools to log and manage the incident handling lifecycle; [3814]
- the approach(es) to secure user access, including security features that will prevent unauthorized users from accessing the system; [3815]
- the processes/procedures followed if security is breached; [3816]

[3800] Adopting Release at 45790 n.782.

[3801] *See* Appendix C, Time and Method by which CAT Data will be Available to Regulators.

[3802] *Id.*

[3803] *Id.*

[3804] Some trade data (e.g., trade data feeds disseminated by the SIPs) is public and therefore of little concern from a security standpoint. However, because this data may be linked to confidential order data or other non-public information, the Participants are requiring the Plan Processor to store this public data in the same manner as the non-public order and trade information submitted to the Central Repository by Data Submitters.

[3805] RFP Question 65.

[3806] RFP Question 66.

[3807] RFP Question 67.

[3808] RFP Question 68.

[3809] RFP Question 69.

[3810] RFP Question 70.

[3811] RFP Question 71.

[3812] RFP Question 72.

[3813] RFP Question 75.

[3814] RFP Question 76.

[3815] RFP Question 77.

[3816] RFP Question 78.

the infrastructure security architecture, including network, firewalls, authentication, encryption, and protocols; and [3817]

the physical security controls for corporate, data center and leased data center locations.[3818]

All Bidders acknowledged the importance of data security; however, the proposals varied in the details about security policies, data access management, proactive monitoring and intrusion prevention, and how data security will be implemented. Some Bidders intend to leverage their experience in financial services and adopt their policies and technologies to control data, and many Bidders supported such measures as role-based access controls, two factor authentication, detailed system logs, and segmentation of sensitive data that is isolated in both logical and physical layers. Other Bidders indicated that they would use role-based security policies, data and file encryption, and redundant and layered controls to prevent unauthorized access. Additionally, Bidders noted that the physical locations at which data is stored need security measures to ensure data is not compromised. Some Bidders indicated that physical controls would include background checks for employees working with the system; physical building security measures (e.g., locks, alarms, key control programs, CCTV monitoring for all critical areas, and computer controlled access systems with ID badges).

The RFP also requested additional information specific to the treatment and control over PII. The RFP required Bidders to specifically address:

how PII will be stored; [3819] and

how PII access will be controlled and tracked.[3820]

All of the Bidders proposed segregating PII from the other data in the Central Repository. Additionally, all of the Bidders recommended limiting access to PII to only those regulators who need to have access to such information, and requiring additional validations to access PII. Although all Bidders proposed to keep a log of access to the Central Repository by user, the Bidders suggested different methods of authentication and utilized varying security policies, including the use of VPNs or HTTPS.

The RFP also requested information from Bidders on data loss prevention (''*DLP*'') and business continuity to ensure the continued security and availability of the data in the Central Repository. Specifically, the RFP asked Bidders to describe:

their DLP program; [3821] and

the process of data classification and how it relates to the DLP architecture and strategy.[3822]

[3817] RFP Question 79.

[3818] RFP Question 80.

[3819] RFP Question 5.

[3820] RFP Question 6.

[3821] RFP Question 73. The Bidders were asked to include information pertaining to strategy, tools and techniques, and operational and management practices that will be used.

[3822] RFP Question 74.

Based upon the RFP responses, as well as input from the Participants' information security teams and discussions with the DAG, information security requirements were developed and are defined in Appendix D, Data Security. These requirements are further explained below.

▪ **General Security Requirements**

SEC Rule 613 requires that the Plan Processor ensure the security and confidentiality of all information reported to and maintained by the Central Repository in accordance with the policies, procedures, and standards in the CAT NMS Plan.[3823] Based on the numerous options and proposals identified by the Bidders, the Participants have outlined multiple security requirements the Plan Processor will be required to meet to ensure the security and confidentiality of data reported to the Central Repository. The Plan Processor will be responsible for ensuring the security and confidentiality of data during transmission and processing as well as data at rest.

The Plan Processor must provide a solution addressing physical security controls for corporate, data center and any leased facilities where any of the above data is transmitted or stored. In addition to physical security, the Plan Processor must provide for data security for electronic access by outside parties, including Participants and the SEC and, as permitted, CAT Reporters or Data Submitters. Specific requirements are detailed in Appendix D, Data Security, and include requirements such as role-based user access controls, audit trails for data access, and additional levels of protection for PII.

Pursuant to SEC Rule 613(i)(C), the Plan Processor has to develop and maintain a comprehensive security program for the Central Repository with dedicated staff: (1) that is subject to regular reviews by the Chief Compliance Officer; (2) that has a mechanism to confirm the identity of all persons permitted to access the data; and (3) that maintains a record of all such instances where such persons access the data. In furtherance of this obligation, the CAT NMS Plan requires the Plan Processor to designate a Chief Compliance Officer and a Chief Information Security Officer, each subject to approval by the Operating Committee. Each position must be a full-time position. Section 6.2(a) of the CAT NMS Plan provides that the Chief Compliance Officer must develop a comprehensive compliance program covering all CAT Reporters, including the Participants and Industry Members.[3824] Section 6.2(b) of the CAT NMS Plan provides that the Chief Information Security Officer shall be responsible for creating and enforcing appropriate policies, procedures, standards and control structures to monitor and address data security issues for the Plan Process and the CAT System as detailed in Appendix D, Data Security.

Section 6.12 of the CAT NMS Plan requires that the Plan Processor develop and maintain a comprehensive information technology security program for the Central Repository, to be approved and reviewed at least annually by the Operating Committee. To effectuate these requirements, Appendix D sets forth certain provisions designed to (1) limit access to data stored in the Central Repository to only authorized personnel and only for permitted purposes; (2) ensure data confidentiality and security during all communications between CAT Reporters and the Plan Processor, data extractions, manipulation and transformation, loading to and from the Central Repository, and data maintenance by the Central Repository; (3) require the establishment of secure controls for data retrieval and query reports by Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC; and (4) otherwise provide appropriate database security for the Central Repository. Section 6.2(a) of the CAT NMS Plan provides that the Chief Compliance Officer, in collaboration with the Chief Information Security Officer, will retain independent third parties with appropriate data security expertise to review and audit on an annual basis the policies, procedures, standards, and real time tools that monitor and address data security issues for the Plan Processor and the Central Repository.[3825]

The Plan Processor must have appropriate solutions and controls in place to ensure data confidentiality and security during all communication between CAT Reporters and the CAT System, data extraction, manipulation and transformation, loading to and from the Central Repository and data maintenance by the system. The solution must also address secure controls for data retrieval and query reports by Participant regulatory staff and the SEC. The solution must provide appropriate tools, logging, auditing and access controls for different components of the system, such as access to the Central Repository, access for CAT Reporters, access to rejected data, processing status and CAT Reporter calculated Error Rates.

In addition, pursuant to SEC Rule 613(e)(4)(i)(C)(2), the Plan Processor will develop and maintain a mechanism to confirm the identity of all persons permitted to access the data. The Plan Processor is responsible for defining, assigning and monitoring CAT Reporter entitlements. Similarly, pursuant to SEC Rule 613(e)(4)(i)(C)(3), the Plan Processor will record all instances where a person accesses the data.

Pursuant to SEC Rule 613(e)(4)(i)(B), Section 6.5(e)(ii) of the CAT NMS Plan requires each Participant to adopt and enforce rules that require information barriers between its regulatory staff and non-regulatory staff with regard to access to and use of data in the Central Repository, and permit only persons designated by such Participants to have access to and use of the data in the Central Repository.

[3823] SEC Rule 613(e)(4). This section of Appendix C provides an outline of the policies and procedures to be implemented. When adopting this requirement, the Commission recognized ''the utility of allowing the [Participants] flexibility to subsequently delineate them in greater detail with the ability to make modifications as needed.'' Adopting Release at 45782. Additional detail is provided in Appendix D, Data Security.

[3824] *See* Section 6.2(a)(v) of the CAT NMS Plan for a more detailed list of the activities to be performed by the Chief Compliance Officer.

[3825] *See* SEC Rule 613(e)(5).

The Plan Processor will also develop a formal cyber incident response plan to provide guidance and direction during security incidents, and will also document all information relevant to any security incidents, as detailed in Appendix D, Data Security.

▪ **PII**

As noted above, because of the sensitivity of PII, the Participants have determined PII should be subject to more stringent standards and requirements than other order and trading data. In response to the RFP questions, many Bidders mentioned that a range of techniques were required to ensure safety of PII. These techniques included development of PII policies and managerial processes for use by Plan Processor as well as Participants' staff and the SEC, physical data center considerations and strong automated levels, such as application, mid-tier, database, and operating systems levels, and use of role-based access and other parameters such as time-limited, case-restricted, and compartmentalized privilege. Most Bidders advocated for separate storage of PII in a dedicated repository to reduce the ability for hacking events to occur.

In accordance with SEC Rule 613(e)(4)(i)(A), all Participants and their employees, as well as all employees of the Plan Processor, will be required to use appropriate safeguards to ensure the confidentiality of data reported to the Central Repository and not to use such data for any purpose other than surveillance and regulatory purposes. A Participant, however, may use the data that it reports to the Central Repository for regulatory, surveillance, commercial, or other purposes.

The Participants anticipate that access to PII will be limited to a ''need-to-know'' basis. Therefore, it is expected that access to PII associated with customers and accounts will have a much lower number of registered users, and access to this data will be limited to Participants' staff and the SEC who need to know the specific identity of an individual. For this reason, PII such as SSN and TIN will not be made available in the general query tools, reports, or bulk data extraction.[3826] The Participants will require that the Plan Processor provide for a separate workflow granting access to PII (including an audit trail of such requests) that allows this information to be retrieved only when required by specific regulatory staff of a Participant or the SEC, including additional security requirements for this sensitive data. Specifically, the Plan Processor must take steps to protect PII as defined in Appendix D, Data Security and including items such as storage of PII separately from order and transaction data, multi-factor authentication for access to PII data, and a full audit trail of all PII data access.

It is anticipated that the Technical Specifications will set forth additional policies and procedures concerning the security of data reported to the Central Repository; however, any such policies and procedures must, at a minimum, meet the requirements set forth in the CAT NMS Plan and Appendix D.

The Flexibility and Scalability of the CAT (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(v))

▪ **Overview**

As required by SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(v), this section discusses the flexibility and scalability of the systems used by the Central Repository to collect, consolidate and store CAT Data, including the capacity of the Central Repository to efficiently incorporate, in a cost-effective manner, improvements in technology, additional capacity, additional order data, information about additional Eligible Securities or transactions, changes in regulatory requirements, and other developments.

The Plan Processor will ensure that the Central Repository's technical infrastructure is scalable, adaptable to new requirements and operable within a rigorous processing and control environment. As a result, the technical infrastructure will require an environment with significant throughput capabilities, advanced data management services and robust processing architecture. The technical infrastructure should be designed so that in the event of a capacity upgrade or hardware replacement, the Central Repository can continue to receive data from CAT Reporters with no unexpected issues.

The Plan Processor will perform assessments of the Central Repository's technical infrastructure to ensure the technology employed therein continues to meet the functional requirements established by the Participants. The Plan Processor will provide such assessments to, and review such assessments with, the Operating Committee within one month of completion. The Operating Committee will set forth the frequency with which the Plan Processor is required to perform such assessments. The Operating Committee must approve all material changes/upgrades proposed by the Plan Processor before they can be acted upon. The Operating Committee may solicit feedback from the Advisory Committee for additional comments and/or suggestions on changes to the capacity study as the Operating Committee determines necessary.

The Central Repository will employ optimal technology for supporting (1) scalability to increase capacity to handle a significant increase in the volume of data reported, (2) adaptability to support future technology developments and new requirements and (3) maintenance and upgrades to ensure that technology is kept current, supported and operational.

Participants will provide metrics and forecasted growth to facilitate Central Repository capacity planning. The Plan Processor will maintain records of usage statistics to identify trends and processing peaks. The Central Repository's capacity levels will be determined by the Operating Committee and used to monitor resources, including CPU power, memory, storage, and network capacity.

The Plan Processor will ensure the Central Repository's compliance with all applicable service level agreements concerning flexibility and scalability of the Central Repository, including those specified in the CAT NMS Plan and by the Operating Committee.

▪ **Approaches proposed by Bidders**

Information received from Shortlisted Bidders indicated that all six Shortlisted Bidders considered incoming transaction volumes to be one of their most significant drivers of cost across hardware, software, and full-time employees (''*FTEs*''), with the expected rate of increase in transaction volumes and retention requirements also being prominent drivers of cost. The approaches described above will facilitate effective management of these factors to provide for a cost-effective and flexible Central Repository.

As noted in the RFP, the Bidders were required to provide comments on how the Central Repository would be scalable for growth in the following aspects: number of issues accepted by the CAT, types of messages accepted by the CAT, addition of fields stored on individual data records or increases in any data type due to market growth. The Bidders were also requested to describe how the system can be scaled up for peak periods and scaled down as needed.

Bidders using a network infrastructure of data collection hubs noted the use of Ethernet links throughout a single hub as a method of handling additional throughput and capacity. Other Bidders note access points will be load balanced, allowing for additional capacity. Some Bidders note the need for continued monitoring to facilitate timely addition of capacity or other upgrades. Other Bidders highlighted the ability to scale processing horizontally by adding nodes to the database structure which will allow for additional capacity. In this instance, adding nodes to an existing clustered environment allows for the preservation of processing speed in the existing processing environment. In a cloud solution, Bidders note the systems will scale automatically. That is, the processing load or capacity is determined at the instance the tool is 'run' by the processer.[3827] Some Bidders broadly note that the selection of platform components or features of their proposed solution infrastructure was the key in developing a scalable system. It is further noted that the selection of these elements allows for technological upgrades to incorporate newer technologies without a system replacement. Bidders identify the use of additional server and storage capacity as a key proponent of providing a scalable system.

[3826] As described in Appendix C, Reporting Data to the CAT, general queries can be carried out using the Customer-ID without the need to know specific, personally-identifiable information (i.e., who the individual Person associated with the Customer-ID is). The Customer-ID will be associated with the relevant accounts of that Person; thus, the use of Customer-ID for querying will not reduce surveillance.

[3827] *See, e.g.,* Google Cloud Platform, *https://cloud.google.com/developers/articles/auto-scaling-on-the-google-cloud-platform/.*

The Feasibility, Benefits, and Costs for Broker-Dealers Reporting Allocations in Primary Market Transactions to the Consolidated Audit Trail (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(vi))

SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(vi) requires the Participants to assess the feasibility, benefits and costs of broker-dealers reporting to the consolidated audit trail in a timely manner:

The identity of all market participants (including broker-dealers and customers) that are allocated NMS Securities, directly or indirectly, in a Primary Market Transaction;[3828]

The number of such NMS Securities each such market participant is allocated; and

The identity of the broker-dealer making each such allocation.[3829]

The objective of this CAT NMS Plan is to provide a comprehensive audit trail that ''allows regulators to efficiently and accurately track all activity in NMS securities throughout the U.S. markets.'' The Participants believe that an eventual expansion of the CAT to gather complete information on Primary Market Transactions would be beneficial to achieving that objective. However, based on the analysis directed to be completed as part of this plan, the Participants have concluded that it is appropriate to limit CAT submissions related to allocations in Primary Market Transactions to sub-account allocations, as described below.

Specifically, based on comments received by the Participants on this and other topics related to the consolidated audit trail,[3830] the Participants believe that information related to sub-account allocations—the allocation of shares in a primary market offering to the accounts that ultimately will own them—currently is maintained by broker-dealers in a manner that would allow for reporting to the Central Repository without unreasonable costs and could assist the Commission and the Participants in their regulatory obligations, including a variety of rulemaking and policy decisions. By contrast, the reporting of so-called ''top account'' information in Primary Market Transactions to the Central Repository would involve significantly more costs which, when balanced against the marginal benefit, is not justified at this time. These issues are discussed further below.

As a preliminary matter, the analysis required pursuant to this section is limited to Primary Market Transactions in NMS Securities that involve allocations. As the Commission has noted, '' 'a primary market transaction is any transaction other than a secondary market transaction and refers to any transaction where a person purchases securities in an offering.' '' [3831] The Participants understand that Primary Market Transactions generally involve two phases that implicate the allocation of shares. The ''book building'' phase involves the process ''by which underwriters gather and assess investor demand for an offering of securities and seek information important to their determination as to the size and pricing of an issue.'' [3832] This process may involve road shows to market an offering to potential investors, typically institutional investors, including the discussion of the prospective issuer, and its management and prospects. The book building phase also involves efforts by the underwriter to ascertain indications of interest in purchasing quantities of the underwritten securities at varying prices from potential investors.[3833] Using this and other information, the underwriter will then decide how to allocate IPO shares to purchasers. The Participants understand that these are so-called ''top account'' allocations—allocations to institutional clients or retail broker-dealers, and that such allocations are conditional and may fluctuate until the offering syndicate terminates. Sub-account allocations occur subsequently, and are made by top account institutions and broker-dealers prior to settlement. Sub-account allocations represent the allocation of IPO shares to the actual account receiving the shares and are based on an allocation process that is similar to secondary market transactions.[3834]

▪ **Feasibility**

In the April 2013 Request for Comment, the Participants requested information on how firms handle Primary Market Transactions. In response to the request, FIF, SIFMA and Thomson Reuters submitted comments explaining current industry practice with respect to Primary Market Transactions.[3835] Both SIFMA and FIF noted that broker-dealers generally maintain top account allocation information in book building systems that are separate from their systems for secondary market transactions and that differ across the industry, including the use of applications provided by third parties, in house systems and spreadsheets for small firms.[3836] The Participants also understand that the investment banking divisions of broker-dealers typically use different compliance systems than those used for secondary market transactions.[3837] The DAG also provided feedback [3838] indicating that the impacted systems differ across the industry, given differing processes for Primary Market Transactions depending upon the structure of the deal, and that initial allocations are stored in book-building systems with varying levels of sophistication across the industry, including third-party systems, custom-built systems, and spreadsheets. The Participants thus believe that capturing indications of interest and other information about top account allocations in an accurate and consistent manner across the industry would be challenging.

By contrast, the Participants believe that it would be more feasible to gather information relating to sub-account allocations in Primary Market Transactions. The Participants understand that sub-account allocations are received in a manner and level of detail similar to allocations in secondary market transactions,[3839] and that the same middle and back office systems that are used for the processing of sub-account allocations for secondary market transactions generally are also used for the sub-account allocations for Primary Market Transactions.[3840] Similarly, sub-account allocations for Primary Market Transactions generally are maintained in an electronic format that could be converted into a reportable format acceptable for the CAT System. Therefore, these systems could more easily report information about sub-account allocations to the Central Repository than systems containing information regarding top-account allocations.

▪ **Benefits**

As the Commission notes, data about the final allocations of NMS Securities in Primary Market Transactions could improve compliance monitoring and market analyses by the Commission and the Participants, which, in turn, could help inform rulemaking and other policy decisions.[3841] For example, such data could enhance the Commission's understanding of the role of the allocations in the capital formation process, when and how investors receiving allocations sell their Eligible Securities and how allocations differ among broker-dealers.[3842] Such data also could assist the Commission and Participants in conducting their respective examinations and investigations related to Primary Market Transactions.[3843]

The Participants believe that most of these potential benefits could be achieved through the gathering of information relating to sub-account allocations rather than top account information. For example, sub-account allocation information would aid the

[3828] All observations and costs as provided in this section include secondary offerings.

[3829] SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(vi).

[3830] Questions for Public Comment re the CAT NMS Plan (Apr. 22, 2013), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/web/groups/catnms/@catnms/documents/appsupportdocs/p246652.pdf* (''*April Request for Comment*'').

[3831] Adopting Release at 45792 n.792.

[3832] *See generally,* Securities Act Release No. 8565, 70 Fed. Reg. 19672 (Apr. 13, 2005) (Commission guidance regarding prohibited conduct in connection with IPO allocations) (''*IPO Allocation Release*'').

[3833] *Id.*

[3834] *See* FIF Letter at 4.

[3835] *See* FIF Letter; SIFMA Letter; Thomson Reuters (May 21, 2013) (''*Thomson Reuters Letter*''), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/industryFeedback/; see also* Thomson Reuters Letter, *http://catnmsplan.com/industryFeedback/P284396* (systems used for primary market allocations differ from those used for secondary market transactions).

[3836] FIF Letter at 4; SIFMA Letter at 3

[3837] FIF Letter at 4. The Participants also understand that top account allocation systems do not generally have execution reporting capacity, since reporting of primary market transactions is not currently required under OATS and other transaction reporting systems. SIFMA Letter at 2.

[3838] *See* DAG Cost Estimate for Adding Primary Market Transactions into CAT (Feb. 17, 2015), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/industryFeedback/P602480.*

[3839] FIF Letter at 4.

[3840] For example, commenters noted that ''firms generally use the same clearance and settlement systems for clearing and settling final allocations in primary market transactions as they do for clearing and settling secondary market trades.'' SIFMA Letter at 4.

[3841] Adopting Release at 45792–93.

[3842] *Id.*

[3843] *Id.*

Commission and the Participants in gaining a better understanding of how shares allocated in Primary Market Transactions are sold in the secondary market, or how allocations differ across broker-dealers. By contrast, because top account information of conditional and interim allocations for NMS Securities fluctuates throughout the syndicate process and may vary significantly among firms, the marginal benefits of such information over final sub-account allocations are much less clear.

▪ **Costs**

The cost of reporting Primary Market Transaction information will depend on the scope of allocation information subject to the rule, as well as the related technology upgrades that would be necessary to report such information to the Central Repository. Based on the response of commenters, the Participants believe that reporting top account information about conditional allocations to the Central Repository would require significant technology enhancements. As noted above, current market practices capture top account allocations using systems and data sources that are different and separate from those used in secondary market transactions. Commenters also noted that there may be significant variability among underwriters in terms of the systems and applications used to gather such data.

The DAG provided cost estimates associated with the reporting of Primary Market Transactions.[3844] These estimates indicated that to report both initial and sub-account allocations would cost the industry as a whole at least $234.8 million [3845] and require approximately 36 person-months per firm to implement. The DAG's estimate to report sub-account allocations only was approximately $58.7 million [3846] for the industry and would require approximately 12 person-months per firm to implement. The DAG commented that given the higher costs associated with reporting initial allocations, if Primary Market Transactions are required to be reported to the Central Repository, that only reporting final sub-account allocations be required.

Based upon this analysis, the Participants are supportive of considering the reporting of Primary Market Transactions, but only at the sub-account level, and will incorporate analysis of this requirement, including how and when to implement such a requirement, into their document outlining how additional Eligible Securities could be reported to the Central Repository, in accordance with SEC Rule 613(i) and Section 6.11 of the Plan.

Analysis of the CAT NMS Plan: These considerations are intended to help inform the Commission about the cost for development, implementation and maintenance of the CAT and to help determine if such plan is in the public interest.

Analysis of Expected Benefits and Estimated Costs for Creating, Implementing, and Maintaining the Consolidated Audit Trail (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(vii))

The analysis of expected benefits and estimated costs presented here is informed by the Commission's public guidance on conducting economic analysis in conjunction with SEC rulemaking.[3847] The analysis begins with a statement of the need for regulatory action, describes the sources of information used in the analysis, and provides a description of the economic baseline used to evaluate the impacts associated with the CAT NMS Plan. The analysis then provides estimates of the costs to build, implement, and maintain the CAT, as contemplated, and ends with a description of the alternatives considered.

▪ **Need for Regulatory Action**

SEC Rule 613 further requires the Participants to consider and discuss in the CAT NMS Plan detailed estimated costs for creating, implementing, and maintaining the CAT as contemplated by the CAT NMS Plan. Specifically, SEC Rule 613 requires that the estimated costs should specify: (1) an estimate of the costs to the Participants in establishing and maintaining the Central Repository; (2) an estimate of the costs to broker-dealers, initially and on an ongoing basis, for reporting the data required by the CAT NMS Plan; (3) an estimate of the costs to the Participants, initially and on an ongoing basis, for reporting the data required by the CAT NMS Plan; and (4) the Participants' proposal to fund the creation, implementation, and maintenance of the CAT, including the proposed allocation of such estimated costs among the Participants and broker-dealers. Set forth below is a discussion of cost estimates, including the studies undertaken to obtain relevant data, as well as the proposed funding model.

▪ **Economic Analysis**

5. *Sources of Cost Information*

Participants relied on two primary sources of information to estimate current audit trail costs (i.e., costs associated with the economic baseline), the costs incurred to meet the requirements of SEC Rule 613 for both the Participants and other CAT Reporters and the costs associated with the creation, implementation and maintenance of the CAT. First, to assess the costs associated with Participant and CAT Reporter obligations, Participants solicited study responses from Participants, broker-dealers and third party vendors. These three constituencies are the primary parties with direct costs arising from SEC Rule 613, as discussed further below. Second, to assess the costs associated with creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT, this analysis relies on estimated costs submitted by the Bidders as part of the bidding process.

Studies

Costs to Participants Study

The first study undertaken collected information from the Participants about current audit trail reporting costs under the existing regulatory reporting framework and the potential costs of reporting to the Central Repository (the ''*Costs to Participants Study*''). Respondents were asked to estimate separately hardware, FTE staffing costs, and third party provider costs, where applicable. The study also requested information about costs associated with retiring current regulatory systems that would be rendered redundant by the CAT.

The Costs to Participants Study was distributed to the 19 Participants on August 11, 2014. The initial due date for responses was August 25, 2014; however due to the complexity of the data collection effort, the due date for the study was extended to September 24, 2014. Discussions with respondents suggested that at least some of the costs were more appropriate to measure at the level of the group of Affiliated Participants that hold multiple licenses (''*Affiliated Participants Group*''). Based on this approach, study results are presented for four Participants holding a single exchange registration and FINRA, which also is a Participant but is a registered securities association, and another five Affiliated Participants Groups representing the remaining fourteen registered exchanges. Subsequent to the filing of the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants determined that additional detail about anticipated costs could be provided to enhance the data collected as part of the Costs to Participants Study and a second data collection was conducted.

Costs to CAT Reporters Study

The study sent to broker-dealers (the ''*Costs to CAT Reporters Study*'') was distributed to 4,406 broker-dealers,[3848] and requested estimates for current costs under the existing regulatory reporting framework as well as future costs for reporting to the Central Repository. Broker-dealer respondents were asked to estimate the future costs to report to the Central Repository under two separate scenarios.[3849] Approach 1 described a scenario in which broker-dealers would submit data to the

[3844] *See supra* note 3838.

[3845] Based upon an assumption of 12 person-months of business analysis, an implementation timeline of 3x the business analysis timeline, 21.741 person-days per month, a $1,200 daily FTE rate, and a multiplier of 250 to reflect the costs of the 250 largest reporting firms. 12 person-months of analysis * 3 * 21.741 person-days per month * $1,200 daily FTE rate = $939,211 * 250 = $234.8 million.

[3846] Based upon an assumption of 3 person-months of business analysis, an implementation timeline of 3x the business analysis timeline, 21.741 person-days per month, a $1,200 daily FTE rate, and a multiplier of 250 to reflect the costs of the 250 largest reporting firms. 3 person-months of analysis * 3 * 21.741 person-days per months * $1,200 daily FTE rate = $234,802 * 250 = $58.7 million.

[3847] *See, e.g.,* Memorandum to File Re: Current Guidance on Economic Analysis in SEC Rulemakings (Mar. 16, 2012), *available at http://www.sec.gov/divisions/riskfin/rsfi_guidance_econ_analy_secrulemaking.pdf* (outlining foundational elements of regulatory economic analysis).

[3848] A unique study link was distributed to 4,406 broker-dealers. For 381 of the broker-dealers, the distribution email either was undeliverable or the broker-dealer responded that the study did not apply to them.

[3849] *See* SEC Rule 613—Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT) Cost Study Overview and Assumptions, *available at http://catnmsplan.com/web/groups/catnms/@catnms/documents/appsupportdocs/p535485.pdf.*

Central Repository using their choice of existing industry messaging protocols, such as the FIX protocol. Approach 2 provided a scenario in which broker-dealers would submit data to the Central Repository using a defined or specified format, such as an augmented version of OATS. For each approach, respondents were asked to estimate separately hardware, FTE staffing costs, and third party provider costs, where applicable. Finally, broker-dealers were requested to provide the cost of retirement of existing systems to be replaced by the CAT.

The development of the Costs to CAT Reporters Study took place over two months, starting in May 2014, and included detailed discussions with the DAG. The Participants developed an initial outline of questions based on the requirements in SEC Rule 613, as well as a detailed assumptions document. To make the Costs to CAT Reporters Study effective and informative, the Participants spent two months formulating the Costs to CAT Reporters Study with detailed input from the DAG. The initial draft of the Costs to CAT Reporters Study was presented to the DAG in May 2014, and was discussed in two additional meetings with the DAG until mid-June 2014. In addition, on June 4, 2014, the Participants received and subsequently incorporated detailed written feedback from DAG members on the Costs to CAT Reporters Study and associated assumptions document.[3850]

The study link was sent on June 23, 2014, to the compliance contact at each recipient CAT Reporter identified by the applicable designated examining authority or designated options examining authority to receive regulatory update and information requests. The initial due date for the study was August 6, 2014. On June 25, 2014 and July 9, 2014, the Participants hosted a webinar[3851] to review the materials associated with the Costs to CAT Reporters Study, and to answer any questions from the CAT Reporters. On July 17, 2014, July 30, 2014, and August 4, 2014, reminders were sent to the CAT Reporters to submit their final responses to the Costs to CAT Reporters Study by August 6, 2014. In addition, the Participants requested that industry associations that are part of the DAG encourage their members to respond to the Costs to CAT Reporters Study.

On August 6, 2014, the first extension was granted for the Costs to CAT Reporters Study, extending the due date to August 20, 2014. On August 20, 2014, an additional extension was granted, extending the due date to September 3, 2014.

During the process of collecting responses to the Costs to CAT Reporters Study, CAT Reporters were informed that all responses were captured on an anonymous basis and would only be reported to the Participants in an aggregated, anonymous format. The third party facilitator of the Costs to CAT Reporters Study reviewed all responses received through the study portal. Study respondents had the option of identifying their firm should additional follow-up be required; any such follow-up was undertaken by the third-party facilitator, as necessary, to enhance the overall quality of responses received.

The Participants received 422 responses. Of those responses, 180 were deemed to be materially incomplete[3852] and, thus, they were considered effectively nonresponsive. An additional 75 responses were determined to be clearly erroneous; for example the responses had repeating values that could not be used in analysis, or the magnitude of reported FTEs or other costs was so high as to be considered an outlier[3853]. As a result, the Participants excluded these incomplete and clearly erroneous responses from the data set, resulting in a population of 167 responses that was used for purposes of conducting the cost analysis described herein.

Costs to Vendors Study

A study requested information from various service providers and vendors about the potential costs of reporting to the Central Repository (the ''*Costs to Vendors Study*''). The Participants developed the content of the Costs to Vendors Study, based on the structure and content of the Costs to CAT Reporters Study. The distribution list for the Costs to Vendors Study was provided by the DAG, and was distributed to 13 service bureaus and technology vendors on August 13, 2014. The initial due date for responses was September 1, 2014; however, due to the complexity of the data collection effort, the due date for the study was extended to September 12, 2014. The Participants received five completed responses to the Costs to Vendors Study.

Bidder Estimates

To estimate the costs to Participants for creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT, Bidders were asked to provide in their Bid documents total one-year and annual recurring cost estimates. As part of the RFP process, the Bidders were asked to provide a schedule of the anticipated total cost of creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT. As noted above in the Background Section of Appendix C, any one of the six Shortlisted Bidders could be selected as the Plan Processor and each Shortlisted Bidder[3854] has proposed different approaches to various issues. The Bidder selected as the Plan Processor must meet the specific requirements set forth in the Plan and Appendix D and may be given the opportunity to revise its Bid prior to the final selection of a Plan Processor. Accordingly, the Participants anticipate that the cost estimates to create, implement and maintain the CAT may differ from what is set forth below.[3855]

In its final rule for the Consolidated Audit Trail, the Commission amended its proposal to include enhanced security and privacy requirements. Specifically, SEC Rule 613(e)(4) requires the NMS Plan to include policies and procedures, including standards, to be used by the Plan Processor to ensure the security and confidentiality of all information reported to the Central Repository. Participants did not ask Bidders to separately assess the costs associated with the enhanced security requirements in SEC Rule 613; rather these costs were embedded in the Bids as a component of the total costs.

The RFP requested that Bidders provide an estimate of the total one-time cost to build the CAT, including technological, operational, administrative, and any other material costs. The six Shortlisted Bidders provided estimates ranging from a low of $30,000,000 to a high of $91,600,000, with an average one-time cost of $53,000,000.[3856]

The RFP also requested that Bidders provide an estimate of annual recurring operating and maintenance costs for the five year period following the selection of the Plan Processor, and an estimate of the annual peak year costs (i.e., cost for the year during which it will cost the most to operate the CAT). The six Shortlisted Bidders provided estimates ranging from a low of $135,000,000 to a high of $465,100,000 over the course of the first five years of operation, with an average five-year cost of $255,600,000 and an average annual cost of $51,100,000. Estimates of peak year recurring costs range from a low of $27,000,000 to a high of $109,800,000, with an average of $59,400,000. The table presented below reports the low, median, average, and maximum expected costs for the build, maintenance, and peak year maintenance of the Central Repository arising from the Shortlisted Bids. These figures are subject to change as Bidders may update their cost estimates.

[3850] *See* Past Events and Announcements, SROs Launch Study to Analyze Implementation Cost of the Consolidated Audit Trail (last updated Dec. 10, 2014), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/PastEvents/*.

[3851] *See* SEC Rule 613: Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT), SRO Hosted Consolidated Audit Trail Cost Study Webinar (July 9, 2014), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/PastEvents/P551992*.

[3852] Materially incomplete responses were those that provided responses for less than half of the cost-related questions.

[3853] Responses were outliers if their values were two times greater than the next highest value.

[3854] Section 5.2(b) of the CAT NMS Plan describes how the Participants selected the Shortlisted Bidders.

[3855] More specifically, Participants anticipate that technology costs and technological solutions may evolve over the bidding process and may affect the Bids. For instance, one Bidder recently provided an update to the Participants, noting ''We expect continued cost reductions as Moore's Law is applied to cloud pricing and to have this bring down total cost to the industry on an ongoing basis.'' As another example, evolving technologies for data security may either increase or decrease estimated costs.

[3856] Due to the complexity of the cost estimation effort, all figures provided in this analysis section have been rounded to a reasonable degree of accuracy and should be considered approximate.

BIDDER ESTIMATES SUMMARY

	Minimum	Median	Mean	Maximum
Build Costs (One-time)	$30,000,000	$46,100,000	$53,000,000	$91,600,000
Maintenance Costs (Annual)	$27,000,000	$42,200,000	$51,100,000	$93,000,000
Maintenance Costs (5 year)	$135,000,000	$211,200,000	$255,600,000	$465,100,000
Peak Year Maintenance	$27,000,000	$52,400,000	$59,400,000	$109,800,000

The Participants note, however, that there may be a relation between the initial construction costs and maintenance costs based on technological choices, among other factors. To better compare estimates, the Participants are providing a range based on the reported combined build and annual recurring costs for the five year period following Plan Processor selection, discounted by a factor of 2%.[3857] Estimates of total costs range from $159,800,000 to $538,700,000.

Participants sought insight into the economic drivers of the cost estimates from the Shortlisted Bidders. Specifically, Participants asked each Shortlisted Bidder to identify the factors, such as the amount of message traffic, complexity of order life cycles, number and complexity of Participant and Commission data requests and administration and support costs that were material to its Bid. Bidders identified the following as primary drivers of their Bid costs: (1) reportable volumes of data ingested into the Central Repository; (2) number of technical environments that would be have to be built to report to the Central Repository; (3) likely future rate of increase of reportable volumes; (4) data archival requirements; and (5) user support and/or help desk resource requirements.[3858]

6. *Economic Baseline*

In publishing SEC Rule 613, the Commission stated that it ''believes that the regulatory infrastructure on which the Participants and the Commission currently must rely generally is outdated and inadequate to effectively oversee a complex, dispersed, and highly automated national market system.'' [3859] The purpose of the CAT NMS Plan is to develop, build and maintain a system that provides an infrastructure to appropriately monitor, surveil and oversee the national market system in its current state and provide sufficient flexibility to reasonably adjust for future financial market innovations.

Such a system will necessarily impact the Commission, Participants, potential future Participant entrants, broker-dealers and other market participants, issuers and investors. Each party may derive costs, benefits and other economic impacts, depending upon plan implementation, the relevant economic activities of each entity and the allocation of costs and responsibilities across those entities. These estimated costs, benefits, and other economic impacts must be assessed against the current economic baseline, capturing the existing state of regulatory audit trail activity in the markets. The economic baseline for different affected parties is described in greater detail below.

Description of Current Audit Trail Reporting

Currently, separate audit trails exist within each exchange in addition to the audit trail requirements for FINRA members to report to OATS.[3860] For equities, all broker-dealers that are members of FINRA must report their orders in NMS Stocks and OTC Equity Securities, including executions or cancellations, to OATS. Accordingly, for FINRA members, it is possible to match OATS reports to related exchange audit trail entries, provided that the related exchange has a regulatory services agreement with FINRA such that FINRA has access to the exchange data. Broker-dealers that are not FINRA members do not have a regular equity audit trail reporting requirement, although NYSE and NASDAQ member proprietary firms that are not FINRA members have an obligation to record OATS data and report to FINRA upon request. Additionally, each exchange creates its own audit trail for each order received that it receives and processes.

For options, the options exchanges utilize the Consolidated Options Audit Trail System (''*COATS*'') to obtain and review information on options transactions. COATS data includes trades, the National Best Bid and National Best Offer at the time of the trade and clearing information for customers at the clearing firm level. It also identifies clearing firm proprietary trading and individual marker maker transactions if they are reported correctly at the time of the trade. However, COATS does not include adjustment data from the Options Clearing Corporation; these adjustments include changes to either the account type or size of the position. Additionally, order information is only available to the Commission upon request from the options exchanges. Currently reports need to be constructed based on order information received from the various options exchanges. As previously noted, only the National Best Bid and National Best Offer at the time of the trade is included in the COATS data; however, this is optional data that the exchanges may or may not provide. The options exchanges utilize their independent quote information to build their reports.

In sum, each equities and options exchange is built on its own unique platform, utilizes unique entry protocols and requirements and thus creates uniquely formatted audit trails.

The existence of multiple non-integrated audit trails has direct consequences on the accuracy and efficiency of regulatory oversight. The Commission has stated that:

> . . . there are shortcomings in the completeness, accuracy, accessibility, and timeliness of these existing audit trail systems. Some of these shortcomings are a result of the disparate nature of the systems, which make it impractical, for example, to follow orders through their entire lifecycle as they may be routed, aggregated, re-routed, and disaggregated across multiple markets. The lack of key information in the audit trails that would be useful for regulatory oversight, such as the identity of the customers who originate orders, or even the fact that two sets of orders may have been originated by the same customer, is another shortcoming.[3861]

In addition, the Intermarket Surveillance Group's (''*ISG*'') consolidated equity audit trail combines transaction data from all exchanges and is used by all Participants for surveillance purposes. However, the ISG audit trail is limited because it contains clearing member and executing broker's CRD numbers, but does not contain information about the beneficial owner to a trade. It also does not contain order detail information such as a complete order entry time or routing history.

COATS and the ISG equity audit trails are utilized to generate various option cross market/cross product exception reports, such as front-running and anticipatory hedges. Since the current data is unable to drill down to beneficial owner or order information, these reports are less effective and produce a large number of false positives.

Costs, Benefits, and Other Economic Impacts of Audit Trail Reporting on Regulators and Market Participants

Participants

There are 19 Participants of varying sizes that have established audit trail reporting requirements for NMS Securities. Of these, one is a registered securities association. The other 18 Participants are exchanges. Fourteen of these exchanges permit quotation and transactions in NMS Securities and 12 permit transactions and quotations in Listed Options.

Participants expend resources currently to maintain and update their audit trail reporting systems. Costs for current surveillance programs as indicated by Participants responding to the Costs to Participants Study vary significantly,

[3857] The discount factor represents an estimate of the average yield on AAA-rated corporate debt for the month period August 28, 2014 to September 27, 2014. Costs anticipated to be accrued after the first year (years 2 through 5) are discounted back to the first year to permit Participants to compare the anticipated costs associated with different Bids on a constant dollar basis.

[3858] Bidders indicated that user support costs primarily consisted of FTE costs.

[3859] Adopting Release at 45723.

[3860] *See* FINRA Rule 7410 *et seq.*

[3861] Adopting Release at 45722.

reflecting the various sizes of Participants: total annual costs associated with meeting current regulatory requirements are estimated to be $6,900,000. Total annual costs for current surveillance programs for all Participants are $147,200,000.

Broker-Dealers

Broker-dealers benefit from the current regime of audit trail reporting to the extent that reporting today permits the Commission and Participants to monitor for rule compliance. Effective regulatory and compliance oversight ensures increased market integrity and supports investor confidence in participating in financial markets. Conversely, if investors believe that regulators are unable to adequately and effectively monitor activities in a complex market (through current audit trail reporting), broker-dealers bear some of the cost in the form of lower market activity.

Broker-dealers that are FINRA members must have systems and processes in place to provide FINRA with the reportable data in the required format. These systems also require resources to ensure that data quality and consistency and timeliness of reporting are maintained, and record-keeping obligations are fulfilled.[3862] Additionally, firm trading and order routing systems send orders and quotations to each exchange in the format required by such exchange. In turn, each exchange must store and convert the data for the purposes of creating internal exchange audit trails. Broker-dealers also commit staff to respond to Participant and Commission requests for additional data and related information based upon surveillance.

Broker-dealers may take varied approaches to fulfilling their regulatory reporting obligations. For instance, many broker-dealers develop internal systems for the purpose of compiling order and trading data into a reportable format. In these instances, the firms may need to centralize varied and disparate systems. Other broker-dealers typically use third parties to help them comply with their reporting obligations. These third parties may include service bureaus that provide the firms with order management systems. Firms may also contract with their clearing firms to package and submit order data files on their behalf.

Some broker-dealers that are FINRA members may be exempt from OATS reporting, or are excluded under FINRA rules from OATS requirements. Exempt firms go through a formal exemption request process through which they certify that they meet the exemption criteria which includes: (1) the member firm has total annual revenue of less than $2,000,000; (2) the member firm and current control affiliates and associated persons of the member have not been subject within the last five years to any final disciplinary action, and within the last 10 years to any disciplinary action involving fraud; (3) the member does not conduct any clearing or carrying activities for other firms; (4) the member does not conduct any market making activities in NMS Stocks and OTC Equity Securities; and (5) the member does not execute principal transactions with its customers.[3863] FINRA also excludes some members from the definition of a reporting member. The criteria to receive this exclusion include: (1) the member must engage in a non-discretionary order routing process where the firm immediately routes all of its orders to a single receiving reporting member; (2) the member cannot direct or maintain control over subsequent routing or execution by the receiving reporting member; (3) the receiving reporting member must record and report all information under applicable FINRA rules; and (4) the member must have a written agreement with the receiving reporting member specifying the respective functions and responsibilities of each party.[3864] Approximately 660 broker-dealers are either exempt or excluded from OATS requirements, but will be required to report to the Central Repository. These broker-dealers are included in the estimate of broker-dealers currently quoting or executing trades in NMS Securities and/or Listed Options.

Additionally, the OATS rules do not require that proprietary orders generated in the normal course of market-making be reported.[3865] While some firms have chosen to voluntarily report such orders, there may be current gaps in the audit trail.

Broker-dealers that are members of other Participants must also have systems and processes in place to provide the necessary reportable data in the required format. These systems also require resources to ensure data quality and consistency, timeliness of reporting, and record-keeping obligations.[3866] Broker-dealers that are members of more than one Participant must maintain and manage systems that provide the relevant audit trail data to each Participant for which they have an obligation to report such data, in the manner and by the rules proscribed by each Participant, as applicable.

Upon request, broker-dealers must submit Electronic Blue Sheet (''*EBS*'') data to the requesting Participant by the specified due date, which is generally ten business days after receipt of the initial request. An EBS request is made by product and trade date range, with the data providing detailed information about the underlying accounts that transacted in the requested security. EBS requests can only be made for settled transactions in equity, option, or fixed income products, and they include information on allocations and executions of the requested product and may cover a time period of up to seven years from the date requested. Large Trader Reports are similar to EBS reports, except they are requested only by the Commission. Large trader requests may only be requested for NMS Securities, which may include unsettled transactions. In addition to requests being made by security and trade date range, a Large Trader request may be made by a LTID and trade date range. An LTID is an SEC identifier used to identify related entities under the same beneficial ownership structure. Broker-dealers must have systems and processes in place to provide EBS or large trader reportable data in the required format. These systems require resources to ensure that the data quality and timeliness of reporting are maintained, and record-keeping obligations are met. As with OATS, broker-dealers must commit staff to respond to requests for EBS or large trader data and may take varied approaches to fulfilling their regulatory reporting obligations.

PHLX Rule 1022 initially required members to submit specified data to PHLX for all accounts, however this rule was amended in May 2014 to more closely mirror NYSE Rule 757, ARCA Rule 6.39, and CBOE Rule 8.9, and to only require broker-dealers to report data for all of the accounts for which they engage in trading activities or which they exercise investment discretion upon request, rather than on a continuing basis. PHLX Rule 1022 was in place prior to the existence of the compliance data files from ISG (COATS and ECAT) and OCC (position). The remaining requirement for members to provide data upon request is to enable a review if required for regulatory purposes. PHLX Rule 1022 is anticipated to be retired once all CAT Reporters are submitting data to the CAT as the information would be obtainable from CAT, rather than from Industry Members.

CBOE Rule 8.9(b) requires clearing firms to submit, on a daily basis and in a manner prescribed by CBOE, every executed order entered by market makers for securities underlying options traded on CBOE or convertible into such securities or for securities traded on CBOE, as well as for opening and closing positions in all such securities held in each market maker account. To the extent that clearing firms do not report such orders and information, the market maker who entered the order is responsible for reporting the order information. These data files are commonly known as Market Maker Equity Trade (MMET) and Market Maker Stock Position (MMSTK) files. The CBOE daily reporting requirement for market makers is comparable to other option exchange reporting requirements. CBOE Rule 8.9(b) is anticipated to be amended once all CAT Reporters are submitting data to the CAT as the information would be obtainable from CAT rather than from Industry Members.

As of June 30, 2014, there were 4,406 registered broker-dealers that were members of at least one Participant. The Participants determined that, as of July 31, 2014, approximately 1,800 of these registered broker-dealers quoted or executed transactions in NMS Securities, Listed Options or OTC Equity Securities. Of these 1,800 broker-dealers, approximately 1,700 are FINRA members and are either reporting to OATS or were identified as routing firms in OATS reports submitted by other OATS reporting broker-dealers, but are otherwise excluded from the definition of an OATS reporting member or exempt from the OATS rules. In addition, there are an estimated 100 broker-dealers that reported transactions to another SRO, but that are not FINRA members. This determination was made

[3862] *See, e.g.,* SEC Rules 17a–3, 17a–4; FINRA Rules 4511–13.

[3863] *See* FINRA Rule 7470.

[3864] *See* FINRA Rule 7410(o).

[3865] *See* FINRA Rule 7410(j).

[3866] *See, e.g.,* SEC Rules 17a–3, 17a–4; FINRA Rules 4511–13.

through a review of the number of broker-dealers that transmitted order information to OATS, reported transaction information or quoted messages to a Participant for each month, over the previous 18 months. The Participants also reviewed message traffic data in the same month in the prior year and found that July 2014 was a reasonable representation of such activity.

Cost components considered in this process included technology costs (hardware/software costs), FTE costs (including, technology, operational, and compliance staffing requirements), and any outsourcing costs.[3867] The study also contained questions related to current costs that are intended to capture the baseline costs to broker-dealers for regulatory reporting, including costs related to compliance with OATS, the EBS and Large Trader reporting, and other reporting requirements, such as NYSE Rule 410B, PHLX Rule 1022, FESC/NYSE Rule123(e)/(f), and CBOE Rule 8.9.

Description of Costs to CAT Reporters Study Results

Of the 167 responses to the Costs to CAT Reporters Study used in the analysis of costs associated with reporting to the Central Repository, 49 were from large firms and 118 were from small firms.[3868] Fifty-one respondents indicated that they have OATS reporting obligations and 116 respondents [3869] stated that they do not currently have OATS reporting obligations.[3870] Of these 51 OATS reporters, 21 were large and 30 were small broker-dealers, with one firm completing all reporting using in-house staffing, 26% using a combination of in-house staffing and outsourcing, 44% of firms outsourcing to clearing firms, and the remaining 26% outsourcing their reporting to service bureaus. Of the remaining 116 broker-dealers, self-identified as non-OATS reporters,[3871] 28 were large and 88 were small. Figures for each respondent category have been provided for reference to support the cost analysis and include the average, median, minimum, maximum, and number of responses received equal to zero (0) or blank.[3872]

In analyzing responses to the Costs to CAT Reporters Study, Participants found responses to specific questions to be outliers. However, if the overall response from that respondent was otherwise deemed to be reasonably complete, the response was included in the analysis. As a result, in some cases, this may result in averages or medians being higher or lower than may be expected. In addition, a significant number of firms, in particular large firms, indicated that their current cost for regulatory obligations is $0. It is the Participants' understanding that this is likely due to current operational practices among broker-dealers that do not differentiate between technology and headcount costs that support business functionality and regulatory reporting.

Tables 1 and 2 describe the costs associated with current regulatory reporting requirements. Current costs for study respondents consisted of hardware/software costs, FTE costs consisting of development/maintenance, operational, and compliance staffing as well as third party outsourcing costs. Current average (median) hardware/software costs for the 49 large firms were equal to $310,000 ($0) and the 118 small firms were equal to $130,000 ($0).

Large firms reported that they employ an average (median) of 9.56 (0.00) FTEs for OATS, EBS and other regulatory reporting requirements, while small firms employed 2.36 (0.00) FTEs for the same reporting requirements. Participants estimate the dollar costs associated with these FTEs by applying an annual expenditure of $401,440 per FTE [3873] to determine cost. The resulting average (median) FTE costs were equal to $3,800,000 ($0) for the 49 large firms and $950,000 ($0) for the 118 small firms.

Third party/outsourcing costs were also varied by firm size. Average (median) third party/outsourcing costs for large firms was $180,000 ($0) and $130,000 ($0) for small firms.[3874]

Based on the costs associated with current regulatory reporting requirements, large firms provided an average cost of $4,290,000, and small firms reported an average cost of $1,210,000 for current reporting costs, with a median estimate of $0 for both large and small firms.

TABLE 1—CURRENT COSTS: LARGE RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (49 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$310,000	9.56	$3,800,000	$180,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	0.13	$52,000	$1,000
Maximum	$6,000,000	190.00	$76,300,000	$6,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	31	25	25	36
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

[3867] These costs are not mutually exclusive, and respondents may have included a combination of costs across all categories.

[3868] Firms were requested to self-select as ''small'' if they would qualify under Exchange Act Rule 0–10(c) as a broker or dealer that:

(1) had total capital (net worth plus subordinated liabilities) of less than $500,000 on the date in the prior fiscal year as of which its audited financial statements were prepared pursuant to 240.17a5(d) or, if not required to file such statements, a broker or dealer that had total capital (net worth plus subordinated liabilities) of less than $500,000 on the last business day of the preceding fiscal year (or in the time that it has been in business, if shorter); and

(2) is not affiliated with any Person (other than a natural Person) that is not a small business or small organization as defined in this section.

[3869] Participants recognize that 116 respondents stated that they do not currently report to OATS and this number is greater than the Participants' estimate of the total number of broker-dealers with reporting obligations to SROs other than FINRA. Participants assume that some broker-dealers who are FINRA members and currently exempt or excluded from OATS reporting requirements identified themselves as having no OATS reporting requirement. Given that these study responses provided data that could not otherwise be presumed to be incomplete or inaccurate, the Participants have chosen to include these responses in the analysis.

[3870] The distinction between cost estimates for OATS and non-OATS reporters is being made so that Participants may assess potential differences in estimated costs across the two identified scenarios in order to capture potential differences in costs that might arise from current reporting practices.

[3871] The distinction between cost estimates for OATS and non-OATS reporters is made so that Plan Participants may assess potential differences in estimated costs across the two identified scenarios in order to capture potential differences in costs that may arise from current reporting practices.

[3872] Some respondents provided no response to a specific question, i.e., left that response blank, while providing responses to the other questions in the study. The tables provided throughout this section provide a count of such blank responses for each question.

[3873] Participants assume an annual cost per FTE of $401,440, consistent with the rate applied by the Commission in the Adopting Release. Participants do note, however, that as part of the Costs to CAT Reporters Study, respondents were solicited to provide a cost for FTEs. Based on responses, the estimated annual cost per FTE would be $210,000 for large firms and $167,000 for small firms. Applying these estimates instead of the Commission's assumed annual cost would lead to dollar costs for FTEs on the order of half as large as reported here.

[3874] One anonymous small firm in the sample reported a total current regulatory reporting cost of $14 million. The Participants are not in a position to verify this number or determine whether it is due to an erroneous response (e.g., the respondent may not have recognized that the study collected responses to the cost questions in $1,000 increments). Therefore, Participants believe median numbers might better represent the typical costs across large and small firms instead of reported averages.

TABLE 2—CURRENT COSTS: SMALL RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (118 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$130,000	2.36	$950,000	$130,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	0.15	$60,000	$1,000
Maximum	$14,000,000	68.00	$27,300,000	$6,500,000
Count of Zero Responses	96	89	89	93
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

Tables 3 to 6 describe the current regulatory costs for respondents who identified themselves as having OATS reporting obligations versus those that do not (referred to as non-OATS). For the 21 large OATS reporters, current hardware/software costs averaged $720,000, with a median cost of $10,000, while the 28 large non-OATS reporters reported an average hardware/ software cost of $2,600, with a median cost of $0. For the 30 small OATS reporters, current hardware/software costs averaged $490,000, with a median value of $3,000, with the 88 small non-OATS reporters reporting an average hardware/software cost of $900 and a median cost of $0.

Large OATS reporters stated they required, on average, 17.88 FTEs, with a median value of 7.00 FTEs. Applying the FTE rate described above, this translates into an average FTE cost of $7,200,000, and a median value of $2,800,000. Large non-OATS reporters indicated an average FTE requirement of 3.32 and a median requirement of 0.00, translating into an average cost of $1,300,000 and a median cost of $0. On the other side of the spectrum, small OATS reporters stated they required, on average, 6.11 FTEs, with a median value of 3.50 FTEs. Applying the FTE rate described previously, this translates into an average FTE cost of $2,500,000, and a median value of $1,400,000. Small non-OATS reporters indicated average FTE requirements of 1.08 and a median requirement of 0.00, translating into an average cost of $430,000 and median cost of $0.

Third party/outsourcing costs for Large OATS reporters averaged $400,000, with a median value of $0; large non-OATS reporters indicated average third party/ outsourcing costs of $22,000, with a median value of $0. For small OATS reporters, third party/outsourcing costs averaged $510,000 with a median value of $3,000; small non-OATS reporters provided average costs of $2,900, with median costs of $0.

Based on the cost estimates above, large OATS reporters estimated an average (median) cost equal to $8,320,000 ($2,810,000) while large non-OATS respondents estimated an average (median) cost equal to $1,324,600 ($0). Small OATS reporters estimated an average (median) cost equal to $3,500,000 ($1,406,000) while small non-OATS respondents estimated an average (median) cost equal to $433,800 ($0).

TABLE 3—CURRENT COSTS: LARGE OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (21 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$720,000	17.88	$7,200,000	$400,000
Median	$10,000	7.00	$2,800,000	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	0.13	$52,000	$1,000
Maximum	$6,000,000	190.00	$76,300,000	$6,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	6	2	2	11
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

TABLE 4—CURRENT COSTS: LARGE NON-OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (28 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$2,600	3.32	$1,300,000	$22,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$5,000	1.00	$400,000	$60,000
Maximum	$50,000	60.00	$24,100,000	$300,000
Count of Zero Responses	25	23	23	25
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

TABLE 5—CURRENT COSTS: SMALL OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (30 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$490,000	6.11	$2,500,000	$510,000
Median	$3,000	3.50	$1,400,000	$3,000
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	0.15	$60,000	$1,000
Maximum	$14,000,000	29.00	$11,600,000	$6,500,000
Count of Zero Responses	11	6	6	8
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

TABLE 6—CURRENT COSTS: SMALL NON-OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (88 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$900	1.08	$430,000	$2,900
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$3,000	3.00	$1,200,000	$3,000
Maximum	$72,000	68.00	$27,300,000	$220,000
Count of Zero Responses	85	83	83	85
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

To understand the current costs associated with regulatory reporting and estimate the direct costs associated with the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants also conducted the Costs to Vendors Study. CAT Reporters may currently rely on third-parties to provide key services necessary to meet the reporting obligations. Smaller broker-dealers may rely wholly or in part on third-party providers for the infrastructure to manage and maintain their electronic records, including all of the data required for audit trail reporting. Larger broker-dealers and Participants may augment their own internal IT capacity and capabilities by purchasing the services of one or more third-party vendor. As a result, it is important to understand the current reporting cost as well as the likely impact of SEC Rule 613 on these vendors and to include them in the estimate of aggregate economic impacts.

The Participants received five completed responses to the Costs to Vendors Study. One of the respondents indicated that the vendor did not currently have any reporting expenses on behalf of its clients and did not expect to face any costs under the CAT. Of the remaining responses, three respondents supported more than 100 clients, and one supported between 50 and 99 clients. Two of the respondents supported up to 25 million accounts, and two supported up to 50 million accounts. Two of the respondents serviced clients with institutional and retail businesses, while the remaining two supported clients with institutional businesses only.

For equity order reporting, two respondents indicated that they process up to 1 million equity orders per day on behalf of their clients, and two respondents indicated that they process up to 2 million equity orders per day on behalf of their clients. For options order reporting, three respondents indicated that they report up to 1 million options orders per day on behalf of their clients, and one respondent indicated that it reports up to 2 million options orders per day on behalf of its clients. All four respondents indicated that they report between 3 million and 100 million OATS reportable order events [3875] per day on behalf of their clients. Three of the four respondents submitted EBS reports for their clients, with two submitting up to 200 responses per month and one submitting up to 400 responses per month.

Reported costs for current regulatory reporting for vendors varied widely across both dollar costs and FTE requirements. Each respondent provided an FTE rate associated with their FTE requirements; therefore, FTE costs for the vendors are reported using rates provided by each respondent. Dollar costs for hardware and software ranged from $50,000 to $15,000,000, and FTE requirements (cost) ranged from 11 ($2,700,000) to 92 ($8,600,000). While the respondent with the largest number of clients reported the highest costs, costs did not always correlate uniformly with the number of clients for other firms.

7. Estimated Costs, Benefits, and Other Economic Impacts of the CAT NMS Plan on Affected Parties

As required by SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(vii), this section provides detailed estimated costs for creating, implementing, and maintaining the CAT, specifying (1) an estimate of the costs to Participants for establishing and maintaining the CAT; (2) an estimate of the costs to members of the Participants, initially and on an ongoing basis, for reporting the data required by the CAT NMS Plan; (3) an estimate of the costs to the Participants, initially and on an ongoing basis, for reporting the data required by the CAT NMS Plan; and (4) the Participants' proposal to fund the creation, implementation, and maintenance of the CAT, including the proposed allocation of such estimated costs among the Participants, and between the Participants and members of the Participants. The Participants are sensitive to the economic impacts of SEC Rule 613. Throughout the development of the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants have continued to focus on minimizing the costs associated with the CAT. The Participants note that the figures presented in this analysis are estimates based on research completed and currently available data and are inherently subject to uncertainties.

Through the RFP, review of proposals received, and interaction with industry, the Participants have identified the sources of the costs associated with the CAT NMS Plan. These include direct costs associated with creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT necessary to meet the requirements of the CAT NMS Plan. There are also direct costs associated with developing and adapting applicable CAT Reporter systems to meet the requirements of the CAT NMS Plan and comply with the Plan on an ongoing basis. Additionally, Participants and broker-dealers may incur direct costs associated with the retirement of redundant reporting systems, although there may also be significant savings to broker-dealers associated with retiring those systems over time.

In order to meet the responsibilities outlined in SEC Rule 613, the Participants have accrued, and will continue to accrue, direct costs associated with the development of the CAT NMS Plan. These costs include staff time contributed by each Participant to, among other things, determine the technological requirements for the Central Repository, develop the RFP, evaluate Bids received, design and collect the data necessary to evaluate costs and other economic impacts, meet with Industry Members to solicit feedback, and complete the CAT NMS Plan submitted to the Commission for consideration. The Participants estimate that they have collectively contributed 20 FTEs in the first 30 months of the CAT NMS Plan development process. In addition, the Participants have incurred public relations, legal, and consulting costs in the preparation of the CAT NMS Plan. The Participants estimate the costs of these services to be $8,800,000. These public relations, legal, and consulting costs are considered reasonably associated with creating, implementing, and maintaining the CAT upon the Commission's adoption of the CAT NMS Plan.

Given the size and scope of the CAT initiative, estimating the costs of the creation, implementation and maintenance of the CAT is a complex task, and one that necessarily relies on input from parties not directly charged under SEC Rule 613 with the responsibility to create and file the CAT NMS Plan. In light of this, the Participants have used a multi-pronged approach to assess the potential costs of the CAT. Among other things, the Participants have evaluated the many cost-related comments received in response to the Commission's rule proposal for SEC Rule 613 and during the CAT NMS Plan development process. In addition, the Participants have considered cost analyses and considerations provided by Bidders as well as the views and related information provided by the DAG and written feedback from the SIFMA and the FIF.

The economic baseline against which the potential costs and benefits of the CAT must be compared are discussed above in Section B(7)(b)(ii). The potential impacts and estimated costs of the CAT are discussed separately below, presenting study results where applicable.

[3875] *See* FINRA, OATS Frequently Asked Questions at D8 (last updated July 6, 1998), *available at http://www.finra.org/Industry/Compliance/MarketTransparency/OATS/FAQ/P085541*.

Investors

Approximately 52% of Americans hold individual stocks, stock mutual funds or stocks through their retirement plan,[3876] and the retail options industry continues to grow.[3877]

Investors benefit from the protections provided through the use of audit trail data, permitting regulators to adequately and effectively monitor activities in today's complex securities markets. In SEC Rule 613, the Commission identified several ways that the CAT would enhance the protections to investors. These include: facilitating risk-based examinations, better identification of potentially manipulative trading activity, improved processes for evaluating tips, complaints and referrals of potential misconduct made to regulators, increased efficiency of cross-market and principal order surveillance, improved analysis and reconstruction of broad-based market events, improved ability to monitor and evaluate changes to market structure, and efficiencies from a potential reduction in disparate reporting requirements and data requests.

For instance, as shown in academic literature, surveillance has been demonstrated to increase investor confidence, by mitigating manipulative behavior and increasing trading activity.[3878] Academic literature provides support for the notion that investors associate enhanced surveillance with greater investment opportunity across a larger number of listed companies and with higher market capitalizations.[3879] Cross-market surveillance—an opportunity expected to be improved by CAT—is likely more effective in detecting manipulative behavior than single-market surveillance. A more recent study provides evidence that better surveillance is associated with reduced insider trading, as it would be harder to hide such trades.[3880]

To the extent that better surveillance leads to more effective rulemaking,[3881] investors should also benefit from the improvements in market quality that might arise from such rulemaking. For example, one study shows that detailed trading rules are positively correlated with liquidity measures evidenced by lower volatility and bid-ask spreads.[3882] Similarly, a separate study finds that European Union countries that have more effective rules to prevent market abuse and enhance transparency experience higher market liquidity.[3883]

Investors may also bear the costs associated with maintaining and enhancing the current audit trail systems. In some cases, broker-dealers may pass on regulatory charges that support Participant supervision, such as with respect to Section 31 fees.[3884] In other cases, broker-dealers may cover some of their regulatory charges through commissions and other charges. Similarly, broker-dealers may seek to pass on to investors their costs to build and maintain the CAT, which may include their own costs and any costs passed on to them by Participants. This analysis does not measure either the likelihood of these costs being passed through to investors nor the potential dollar impact on investors. The extent to which these costs are passed on to investors depends on the materiality of the costs and the ease with which investors can substitute away from any given broker-dealer.

Participants

Participants are expected to benefit from the requirements to report to the Central Repository. To the extent that the CAT enhances comparability of audit trail data—thereby enhancing order lifecycle comparability across different trading venues—Participants may better fulfill their obligations 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 regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to, and facilitating transactions in securities'' as set forth in Section 6 of the Exchange Act.

Participants would also incur direct costs associated with creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT infrastructure. The full cost associated with the build and maintenance of the CAT would be shared among Participants and Industry Members, consistent with the CAT NMS Plan. Participants would also be subject to costs associated with updating and maintaining their own systems to comply with their obligations to report to the Central Repository.

Central Repository Build and Maintenance Costs

The CAT NMS Plan provides that the costs arising from the build and maintenance of the CAT will be collected from all CAT Reporters, which includes Participants. As described in Article XI of the CAT NMS Plan and in Section C(b)(7)(iii) below, Participants will be required to pay their allocated portion of these costs on an annual basis.

The CAT NMS Plan also contemplates that Participants may impose greater requirements on the Central Repository based on their use of information in the repository for regulatory purposes. These requirements may take the form of frequent and complex analyses of data which may likely require more resources from the Central Repository. It is critical that the Company recover its costs in a manner consistent with the principles articulated in the CAT NMS Plan, which include both the need to allocate costs in a manner consistent with the cost to operations and that the CAT NMS Plan not create significant disincentives to Participants in seeking to meet their regulatory obligations. As such, the CAT NMS Plan permits the Company to assess additional charges to Participants associated with their use of the Central Repository's data and reporting facilities as it deems necessary.

Costs to Participants to Meet Reporting Requirements

The Costs to Participants Study was distributed to the Participants to collect information about the potential costs of the CAT to the Participants. The Costs to Participants Study was designed to provide insight into the current total costs associated with regulatory reporting and surveillance programs discussed above, as well as expected implementation and maintenance costs associated with reporting to and surveillance through the Central Repository.

The anticipated costs associated with the implementation of regulatory reporting to the Central Repository were estimated to be a total of $17,900,000 across all ten Participants. Included in this cost, Participants reported a total of $770,000 in legal and consulting costs, as well as total FTE costs of $10,300,000 for operational, technical/development and compliance-type functions.

Maintenance costs associated with regulatory reporting to Central Repository were estimated to be a total of $14,700,000 across all ten Participants. Included in this estimate are legal, consulting, and other costs associated with maintenance, a total of $720,000, and $7,300,000 to FTEs for operational, technical/development, and compliance functions regarding the maintenance of regulatory reporting associated with CAT.

The Participants were also asked to identify the costs associated with the implementation of surveillance programs within the Central Repository. The estimated total costs across all ten Participants were $23,200,000 including estimated legal, consulting, and other costs of $560,000. Also included in the total, Participants reported that they would allocate a total of $17,500,000 to FTEs to operational, technical/development, and compliance staff to be engaged in the creation of surveillance programs.

[3876] *See* Hibah Yousuf, *Only Half of All Americans Invested in Stocks,* CNN Money (May 9, 2014), *http://money.cnn.com/2013/05/09/investing/american-stock-ownership/* (includes Gallup Poll results).

[3877] *See, e.g.,* Andy Nybo, *The Retail Options Renaissance,* TABB Forum (Jan. 27, 2014), *http://tabbforum.com/opinions/the-retail-options-reneissance*.

[3878] Cumming et al., *Global Market Surveillance,* 10(2) Am. Law & Econ. Rev. at 454–506 (July 24, 2008).

[3879] *See, e.g.,* La Porta, et al., *Legal Determinants of External Finance,* 52(3) J. Finance 1131–1150 (1997).

[3880] Cumming et al., *Exchange Trading Rules, Surveillance and Insider Trading* (working paper, Oct. 29, 2013), *available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2101826*.

[3881] Where better surveillance identifies behaviors and practices that are manipulative and harmful to the investing public more quickly and more accurately, the Commission and Participants may be able to adopt rules to stop these practices more quickly and in a more tailored fashion.

[3882] Cumming et al., *Exchange Trading Rules and Stock Market Liquidity,* 99(3) J. Financial Economics 651–71 (Mar. 2011).

[3883] Christensen et al., *Capital-Market Effects of Securities Regulation: Prior Conditions, Implementation, and Enforcement* (Dec. 31, 2013), *available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1745105*.

[3884] Pursuant to Section 31 of the Exchange Act, Participants are required to pay transaction fees and assessments to the Commission that are designed to recover the costs related to the government's supervision and regulation of the securities markets and securities professionals. Participants, in turn, may collect their Section 31 fees and assessments from their broker-dealer members. 15 U.S.C. § 78ee.

The estimated total costs associated with the maintenance of surveillance programs were $87,700,000, including $1,000,000 for legal, consulting, and other costs. Of the total cost, the Participants estimated that they would allocate a total of $66,700,000 to FTEs to operational, technical/development and compliance staff.

Retirement costs for current systems were estimated to be $310,000 across all Participants. However, Participants expect that by no longer needing to maintain these legacy systems due to adoption of the CAT, they will realize aggregate savings of $10,600,000, which will partially offset some of the costs expected to be borne by the Participants as described further below. To the extent that the Participants are able to retire legacy systems and replace them with more efficient and cost effective technologies, they may experience additional cost savings. The Costs to Participants Study does not attempt to quantify any such additional cost savings to broker-dealers.

Broker-Dealers

The CAT is expected to provide a more resilient audit trail system that may benefit broker-dealers. For instance, as noted above, more effective oversight of market activity may increase investor confidence and help expand the investment opportunity set through increased listings. Broker-dealers may benefit from increased investor confidence, provided that it results in increased trading activity. In addition, broker-dealers may experience less burden, to the extent that, data provided to the Central Repository reduces the number of direct requests by regulators for their surveillance, examination and enforcement programs. For example, after the implementation of CAT, regulators seeking to identify activity for NMS Securities at the customer account level, would access that information from the Central Repository, rather than making a Blue Sheet request.

More broadly, one benefit identified to broker-dealers of the CAT may arise from consolidating the collection and transmission of audit trail data into a uniform activity, regardless of where the quoting and trading occur. Such a consolidation may permit some broker-dealers to reduce the number of systems they operate to provide audit trail data to Participants and to retire legacy systems, at an appropriate time. Additionally, technological advances may make the operation of the new CAT Systems more efficient than those associated with the legacy systems. The Costs to CAT Reporters Study did not attempt to quantify any such cost savings to firms, and as such, the cost estimates provided here do not include consideration that such cost savings may be low.

Broker-dealers would also incur costs associated with creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT infrastructure. These costs would arise from building and maintaining the CAT and updating and maintaining their own systems to comply with their reporting obligations.

CAT Build and Maintenance Costs

Broker-dealers will also be required to contribute their portion of the direct costs associated with building and maintaining the CAT, as required by SEC Rule 613 and implemented by the CAT NMS Plan. Broker-dealers with CAT reporting obligations will be required to pay their allocated portion of these costs on an annual basis, pursuant to the Funding Model.

The Funding Model acknowledges that the operating models of broker-dealers and Execution Venues are substantially different. Therefore, the Funding Model imposes different fee structures for broker-dealers and Executions Venues. ATSs that execute orders, which are operated by registered broker-dealers pursuant to Regulation ATS, are considered Execution Venues, for purposes of the CAT NMS Plan.

CAT Reporters Costs to Meeting Reporting Requirements

Responses to the Costs to CAT Reporters Study provide estimates of the direct costs to broker-dealers associated with meeting requirements to report to the Central Repository. The Costs to CAT Reporters Study contained questions related to future costs related to both the retirement of existing systems and compliance with requirements of SEC Rule 613.

Respondents were asked to evaluate the future costs under two separate approaches.[3885] For each approach, respondents were asked to estimate both for CAT implementation and maintenance: (1) the associated hardware and software costs; (2) the number of required FTEs; and (3) third-party provider costs.

a. *Implementation Phase of Approach 1*

Tables 7 and 8 describe the costs associated with the implementation of Approach 1. Based on the 167 study responses for the implementation of Approach 1, large firms provided an average (medium) hardware/software cost of $580,000 ($0) and small firms provided an average (median) cost estimates of $5,200 ($0).

Large firms provided an average (median) FTE count of 11.00 (0.00). Multiplying these counts by the rate employed by the Commission in SEC Rule 613 as described above, FTE costs are estimated as $4,400,000, with a median FTE cost of $0. Small firms provided an average FTE count requirement of 1.17, with the median response provided by small respondents equal to 0.00. Participants estimate a dollar cost for the small respondent FTE requirements to be on average $470,000, with a median estimated cost of $0.

Participants estimate large firms would incur average (median) third party/outsourcing costs of $72,000 ($0) and small firms would incur an estimated average (median) cost of $76,000 ($0).

Total average (median) costs for Approach 1 Implementation are estimated to be $5,052,000 ($0) for large firms, and $551,200 ($0) for small firms.

TABLE 7—APPROACH 1 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: LARGE RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (49 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$580,000	11.00	$4,400,000	$72,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$5,000	0.02	$8,000	$1,000
Maximum	$10,000,000	142.00	$57,000,000	$2,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	28	27	27	41
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

TABLE 8—APPROACH 1 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: SMALL RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (118 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$5,200	1.17	$470,000	$76,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	0.20	$80,000	$1,000

[3885] The two approaches are described in detail in Appendix C, Analysis of Expected Benefits and Estimated Costs for Creating, Implementing, and Maintaining the Consolidated Audit Trail (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(vii)).

TABLE 8—APPROACH 1 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: SMALL RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (118 FIRMS)—Continued

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Maximum	$500,000	20.00	$8,000,000	$8,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	95	94	94	95
Count of Blank Responses	2	0	0	1

Tables 9 and 10 describe the costs associated with the implementation of Approach 1 for large respondents with current OATS and non-OATS reporting obligations. Large OATS respondents provided an average (median) hardware/ software cost estimate of $750,000 ($0), and large non-OATS respondents providing average (median) estimated costs of $450,000 ($0).

Large OATS reporters provided an average (median) FTE requirement of 14.92 (7.00), translating into estimated costs of $6,000,000 ($2,800,000), while large non-OATS respondents provided an average (median) FTE requirement of 8.05 (0.00), translating into an average (median) estimated cost of $3,200,000 ($0).

Large OATS respondents estimated an average (median) third party/outsourcing cost of $150,000 ($0), while large non-OATS respondents provided an average (median) estimate of $9,500 ($0).

TABLE 9—APPROACH 1 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: LARGE OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (21 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$750,000	14.92	$6,000,000	$150,000
Median	$60,000	7.00	$2,800,000	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$5,000	0.02	$8,000	$1,000
Maximum	$7,000,000	63.00	$25,300,000	$2,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	6	5	5	15
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

TABLE 10—APPROACH 1 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: LARGE NON-OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (28 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$450,000	8.05	$3,200,000	$9,500
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$5,000	1.00	$400,000	$15,000
Maximum	$10,000,000	142.00	$57,000,000	$250,000
Count of Zero Responses	22	22	22	26
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

Tables 11 and 12 describe the costs associated with the implementation of Approach 1 for small respondents with current OATS and non-OATS reporting obligations, small OATS respondents provided an average (median) hardware/ software cost estimate of $21,000 ($1,000), with small non-OATS respondents providing an estimated average (median) cost of $100 ($0).

Small OATS reporters provided an average (median) FTE requirement of 3.51 (2.00), translating into estimated an average (median) costs of $1,400,000 ($800,000), while small non-OATS respondents provided an average (median) FTE requirement of 0.38 (0.00), translating into an estimated average (median) cost of $150,000 ($0).

Finally, small OATS respondents estimated an average (median) third party/ outsourcing cost of $300,000 ($1,000), while small non-OATS respondents provided an average (median) estimate of $1,100 ($0).

TABLE 11—APPROACH 1 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: SMALL OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (30 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$21,000	3.51	$1,400,000	$300,000
Median	$1,000	2.00	$800,000	$1,000
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	0.20	$80,000	$1,000
Maximum	$500,000	20.00	$8,000,000	$8,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	12	12	12	12
Count of Blank Responses	1	0	0	1

TABLE 12—APPROACH 1 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: SMALL NON-OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (88 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$100	0.38	$150,000	$1,100
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	3.00	$1,200,000	$1,000
Maximum	$5,000	15.00	$6,000,000	$72,000
Count of Zero Responses	83	82	82	83
Count of Blank Responses	1	0	0	0

b. *Maintenance Phase of Approach 1*

Tables 13 and 14 describe the costs associated with the maintenance of CAT reporting obligations for the full set of study responses under Approach 1. Based on the 167 study responses for the maintenance of Approach 1, large firms reported an average (median) hardware/software cost estimate of $210,000 ($0), and small firms reported an estimated cost of $1,600 ($0).

Large firms provided an average FTE count requirement of 8.54, with the median response provided by large firms equaled to 0.00. Multiplying these counts by the rate employed by the Commission in SEC Rule 613 as described above, FTE costs are estimated to be $3,400,000, with a median FTE cost of $0. Small firms provided an average FTE count requirement of 1.12, with the median response provided by small respondents equal to 0.00. Participants estimated the average dollar cost for the small respondent FTE requirement l to be $450,000, and a median cost of $0.

Large firms estimated that the average (median) third party/outsourcing cost is equal to $52,000 ($0) and small firms estimated average (median) costs to be equal to $24,000 ($0).

Total average (median) costs for Approach 1 Maintenance are estimated to be $3,662,000 ($0) for large firms and $475,600 ($0) for small firms.

TABLE 13—APPROACH 1 MAINTENANCE COSTS: LARGE RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (49 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$210,000	8.54	$3,400,000	$52,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$2,000	0.02	$8,000	$1,000
Maximum	$5,200,000	152.00	$61,000,000	$1,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	28	27	27	41
Count of Blank Responses	1	0	0	0

TABLE 14—APPROACH 1 MAINTENANCE COSTS: SMALL RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (118 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$1,600	1.12	$450,000	$24,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$500	0.15	$60,000	$500
Maximum	$120,000	18.00	$7,200,000	$1,500,000
Count of Zero Responses	96	93	93	96
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

Tables 15 and 16 show the costs associated with the maintenance of CAT reporting obligations for Approach 1 for large respondents with current OATS and non-OATS reporting obligations. Large OATS respondents provided estimated average (median) hardware/software requirements of $380,000 ($22,000), with large non-OATS respondents providing estimated average (median) costs of $80,000 ($0).

Large OATS reporters provided average (median) FTE requirements of 10.03 (4.00), translating to estimated costs of $4,000,000 ($1,600,000), while large non-OATS respondents provided average (median) FTE requirements of 7.41 (0.00), translating to estimated costs of $3,000,000 ($0).

Large OATS respondents estimated average (median) third party/outsourcing costs of $120,000 ($0), while large non-OATS respondents provided estimates of $1,300 ($0).

TABLE 15—APPROACH 1 MAINTENANCE COSTS: LARGE OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (21 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$380,000	10.03	$4,000,000	$120,000
Median	$22,000	4.00	$1,600,000	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$2,000	0.02	$8,000	$1,000
Maximum	$5,200,000	50.00	$20,100,000	$1,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	6	5	5	14

TABLE 15—APPROACH 1 MAINTENANCE COSTS: LARGE OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (21 FIRMS)—Continued

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Count of Blank Responses	1	0	0	0

TABLE 16—APPROACH 1 MAINTENANCE COSTS: LARGE NON-OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (28 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$80,000	7.41	$3,000,000	$1,300
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$8,000	1.00	$400,000	$35,000
Maximum	$900,000	152.00	$61,000,000	$35,000
Count of Zero Responses	22	22	22	27
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

Tables 17 and 18 describe the costs associated with the maintenance of CAT reporting obligations for Approach 1 for small respondents with current OATS and non-OATS reporting obligations. Small OATS respondents provided estimated average (median) hardware/software requirements of $6,000 ($1,000), with small non-OATS respondents providing estimated average (median) costs of $100 ($0).

Small OATS reporters provided average (median) FTE requirements of 3.52 (2.00), translating to estimated costs of $1,400,000 ($800,000), while small non-OATS respondents provided average (median) FTE requirements of 0.31 (0.00), translating to estimated costs of $120,000 ($0).

Finally, small OATS respondents estimated average (median) third party/ outsourcing costs of $90,000 ($1,000), while small non-OATS respondents provided estimates of $1,100 ($0).

TABLE 17—APPROACH 1 MAINTENANCE COSTS: SMALL OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (30 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$6,000	3.52	$1,400,000	$90,000
Median	$1,000	2.00	$800,000	$1,000
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$500	0.15	$60,000	$500
Maximum	$120,000	18.00	$7,200,000	$1,500,000
Count of Zero Responses	12	10	10	12
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

TABLE 18—APPROACH 1 MAINTENANCE COSTS: SMALL NON-OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (88 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$100	0.31	$120,000	$1,100
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	3.00	$1,200,000	$1,000
Maximum	$2,000	14.00	$5,600,000	$72,000
Count of Zero Responses	84	83	83	84
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

c. *Implementation Phase of Approach 2*

Tables 19 and 20 show the costs associated with the implementation phase of Approach 2 for the full set of study responses. Based on the 167 study responses for the implementation phase of Approach 2, large firms provided average (median) hardware/ software costs of $570,000 ($0), and small firms provided costs estimates of $5,000 ($0).

Large firms provided average FTE count requirements of 10.15, with the median response provided by a large firm equal to 0.00. Multiplying these counts by the rate employed by the Commission in SEC Rule 613 as described above, FTE costs can be estimated to be $4,100,000, with a median FTE cost of $0. Small firms provided average FTE count requirements of 1.08, with the median response provided by a small respondent equal to 0.00. Participants estimate the dollar cost for the small respondent FTE requirements to be $440,000, and a median cost of $0.

Large firms estimated that average (median) third party/outsourcing costs are equal to $68,000 ($0) and small firms estimated average (median) costs to be equal to $16,000 ($0).

Total average (median) costs for Approach 2 Implementation are estimated to be $4,738,000 ($0) for large firms, and $461,000 ($0) for small firms.

TABLE 19—APPROACH 2 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: LARGE RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (49 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$570,000	10.15	$4,100,000	$68,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$5,000	0.02	$8,000	$1,000
Maximum	$10,000,000	116.00	$46,600,000	$2,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	28	28	28	41
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

TABLE 20—APPROACH 2 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: SMALL RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (118 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$5,000	1.08	$440,000	$16,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	1.00	$400,000	$1,000
Maximum	$500,000	20.00	$8,000,000	$1,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	98	96	96	97
Count of Blank Responses	1	0	0	1

Tables 21 and 22 show the costs associated with the implementation phase of Approach 2 for large respondents with current OATS and non-OATS reporting obligations. Large OATS respondents provided estimated average (median) hardware/software requirements of $740,000 ($60,000), with large non-OATS respondents providing estimated average (median) costs of $450,000 ($0).

Large OATS reporters provided average (median) FTE requirements of 14.81 (7.00), translating to estimated costs of $5,900,000 ($2,800,000), while large non-OATS respondents provided average (median) FTE requirements of 6.66 (0.00), translating to estimated costs of $2,700,000 ($0).

Finally, large OATS respondents estimated average (median) third party/outsourcing costs of $140,000 ($0), while large non-OATS respondents provided estimates of $10,000 ($0).

TABLE 21—APPROACH 2 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: LARGE OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (21 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$740,000	14.81	$5,900,000	$140,000
Median	$60,000	7.00	$2,800,000	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$5,000	0.02	$8,000	$1,000
Maximum	$7,000,000	63.00	$25,300,000	$2,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	6	5	5	15
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

TABLE 22—APPROACH 2 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: LARGE NON-OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (28 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$450,000	6.66	$2,700,000	$10,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$5,000	1.00	$400,000	$35,000
Maximum	$10,000,000	116.00	$46,600,000	$250,000
Count of Zero Responses	22	23	23	26
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

Tables 23 and 24 show the costs associated with the implementation of Approach 2 for small respondents with current OATS and non-OATS reporting obligations. Small OATS respondents provided estimated average (median) hardware/software requirements of $20,000 ($1,000), with small non-OATS respondents providing estimated average (median) costs of $100 ($0).

Small OATS reporters provided average (median) FTE requirements of 3.33 (2.00), translating to estimated costs of $1,300,000 ($800,000), while small non-OATS respondents provided average (median) FTE requirements of 0.32 (0.00), translating to estimated costs of $130,000 ($0).

Finally, small OATS respondents estimated average (median) third party/ outsourcing costs of $60,000 ($1,000), while small non-OATS respondents provided estimates of $1,100 ($0).

TABLE 23—APPROACH 2 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: SMALL OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (30 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$20,000	3.33	$1,300,000	$60,000
Median	$1,000	2.00	$800,000	$1,000
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	1.00	$400,000	$1,000
Maximum	$500,000	20.00	$8,000,000	$1,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	14	13	13	13
Count of Blank Responses	1	0	0	1

TABLE 24—APPROACH 2 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: SMALL NON-OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (88 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$100	0.32	$130,000	$1,100
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	3.00	$1,200,000	$1,000
Maximum	$5,000	15.00	$6,000,000	$72,000
Count of Zero Responses	84	83	83	84
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

d. *Maintenance Phase of Approach 2*

Tables 25 and 26 show the costs associated with the maintenance of CAT reporting obligations for Approach 2 for the full set of study responses. Based on the 167 study responses for the maintenance phase of Approach 2, large firms provided average (median) hardware/software costs of $200,000 ($0) and small firms provided costs estimates of $1,500 ($0).

Large firms provided average FTE count requirements of 7.27, with the median response provided by a large firm equal to 0.00. Multiplying these counts by the rate employed by the Commission in SEC Rule 613 as described above, FTE costs can be estimated to be $2,900,000, with a median FTE cost of $0. Small firms provided average FTE count requirements of 1.06, with the median response provided by a small respondent equal to 0.00. Participants estimate the dollar cost for the small respondent FTE requirements to be $430,000, with a median cost of $0.

Large firms estimated that average (median) third party/outsourcing costs are equal to $48,000 ($0) and small firms estimated average (median) costs to be equal to $10,000 ($0).

Total average (median) costs for Approach 2 Maintenance are estimated to be $3,148,000 ($0) for large firms, and $441,500 ($0) for small firms.

TABLE 25—APPROACH 2 MAINTENANCE COSTS: LARGE RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (49 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$200,000	7.27	$2,900,000	$48,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$2,000	0.00	$0	$1,000
Maximum	$5,200,000	102.00	$40,900,000	$1,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	28	28	28	41
Count of Blank Responses	1	0	0	0

TABLE 26—APPROACH 2 MAINTENANCE COSTS: SMALL RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (118 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$1,500	1.06	$430,000	$10,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$500	1.00	$400,000	$500
Maximum	$100,000	18.00	$7,000,000	$1,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	97	94	94	93
Count of Blank Responses	2	0	0	5

Tables 27 and 28 provide the costs associated with the maintenance of CAT reporting obligations for Approach 2 for large respondents with current OATS and non-OATS reporting obligations. Large OATS respondents provided estimated average (median) hardware/software requirements of $370,000 ($14,000), with large non-OATS respondents providing estimated average (median) costs of $79,000 ($0).

Large OATS reporters provided average (median) FTE requirements of 9.79 (5.60), translating to estimated costs of $3,900,000 ($2,200,000), while large non-OATS respondents provided average (median) FTE requirements of 5.38 (0.00), translating to estimated costs of $2,200,000 ($0).

Finally, large OATS respondents estimated average (maximum) third party/outsourcing costs of $110,000 ($0), while large non-OATS respondents provided estimates of $1,300 ($0).

TABLE 27—APPROACH 2 MAINTENANCE COSTS: LARGE OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (21 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$370,000	9.79	$3,900,000	$110,000
Median	$14,000	5.60	$2,200,000	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$2,000	0.02	$8,000	$1,000
Maximum	$5,200,000	50.00	$20,100,000	$1,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	6	5	5	14
Count of Blank Responses	1	0	0	0

TABLE 28—APPROACH 2 MAINTENANCE COSTS: LARGE NON-OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (28 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$79,000	5.38	$2,200,000	$1,300
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$3,000	1.00	$400,000	$36,000
Maximum	$900,000	102.00	$40,900,000	$36,000
Count of Zero Responses	22	23	23	27
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

Tables 29 and 30 show the costs associated with the maintenance of CAT reporting obligations for Approach 2 for small respondents with current OATS and non-OATS reporting obligations. Small OATS respondents provided estimated average (median) hardware/software requirements of $6,000 ($500), with small non-OATS respondents providing estimated average (median) costs of $100 ($0).

Small OATS reporters provided average (median) FTE requirements of 3.28 (2.00), translating to estimated costs of $1,300,000 ($800,000), while small non-OATS respondents provided average (median) FTE requirements of 0.31 (0.00), translating to estimated costs of $120,000 ($0).

Finally, small OATS respondents estimated average (median) third party/ outsourcing costs of $42,000 ($1,000), while small non-OATS respondents provided estimates of $1,100 ($0).

TABLE 29—APPROACH 2 MAINTENANCE COSTS: SMALL OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (30 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$6,000	3.28	$1,300,000	$42,000
Median	$500	2.00	$800,000	$1,000
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$500	1.00	$400,000	$500
Maximum	$120,000	18.00	$7,000,000	$1,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	14	11	11	12
Count of Blank Responses	1	0	0	2

TABLE 30—APPROACH 2 MAINTENANCE COSTS: SMALL NON-OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (88 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$100	0.31	$120,000	$1,100
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	3.00	$1,200,000	$1,000
Maximum	$2,000	14.00	$5,600,000	$72,000
Count of Zero Responses	83	83	83	81
Count of Blank Responses	1	0	0	3

e. *Implementation and Maintenance Costs for Approach 1 vs. Approach 2*

Participants compared the estimated implementation and maintenance costs for Approach 1 and Approach 2 to determine if one solution would be more cost effective for the industry than the other. In general, respondents indicated that Approach 1 would lead to larger costs than Approach 2. Large firms estimated that it will cost approximately $5,052,000 to implement Approach 1, versus an estimated $4,738,000 for Approach 2, a cost difference of $314,000. From a maintenance perspective, large firms estimated that it would cost $3,662,000 for Approach 1 versus $3,148,000 for Approach 2, a cost difference of $514,000. Small firms also indicated that Approach 1 would be

more expensive to implement and maintain than Approach 2. Small firms indicated that it would cost $551,200 to implement Approach 1 versus $475,600 for Approach 2, indicating a cost difference of $90,200. For the maintenance phases, small firms estimated it would cost approximately $475,600 for Approach 1 maintenance, versus $441,500 for Approach 2 maintenance, a cost difference of $34,100 between approaches. However, the cost estimates between these two approaches are not statistically significant and Participants conclude that there would likely be no incremental costs associated with either Approach.[3886]

f. *Retirement of Systems Costs*

Participants recognize that in implementing the anticipated requirements in the CAT NMS Plan, broker-dealers would likely replace some components of their current systems. The costs associated with retiring current systems were considered as part of the impacts associated with the CAT NMS Plan.

Tables 31 and 32 describe the cost associated with retirement of systems for the full set of study responses. Based on the 167 study responses for the retirement of systems large firms provided average (median) hardware/software costs of $120,000 ($0) and small firms provided cost estimates of $31,000 ($0).

Large firms provided average FTE count requirements of 6.80, with the median response provided by a large firm equal to 0.00. Multiplying these counts by the rate employed by the Commission in SEC Rule 613 as described above, FTE costs are estimated to be $2,700,000, with a median FTE cost of $0. Small firms provided average FTE count requirements of 1.92, with the median response provided by a small respondent of 0.00. Participants estimate the dollar cost for the small respondent FTE requirements to be an average costs of $770,000, and a median cost of $0.

Large firms estimated that average (median) third party/outsourcing costs to be $10,000 ($0) and small firms estimated average (median) costs to be $63,000 ($0).

Total average (median) costs for the Retirement of Systems are estimated to be $2,830,000 ($0) for large firms and $864,000 ($0) for small firms.

TABLE 31—RETIREMENT OF SYSTEMS COSTS: LARGE RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (49 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$120,000	6.80	$2,700,000	$10,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,500	0.06	$24,000	$5,000
Maximum	$4,000,000	206.00	$82,700,000	$360,000
Count of Zero Responses	37	32	32	44
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

TABLE 32—RETIREMENT OF SYSTEMS COSTS: SMALL RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (118 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$31,000	1.92	$770,000	$63,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	1.00	$400,000	$1,000
Maximum	$3,500,000	68.00	$27,300,000	$7,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	98	100	100	97
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

Tables 33 and 34 describe the costs associated with the retirement of systems for large respondents with current OATS and non-OATS reporting obligations. Large OATS respondents provided estimated average (median) hardware/software requirements of $270,000 ($0), with large non-OATS respondents providing estimated average (median) costs of $4,300 ($0).

Large OATS reporters provided average (median) FTE requirements of 4.92 (3.10), translating to estimated costs of $2,000,000 ($1,200,000), while large non-OATS respondents provided average (median) FTE requirements of 8.21 (0.00), translating to estimated costs of $3,300,000 ($0).

Finally, large OATS respondents estimated average (median) third party/outsourcing costs of $18,000 ($0), while large non-OATS respondents provided estimates of $4,800 ($0).

TABLE 33—RETIREMENT OF SYSTEMS COSTS: LARGE OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (21 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$270,000	4.92	$2,000,000	$18,000
Median	$0	3.10	$1,200,000	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,500	0.06	$24,000	$5,000
Maximum	$4,000,000	33.00	$13,200,000	$360,000
Count of Zero Responses	11	6	6	18
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

[3886] Participants arrive at this conclusion on the basis of a standard t-test of the hypothesis that the difference between Approach 1 and Approach 2 costs is different from zero. The t-test is unable to reject the null hypothesis (*i.e.,* that the difference in costs between the two approaches is not distinguishable from zero) at the 0.05% level. The t-test rejects the null hypothesis for estimates of hardware/software costs, FTE costs, vendor costs, and total costs. The t-test also rejects any significant difference in estimated costs under the two approaches separately for large OATS reporters, small OATS reporters, large non-OATS reporters, and small non-OATS reporters.

TABLE 34—RETIREMENT OF SYSTEMS COSTS: LARGE NON-OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (28 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$4,300	8.21	$3,300,000	$4,800
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$10,000	24.00	$9,600,000	$60,000
Maximum	$110,000	206.00	$82,700,000	$75,000
Count of Zero Responses	26	26	26	26
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

Tables 35 and 36 show the costs associated with the retirement of systems for small respondents with current OATS and non-OATS reporting obligations for the full set of study respondents. Small OATS respondents provided estimated average (median) hardware/software requirements of $3,600 ($500), with small non-OATS respondents providing estimated average (median) costs of $40,000 ($0).

Small OATS reporters provided average (median) FTE requirements of 4.60 (0.00), translating to estimated costs of $1,800,000 ($0), while small non-OATS respondents provided average (median) FTE requirements of 1.00 (0.00), translating to estimated costs of $400,000 ($0).

Finally, small OATS respondents estimated average (median) third party/ outsourcing costs of $240,000 ($1,500), while small non-OATS respondents provided estimates of $3,000 ($0).

TABLE 35—RETIREMENT OF SYSTEMS COSTS: SMALL OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (30 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$3,600	4.60	$1,800,000	$240,000
Median	$500	0.00	$0	$1,500
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	1.00	$400,000	$1,000
Maximum	$39,000	30.00	$12,000,000	$7,000,000
Count of Zero Responses	15	16	16	13
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

TABLE 36—RETIREMENT OF SYSTEMS COSTS: SMALL NON-OATS RESPONDENTS SUMMARY (88 FIRMS)

	Hardware/ software	FTE counts	FTE costs	Third party/ outsourcing
Average	$40,000	1.00	$400,000	$3,000
Median	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum	$0	0.00	$0	$0
Minimum (non-zero)	$1,000	3.00	$1,200,000	$3,000
Maximum	$3,500,000	68.00	$27,300,000	$220,000
Count of Zero Responses	83	84	84	84
Count of Blank Responses	0	0	0	0

In comparing the two approaches and their costs to the current costs incurred by a broker-dealer for current regulatory reporting, respondents have indicated that they estimate both Approach 1 and Approach 2 to be less expensive than current regulatory reporting requirements. Overall, firms estimated that current costs would be $4,290,000 for large firms versus $1,210,000 for small firms, while maintenance costs of Approach 1 for large firms would cost $3,662,000 and $475,600 for small firms, indicating cost savings of $628,000 for large firms and cost savings of $734,400 for small firms. For maintenance costs related to Approach 2, large firms indicated costs of $3,148,000 with an expected savings of $1,142,000 while small firms estimated maintenance costs of $441,500 with expected savings of $768,500.

Although there are differences in the current and anticipated maintenance costs discussed above, the Participants conclude that there would be no statistical difference in costs associated with the maintenance of the CAT, compared to maintenance costs for existing regulatory reporting requirements. Participants arrive at this conclusion on the basis of a standard t-test of the hypothesis that the difference in costs to broker-dealers between Approach 1 and Approach 2 is different from zero. The t-test is unable to reject the null hypothesis (*i.e.,* that the difference in costs between the two approaches is not distinguishable from zero) at the 0.05% level separately for estimates of hardware/software costs, FTE costs, vendor costs, and total costs across large OATS reporters, small OATS reporters, large non-OATS reporters, and small non-OATS reporters.

g. *Industry Feedback on Costs to CAT Reporters Study*

Participants' understanding of broker-dealer costs has been enhanced through frequent dialogue with Industry Members. The DAG has largely provided written feedback on costs through the industry association members. In March 2013, SIFMA provided feedback on industry costs in its Consolidated Audit Trail White Paper.[3887] The association group stated that the industry is likely to face costs related to upgrading the regulatory reporting infrastructure. SIFMA highlighted that additional costs borne will be distributed across the front office, middle office, customer master data, compliance and risk and data management. Additionally, in February 2012, the FIF conducted a study to assess the costs associated with the implementation of OATS.[3888] In a summary of the study, FIF highlights that ''future estimates of cost should consider the FIF cost model, most importantly the effort expended

[3887] *See* SIFMA Recommendations.

[3888] *See* SEC Memorandum to File No. S7–11–10, Re: Staff Meeting with the Financial Information Forum (Feb. 29, 2012), *available at http://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-11-10/s71110-112.pdf.*

on business analysis and testing as part of the implementation effort.'' One key view presented by the DAG was that retiring legacy systems will likely reduce costs to the industry, given their redundancies with the CAT. However, the FIF highlighted that existing timelines do not take into account costs associated with concurrent reporting for existing regulatory reporting and new regulatory requirements associated with the Central Repository.[3889] Additional detail around the plan to retire existing regulatory reports can be found in Appendix C, Section C.9.

Vendors

The Costs to Vendors Study requested information regarding various third party service provider and vendor costs to comply with the requirements of SEC Rule 613.

Based upon the responses to the Costs to Vendors Study, the expected dollar costs for implementation and maintenance of the CAT are largely the same for both approaches, and ranged widely between $0 and $20,000,000 for implementation and $50,000 and $6,000,000 for ongoing maintenance. One firm did indicate that Approach 1 would have substantially higher maintenance costs ($400,000 for Approach 1 versus $50,000 for Approach 2). For headcount and costs associated with implementation and maintenance of the CAT, all respondents indicated that Approach 1 would require more FTE resources (costs) to implement (ranging from 14 ($9,600,000) to 170 ($35,900,000) FTEs for Approach 1 and from 4 ($2,700,000) to 45 ($24,200,000) for Approach 2), while Approach 2 would require more FTE resources to maintain (ranging from 4.5 ($4,100,000) to 35 ($9,300,000) for Approach 1 and from 2 ($2,500,000) to 56 ($11,200,000) for Approach 2). As with current regulatory reporting costs, the firm with the largest number of clients reported the highest costs, but number of clients did not always correlate uniformly with higher expected costs for the other firms.

Three of the four respondents to the vendor study indicated that they would incur costs to retire current regulatory reporting systems, with costs ranging from $500,000 to $5,000,000, with the firm with the highest expected retirement costs also having the highest current reporting costs. FTE requirements ranged from 1.5 ($250,000) to 23 ($7,200,000) FTEs.

Under Approach 1, two respondents expected ongoing maintenance to cost less than the maintenance of current regulatory reporting requirements, with the remaining two expecting higher costs. Under Approach 2, two respondents expected ongoing maintenance to cost less than the maintenance of current regulatory reporting requirements, one expected costs to be the same, and the final firm expected costs to be greater. All firms expected headcount associated with ongoing maintenance of the CAT to be less than under current reporting requirements.

Issuers

Issuers also benefit from an effective regulatory regime supported by a reliable and complete audit trail. Specifically, issuers may benefit from enhanced investor confidence associated with better and more efficient oversight. The increase in investor confidence may draw more investors into the market, relative to other investment opportunities that do not provide the same protections. Increasing the pool of investors willing to invest in a primary offering may manifest itself in a lower cost of capital. Increased investor participation in secondary trading may also increase demand in the primary market, as the increased interest would be associated with greater efficiency in pricing and lower adverse selection costs. To the extent that the issuers do not have independent reporting obligations to the Central Repository (*i.e.,* they are not otherwise CAT Reporters), they are not anticipated to incur direct costs associated with the CAT NMS Plan.

Indirect Costs

The Participants recognize that in addition to direct costs, there may be indirect costs borne by parties as a result of the implementation of the CAT NMS Plan. As discussed further below, it is not possible for the Participants to quantify these costs, and as such, we present a qualitative discussion.

The Participants have identified at least three distinct ways for indirect costs to arise as a result of the implementation of the CAT NMS Plan. First, all CAT Reporters are subject to direct fees to pay for the creation, implementation, and maintenance of the CAT along with other direct costs to meet CAT NMS Plan obligations. CAT Reporters may endeavor to shift these fees and other costs to their clients. Where CAT Reporters can do so successfully, the clients bear an indirect cost arising from the CAT NMS Plan. Second, to the extent that the Commission and the Participants amend their surveillance programs in the presence of the Central Repository, the broker-dealers may incur costs to adjust their internal compliance programs. And third, as described more fully in Appendix C, Analysis of the Impact on Competition, Efficiency and Capital Formation, broker-dealer competition may be impacted if the direct and indirect costs associated with meeting the CAT NMS Plan's requirements materially impact the provision of their services to the public. Such a reduction in the provision of these services may impose an indirect cost on the public as well.

The Participants considered the potential for CAT Reporters to shift fees and other costs associated with the CAT NMS Plan. Participants may charge their members to cover the CAT NMS Plan costs either explicitly or subsume those costs in other fees or assessments. Broker-dealers may charge their clients for their own costs, whether incurred directly or indirectly, either through explicit fees associated with CAT or through their existing fee structures. This analysis does not measure either the likelihood of costs being passed from the Participant to the broker-dealers or from the broker-dealers to their clients, or the potential associated dollar impacts. The extent to which these costs may be passed on to clients is related to alternative sources of revenue available to the CAT Reporters, the materiality of those costs, and the ease with which clients can substitute away from any given Participant or broker-dealer. Participants note, however, that Participants and broker-dealers may currently have incentives and opportunity to shift regulatory compliance costs to their customers and that nothing in the CAT NMS Plan alters those incentives or the likelihood of those costs being passed on.

In addition, indirect costs to broker-dealers may arise as a result of the implementation of the CAT NMS Plan. First, broker-dealers may incur additional costs related to training and professional development, to equip the staff with the necessary knowledge necessary for compliance with the SEC Rule 613. Broker-dealers were specifically asked to consider these costs as part of their study response. Second, the enhanced and standardized data to be captured by the Central Repository is anticipated to increase the effectiveness of surveillance by regulators, which may impact broker-dealer compliance programs.

8. *Estimate of Aggregate Direct Costs and the Allocation of Costs across CAT Reporters*

Estimate of Aggregate Costs

In order to create the regulatory data infrastructure required by SEC Rule 613, this Plan proposes to build and maintain the CAT, along with resources necessary to generate regulatory reports and related analysis. CAT Reporters, including Participants and broker-dealers engaging in trading and quoting activities in Eligible Securities, will be jointly responsible for providing the capital to build and maintain the CAT. Costs eligible to be allocated jointly include any associated liabilities accrued during the planning and building phases of the project that are directly attributable to the CAT NMS Plan, for example, legal and consulting fees, and will be allocated according to the funding model described in Article XI of the CAT NMS Plan.

In order to calculate to the implementation and annual maintenance costs of the CAT, the Participants considered the relevant cost factors for the following entities: Plan Processor, Participants, broker-dealers (large and small) and vendors. All implementation costs reflected below are in dollar costs for the year they are expected to be incurred, while all maintenance costs are estimated for the fifth year after the approval of the CAT NMS Plan, when all CAT Reporters are expected to be live.

(1) Plan Processor

Implementation Costs. For implementation costs associated with the Plan Processor, the Participants reviewed the build costs received from the Shortlisted Bidders and identified the high and low costs to use as a component of the overall industry cost. The lowest cost received was $30,000,000 and the highest estimate received was $91,600,000.

[3889] *See* FIF, Comment Letter Re: Consolidated Audit Trail National Market System Plan Submission (Nov. 19, 2014), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/web/groups/catnms/@catnms/documents/appsupportdocs/p601972.pdf.*

Maintenance Costs. For maintenance costs associated with the Plan Processor, the Participants also reviewed the cost schedules received from the Shortlisted Bidders to build the range. To define the range of maintenance costs, the Participants reviewed the peak year maintenance costs from the Shortlisted Bidders. In addition to the costs received from the Shortlisted Bidders associated with the maintenance of operating and running the CAT, the Participants also included a yearly technical upgrade estimate to conservatively take into account changes in technology that may take place during the maintenance of the CAT. These additional costs begin at approximately 20% in year one, and slowly decrease to 5% during year five of operation. As such, the annual maintenance costs are estimated to range from $35,200,000 to $134,900,000.

Retirement of Systems Costs. The Plan Processor is not expected to incur costs related to the retirement of systems.

(2) Participants

Upon review of the requirements associated with Approach 1 and Approach 2, the Participants identified that they do not favor one approach over the other.

Implementation Costs. To estimate implementation costs for the Participants, the Participants used the aggregated results from the Costs to Participants Study. Based on the responses received from the Participants, the implementation of regulatory reporting is expected to cost $17,900,000 and the implementation of surveillance functions is estimated to cost $23,200,000.

Maintenance Costs. To estimate the maintenance costs for the Participants, the Participants reviewed the results from the Costs to Participants Study for regulatory reporting and surveillance costs. The Participants estimated that annual aggregate regulatory reporting costs would be equal to $14,700,000 and that annual aggregate surveillance maintenance costs would cost $87,700,000.

Retirement of Systems Costs. To estimate the costs related to the retirement of systems for the Participants, the Participants reviewed the results from the Costs to Participants Study for retirement of systems costs. The Participants estimated that costs associated with retirement of systems would be equal to $310,000.

(3) Broker-Dealers

Implementation and maintenance costs related to the CAT for broker-dealers were extrapolated from the results of the Costs to CAT Reporters Study. As described above, the Participants believe there to be approximately 1,800 broker-dealers that would be CAT Reporters. Of the 167 respondents to the Costs to CAT Reporters Study, 49 were large firms, and 118 were small firms, indicating a large to small firm ratio in the overall population of 29% to 71%. Applying this ratio to the total population of 1,800 broker-dealers, results in 522 large firms and 1,278 small firms. In comparing the costs between the two approaches, the Participants have identified that Approach 1 is more expensive than the Approach 2, which causes Approach 1 to form the upper bound of the broker-dealer cost range, and Approach 2 to form the lower bound of the broker-dealer cost range.

Implementation Costs. For Approach 1, large firm respondents estimated that implementation costs would be equal to $5,052,000 per firm, for a total estimated implementation cost of approximately $2.6 billion. Small firm respondents estimated that implementation costs for Approach 1 would be equal to $551,200 per firm, for a total estimated implementation cost of $740 million.[3890] For Approach 2, large firm respondents estimated that implementation costs would be equal to $4,738,000 per firm, for a total estimated implementation cost of approximately $2.5 billion, while small firms estimated implementation costs for Approach 2 to be equal to $461,000 per firm, for a total cost of $619 million.[3891] This results in a cost range of $2.5 billion to $2.6 billion for large firms, and a cost range of $619 million to $740 million for small firms for the implementation of the CAT.

Maintenance Costs. For Approach 1, large firm respondents estimated that maintenance costs would be equal to $3,662,000 per firm per year, for a total estimated annual maintenance cost of approximately $2.3 billion.[3892] Small firm respondents estimated that maintenance costs for Approach 1 would be equal to $475,600 per firm per year, for a total estimated annual maintenance cost of approximately $739 million.[3893] For Approach 2, large firm respondents estimated that maintenance costs would be equal to $3,148,000 per firm per year, for a total estimated annual maintenance cost of approximately $2.0 billion,[3894] while small firms estimated maintenance costs for Approach 2 to be equal to $441,500 per firm per year, for a total annual cost of approximately $686 million.[3895] This implies an annual cost range of approximately $2.0 billion to $2.3 billion for large firms, and an annual cost range of approximately $686 million to $739 million for small firms for maintenance of reporting to the Central Repository. These maintenance costs are discrete costs for the maintenance of CAT reporting, and are not intended to show incremental costs against current regulatory reporting requirements. Based on the Costs to CAT Reporters Study, Participants estimate these incremental costs to be negligible.

Retirement of Systems Costs. To estimate the costs related to the retirement of systems for the broker dealers, the Participants reviewed the results from the Costs to CAT Reporters Study for retirement of systems costs. Large firm respondents estimated costs to be equal to $2,830,000, for a total retirement of systems cost equal to approximately $1.47 billion. Small firms estimated that costs related to the retirement of systems would cost $864,000, for a total retirement of systems cost of approximately $1.10 billion.

(4) Vendors

Implementation Costs. For implementation costs associated with Vendors, the Participants reviewed the aggregate build costs received from the Costs to Vendors Study and identified that Approach 1 would cost $118,200,000 to implement, while it would cost $51,600,000 to implement Approach 2.[3896]

Maintenance Costs. For maintenance costs associated with Vendors, the Participants also reviewed the cost schedules received from the Costs to Vendors Study. Vendors indicated an aggregate estimated annual cost of $38,600,000 for maintenance of Approach 1, and annual estimated maintenance costs of $48,700,000 for Approach 2.[3897]

Retirement of Systems Costs. Vendors indicated an aggregate cost of $21,300,000 for the retirement of existing regulatory reporting systems.

(5) Total Aggregate Costs

Based on the analysis of responses to the studies described above, and cost estimates provided by the Shortlisted Bidders, the Participants estimate the initial aggregate cost to the industry related to building and implementing the CAT would range from $3.2 billion to $3.6 billion. Estimated annual aggregate costs for the maintenance and enhancement of the CAT would range from $2.8 billion and $3.4 billion. Additionally, costs to retire existing systems would be approximately $2.6 billion.

Impacts of Not Receiving Requested Exemptions

On January 30, 2015, the Participants submitted a letter to request that the Commission grant exemptions, pursuant to its authority under Section 36 of the Exchange Act, from the requirement to submit a national market system plan that meets certain reporting requirements specified in SEC Rule 613(c) and (d). Specifically, the Participants requested exemptive relief related to: (1) options market maker quotes; (2) Customer-IDs; (3) CAT-Reporter-IDs; (4) linking executions to specific subaccount allocations on Allocation

[3890] Small firm total estimated implementation costs include a compound annual growth rate of 5% to account for increases in labor and operational costs over time. The rate was applied for one year, from the beginning of CAT reporting in year 1 through the expected incurring of build costs by small firms in the year prior to the start of their reporting (*i.e.,* year 2). Because large firms report a year earlier than small firms and would incur most implementation costs in year 1, a similar rate has not been applied to their implementation costs.

[3891] *Id.*

[3892] Large and small firm total estimated maintenance costs are estimated in year 5 to account for a steady state of reporting, and include a compound annual growth rate of 5% to account for increases in labor and operational costs over time. The rate was applied for four years, from the beginning of CAT reporting in year 1 through year 5.

[3893] *Id.*

[3894] *Id.*

[3895] *Id.*

[3896] Vendor cost estimates assume an annual cost per FTE of $401,440, consistent with the rate applied by the Commission in the Adopting Release.

[3897] The total estimated vendor maintenance costs include a compound annual growth rate of 5% to account for increases in labor and operational costs over time. The rate was applied for four years, from the beginning of broker-dealer CAT reporting in year one through year five.

Reports; and (5) time stamp granularity. On September 2, 2015, the Participants supplemented their request with a supplemental request, clarifying its original requested exemption from the requirement in Rule 613(c)(7)(viii)(B) (including, in some instances, requesting an exemption from the requirement to provide an account number, account type and date account opened under Rule 613(c)(7)(viii)(B)).

First, SEC Rule 613(c)(7) requires both options market makers and the options exchanges to record and report the details of options market maker quotes received by the options exchanges to the Central Repository. The Participants requested that the Commission provide the Participants with an exemption so that only options exchanges would record and report details for each options market maker quote and related Reportable Event to the Central Repository, while options market makers would be relieved of their obligation to record and report their quotes and related Reportable Events to the Central Repository. The Participants estimated that having both parties report options market maker quotes to the CAT would impose significant costs on the Plan Processor due to increased data storage and technical infrastructure, and on the options market makers due to a higher volume of reporting obligations. The Participants estimated that having both parties report options market maker quotes to the CAT would increase the size of data submitted to the CAT by approximately 18 billion records each day. Bidders estimated that requiring dual reporting of options market maker quotes would, over a five year period, lead to additional costs of between $2 million and $16 million for data storage and technical infrastructure for the Plan Processor. In addition, according to the results of a cost study conducted by three industry associations,[3898] the cost to options market makers to meet their quote reporting obligations ranges from $307 million to $382 million over a five year period.

Second, Rule 613(c)(7) requires each CAT Reporter to record and report ''Customer-ID(s) for each customer'' when reporting order receipt or origination information to the Central Repository. The Commission noted that including a unique customer identifier could enhance the efficiency of surveillance and regulatory oversight. The Participants, however, favor the Customer Information Approach, that would require broker-dealers to provide detailed account and Customer information to the CAT, and have the Plan Processor correlate the Customer information across broker-dealers, assign a unique Customer identifier to each Customer and use that unique Customer identifier consistently across all CAT Data. The Participants believe that the Customer-ID approach imposes a significant cost burden on market participants and on the Plan Processor. According to cost estimates provided by the DAG,[3899] the cost for the top 250 CAT reporters to implement the Customer-ID as required in SEC Rule 613 would be at least $195 million. The Participants believe that this cost estimate is conservative, since it only represents the cost estimate for 11% of the total broker-dealers that are expected to be CAT Reporters.

Third, SEC Rule 613(c)(7) requires that a CAT-Reporter-ID be reported to the Central Repository for each order and Reportable Event, so that regulators can determine which market participant took action with respect to an order at each Reportable Event. The Participants, however, have proposed to leverage existing business practices and identifiers (''*Existing Identifier Approach*''), rather than requiring new identifiers be established, as the former is deemed more efficient and cost-effective in implementing the CAT-Reporter-ID. The Participants believe that the CAT-Reporter-ID approach would impose a material cost burden on broker-dealers and Participants, as compared to the Existing Identifier Approach, since it would require major changes to broker-dealer systems. According to cost estimates provided by the DAG, the cost for the 250 largest CAT Reporters to implement the CAT-Reporter-ID as required by SEC Rule 613 would be $78 million.

Fourth, Rule 613(c)(7) requires each CAT Reporter to record and report the ''the account number for any subaccounts to which the execution is allocated (in whole or part)'' if an order is executed. The Participants acknowledge that this information is useful to regulators to fulfill their obligations to protect investors. However, the Participants estimate that meeting the obligations of the Rule would be unduly burdensome and costly to achieve given the existing allocation practices. As an alternative, the Participants proposed that allocations will be reported by CAT Reporters via a tool described as an Allocation Report. To create linkages from the order execution to the allocation process by means of an order identifier, the broker-dealers would be required to perform extensive re-engineering of their front, middle, and back office systems, and thus incur significant costs. According to cost estimates provided by the DAG, the cost for the 250 largest CAT Reporters to link allocations to executions would be $525 million.

Finally, Rule 613(d) requires the recording and reporting of the time of certain Reportable Events to the Central Repository with time stamps at least to the millisecond. The Participants understand that time stamp granularity to the millisecond reflects current industry standards with respect to electronically-processed events in the order lifecycle. However, due to the lack of precision, the industry practice with respect to manual orders is to capture manual time stamps with granularity at the level of one second. The Participants believe that compliance with the time stamp granularity requirements of the Plan for Manual Order Events would result in added costs to the industry as there may be a need to upgrade databases, internal messaging applications/protocols, data warehouses, and reporting applications to enable the reporting of such time stamps to the Central Repository. The Participants estimate that the total minimum cost to the industry to comply with a singular time stamp requirement for all CAT reporting would be approximately $10.5 million. This estimate is based on a current cost of $1,050 per manual timestamp clock which stamps to the second, with approximately 10,000 clocks requiring replacement across the industry. Upgrading this to millisecond granularity would likely add to the cost to the industry.

Allocation of Costs Across CAT Reporters

Article XI of the CAT NMS Plan provides the process for determining the funding of the Company. In general, the Participants' approach to funding of the Company is: (A) to operate the Company on a break-even basis, which means having fees imposed and collected that cover the Company's costs and an appropriate reserve; and (B) to establish a fee structure that is equitable based on funding principles.[3900] Such equitable funding principles include: (1) to create transparent, predictable revenue streams aligned with anticipated costs; (2) to allocate costs among Participants and Industry Members taking into account the timeline for implementation of the CAT and the distinctions in the securities trading operations of Participants and Industry Members and their impact on the Company's resources and operations; (3) to establish a tiered fee structure in which there is general comparability in the level of fees charged to CAT Reporters with the most CAT-related activity as measured by market share for Execution Venues, including ATSs, and by message traffic for non-ATS activities of Industry Members, where, for these comparability purposes, the tiered fee structure takes into consideration affiliations between or among CAT Reporters, whether Execution Venues and/or Industry Members; (4) to provide ease of administrative functions; (5) to avoid disincentives such as burdens on competition and reduction in market quality; and (6) to build financial stability for the Company as a going concern.[3901]

Based on these principles, the Operating Committee will establish the Company's funding, which is expected to arise primarily from fees charged to Participants and Industry Members. The Participants have sought input from the DAG as to the specific types of fees. Accordingly, the Participants propose to include the following fee types: (i) fixed fees payable by each Execution Venue that trades NMS Securities and OTC Equity Securities based on its market share (establishing two to five tiers of fixed fees); (ii) fixed fees payable by each Execution Venue that trades Listed Options (as defined in Rule 600(b)(35) of Regulation NMS) based

[3898] Cost Survey Report on CAT Reporting of Options Quotes by Market Makers, conducted by the Financial Information Forum, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association and Securities Traders Association (Nov. 5, 2013); *available at http://catnmsplan.com/web/groups/catnms/@catnms/documents/appsupportdocs/p601771.pdf.*

[3899] Cost estimates provided by the DAG on topics where the Participants have requested exemptive relief can be found at: *http://catnmsplan.com/web/groups/catnms/@catnms/documents/appsupportdocs/p602494.pdf.*

[3900] *See* Section 11.2 of the CAT NMS Plan.

[3901] *See id.*

on its market share (establishing two to five tiers of fixed fees); (iii) fixed fees payable by each Industry Member based on message traffic generated by such Industry Member (for the avoidance of doubt, the fixed fees payable by Industry Members pursuant to this paragraph shall, in addition to any other applicable message traffic, include message traffic generated by: (i) an ATS that does not execute orders that is sponsored by such Industry Member; (ii) routing orders to and from any ATS sponsored by such Industry Member); and (iii) ancillary fees (e.g., fees for late or inaccurate reporting, corrections, and access and use of the CAT for regulatory and oversight purposes).[3902]

The Operating Committee will use two different criteria to establish fees—market share [3903] for Execution Venues, including ATSs, and message traffic for Industry Members' non-ATS activities—due to the fundamental differences between the two types of entities. While there are multiple factors that contribute to the cost of building, maintaining and using the CAT, Bidders stated during workshops and in response to specific questions posed by the Participants that processing and storage of incoming message traffic is one of the most significant cost drivers for the CAT. Thus, the Participants believe that basing fees on message traffic for non-Execution Venue Industry Members is consistent with an equitable allocation of the costs of the CAT. On the other hand, message traffic would not provide the same degree of differentiation between Participants that it does for Industry Members. Because the majority of message traffic at the Participants consists of quotations, and Participants usually disseminate quotations in all instruments they trade, regardless of execution volume, Execution Venues that are Participants generally disseminate similar amounts of message traffic. In contrast, execution volume more accurately delineates the different levels of trading activity of the Participants. For these reasons, the Participants believe that market share is the appropriate metric to use in establishing fees for Participants. Moreover, given the similarity between the activity of exchange Participants and ATSs, both of which meet the definition of an ''exchange'' as set forth in the Exchange Act, the Participants believe that ATSs should be treated in the same manner as the exchange Participants for the purposes of determining the level of fees associated with the CAT.

Costs are allocated across the different types of CAT Reporters (broker-dealers, Execution Venues) on a tiered basis, in order to equitably allocate costs to those CAT Reporters that contribute more to the costs of creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT. The fees to be assessed at each tier are calculated so as to recoup a proportion of costs appropriate to the message traffic from firms in each tier. Therefore, larger broker-dealers, generating the majority of message traffic, will be in the higher tiers, and therefore be charged a higher fee. Smaller broker-dealers with low levels of message traffic will be in lower tiers and will be assessed a minimal fee for the CAT. The Participants estimate that up to 75% of broker-dealers will be in the lower tiers of the Funding Model.

All fees under Article XI charged directly to Participants and indirectly to Industry Members will be reviewed by the Operating Committee at least annually.[3904] All proposed fees to be charged to Industry Members by Participants will be filed with the Commission pursuant to Section 19(b) of the Exchange Act.[3905] In addition, all disputes with respect to the fees the Company charges Participants will be resolved by the Operating Committee or a Subcommittee designated by the Operating Committee, subject to the right of Participants to seek redress from the Commission pursuant to SEC Rule 608 or in any other appropriate forum.[3906] The Participants will adopt rules requiring that disputes with respect to fees charged to Industry Members will be resolved by the Operating Committee or a Subcommittee, subject to the right of any Industry Member to seek redress from the SEC pursuant to SEC Rule 608 or in any other appropriate forum.[3907]

[Section 8.5 of the CAT NMS Plan addresses the very limited situations in which the Company may need to make distributions of cash and property of the Company to the Participants. Any distribution to the Participants requires approval by a Supermajority Vote of the Operating Committee.[3908] The Participants do not expect any distributions to be made to them except in two possible situations. One situation is if the Participants incur tax liabilities due to their ownership of the Company. An example of tax liabilities being incurred would be if the Company generates profits. Those profits could be taxable to the Participants even if the profits are not distributed to the Participants. In such situation, the Participants could be taxed on amounts they have not received, in which case the Company would make distributions to the Participants, but only to the extent to permit each Participant to pay its incurred tax liability. As discussed, the Participants do not expect the Company to generate profits and rather expect the Company to operate on a break-even basis. The other situation that may require distributions to the Participants would be if the Company dissolves. In that situation, the Company's assets would be distributed first to the Company's creditors such as the Plan Processor or other third parties, second to a reserve for contingent or future liabilities (such as taxes), and third (assuming there are any amounts remaining) to the Participants in proportion to their Capital Accounts. Each Participant is expected to make a nominal contribution of cash or services to its Capital Account at the beginning of the operation of the CAT System. Therefore, any distribution to the Participant of an amount equal to its Capital Account would be limited to the nominal amount contributed. Other than these two limited situations, the Participants do not expect the Company to make any distributions.]

The CAT NMS Plan contemplates that the Plan Processor will be responsible for developing and executing administrative processes and procedures to effectuate the smooth functioning of the CAT, consistent with the principles articulated in Article XI. These processes and procedures would include, but are not limited to, establishing budget, notice, billing and collection cycles that provide transparency, predictability and ease of administrative functions to CAT reporters. Criteria and schedules for ancillary fees that might be collected pursuant to Article XI are also anticipated to be published by the Operating Committee.

In articulating the funding principles of the CAT NMS Plan, Participants have established the need for the CAT NMS Plan to, among other things: (1) create transparent, predictable revenue streams for the Company that are aligned with the anticipated costs to build, operate, and administer the CAT and the other costs of the Company; and (2) provide for ease of billing and other administrative functions. The funding principles articulated in Article XI should also inform the policies and procedures adopted by the Operating Committee in executing the associated functions. To that end, to promote fairness and transparency with respect to fees, the Participants expect that the Operating Committee will adopt policies, procedures, and practices around budgeting, assignment of tiers, adjudicating disputes, billing, and collection of fees that provide appropriate transparency to all CAT Reporters. Participants expect that policies or procedures adopted to implement the administration of fee allocation and collection among CAT Reporters would be subject to comment by impacted parties before adoption.

9. *Alternatives Considered*

Technical Solution

SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(xii) directs Participants to discuss reasonable alternative approaches to creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT. As part of the development of the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants considered a variety of alternatives with respect to technical and user support considerations. The technical considerations include: primary storage, data ingestion format, development process, quality assurance staffing and user support staffing. The analysis presented in Appendix C, D.12, below, describes alternative approaches considered for each technical consideration and the ultimate choice of the CAT NMS Plan based on factors that consider feasibility, cost and efficiency.

In addition, the questions included in the Costs to CAT Reporters Study described above permitted the Participants to evaluate cost considerations to Industry Members associated with two different technical formats for reporting audit trail data to the

[3902] *See* Section 11.3 (a)–(c) of the CAT NMS Plan.

[3903] Market share for Execution Venues is defined as the total trade volume executed on an individual Execution Venue as a percentage of total trades executed across all Venues.

[3904] *See* Section 11.3(d) of the CAT NMS Plan.

[3905] *See* Section 11.1(b) of the CAT NMS Plan.

[3906] *See* Section 4.1 and Section 11.5 of the CAT NMS Plan.

[3907] *See id.*

[3908] *See* Section 8.5(a) of the CAT NMS Plan.

Central Repository. One approach might permit broker-dealers to submit information data to the Central Repository using their choice among existing industry protocols, such as FIX. The second approach provided a scenario where CAT Reporters would submit relevant data to the Central Repository using a defined or specified format, such as an augmented version of OATS.

Funding Model

As discussed above, Article XI of the CAT NMS Plan sets forth the provisions for establishing the funding of the Company and recovering the costs of operating the CAT. The Participants recognize that there are a number of different approaches to funding the CAT and have considered a variety of different funding and cost allocation models. Each model has its potential advantages and disadvantages. For example, a structure in which all CAT Reporters are charged a fixed fee regardless of reportable activity would provide CAT Reporters greater certainty regarding their fee obligations, but may place undue burden on small CAT Reporters. A variable fee structure focused on specific reportable information may make it easier for Industry Members to pass fees to their customers. However, such fees would be more complex and difficult to administer. Participants were particularly sensitive to the possibility that the fee structure might create distortions to the economic activities of CAT Reporters if not set appropriately.

The Participants considered alternatives to cost allocation ranging from a strict pro-rata distribution, regardless of the type or size of the CAT Reporters, to a distribution based purely on CAT Reporter activity. Participants also considered a variety of ways to measure activity, including notional value of trading (as currently used for purposes of Section 31 fees), number of trades or quotations, and all message traffic sent. Further, Participants considered the comparability of audit trail activity across different Eligible Securities. The Participants discussed the potential approaches to funding, including the principles articulated in Article XI and an illustrative funding model, with the DAG multiple times, beginning on September 3, 2014.

After extensive analysis and taking into consideration feedback from the DAG, the Participants determined that a tiered fixed fee structure would be fair and relatively uncomplicated. The Participants discussed several approaches to developing a tiered model, including defining fee tiers based on such factors as size of firm, message traffic or trading dollar volume. For example, a review of OATS data for a recent month shows the wide range in activity among broker-dealers, with a number of broker-dealers submitting fewer than 1,000 orders for the month and other broker-dealers submitting millions and even billions of orders in the same period. The Participants also considered a tiered model where CAT Reporters would be charged different variable fees based on tier assignment. However, the Participants believe a tiered fixed fee model is preferable to a variable model because a variable model would lack the transparency, predictability, and ease of calculation afforded by fixed fees. Such factors are crucial to estimating a reliable revenue stream for the Company and to permitting CAT Reporters to reasonably predict their obligations. Moreover, the Participants believe that the tiered approach would help ensure that fees are equitably allocated among similarly situated CAT Reporters and would further the goal of the Participants to lessen the impact on smaller firms. Irrespective of the approach taken with fees, the Participants believe that revenues generated should be aligned to the costs of building, implementing and maintaining the CAT, and if revenues collected are in excess of costs for any given year, such excess should be considered in setting fees for the following year.

Finally, the Participants believe that it is important to establish a simple fee structure that is easy to understand and administer. The Participants are committed to establishing and billing fees so that Industry Members will have certainty and the ability to budget for them. In that regard, the CAT NMS Plan expressly provides that the Operating Committee shall not make any changes to any fees on more than a semi-annual basis unless, pursuant to a Supermajority Vote, the Operating Committee concludes that such change is necessary for the adequate funding of the Company.[3909]

An Analysis of the Impact on Competition, Efficiency, and Capital Formation (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(viii))

As required by SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(viii), this section provides an analysis of the impact on competition, efficiency and capital formation of creating, implementing, and maintaining the CAT NMS Plan. In recognition of the complexity of this analysis, the Participants have evaluated a variety of sources of information to assist in the analysis of the impact of the CAT NMS Plan on competition, efficiency and capital formation. Specifically, the Participants have evaluated the many comments related to competition, efficiency and capital formation received in response to the Commission's proposal of SEC Rule 613 and during the CAT NMS Plan development process. In addition, the Participants considered the input of the DAG. Finally, the Participants used information derived from three cost studies described in the prior section on costs. Based on a review and analysis of these materials, the Participants believe that the CAT NMS Plan, as submitted, is justified given its estimated impacts on competition, efficiency and capital formation.

- **Impact on Competition**

Through an analysis of the data and information described above, the Participants have evaluated the potential impact of the CAT NMS Plan on competition, including the competitive impact on the market generally and the competitive impact on each type of Person playing a role in the market (e.g., Participants, broker-dealers, vendors, investors). Potential negative impacts on competition could arise if the CAT NMS Plan were to burden a group or class of CAT Reporters in a way that would harm the public's ability to access their services, either through increasing costs or decreased provision of those services. These impacts may be direct, as in the provision of brokerage services to individual investors, or indirect, as in the aggregate costs of managing, trading and maintaining a securities holding. These impacts should be measured relative to the economic baseline, described above.

The Participants have identified a series of potential impacts on competition that may arise as a result of the terms and conditions of the CAT NMS Plan. These potential impacts may be related to: (1) the technology ultimately used by the CAT and differences across CAT Reporters in their efforts necessary to meet the CAT NMS Plan's requirements; (2) the method of cost allocation across CAT Reporters; and (3) changes in regulatory reporting requirements, and their attendant costs, particularly to smaller entities, who may previously have benefited from regulatory exemptions.

In general, the Participants believe that the CAT NMS Plan will avoid disincentives such as placing an inappropriate burden on competition in the U.S. securities markets. The discussion below focuses on competition in the Participant and broker-dealer communities, where the Participants believe there is the greatest potential for impact on competition.

10. *Participants*

The Participants already incur significant costs to maintain and surveil an audit trail of activity for which they are responsible. Each Participant bears these costs whether it expends internal resources to monitor relevant activity itself, or whether it contracts with others to perform these services on its behalf. The CAT NMS Plan, through the funding principles it sets forth in Section 11.2, seeks to distribute the regulatory costs associated with the development and maintenance of a meaningful and comprehensive audit trail in a principled manner. By calibrating the CAT NMS Plan's funding according to these principles, the Participants sought to avoid placing undue burden on exchanges relative to their core characteristics, including market share and volume of message traffic. Thus, the Participants do not believe that any particular exchange in either the equities or options markets would be placed at a competitive disadvantage in a way that would materially impact the respective Execution Venue marketplaces for either type of security.

In addition, because the CAT NMS Plan seeks to allocate costs in a manner consistent with the Participants' activities, the Participants do not believe that it would discourage potential new entrants. For instance, an equity ATS—which would already incur costs under the CAT NMS Plan as a reporting broker-dealer—should not be discouraged from becoming a national securities exchanges because of the costs it would incur as a Participant based on its business model or pricing structure. As proposed here, the entity would be assessed

[3909] *See* Section 11.3(d) of the CAT NMS Plan.

exactly the same amount for a given level of activity whether it acted as an ATS or as an exchange. Accordingly, the Participants do not believe that adoption of the CAT NMS Plan would favor existing exchanges or types of exchanges vis-à-vis potential new competitors in a way that would degrade available Execution Venue services or pricing. For similar reasons, the Participants also do not believe that the costs of the CAT NMS Plan would distort the marketplace for existing or potential registered securities associations.

11. *Broker-Dealers*

Broker-dealer competition may be impacted if the direct and indirect costs associated with meeting the CAT NMS Plan's requirements materially impact the provision of their services to the public. Further, competition may be harmed if a particular class or group of broker-dealers bears the costs disproportionately, and as a result, investors have more limited choices or increased costs for certain types of broker-dealer services.

For larger broker-dealers, the Participants rely on the information obtained from the Costs to CAT Reporters Study and discussions with the industry to preliminarily conclude that the CAT NMS Plan will not likely have an adverse impact on competition. Under the CAT NMS Plan, broker-dealers would be assessed charges, as determined by the Operating Committee, for the build and maintenance of the CAT. They would also incur costs to build and maintain systems and processes necessary to submit and retain their own information to the Central Repository. The Participants' efforts to align costs with market activity leads to an outcome where dollar costs are borne significantly more by larger entities.

Additionally, large broker-dealers may view themselves as direct competitors to large Participants, in that they may provide similar execution services. The CAT NMS Plan seeks to mitigate competitive impacts by aligning the cost allocation in a manner that seeks comparability among the largest CAT Reporters regardless of their regulatory status.[3910]

According to the Costs to CAT Reporters Study, for large broker-dealers, the average decrease in maintenance costs associated with the CAT (i.e., the cost that CAT would impose on firms beyond the current economic baseline) would be $651,924, and the average decrease in maintenance costs for small firms would be $726,216 using Approach 1. For Approach 2, large broker-dealers would see a decrease in maintenance costs associated with the CAT of $1,170,548, and small firms would see a decrease in the same costs of $763,371. These averages could suggest that the decreased costs imposed by the CAT would represent a benefit to both large and small broker-dealers' regulatory budgets. The Participants believe that the CAT NMS Plan would not materially disadvantage small broker-dealers versus large broker-dealers.

For small broker-dealers, the Participants considered their contribution to market activity as an important determinant of the amount of the cost of the CAT that they should bear. While this allocation of costs may be significant for some small firms, and may even impact their business models materially, SEC Rule 613 requires these entities to report. The Participants have not identified a way to further minimize the costs to these firms within the context of the funding principles established as part of the CAT NMS Plan.

The Participants were particularly sensitive during the development of the CAT NMS Plan to the potential burdens it could place on small broker-dealers. These broker-dealers may incur minimal costs under existing audit trail requirements because they are OATS-exempt or excluded broker-dealers or limited purpose broker-dealers. The Participants note that the CAT NMS Plan contemplates steps to diffuse the potential cost differential between large and small firms. For instance, small broker-dealers generally will have an additional year before they are required to start reporting data under the CAT NMS Plan to the Central Repository. This will permit these firms greater time to implement the changes to their own systems necessary to comply with the Plan. Furthermore, the Participants have sought exemptive relief concerning time stamps for recording the time of Manual Order Events.

The Participants are cognizant that the method by which costs are allocated to broker-dealers may have implications for their business models that might ultimately impact competition. For instance, if the method of cost allocation created disincentives to quoting activity, certain broker-dealer's business models might be affected more greatly than others. The Participants are unable to determine whether and how changing these incentives may impact competition. Participants intend to monitor changes to overall market activity and market quality and consider appropriate changes to the cost allocation model where merited.

The Participants note that if the exemption requests that have been submitted to the Commission are not granted, the requirements of SEC Rule 613 may impose significantly greater costs that could potentially cause small broker-dealers to exit the marketplace, discourage new entrants to the small broker-dealer marketplace, or impact the broker-dealer landscape in other ways that may dampen competitive pressures.

▪ Impact on Efficiency

Through an analysis of the data and information described above, the Participants have evaluated the impact of the CAT NMS Plan on efficiency, including the impact on the time, resources and effort needed to perform various regulatory and other functions. In general, the Participants believe that the CAT NMS Plan should have a net positive effect on efficiency.

Overall, the Participants believe that the CAT NMS Plan could improve market efficiency by reducing monitoring costs and increasing efficiency in the enforcement of Participant and Commission rules. Additionally, the Participants believe that the CAT will enable the Participants and the Commission to detect more quickly wrongdoing on a cross-market basis, which may deter some market participants from taking such actions. For example, FINRA's equity cross-market surveillance patterns have already demonstrated the value of integrating data from multiple markets. FINRA has found that approximately 44 percent of the manipulation-based alerts it generated involved conduct on two or more equity markets and 43 percent of the alerts involved conduct by two or more market participants.[3911] A reduction in prohibited activity, as well as faster identification of such activity by regulators, would lead to a reduction in losses to investors and increased efficiency.

The CAT could also create more focused efficiencies for broker-dealers and Participants by reducing the redundant and overlapping systems and requirements identified above. For all CAT Reporters, the standardization of various technology systems will provide, over time, improved process efficiencies, including efficiencies gained through the replacement of outdated processes and technology with cost saving and related staffing reductions. Standardization of systems will improve efficiency, for both Participants and broker-dealers, in the form of resource consolidation, sun-setting of systems, consolidated legacy systems and processes and consolidated data processing. In addition, more sophisticated monitoring may reduce the number of ad hoc information requests, thereby reducing the overall burden and increasing the operational efficiency of CAT Reporters.

CAT Reporters may also experience various long term efficiencies from the increase in surveillance capabilities, such as greater efficiencies related to administrative functions provided by enhanced regulatory access, superior system speed and reduced system downtime. Moreover, the Commission and the Participants expect to have more fulsome access to unprocessed regulatory data and timely and accurate information on market activity, thus providing the opportunity for improved market surveillance and monitoring.

Note, however, that uniform reporting of data to the Central Repository may require the development of data mapping and data dictionaries that will impose burdens in the short term. CAT Reporters also may incur

[3910] There is empirical evidence that firms' order routing decisions respond to changes in trading fees. Such evidence finds that an increase in the level of an exchange's net fee is associated with a decrease in trading volume and market share relative to other exchanges. This evidence suggests that there is sufficient competition among Execution Venues such that where the Participant's costs for the CAT are material it may be difficult for Execution Venues to fully pass those costs to broker-dealers. This argument holds as long as broker-dealers are not able to pass such costs on to their customers. *See* Cardella et al., *Make and Take Fees in the U.S. Equity Market* (working paper, Apr. 29, 2013), *available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2149302*.

[3911] Remarks of Robert Ketchum, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, FINRA (Sept. 17. 2014), *available athttp://www.finra.org/Newsroom/Speeches/Ketchum/P600785*.

additional time and direct costs to comply with new encryption mechanisms in connection with the transmission of PII data (although the quality of the process will improve).

The Participants are cognizant that the method by which costs are allocated to broker-dealers may have implications for their business models that might ultimately impact efficiency. For instance, if the method of cost allocation created disincentives to the provision of liquidity, there may be an impact on the quality of the markets and an increase in the costs to investors to transact. As a result, the Participants set forth the funding principles that will guide the selection of the cost allocation model. The Participants have also sought out evidence available to best understand how cost allocation models may impact market participation, and more importantly, ultimately market outcomes.[3912]

The Participants intend to monitor changes to overall market activity and market quality and will consider appropriate changes to the cost allocation model where merited.

▪ **Impact on Capital Formation**

Through an analysis of the data and information described above, the Participants also have assessed the impact of the CAT NMS Plan on capital formation, including the impact on both investments and the formation of additional capital. In general, the Participants believe that the CAT NMS Plan will have no deleterious effect on capital formation.

In general the Participants believe that the enhanced surveillance of the markets may instill greater investor confidence in the markets, which, in turn, may prompt greater participation in the markets. It is possible that greater investor participation in the markets could bolster capital formation by supporting the environment in which companies raise capital.

Moreover, the Participants believe that the CAT NMS Plan would not discourage capital formation. As discussed in greater detail above, the Participants have analyzed the degree to which the CAT NMS Plan should cover Primary Market Transactions. Based on this analysis, the Participants believe that the CAT NMS Plan has been appropriately tailored so it does not create an undue burden on the primary issuances that companies may use to raise capital.

In addition, the Participants do not believe that the costs of the CAT NMS Plan would come to bear on investors in a way that would materially limit their access to or participation in the capital markets.

Finally, the Participants believe that, given the CAT NMS Plan's provisions to secure the data collected and stored by the Central Repository, the CAT NMS Plan should not discourage participation by market participants who are worried about data security and data breaches. As described more fully in the CAT NMS Plan and Appendix C, The Security and Confidentiality of the Information Reported to the Central Repository, and Appendix D, Data Security, the Plan Processor will be responsible for ensuring the security and confidentiality of data during transmission and processing, as well as at rest, and for ensuring that the data is used only for permitted purposes. The Plan Processor will be required to provide physical security for facilities where data is transmitted or stored, and must provide for the security of electronic access to data by outside parties, including Participants and the Commission, CAT Reporters, or Data Submitters. The Plan Processor must include in these measures heightened security for populating, storing, and retrieving particularly sensitive data such as PII. Moreover, the Plan Processor must develop and maintain this security program with a dedicated staff including, among others, a Chief Information Security Officer dedicated to monitoring and addressing data security issues for the Plan Processor and Central Repository, subject to regular review by the Chief Compliance Officer. The Plan Processor also will be required to provide regular reports to the Operating Committee on a number of items, including any data security issues for the Plan Processor and Central Repository.

▪ **Impacts of the CAT NMS Plan Governance on Efficiency, Competition, and Capital Formation**

Participants considered the impacts of the CAT NMS Plan governance on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. Participants recognize that without effective governance, it will become harder for the CAT NMS Plan to achieve its intended outcome, namely, enhanced investor protection, in an efficient manner. Participants specifically considered two areas where ineffective governance might lead to economic distortions or inefficiencies: (i) the voting protocols defined in the CAT NMS Plan both for Participants in developing the CAT, and for the Operating Committee after the adoption of the CAT NMS Plan; and (ii) the role of industry advisors within the context of CAT NMS Plan governance.

Participants understand that there may be detrimental impacts to adopting voting protocols that might impede the effective administration of the CAT System. For instance, too high a threshold for decision making may limit the ability of the body to adopt broadly agreed upon provisions. The extreme form of this would have been for the CAT NMS Plan to require unanimity on all matters. In such case, one dissenting opinion could effectively derail the entire decision-making apparatus. The inability to act in a timely way may create consequences for efficiency, competition, and capital. Conversely, if Participants set a voting threshold that is too low, it might have the impact of not giving sufficient opportunity to be heard or value to dissenting opinions and alternative approaches. As an example, if Participants were to set voting thresholds too low, it might be possible for a set of Participants to adopt provisions that might provide them a competitive advantage over other Participants. Either forms (a too high or too low threshold) could result in negative impacts to efficiency, competition, and capital formation. These issues apply in the context of efforts of the Participants to develop the CAT NMS Plan submitted here or in the context of the Operating Committee's responsibilities after approval of the CAT NMS Plan.

To address these concerns, Participants carefully considered which matters should require a Supermajority Vote and which matters should require a Majority Vote.[3913] The decision required Participants to balance the protection of rights of all parties with the interest of avoiding unnecessary deadlock in the decision making process. As a result, Participants have determined that use of a Supermajority Vote should be for instances considered by the Participants to have a direct and significant impact on the functioning, management, and financing of the CAT System. This formulation, relying on Majority Vote for routine decisions and Supermajority Vote for significant matters, is intended to meet the Commission's direction for ''efficient and fair operation of the NMS plan governing the consolidated audit trail.'' [3914]

Participants also considered the role of industry representation as part of the governance structure. Participants recognize the importance of including industry representation in order to assure that all affected parties have a representative in discussing the building, implementation, and maintenance of the CAT System. Participants actively sought insight and information from the DAG and other industry representatives in developing the CAT NMS Plan. The CAT NMS Plan also contemplates continued industry representation through an Advisory Committee, intended to support the Operating Committee and to promote continuing efficiency in meeting the objective of the CAT.

Implementation and Milestones of the CAT

9. *A Plan to Eliminate Existing Rules and Systems (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(ix))*

As required by SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(ix), this section sets forth a plan to eliminate rules and systems (or components thereof) that will be rendered duplicative by the consolidated audit trail, including identification of such rules and systems (or components thereof); to the extent that any existing rules or systems related to monitoring quotes, orders and executions provide information that is not rendered duplicative by the consolidated audit trail, an analysis of, among other things, whether the collection of such information remains appropriate; if still appropriate whether such information should continue to be separately collected or should instead be incorporated into the CAT; or if no longer appropriate,

[3912] *See, e.g.,* IIROC's analysis of its market regulation fee model, *available at http://www.iiroc.ca/Documents/2011/5f95e549-10d1-473e-93cf-3250e026a476_en.pdf[iiroc.ca]* and *http://www.iiroc.ca/Documents/2012/bf393b26-7bdf-49ff-a1fc-3904d1de3983_en.pdf[iiroc.ca]*.

[3913] Further discussion of the Participants' consideration of the use of the Majority Vote and Supermajority Vote is contained in Appendix C, 11, Process by Which Participants Solicited Views of Members and Other Appropriate Parties Regarding Creation, Implementation, and Maintenance of CAT; Summary of Views; and How Sponsors Took Views Into Account in Preparing NMS Plan (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(xi)).

[3914] Adopting Release at 45787.

how the collection of such information could be efficiently terminated.

Milestone	*[Projected] Completion Date*
Identification of Duplicative Rules and Systems	
Each Participant will initiate an analysis of its rules and systems to determine which require information that is duplicative of the information available to the Participants through the Central Repository. Examples of Participants' rules to be reviewed include: • The Participants' rules that implement the exchange-wide Consolidated Options Audit Trail System (e.g., CBOE Rule 6.24, etc.) • FINRA rules that implement the Order Audit Trail System (OATS) including the relevant rules of the NASDAQ Stock Market, NASDAQ OMX BX, NASDAQ OMX PHLX, New York Stock Exchange, NYSE MKT, and NYSE ARCA • Option exchange rules that require the reporting of transactions in the equity underlier for options products listed on the options exchange (e.g., PHLX Rule 1022, portions of CBOE Rule 8.9, etc.)	[Each Participant has begun reviewing its existing rulebooks and is waiting for the publication of the final reporting requirements to the Central Repository. Each Participant should complete its analysis within twelve (12) months after Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository or, if such Participant determines sufficient data is not available to complete such analysis by such date, a subsequent date needs to be determined by such Participant based on the availability of such data.] *The Participants with duplicative systems have completed gap analyses for systems and rules identified for retirement in full,*[3915] *and have confirmed that data that would need to be captured by the CAT to support retirement of these systems will be included in the CAT.*
Identification of Partially Duplicative Rules and Systems	
Each Participant will initiate an analysis of its rules and systems to determine which rules and/or systems require information that is partially duplicative of the information available to the Participants through the Central Repository. The analysis should include a determination as to (1) whether the duplicative information available in the Central Repository should continue to be collected by the Participant; (2) whether the duplicative information made available in the Central Repository can be used by the Participant without degrading the effectiveness of the Participant's rules or systems; and (3) whether the non-duplicative information should continue to be collected by the Participant or, alternatively, should be added to information collected by the Central Repository. Examples of Participants' rules to be reviewed include: • Options exchange rules that require the reporting of large options positions (e.g., CBOE Rule 4.13, etc.) • NYSE Rule 410B which requires the reporting of transactions effected in NYSE listed securities by NYSE members which are not reported to the consolidated reporting systems • Portions of CBOE Rule 8.9 concerning position reporting details.	[Each Participant has begun reviewing its existing rulebooks and is waiting for publication of the final reporting requirements to the Central Repository. Upon publication of the Technical Specifications, each Participant should complete its analysis within eighteen (18) months after Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository or, if such Participant determines sufficient data is not available to complete such analysis by such date, a subsequent date needs to be determined by such Participant based on the availability of such data.] *The Participants with duplicative systems have completed gap analyses for systems and rules identified for retirement in part, and have confirmed that data that would need to be captured by the CAT to support retirement of these systems will be included in the CAT.*
Identification of Non-Duplicative Rules or System related to Monitoring Quotes, Orders and Executions	
Each Participant will initiate an analysis of its rules and systems to determine which of the Participant's rules and systems related to monitoring quotes, orders, and executions provide information that is not rendered duplicative by the consolidated audit trail. Each Participant must analyze (1) whether collection of such information should continue to be separately collected or should instead be incorporated into the consolidated audit trail; (2) if still appropriate, whether such information should continue to be separately collected or should instead be incorporated into the consolidated audit trail.; and (3) if no longer appropriate, how the collection of such information could be efficiently terminated, the steps the Participants propose to take to seek Commission approval for the elimination of such rules and systems (or components thereof), and a timetable for such elimination, including a description of the phasing-in of the consolidated audit trail and phasing-out of such existing rules and systems (or components thereof).	[Each Participant should complete its analysis within eighteen (18) months after Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository or, if such Participant determines sufficient data is not available to complete such analysis by such date, a subsequent date needs to be determined by such Participant based on the availability of such data.] *The Participants with duplicative systems have completed gap analyses for systems and rules identified for retirement in full or in part, and have confirmed that data that would need to be captured by the CAT to support retirement of these systems will be included in the CAT.*
Identification of Participant Rule and System Changes Due to Elimination or Modification of SEC Rules	
To the extent the SEC eliminates SEC rules that require information that is duplicative of information available through the Central Repository, each Participant will analyze its rules and systems to determine whether any modifications are necessary (e.g., delete references to outdated SEC rules, etc.) to support data requests made pursuant to such SEC rules. Examples of rules the SEC might eliminate or modify as a result of the implementation of CAT include: • SEC Rule 17a–25 which requires brokers and dealers to submit electronically to the SEC information on Customers and firms securities trading	

Milestone	*[Projected] Completion Date*
• SEC Rule 17h–1 concerning the identification of large traders and the required reporting obligations of large traders	Each Participant should complete its analysis within three (3) months after the SEC approves the deletion or modification of an SEC rule related to the information available through the Central Repository. The Participants will coordinate with the SEC regarding modification of the CAT NMS Plan to include information sufficient to eliminate or modify those Exchange Act rules or systems that the SEC deems appropriate. With respect to SEC Rule 17a–25, such coordination will include, among other things, consideration of EBS data elements and asset classes that would need to be included in the Plan, as well as the timing of when all Industry Members will be subject to the Plan.[3916] Based on preliminary industry analyses, broker-dealer large trader reporting requirements under SEC Rule [17h–1] *13h–1* could be eliminated via the CAT. The same appears true with respect to broker-dealer *large trader* recordkeeping. Large trader reporting responsibilities on Form 13H and self-identification would not appear to be covered by the CAT.[3917]
Participant Rule Changes to Modify or Eliminate Participant Rules	
Each Participant will prepare appropriate rule change filings to implement the rule modifications or deletions that can be made based on the Participant's analysis of duplicative or partially duplicative rules. The rule change filing should describe the process for phasing out the requirements under the relevant rule.	Each Participant will file [to] *with* the SEC the relevant rule change filing to eliminate or modify its *duplicative* rules within six (6) months of the [Participant's determination that such modification or deletion is appropriate] *SEC's approval of the CAT NMS Plan, the elimination of such rules and the retirement of the related systems to be effective at such time as CAT Data meets minimum standards of accuracy and reliability. In this filing, each Participant shall discuss:* *(i) specific accuracy and reliability standards that will determine when duplicative systems will be retired, including, but not limited to, whether the attainment of a certain Error Rate should determine when a system duplicative of the CAT can be retired;* *(ii) whether the availability of certain data from Small Industry Members two years after the Effective Date would facilitate a more expeditious retirement of duplicative systems; and* *(iii) whether individual Industry Members can be exempted from reporting to duplicative systems once their CAT reporting meets specified accuracy and reliability standards, including, but not limited to, ways in which establishing cross-system regulatory functionality or integrating data from existing systems and the CAT would facilitate such Individual Industry Member exemptions.* *Between the Effective Date and the retirement of the Participants' duplicative systems, each Participant, to the extent practicable, will attempt to minimize changes to those duplicative systems.*
Elimination (including any Phase-Out) of Relevant Existing Rules and Systems	
After each Participant completes the above analysis of its rules and systems, each Participant will analyze the most appropriate and expeditious timeline and manner for eliminating such rules and systems.	Upon the SEC's approval of relevant rule changes, each Participant will implement such timeline. One consideration in the development of these timelines will be when the quality of CAT Data will be sufficient to meet the surveillance needs of the Participant (i.e., to sufficiently replace current reporting data) before existing rules and systems can be eliminated.

[3915] *The systems and rules identified for retirement (in full or in part) include: FINRA's OATS Rules (7400 Series), the rules of other Participants that incorporate FINRA's OATS requirements (e.g. NASDAQ Rule 7000A Series, BX Rule 6950 Series, PHLX Rule 3400 Series, NYSE Rule 7400 Series, NYSE Arca Equities Rule 7400 Series, and NYSE MKT Rule 7400 Series), COATS and associated rules, NYSE Rule 410(b), PHLX Rule 1022, CBOE Rule 8.9, EBS and associated rules, C2 Rule 8.7, and CHX BrokerPlex reporting (Rule 5).*

[3916] *See* SEC Rule 613—Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT) Preliminary EBS–CAT Gap Analysis, *available at http://catnmsplan.com/web/groups/catnms/@catnms/documents/appsupportdocs/p450537.pdf.*

[3917] *See* FIF CAT WG: Preliminary Large Trader Rule (Rule 13h–1)—CAT (Rule 613) Gap Analysis (Feb. 11, 2014), *available at https://fif.com/fif-working-groups/consolidated-audit-trail/member-resources/current-documents?download=1221:february-11-2014-fif-cat-wg-preliminary-large-trader-rule-rule-13h-1-cat-rule-613-gap-analysis&start=35.*

[3918] *See* FINRA Rule 7410(l).

[3919] Other SROs have rules requiring their members to report information pursuant to the OATS Rules. *See, e.g.,* NYSE Rule 7400 Series; NASDAQ Rule 7400 Series.

Order Audit Trail System (''*OATS*'')

The OATS Rules impose obligations on FINRA members to record in electronic form and report to FINRA, on a daily basis, certain information with respect to orders originated, received, transmitted, modified, canceled, or executed by members relating to OTC equity securities [3918] and NMS Securities.[3919] OATS captures this order information and integrates it with quote and transaction information to create a time-sequenced record of orders, quotes, and transactions. This information is then used by FINRA staff to conduct surveillance and investigations of member firms for potential violations of FINRA rules and federal securities laws. In general, the OATS Rules apply to any FINRA member that is a ''Reporting Member,'' which is defined in Rule 7410 as ''a member that receives or originates an order and has an obligation to record and report information under Rules 7440 and 7450.''

Although FINRA is committed to retiring OATS in as efficient and timely a manner as practicable, its ability to retire OATS is dependent on a number of events. Most importantly, before OATS can be retired, the Central Repository must contain CAT Data sufficient to ensure that FINRA can effectively conduct surveillance and investigations of its members for potential violations of FINRA rules and federal laws and regulations, which includes ensuring that the CAT Data is complete and accurate. Consequently, one of the first steps taken by the Participants to address the elimination of OATS was an analysis of gaps between the informational requirements of SEC Rule 613 and current OATS recording and reporting rules. In particular, SEC Rule 613(c)(5) and (6) require reporting of data only for each NMS Security that is (a) registered or listed for trading on a national securities exchange; (b) or admitted to unlisted trading privileges on such exchange; or (c) for which reports are required to be submitted to the national securities association. SEC Rule 613(i) requires the Participants to provide to the Commission within six months after the Effective Date a document outlining how the Participants could incorporate into the consolidated audit trail information with respect to equity securities that are not NMS Securities (''*OTC Equity Securities*'') and debt securities (and Primary Market Transactions in such securities). Even though SEC Rule 613 does not require reporting of OTC Equity Securities, the Participants have agreed to expand the reporting requirements to include OTC Equity Securities to facilitate the elimination of OATS.[3920]

Next, the Participants performed a detailed analysis of the current OATS requirements and the specific reporting obligations under SEC Rule 613 and concluded that there are 42 data elements found in both OATS and SEC Rule 613; however, there are 33 data elements currently captured in OATS that are not specified in SEC Rule 613.[3921] The Participants believe it is appropriate to incorporate data elements into the Central Repository that are necessary to retire OATS and the OATS Rules. The Participants believe that these additional data elements will increase the likelihood that the Central Repository will include sufficient order information to ensure FINRA can continue to perform its surveillance with CAT Data rather than OATS data and can, thus, more quickly eliminate OATS and the OATS Rules.

The purpose of OATS is to collect data to be used by FINRA staff to conduct surveillance and investigations of member firms for potential violations of FINRA rules and federal securities laws and regulations. SEC Rule 613 requires the Participants to include in the CAT NMS Plan a requirement that all Industry Members report information to the Central Repository within three years after the Effective Date. Consistent with this provision, under the terms of Sections 6.4 and 6.7 of the CAT NMS Plan, some Reporting Members will not be reporting information to the Central Repository until three years after the Effective Date. Because FINRA must continue to perform its surveillance obligations without interruption, OATS cannot be entirely eliminated until all FINRA members who currently report to OATS are reporting CAT Data to the Central Repository. However, FINRA will monitor its ability to integrate CAT Data with OATS data to determine whether it can continue to perform its surveillance obligations. If it is practicable to integrate the data in a way that ensures no interruption in FINRA's surveillance capabilities, FINRA will consider exempting firms from the OATS Rules provided they report data to the Central Repository pursuant to the CAT NMS Plan and any implementing rules.

FINRA's ability to eliminate OATS reporting obligations is dependent upon the ability of the Plan Processor and FINRA to work together to integrate CAT Data with the data collected by OATS. FINRA is committed to working diligently with the Plan Processor to ensure this process occurs in a timely manner; however, it is anticipated that Reporting Members will have to report to both OATS and the Central Repository for some period of time until FINRA can verify that the data into the Central Repository is of sufficient quality for surveillance purposes and that all reporting requirements meet the established steady state Error Rates set forth in Section A.3(b). Once this is verified, FINRA's goal is to minimize the dual-reporting requirement.

Finally, the Participants note that, pursuant to Section 19 of the Exchange Act, the amendment or elimination of the OATS Rules can only be done with Commission approval. Approval of any such filings is dependent upon a number of factors, including public notice and comment and required findings by the Commission before it can approve any amendments; therefore, FINRA cannot speculate how long this process may ultimately take.

Objective Milestones to Assess Progress (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(x))

As required by SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(x), this section sets forth a series of detailed objective milestones, with [projected] *required* completion dates, toward implementation of the consolidated audit trail.

▪ Publication and Implementation of the Methods for Providing Information to the Customer-ID Database

Milestone	[Projected] completion date
Selection of Plan Processor	
Participants jointly select the Initial Plan Processor pursuant to the process set forth in Article V of the CAT NMS Plan.	*No later than* 2 months after Effective Date
Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members[3922])	
Plan Processor begins developing the procedures, connectivity requirements and Technical Specifications for Industry Members to report Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information to the Central Repository.	*No later than 15 months before Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository*
Plan Processor publishes iterative drafts of the procedures, connectivity requirements and Technical Specifications for Industry Members to Report Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information to the Central Repository.	*As needed before publishing the final documents*
Plan Processor publishes the procedures, connectivity requirements and Technical Specifications for Industry Members to report Customer Account Information *and Customer Identifying Information* to the Central Repository.	*No later than* 6 months before Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) begin connectivity and acceptance testing with the Central Repository.	*No later than* 3 months before Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository

[3920] This expansion of the CAT reporting requirements to OTC Equity Securities was generally supported by members of the broker-dealer industry and was discussed with the DAG on July 24, 2013.

[3921] SEC Rule 613(c)(7) lists the minimum order information that must be reported to the CAT and specifies the information that must be included in the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission noted in the Adopting Release that ''the SROs are not prohibited from proposing additional data elements not specified in Rule 613 if the SROs believe such data elements would further, or more efficiently, facilitate the requirements of [SEC Rule 613].'' Adopting Release at 45750.

[3922] Small broker-dealers are defined SEC Rule 0–10(c).

Milestone	[Projected] completion date
Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) begin reporting customer/institutional/firm account information to the Central Repository for processing.	*No later than* 1 month before Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Small Industry Members	
Small Industry Members begin connectivity and acceptance testing with the Central Repository.	*No later than* 3 months before Small Industry Members are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Small Industry Members begin reporting customer/institutional/firm account information to the Central Repository for processing.	*No later than* 1 month before Small Industry Members are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository

▪ **Submission of Order and MM Quote Data to Central Repository**

Milestone	[Projected] completion date
Participants	
Plan Processor begins developing Technical Specification(s) for Participant submission of order and MM Quote data.	*No later than* 10 months before Participants are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor publishes iterative drafts of Technical Specification(s) ..	As needed before publishing of the final document
Plan Processor publishes Technical Specification(s) for Participant submission of order and MM Quote data.	*No later than* 6 months before Participants are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor begins connectivity testing and accepting order and MM Quote data from Participants for testing purposes.	*No later than* 3 months before Participants are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor plans specific testing dates for Participant testing of order and MM Quote submission.	*No later than* [Beginning] 3 months before Participants are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members)	
Plan Processor begins developing Technical Specification(s) for Industry Members submission of order data.	*No later than* 15 months before Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor publishes iterative drafts of Technical Specification(s) ..	As needed before publishing of the final document
Plan Processor publishes Technical Specification(s) for Industry Member submission of order data.	*No later than* 1 year before Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Participant exchanges that support options MM quoting publish specifications for adding Quote Sent time to Quoting APIs.	*No later than* 6 months before Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor *makes the testing environment available on a voluntary basis and* begins connectivity testing and accepting order data from Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) for testing purposes.	*No later than* 6 months before Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor and Industry Members begin coordinated and structured [plans specific testing dates for Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members)] testing of order submission.	*No later than* [Beginning] 3 months before Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Participant exchanges that support options MM quoting begin accepting Quote Sent time on Quotes.	*No later than* 1 month before Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Small Industry Members	
Plan Processor *makes the testing environment available on a voluntary basis and* begins connectivity testing and accepting order data from Small Industry Members for testing purposes.	*No later than* 6 months before Small Industry Members are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor and Small Industry Members begin coordinated and structured [Plan Processor plans specific testing dates for Small Industry Members] testing of order submissions.	*No later than* [Beginning] 3 months before Small Industry Members are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository

▪ **Linkage of Lifecycle of Order Events**

Milestone	[Projected] completion date
Participants	
Using order and MM Quote data submitted during planned testing, Plan Processor creates linkages of the lifecycle of order events based on the received data.	*No later than* 3 months before Participants are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository

Milestone	[Projected] completion date
Participants must synchronize Business Clocks in accordance with Section 6.8 of the CAT NMS Plan.	*No later than* 4 months after effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan
Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members)	
Using order and MM Quote data submitted during planned testing, Plan Processor creates linkages of the lifecycle of order events based on the received data.	*No later than* 6 months before Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Industry Members must synchronize Business Clocks in accordance with Section 6.8 of the CAT NMS Plan.	*No later than* 4 months after effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan
Small Industry Members	
Using order and MM Quote data submitted during planned testing, Plan Processor creates linkages of the lifecycle of order events based on the received data.	*No later than* 6 months before Small Industry Members are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Industry Members must synchronize Business Clocks in accordance with Section 6.8 of the CAT NMS Plan.	*No later than* 4 months after effectiveness of the CAT NMS Plan

▪ **Access to the Central Repository for Regulators**

Milestone	[Projected] completion date
Plan Processor publishes a draft document detailing methods of access to the Central Repository for regulators.	*No later than* 6 months before Participants are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor publishes a finalized document detailing methods of access to the Central Repository for regulators, including any relevant APIs, GUI descriptions, etc. that will be supplied for access.	*No later than* 1 month before Participants are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor provides (1) test information, either from Participant testing or from other test data, for regulators to test use of the Central Repository and (2) regulators connectivity to the Central Repository test environment and production environments.	*No later than* 1 month before Participants are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor provides regulators access to test data for Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members).	*No later than* 6 months before Industry Members (other than Small Industry Members) are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor provides regulators access to test data for Small Industry Members.	*No later than* 6 months before Small Industry Members are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository

▪ **Integration of Other Data (“*Other Data*” includes, but is not limited to, SIP quote and trade data, OCC data, trade and quote information from Participants and reference data)**

Milestone	[Projected] completion date
Operating Committee finalizes Other Data requirements	*No later than* 10 months before Participants are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor determines methods and requirements for each additional data source and publish applicable Technical Specifications, if required.	*No later than* 3 months before Participants are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor begins testing with Other Data sources	*No later than* 1 month before Participants are required to begin reporting data to the Central Repository
Plan Processor begins accepting Other Data sources	*No later than* [C]concurrently when Participants report to the Central Repository

PROCESS FOLLOWED TO DEVELOP THE NMS PLAN: These considerations require the CAT NMS Plan to discuss: (i) the views of the Participants’ Industry Members and other appropriate parties regarding the creation, implementation, and maintenance of the CAT; and (ii) the alternative approaches to creating, implementing, and maintaining the CAT considered and rejected by the Participants.

11. *Process by Which Participants Solicited Views of Members and Other Appropriate Parties Regarding Creation, Implementation, and Maintenance of CAT; Summary of Views; and How Sponsors Took Views Into Account in Preparing NMS Plan (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(xi))*

▪ **Process Used to Solicit Views:**

When the Participants first began creating a CAT pursuant to SEC Rule 613, the Participants developed the following guiding principles (the ‘‘*Guiding Principles*’’):

i. The CAT must meet the specific requirements of SEC Rule 613 and achieve the primary goal of creating a single, comprehensive audit trail to enhance regulators’ ability to surveil the U.S. markets in an effective and efficient way.

ii. The reporting requirements and technology infrastructure developed must be adaptable to changing market structures and

reflective of trading practices, as well as scalable to increasing market volumes.

iii. The costs of developing, implementing, and operating the CAT should be minimized to the extent possible. To this end, existing reporting structures and technology interfaces will be utilized where practicable.

iv. Industry input is a critical component in the creation of the CAT. The Participants will consider industry feedback before decisions are made with respect to reporting requirements and cost allocation models.

The Participants explicitly recognized in the Guiding Principles that meaningful input by the industry was integral to the successful creation and implementation of the CAT, and as outlined below, the Participants have taken numerous steps throughout this process to ensure the industry and the public have a voice in the process.

12. *General Industry Solicitation*

SEC Rule 613 was published in the **Federal Register** on August 1, 2012, and the following month, the Participants launched the CAT NMS Plan Website, which includes a dedicated email address for firms or the public to submit views on any aspect of the CAT. The CAT NMS Plan Website has been used as a means to communicate information to the industry and the public at large since that time. Also beginning in September 2012, the Participants hosted several events intended to solicit industry input regarding the CAT NMS Plan. A summary of the events is provided below: [3923]

CAT Industry Call (September 19, 2012). The Participants provided an overview of SEC Rule 613, the steps the Participants were taking to develop a CAT NMS Plan as required by SEC Rule 613, and how the Participants planned to solicit industry comments and feedback on key implementation issues.

CAT Industry Events (October 2012). The Participants provided an overview of SEC Rule 613 and the steps the Participants were taking to develop an NMS Plan as required by SEC Rule 613. The events included an open Q & A and feedback session so that Industry Members could ask questions of the Participants and share feedback on key implementation issues. Two identical sessions were held on October 15, 2012 from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and on October 16, 2012 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. A total of 89 Industry Members attended the October 15 event in person, and a total of 162 Industry Members attended it by phone. A total of 130 Industry Members attended the October 16 event in person, and a total of 48 Industry Members attended it by phone.

CAT Industry Call and WebEx (November 29, 2012). The Participants provided an update on CAT NMS Plan development efforts including the process and timeline for issuing the RFP to solicit Bids to build and operate the CAT.

CAT Industry Events (February 27, 2014 and April 9, 2014). During these two events, the Participants provided an overview of the latest progress on the RFP process and the overall development of the NMS Plan. A total of 120 Industry Members attended the February event in person, and a total of 123 Industry Members attended it by phone. A total of 46 Industry Members attended the April event in person, and a total of 76 Industry Members attended it by phone.

CAT Cost Study Webinars (June 25, 2014 and July 9, 2014). The Participants hosted two Webinars to review and answer questions related to the Reporter Cost Study. There were approximately 100 to 120 Industry Members on each call.

CAT Industry Call and WebEx (December 10, 2014). The Participants provided an update on CAT NMS Plan development efforts, including filing of the CAT NMS Plan on September 30, 2014, the development of a funding model, and the PPR, which documents additional requirements for the CAT.

For the above events, documentation was developed and presented to attendees, as well as posted publicly on the CAT NMS Plan Website.

In addition to the above events, some Participants individually attended or participated in additional industry events, such as SIFMA conferences and FIF working groups, where they provided updates on the status of CAT NMS Plan development and discussed areas of expected CAT functionality.

The Participants received general industry feedback from broker-dealers and software vendors.[3924] The Participants reviewed such feedback in detail, and addressed as appropriate while developing the RFP.

The Participants also received industry feedback in response to solicitations by the Participants for industry viewpoints as follows:

Proposed RFP Concepts Document (published December 5, 2012, updated January 16, 2013). The Participants published via the CAT NMS Plan Website this document to solicit feedback on the feasibility and cost of implementing the CAT reporting requirements being considered by the Participants. Feedback was received from seven organizations, including software vendors, industry associations and broker-dealers, and the Participants discussed and addressed the feedback as appropriate in the final RFP document.

Representative Order Scenarios Solicitation for Feedback (February 1, 2013). The Participants solicited feedback via the CAT NMS Plan Website on potential CAT reporting requirements to facilitate the reporting of representative orders. Approximately 30 responses were received.

CAT Industry Solicitation for Feedback Concerning Selected Topics Related to NMS Plan (April 22, 2013). The Participants solicited feedback via the CAT NMS Plan Website on four components of the CAT NMS Plan: (1) Primary Market Transactions; (2) Advisory Committee; (3) Time Stamp Requirement; and (4) Clock Synchronization. Approximately 80 Industry Members provided responses. FIF, SIFMA, and Thomson Reuters submitted detailed responses to the request for comments.

CAT Industry Solicitation for Feedback Concerning Selected Topics Related to NMS Plan (June 2013). The Participants solicited feedback via the CAT NMS Plan Website concerning Customer identifiers, Customer information, CAT-Reporter-IDs, CAT-Order-IDs, CAT intra-firm order linkages, CAT inter-firm order linkages, broker-dealer CAT order-to-exchange order linkages, data transmission, and error correction.

CAT Industry Feedback on Clock Drift and Time Stamp Issues (September 2013). The Participants solicited feedback via the DAG concerning the implementation impact associated with a 50 millisecond clock drift requirement for electronic orders and executions.

Cost Survey on CAT Reporting of Options Market Maker Quotes (November 2013). The Participants solicited feedback via the DAG concerning the implementation impact and costs associated with reporting of quotes by options market makers to the Central Repository.

Cost Estimates for CAT Exemptive Relief (December 2014). The Participants solicited feedback via the DAG regarding minimum additional costs to be expected by Industry Members in the absence of the requested Exemptive Relief.

Cost Estimate for Adding Primary Market Transactions in CAT (February 2015). The Participants solicited feedback via the DAG concerning the feasibility and costs of broker-dealers to report to the Central Repository information regarding primary market transactions in NMS securities.

Clock Offset Survey (February 2015). The Participants solicited further feedback via the DAG concerning current broker-dealer clock synchronization practices and expected costs associated with complying with a 50ms, 5ms, 1ms, and 100 microsecond clock drift requirement for electronic orders and executions.

Feedback on these topics was received primarily through discussion during meetings of the DAG.

13. *The Development Advisory Group (DAG)*

In furtherance of Guiding Principle (iv) above, the Participants solicited members for the DAG in February 2013 to further facilitate input from the industry regarding various topics that are critical to the success of the CAT NMS Plan. Initially, the DAG consisted of 10 firms that represented large, medium, and small broker-dealers, the Options Clearing Corporation (OCC), a service bureau and three industry associations: the Security Traders Association (STA), SIFMA, and FIF.

In March 2014, the Participants invited additional firms to join the DAG in an effort to ensure that it reflected a diversity of perspectives. At this time, the Participants increased the membership of the DAG to include 12 additional firms. As of January 2015, the DAG consisted of the Participants and Representatives from 24 firms and industry associations.

[3922] Small broker-dealers are defined SEC Rule 0–10(c).

[3924] *See generally* Industry Feedback on the Consolidated Audit Trail (last updated Feb. 17, 2015), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/industryFeedback/*.

The DAG has had 49 meetings since April 2013. Topics discussed with the DAG have included:

CAT Plan Feedback. The Participants shared draft versions of the CAT NMS Plan, including the PPR, as it was being developed with the DAG, who provided feedback to the Participants. The Participants reviewed and discussed this feedback with the DAG, and incorporated portions of it into the CAT NMS Plan.

Options Market Maker Quotes. The DAG discussed the impact of options market maker quotes on the industry. A cost analysis was conducted by the industry trade associations to analyze the impact of market maker quote reporting, as well as adding a ''quote sent'' time stamp to messages sent to exchanges by all options market makers The Participants included in the Exemptive Request Letters a request for exemptive relief related to option market maker quotes given that exchanges will be reporting this data to the CAT.

Customer-ID. The DAG discussed the requirements for capturing Customer-ID. The Participants proposed a Customer Information Approach in which broker-dealers assign a unique Firm Designated ID to each Customer and the Plan Processor creates and stores the Customer-ID. This concept was supported by the DAG and the Participants included in the Exemptive Request Letters a request for exemptive relief related to the Customer-ID to reduce the reporting on CAT Reporters.

Time Stamp, Clock Synchronization and Clock Drift. The DAG discussed time stamps in regards to potential exemptive relief on the time stamp requirements for allocations and Manual Order Events. In addition, industry clock synchronization processes were discussed as well as the feasibility of specific clock drift requirements (*e.g.,* 50ms), with the DAG and the FIF conducting an industry survey to identify the costs and challenges associated with various levels of clock synchronization requirements.[3925] The Participants included in the Exemptive Request Letters a request for exemptive relief related to manual time stamps.

Exemptive Request Letters. In addition to the specific areas detailed above (Options Market Maker Quotes, Customer-ID, and Time Stamp, Clock Synchronization, and Clock Drift), the DAG provided input and feedback on draft versions of the Exemptive Request Letters prior to their filing with the SEC, including cost estimates to firms and the Industry as a whole should the exemptive requests not be granted. This feedback was discussed by the Participants and the DAG and incorporated into the Exemptive Request Letters. The DAG also provided input and feedback on the Exemptive Request Letters covering Linking Allocations to Executions and Account Effective Date submitted on April 3, 2015 and September 2, 2015 respectively.

Primary Markets. At the request of the Participants, the DAG discussed with the Participants the feasibility, costs, and benefits associated with reporting allocations of NMS Securities in Primary Market Transactions. The DAG further provided estimated costs associated with reporting allocations of NMS Securities in Primary Market Transactions at the top-account and sub-account levels, which was incorporated into the CAT NMS Plan.[3926]

Order Handling Scenarios. The DAG discussed potential CAT reporting requirements for certain order handling scenarios and additional corresponding sub-scenarios (*e.g.,* riskless principal order and sub-scenarios involving post-execution print-for-print matching, pre-execution one-to-one matching, pre-execution many-to-one matching, complex options and auctions) An Industry Member and Participant working group was established to discuss order handling scenarios in more detail.

Error Handling and Correction Process. The DAG discussed error handling and correction process. Industry Members of the DAG provided recommendations for making the CAT error correction processes more efficient. The Participants have reviewed and analyzed these recommended solutions for error correction processes and incorporated them in the requirements for the Plan Processor.

Elimination of Systems. The DAG discussed the gaps between CAT and both OATS and EBS. An OATS–EBS–CAT gap analysis was developed and published on the CAT NMS Plan Website to identify commonalities and redundancies between the systems and the functionality of the CAT. Additionally, gaps between LTID and the CAT were also developed. Additional examples of systems and rules being analyzed include, but are not limited to: CBOE Rule 8.9, PHLX Rule 1022, COATS, Equity Cleared Reports, LOPR, and FINRA Rule 4560.

Cost and Funding of the CAT. The DAG helped to develop the cost study that was distributed to Industry Members. Additionally, the Participants have discussed with the DAG the funding principles for the CAT and potential funding models.

In addition, a subgroup of the DAG has met six times to discuss equity and option order handling scenarios, order types, how and whether the orders are currently reported and how linkages could be created for the orders within the CAT.

▪ Summary of Views Expressed by Members and Other Parties and How Participants Took Those Views Into Account in Preparing the CAT NMS Plan

The various perspectives of Industry Members and other appropriate parties informed the Participants' consideration of operational and technical issues during the development of the CAT NMS Plan. In addition to the regular DAG meetings and special industry calls and events noted above, the Participants conducted multiple group working sessions to discuss the industry's unique perspectives on CAT-related operational and technical issues. These sessions included discussions of options and equity order scenarios and the RFP specifications and requirements.

Industry feedback was provided to Participants through gap analyses, cost studies, comment letters and active discussion in DAG meetings and industry outreach events. Specific topics on which the industry provided input include:

Overall Timeline. Industry Members expressed a concern that the original timeline for implementation of the CAT is significantly shorter than the timeline for other large scale requirements such as Large Trader Reporting. The industry requested that, in developing the overall timeline for development and implementation of the CAT NMS Plan, the Participants account for additional industry comment/input on specifications in the official timeline and discussed risk mitigation strategies for implementation of the Central Repository.

Request for proposal. The Participants provided relevant excerpts of the RFP to DAG members for review and input. These sections were discussed by the Participants, and appropriate feedback was incorporated prior to publishing the RFP.

Options Market Maker Quotes. Industry Members expressed the view that requiring market makers to provide quote information to the CAT will be duplicative of information already being submitted to the CAT by the exchanges. Participants worked closely with DAG members to develop an alternative approach that will meet the goals of SEC Rule 613, and which is detailed in the Exemptive Request Letter that the Participants submitted to the Commission related to manual time stamps.

Customer-ID. Extensive DAG discussions reviewed the Customer-ID requirements in SEC Rule 613. The industry expressed significant concern that the complexities of adding a unique CAT customer identifier to order reporting would introduce significant costs and effort related to the system modifications and business process changes broker-dealers would face in order to implement this requirement of SEC Rule 613. Working with Industry Members, the Participants proposed a Customer Information Approach in which broker-dealers would assign a unique Firm Designated ID to each Customer which the Plan Processor would retain. Additional feedback was provided by the DAG for the use of the Legal Entity Identifier (''*LEI*'') as a valid unique customer identifier as an alternative to Tax Identification Numbers to identify non-natural person accounts. This Customer Information Approach is included in the Exemptive Request Letters that the Participants submitted to the Commission.

Error Correction. DAG members discussed the criticality of CAT Data quality to market surveillance and reconstruction, as well as the need for a robust process for the timely identification and correction of errors. Industry Members provided feedback on

[3925] *See* FIF, Clock Offset Survey Preliminary Report (last updated Feb. 17, 2015), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/web/groups/catnms/@catnms/documents/appsupportdocs/p602479.pdf* (the ''*FIF Clock Offset Survey Preliminary Report*'').

[3926] *See* DAG, Cost Estimate for Adding Primary Market Transactions into CAT (Feb. 17, 2015), *available at http://catnmsplan.com/industryFeedback/P602480.*

error correction objectives and processes, including the importance of those data errors not causing linkage breaks. This feedback was incorporated into the RFP and relevant portions of the PPR.

Industry Members also suggested that CAT Reporters be provided access to their submitted data. Participants discussed the data security and cost considerations of this request and determined that it was not a cost-effective requirement for the CAT.

Governance of the CAT. Industry Members provided detailed recommendation for the integration of Industry Members into the governance of the CAT, including an expansion of the proposed Advisory Committee to include industry associations such as FIF and SIFMA. Industry Members also recommended a three-year term with one-third turnover per year is recommended to provide improved continuity given the complexity of CAT processing.

The Participants have discussed CAT governance considerations with the DAG at several meetings. The Participants incorporated industry feedback into the CAT NMS Plan to the extent possible in light of the regulatory responsibilities placed solely upon the Participants under the provisions of SEC Rule 613. The proposed structure and composition of the Advisory Committee in Article 4.12 was discussed with the DAG in advance of the submission of this Plan.

Role of Operating Committee. The Operating Committee, consisting of one voting member representing each Participant, is structured to ensure fair and equal representation of the Participants in furtherance of SEC Rule 613(b)(1). The overarching role of the Operating Committee is to manage the Company and the CAT System similar to the manner in which a board of directors manages the business and affairs of a corporation. The primary and more specific role of the Operating Committee is to make all policy decisions on behalf of the Company in furtherance of the functions and objectives of the Company under the Exchange Act, any rules thereunder, including SEC Rule 613, and the CAT NMS Plan. In connection with its role, the Operating Committee has the right, power and authority to exercise all of the powers of the Company, to make all decisions, and to authorize or otherwise approve all actions by the Company, except as otherwise provided by applicable law or as otherwise provided in the CAT NMS Plan (Section 4.1 of the CAT NMS Plan). The Operating Committee also monitors, supervises and oversees the actions of the Plan Processor, the Chief Compliance Officer and the Chief Information Security Officer, all of whom are involved with the CAT System on a more detailed and day-to-day basis.

The decisions made by the Operating Committee include matters that are typically considered ordinary course for a governing body like a board of directors (e.g., approval of compensation of the Chief Compliance Officer (Section 6.2(a)(iv) the CAT NMS Plan) and approval to hold an executive session of the Operating Committee (Section 4.3(a)(v) of the CAT NMS Plan)), in addition to matters that are specific to the functioning, management and financing of the CAT System (e.g., changes to Technical Specifications (Sections 4.3(b)(vi)–(vii) of the CAT NMS Plan) and significant changes to the CAT System (Section 4.3(b)(v) of the CAT NMS Plan)).

The CAT NMS Plan sets forth a structure for decisions that the Operating Committee may make after approval of the CAT NMS Plan by the SEC. These decisions relate to events that may occur in the future as a result of the normal operation of any business (e.g., additional capital contributions (Section 3.8 of the CAT NMS Plan), approval of a loan to the Company (Section 3.9 of the CAT NMS Plan)) or that may occur due to the operation of the CAT System (e.g., the amount of the Participation Fee to be paid by a prospective Participant (Section 3.3(a) of the CAT NMS Plan)). These decisions cannot be made at the time of approval of the CAT NMS Plan because the Operating Committee will need to make its determination based on the facts and circumstances as they exist in the future. For example, in determining the appropriate Participation Fee, the Operating Committee will apply the factors identified in Section 3.3 of the CAT NMS Plan (e.g., costs of the Company and previous fees paid by other new Participants) to the facts existing at the time the prospective Participant is under consideration. Another example is the establishment of funding for the Company and fees for Participants and Industry Members. Section 11.2 of the CAT NMS Plan sets forth factors and principles that the Operating Committee will use in determining the funding of the Company. The Operating Committee then has the ability to review the annual budget and operations and costs of the CAT System to determine the appropriate funding and fees at the relevant future time. This approach, which sets forth standards at the time the CAT NMS Plan is approved that will be applied to future facts and circumstances, provides the Operating Committee with guiding principles to aid its decision-making in the future.

The Participants also recognize that certain decisions that are fundamental and significant to the operation of the Company and the CAT System must require the prior approval of the SEC, such as the use of new factors in determining a Participation Fee (Section 3.3(b)(v) of the CAT NMS Plan). In addition, any decision that requires an amendment to the CAT NMS Plan, such as termination of a Participant (Section 3.7(b) of the CAT NMS Plan), requires prior approval of the SEC (Section 12.3 of the CAT NMS Plan).

The Operating Committee has the authority to delegate administrative functions related to the management of the business and affairs of the Company to one or more Subcommittees and other Persons; however, the CAT NMS Plan expressly states that the Operating Committee may not delegate its policy-making functions (except to the extent policy-making determinations are already delegated as set forth in the CAT NMS Plan, which determinations will have been approved by the SEC) (Section 4.1 of the CAT NMS Plan). For example, the CAT NMS Plan provides for the formation of a Compliance Subcommittee to aid the Chief Compliance Officer in performing compliance functions, including (1) the maintenance of confidentiality of information submitted to the CAT; (2) the timeliness, accuracy and completeness of information; and (3) the manner and extent to which each Participant is meeting its compliance obligations under SEC Rule 613 and the CAT NMS Plan (Section 4.12(b) of the CAT NMS Plan). The Operating Committee also has delegated authority to the Plan Processor with respect to the normal day-to-day operating function of the Central Repository (Section 6.1 of the CAT NMS Plan). Nevertheless, decisions made by the Plan Processor that are more significant in nature remain subject to approval by the Operating Committee, such as decisions related to the implementation of policies and procedures (Section 6.1(c) of the CAT NMS Plan), appointment of the Chief Compliance Officer, Chief Information Officer, and Independent Auditor (Section 6.1(b) of the CAT NMS Plan), Material System Changes or any system changes for regulatory compliance (Sections 6.1(i) and 6.1(j) of the CAT NMS Plan). In addition, the Operating Committee will conduct a formal review of the Plan Processor's performance under the CAT NMS Plan on an annual basis (Section 6.1(n) of the CAT NMS Plan). As to Subcommittees that the Operating Committee may form in the future, the Participants have determined that the Operating Committee will establish a Selection Subcommittee to select a successor Plan Processor when the time arises (Section 6.1(t) of the CAT NMS Plan). In the future, the Operating Committee will take a similar approach when delegating authority by providing Subcommittees or other Persons with discretion with respect to administrative functions and retaining authority to approve decisions related to policy and other significant matters of the Company and the CAT System.

The role of the Operating Committee, including the delegation of its authority to Subcommittees and other limited Persons, as provided in the CAT NMS Plan is similar to that of other national market system plans, including the Limited Liability Company Agreement of the Options Price Reporting Authority, LLC. It also is based on rules and regulations under the Exchange Act, and general principles with respect to the governance of a limited liability company. All decisions made by the Operating Committee will be governed by the guiding principles of the CAT NMS Plan and SEC Rule 613.

Voting Criteria of the Operating Committee: This section describes the voting criteria for decisions made by the Operating Committee, which consists of a representative for each Participant, and by any Subcommittee of the Operating Committee in the management and supervision of the business of the Company and the CAT System.

A Majority Vote (an affirmative vote of at least a majority of all members of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee authorized to vote on a particular matter) is the default standard for decisions that are typically considered ordinary course matters for a governing body like a board of directors or board of managers or that address the general governance and function of the

Operating Committee and its Subcommittees. All actions of the Company requiring a vote by the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee requires authorization by a Majority Vote except for matters specified in certain sections of the CAT NMS Plan described below, which matters require either a Supermajority Vote or a unanimous vote. As a general matter, the approach adopted by the Operating Committee is consistent with the voting criteria of the NASDAQ Unlisted Trading Privileges Plan (the ''NASDAQ UTP Plan''), the Limited Liability Company Agreement of the Options Price Reporting Authority, LLC, the Consolidated Quotation Plan and the Consolidated Tape Association Plan.

A Supermajority Vote (an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all of the members of the Operating Committee or any Subcommittee authorized to vote on a particular matter) is required to authorize decisions on matters that are outside ordinary course of business and are considered by the Participants to have a direct and significant impact on the functioning, management and financing of the CAT System. This approach was informed by similar plans (e.g., the NASDAQ UTP Plan, which requires a unanimous vote in many similar circumstances); however, the CAT NMS Plan has the lower requirement of a Supermajority Vote because overuse of the unanimity requirement makes management and oversight difficult. This approach takes into account concerns expressed by the Participants regarding management of the CAT NMS Plan, and is consistent with suggestions in the Adopting Release for the Participants to take into account the need for efficient and fair operation of the CAT NMS Plan and to consider the appropriateness of a unanimity requirement and the possibility of a governance requirement other than unanimity, or even supermajority approval, for all but the most important decisions.

The Participants believe that certain decisions that may directly impact the functioning and performance of the CAT System should be subject to the heightened standard of a Supermajority Vote, such as: selection and removal of the Plan Processor and key officers; approval of the initial Technical Specifications; approval of Material Amendments to the Technical Specifications proposed by the Plan Processor; and direct amendments to the Technical Specifications by the Operating Committee. In addition, the Participants believe the instances in which the Company enters into or modifies a Material Contract, incurs debt, makes distributions or tax elections or changes fee schedules should be limited, given that the Company is intended to operate on a break-even basis. Accordingly, those matters should also require the heightened standard of a Supermajority Vote.

A unanimous vote of all Participants is required in only three circumstances. First, a decision to obligate Participants to make a loan or capital contribution to the Company requires a unanimous vote (Section 3.8(a) of the CAT NMS Plan). Requiring Participants to provide additional financing to the Company is an event that imposes an additional and direct financial burden on each Participant, thus it is important that each Participant's approval is obtained. Second, a decision by the Participants to dissolve the Company requires unanimity (Section 10.1 of the CAT NMS Plan). The dissolution of the Company is an extraordinary event that would have a direct impact on each Participant's ability to meet its compliance requirements so it is critical that each Participant consents to this decision. Third, a unanimous vote is required if Participants decide to take an action by written consent in lieu of a meeting (Section 4.10 of the CAT NMS Plan). In that case, because Participants will not have the opportunity to discuss and exchange ideas on the matter under consideration, all Participants must sign the written consent. This approach is similar to the unanimity requirement under the Delaware General Corporation Law for decisions made by written consent of the directors of a corporation in lieu of a meeting.

Voting on Behalf of Affiliated Participants: Each Participant has one vote on the Operating Committee to permit equal representation among all the Participants. Initially, the Operating Committee will have 19 Participants. Of the 19 Participants, there are five Participants that are part of the Affiliated Participants Group and five Participants without any Affiliated Participants. Because of the relationship between the respective Affiliated Participants and given the large number of Participants on the Operating Committee, the Participants believe an efficient and effective way of structuring the Operating Committee in order to have an orderly and well-functioning committee is to permit but not require one individual to serve as a voting member for multiple Affiliated Participants. This approach does not change the standard rule that each Participant has one vote. This approach provides Affiliated Participants with the flexibility to choose whether to have one individual represent one or more of the Affiliated Participants or to have each of them represented by a separate individual. Affiliated Participants may likely vote on a matter similarly, and allowing them to choose the same individual as a voting member would be a convenient and practical way of having the Affiliated Participants' votes cast. Because there is no requirement that the representative of multiple Affiliated Participants cast the same vote for all represented Participants, there is no practical difference between this approach and an approach that mandates a separate representative for each Participant. In addition, the Participants considered whether this approach would result in less participation because of a reduced number of individuals on the Operating Committee. If each group of Affiliated Participants were to choose one individual to serve as a voting member, there would be still be 10 individuals on the Operating Committee, which the Participants do not believe would cause less active representation or participation or would otherwise lead to unwanted concentration on the Operating Committee.

Affiliated Participant Groups and Participants without Affiliations:

1. New York Stock Exchange LLC; NYSE Arca, Inc.; NYSE MKT LLC
2. The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC; NASDAQ OMX BX, Inc.; NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC
3. BATS Exchange, Inc.; BATS Y-Exchange, Inc.; EDGX Exchange, Inc.; EDGA Exchange, Inc.
4. Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated; C2 Options Exchange, Incorporated
5. International Securities Exchange, LLC; ISE Gemini, LLC
6. National Stock Exchange, Inc.
7. Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc.
8. BOX Options Exchange LLC
9. Miami International Securities Exchange LLC
10. Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc.

Conflicts of Interest Definition: The Participants arrived at the definition of Conflicts of Interest set forth in Article I of the CAT NMS Plan based on a review of existing rules and standards of securities exchanges, other plans, including the Selection Plan as to qualifications of a Voting Senior Officer of a Bidding Participant, and general corporate and governance principles.

Transparency in the Bidding and Selection Process: DAG members requested input into the bidding and selection process for the Plan Processor, citing the extensive impact of CAT requirements on the industry as well as proposed cost for compliance. Specifically, Industry Members requested that non-proprietary aspects of the responses to the RFP should be available to the public to inform the discussion regarding the costs and benefits of various CAT features and the technological feasibility of different solutions. Participants, working with counsel, determined that such information could be appropriately shared with DAG members pursuant to the provisions of a non-disclosure agreement (''*NDA*'') that was consistent with the terms of the NDA executed between the Participants and the Bidders. After extensive discussion, DAG members declined to sign such an NDA. The Participants continued to share non-bid specific information and to solicit the views and perspective of DAG members as it developed a Plan approach and related solutions.

Time Stamp Granularity and Clock Synchronization Requirement: Industry Members recommended a millisecond time stamp for electronic order and execution events and a time stamp in seconds for manual order handling. Industry Members suggested a grace period of two years after the CAT requirements are finalized to allow broker-dealers sufficient time to meet the millisecond time stamp granularity. In addition, Industry Members recommended maintaining the current OATS rule of a one second clock drift tolerance for electronic order and execution events, citing a significant burden to Industry Members to comply with a change to the current one-second clock drift.[3927] Participants

[3927] *See* FIF Clock Offset Survey Preliminary Report.

conducted active discussions with Industry Members on this topic, and included in the Exemptive Request Letter a request for exemptive relief related to time stamp granularity for Manual Order Events.

Equitable Cost and Funding: Industry Members expressed the view that any funding mechanism developed by the Participants should provide for equitable funding among all market participants, including the Participants. The Participants recognized the importance of this viewpoint and have incorporated it within the guiding principles that were discussed with the Industry.

Order ID/Linkages: The DAG formed an order scenarios working group to discuss approaches to satisfy the order linkage requirements of SEC Rule 613. On the topic of allocations, Industry Members provided feedback that the order and execution processes are handled via front office systems, while allocation processes are conducted in the back office. Industry Members expressed the view that creating linkages between these systems, which currently operate independently, would require extensive reengineering of middle and back office processes not just within a broker-dealer but across broker-dealers, imposing significant additional costs on the industry as a whole. Given the widespread use of average price processing accounts, clearing firms, prime brokers and self-clearing firm cannot always determine which specific order results in a given allocation or allocations. Industry Members worked closely with Participants on a proposed alternative approach which the Participants submitted to the Commission in the Exemptive Request Letters.

Elimination of Systems and Rules: The elimination of duplicative and redundant systems and rules is a critical aspect of the CAT development process. Industry DAG members including SIFMA and FIF provided broad based and comprehensive insight on the list of existing regulatory systems and Participant rules that they deem to be duplicative, including, among others, OATS, the EBS reporting system, and Large Trader reporting. In addition, FIF provided a gap analysis of CAT requirements against Large Trader transactional reporting obligations.

The Participants discussed feedback from the industry in a variety of forums: (i) during DAG meetings; (ii) in relevant Subcommittee meetings, depending on the topic; and (iii) at two multi-day offsite meetings where Representatives of each Participant gathered in a series of in-person workshops to discuss the requirements of the Plan Processor, both technical and operational. This was in addition to numerous video-conference meetings when Participants discussed and developed the RFP document incorporating, where appropriate, feedback from the industry.

Discuss Reasonable Alternative Approaches that the Participants Considered to Create, Implement, and Maintain the CAT (SEC Rule 613(a)(1)(xii))

The Participants, working as a consortium, selected the approach reflected in the Plan through a detailed analysis of alternatives, relying on both internal and external knowledge and expertise to collect and evaluate information related to the CAT. For some of the requirements of SEC Rule 613, the Participants' analysis indicated that the required approach would be unduly burdensome or complex. In these cases, the Participants have requested exemption from these requirements in the Exemptive Request Letter, which details the analysis performed and alternatives considered for these specific requirements.

The Participants leveraged their own extensive experience with regulatory, technical and securities issues in formulating, drafting and filing the CAT NMS Plan. Specifically, the nineteen Participants formed various Subcommittees to focus on specific critical issues during the development of the CAT NMS Plan. The Subcommittees included:

a Governance Committee, which developed recommendations for decision-making protocols and voting criteria critical to the development of the CAT NMS Plan, in addition to developing formal governance and operating structures for the CAT NMS Plan;

a Technical Committee, which developed the technical scope requirements of the CAT, the CAT RFP documents, and the PPR;

an Industry Outreach Committee, which provided recommendations on effective methods for soliciting industry input, in addition to facilitating industry involvement in CAT-related public events[3928] and development of the CAT NMS Plan and the Exemptive Request Letters;

a Press Committee as a Subcommittee of the Industry Outreach Committee, which coordinated interactions with the press;

a Cost and Funding Committee, which drafted a framework for determining the costs of the CAT, and provided recommendations on revenue/funding of the CAT for both initial development costs and ongoing costs; and

an Other Products Committee, which is designed to assist the SEC, as necessary, when the SEC is determining whether and how other products should be added to the CAT.[3929]

Representatives from all Subcommittees met to discuss the overall progress of the CAT initiative in the Operating Committee.

To support the Participants' internal expertise, the Participants also engaged outside experts to assist in formulating the CAT NMS Plan. Specifically, the Participants engaged the consulting firm Deloitte & Touche LLP as a project manager, and engaged the law firm Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP to serve as legal counsel in drafting the CAT NMS Plan, both of which have extensive experience with issues raised by the CAT. Additionally, the Participants engaged the services of the public relations firm Peppercomm to assist with public relations and press engagement in formulating the CAT NMS Plan.

Furthermore, as discussed in more detail above in Appendix C, Process by Which Participants Solicited Views of Members and Other Appropriate Parties Regarding Creation, Implementation, and Maintenance of CAT; Summary of Views; and How Sponsors Took Views Into Account in Preparing NMS Plan, the Participants engaged in meaningful dialogue with Industry Members with respect to the development of the CAT through the DAG and other industry outreach events.

Using this internal and external expertise, the Participants developed a process to identify, evaluate and resolve issues so as to finalize the CAT NMS Plan. As discussed above in Appendix C, the Participants have, among other things, developed the Selection Plan to describe the process for selecting the Plan Processor, created and published an RFP, evaluated Bids, and chosen a shortlist of Bids. Contemporaneously, the Participants have drafted the Plan set forth herein to reflect the recommendations that have resulted from the approach and analysis described above.

For certain technical considerations for the development and maintenance of the CAT that do not materially impact cost, required functionality or data security, the Participants did not mandate specific approaches, but rather chose to consider solutions proposed by the Bidders.

- **Request for Proposal**

The Participants considered multiple alternatives for the best approach to gathering the information necessary to determine how to create, implement and maintain the CAT, including issuance of a Request for Information (''*RFI*'') and Request for Proposal (''*RFP*''). After due consideration, with a view to meeting the demanding deadline set forth in SEC Rule 613, the Participants decided to use their expertise to craft an RFP seeking proposals to implement the main requirements to successfully build and operate the CAT. This approach was designed to solicit imaginative and competitive proposals from the private sector as well as to provide an adequate amount of insight into the costs associated with creating, implementing, and maintaining the CAT.

To design the RFP process, the Participants consulted with their technology subject matter resources to determine technical implications and requirements of the CAT and to develop the RFP. Based on these requirements, the Participants developed the Proposed RFP Concepts Document,[3930] which identified the high level requirements for which potential Bidders would be expected to design a solution, ahead of publishing the full RFP on February 26, 2013. The Participants received 31 intents to bid, and then hosted a Bidder conference on March 8, 2013 to discuss the requirements

[3928] A summary of industry outreach events is included in Appendix C, General Industry Solicitation.

[3929] When adopting the CAT, the Commission directed the Commission staff ''to work with the SROs, the CFTC staff, and other regulators and market participants to determine how other asset classes, such as futures, might be added to the consolidated audit trail.'' Adopting Release at 45744–5 n.241.

[3930] *See supra* note 3692.

and provide additional context to the industry and potential Bidders. Two additional conference calls to discuss additional questions on the RFP were held on April 25, 2013 and May 2, 2013. The Participants also established an e-mail box through which questions on the RFP were received.

Ten competitive proposals were submitted on March 21, 2014. Each of the ten proposals was carefully reviewed by the Participants, including in-person meetings with each of the ten Bidders. Following this review, the Bids were reduced to six proposals in accordance with the Selection Plan approved by the Commission in February 2014. In accordance with the Selection Plan Amendment approved by the Commission on June 23, 2015, the Participants asked the Bidders on July 14, 2015 to revise their bids to account for the updated requirements included in the CAT NMS Plan as filed on February 27, 2015, as well as to address specific additional questions and considerations. As described more fully throughout this Appendix C, the proposals offer a variety of solutions for creating, implementing and maintaining the CAT.

As stated above, the Participants received proposals from ten Bidders that were deemed qualified, including many from large and well-respected information technology firms. The open ended nature of the questions contained in the RFP allowed Bidders to provide thoughtful and creative responses with regards to all aspects of the implementation and the operation of the CAT. The RFP process also resulted in the submission of multiple competitively-priced Bids. The six Shortlisted Bids remaining under consideration by the Participants, inclusive of the initial system build and the first five years of maintenance costs, have ranges between $165 million and $556 million, and encompass a number of innovative approaches to meeting the requirements of SEC Rule 613, such as use of non-traditional database architectures and cloud-based infrastructure solutions.

The Participants conducted the RFP process and the review of Bids pursuant to the Selection Plan approved by the Commission, which was designed to mitigate the conflicts of interest associated with Participants that are participating in developing the CAT while also seeking to become the Plan Processor and to ensure a level playing field for all potential Bidders to be considered on a fair and equal basis.

▪ Organizational Structure

The Participants considered various organizational structures of the Bidders to assess whether a particular structure would be a material factor in the ability of a Bidder to effectively operate as the Plan Processor. Of the Bids submitted, three general organizational structures for the Plan Processor emerged: (1) consortiums or partnerships (i.e., the Plan Processor would consist of more than one unaffiliated entity that would operate the CAT); (2) single firms (i.e., one entity would be the Plan Processor and that entity would operate the CAT as part of its other ongoing business operations); and (3) dedicated legal entities (i.e., CAT operations would be conducted in a separate legal entity that would perform no other business activities). Each type of organizational structure has strengths and limitations, but the Participants did not find that a particular organizational structure should be a material factor in selecting a Bidder. Accordingly the Participants have not mandated a specific organizational structure for the Plan Processor.

▪ Primary Storage

The Bidders proposed two methods of primary data storage: traditionally-hosted storage architecture, and infrastructure-as-a-service. Traditionally-hosted storage architecture is a model in which an organization would purchase and maintain proprietary servers and other hardware to store CAT Data. Infrastructure-as-a-service is a provisioning model in which an organization outsources the equipment used to support operations, including storage, hardware, servers and networking components to a third party who charges for the service on a usage basis.

Each data storage method has a number of considerations that the Participants will take into account when evaluating each Bidder's proposed solution. Such considerations include the maturity, cost, complexity, and reliability of the data storage method as used in each Bidder's proposal. The Participants are not mandating a specific method for primary data storage provided that the data storage solution can meet the security, reliability, and accessibility requirements for the CAT, including storage of PII data, separately.

▪ Customer and Account Data

All Bidders proposed solutions consistent with the Customer Information Approach in which broker-dealers would report a unique Firm Designated ID for each Customer to the Plan Processor and the Plan Processor would create and store the CAT Customer-ID without passing this information back to the broker-dealer. The use of existing unique identifiers (such as internal firm customer identifiers) could minimize potentially large overhead in the CAT System that otherwise would be required to create and transmit back to CAT Reporters a CAT System-generated unique identifiers. Allowing multiple identifiers also will be more beneficial to CAT Reporters. This approach would still require mapping of identifiers to connect all trading associated with a single Customer across multiple accounts, but it would also ease the burden on CAT Reporters because each CAT Reporter would report information using existing identifiers it currently uses in its internal systems. Moreover, because the CAT System would not be sending a CAT System-generated Customer-ID back to the CAT Reporters, CAT Reporters would not need to process CAT Customer-IDs assigned by the Plan Processor. This approach would reduce the burden on the CAT Reporters because they would not need to build an additional process to receive a Customer-ID and append that identifier to each order origination, receipt or cancellation. This approach may also help alleviate storage and processing costs and potentially reduce the security risk of transmission of the Customer-ID to the CAT Reporter.

The Participants support the use of the Customer Information Approach and included the approach in the Exemptive Request Letter so that the Central Repository could utilize this approach to link Customer and Customer Account Information. The Participants believe this approach would be the most efficient approach for both the Plan Processor and CAT Reporters.

▪ Personally Identifying Information (PII)

All Bidders proposed encrypting all PII, both at rest and in motion. This approach allows for secure storage of PII, even if servers should be compromised or data should be leaked. However, encryption can be highly complex to implement effectively (e.g., the poor choice of password salting or an insecure storage of private keys can compromise security, even without knowledge of the system administrator).

All Bidders also proposed imposing a Role Based Access Control [3931] to PII. These controls would allow for varying levels of access depending on user needs, and would allow compartmentalizing access based on ''need to know.'' However, multiple layers of access can add further complexity to the implementation and use of a system.

Some Bidders also proposed implementing multi-factor authentication.[3932] This greatly enhances security and can prevent a leak of passwords or keys from completely compromising security. However, it increases system overhead, and increases the difficulty of accessing data.

The Participants are requiring multi-factor authentication and Role Based Access Control for access to PII, separation of PII from other CAT Data, restricted access to PII (only those with a ''need to know'' will have access), and an auditable record of all access to PII data contained in the Central Repository. The Participants believe potential increased costs to the Plan Processor and delays that this could cause to accessing PII are balanced by the need to protect PII.

▪ Data Ingestion Format

Bidders proposed several approaches for the ingestion format for CAT Data: uniform defined format, use of existing messaging protocols or a hybrid approach whereby data can be submitted in a uniform defined format or using existing message protocols. There are benefits to the industry under any of the three formats. A large portion of the industry currently reports to OATS in a uniform defined format. These firms have invested time and resources to develop a process for reporting to OATS. The uniform formats recommended by the Bidders would leverage the OATS format and enhance it to meet the

[3931] Role Based Access Control (RBAC) is a mechanism for authentication in which users are assigned to one or many roles, and each role is assigned a defined set of permissions. Additional details are provided in Appendix D, Data Security.

[3932] Multifactor authentication is a mechanism that requires the user to provide more than one factor (e.g., biometrics/personal information in addition to a password) in order to be validated by the system.

requirements of SEC Rule 613. This uniform format, therefore, may reduce the burden on certain CAT Reporters and simplify the process for those CAT Reporters to implement the CAT. However, some firms use message protocols, like FIX, as a standard point of reference with Industry Members that is typically used across the order lifecycle and within a firm's order management processes. Leveraging existing messaging protocols could result in quicker implementation times and simplify data aggregation for Participants, CAT Reporters, and the Plan Processor, though it is worth noting that message formats may need to be updated to support CAT Data requirements.

The Participants are not mandating the data ingestion format for the CAT. The Participants believe that the nature of the data ingestion is key to the architecture of the CAT. A cost study of members of the Participants did not reveal a strong cost preference for using an existing file format for reporting vs. creating a new format.[3933] However, FIF did indicate there was an industry preference among its members for using the FIX protocol.[3934]

▪ **Process to Develop the CAT**

Bidders proposed several processes for development of the CAT: the agile or iterative development model, the waterfall model, and hybrid models that incorporate aspects of both the waterfall and agile methodologies. An agile methodology is an iterative model in which development is staggered and provides for continuous evolution of requirements and solutions. A waterfall model is a sequential process of software development with dedicated phases for Conception, Initiation, Analysis, Design, Construction, Testing, Production/ Implementation and Maintenance. The agile or iterative model is flexible to changes and facilitates early delivery of usable software that can be used for testing and feedback, helping to facilitate software that meets users' needs. However, at the beginning of an agile or iterative development process, it can be difficult to accurately estimate the effort and time required for completion. The waterfall model would provide an up-front estimate of time and effort and would facilitate longer-term planning and coordination among multiple vendors or project streams. However, the waterfall model could be less flexible to changes, particularly changes that occur between design and delivery (and thereby potentially producing software that meets specifications but not user needs).

The Participants are not mandating a development process. The Participants believe that either agile or iterative development or waterfall method or even a combination of both methods could be utilized to manage the development of CAT.

▪ **Industry Testing**

Bidders also proposed a range of approaches to industry testing, including dedicated environments, re-use of existing environments, scheduled testing events, and ongoing testing.

Dedicated industry test environments could provide the possibility of continuous testing by participants, rather than allow for testing only on scheduled dates. Use of dedicated industry test environments also would not impact other ongoing operations (such as disaster recovery sites). However, developing and maintaining dedicated test environments would entail additional complexity and expense. Such expenses may be highest in hosted architecture systems where dedicated hardware would be needed, but potentially rarely used.

The re-use of existing environments, such as disaster recovery environment, would provide simplicity and lower administrative costs. However, it could impact other ongoing operations, such as disaster recovery.

Scheduled testing events (which might be held, for example, on weekends only, or on specific dates throughout the year) could provide for more realistic testing by involving multiple market participants. This approach also would not require the test environment to be available at all times. However, scheduled events would not allow users to test on the CAT System until a dedicated time window is open.

Ongoing testing would allow users to test the CAT System as often as needed. However, this approach would require the test environment to be available at all times. It also may lead to lower levels of test participation at any given time, which may lead to less realistic testing.

The Participants are requiring that the CAT provide a dedicated test environment that is functionally equivalent to the production environment and available on a 24x6 basis. The Participants believe that an ongoing testing model will be more helpful to the industry because it will provide an environment in which to test any internal system changes or updates that may occur in the course of their business that may affect reporting to the CAT. Additionally, this environment will provide a resource through which the CAT Reporters can continually test any CAT System mandated or rule associated changes to identify and reduce data errors prior to the changes being implemented in the production environment.

▪ **Quality Assurance (QA)**

The Participants considered a number of QA approaches and methodologies, informed by the Bidder's proposals as well as discussions with the Participants' own subject matter resources. Some of the approaches considered included ''continuous integration,'' where developer working copies are merged into the master and tested several times a day, test automation, and various industry standards such as ISO 20000/ITIL. The Participants are not mandating a single approach to QA beyond the requirements detailed in the RFP, for which each Bidder provided a detailed approach.

One key component of the QA approaches proposed by the Bidders was the staffing levels associated with QA. Initial QA proposals from Bidders included staffing ranges from between 2 and 90 FTEs, although some Bidders indicated that their QA function was directly incorporated into their development function. Some Bidders proposed allocating QA resources after the third month. A larger number of QA resources may facilitate structured, in-depth testing and validation of the CAT System. However, a larger set of QA resources could lead to higher fixed costs and administrative overhead.

The Participants are not mandating the size for QA staffing; however, the Participants will consider each Bidder's QA staffing proposals in the context of the overall Bid, and the selected Bidder must ensure that its QA staffing is sufficient to perform the activities required by the CAT NMS Plan. The Participants believe the QA staffing numbers varied in the Bids because they are largely dependent on both the staffing philosophy of the Bidder as well as the organizational structure for the proposed Central Repository.

▪ **User Support and Help Desk**

The RFP required that the CAT Help Desk be available on a 24x7 basis, and that it be able to manage 2,500 calls per month. To comply with these requirements, Bidders proposed user support staffing ranges from five to 36 FTEs. They also proposed dedicated support teams and support teams shared with other groups.

A larger number of FTE user support staff could provide a higher level and quality of support. However, a higher number of staff would impose additional overhead and administrative costs. Additionally, as the support organization grows, it may become less closely integrated with the development team, which could decrease support effectiveness.

A dedicated CAT support team would facilitate deep knowledge of the CAT System and industry practices. However, it would create additional overhead and costs. Additionally, management of support teams may not be the managing firm's primary business, which could lead to inefficiencies. A support staff shared with non-CAT teams could provide for increased efficiency, if the team has greater experience in support more broadly. However, support resources may not have the depth of knowledge that dedicated support teams could be expected to develop.

The Participants are not requiring specific FTEs for user support staffing; however, the Participants will consider each Bidder's user support staffing proposals in the context of the overall Bid, and the selected Bidder must ensure that its staffing is sufficient to perform the activities required by the CAT NMS Plan. The Participants believe that the number of FTEs varied in the Bids because they are largely dependent on both the staffing philosophy of the Bidder as well as the organizational structure for the proposed Central Repository.

Some Bidders proposed a US-based help desk, while others proposed basing it offshore. A U.S.-based help desk could facilitate a higher level of service, and could provide a greater level of security (given the sensitive nature of the CAT). However, a U.S.-based help desk may have greater labor

[3933] *See* Appendix C, Analysis of the CAT NMS Plan, for additional details on cost studies.

[3934] *See* FIF Response.

costs. An offshore help desk would potentially have lower labor costs, but could provide (actual or perceived) lower level of service, and could raise security concerns (particularly where the help desk resources are employed by a third-party).

The Participants are not requiring a specific location for the help desk. The Participants believe that as long as the Bidder's solution meets the service and security requirements of the CAT, it is not necessary to prescribe the location.

▪ **CAT User Management**

Bidders proposed several approaches to user management [3935]: help desk creation of user accounts, user (e.g., broker-dealer) creation of accounts, and multi-role. Help desk creation of accounts would allow for greater oversight and validation of user creation. However, it would increase administrative costs, particularly in the early stages of the CAT (as an FTE must setup each user). User creation of accounts would require lower staffing levels but would provide less oversight and validation of user creation.

A multi-role approach would allow for a blended approach in which the Plan Processor could, for example, set up an administrator at each broker-dealer, and then allow the broker-dealer to set up additional accounts as needed. This approach could allow users with different levels of access to be provisioned differently, with those requiring greater oversight being provisioned manually. However, it would add complexity to the user creation system, and would provide less oversight and validation than would a fully manual system.

For CAT Reporters entering information into the CAT, the Participants are requiring that each user be validated by the Plan Processor to set-up access to the system. However, for staff at regulators that will be accessing the information for regulatory purposes only, the Plan Processor can establish a set-up administrator who has the ability to provide access to other users within its organization. However, such administrators cannot set up access for PII information. Staff at regulators who need access to PII information must go through an authentication process directly with the Plan Processor. The Participants believe that this approach balances the demand on the staff at the Plan Processor with the need to ensure proper oversight and validation for users of the CAT.

▪ **Required Reportable Order Events**

The Participants considered multiple order event types for inclusion in the Plan. Of the order event types considered, the results order event type and the CAT feedback order event were not required. The Participants determined that a results order event type would not provide additional value over a ''daisy chain'' linkage method. A CAT feedback order event can be generated by the Plan Processor, thereby removing the reporting burden from reporting firms. Therefore the Participants are not requiring CAT Reporters to provide data for these two event types to the CAT. The required reportable order events are listed in Section 6.3(d).

▪ **Data Retention Requirements**

SEC Rule 613(e)(8) requires data to be available and searchable for a period of not less than five years. Broker-dealers are currently required to retain data for six years under the Exchange Act Rule 17a–4(a).

The Participants support the use of a six year retention timeframe as it complies with Exchange Act Rule 17a–4(a). The Participants are requiring data for six years to be kept online in an easily accessible format to enable regulators to have access to six years of audit trail materials for purposes of its regulation.

The Participants understand that requiring this sixth year of data storage may increase the cost to run the CAT; however, they believe the incremental cost would be outweighed by the needs of regulators to have access to the information. An analysis of the six Shortlisted Bidder proposals indicated that the average expected year-on-year annual cost increase during years four and five (i.e., once all reporters were reporting to the Central Repository) was approximately 4%. Extending this increase to another year would result in incremental annual costs to the Plan Processor ranging from approximately $1.15 million to $4.44 million depending upon the Bidder. Based on the assumption that the cumulative annual cost increase from year five to year six will also be 4% (including all the components provided by the Bidders in their respective cost schedules [3936]), the maximum cost increase for data retention for an additional year would be 4%.

▪ **Data Feed Connectivity**

Bidders proposed either real-time SIP connectivity or end-of-day batch SIP connectivity. Real-time SIP connectivity would provide for more rapid access to SIP Data, but may require additional processing support to deal with out-of-sequence or missing records. End-of-day batch SIP connectivity provides the possibility of simpler implementation, but data from SIPs would not be available in the CAT until after overnight processing. Because CAT Reporters are only required to report order information on a next-day basis, the Participants are not requiring that the Plan Processor have real-time SIP connectivity.

▪ **Disaster Recovery**

Participants discussed two commonly accepted structures for disaster recovery: hot-hot [3937] and hot-warm.[3938] While hot-hot allows for immediate cutover, the Participants agreed that real-time synchronization was not required, but rather that data must be kept synchronized to satisfy disaster recovery timing requirements (e.g., 48 hour cutover). A hot-warm structure meets the requirements of SEC Rule 613, and costs for hot-hot were considered to be higher than hot-warm. Therefore, the Participants are requiring a hot-warm disaster recovery structure, provided it meets the requirements set forth in Appendix D, BCP/DR Process.

▪ **Synchronization of Business Clocks**

The Participants considered multiple levels of precision for the clock synchronization standard set forth in the plan, ranging from 1 second (s) to 100 microseconds (µs). The Participants determined based on their expertise and feedback from industry that an initial clock synchronization of 50 milliseconds (ms) would be the most practical and effective choice and represents the current industry standard. Pursuant to SEC Rule 613(d), the initial standard of 50ms will be subject to annual analysis as to whether or not a more stringent clock synchronization tolerance could be implemented consistent with changes in industry standards.

In order to identify the industry standard the Participants and Industry Members reviewed their own internal technology around Network Time Protocol (''*NTP*'') and Precision Time Protocol (''*PTP*''),[3939] potentially used in conjunction with Global Positioning System (''*GPS*'').[3940] In reviewing internal infrastructure, the Participants and Industry Members noted that the majority of firms had indicated that they leveraged at least NTP clock synchronization technology. In addition, the FIF conducted a clock synchronization survey [3941] (''*FIF Clock Offset Survey*'') of 28 firms to identify costs and challenges associated with clock synchronization tolerances of 50ms, 5ms, 1ms, and 100µs. The FIF Clock Offset Survey indicated that 93% of responding firms leverage NTP technology, while fewer than half of responding firms use SNTP, PTP, or GPS. In reviewing the standards for NTP technology, the Participants determined that this technology can accommodate a 50ms tolerance. In addition, the FIF Clock Offset Survey demonstrated that 60% of responding firms currently synchronize their clocks with an offset of 50ms or greater, with approximately 20% of responding firms currently using an offset of 50ms. Only 18% of responding firms used a clock offset of 30ms or less. In light of these reviews and the survey data, the Participants concluded that a clock offset of 50ms represents an aggressive, but achievable, industry standard.

In addition to determining current industry clock offset standards used in the industry, the FIF Clock Offset Survey indicated that the costs to survey respondents were as follows: [3942]

[3935] User management is a business function that grants, controls, and maintains user access to a system.

[3936] RFP at 57.

[3937] In a hot-hot disaster recovery design, both the production site as well as the backup site are live, and the backup can be brought online immediately.

[3938] In a hot-warm disaster recovery design, the backup site is fully equipped with the necessary hardware. In the event of a disaster, the software and data would need to be loaded into the backup site for it to become operational.

[3939] NTP and PTP are protocols used to synchronize clocks across a computer network.

[3940] GPS is a radio navigation system that can be used to capture a precise determination of time.

[3941] FIF Clock Offset Survey Preliminary Report.

[3942] The Participants consider the estimates provided to be conservative as a majority of the study respondents fell into the category of large broker-dealers.

Proposed clock offset	Estimated implementation cost (per firm)	Estimated annual maintenance cost (per firm)
50ms	$554,348	$313,043
5ms	$887,500	$482,609
1ms	$1,141,667	$534,783
100µs	$1,550,000	$783,333

As indicated in the above table, annual maintenance costs of survey respondents for a 50ms standard would be on average 31% higher than current costs, and would escalate to 102%, 123%, and 242% increases over current maintenance costs as clock synchronization standards move to 5ms, 1ms, and 100µs respectively, indicating that maintenance costs rapidly escalate as clock synchronization standards increase beyond 50ms. Survey respondents also indicated that increasing clock synchronization requirements would require escalating technology changes, including significant hardware changes (such as installation of dedicated GPS or other hardware clocks and network architecture redesign), migration to new time synchronization standards, and widespread upgrades of operating systems and databases currently in use. For example, to achieve a 5ms clock offset would require firms to install GPS clocks in all locations and migrate from NTP to PTP. The Participants believe, based on the FIF Clock Offset Survey, that fewer than half of firms currently leverage GPS technology or PTP for clock synchronization.

As noted in Article VI, Section 6.8, the Participants, working with the Processor's Chief Compliance Officer, shall annually evaluate and make recommendations as to whether industry standards have evolved such that changes to the clock synchronization standards should be changed. It is the belief of the Participants that, while setting an initial clock synchronization of 5ms lower than 50ms may be achievable, it does not represent current industry standard and there may be challenges with small broker-dealers' potentially substantial costs. However, once both large and small broker-dealers begin reporting data to the Central Repository, and as increased time synchronization standards become more mature, the Participants will assess the ability to tighten the clock synchronization standards to reflect changes in industry standards in accordance with SEC Rule 613.

- **Reportable Securities**

SEC Rule 613(c)(6) requires NMS Securities to be reported the Central Repository and SEC Rule 613(i) requires the Participants to detail a plan outlining how non-NMS Securities, debt securities, and Primary Market Transactions in equity securities that are not NMS Securities can be reported to the Central Repository in the future. The Participants considered whether to require including OTC Equity Securities, non NMS Securities, in a future phase of the CAT NMS Plan, as contemplated by the Commission in SEC Rule 613, or accelerating their inclusion into the first phase of the Plan. As part of this consideration, Participants weighed heavily the feedback from the DAG and other market participants of the considerations associated with the two alternatives, and made the determination to include OTC Equities in the requirements under the CAT NMS Plan.

APPENDIX D

CAT NMS Plan Processor Requirements

Appendix D, CAT NMS Plan Processor Requirements, outlines minimum functional and technical requirements established by the Participants of the CAT NMS Plan for the Plan Processor. Given the technical nature of many of these requirements, it is anticipated, as technology evolves, that some may change over time. The Participants recognize that effective oversight of, and a collaborative working relationship with, the Plan Processor will be critical to ensure the CAT achieves its intended purpose, namely enhanced investor protection, in an efficient and cost-effective manner. The Participants also recognize that maintaining the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the CAT requires flexibility to respond to technological innovations and market changes. For example, these minimum functional and technical requirements allow the Plan Processor flexibility to make certain changes to the Technical Specifications, while limiting others to the Operating Committee, and anticipate agreement between the Operating Committee and the Plan Processor on SLAs relating to, among other things, development, change management, and implementation processes and timelines. Maintaining such flexibility to adapt in these and other areas relating to the development and operation of the CAT is a foundational principle of this Appendix D.

Central Repository Requirements

Technical Architecture Requirements

The Central Repository must be designed and sized to ingest, process, and store large volumes of data. The technical infrastructure needs to be scalable, adaptable to new requirements and operable within a rigorous processing and control environment. As a result, the technical infrastructure will require an environment with significant throughput capabilities, advanced data management services and robust processing architecture.

The technical architecture must be scalable and able to readily expand its capacity to process significant increases in data volumes beyond the baseline capacity. The baseline capacity requirements are defined in this document. Once the CAT NMS Plan is approved, the Operating Committee will define the baseline metrics on an ongoing basis. CAT capacity planning must include SIP, OPRA and exchange capacity and growth forecasts. The initial baseline capacity requirements will be based on twice (2X) the historical peaks for the most recent six years, and the Plan Processor must be prepared to handle peaks in volume that could exceed this baseline for short periods. The SLA(s) will outline details of the technical performance and scalability requirements, and will be specifically targeted to the selected Bidder's solution.

The Central Repository must have the capacity and capability to:

- Ingest and process throughput to meet baseline capacity requirements as well as scalability to meet peak capacity requirements, including staging, loading, speed of processing, and linking of data;
- Accommodate data storage and query compute, such as:
  - Scalable for growth data storage and expansion capability, including but not limited to, resizing of database(s), data redistribution across nodes, and resizing of network bandwidth;
  - Robust processes to seamlessly add capacity without affecting the online operation and performance of the CAT System; and
  - Quantitative methods for measuring, monitoring, and reporting of excess capacity of the solution;
- Satisfy minimum processing standards as described in the CAT RFP and that will be further defined in the SLA(s);
- Adapt to support future technology developments and new requirements (including considerations for anticipated/potential changes to applicable rules and market behavior);
- Handle an extensible architecture that is capable of supporting asset classes beyond the initial scope of NMS Securities and OTC Equity Securities;
- Comply with the clock synchronization standards as set forth in Article VI, Section 6.8; and
- Handle an extensible data model and messaging protocols that are able to support future requirements such as, but not limited to:
  - Expansion of trading hours, including capability and support for 24-hour markets;
  - Sessions for securities;[3943] and
  - New asset classes, such as debt securities or derivative instruments.

Technical Environments

The architecture must include environments for production, development, quality assurance testing, disaster recovery,

[3943] Equity markets currently have morning, primary, and evening sessions. It is possible that over time sessions may cross into the next calendar day.

industry-wide coordinated testing, and individual on-going CAT Reporter testing. The building and introduction of environments available to CAT Reporters may be phased in to align with the following agreed upon implementation milestones:

Development environment—the development environment must be created to build, develop, and maintain enhancements and new requirements. This environment must be separate from those listed below.

Quality assurance environment—a quality assurance (QA) environment must be created to allow simulation and testing of all applications, interfaces, and data integration points contained in the CAT System.

- The QA environment shall be able to simulate end-to-end production functionality and perform with the same operational characteristics, including processing speed, as the production environment.
- The QA environment shall support varied types of changes, such as, but not limited to, the following:

Application patches;
Bug fixes;
Operating system upgrades;
Introduction of new hardware or software components;
New functionality;
Network changes;
Regression testing of existing functionality;
Stress or load testing (simulation of production-level usage); and
Recovery and failover.

- A comprehensive test plan for each build and subsequent releases must be documented.

Production environment—fully operational environment that supports receipt, ingestion, processing and storage of CAT Data. Backup/disaster recovery components must be included as part of the production environment.

Industry test environment—

- The Plan Processor must provide an environment supporting industry testing (test environment) that is functionally equivalent to the production environment, including:

End-to-end functionality (*e.g.,* data validation, processing, linkage, error identification, correction and reporting mechanism) from ingestion to output, sized to meet the standards of the production SLA;
Performance metrics that mirror the production environment; and
Management with the same information security policies applicable to the production environment.

- The industry test environment must also contain functionality to support industry testing, including:

Minimum availability of 24x6;
Replica of production data when needed for testing;
Data storage sized to meet varying needs, dependent upon scope and test scenarios; and
Support of two versions of code (current and pending).

- The industry test environment must support the following types of industry testing:

Technical upgrades made by the Plan Processor;
CAT code releases that impact CAT Reporters;
Changes to industry data feeds (*e.g.,* SIP, OPRA, etc.);
Industry-wide disaster recovery testing;
Individual CAT Reporter and Data Submitter testing of their upgrades against CAT interfaces and functionality; and
Multiple, simultaneous CAT Reporter testing.

- The industry test environment must be a discrete environment separate from the production environment.
- The Plan Processor must provide the linkage processing of data submitted during coordinated, scheduled, industry-wide testing. Results of the linkage processes must be communicated back to Participants as well as to the Operating Committee.
- Data from industry testing must be saved for three months. Operational metrics associated with industry testing (including but not limited to testing results, firms who participated, and amount of data reported and linked) must be stored for the same duration as the CAT production data.
- The Plan Processor must provide support for industry testing, including testing procedures, coordination of industry testing, publish notifications, and provide help desk support during industry testing.
- The Participants and the SEC must have access to industry test data.

Capacity Requirements

System capacity must have the following characteristics.[3944]

The Central Repository must be:

Designed such that additional capacity can be quickly and seamlessly integrated while maintaining system access and availability requirements;
Able to efficiently and effectively handle data ingestion on days with peak and above-peak data submission volumes; and
Required to maintain and store data for a 6-year sliding window of data. System access and availability requirements must be maintained during the maintenance of the sliding window. It is expected that the Central Repository will grow to more than 29 petabytes of raw, uncompressed data.

The Plan Processor must:

Define a capacity planning process to be approved by the Operating Committee, with such process incorporating industry utility capacity metrics; and
Develop a robust process to add capacity, including both the ability to scale the environment to meet the expected annual increases as well as to rapidly expand the environment should unexpected peaks in data volumes breach the defined capacity baseline. Capacity forecasts from systems, including OPRA, UTP, and CTA, must also be included for capacity planning purposes. This capacity planning process must be approved by the Operating Committee.

Monitoring Capacity Utilization and Performance Optimization

In order to manage the data volume, operational capacity planning must be conducted on a periodic basis. The Plan Processor must submit capacity-planning metrics to the Operating Committee for review to ensure that all parties are aware of the system processing capabilities and changes to assumptions. Changes to assumptions could lead to positive or negative adjustments in the costs charged to CAT Reporters. Reports that capture daily disk space, processing time, amount of data received and linkage completion times must be provided by the Plan Processor to the Operating Committee.

Data Retention Requirements

The Plan Processor must develop a formal record retention policy and program for the CAT, to be approved by the Operating Committee, which will, at a minimum:

Contain requirements associated with data retention, maintenance, destruction, and holds;
Comply with applicable SEC record-keeping requirements;
Have a record hold program where specific CAT Data can be archived offline for as long as necessary;
Store and retain both raw data submitted by CAT Reporters and processed data; and
Make data directly available and searchable electronically without manual intervention for at least six years.

Data Management

The Plan Processor must develop data management policies and procedures to govern and manage CAT Data, reference data, and metadata contained in and used by the Central Repository.

The CAT must capture, store, and maintain current and historical reference data information. This master/reference database will include data elements such as, but not limited to, SRO-assigned market participant identifiers, product type, trading unit size, trade/quote minimum price variation, corporate actions, symbology changes, and changes in listings market center. The Plan Processor must support bi-temporal milestones (*e.g.,* Effective Date and as-of-date) of the reference data.

CAT Reporters will submit data to the Central Repository with the listing exchange symbology format. The Central Repository must use the listing exchange symbology format for output of the linked data. Instrument validation must be included in

[3944] References to data sizing refer to raw, uncompressed data and do not account for benefits of compression, overhead of data storage or indices. Data sizing estimates do not include meta-data and are based on delimited, fixed length data sets. The Plan Processor is responsible for calculating its platform capacity capabilities based on its proposed solution. Three years after the finalization of the CAT NMS Plan, when all CAT Reporters submit their data to the Central Repository, the Central Repository must be sized to receive process and load more than 58 billion records per day.

the processing of data submitted by CAT Reporters.

The Central Repository must be able to link instrument data across any time period so that data can be properly displayed and linked regardless of changes to issue symbols or market class. The Plan Processor is required to create and maintain a symbol history and mapping table, as well as to provide a tool that will display a complete issue symbol history that will be accessible to CAT Reporters, Participants and the SEC. In addition, the Plan Processor will be required to create a start-of-day (''*SOD*'') and end-of-day (''*EOD*'') CAT reportable list of securities for use by CAT Reporters. This list must be available online and in a machine readable (*e.g.,* .csv) format by 6 a.m. on each Trading Day.

Queries, reports, and searches for data that span dates where there are changes to reference data must automatically include data within the requested date range. For example, if a query is run for a symbol that had three issue symbol changes during the time window of the query parameters, the result set must automatically include data for all three symbols that were in use during the time window of the query.

The Plan Processor must also develop an end-to-end process and framework for technical, business and operational metadata.

Data Types and Sources

The Plan Processor will be responsible for developing detailed data and interface specifications for data to be submitted by CAT Reporters. These specifications will be contained in the Technical Specifications, the initial version of which will be presented to the Operating Committee for approval. The Technical Specifications must be designed to capture all of the data elements required by SEC Rule 613, as well as other information the Participants determine necessary to facilitate elimination of reporting systems that the CAT may cause to be redundant, such as EBS and OATS. In the future, new data sources such as public news may be added to the specifications.

CAT Reporters and Data Submitters will transmit data in an electronic data format(s) that will be defined by the Plan Processor. The Technical Specifications must include details for connectivity and electronic submission, transmission, retransmission and processing. It is possible that more than one format will be defined to support the various senders throughout the industry.

The Participants anticipate that some broker-dealers will not directly report to the CAT but will rely on other organizations to report on their behalf. However, the CAT will need to have the flexibility to adapt on a timely basis to changes in the number of entities that report CAT Data.

Data Feed Management

The Plan Processor must monitor and manage incoming and outgoing data feeds for, at a minimum, the following:

Data files from each CAT Reporter and Data Submitter;
Files that cover multiple trade dates (*e.g.,* to account for clearing and changes);
Full and partial file submissions that contain corrections from previously rejected files;
Full and partial file submissions based on CAT Reporter; and
Receipt and processing of market data feeds (SIP, OPRA, OCC).

The Plan Processor must also develop a process for detecting, managing, and mitigating duplicate file submissions. It must create and store operational logs of transmissions, success, and failure reasons in order to create reports for CAT Reporters, Participants, and the SEC. Outgoing data feeds must be logged and corresponding metadata elements must be monitored and captured.

Managing connectivity for data feeds (e.g., SIPs, broker-dealers and regulators)

The Plan Processor will be required to ensure that it provides all CAT Reporters with the ability to transmit CAT Data to the Central Repository as required to meet the reporting requirements. The Plan Processer is required to have a robust managed file transfer (''*MFT*'') tool, including full monitoring, permissioning, auditing, security, high availability,[3945] file integrity checks, identification of data transmission failures/errors, transmission performance metrics, multiple transmission protocols, Latency/network bottlenecks or delays, key management, etc. CAT Reporters must also have the ability to conduct manual data entry via a GUI interface or the uploading of a file, subject to a maximum record capacity, which will be defined by the Plan Processor in consultation with the Operating Committee.

Reporting and Linkage Requirements

All CAT Data reported to the Central Repository must be processed and assembled to create the complete lifecycle of each Reportable Event. Reportable Events must contain data elements sufficient to ensure the same regulatory coverage currently provided by existing regulatory reporting systems that have been identified as candidates for retirement.

Additionally, the Central Repository must be able to:

Assign a unique CAT-Reporter-ID to all reports submitted to the system based on sub-identifiers, (*e.g.,* MPIDs, ETPID, trading mnemonic) currently used by CAT Reporters in their order handling and trading processes.
Handle duplicate sub-identifiers used by members of different Participants to be properly associated with each Participant.
Generate and associate one or more Customer-IDs with all Reportable Events representing new orders received from a Customer(s) of a CAT Reporter. The Customer-ID(s) will be generated from a Firm Designated ID provided by the CAT Reporter for each such event, which will be included on all new order events.
Accept time stamps on order events handled electronically to the finest level of granularity captured by CAT Reporters. Additionally, the CAT must be able to expand the time stamp field to accept time stamps to an even finer granularity as trading systems expand to capture time stamps in ever finer granularity. The Plan Processor must normalize all processed date/time CAT Data into a standard time zone/format.

In addition, the data required from CAT Reporters will include all events and data elements required by the Plan Processor in the Technical Specifications to build the:

Life cycle of an order for defined events within a CAT Reporter;
Life cycle of an order for defined events intra-CAT Reporter; and
State of all orders across all CAT Reporters at any point in time.

The Plan Processor must use the ''daisy chain approach'' to link and create the order lifecycle. In the daisy chain approach, a series of unique order identifiers, assigned to all order events handled by CAT Reporters are linked together by the Central Repository and assigned a single CAT-generated CAT-Order-ID that is associated with each individual order event and used to create the complete lifecycle of an order.

By using the daisy chain approach the Plan Processor must be able to link all related order events from all CAT Reporters involved in the lifecycle of an order. At a minimum, the Central Repository must be able to create the lifecycle between:

All order events handled within an individual CAT Reporter, including orders routed to internal desks or departments with different functions (*e.g.,* an internal ATS);
Customer orders to ''representative'' orders created in firm accounts for the purpose of facilitating a customer order (*e.g.,* linking a customer order handled on a riskless principal basis to the street-side proprietary order);
Orders routed between broker-dealers;
Orders routed from broker-dealers to exchanges;
Orders sent from an exchange to its routing broker-dealer;
Executed orders and trade reports;
Various legs of option/equity complex orders; and
Order events for all equity and option order handling scenarios that are currently or may potentially be used by CAT Reporters, including:
  - Agency route to another broker-dealer or exchange;
  - Riskless principal route to another broker-dealer or exchange capturing within the lifecycle both the customer leg and street side principal leg;
  - Orders routed from one exchange through a routing broker-dealer to a second exchange;
  - Orders worked through an average price account capturing both the individual street side execution(s) and the average price fill to the Customer;
  - Orders aggregated with other orders for further routing and execution capturing both the street side executions for the aggregated order and the fills to each customer order;
  - Complex orders involving one or more options legs and an equity leg, with a

[3945] To be defined in the SLAs to be agreed to between the Participants and the Plan Processor, as detailed in Appendix D, Functionality of the CAT System.

linkage between the option and equity legs;
- Complex orders containing more legs than an exchange's order management system can accept, causing the original order to be broken into multiple orders;
- Orders negotiated over the telephone or via a negotiation system;
- Orders routed on an agency basis to a foreign exchange;
- Execution of customer order via allocation of shares from a pre-existing principal order;
- Market maker quotes; and
- Complex orders involving two or more options legs.

Additionally, the Central Repository must be able to:

Link each order lifecycle back to the originating Customer;

Integrate and appropriately link reports representing repairs of original submissions that are rejected by the CAT due to a failure to meet a particular data validation;

Integrate into the CAT and appropriately link reports representing records that are corrected by a CAT Reporter for the purposes of correcting data errors not identified in the data validation process;

Assign a single CAT-Order-ID to all events contained within the lifecycle of an order so that regulators can readily identify all events contained therein; and

Process and link Manual Order Events with the remainder of the associated order lifecycle.

Timelines for Reporting

CAT Data for the previous Trading Day must be reported to the Central Repository by 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time on the Trading Day following the day the Industry Member receives such data; however, the Plan Processor must accept data prior to that deadline, including intra-day submissions.

Other Items

The Plan Processor must anticipate and manage order data processing over holidays, early market closures and both anticipated and unanticipated market closures. The Plan Processor must allow and enable entities that are not CAT Reporters (*e.g.,* service bureaus) to report on behalf of CAT Reporters only upon being permissioned by the CAT Reporter, and must develop appropriate tools to facilitate this process.

Required Data Attributes for Order Records Submitted by CAT Reporters

At a minimum, the Plan Processor must be able to receive the data elements as detailed in the CAT NMS Plan.

Data Security

Overview

SEC Rule 613 requires that the Plan Processor ensure the security and confidentiality of all information reported to and maintained by the CAT in accordance with the policies, procedures and standards in the CAT NMS Plan.

The Plan Processor must have appropriate solutions and controls in place to ensure data confidentiality and security during all communication between CAT Reporters and Data Submitters and the Plan Processor, data extraction, manipulation and transformation, loading to and from the Central Repository and data maintenance by the CAT System. The Plan Processor must address security controls for data retrieval and query reports by Participant and the SEC. The solution must provide appropriate tools, logging, auditing and access controls for all components of the CAT System, such as but not limited to access to the Central Repository, access for CAT Reporters, access to rejected data, processing status and CAT Reporter performance and comparison statistics.

The Plan Processor must provide to the Operating Committee a comprehensive security plan that covers all components of the CAT System, including physical assets and personnel, and the training of all persons who have access to the Central Repository consistent with Article VI, Section 6.1(m). The security plan must be updated annually. The security plan must include an overview of the Plan Processor's network security controls, processes and procedures pertaining to the CAT Systems. Details of the security plan must document how the Plan Processor will protect, monitor and patch the environment; assess it for vulnerabilities as part of a managed process, as well as the process for response to security incidents and reporting of such incidents. The security plan must address physical security controls for corporate, data center, and leased facilities where Central Repository data is transmitted or stored. The Plan Processor must have documented ''hardening baselines'' for systems that will store, process, or transmit CAT Data or PII data.

Connectivity and Data Transfer

The CAT System(s) must have encrypted internet connectivity. CAT Reporters must connect to the CAT infrastructure using secure methods such as private lines or (for smaller broker-dealers) Virtual Private Network connections over public lines. Remote access to the Central Repository must be limited to authorized Plan Processor staff and must use secure multi-factor authentication that meets or exceeds the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (''*FFIEC*'') security guidelines surrounding authentication best practices.[3946]

The CAT databases must be deployed within the network infrastructure so that they are not directly accessible from external end-user networks. If public cloud infrastructures are used, virtual private networking and firewalls/access control lists or equivalent controls such as private network segments or private tenant segmentation must be used to isolate CAT Data from unauthenticated public access.

Data Encryption

All CAT Data must be encrypted *at rest and* in flight using industry standard best practices (*e.g.,* SSL/TLS*) including archival data storage methods such as tape backup.* Symmetric key encryption must use a minimum key size of 128 bits or greater (*e.g.,* AES–128), larger keys are preferable. Asymmetric key encryption (*e.g.,* PGP) for exchanging data between Data Submitters and the Central Repository is desirable.

[All PII data must be encrypted both at rest and in flight, including archival data storage methods such as tape backup.] Storage of unencrypted PII data is not permissible. PII encryption methodology must include a secure documented key management strategy such as the use of HSM(s). The Plan Processor must describe how PII encryption is performed and the key management strategy (*e.g.,* AES–256, 3DES).

[CAT Data stored in a public cloud must be encrypted at rest. Non-PII CAT Data stored in a Plan Processor private environment is not required to be encrypted at rest.]

If public cloud managed services are used that would inherently have access to the data (*e.g.,* BigQuery, S3, Redshift), then the key management surrounding the encryption of that data must be documented (particularly whether the cloud provider manages the keys, or if the Plan Processor maintains that control). Auditing and real-time monitoring of the service for when cloud provider personnel are able to access/decrypt CAT Data must be documented, as well as a response plan to address instances where unauthorized access to CAT Data is detected. Key management/rotation/revocation strategies and key chain of custody must also be documented in detail.

Data Storage and Environment

Data centers housing CAT Systems (whether public or private) must, at a minimum, be *AICPA* SOC 2 certified by [an independent third party auditor] *a qualified third-party auditor that is not an affiliate of any of the Participants or the CAT Processor.* The frequency of the audit must be at least once per year.

CAT compute infrastructure may not be commingled with other non-regulatory systems (or tenets, in the case of public cloud infrastructure). Systems hosting the CAT processing for any applications must be segmented from other systems as far as is feasible on a network level (firewalls, security groups, ACL's, VLAN's, authentication proxies/bastion hosts and similar). In the case of systems using inherently shared infrastructure/storage (e.g., public cloud storage services), an encryption/key management/access control strategy that effectively renders the data private must be documented.

The Plan Processor must include penetration testing and an application security code audit by a reputable (and named) third party prior to launch as well as periodically as defined in the SLA(s). Reports of the audit will be provided to the Operating Committee as well as remediation plan for identified issues. The penetration test reviews of the Central Repository's network, firewalls, and development, testing and production systems should help the CAT evaluate the system's security and resiliency in the face of attempted and successful systems intrusions.

[3946] Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, Supplement to Authentication in an Internet Banking Environment (June 22, 2011), *available at http://www.ffiec.gov/pdf/Auth-ITS-Final%206-22-11%20(FFIEC%20Formated).pdf.*

Data Access

The Plan Processor must provide an overview of how access to PII and other CAT Data by Plan Processor employees and administrators is restricted. This overview must include items such as, but not limited to, how the Plan Processor will manage access to the systems, internal segmentation, multi-factor authentication, separation of duties, entitlement management, background checks, etc.

The Plan Processor must develop and maintain policies and procedures reasonably designed to prevent, detect, and mitigate the impact of unauthorized access or usage of data in the Central Repository. Such policies and procedures must be approved by the Operating Committee, and should include, at a minimum:

Information barriers governing access to and usage of data in the Central Repository;
Monitoring processes to detect unauthorized access to or usage of data in the Central Repository; and
Escalation procedures in the event that unauthorized access to or usage of data is detected.

A Role Based Access Control (''*RBAC*'') model must be used to permission user with access to different areas of the CAT System. The CAT System must support an arbitrary number of roles with access to different types of CAT Data, down to the attribute level. The administration and management of roles must be documented. Periodic reports detailing the current list of authorized users and the date of their most recent access must be provided to Participants, the SEC and the Operating Committee. The reports of the Participants and the SEC will include only their respective list of users. The Participants [and the SEC] must provide a response to the report confirming that the list of users is accurate. The required frequency of this report will be defined by the Operating Committee. The Plan Processor must log every instance of access to Central Repository data by users.

Passwords stored in the CAT System must be stored according to industry best practices. Reasonable password complexity rules should be documented and enforced, such as, but not limited to, mandatory periodic password changes and prohibitions on the reuse of the recently used passwords.

Password recovery mechanisms must provide a secure channel for password reset, such as emailing a one-time, time-limited login token to a pre-determined email address associated with that user. Password recovery mechanisms that allow in-place changes or email the actual forgotten password are not permitted.

Any login to the system that is able to access PII data must follow non-PII password rules and must be further secured via multi-factor authentication (''*MFA*''). The implementation of MFA must be documented by the Plan Processor. MFA authentication capability for all logins [(including non-PII)] is required to be implemented by the Plan Processor.

Breach Management

The Plan Processor must develop policies and procedures governing its responses to systems or data breaches. Such policies and procedures will include a formal cyber incident response plan, and documentation of all information relevant to breaches.

The cyber incident response plan will provide guidance and direction during security incidents. The plan will be subject to approval by the Operating Committee. The plan may include items such as:

Guidance on crisis communications;
Security and forensic procedures;
Customer notifications;
''Playbook'' or quick reference guides that allow responders quick access to key information;
Insurance against security breaches;
Retention of legal counsel with data privacy and protection expertise; and
Retention of a Public Relations firm to manage media coverage.

Documentation of information relevant to breaches should include:

A chronological timeline of events from the breach throughout the duration of the investigation;
Relevant information related to the breach (e.g., date discovered, who made the discovery, and details of the breach);
Response efforts, involvement of third parties, summary of meetings/conference calls, and communication; and
The impact of the breach, including an assessment of data accessed during the breach and impact on CAT Reporters.

PII Data Requirements

PII data must not be included in the result set(s) from online or direct query tools, reports or bulk data extraction. Instead, results will display existing non-PII unique identifiers (e.g., Customer-ID or Firm Designated ID). The PII corresponding to these identifiers can be gathered using the PII workflow described in Appendix D, Data Security, PII Data Requirements. By default, users entitled to query CAT Data are not authorized for PII access. The process by which someone becomes entitled for PII access, and how they then go about accessing PII data, must be documented by the Plan Processor. The chief regulatory officer, or other such designated officer or employee at each Participant [and the Commission] must, at least annually, review and certify that people with PII access have the appropriate level of access for their role.

Using the RBAC model described above, access to PII data shall be configured at the PII attribute level, following the ''least privileged'' practice of limiting access as much as possible.

PII data must be stored separately from other CAT Data. It cannot be stored with the transactional CAT Data, and it must not be accessible from public internet connectivity. A full audit trail of PII access (who accessed what data, and when) must be maintained. The Chief Compliance Officer and the Chief Information Security Officer shall have access to daily PII reports that list all users who are entitled for PII access, as well as the audit trail of all PII access that has occurred for the day being reported on.

Industry Standards

The following industry standards [, at a minimum,]—*which is not intended to be an exclusive list*—must be followed as such standards and requirements may be replaced by successor publications, or modified, amended, or supplemented and as approved by the Operating Committee (in the event of a conflict between standards, the more stringent standard shall apply, subject to the approval of the Operating Committee):

National Institute of Standards and Technology:
- 800–23—Guidelines to Federal Organizations on Security Assurance and Acquisition/Use of Test/Evaluated Products
- 800–53—Security and Privacy Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations
- 800–115—Technical Guide to Information Security Testing and Assessment
- 800–118—Guide to Enterprise Password Management
- 800–133—Recommendation for Cryptographic Key Generation
- 800–137—Information Security Continuous Monitoring for Federal Information Systems and Organizations
- *To the extent not specified above, all other provisions of the NIST Cyber Security Framework*

Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council:
- Authentication Best Practices

International Organization for Standardization:
- ISO/IEC 27001—Information Security Management

The Company shall endeavor to join the FS–ISAC and comparable bodies as the Operating Committee may determine. The FS–ISAC provides real time security updates, industry best practices, threat conference calls, xml data feeds and a member contact directory. The FS–ISAC provides the Company with the ability to work with the entire financial industry to collaborate for the purposes of staying up to date with the latest information security activities.

BCP/DR Process

Overview

The Plan Processor must develop and implement disaster recovery (''*DR*'') and business continuity plans (''*BCP*'') that are tailored to the specific requirements of the CAT environment, and which must be approved and regularly reviewed by the Operating Committee. The BCP must address the protection of data, service for the data submissions, processing, data access, support functions and operations. In the context of this document, BCP generally refers to how the business activities will continue in the event of a widespread disruption and the DR requirements refer to how the CAT infrastructure will be designed to support a full data center outage. In addition, the Plan Processor must have SLAs in place to govern redundancy (i.e., no single point of failure) of critical aspects of the CAT System (e.g., electrical feeds, network connectivity, redundant processors, storage units, etc.) and

must have an architecture to support and meet the SLA requirements. Any SLAs between the Plan Processor and third parties must be approved by the Operating Committee.

Industry Standards

The following National Institute of Standards and Technology standards, at a minimum, must be followed in association with Disaster Recovery, in each case as such standards and requirements may be replaced by successor publications, or modified, amended, or supplemented and as approved by the Operating Committee:

- 800–34—Contingency Planning for Federal Information Systems; and

Specifically, the following sections as minimum requirements for designing and implementing BCP and DR plans:

- Chapter 3: Information System Contingency Planning Process, which identifies seven steps to use when developing contingency plans;
- Chapter 4: Information System Contingency Plan Development, which outlines the key elements of a contingency plan;
- Chapter 5: Technical Contingency Planning Considerations (using the specific sections applicable to the Plan Processor's systems) which provides considerations specific to different types of technology; and
- Other sections and the appendices should be taken into consideration as warranted.

In addition, the Plan Processor will need to develop a process to manage and report all breaches.

Business Continuity Planning

The Plan Processor will design a BCP that supports a continuation of the business activities required of the CAT in the event of a widespread disruption.

With respect to the team supporting CAT business operations, a secondary site must be selected that is capable of housing the critical staff necessary for CAT business operations. The site must be fully equipped to allow for immediate use. The selection of the site must take into account diversity in utility and telecommunications infrastructure as well as the ability for CAT staff to access the site in the event of transit shutdowns, closure of major roadways and other significant disruptions that may affect staff. Planning should consider operational disruption involving significant unavailability of staff.

A bi-annual test of CAT operations where CAT staff operates the facility from the secondary site is required. This will ensure that phone systems, operational tools and other help desk functions all work as expected and the Plan Processor still functions as usual even in the event of a disruption.

CAT operations staff must maintain, and annually test, remote access capabilities to ensure smooth operations during a site un-availability event. Certain critical staff may be required to report directly to the secondary office site. However, an effective telecommuting solution must be in place for all critical CAT operations staff. Furthermore, any telecommuting strategy must require a remote desktop style solution where CAT operations and data consoles remain at the primary data center and must further ensure that CAT Data may not be downloaded to equipment that is not CAT-owned and compliant with CAT security requirements.

The BCP must identify critical third party dependencies. The Plan Processor will coordinate with critical suppliers regarding their arrangements and involve these parties in tests on an annual basis. Critical third party firms may be required to provide evidence of their BCP capabilities and testing.

The Plan Processor must conduct third party risk assessments at regular intervals to verify that security controls implemented are in accordance with NIST SP 800–53. These risk assessments must include assessment scheduling, questionnaire completion and reporting. The Plan Processor should provide assessment reports to the Operating Committee.

The Plan Processor will develop and annually test a detailed crisis management plan to be invoked following certain agreed disruptive circumstances.

The processing sites for business continuity must adhere to the ''Interagency Paper on Sound Practices to Strengthen the Resilience of the U.S. Financial System.'' [3947]

The Plan Processor will conduct an annual Business Continuity Audit using an Independent Auditor approved by the Operating Committee. The Independent Auditor will document all findings in a detailed report provided to the Operating Committee.

Disaster Recovery Requirements

The Plan Processor will implement a DR capability that will ensure no loss of data and will support the data availability requirements and anticipated volumes of the CAT.

A secondary processing site must be capable of recovery and restoration of services at the secondary site within a minimum of 48 hours, but with the goal of achieving next day recovery after a disaster event. The selection of the secondary site must consider sites with geographic diversity that do not rely on the same utility, telecom and other critical infrastructure services. The processing sites for disaster recovery and business continuity must adhere to the ''Interagency Paper on Sound Practices to Strengthen the Resilience of the U.S. Financial System.''

The secondary site must have the same level of availability/capacity/throughput and security (physical and logical) as the primary site. The requirement implies and expects that fully redundant connectivity between the primary and secondary processing sites be established and fully available. Further, given this recovery window, this connectivity must be used to replicate repositories between the primary and secondary sites. Finally, CAT Reporter and Data Submitter submissions must be replicated to the secondary site for possible replay if recent replications are incomplete. Replication must occur as deliveries complete to ensure that a widespread communications failure will have minimal impact to the state of the secondary site.

On an annual basis, the Plan Processor must execute an industry DR test, which must include Plan Participants and a critical mass of non-Plan Participant CAT Reporters and Data Submitters. The tests must be structured such that all CAT Reporters and other Data Submitters can upload to the DR site and the data be ingested by the CAT Data loaders. All DR tests are required to realistically reflect the worst-case scenario.

Failover processes must be transparent to CAT Reporters, as well as failback. In the event of a site failover, CAT Reporters must be able to deliver their daily files without changing configuration. This avoids requiring all CAT Reporters to update configurations, which is an error-prone effort.

After a DR event, the primary processing site must be made available as quickly as possible. For short duration DR events, the primary site must be returned to primary within 48 hours after the DR event. Longer duration outages will have differing SLAs. The DR plan must include designs that allow the re-introduction of the primary site or the introduction of a new primary site as the event dictates and an indication of the time required for this re-introduction.

Data Availability

Data Processing

CAT order events must be processed within established timeframes to ensure data can be made available to Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC in a timely manner. The processing timelines start on the day the order event is received by the Central Repository for processing. Most events must be reported to the CAT by 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time the Trading Day after the order event occurred (referred to as transaction date). The processing timeframes below are presented in this context. All events submitted after T+1 (either reported late or submitted later because not all of the information was available) must be processed within these timeframes based on the date they were received.

The Participants require the following timeframes (Figure A) for the identification, communication and correction of errors from the time an order event is received by the processor:

Noon Eastern Time T+1 (transaction date + one day)—Initial data validation, lifecycle linkages and communication of errors to CAT Reporters;

8:00 a.m. Eastern Time T+3 (transaction date + three days)—Resubmission of corrected data; and

8:00 a.m. Eastern Time T+5 (transaction date + five days)—Corrected data available to Participant regulatory staff and the SEC.

Late submissions or re-submissions (after 8:00 a.m.) may be considered to be processed that day if it falls within a given time period after the cutoff. This threshold will be determined by the Plan Processor and approved by the Operating Committee. In the event that a significant portion of the data

[3947] *See* Interagency Paper on Sound Practices to Strengthen the Resilience of the U.S. Financial System (Apr. 8, 2003), *available at http://www.sec.gov/news/studies/34-47638.htm.*

has not been received as monitored by the Plan Processor, the Plan Processor may decide to halt processing pending submission of that data.

Figure A: CAT Central Repository Data Processing Timelines



Data Availability Requirements

Prior to 12:00 p.m. Eastern Time on T+1, raw unprocessed data that has been ingested by the Plan Processor must be available to Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC.

Between 12:00 p.m. Eastern Time on T+1 and T+5, access to all iterations of processed data must be available to Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC.

The Plan Processor must provide reports and notifications to Participant regulatory staff and the SEC regularly during the five-day process, indicating the completeness of the data and errors. Notice of major errors or missing data must be reported as early in the process as possible. If any data remains unlinked after T+5, it must be available and included with all linked data with an indication that the data was not linked.

If corrections are received after T+5, Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC must be notified and informed as to how re-processing will be completed. The Operating Committee will be involved with decisions on how to re-process the data; however, this does not relieve the Plan Processor of notifying the Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC.

Figure B: Customer and Account Information (Including PII)



CAT PII data must be processed within established timeframes to ensure data can be made available to Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC in a timely manner. Industry Members submitting new or modified Customer information must provide it to the Central Repository no later than 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time on T+1. The Central Repository must validate the data and generate error reports no later than 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on T+[3]*1*. The Central Repository must process the resubmitted data no later than 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on T+4. Corrected data must be resubmitted no later than 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on T+3. The Central Repository must process the resubmitted data no later than 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on T+4. Corrected data must be available to regulators no later than 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time on T+5.

Customer information that includes PII data must be available to regulators immediately upon receipt of initial data and corrected data, pursuant to security policies for retrieving PII.

Receipt of Data from Reporters

Receipt of Data Transmission

Following receipt of data files submitted by the CAT Reporter or Data Submitter, the Plan Processor must send an acknowledgement of data received to the CAT Reporter and Data Submitter, if applicable. Such acknowledgment will enable CAT Reporters to create an audit trail of their submissions and allow for tracing of data breakdowns when data is not received. At a minimum, the receipt acknowledgement will include:

SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier;
Date of Receipt;
Time of Receipt;
File Identifier; and
Value signifying the acknowledgement of receipt, but not processing, of the file.

Data Validation

The Plan Processor will implement data validations at the file and individual record

level for data received by the Plan Processor including customer data. If a record does not pass basic validations, such as syntax rejections, then it must be rejected and sent back to the CAT Reporter as soon as possible, so it can repair and resubmit.[3948] The required data validations may be amended based on input from the Operating Committee and the Advisory Committee. All identified exceptions will be reported back to the CAT Reporter submitting the data and/or the CAT Reporter on whose behalf the data was submitted.

The data validations must include the following categories and must be explained in the Technical Specifications document:

File Validations—Confirmation of file transmission and receipt are in the correct formats. This includes validation of header and trailers on the submitted report, confirmation of a valid SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier, and verification of the number of records in the file.

Validation of CAT Data—Syntax and context checks, including:

- Format checks:

Check that the data is entered in the specified format

- Data Type checks:

Check that the data type of each attribute is as per specification

- Consistency checks:

Check that all attributes for a record of a specified type are consistent

- Range/logic checks:

Range check—Validate that each attribute for every record has a value within specified limits

Logic check—Validate that the values provided against each attribute are associated with the event type they represent

- Data validity checks:

Validate that each attribute for every record has an acceptable value

- Completeness checks:

Verify that each mandatory attribute for every record is not null

- Timeliness checks:

Verify that records were submitted within the submission timelines

Linkage Validation[3949]—Process by which related CAT Reportable Events are in a linked daisy chain method

CAT Reporters must have the ability to correct, replace or delete records that have passed initial validations within the CAT.

After the Central Repository has processed the data, the Plan Processor must provide daily statistics, including at a minimum, the following information:

SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier;
Date of Submission;
Number of files received;
Number of files accepted;
Number of files rejected;
Number of total order events received;
Number of order events accepted;
Number of order events rejected;
Number of each type of report received;
Number of each type of report accepted;
Number of each type of report rejected;
Number of customer records received;
Number of total customer records accepted;
Number of total customer records rejected;
Number of unknown accounts;
Number of late submissions;
Order-IDs rejected;
Reason(s) for rejection;
Number of records attempted to be matched;
Number of records matched; and
Percentage of records matched.

Individual records contained in files that do not pass the file validation process must not be included for further processing. Once a file passes the initial validation, individual records contained therein may then be processed for further validation. Individual records that do not pass the data validation processes will not be included in the final audit trail but must be retained. Additionally, records not passing the validations will not be included for matching processes.

Exception Management

The Plan Processor must capture rejected records for each CAT Reporter and make them available to the CAT Reporter. The ''rejects'' file must be accessible via an electronic file format and the rejections and daily statistics must be available via a web interface. The Plan Processor must provide functionality for CAT Reporters to amend any exceptions.

The Plan Processor must support bulk error correction. Rejected records can be resubmitted as a new file with appropriate indicators to identify the rejection record, which is being repaired. The Plan Processor will then reprocess repaired records.

A GUI must be available for CAT Reporters to make updates to individual records or attributes and must include, at a minimum, the:

Count of each type of rejection;
Reason for each rejection;
Ability to download the rejections;
Firm assigned order ID of each rejection;
Details of each rejection;
Type of report rejected; and
Repair status.

The Plan Processor must support bulk replacement of records, and reprocess such replaced records. The Plan Processor must provide CAT Reporters with documentation that detail the process how to amend and upload records that fail the validations that are outlined as part of Section 7.4. The Plan Processor must maintain a detailed audit trail capturing corrections to and replacements of records.

The Plan Processor will provide CAT Reporters with their error reports as they become available, and daily statistics will be provided after data has been uploaded and validated by the Plan Processor. The Plan Processor must support a continuous validation and feedback model so that CAT Reporters can identify and correct rejections on an ongoing basis. The rejected reports will include descriptive details, or codes related to descriptive details, as to why each data record was rejected by the Plan Processor.

On a monthly basis, the Plan Processor must produce and publish reports detailing performance and comparison statistics for CAT Reporters,[3950] similar to the Report Cards published for OATS presently. This will enable CAT Reporters to assess their performance in relation to their industry peers and help them assess the risk related to their reporting of transmitted data.

Breaks in intermittent lifecycle linkages must not cause the entire lifecycle to break nor cause a reject to the CAT Reporter that correctly reported.

Error Corrections

Error corrections must be able to be submitted and processed at any time, including timeframes after the standard repair window. Additionally, in order to make corrections, CAT Reporters must have access to the Central Repository over weekends.

CAT Reporters must be able to submit error corrections for data errors identified by CAT Reporters that passed format validations.

Additionally, the Plan Processor must:

Provide feedback as to the reason(s) for errors;
Prevent a linkage break between reports from resulting in additional events being rejected;
Allow broken linkages to be repaired without having to submit or resubmit additional reports;
Allow error corrections to be submitted both via online and bulk uploads or via file submission;
Support auto-correction of identified errors and notify reporters of any auto-corrections;
Support group repairs (i.e., the wrong issue symbol affecting multiple reports).

Data Ingestion

Data submitted to the Central Repository, including rejections and corrections, must be stored in repositories designed to hold information based on the classification of the CAT Reporter (i.e., whether the CAT Reporter is a Participant, a broker-dealer, or a third party Data Submitter). After ingestion by the Central Repository, the Raw Data must be transformed into a format appropriate for data querying and regulatory output.

Functionality of the CAT System

Regulator Access

The Plan Processor must provide Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC with access to all CAT Data for regulatory purposes only. Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC will access CAT Data to perform functions, including economic analyses, market structure analyses, market surveillance, investigations, and examinations.

The CAT must be able to support, at a minimum, 3,000 regulatory users within the

[3948] If needed—data validation may be a process with an initial validation phase for data errors and a subsequent validation phase later in processing where more time is needed to assess the context of the record in relation to data that may be submitted to the CAT later in the submission window. The Plan Processor must have an additional ''matching'' process for the purposes of linking together order data passed between CAT Reporters.

[3949] A linkage validation error should only populate for the CAT Reporter that the Plan Processor determines to have broken the link.

[3950] *See* Appendix C, Error Communication, Correction, and Processing.

system. It is estimated that approximately 20% of all users will use the system on a daily or weekly basis while approximately 10% of all users will require advanced regulator-user access, as described below. Furthermore, it is estimated that there may be approximately 600 concurrent users accessing the CAT at any given point in time. These users must be able to access and use the system without an unacceptable decline in system performance.[3951]

As stated in Appendix D, Data Security, the Plan Processor must be able to support an arbitrary number of user roles. Defined roles must include, at a minimum:

Basic regulator users—Individuals with approved access who plan to use the Central Repository to run basic queries (e.g., pulling all trades in a single stock by a specific party).

Advanced regulator users—Individuals with approved access who plan to use the Central Repository to construct and run their own complex queries.

Regulators will have access to processed CAT Data through two different methods, an online-targeted query tool and user-defined direct queries and bulk extracts.

Online Targeted Query Tool

The online targeted query tool will provide authorized users with the ability to retrieve processed and/or validated (unlinked) data via an online query screen that includes the ability to choose from a variety of pre-defined selection criteria. Targeted queries must include date(s) and/or time range(s), as well as one or more of a variety of fields, including the following:

Instrument(s);
Related instruments (e.g., single stock and all options with for the stock);
Data type (executions, orders, cancelations, quotes, etc.);
Product type (equity, option, etc.);
Processed data, unlinked data or both;
Listing market;
Exchange;
CAT-Reporter-ID(s)—CAT assigned and Participant assigned;
Customer-ID(s)—CAT assigned and CAT Reporter assigned;
CAT-Order-ID(s)—CAT assigned and CAT Reporter assigned;
ISO flag;
Put/call;
Strike price (include ability to select range);
Size;
Price;
Side;
Short-sale identifier;
Time-in-force (IOC, GTC, etc.);
Orders, quotes, BBOs or trades above or below a certain size;
Orders, quotes, BBOs or trades within a range of prices;
Canceled orders and/or trades;
CAT Reporters exceeding specified volume or percentage of volume thresholds in a single instrument or market-wide during a specified period of time;
CAT Reporter correction rate over time;
Audit trail of order linkages;
Corporate action events;
Instrument history; and
Others to be defined.

The tool must provide a record count of the result set, the date and time the query request is submitted, and the date and time the result set is provided to the users. In addition, the tool must indicate in the search results whether the retrieved data was linked or unlinked (*e.g.,* using a flag). In addition, the online targeted query tool must not display any PII data. Instead, it will display existing non-PII unique identifiers (*e.g.,* Customer-ID or Firm Designated ID). The PII corresponding to these identifiers can be gathered using the PII workflow described in Appendix D, Data Security, PII Data Requirements. The Plan Processor must define the maximum number of records that can be viewed in the online tool as well as the maximum number of records that can be downloaded. Users must have the ability to download the results to .csv, .txt, and other formats, as applicable. These files will also need to be available in a compressed format (*e.g.,* .zip, .gz). Result sets that exceed the maximum viewable or download limits must return to users a message informing them of the size of the result set and the option to choose to have the result set returned via an alternate method.

The Plan Processor must define a maximum number of records that the online targeted query tool is able to process. The minimum number of records that the online targeted query tool is able to process is 5,000 (if viewed within the online query tool) or 10,000 (if viewed via a downloadable file).

Once query results are available for download, users are to be given the total file size of the result set and an option to download the results in a single or multiple file(s). Users that select the multiple file option will be required to define the maximum file size of the downloadable files. The application will then provide users with the ability to download the files. This functionality is provided to address limitations of end-user network environment that may occur when downloading large files.

The tool must log submitted queries and parameters used in the query, the user ID of the submitter, the date and time of the submission, as well as the delivery of results. The Plan Processor will use this logged information to provide monthly reports to each Participant and the SEC of its respective metrics on query performance and data usage of the online query tool. The Operating Committee must receive all monthly reports in order to review items, including user usage and system processing performance.

Online Targeted Query Tool Performance Requirements

For targeted search criteria, the minimum acceptable response times will be increments of less than one minute. For the complex queries that either scan large volumes of data (*e.g.,* multiple trade dates) or return large result sets (>1M records), the response time must generally be available within 24 hours of the submission of the request. Regardless of the complexity of the criteria used within the online query tool, any query request for data within one business date of a 12-month period must return results within 3 hours.

Performance requirements listed below apply to data:

- Online targeted query tool searches that include equities and options trade data only in the search criteria must meet minimum requirements, including:
  - Returning results within 1 minute for all trades and related lifecycle events for a specific Customer or CAT Reporter with the ability to filter by security and time range for a specified time window up to and including an entire day;
  - Returning results within 30 minutes for all trades and related lifecycle events for a specific Customer or CAT Reporter in a specified date range (maximum 1 month);
  - Returning results within 6 hours for all trades and related lifecycle events for a specific Customer or CAT Reporter in a specified date range (maximum 12-month duration from the most recent 24 months); and
  - Returning results for the full 6 years of data for all trades and lifecycle events across daily, weekly, and multi-year periods.
- Online targeted query tool searches that include equities and options order and National Best Bid and National Best Offer data in search criteria must meet minimum requirements, including:
  - Returning results within 5 minutes for all orders and their complete lifecycles for a single security from a specific Participant across all markets (note: a Participant could have multiple participant identifiers) in a specified time window not to exceed 10 minutes for a single date;
  - Returning results within 5 minutes for all orders, cancelations, and the National Best Bid and National Best Offer (or the protected best bid and offer) at the time the order is created for a single security in a specified time window not to exceed 10 minutes for a single date;
  - Returning results within 5 minutes for all equity and options orders, cancelations, and executions from a specific market participant in a single underlying instrument in a specified time window not to exceed 10 minutes for a single date;
  - Returning results within 5 minutes for all orders, quotes, routes, cancelations and trades (complete life-cycle) for related instruments (*e.g.,* single stock and all options series for the same stock) in a specified time window not to exceed 10 minutes for a single date;
  - Returning results within 5 minutes for all orders and quotes entered during a specific time period by a list of specific CAT Reporters, with the ability to drill down to show the complete life-cycle must return results in a specified time window not to exceed 10 minutes for a single date; and
  - Returning results within 5 minutes for all orders and quotes entered during a specific time period for a specified list of instruments must return results in a specified time window not to exceed 10 minutes for a single date.

The online targeted query tool architecture must include an automated application-level

[3951] Specific performance requirements will be included in the SLA.

resource management component. This feature must manage query requests to balance the workload to ensure the response times for targeted and complex queries meet the defined response times. The resource management function will categorize and prioritize query requests based on the input parameters, complexity of the query, and the volume of data to be parsed in the query. Additionally, the source of the query may also be used to prioritize the processing. The Plan Processor must provide details on the prioritization plan of the defined solution for online query requests.

The online targeted query tool must support parallel processing of queries. At a minimum, the online targeted query tool must be able to process up to 300 simultaneous query requests with no performance degradation.

Online Targeted Query Tool Access and Administration

Access to CAT Data is limited to authorized regulatory users from the Participants and the SEC. Authorized regulators from the Participants and the SEC may access all CAT Data, with the exception of PII data. A subset of the authorized regulators from the Participants and the SEC will have permission to access and view PII data. The Plan Processor must work with the Participants and SEC to implement an administrative and authorization process to provide regulator access. The Plan Processor must have procedures and a process in place to verify the list of active users on a regular basis.

A two-factor authentication is required for access to CAT Data. PII data must not be available via the online targeted query tool or the user-defined direct query interface.

User-Defined Direct Queries and Bulk Extraction of Data

The Central Repository must provide for direct queries, bulk extraction, and download of data for all regulatory users. Both the user-defined direct queries and bulk extracts will be used by regulators to deliver large sets of data that can then be used in internal surveillance or market analysis applications. The data extracts must use common industry formats.

Direct queries must not return or display PII data. Instead, they will return existing non-PII unique identifiers (*e.g.,* Customer-ID or Firm Designated ID). The PII corresponding to these identifiers can be gathered using the PII workflow described in Appendix D, Data Security, PII Data Requirements.

Participants and regulators must have the ability to create, save, and schedule dynamic queries that will run directly against processed and/or unlinked CAT Data. The examples below demonstrate robust usage of the CAT Data to perform a variety of complex query, surveillance, and market analysis use cases. User-defined direct queries will be used to perform tasks such as market reconstruction, behavioral analysis, and cross-market surveillance.

The method(s) for providing this capability is dependent upon the architecture of the CAT and will be defined by the final solution. The CAT cannot be web-based due to the volumes of data that could be extracted.

The Participants are agnostic as to how user-defined direct queries or bulk extracts are implemented as long as the solution provides an open API that allows regulators to use analytic tools (*e.g.,* R, SAS, Python, Tableau) and can use ODBC/JDBC drivers to access the CAT Data. Queries invoked through the open API must be auditable. The CAT System must contain the same level of control, monitoring, logging and reporting as the online targeted query tool. The Plan Processor may define a limited set of basic required fields (*e.g.,* date and at least one other field such as symbol, CAT-Reporter ID, or CAT-Customer-ID) that regulators must use in direct dynamic queries.

The Plan Processor must provide procedures and training to regulators that will use the direct query feature. The Plan Processor may choose to require that user-defined direct query users participate in mandatory training sessions.

The bulk extract feature will replace the current Intermarket Surveillance Group (ISG) ECAT and COATS compliance data files that are currently processed and provided to Participants for use in surveillance applications. These files are used extensively across all Participants in a variety of surveillance applications and are a critical data input to many surveillance algorithms. With the initial implementation of the CAT, opportunities exist to improve the content and depth of information available in these data files. The Plan Processor will need to work with ISG to define new layouts that will include additional data elements that will be available in the CAT Data.

The Plan Processor is responsible for providing data models and data dictionaries for all processed and unlinked CAT Data.

User-Defined Direct Query Performance Requirements

The user-defined direct query tool is a controlled component of the production environment made available to allow the Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC to conduct queries. The user-defined direct query tool must:

Provide industry standard programmatic interface(s) that allows Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC with the ability to create, save, and run a query;

Provide query results that are extractable/downloadable and can be used to refine subsequent queries;

Support complex, multistage queries;

Run at a minimum 3,000 queries on a daily basis. Of these, it is anticipated that roughly 60% would be simple queries (*e.g.,* pulling of all trades in a given symbol traded during a certain time period) and 40% would be complex (*e.g.,* looking for quotes or orders more than 5% away from the National Best Bid and National Best Offer);

Process and run approximately 1,800 queries concurrently;

Support SQL 92 as well as recursive queries with common table expressions (recursive CTEs), bulk load utility, interface for dimension management, windowing functions, JBDC and ODBC, or provide another API with equal or greater query capabilities, so long as ODBC and JDBC are supported. Support for stored procedures and user-defined functions are optional;

Include data presentation tools/query tools that support query results that produce data sets ranging from less than 1 gigabyte to at least 10 terabytes or more of uncompressed data;

Provide query owners with the ability to schedule queries;

Provide query owners with the ability to cancel a query during execution or prior to the scheduled running of a query;

Provide Participants with a means to view all saved queries owned by the Participants as well as the scheduling of query executions (for queries that have been scheduled);

Provide an automated delivery method of scheduled query results to the appropriate Participant. Delivery methods must comply with all information security guidelines (encryption, etc.);

Provide technical expertise to assist regulators with questions and/or functionality about the content and structure of the CAT query capability;

Include workload balancer to allow prioritization and processing of queries and delivery of results; and

Support parallel processing of queries. At a minimum, the user-defined direct query tool must be able to process up to 300 simultaneous query requests with no performance degradation.

Bulk Extract Performance Requirements

For bulk extracts of an entire day of data, the minimum acceptable transfer time of equity and options data is four hours. This requirement assumes that there are no limitations within the regulator's own network environment that will prevent the Plan Processor from meeting this requirement.

A consideration was made to require an online Report Center that would include pre-canned reports that could be delivered to regulators or pulled upon request. The reports would be predefined based on requirements developed by Participants and the SEC. Due to the added complexity and the lack of quantifiable use cases, the Participants determined that this was something that may be useful in the future but not at the initial implementation and launch of the CAT. This will be reassessed when broker-dealers begin submitting data to the CAT.

It is envisioned that non-Participant CAT Reporters will be unable to access their data submissions through bulk data exports with the initial implementation of CAT. Only Participants and the SEC will have access to full lifecycle corrected bulk data exports.

Extraction of data must be consistently in line with all permissioning rights granted by the Plan Processor. Data returned must be encrypted, password protected and sent via secure methods of transmission. In addition, PII data must be masked unless users have permission to view the data that has been requested.

The Plan Processor must have an automated mechanism in place to monitor

user-defined direct query usage. This monitoring must include automated alerts to notify the Plan Processor of potential issues with bottlenecks or excessively long queues for queries or data extractions. The Plan Processor must provide details as to how the monitoring will be accomplished and the metrics that will be used to trigger alerts.

The user-defined direct query and bulk extraction tool must log submitted queries and parameters used in the query, the user ID of the submitter, the date and time of the submission and the date and time of the delivery of results. The Plan Processor will use this logged information to provide monthly reports to the Operating Committee, Participants and the SEC of their respective usage of the online query tool.

The bulk extract tool must support parallel processing of queries. At a minimum, the bulk extract tool must be able to process up to 300 simultaneous query requests with no performance degradation.

Identifying Latency and Communicating Latency Warnings to CAT Reporters

The Plan Processor will measure and monitor Latency within the CAT network. Thresholds for acceptable levels of Latency will be identified and presented to the Operating Committee for approval. The Plan Processor will also define policies and procedures for handling and the communication of data feed delays to CAT Reporters, the SEC, and Participants' regulatory staff that occur in the CAT. Any delays will be posted for public consumption, so that CAT Reporters may choose to adjust the submission of their data appropriately, and the Plan Processor will provide approximate timelines for when system processing will be restored to normal operations.

Technical Operations

The Plan Processor will develop policies, procedures, and tools to monitor and manage the performance of the Central Repository, to be approved by the Operating Committee. Such policies, procedures, and tools will include, at a minimum:

Monitoring and management of system availability and performance, to include both Online Targeted Query Tool and User-Defined Direct Queries;
Monitoring and management of query tool usage (*e.g.,* to identify long-running or ''stuck'' queries); and
Segregation of query queues by regulator or Participant (*i.e.,* one regulator or Participant's queries should not prevent another regulator or Participant's queries from running).

System SLAs

Service Level Agreements for system and operational performance will be established for areas, including the following:

Linkage and order event processing performance;
Query performance and response times;
System availability;
User support/help desk performance;
Application, network, and data security performance; and
Development, change management, and implementation processes and timelines.

The actual terms of the SLAs will be negotiated between the Plan Participants and the eventual Plan Processor.

CAT Customer and Customer Account Information

Customer and Customer Account Information Storage

The CAT must capture and store Customer and Customer Account Information in a secure database physically separated from the transactional database. The Plan Processor will maintain information of sufficient detail to uniquely and consistently identify each Customer across all CAT Reporters, and associated accounts from each CAT Reporter. The following attributes, at a minimum, must be captured:

Social security number (SSN) or Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN);
Date of birth;
Current name;
Current address;
Previous name; and
Previous address.

For legal entities, the CAT must capture the following attributes:

- Legal Entity Identifier (LEI) (if available);
- Tax identifier;
- Full legal name; and
- Address.

The Plan Processor must maintain valid Customer and Customer Account Information for each trading day and provide a method for Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC to easily obtain historical changes to that information (*e.g.,* name changes, address changes, etc.).

The Plan Processor will design and implement a robust data validation process for submitted Firm Designated ID, Customer Account Information and Customer Identifying Information, and must continue to process orders while investigating Customer information mismatches. Validations should:

Confirm the number of digits on a SSN,
Confirm date of birth, and
Accommodate the situation where a single SSN is used by more than one individual.

The Plan Processor will use the Customer information submitted by all broker-dealer CAT Reporters to assign a unique Customer-ID for each Customer. The Customer-ID must be consistent across all broker-dealers that have an account associated with that Customer. This unique CAT-Customer-ID will not be returned to CAT Reporters and will only be used internally by the CAT.

Broker-Dealers will initially submit full account lists for all active accounts to the Plan Processor and subsequently submit updates and changes on a daily basis. In addition, the Plan Processor must have a process to periodically receive full account lists to ensure the completeness and accuracy of the account database. The Central Repository must support account structures that have multiple account owners and associated Customer information (joint accounts, managed accounts, etc.), and must be able to link accounts that move from one CAT Reporter to another (*e.g.,* due to mergers and acquisitions, divestitures, etc.).

Required Data Attributes for Customer Information Data Submitted by Industry Members

At a minimum, the following Customer information data attributes must be accepted by the Central Repository:

Account Owner Name;
Account Owner Mailing Address;
Account Tax Identifier (SSN, TIN, ITIN);
Market Identifiers (Larger Trader ID, LEI);
Type of Account;
Firm Identifier Number;
- The number that the CAT Reporter will supply on all orders generated for the Account;

Prime Broker ID;
Bank Depository ID; and
Clearing Broker.

Customer-ID Tracking

The Plan Processor will assign a CAT-Customer-ID for each unique Customer. The Plan Processor will determine a unique Customer using information such as SSN and DOB for natural persons or entity identifiers for Customers that are not natural persons and will resolve discrepancies. Once a CAT-Customer-ID is assigned, it will be added to each linked (or unlinked) order record for that Customer.

Participants and the SEC must be able to use the unique CAT-Customer-ID to track orders from any Customer or group of Customers, regardless of what brokerage account was used to enter the order.

Error Resolution for Customer Data

The Plan Processor must design and implement procedures and mechanisms to handle both minor and material inconsistencies in Customer information. The Central Repository needs to be able to accommodate minor data discrepancies such as variations in road name abbreviations in searches. Material inconsistencies such as two different people with the same SSN must be communicated to the submitting CAT Reporters and resolved within the established error correction timeframe as detailed in Section 8.

The Central Repository must have an audit trail showing the resolution of all errors. The audit trail must, at a minimum, include the:

CAT Reporter submitting the data;
Initial submission date and time;
Data in question or the ID of the record in question;
Reason identified as the source of the issue, such as:
- duplicate SSN, significantly different Name;
- duplicate SSN, different DOB;
- discrepancies in LTID; or
- others as determined by the Plan Processor;

Date and time the issue was transmitted to the CAT Reporter, included each time the issue was re-transmitted, if more than once;
Corrected submission date and time, including each corrected submission if more than one, or the record ID(s) of the corrected data or a flag indicating that the issue was resolved and corrected data was not required; and
Corrected data, the record ID, or a link to the

corrected data.

User Support

CAT Reporter Support

The Plan Processor will provide technical, operational and business support to CAT Reporters for all aspects of reporting. Such support will include, at a minimum:

Self-help through a web portal;
Direct support through email and phone;
Support contact information available through the internet; and
Direct interface with Industry Members and Data Submitters via industry events and calls, industry group meetings and informational and training sessions.
The Plan Processor must develop tools to allow each CAT Reporter to:
Monitor its submissions;
View submitted transactions in a non-bulk format (i.e., non-downloadable) to facilitate error corrections;
Identify and correct errors;
Manage Customer and Customer Account Information;
Monitor its compliance with CAT reporting requirements; and
Monitor system status.

The Plan Processor will develop and maintain communication protocols (including email messaging) and a secure website to keep CAT Reporters informed as to their current reporting status, as well as issues with the CAT that may impact CAT Reporters' ability to submit or correct data. The website will use user authentication to prevent users for seeing information about firms other than their own, and will contain:

Daily reporting statistics for each CAT Reporter,[3952] including items such as:
- SRO-Assigned Market Participant Identifier;
- Date of submission;
- Number of files received;
- Number of files accepted;
- Number of files rejected;
- Number of total order events received;
- Number of order events accepted;
- Number of order events rejected;
- Number of each type of report received;
- Number of each type of report accepted;
- Number of each type of report rejected;
- Number of total customer records accepted;
- Number of total customer records rejected;
- Order-IDs rejected;
- Reason for rejection;
- Number of records attempted to be matched;
- Number of records matched;
- Percentage of records matched;
- Number of customer records received;
- Number of unknown accounts;
- Latest view of statistics inclusive of re-submissions to get a trade-date view of exceptions and correction statistics available for CAT Reporters to know when everything for a given trade date has been completed; and
- Most recent CAT Reporter Compliance Report Card, as defined in section 12.4;

CAT System status, system notifications, system maintenance, and system outages; and
A mechanism for submitting event data and correcting and resubmitting rejections or inaccurate data.

The Plan Processor will develop and maintain a public website containing comprehensive CAT reporting information, including:

Technical Specifications;
Reporting guidance (*e.g.,* FAQs);
Pending rule changes affecting CAT reporting;
CAT contact information;
Availability of test systems;
Testing plans;
Proposed changes to the CAT; and
Fee schedule.

The Plan Processor will develop and maintain a mechanism for assigning CAT Reporter-IDs. A mechanism will also be developed and maintained to change CAT Reporter-IDs should this be necessary (*e.g.,* due to a merger), with the expectations that such changes should be infrequent. Changes to CAT-Reporter-IDs must be reviewed and approved by the Plan Processor.

Initially, non-Participant CAT Reporters will not have access to their data submissions through bulk data exports with the initial implementation of the Central Repository. Only Participants and the SEC will have access to full lifecycle corrected bulk data exports. Non-Participant CAT Reporters will be able to view their submissions online in a read-only, non-exportable format to facilitate error identification and correction. Data Submitters will be able to export bulk file rejections for repair and error correction purposes.

The Plan Processor will define methods by which it will consult with and inform CAT Reporters and industry groups on updates and changes to user support.

The Plan Processor will define pre- and post-production support programs to minimize the Error Rate and help CAT Reporters to meet their compliance thresholds. Such pre-production support program shall include, but are not limited to, the following activities:

Educational programs—Includes the following:
- Publication and industry-wide communication (including FAQs) of the Technical Specifications, including:
  - Appropriate definitions/expected usages for each value in field format
  - All available attribute values for each field
  - Establishment of a dedicated help desk for Reporters to contact;
  - Industry participation in order linkage methodologies;
  - Include information on new order/trade types;
  - Hosting of industry educational calls; and
  - Hosting of industry-wide training.

Registration—Requires all firms to:
- Register and be certified as CAT Reporters;
- Attend industry-wide training;
- Establish internal controls to capture potential misreporting scenarios; and
- Work with the Plan Processor to understand scenario-based reporting and expected outputs.

Communications Plan—A strong communications plan of the timeline to reporting go-live shall:
- Include communication on how Error Rates and Compliance Thresholds are calculated; and
- Describe how errors will be communicated back to CAT Reporters.

Industry-wide testing—Industry-wide test results must be available for all CAT Reporters.
- As mentioned in Appendix C, Objective Milestones to Assess Progress, appropriate time must be provided between Technical Specification publication and production go-live.
- Ample testing time must be provided.
- Appropriate scenario-based testing, including all three validation processes, shall be established.
- A separate test environment for CAT Reporters that mirrors the production environment shall be provided.

Post-production support program activities shall include, but are not limited to the following:

Issuing a monthly Report Card on reporting statistics, with information on how reporters stand against similar entities;
Publishing daily reporting statistics;
Maintaining Technical Specifications with defined intervals for new releases/updates;
Posting FAQs and other informational notices to be updated as necessary;
Hosting of industry educational calls;
Hosting of industry-wide training;
Emailing outliers, meaning firms significantly reporting outside of industry standards;
Conducting annual assessments of dedicated help desk to determine appropriate staffing levels;
Using the test environment prior to releasing new code to production; and
Imposing CAT Reporter requirements:
- Attendance/participation of industry testing sessions;
- Attendance in industry educational calls; and
- Attendance in industry-wide training.

CAT User Support

The Plan Processor will develop a program to provide technical, operational and business support to CAT users, including Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC. The CAT help desk will provide technical expertise to assist regulators with questions and/or functionality about the content and structure of the CAT query capability.

The Plan Processor will develop tools, including an interface, to allow users to monitor the status of their queries and/or reports. Such website will show all in-progress queries/reports, as well as the current status and estimated completion time of each query/report.

The Plan Processor will develop communication protocols to notify regulators of CAT System status, outages and other issues that would affect Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC's ability to

[3952] Each CAT Reporter or Data Submitter must only be able to view its own data and data it submits on behalf of others.

access, extract, and use CAT Data. At a minimum, Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC must each have access to a secure website where they can monitor CAT System status, receive and track system notifications, and submit and monitor data requests.

The Plan Processor will develop and maintain documentation and other materials as necessary to train regulators in the use of the Central Repository, including documentation on how to build and run reporting queries.

CAT Help Desk

The Plan Processor will implement and maintain a help desk to support broker-dealers, third party CAT Reporters, and Participant CAT Reporters (the ''*CAT Help Desk*''). The CAT Help Desk will address business questions and issues, as well as technical and operational questions and issues. The CAT Help Desk will also assist Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC with questions and issues regarding obtaining and using CAT Data for regulatory purposes.

The CAT Help Desk must go live within a mutually agreed upon reasonable timeframe after the Plan Processor is selected, and must be available on a 24x7 basis, support both email and phone communication, and be staffed to handle at minimum 2,500 calls per month. Additionally, the CAT Help Desk must be prepared to support an increased call volume at least for the first few years. The Plan Processor must create and maintain a robust electronic tracking system for the CAT Help Desk that must include call logs, incident tracking, issue resolution escalation.

CAT Help Desk support functions must include:

Setting up new CAT Reporters, including the assignment of CAT-Reporter-IDs and support prior to submitting data to CAT;

Managing CAT Reporter authentication and entitlements;

Managing CAT Reporter and third party Data Submitters testing and certification;

Managing Participants and SEC authentication and entitlements;

Supporting CAT Reporters with data submissions and data corrections, including submission of Customer and Customer Account Information;

Coordinating and supporting system testing for CAT Reporters;

Responding to questions from CAT Reporters about all aspects of CAT reporting, including reporting requirements, technical data transmission questions, potential changes to SEC Rule 613 that may affect the CAT, software/hardware updates and upgrades, entitlements, reporting relationships, and questions about the secure and public websites;

Responding to questions from Participants' regulatory staff and the SEC about obtaining and using CAT Data for regulatory purposes, including the building and running of queries; and

Responding to administrative issues from CAT Reporters, such as billing.

CAT Reporter Compliance

The Plan Processor must include a comprehensive compliance program to monitor CAT Reporters' adherence to SEC Rule 613. The Chief Compliance Officer will oversee this compliance program, and will have responsibility for reporting on compliance by CAT Reporters to the Participants. The compliance program covers all CAT Reporters, including broker-dealers and Participants.

As a fundamental component of this program, the Plan Processor will identify on a daily basis all CAT Reporters exceeding the maximum allowable Error Rate established by the Participants. The Error Rate will initially be set by the CAT NMS Plan, and will be reviewed and adjusted on an ongoing basis by the Operating Committee. Error Rates will be based on timeliness, correctness, and linkages.

The Plan Processor will, on an ongoing basis, analyze reporting statistics and Error Rates and recommend to Participants proposed changes to the maximum allowable Error Rates established by the Participants. All CAT Reporters exceeding this threshold will be notified that they have exceeded the maximum allowable Error Rate and will be informed of the specific reporting requirements that they did not fully meet (*e.g.,* timeliness or rejections).

The Plan Processor will develop and publish CAT Reporter compliance report cards on a periodic basis to assist CAT Reporters in monitoring overall compliance with CAT reporting requirements. The Plan Processor will also recommend criteria and processes by which CAT Reporters will be fined for inaccurate, incomplete, or late submissions. The compliance report cards will include the following information:

Number of inaccurate transactions submitted;

Number of incomplete transactions submitted; and

Number of transactions submitted later than reporting deadlines.

The CAT Reporter compliance program will include reviews to identify CAT Reporters that may have failed to submit order events to the CAT, as well as to ensure CAT Reporters correct all identified errors even if such errors do not exceed the maximum allowable Compliance Threshold.

The Plan Processor will, on a monthly basis, produce and provide reports containing performance and comparison statistics as needed to each Participant on its members' CAT reporting compliance thresholds so that Participants can monitor their members' compliance with CAT reporting requirements and initiate disciplinary action when appropriate. The Plan Processor will also produce and provide, upon request from the Participants and the SEC, reports containing performance and comparison statistics as needed on each CAT Reporter's compliance thresholds so that the Participants or the SEC may take appropriate action if a Participant fails to comply with its CAT reporting obligations.

The Plan Processor will produce and make available on a monthly basis reports for all CAT Reporters, benchmarking their performance and comparison statistics against similar peers. The reports will be anonymized such that it will not be possible to determine the members of the peer group to which the CAT Reporter was compared.

The Plan Processor will produce and make available to regulators on a monthly basis a report detailing Error Rates, transaction volumes, and other metrics as needed to allow regulators to oversee the quality and integrity of CAT Reporter reporting to the Central Repository.

Upgrade Process and Development of New Functionality

CAT Functional Changes

The Plan Processor must propose a process governing the determination to develop new functionality, which process must be reviewed and approved by the Operating Committee. The process must, at a minimum:

Contain a mechanism by which changes can be suggested to the Operating Committee by Advisory Committee members, the Participants, or the SEC;

Contain a defined process for developing impact assessments, including implementation timelines, for proposed changes; and

Contain a mechanism by which functional changes which the Plan Processor wishes to undertake can be reviewed and approved by the Operating Committee.

The Plan Processor shall not unreasonably withhold, condition, or delay implementation of any changes or modifications reasonably requested by the Operating Committee.

CAT Infrastructure Changes

The Plan Processor must implement a process to govern changes to CAT. This process must contain provisions for:

Business-as-usual changes (*e.g.,* replacing failed hardware, adding capacity to deal with expected increases in transaction volumes) that would require the Plan Processor to provide the Operating Committee with a summary report (*e.g.,* infrastructure changes, acquired costs, etc.); and

Isolated infrastructure changes (*e.g.,* moving components of the system from a self-hosted to an Infrastructure-as-a-Service provider) that would require the Plan Processor to provide a request to the Operating Committee for review and approval before commencing any actions.

Testing of New Changes

The Plan Processor must implement a process governing user testing of changes to CAT functionality and infrastructure, which process must be reviewed and approved by the Operating Committee. The process must:

Define the process by which changes are to be tested by CAT Reporters[and regulators];

Define the criteria by which changes will be approved prior to their deployment into the production environment(s); and

Define the environment(s) to be used for user testing.

EXHIBIT B

KEY TO COMMENT LETTERS CITED IN APPROVAL ORDER

Proposed National Market System Plan Governing the Consolidated Audit Trail

(File No. 4–698)

1. Letter from Kathleen Weiss Hanley, Bolton-Perella Chair in Finance, Lehigh University, and Jay. R. Ritter, Joseph B. Cordell Eminent Scholar Chair, University of Florida, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 12, 2016 (''Hanley Letter'').
2. Letter from Courtney D. McGuinn, Operations Director, FIX Trading Community, to Commission, dated July 14, 2016 (''FIX Trading Letter'').
3. Letter from Kelvin To, Founder and President, Data Boiler Technologies, LLC, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 15, 2016 (''Data Boiler Letter'').
4. Letter from Richard Foster, Senior Vice President and Senior Counsel for Regulatory and Legal Affairs, Financial Services Roundtable, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, and Marcia E. Asquith, Corporate Secretary, Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, dated July 15, 2016 (''FSR Letter'').
5. Letter from David T. Bellaire, Esq., Executive Vice President and General Counsel, Financial Services Institute, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated, July 18, 2016 (''FSI Letter'')
6. Letter from Stuart J. Kaswell, Executive Vice President and Managing Director, General Counsel, Managed Funds Association, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 18, 2016 (''MFA Letter'').
7. Letter from Bonnie K. Wachtel, Wachtel and Company, Inc., to Commission, dated July 18, 2016. (''Wachtel Letter'').
8. Letter from David W. Blass, General Counsel, Investment Company Institute, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 18, 2016 (''ICI Letter'').
9. Letter from Larry E. Thompson, Vice Chairman and General Counsel, Depository Trust and Clearing Corporation, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 18, 2016 (''DTCC Letter'').
10. Letter from Manisha Kimmel, Chief Regulatory Officer, Wealth Management, Thomson Reuters, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 18, 2016 (''TR Letter'').
11. Letter from Theodore R. Lazo, Managing Director and Associate General Counsel, and Ellen Greene, Managing Director, Financial Services Operations, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 18, 2016 (''SIFMA Letter'').
12. Letter from Anonymous, to Commission, received July 18, 2016 (''Anonymous Letter I'').
13. Letter from Mary Lou Von Kaenel, Managing Director, Financial Information Forum, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 18, 2016 (''FIF Letter'').
14. Letter from Marc R. Bryant, Senior Vice President, Deputy General Counsel, Fidelity Investments, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 18, 2016 (''Fidelity Letter'').
15. Letter from Mark Husler, CEO, UniVista, and Jonathan Jachym, Head of North America Regulatory Strategy and Government Relations, London Stock Exchange Group, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 18, 2016 (''UnaVista Letter'').
16. Letter from Gary Stone, Chief Strategy Officer for Trading Solutions and Global Regulatory and Policy Group, Bloomberg, L.P., to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 18, 2016 (''Bloomberg Letter'').
17. Letter from Dennis M. Kelleher, President and CEO, Stephen W. Hall, Legal Director and Securities Specialist, and Lev Bagramian, Senior Securities Policy Advisor, Better Markets, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 18, 2016 (''Better Markets Letter'').
18. Letter from Industry Members of the Development Advisory Group (''DAG'') (including Financial Information Forum, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association and Securities Traders Association), to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 20, 2016 (''DAG Letter'').
19. Letter from John A. McCarthy, General Counsel, KCG Holdings, Inc., to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 20, 2016 (''KCG Letter'').
20. Letter from Joanne Moffic-Silver, EVP, General Counsel and Corporate Secretary, Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc., to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 21, 2016 (''CBOE Letter'').
21. Letter from Elizabeth K. King, General Counsel and Corporate Secretary, NYSE Group, Inc., to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 21, 2016 (''NYSE Letter'').
22. Letter from John Russell, Chairman of the Board, and James Toes, Securities President and CEO, Securities Traders Association, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated July 25, 2016 (''STA Letter'').
23. Letter from Anonymous, to Commission, received August 12, 2016 (''Anonymous Letter II'').
24. Letter from Scott Garrett, Barry Loudermilk, French Hill, Lynn Westmoreland, Randy Hultgren, Jody Hice, Lamar Smith, Tom Emmer, Bill Huizenga, Sean Duffy, Robert Pittenger, Robert Hurt, and Ann Wagner, Members of Congress, to Mary Jo White, Chair, Commission, dated October 14, 2016 (''Garrett Letter'').
25. Letter from Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated September 2, 2016 (''Response Letter I'').
26. Letter from Participant to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated September 23, 2016 (''Response Letter II'').
27. Letter from Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated October 7, 2016 (''Response Letter III'').
28. Letter from Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated November 2, 2016 (''Participants' Letter I'').
29. Letter from Participants to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated November 14, 2016 (''Participants' Letter II'').

[FR Doc. 2016–27919 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 81 Wednesday,
No. 226 November 23, 2016

Part III

Environmental Protection Agency

40 CFR Part 52
Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Arizona; Revised Format for Materials Incorporated by Reference; Final Rule

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[AZ–127–NBK; FRL–9948–55–Region 9]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Arizona; Revised Format for Materials Incorporated by Reference

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule; notice of administrative change.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is revising the format for materials submitted by the State of Arizona that are incorporated by reference (IBR) into the Arizona State Implementation Plan (SIP). The regulations affected by this format change have all been previously submitted by the State of Arizona and approved by the EPA. This format revision will primarily affect the ''Identification of plan'' section, as well as the format of the SIP materials that will be available for public inspection at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) and the EPA Regional Office. The EPA is also adding a table in the ''Identification of plan'' section which summarizes the approval actions that the EPA has taken on the non-regulatory and quasi-regulatory portions of the Arizona SIP.

DATES: *Effective Date:* This rule is effective on November 23, 2016.

ADDRESSES: SIP materials which are incorporated by reference into 40 CFR part 52 are available for inspection at the following locations:

Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901; and

National Archives and Records Administration.

For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to: *http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kevin Gong, EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3073, *gong.kevin@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, wherever ''we'', ''us'' or ''our'' are used, we mean the EPA. Information is organized as follows:

Table of Contents

I. Background

A. What a SIP Is

Each State has a SIP containing the control measures and strategies used to attain and maintain the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The SIP is extensive, containing such elements as air pollution control regulations, emission inventories, monitoring network, attainment demonstrations, and enforcement mechanisms.

B. How the EPA Enforces SIPs

Each state must formally adopt the control measures and strategies in the SIP after the public has had an opportunity to comment on them. They are then submitted to the EPA as SIP revisions upon which the EPA must formally act. Once these control measures and strategies are approved by the EPA, after notice and comment, they are incorporated into the Federally approved SIP and are identified in part 52 (Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans), title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR part 52). The actual state regulations approved by the EPA are not reproduced in their entirety in 40 CFR part 52, but are ''incorporated by reference'' (IBR'd) which means that the EPA has approved a given state regulation with a specific effective date. This format allows both the EPA and the public to know which measures are contained in a given SIP and ensures that the state is enforcing the regulations. It also allows the EPA and the public to take enforcement action, should a state not enforce its SIP-approved regulations.

C. How the State and the EPA Update the SIP

The SIP is a living document that the state can revise as necessary to address the unique air pollution problems in the state. Therefore, the EPA must, from time to time, take action on SIP revisions containing new and/or revised regulations in order to make them part of the SIP. On May 22, 1997 (62 FR 27968), the EPA revised the procedures for IBR'ing Federally-approved SIPs, as a result of consultations between the EPA and the Office of the Federal Register (OFR).

The EPA began the process of developing: (1) A revised SIP document for each state that would be IBR'd under the provisions of title 1 CFR part 51; (2) a revised mechanism for announcing the EPA's approval of revisions to an applicable SIP and updating both the IBR document and the CFR; and (3) a revised format of the ''Identification of Plan'' sections for each applicable subpart to reflect these revised IBR procedures. The description of the revised SIP document, IBR procedures, and ''Identification of Plan'' format are discussed in further detail in the May 22, 1997, **Federal Register** document.

D. How the EPA Compiles the SIPs

The Federally-approved regulations, source-specific requirements, and nonregulatory provisions (entirely or portions of) submitted by each state agency have been compiled by the EPA into a ''SIP compilation.'' The SIP compilation contains the updated regulations, source-specific requirements, and nonregulatory provisions approved by the EPA through previous rulemaking actions in the **Federal Register**.

E. How the EPA Organizes the SIP Compilation

Each compilation contains three parts. Part one contains the regulations, part two contains the source-specific requirements that have been approved as part of the SIP, and part three contains nonregulatory provisions that have been EPA-approved. Each part consists of a table of identifying information for each SIP-approved regulation, each SIP-approved source-specific requirement, and each nonregulatory SIP provision. In this action, the EPA is publishing the tables summarizing the applicable SIP requirements for Arizona. The EPA Regional Offices have the primary responsibility for updating the compilations and ensuring their accuracy.

F. Where You Can Find a Copy of the SIP Compilation

EPA Region IX developed and will maintain the compilation for Arizona. A copy of the full text of Arizona's regulatory and source-specific SIP compilation will also be maintained at NARA.

G. The Format of the New Identification of Plan Section

In order to better serve the public, the EPA revised the organization of the ''Identification of Plan'' section and included additional information to clarify the enforceable elements of the SIP. The revised Identification of Plan section contains five subsections:

1. Purpose and scope.
2. Incorporation by reference.
3. EPA-approved regulations.
4. EPA-approved source-specific requirements.
5. EPA-approved nonregulatory and quasi-regulatory provisions such as air quality attainment plans, rate of progress plans, maintenance plans, monitoring networks, and small business assistance programs.

H. When a SIP Revision Becomes Federally Enforceable

All revisions to the applicable SIP become Federally enforceable as of the effective date of the revisions to paragraphs (c), (d), or (e) of the applicable Identification of Plan section found in each subpart of 40 CFR part 52.

I. The Historical Record of SIP Revision Approvals

To facilitate enforcement of previously approved SIP provisions and provide a smooth transition to the new SIP processing system, the EPA retains the original Identification of Plan section, previously appearing in the CFR as the first or second section of part 52 for each state subpart. After an initial two-year period, the EPA will review its experience with the new system and enforceability of previously-approved SIP measures and will decide whether or not to retain the Identification of Plan appendices for some further period.

II. What the EPA Is Doing in This Action

Today's rule constitutes a ''housekeeping'' exercise to ensure that all revisions to the state programs that have occurred are accurately reflected in 40 CFR part 52. State SIP revisions are controlled by the EPA's regulations at 40 CFR part 51. When the EPA receives a formal SIP revision request, the Agency must publish the proposed revision in the **Federal Register** and provide for public comment before approval.

The EPA has determined that today's rule falls under the ''good cause'' exemption in section 553(b)(3)(B) of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) which, upon finding ''good cause,'' authorizes agencies to dispense with public participation and section 553(d)(3) which allows an agency to make a rule effective immediately (thereby avoiding the 30-day delayed effective date otherwise provided for in the APA). Today's rule simply codifies provisions which are already in effect as a matter of law in Federal and approved state programs. Under section 553 of the APA, an agency may find good cause where procedures are ''impractical, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.'' Public comment is ''unnecessary'' and ''contrary to the public interest'' since the codification only reflects existing law. Immediate notice in the CFR benefits the public by removing outdated citations.

III. Incorporation by Reference

In this rule, the EPA is finalizing regulatory text that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, the EPA is reformatting the materials incorporated by reference in previous rulemakings on submittal of the Arizona SIP and SIP revisions. The EPA has made, and will continue to make, these documents generally available at the appropriate EPA office (see the **ADDRESSES** section of this preamble for more information).

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

A. General Requirements

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a ''significant regulatory action'' and is therefore not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, ''Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use'' (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001) because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866. Because the agency has made a ''good cause'' finding that this action is not subject to notice-and-comment requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute as indicated in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section above, it is not subject to the regulatory flexibility provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), or to sections 202 and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Public Law 104–4). In addition, this action does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments or impose a significant intergovernmental mandate, as described in sections 203 and 204 of UMRA. This rule also does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), nor will it have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant. This rule does not involve technical standards; thus the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. The rule also does not involve special consideration of environmental justice related issues as required by Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994). In issuing this rule, the EPA has taken the necessary steps to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize potential litigation, and provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct, as required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996). The EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (63 FR 8859, March 15, 1998) by examining the takings implications of the rule in accordance with the ''Attorney General's Supplemental Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings'' issued under the executive order. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*). The EPA's compliance with these statutes and Executive Orders for the underlying rules are discussed in previous actions taken on the State's rules.

B. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

The Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. Section 808 allows the issuing agency to make a rule effective sooner than otherwise provided by the CRA if the agency makes a good cause finding that notice and public procedure is impracticable, unnecessary or contrary to the public interest. Today's action simply codifies provisions which are already in effect as a matter of law in Federal and approved

State programs. 5 U.S.C. 802(2). As stated previously, the EPA has made such a good cause finding, including the reasons therefore, and established an effective of November 23, 2016. The EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. The change in format to the ''Identification of plan'' section for the State of Arizona are not a 'major rule' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

C. Petitions for Judicial Review

The EPA has also determined that the provisions of section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act pertaining to petitions for judicial review are not applicable to this action. Prior EPA rulemaking actions for each individual component of the Arizona SIP compilations had previously afforded interested parties the opportunity to file a petition for judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days of such rulemaking action. Thus, the EPA sees no need in this action to reopen the 60-day period for filing such petitions for judicial review for these ''Identification of plan'' reorganization actions for Arizona.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur dioxide, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: June 15, 2016.

Alexis Strauss,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

Note: This document was received by the Office of the Federal Register on November 14, 2016.

Part 52, chapter I, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations are amended as follows:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart D—Arizona

■ 2. Section 52.120 is redesignated as § 52.152 and the section heading and paragraph (a) are revised to read as follows:

§ 52.152 Original identification of plan.

(a) This section identified the original ''The State of Arizona Air Pollution Control Implementation Plan'' and all revisions submitted by the State of Arizona that were federally approved prior to June 30, 2016.

■ 3. A new § 52.120 is added to read as follows:

§ 52.120 Identification of plan.

(a) *Purpose and scope.* This section sets forth the applicable State implementation plan for the State of Arizona under section 110 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q and 40 CFR part 51 to meet national ambient air quality standards.

(b) *Incorporation by reference.*

(1) Material listed in in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section with an EPA approval date prior to June 30, 2016, was approved for incorporation by reference by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Entries in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section with the EPA approval dates after June 30, 2016 have been approved by EPA for inclusion in the State implementation plan and for incorporation by reference into the plan as it is contained in this section, and will be considered by the Director of the Federal Register for approval in the next update to the SIP compilation.

(2) EPA Region IX certifies that the materials provided by EPA at the addresses in paragraph (b)(3) of this section are an exact duplicate of the officially promulgated state rules/regulations which have been approved as part of the state implementation plan as of the dates referenced in paragraph (b)(1).

(3) Copies of the materials incorporated by reference into the state implementation plan may be inspected at the Region IX EPA Office at 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105; or the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). To obtain the material, please call the Regional Office. You may also inspect the material with an EPA approval date prior to June 30, 2016 at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, go to: *http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html.*

(c) *EPA-approved regulations.*

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA STATUTES

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES [1] Title 9 (Cities and Towns) Chapter 4 (General Powers) Article 8 (Miscellaneous)				
9–500.03	Air quality control	May 22, 1987	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Approval only included subsection A, paragraphs 1 and 2, subsection B. Submitted on March 23, 1988. Senate Bill 1360, section 2.†
9–500.04, excluding paragraphs A.1, A.2, A.4, and A.10; paragraphs B through G; and paragraph I..	Air quality control; definitions	September 19, 2007	December 3, 2013, 78 FR 72579.	Arizona Revised Statutes (Thomson/West, 2008). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.
9–500.27, excluding paragraphs D and E. =.	Off-road vehicle ordinance; applicability; violation; classification.	September 19, 2007	March 31, 2014, 79 FR 17878	Arizona Revised Statutes (Thomson/West, 2008). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA STATUTES—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Title 11 (Counties) Chapter 6 (County Planning and Zoning) Article 6 (Air Quality)				
11–871, excluding paragraphs C through E..	Emissions control; no burn; exemptions; penalty.	September 19, 2007	March 31, 2014, 79 FR 17878	Arizona Revised Statutes (West, 2012). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.
11–877	Air quality control measures	September 19, 2007	December 3, 2013, 78 FR 72579.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West, 2012). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.
Title 28 (Transportation) Chapter 3 (Traffic and Vehicle Regulation) Article 18 (Vehicle Size, Weight and Load)				
28–1098, excluding paragraphs B and C.	Vehicle loads; restrictions; civil penalties.	September 19, 2007	March 31, 2014, 79 FR 17878	Arizona Revised Statutes (West, 2012). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.
Title 36 (Public Health and Safety) Chapter 14 (Air Pollution) Article 3 (Annual Emissions Inspection of Motor Vehicles)				
36–1776	Fleet Emissions Inspection Stations; Certificates of Inspection; Dealer's Inventory; Investigations; Revocation of Permit..	January 1, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382 ..	Submitted on August 5, 1981.
36–1777	Authority of Director to Acquire Enforcement Equipment; Random Vehicle Tests..	January 1, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382 ..	Submitted on August 5, 1981.
36–1778	Improper Representation.	January 1, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382 ..	Submitted on August 5, 1981.
36–1779	False Certificates	January 1, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382 ..	Submitted on August 5, 1981.
Title 41 (State Government) Chapter 15 (Department of Weights and Measures) Article 1 (General Provisions)				
41–2051 (6), (10), (11), (12), and (13).	Definitions—''Certification,'' ''Department,'' ''Diesel fuel,'' ''Director,'' and ''E85''.	September 26, 2008	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Laws 2008, Ch. 254, § 2. Submitted on September 21, 2009.
Article 3 (Method of Sale of Commodities and Services)				
41–2083	Standards for liquid fuels; exceptions.	July 18, 1996	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353; corrected March 18, 2004, 69 FR 12802.	Senate Bill 1002, section 26. In connection with approval of 1996 Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan for the Tucson Air Planning Area (as updated August 1997). Previous versions approved in connection with the Maricopa County Ozone Plan.
Article 5 (Regulation)				
41–2113(B)(4)	Violation; classification; jurisdiction.	August 21, 1998	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161.	Last amended Laws 1998, Ch. 146, § 16. Submitted on January 22, 2004.
41–2115	Civil Penalties	July 18, 2000	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161.	Last amended Laws 2000, Ch. 193, § 463. Submitted on January 22, 2004.
Article 6 (Motor Fuel)				
41–2121	Definitions	May 18, 1999	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353.	Submitted on September 1, 1999. House Bill 2189, section 9. The definition of ''gasoline'' was superseded at 77 FR 35279 (September 19, 2007)

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA STATUTES—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
41–2121(5)	Definitions [“Gasoline”]	September 19, 2007	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Laws 2007, Ch. 292, § 11. Submitted on September 21, 2009.
41–2122	Standards for oxygenated fuel; volatility exceptions.	July 18, 1996	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353; corrected March 18, 2004, 69 FR 12802.	Senate Bill 1002, section 27. In connection with approval of 1996 Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan for the Tucson Air Planning Area (as updated August 1997).
41–2123	Area A; sale of gasoline; oxygen content.	August 6, 1999	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Last amended Laws 1999, Ch. 295, § 11. Submitted on January 22, 2004.
41–2124	Area A; fuel formulation; rules	July 18, 2000	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Last amended Laws 2000, Ch. 405, § 21. Submitted on January 22, 2004.
41–2125	Area B; sale of gasoline; oxygen content.	July 18, 1996	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353; corrected March 18, 2004, 69 FR 12802.	Senate Bill 1002, section 28. In connection with approval of 1996 Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan for the Tucson Air Planning Area (as updated August 1997).
Article 7 (Gasoline Vapor Control)				
41–2131	Definitions	April 22, 2014	November 16, 2015, 80 FR 70689.	House Bill 2128, section 5, effective through September 29, 2018. Includes the text that appears in all capital letters and excludes the text that appears in strikethrough. Submitted on September 2, 2014.
41–2131	Definitions	April 22, 2014	November 16, 2015, 80 FR 70689.	House Bill 2128, section 6, effective from and after September 30, 2018. Includes the text that appears in all capital letters and excludes the text that appears in strikethrough. Submitted on September 2, 2014.
41–2132	Stage I vapor recovery systems.	April 22, 2014	November 16, 2015, 80 FR 70689.	House Bill 2128, section 7. Includes the text that appears in all capital letters and excludes the text that appears in strikethrough. Submitted on September 2, 2014.
41–2133	Compliance schedules	April 22, 2014	November 16, 2015, 80 FR 70689.	House Bill 2128, section 8. Includes the text that appears in all capital letters and excludes the text that appears in strikethrough. Submitted on September 2, 2014.
41–2135	Stage II vapor recovery systems.	April 22, 2014	November 16, 2015, 80 FR 70689.	House Bill 2128, section 10. Includes the text that appears in all capital letters and excludes the text that appears in strikethrough. Submitted on September 2, 2014. *ARS 41–2135 is repealed from and after September 30, 2018 pursuant to section 11 of House Bill 2128.*
Title 49 (The Environment) Chapter 1 (General Provisions)				
49–107	Local delegation of state authority.	July 1, 1987	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
Chapter 3 (Air Quality) Article 1 (General Provisions)				
49–401.01	Definitions	May 18, 1999	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353	Submitted on September 1, 1999. House Bill 2189, section 40.

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA STATUTES—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Article 2 (State Air Pollution Control)				
49–454	Adjusted work hours	May 18, 1999	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353	Submitted on September 1, 1999. House Bill 2189, section 43.
49–457	Agricultural best management practices committee; members; powers; permits; enforcement; preemption; definitions.	May 29, 1998	June 29, 1999, 64 FR 34726	Submitted on September 4, 1998.
49–457.01	Leaf blower use restrictions and training; leaf blowers equipment sellers; informational material; outreach; applicability.	September 19, 2007	December 3, 2013, 78 FR 72579.	Arizona Revised Statutes (Thomson/West, 2005 mail volume, 2012 cumulative pocket part). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.
49–457.03, excluding paragraphs C and D.	Off-road vehicles; pollution advisory days; applicability; penalties.	September 19, 2007	March 31, 2014, 79 FR 17878	Arizona Revised Statutes (West, 2012 Cumulative Pocket Part). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.
49–457.04	Off-highway vehicle and all-terrain vehicle dealers; informational material; outreach; applicability.	September 19, 2007	March 31, 2014, 79 FR 17878	Arizona Revised Statutes (West, 2012 Cumulative Pocket Part). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.
49–457.05, excluding paragraph C and paragraphs E, F, G, and H.	Dust action general permit; best management practices; applicability; definitions.	July 20, 2011	March 31, 2014, 79 FR 17879	Arizona Revised Statutes (West, 2012 Cumulative Pocket Part). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.
Article 3 (County Air Pollution Control)				
49–474.01	Additional board duties in nonattainment areas.	May 22, 1987	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on March 23, 1988. Senate Bill 1360, section 18.†
49–474.01, excluding paragraphs A.1 through A.3, A.9, A.10; paragraphs C through G, and paragraph I.	Additional board duties in vehicle emissions control areas; definitions.	September 19, 2007	December 3, 2013, 78 FR 72579.	Arizona Revised Statutes (Thomson/West, 2005 mail volume, 2012 cumulative pocket part). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.
49–474.05	Dust control; training; site coordinators.	September 19, 2007	December 3, 2013, 78 FR 72579.	Arizona Revised Statutes (Thomson/West, 2005 mail volume, 2012 cumulative pocket part). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.
49–474.06	Dust control; subcontractor registration; fee.	September 19, 2007	December 3, 2013, 78 FR 72579.	Arizona Revised Statutes (Thomson/West, 2005 mail volume, 2012 cumulative pocket part). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.
49–501, excluding paragraph A.1, paragraphs B.2 through B.6, and paragraphs D, E, G, and H.	Unlawful open burning; exceptions; civil penalty; definition.	September 19, 2007	March 31, 2014, 79 FR 17878	Arizona Revised Statutes (West, 2012 Cumulative Pocket Part). Submitted on May 25, 2012. ADEQ clarified and revised the May 25, 2012 submittal by letter dated September 26, 2013.

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA STATUTES—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
49–506	Voluntary No-drive Days	June 28, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on July 18, 1988. House Bill 2206, section 17.†
Article 5 (Annual Emissions Inspection of Motor Vehicles)				
49–541	Definitions	May 18, 1999	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353 and also January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912.	Submitted on September 1, 1999. House Bill 2189, 44th Legislature, 1st Regular Session (1999), section 44. Approved in rulemakings related to the Tucson carbon monoxide plan and Arizona VEI Program.
49–541, subsection (1)	Definitions [“Area A”]	August 9, 2001	May 22, 2013, 78 FR 30209	Submitted on May 25, 2012. Arizona Revised Statutes (West Group, 2001 Cumulative Pocket Part). Supported by an affidavit signed by Barbara Howe, Law Reference Librarian, Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records on May 3, 2012, certifying authenticity of reproduction of A.R.S. § 49–451 (*sic*)(corrected to § 49–541 (2001 pocket part).
49–541.01, paragraphs D and E.	Vehicle emissions inspection program; constant four wheel drive vehicles; requirements; location; violation; classification; penalties; new program termination.	May 18, 1999	March 9, 2005, 70 FR 11553	Submitted on April 18, 2001 as part of the Revised MAG 1999 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area, dated March 2001. Submitted as section 2 of H.B. 2254 (1999).
49–542	Emissions inspection program; powers and duties of director; administration; periodic inspection; minimum standards and rules; exceptions; definition.	June 21, 2013	May 22, 2013, 78 FR 30209	Submitted on November 6, 2009. Arizona Revised Statutes (Thomson West, 2008 Cumulative Pocket Part). Supported by an affidavit signed by Efrem K. Sepulveda, Law Librarian, Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records on January 11, 2013, certifying authenticity of reproduction of A.R.S. § 49–542 (2008 edition) plus title page to pocket part of Title 49 (2008 edition).
49–542.05	Alternative fuel vehicles	December 14, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001. Senate Bill 1004, 44th Legislature, 7th Special Session (2000), section 23. Related to VEI Program.
49–543	Emissions inspection costs; disposition; fleet inspection; certificates.	May 7, 2001	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on April 10, 2002. House Bill 2538, 45th Legislature, 1st Regular Session (2001), section 11. Related to VEI Program.
49–544	Emissions inspection fund; composition; authorized expenditures; exemptions; investment.	May 20, 1998	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001. Senate Bill 1007, 43rd Legislature, 4th Special Session (1998), section 15. Related to VEI Program.
49–545	Agreement with independent contractor; qualifications of contractor; agreement provisions.	April 28, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001. House Bill 2104, 44th Legislature, 2nd Regular session (2000), section 5. Related to VEI Program.
49–550	Violation; Classification; Civil Penalty.	June 28, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on July 18, 1988. House Bill 2206, section 19.†
49–551	Air quality fee; air quality fund; purpose.	May 29, 1998	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001. Senate Bill 1427, 43rd Legislature, 2nd Regular Session (1998), section 27. Related to VEI Program.

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA STATUTES—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
49–552	Enforcement on city, town, county, school district or special district property.	June 1, 1998	March 9, 2005, 70 FR 11553 ..	Submitted on April 18, 2001 as part of the Revised MAG 1999 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area, dated March 2001. Submitted as amended in section 28 of S.B. 1427 (1998).
49–553	Reports to the Legislature by Department of Environmental Quality.	June 28, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on July 18, 1988. House Bill 2206, section 21.†
49–557	Government vehicles; emissions inspections; noncompliance; vehicle operation privilege suspension.	January 1, 2002	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353	Submitted on September 1, 1999. House Bill 2254, section 5. Effective date set in section 8 of House Bill 2254.
Article 7 (Emissions Control)				
49–571	Clean burning alternative fuel requirements for new buses; definition.	May 18, 1999	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353	Submitted on September 1, 1999. House Bill 2189, section 46.
49–573	Emissions controls; federal vehicles; definition.	January 1, 2002	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353	Submitted on September 1, 1999. House Bill 2254, section 6. Effective date set in section 8 of House Bill 2254.
Article 8 (Travel Reduction Programs)				
49–581	Definitions	December 31, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on July 18, 1988. House Bill 2206, section 23. House Bill section 25 lowered the threshold defining ''major employer'' from 500 or more employers between December 31, 1988-September 30, 1989, to 200 or more from September 30, 1989-December 31, 1989, to 100 or more thereafter. Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.†
49–582	Travel Reduction Program Regional Task Force; Composition.	December 31, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on July 18, 1988. House Bill 2206, section 23. Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.†
49–583	Duties and Powers of the Task Force.	December 31, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on July 18, 1988. House Bill 2206, section 23. Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.†
49–584	Staff Duties	December 31, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on July 18, 1988. House Bill 2206, section 23. Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.†
49–585	Powers and Duties of the Board.	December 31, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on July 18, 1988. House Bill 2206, section 23. Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.†
49–586	Enforcement by Cities or Towns.	December 31, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on July 18, 1988. House Bill 2206, section 23. Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.†
49–588	Requirements for Major Employers.	December 31, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on July 18, 1988. House Bill 2206, section 23. Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.†
49–590	Requirements for High Schools	December 31, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on July 18, 1988. House Bill 2206, section 23.†
49–593	Violations; Civil Penalties	December 31, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on July 18, 1988. House Bill 2206, section 23. Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.†

[1] The statutory provisions listed in table 1 of paragraph (c) are considered regulatory. Other statutory provisions are considered nonregulatory and are listed in table 3 of paragraph (e).

† Vacated by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Delaney* v. EPA, 898 F.2d 687 (9th Cir. 1990). Restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA REGULATIONS

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
ARIZONA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE Title 9 (Health Services) Chapter 3 Article 1				
R9–3–101	Definitions [“Begin actual construction”].	May 28, 1982	May 3, 1983, 48 FR 19878	Included 36 defined terms. All but one (“Begin actual construction”) have been superseded by subsequent approvals of R18–2–101, R18–2–217, R18–2–218, R18–2–301, R18–2–401, and R18–2–701. Submitted on June 3, 1982.
7–1–1.1 (R9–3–101)	Policy and Legal Authority	August 20, 1973	July 31, 1978, 43 FR 33245	Submitted on August 20, 1973.
7–1–1.3 (R9–3–103, excluding paragraph E).	Air Pollution Prohibited	August 20, 1973	July 31, 1978, 43 FR 33245	Submitted on August 20, 1973. EPA disapproved Paragraph E—see 40 CFR 52.133(b).
7–1–1.5 (R9–3–105)	Enforcement	August 20, 1973	July 31, 1978, 43 FR 33245	Submitted on August 20, 1973.
Article 2				
R9–3–217, paragraph A	Attainment Areas; Classification and Standards.	May 14, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on January 4, 1979. Paragraph B was deleted at 80 FR 67319 (November 2, 2015).
Article 3				
R9–3–301, paragraphs I and K	Installation Permits: General	July 25, 1979	May 5, 1982, 47 FR 19326	Submitted on July 17, 1980. All of R9–3–301 (except for Paragraphs I (Requirement for preliminary determination) and K (Degree of increment consumption)) was deleted at 80 FR 67319 (November 2, 2015).
R9–3–304, paragraph H	Installation Permit Requirements for Sources located in Attainment and Unclassifiable Areas.	May 28, 1982	May 3, 1983, 48 FR 19878	Paragraph H is untitled but sets forth special rules applicable to Federal land managers regarding visibility impacts. Relates to State PSD regulations. Submitted on June 3, 1982. All of R9–3–304 (except for paragraph H was deleted at 80 FR 67319 (November 2, 2015).
Article 4				
7–1–4.5 (R9–3–405)	Sulfur Emissions: Other Industries.	August 20, 1973	July 31, 1978, 43 FR 33245	Submitted on August 20, 1973.
R9–3–409	Agricultural Practices	May 14, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on January 4, 1979.
Article 5				
R9–3–505, paragraphs B to B.1, B.2, B.3 and B.4.	Standards of Performance for Existing Portland Cement Plants.	May 28, 1982	September 28, 1982, 47 FR 42572.	Submitted on June 3, 1982.
R9–3–505, paragraphs B.1.a and B.2.a.	Standards of Performance for Existing Portland Cement Plants.	July 25, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on July 17, 1980.
R9–3–505, paragraphs A, B.1.b, B.2.b, and B.3 to D.	Standards of Performance for Existing Portland Cement Plants.	May 14, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on January 4, 1979.
R9–3–508, paragraphs B to B.1, B.2, and B.5.	Standards of Performance for Existing Asphalt Concrete Plants.	May 28, 1982	September 28, 1982, 47 FR 42572.	Submitted on June 3, 1982.
R9–3–508, paragraphs B.1 to B.6.	Standards of Performance for Existing Asphalt Concrete Plants.	July 25, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on April 1, 1980.
R9–3–508, paragraphs A and C.	Standards of Performance for Existing Asphalt Concrete Plants.	May 14, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on January 4, 1979.
R9–3–516, paragraphs A to A.1 and A.2.	Standards of Performance for Existing Coal Preparation Plants.	May 28, 1982	September 28, 1982, 47 FR 42572.	Submitted on June 3, 1982.
R9–3–516, paragraphs A.1 to A.6.	Standards of Performance for Existing Coal Preparation Plants.	July 25, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on April 1, 1980.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA REGULATIONS—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
R9–3–516, paragraph B	Standards of Performance for Existing Coal Preparation Plants.	May 14, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on January 4, 1979.
R9–3–521, paragraphs A to A.1 and A.2.	Standards of Performance for Existing Nonferrous Metals Industry Sources.	May 28, 1982	September 28, 1982, 47 FR 42572.	Submitted on June 3, 1982.
R9–3–521, paragraphs A.1 to A.5.	Standards of Performance for Existing Nonferrous Metals Industry Sources.	July 25, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on April 1, 1980.
R9–3–521, paragraphs B to D	Standards of Performance for Existing Nonferrous Metals Industry Sources.	May 14, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on January 4, 1979.
R9–3–522, paragraphs A to A.1 and A.2.	Standards of Performance for Existing Gravel or Crushed Stone Processing Plants.	May 28, 1982	September 28, 1982, 47 FR 42572.	Submitted on June 3, 1982.
R9–3–522, paragraphs A.1 to A.5, B, and C.	Standards of Performance for Existing Gravel or Crushed Stone Processing Plants.	May 14, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on January 4, 1979.
Title 18 (Environmental Quality) Chapter 2 (Department of Environmental Quality Air Pollution Control) Article 1 (General)				
R18–2–101, definitions (2), (32), (87), (109), and (122).	Definitions	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Includes definitions for ''Actual emissions,'' ''Construction,'' ''Net emissions increase,'' ''Potential to emit,'' and ''Regulated NSR pollutant.'' Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–101 excluding definitions (2), (20), (32), (87), (109), and (122).	Definitions	August 7, 2012	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Includes 147 of the 153 total number of defined terms. Does not include ''Actual emissions,'' ''Begin actual construction,'' ''Construction,'' ''Net emissions increase,'' ''Potential to emit,'' and ''Regulated NSR pollutant.'' Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–102	Incorporated materials	August 7, 2012	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
Article 2 (Ambient Air Quality Standards; Area Designations; Classifications)				
R18–2–201	Particulate Matter: PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$.	August 7, 2012	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–202	Sulfur Oxides (Sulfur Dioxide)	August 7, 2012	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–203	Ozone: One-hour Standard and Eight-hour Averaged Standard.	August 7, 2012	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–204	Carbon monoxide	September 26, 1990	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–205	Nitrogen Oxides (Nitrogen Dioxide).	August 7, 2012	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA REGULATIONS—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
R18–2–206	Lead	August 7, 2012	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–210	Attainment, Nonattainment, and Unclassifiable Area Designations.	August 7, 2012	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on October 29, 2012 and supplemented on September 6, 2013. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–215	Ambient air quality monitoring methods and procedures.	September 26, 1990	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–216	Interpretation of Ambient Air Quality Standards and Evaluation of Air Quality Data.	March 7, 2009	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–217	Designation and Classification of Attainment Areas.	November 15, 1993	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–218	Limitation of Pollutants in Classified Attainment Areas.	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–220	Air pollution emergency episodes, Department of Environmental Quality-Air Pollution Control.	September 26, 1990	October 15, 2012, 77 FR 62452.	Submitted on August 15, 1994.
Article 3 (Permits and Permit Revisions)				
R18–2–301	Definitions	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–302	Applicability; Registration; Classes of Permits.	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–302.01	Source Registration Requirements.	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–303	Transition from Installation and Operating Permit Program to Unitary Permit Program; Registration Transition; Minor NSR Transition.	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–304	Permit Application Processing Procedures.	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–306	Permit Contents	December 20, 1999	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–306.01	Permits Containing Voluntarily Accepted Emission Limitations and Standards.	January 1, 2007	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–306.02	Establishment of an Emissions Cap.	September 22, 1999	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–310	Affirmative Defenses for Excess Emissions Due to Malfunctions, Startup, and Shutdown.	February 15, 2001	September 18, 2001, 66 FR 48087.	Submitted on March 26, 2001.
R18–2–310.01	Reporting Requirements	February 15, 2001	September 18, 2001, 66 FR 48087.	Submitted on March 26, 2001.
R18–2–311	Test Methods and Procedures	November 15, 1993	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on July 28, 2011.
R18–2–312	Performance Tests	November 15, 1993	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on July 28, 2011.
R18–2–313	Existing Source Emission Monitoring.	February 15, 2001	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66405.	Submitted on August 24, 2012.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA REGULATIONS—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
R18–2–315	Posting of Permit	November 15, 1993	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–316	Notice by Building Permit Agencies.	May 14, 1979	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–319	Minor Permit Revisions	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–320	Significant Permit Revisions	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–321	Permit Reopenings; Revocation and Reissuance; Termination.	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–323	Permit Transfers	February 3, 2007	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–327	Annual Emissions inventory Questionnaire.	December 7, 1995	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66405.	Submitted on August 24, 2012.
R18–2–330	Public Participation	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–332	Stack Height Limitation	November 15, 1993	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–334	Minor New Source Review	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
Article 4 (Permit Requirements for New Major Sources and Major Modifications to Existing Major Sources)				
R18–2–401	Definitions	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–402	General	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–403	Permits for Sources Located in Nonattainment Areas.	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–404	Offset Standards	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–405	Special Rule for Major Sources of VOC or Nitrogen Oxides in Ozone Nonattainment Areas Classified as Serious or Severe.	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–406	Permit Requirements for Sources Located in Attainment and Unclassifiable Areas.	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–407, excluding subsection (H)(1)(c).	Air Quality Impact Analysis and Monitoring Requirements.	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–409	Air Quality Models	November 15, 1993	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.
R18–2–412	PALs	August 7, 2012	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA REGULATIONS—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Article 6 (Emissions from Existing and New Nonpoint Sources)				
R18–2–601	General	November 15, 1993	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 15, 1998, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–602	Unlawful Open Burning	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
R18–2–604	Open Areas, Dry Washes or Riverbeds.	November 15, 1993	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 15, 1998, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–605	Roadways and Streets	November 15, 1993	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 15, 1998, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–606	Material Handling	November 15, 1993	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 15, 1998, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–607	Storage Piles	November 15, 1993	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 15, 1998, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–608	Mineral Tailings	March 7, 2009	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 09–1, March 31, 2009.
R18–2–610	[Definitions for R18–2–611]	May 12, 2000	October 11, 2001, 66 FR 51869.	Submitted on July 11, 2000.
R18–2–611	Agricultural PM_{10} General Permit; Maricopa PM_{10} Nonattainment Area.	May 12, 2000	October 11, 2001, 66 FR 51869.	Submitted on July 11, 2000.
R18–2–614	Evaluation of nonpoint source emissions.	August 7, 2012	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 15, 1998, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
Article 7 (Existing Stationary Source Performance Standards)				
R18–2–701	Definitions	August 7, 2012	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–702	General Provisions	February 3, 2004	August 24, 2004, 69 FR 51952	Establishes opacity standards. Submitted on January 16, 2004.
R18–2–703	Standards of Performance for Existing Fossil-Fuel Fired Steam Generators and General Fuel Burning Equipment.	March 7, 2009	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 09–1, March 31, 2009.
R18–2–704	Standards of Performance for Incineration.	August 4, 2007	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 09–1, March 31, 2009.
R18–2–706	Standards of Performance for Existing Nitric Acid Plants.	November 15, 1993	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 15, 1998, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–707	Standards of Performance for Existing Sulfuric Acid Plants.	November 15, 1993	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 15, 1998, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–710	Standards of Performance for Existing Vessels for Petroleum Liquids.	November 15, 1993	March 24, 2003, 68 FR 14151	Submitted on July 15, 1998.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA REGULATIONS—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
R18–2–714	Standards of Performance for Existing Sewage Treatment Plants.	November 15, 1993	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 15, 1998, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–715, sections F, G, and H.	Standards of Performance for Existing Primary Copper Smelters: Site-Specific Requirements.	March 7, 2009	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 09–1, March 31, 2009.
R18–2–715.01	Standards of Performance for Existing Primary Copper Smelters, Compliance and Monitoring.	July 18, 2002	November 1, 2004, 69 FR 63321.	Submitted on September 12, 2003.
R18–2–715.02	Standards of Performance for Existing Primary Copper Smelters, Fugitive Emissions.	November 15, 1993	November 1, 2004, 69 FR 63321.	Submitted on July 15, 1998.
R18–2–719	Standards of Performance for Existing Stationary Rotating Machinery.	March 7, 2009	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–720	Standards of Performance for Existing Lime Manufacturing Plants.	March 7, 2009	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 09–1, March 31, 2009.
R18–2–723	Standards of Performance for Existing Concrete Batch Plants.	November 15, 1993	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 15, 1998, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–724	Standards of Performance for Existing Fossil-Fuel Fired Industrial and Commercial Equipment.	March 7, 2009	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 09–1, March 31, 2009.
R18–2–725	Standards of Performance for Existing Dry Cleaning Plants.	November 15, 1993	March 24, 2003, 68 FR 14151	Submitted on July 15, 1998.
R18–2–726	Sandblasting Operations	November 15, 1993	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 15, 1998, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–727	Standards of Performance for Spray Painting Operations.	November 15, 1993	March 24, 2003, 68 FR 14151	Submitted on July 15, 1998.
R18–2–728	Standards of Performance for Existing Ammonium Sulfide Manufacturing Plants.	November 15, 1993	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 15, 1998, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
R18–2–729	Standards of Performance for Cotton Gins.	August 4, 2007	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 09–1, March 31, 2009.
R18–2–730	Standards of Performance for Unclassified Sources.	March 7, 2009	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 09–1, March 31, 2009.
R18–2–732	Standards of Performance for Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators.	August 4, 2007	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 09–2, June 30, 2009.
Article 8 (Emissions from Mobile Sources (New and Existing))				
R18–2–801	Classification of Mobile Sources.	November 15, 1993	March 24, 2003, 68 FR 14151	Submitted on July 15, 1998.
R18–2–802	Off-Road Machinery	November 15, 1993	March 24, 2003, 68 FR 14151	Submitted on July 15, 1998.
R18–2–803	Heater-Planer Units	November 15, 1993	March 24, 2003, 68 FR 14151	Submitted on July 15, 1998.
R18–2–804	Roadway and Site Cleaning Machinery.	November 15, 1993	March 24, 2003, 68 FR 14151	Submitted on July 15, 1998.
R18–2–805	Asphalt and Tar Kettles	November 15, 1993	March 24, 2003, 68 FR 14151	Submitted on July 15, 1998.
Article 10 (Motor Vehicles; Inspections and Maintenance)				
R18–2–1001	Definitions	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA REGULATIONS—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
R18–2–1003	Vehicles to be Inspected by the Mandatory Vehicle Emissions Inspection Program.	June 28, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1005	Time of Inspection	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1006	Emissions Test Procedures	January 1, 2002	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on April 10, 2002.
R18–2–1007	Evidence of Meeting State Inspection Requirements.	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1008	Procedure for Issuing Certificates of Waiver.	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1009	Tampering Repair Requirements.	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1010	Low Emissions Tune-up, Emissions and Evaporative System Repair.	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1011	Vehicle Inspection Report	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1012	Inspection Procedures and Fee	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1013	Reinspections	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1016	Licensing of Inspectors	January 14, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1017	Inspection of Government Vehicles.	January 14, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1018	Certificate of Inspection	January 14, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1019	Fleet Station Procedures and Permits.	January 1, 2002	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on April 10, 2002.
R18–2–1022	Procedure for Waiving Inspections Due to Technical Difficulties.	January 14, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1023	Certificate of Exemption for Out-of-State Vehicles.	January 14, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1025	Inspection of Contractor's Equipment and Personnel.	January 14, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1026	Inspection of Fleet Stations	January 14, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1027	Registration and Inspection of Emission Analyzers and Opacity Meters.	January 14, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1028	Certification of Users of Registered Analyzers and Analyzer Repair Persons.	January 14, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1029	Vehicle Emission Control Devices.	January 14, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1030	Visible Emissions; Mobile Sources.	January 14, 2000	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
R18–2–1031	Standards for Evaluating the Oxidation Efficiency of a Catalytic Converter.	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Submitted on July 6, 2001.
Table 1	Dynamometer Loading Table—Annual Tests.	November 14, 1994	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Table 1 is cited in R18–2–1006. Submitted on July 6, 2001.
Table 2	Emissions Standards—Annual Tests, Maximum Allowable.	June 21, 1995	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Table 2 is cited in R18–2–1006 and R18–2–1019. Submitted on July 6, 2001.
Table 3	Emissions Standards—Biennial Tests.	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Table 3 is cited in R18–2–1006. Submitted on July 6, 2001.
Table 4	Transient Driving Cycle	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Table 4 is cited in R18–2–1006 and R18–2–1016. Submitted on July 6, 2001.
Table 5	Tolerances	November 14, 1994	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Table 5 is cited in R18–2–1006. Submitted on July 6, 2001.
Table 6	Emissions Standards—Remote Sensing Identification.	December 20, 1999	January 22, 2003, 68 FR 2912	Table 6 is cited in the VEI regulations. Submitted on July 6, 2001.
Article 14 (Conformity Determinations)				
R18–2–1438	General Conformity for Federal Actions.	January 31, 1995	April 23, 1999, 64 FR 19916	Submitted on March 3, 1995.
Article 15 (Forest and Range Management Burns)				
R18–2–1501	Definitions	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
R18–2–1502	Applicability	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
R18–2–1503	Annual Registration	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
R18–2–1504	Prescribed Burn Plan	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
R18–2–1505	Prescribed Burn Requests and Authorization.	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
R18–2–1506	Smoke Dispersion and Evaluation.	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA REGULATIONS—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
R18–2–1507	Prescribed Burn Accomplishment; Wildlife Reporting.	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
R18–2–1508	Wildland Fire Use: Plan, Authorization, Monitoring; Inter-Agency Consultation; Status Reporting.	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
R18–2–1509	Emission Reduction Techniques.	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
R18–2–1510	Smoke Management Techniques.	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
R18–2–1511	Monitoring	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
R18–2–1512	Burner Qualifications	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
R18–2–1513	Public Notification Program; Regional Coordination.	March 16, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.
Appendices to Title 18 (Environmental Quality), Chapter 2 (Department of Environmental Quality Air Pollution Control)				
Appendix 1	Filing Instructions for Installation Permit Application.	July 25, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on April 1, 1980. Appendix 1 in its entirety was approved at 47 FR 17483 (April 23, 1982). Certain subsections of appendix 1 were superseded by approval of revisions at 48 FR 19878 (May 3, 1983) and at 49 FR 41026 (October 19, 1984. The latter rule was corrected 69 FR 2509 (January 16, 2004).
Appendix 1, subsections A1.4, A1.4.1, A1.4.3 (added), A1.4.3 (renumbered only), A1.5, A1.6.1 (deleted), A1.6.2 and A1.6.3 (renumbered only), A1.6.4 and A1.6.5 (deleted), A1.6.6 (renumbered only), A1.6.6.1, A1.6.6.2 and A1.6.6.3 (renumbered only), A1.6.6.4 (deleted), A1.6.6.5 (renumbered only) A1.6.6.6, A1.6.6.7 (Renumbered), A1.6.7.1, A1.6.7.2, A1.6.7.3 and Form ADHS/EHS Air Quality 100A (rev 12–80).	Filing Instructions for Installation Permit Application.	May 28, 1982	May 3, 1983, 48 FR 19878	Relates to State PSD regulations. Submitted on June 3, 1982.
Appendix 1, subsections A1.5.6, and A1.9 (added).	Filing Instructions for Installation Permit Application.	September 22, 1983	October 19, 1984, 49 FR 41026; corrected on January 16, 2004, 69 FR 2509.	Submitted on February 3, 1984.
Appendix 2	Test Methods and Protocols	October 3, 2005	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. AAC, title 18, chapter 2, supp. 12–2, June 30, 2012.
Appendix 2	Filing Instructions for Operating Permit Application.	July 25, 1979	April 23, 1982, 47 FR 17483	Submitted on April 1, 1980. Appendix 2 in its entirety was approved at 47 FR 17483 (April 23, 1982). Certain subsections of appendix 2 were superseded by approval of revisions at 48 FR 19878 (May 3, 1983).
Appendix 2, subsections A2.2.5, A2.3, A2.3.8.	Filing Instructions for Operating Permit Application.	May 28, 1982	May 3, 1983, 48 FR 19878	Relates to State PSD regulations. Submitted on June 3, 1982.
Appendix 8	Procedures for Utilizing the Sulfur Balance Method for Determining Sulfur Emissions.	July 18, 2005	April 12, 2006, 71 FR 18624	Cited in Arizona Administrative Code rule R18–2–715.01. Submitted on March 1, 2006.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA REGULATIONS—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Materials Incorporated By Reference in Title 18 (Environmental Quality) Chapter 2 (Department of Environmental Quality Air Pollution Control)				
[Incorporated by reference through R18–2–102].	Arizona Testing Manual for Air Pollutant Emissions, Revision F, excluding sections 2 through 7.	March 1992	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	Approval includes section 1 only. Submitted on July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014. Relates to various provisions in Arizona Administrative Code, title 18, chapter 2, articles 4, 6, and 7.
[Incorporated by reference through R18–2–220].	Procedures for Prevention of Emergency Episodes.	1988 Edition	October 15, 2012, 77 FR 62452.	Submitted on August 15, 1994.
Title 20 (Commerce, Financial Institutions, and Insurance) Chapter 2 (Department of Weights and Measures) Article 1 (Administration and Procedures)				
R20–2–101	Definitions	June 5, 2004	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Submitted on September 21, 2009.
Article 7 (Motor Fuels and Petroleum Products)				
R20–2–701	Definitions	February 9, 2001	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–716	Sampling and Access to Records.	October 18, 1999	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–750	Registration Relating to Arizona CBG or AZR–BOB.	September 22, 1999	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–751	Arizona CBG Requirements	February 9, 2001	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–752	General Requirements for Registered Suppliers.	September 22, 1999	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–753	General Requirements for Pipelines and 3rd-party Terminals.	September 22, 1999	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–754	Downstream Blending Exceptions for Transmix.	September 22, 1999	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–755	Additional Requirements for AZRBOB and Downstream Oxygenate Blending.	September 22, 1999	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–756	Downstream Blending of Arizona CBG with Non-oxygenate Blendstocks.	September 22, 1999	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–757	Product Transfer Documentation; Records; Retention.	September 22, 1999	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–758	Adoption of Fuel Certification Models.	September 22, 1999	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–759	Testing Methodologies	February 9, 2001	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–760	Compliance Surveys	February 9, 2001	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161.	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
R20–2–761	Liability for Noncompliant Arizona CBG or AZRBOB.	September 22, 1999	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA REGULATIONS—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
R20–2–762	Penalties	September 22, 1999	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
Table 1	Type 1 Gasoline Standards	February 9, 2001	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Table 1 is cited in R20–2–751 (''Arizona CBG Requirements''). Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
Table 2	Type 2 Gasoline Standards	February 9, 2001	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161 ..	Table 2 is cited in R20–2–751 (''Arizona CBG Requirements''). Submitted on August 15, 2001. Relates to the Arizona Cleaner Burning Gasoline (CBG) program.
Article 9 (Gasoline Vapor Control)				
R20–2–901	Material Incorporated by Reference.	June 5, 2004	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Submitted on September 21, 2009.
R20–2–902	Exemptions	June 5, 2004	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Submitted on September 21, 2009.
R20–2–903	Equipment and Installation	June 5, 2004	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Submitted on September 21, 2009.
R20–2–904	Application Requirements and Process for Authority to Construct Plan Approval.	June 5, 2004	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Submitted on September 21, 2009.
R20–2–905	Initial Inspection and Testing	June 5, 2004	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Submitted on September 21, 2009.
R20–2–907	Operation	October 8, 1998	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Submitted on September 21, 2009.
R20–2–908	Training and Public Education	October 8, 1998	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Submitted on September 21, 2009.
R20–2–909	Recordkeeping and Reporting	October 8, 1998	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Submitted on September 21, 2009.
R20–2–910	Annual Inspection and Testing	June 5, 2004	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Submitted on September 21, 2009.
R20–2–911	Compliance Inspections	June 5, 2004	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Submitted on September 21, 2009.
R20–2–912	Enforcement	June 5, 2004	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35279 ..	Submitted on September 21, 2009.

TABLE 3—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA GENERAL PERMITS

Title	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Dust Action General Permit, including the general permit itself, and attachments A, B, and C.	December 30, 2011	March 31, 2014, 79 FR 17881	Issued by Arizona Department of Environmental Quality pursuant to ARS 49–457.05. Applies to certain types of dust sources in a county with a population of two million or more persons or any portion of a county within an area designated by EPA as a serious PM–10 nonattainment area or a maintenance area that was designated as a serious PM–10 nonattainment area. Submitted on May 25, 2012.

TABLE 4—EPA-APPROVED MARICOPA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Pre-July 1988 Rule Codification				
Regulation I—General Provisions				
Rule 1	Emissions Regulated; Policy; Legal Authority.	August 12, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080.	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Rule 2, No. 11 ''Alteration or Modification'' and No. 33 ''Existing Source''.	Definitions	June 23, 1980	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	Submitted on March 8, 1982.

TABLE 4—EPA-APPROVED MARICOPA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Rule 2, except Nos. 18, 49, 50, 52, 54 and 57.	Definitions	June 23, 1980	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Submitted on June 23, 1980.
Rule 3	Air pollution prohibited	June 23, 1980	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Submitted on June 23, 1980.
	Regulation II—Permits			
Rule 21.0 (paragraphs A–C; subparagraphs D.l.a–d; and paragraph E only).	Procedures for obtaining an installation permit.	October 25, 1982	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on March 4, 1983.†
Rule 21.0 (subparagraph D.1, and subparagraphs D.1.e, f, and g only).	Procedures for obtaining an installation permit.	July 9, 1984	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on March 4, 1983. Submitted on April 17, 1985.†
Rule 21 (paragraph G)	Permit Conditions	October 2, 1978	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Relates to public comment period.
Rule 22 (paragraphs A, C, D, F, G, and H).	Permit Denial-Action-Transfer-Expiration-Posting-Revocation-Compliance.	August 12, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080.	Paragraphs B and E have been superseded.
Rule 23	Permit Classes	August 12, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080.	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Rule 25	Emissions test methods and procedures.	June 23, 1980	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Submitted on June 23, 1980.
Rule 26	Portable Equipment	August 12, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080.	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Rule 26	Air quality models	June 23, 1980	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Submitted on June 23, 1980.
Rule 27	Performance tests	June 23, 1980	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Submitted on June 23, 1980.
Rule 28	Permit Fees	March 8, 1982	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	Submitted on March 8, 1982.
	Regulation III—Control of Air Contaminants			
Rule 32, Paragraph G	Other Industries	October 1, 1975	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Paragraph G of Rule 32 (“Odors and Gaseous Emissions”) is titled “Other Industries.” Submitted on June 23, 1980.
Rule 32, Paragraph H	Fuel Burning Equipment for Producing Electric Power (Sulfur Dioxide).	October 1, 1975	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Paragraph H of Rule 32 (“Odors and Gaseous Emissions”) is titled “Fuel Burning Equipment for Producing Electric Power (Sulfur Dioxide).” Submitted on June 23, 1980.
Rule 32, Paragraph J	Operating Requirements for an Asphalt Kettle.	June 23, 1980	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Paragraph J of Rule 32 (“Odors and Gaseous Emissions”) is titled “Operating Requirements for an Asphalt Kettle.” Submitted on June 23, 1980.
Rule 32, Paragraph K	Emissions of Carbon Monoxide.	June 23, 1980	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Paragraph K of Rule 32 (“Odors and Gaseous Emissions”) is titled “Emissions of Carbon Monoxide.” Submitted on June 23, 1980.
Rule 32 (Paragraphs A through F only).	Odors and Gaseous Emissions.	August 12, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080.	Paragraph G was superseded by approval of paragraph J of amended Rule 32. Submitted on May 26, 1972.

TABLE 4—EPA-APPROVED MARICOPA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Rule 35	Incinerators	August 12, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080.	Superseded by approval of Maricopa Rule 313 at 79 FR 57445 (September 25, 2014) except for Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators. Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Regulation IV—Production of Records; Monitoring; Testing and Sampling Facilities				
Rule 40	Recordkeeping and Reporting.	June 23, 1980	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Submitted on June 23, 1980.
Rule 41, paragraph A	Monitoring	August 12, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080.	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Rule 41, paragraph B	Monitoring	October 2, 1978	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Submitted on January 18, 1979.
Rule 42	Testing and Sampling	August 12, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080.	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Rule 43	Right of inspection	August 12, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080.	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Regulation VII—Emergency Procedures				
Rule 71	Anti-degradation	October 1, 1975	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Submitted on June 23, 1980.
Rule 74, paragraph C	Public Notification	June 23, 1980	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579.	Submitted on June 23, 1980. Paragraphs A, B, and D superseded by approval of Rule 510 at 74 FR 57612 (November 9, 2009).
Regulation VIII—Validity and Operation				
Rule 80	Validity	August 12, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080.	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Rule 81	Operation	August 12, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080.	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Post-July 1988 Rule Codification				
Regulation I—General Provisions				
Rule 100, Section 100, Subsection 108.	Hearing Board	September 25, 2013	August 10, 2015, 80 FR 47859.	Subsection 108 is a subsection within section 100 (“General”) of Rule 100 (“General Provisions and Definitions”). Submitted on December 6, 2013.
Rule 100, Section 500	Monitoring and Records	March 15, 2006	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66405.	Section 500 is a section within Rule 100 (“General Provisions and Definitions”). Includes subsections 501 (Reporting requirements), 502 (Data reporting), 503 (Emissions statements required as stated in the Act), 504 (Retention of records); and 505 (Annual emissions inventory report). Submitted on August 24, 2012.
Rule 140	Excess Emissions	Revised September 5, 2001.	August 27, 2002, 67 FR 54957.	Submitted on February 22, 2002.
Regulation II—Permits and Fees				
Rule 220	Permits to Operate	July 13, 1988	January 6, 1992, 57 FR 354.	Submitted on January 4, 1990.

TABLE 4—EPA-APPROVED MARICOPA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Rule 242	Emissions Offsets Generated by the Voluntary Paving of Unpaved Roads.	June 20, 2007	August 6, 2007, 72 FR 43538.	Submitted on July 5, 2007.
Regulation III—Control of Air Contaminants				
Rule 300	Visible Emissions	March 12, 2008	July 28, 2010, 75 FR 44141.	Submitted on July 10, 2008.
Rule 310	Fugitive Dust From Dust-Generating Operations.	January 27, 2010	December 15, 2010, 75 FR 78167.	Submitted on April 12, 2010. Cites appendices C and F, which are listed separately in this table.
Rule 310.01	Fugitive Dust From Non-Traditional Sources of Fugitive Dust.	January 27, 2010	December 15, 2010, 75 FR 78167.	Submitted on April 12, 2010. Cites appendix C, which is listed separately in this table.
Rule 311	Particulate matter from process industries.	August 2, 1993	April 10, 1995, 60 FR 18010. Vacated by *Ober* decision. Restored August 4, 1997, 62 FR 41856.	Submitted on March 3, 1994.
Rule 312	Abrasive Blasting	July 13, 1988	January 4, 2001, 66 FR 730.	Submitted on January 4, 1990.
Rule 313	Incinerators, Burn-Off Ovens and Crematories.	May 9, 2012	September 25, 2014, 79 FR 57445.	Submitted on August 27, 2012.
Rule 314	Open Outdoor Fires and Indoor Fireplaces at Commercial and Institutional Establishments.	March 12, 2008	November 9, 2009, 74 FR 57612.	Submitted on July 10, 2008.
Rule 316	Nonmetallic Mineral Processing.	March 12, 2008	November 13, 2009, 74 FR 58553.	Submitted on July 10, 2008.
Rule 318	Approval of Residential Woodburning Devices.	April 21, 1999	November 8, 1999, 64 FR 60678.	Submitted on August 4, 1999.
Rule 322	Power Plant Operations	October 17, 2007	October 14, 2009, 74 FR 52693.	Submitted on January 9, 2008.
Rule 323	Fuel Burning Equipment from Industrial/Commercial/Institutional (ICI) Sources.	October 17, 2007	October 14, 2009, 74 FR 52693.	Submitted on January 9, 2008.
Rule 324	Stationary Internal Combustion (IC) Engines.	October 17, 2007	October 14, 2009, 74 FR 52693.	Submitted on January 9, 2008.
Rule 325	Brick and Structural Clay Products (BSCP) Manufacturing.	August 10, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564.	Element of the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area, September 2005. Submitted on October 7, 2005.
Rule 331	Solvent Cleaning	April 21, 2004	December 21, 2004, 69 FR 76417.	Submitted on July 28, 2004.
Rule 333	Petroleum Solvent Dry Cleaning.	June 19, 1996	February 9, 1998, 63 FR 6489.	Submitted on February 26, 1997.
Rule 334	Rubber Sports Ball Manufacturing.	June 19, 1996	February 9, 1998, 63 FR 6489.	Submitted on February 26, 1997.
Rule 335	Architectural Coatings	July 13, 1988	January 6, 1992, 57 FR 354.	Submitted on January 4, 1990.
Rule 336	Surface Coating Operations.	April 7, 1999	September 20, 1999, 64 FR 50759.	Submitted on August 4, 1999.
Rule 337	Graphic Arts	November 20, 1996	February 9, 1998, 63 FR 6489.	Submitted on March 4, 1997.
Rule 338	Semiconductor Manufacturing.	June 19, 1996	February 9, 1998, 63 FR 6489.	Submitted on February 26, 1997.
Rule 339	Vegetable Oil Extract Processes.	November 16, 1992	February 9, 1998, 63 FR 6489.	Submitted on February 4, 1993.
Rule 340	Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt.	September 21, 1992	February 1, 1996, 61 FR 3578.	Submitted on November 13, 1992.
Rule 341	Metal Casting	August 5, 1994	February 12, 1996, 61 FR 5287.	Submitted on August 16, 1994.
Rule 342	Coating Wood Furniture and Fixtures.	November 20, 1996	February 9, 1998, 63 FR 6489.	Submitted on March 4, 1997.

TABLE 4—EPA-APPROVED MARICOPA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Rule 343	Commercial Bread Bakeries.	February 15, 1995	March 17, 1997, 62 FR 12544.	Submitted on August 31, 1995.
Rule 344	Automobile Windshield Washer Fluid.	April 7, 1999	November 30, 2001, 66 FR 59699.	Submitted on August 4, 1999.
Rule 346	Coating Wood Millwork	November 20, 1996	February 9, 1998, 63 FR 6489.	Submitted on March 4, 1997.
Rule 347	Ferrous Sand Casting	March 4, 1998	June 12, 2000, 65 FR 36788.	Submitted on August 4, 1999.
Rule 348	Aerospace Manufacturing and Rework Operations.	April 7, 1999	September 20, 1999, 64 FR 50759.	Submitted on August 4, 1999.
Rule 349	Pharmaceutical, Cosmetic, and Vitamin Manufacturing Operations.	April 7, 1999	June 8, 2001, 66 FR 30815.	Submitted on August 4, 1999.
Rule 350	Storage of Organic Liquids at Bulk Plants and Terminals.	April 6, 1992	September 5, 1995, 60 FR 46024.	Submitted on June 29, 1992.
Rule 351	Loading of Organic Liquids	February 15, 1995	February 9, 1998, 63 FR 6489.	Submitted on August 31, 1995.
Rule 352	Gasoline Delivery Vessels	November 16, 1992	September 5, 1995, 60 FR 46024.	Submitted on February 4, 1993.
Rule 353	Transfer of Gasoline into Stationary Dispensing Tanks.	April 6, 1992	February 1, 1996, 61 FR 3578.	Submitted on June 29, 1992.
Rule 358	Polystyrene Foam Operations.	April 20, 2005	May 26, 2005, 70 FR 30370.	Submitted on April 25, 2005.
Regulation V—Air Quality Standards and Area Classification				
Rule 510, excluding Appendix G to the Maricopa County Air Pollution Control Regulations.	Air Quality Standards	November 1, 2006	November 9, 2009, 74 FR 57612.	Submitted on June 7, 2007.
Regulation VI—Emergency Episodes				
Rule 600	Emergency Episodes	July 13, 1988	March 18, 1999, 64 FR 13351.	Submitted on January 4, 1990.
Appendices to Maricopa County Air Pollution Control Rules and Regulations				
Appendix C	Fugitive Dust Test Methods.	March 26, 2008	December 15, 2010, 75 FR 78167.	Cited in Rules 310 and 310.01. Submitted on July 10, 2008.
Appendix F	Soil Designations	April 7, 2004	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564.	Cited in Rule 310. Submitted on October 7, 2005.

† Vacated by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Delaney* v. *EPA,* 898 F.2d 687 (9th Cir. 1990). Restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.

TABLE 5—EPA-APPROVED MARICOPA COUNTY DOCUMENTS RELATED TO APPLICATIONS FOR DUST CONTROL PERMITS

Title	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Application for Dust Control Permit	June 22, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Relates to Rule 310 (“Fugitive Dust from Dust-Generating Operations”). Element of the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area, Additional Materials, September 2005. Submitted on November 29, 2005.
Guidance for Application for Dust Control Permit.	June 22, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Relates to Rule 310 (“Fugitive Dust from Dust-Generating Operations”). Element of the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area, Additional Materials, September 2005. Submitted on November 29, 2005.

TABLE 6—EPA-APPROVED ORDINANCES ADOPTED BY MARICOPA COUNTY AND OTHER LOCAL JURISDICTIONS WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Maricopa County Ordinance P–26.	Residential Woodburning Restriction Ordinance.	March 26, 2008	November 9, 2009, 74 FR 57612.	Submitted on July 10, 2008.
Maricopa County, Ordinance P–7.	Trip Reduction Ordinance	Adopted May 26, 1994	May 4, 1998, 63 FR 24434	Submitted on August 31, 1995.
Town of Carefree Ordinance No. 98–14.	An Ordinance of the Town of Carefree, Maricopa County, Arizona, Adding Section 10–4 to the Town Code Relating to Clean-Burning Fireplaces, Providing Penalties for Violations (3 pages).	Adopted September 1, 1998.	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718.	Submitted on February 16, 2000.
Town of Gilbert Ordinance 1066.	An Ordinance of the Common Council of the Town of Gilbert, Arizona Amending the Code of Gilbert by Amending Chapter 30 *Environment,* by adding New Article II *Fireplace Restrictions* Prescribing Standards for Fireplaces, Woodstoves, and Other Solid-Fuel Burning Devices in New Construction; Providing for an Effective Date of January 1, 1999; Providing for Repeal of Conflicting Ordinances; Providing for Severability (3 pages).	January 1, 1999	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718.	Adopted by the Town of Gilbert on November 25, 1997. Submitted on February 16, 2000.
City of Mesa Ordinance No. 3434.	An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Mesa, Maricopa County, Arizona, Relating to Fireplace Restrictions Amending Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 2 Establishing a Delayed Effective Date; and Providing Penalties for Violations (3 pages).	December 31, 1998	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718.	Adopted by the City of Mesa on February 2, 1998. Submitted on February 16, 2000.
Town of Paradise Valley Ordinance Number 454.	An Ordinance of the Town of Paradise Valley, Arizona, Relating to Grading and Dust Control, Amending Article 5–13 of the Town Code and Sections 5–13–1 Through 5–13–5, Providing Penalties for Violations and Severability (5 pages).	January 22, 1998	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718.	Adopted by the Town of Paradise Valley on January 22, 1998. Submitted on February 16, 2000. [Incorporation Note: There is an error in the ordinance's title, ordinance amended only sections 5–13–1 to 5–13–4; see section 1 of the ordinance.]
Town of Paradise Valley Ordinance Number 450.	An Ordinance of the Town of Paradise Valley, Arizona, Adding Section 5–1–7 to the Town Code Relating to Clean-Burning Fireplaces, Providing Penalties for Violations (3 pages).	December 18, 1997	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718.	Adopted by the Town of Paradise Valley on December 18, 1997. Submitted on February 16, 2000.

TABLE 6—EPA-APPROVED ORDINANCES ADOPTED BY MARICOPA COUNTY AND OTHER LOCAL JURISDICTIONS WITHIN MARICOPA COUNTY—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
City of Phoenix Ordinance No. G4062.	An Ordinance Amending the Phoenix City Code By Adding A New Chapter 40 "Environmental Protections," By Regulating Fireplaces, Wood Stoves and Other Solid-Fuel Burning Devices and Providing that the Provisions of this Ordinance Shall Take Effect on December 31, 1998 (5 pages).	December 31, 1998	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718.	Adopted by the City of Phoenix on December 10, 1997. Submitted on February 16, 2000.
City of Phoenix Ordinance No. G4037.	An Ordinance Amending Chapter 39, Article 2, Section 39–7 of the Phoenix City Code by Adding Subsection G Relating to Dust Free Parking Areas; and Amending Chapter 36, Article XI, Division I, Section 36–145 of the Phoenix City Code Relating to Parking on Non-Dust Free Lots (5 pages).	Adopted July 2, 1997	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718.	Adopted by the City of Phoenix on July 2, 1997. Submitted on February 16, 2000.
City of Tolleson Ordinance No. 376, N.S..	An Ordinance of the City of Tolleson, Maricopa County, Arizona, Amending Chapter 7 of the Tolleson City Code by Adding a New Section 7–9, Prohibiting the Installation or Construction of a Fireplace or Wood Stove Unless It Meets the Standards Set Forth Herein (including Exhibit A, 4 pages).	Adopted December 8, 1998.	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718.	Adopted by the City of Tolleson on December 8, 1998. Submitted on February 16, 2000.

TABLE 7—EPA-APPROVED PIMA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Pre-1976 Rule Codification				
Regulation I—General Provisions				
Rule 2	Definitions	February 20, 1975	May 11, 1977, 42 FR 23802 ...	Submitted on February 20, 1975.
Rule 3	Standard Conditions	December 20, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Rule 19	Decisions of Hearing Board; Subpoenas; Effective Date.	December 20, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Rule 20	Judicial Review; Grounds; Procedures.	December 20, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Rule 21	Notice of Hearing; Publication; Service.	December 20, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Rule 22	Hearing Board Fees	December 20, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Regulation II—Emissions Prohibited				
Rule 2B	Emissions of Particulate Matter	March 19, 1974	September 19, 1977, 42 FR 46926.	Submitted on March 19, 1974.
Rule 3	Emissions of Gases, Vapors, Fumes or Odors.	December 20, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Rule 5	Organic Solvents	December 20, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submitted on May 26, 1972.
Rule 7	Emissions of Certain Sulfur Compounds.	December 20, 1971	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submitted on May 26, 1972.

TABLE 7—EPA-APPROVED PIMA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
1976–1978 Rule Codification				
Regulation I—General Provisions				
Rule 2, paragraphs uu–yy	Definitions	June 21, 1976	July 19, 1977, 42 FR 36998	Submitted on September 30, 1976.
Regulation II—Fuel Burning Equipment				
Rule 2G (Paragraphs 1–4c)	Particulate Emissions	June 21, 1976	July 19, 1977, 42 FR 36998	Submitted on September 30, 1976.
Rule 7A (Paragraph 1)	Sulfur Dioxide Emissions	June 21, 1976	July 19, 1977, 42 FR 36998	Submitted on September 30, 1976. Paragraphs 2 to 5 were disapproved. See 42 FR 36998 (July 19, 1977).
Rule 7B (Paragraph 1)	Nitrogen Oxide Emissions	June 21, 1976	July 19, 1977, 42 FR 36998	Submitted on September 30, 1976.
Regulation VII—New Source Performance Standards				
Regulation VII (Paragraphs A–D).	Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources.	June 21, 1976	July 19, 1977, 42 FR 36998	Submitted on September 30, 1976.
Regulation VIII—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants				
Regulation VIII (Paragraphs A–C).	Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants.	June 21, 1976	July 19, 1977, 42 FR 36998	Submitted on September 30, 1976.
1979–1993 Rule Codification				
Chapter I: General Provisions				
Rule 101	Declaration of Policy	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 102	Purpose	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 103	Authority	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 111	General Applicability	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 112	State and/or County	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 113	Limitations	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 121	Air Quality Control District	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 122	Executive Head	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 123	Governing Body	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 151	Severability Clause	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 161	Format	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 162	Headings and Special Type	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 163	Use of Number and Gender	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 165	Effective Date	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 166	Adoption by Reference	December 6, 1983	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on October 18, 1985.†
Rule 171	Words, Phrases, and Terms	December 6, 1983	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on October 18, 1985.†
Rule 171 [paragraphs B.1 (''Air Contaminant or Air Pollutant'', B.1.a (''Common Air Pollutant''), B.7 (''Emission or Emissions''), B.8 (''Source or Existing Source''), C.1.a (''Existing Source''), C.1.b (''New Source''), C.2.a (''Major Source''), C.2.c (''New Major Source''), C.2.d (''Modification or Alteration''), C.3.a (''Stationary Source''), E.1.b (''Lowest Achievable Emission Rate'')].	Words, Phrases, and Terms	August 17, 1979	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 172	Meanings of Mathematical Symbols.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 173	Chemical Symbols and Abbreviations.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 174	Scientific Units	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 175	Acronyms	December 6, 1983	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on October 18, 1985.†
Chapter II: Permits				
Rule 201	Statutory Authority	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.

TABLE 7—EPA-APPROVED PIMA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Rule 202, paragraph D only	Installation Permits	December 6, 1983	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on October 18, 1985.†
Rule 202	Installation Permits	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 203	Operating Permits	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 211	Permit Application	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 212	Sampling, Testing, and Analysis Requirements.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 213	Public Notification/Public Comments.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 215	Permit Revocation	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 221	General Control	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 222	Permit Display or Posting	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 223	Permit Transferability	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 224	Fugitive Dust Producing Activities.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 225	Open Burning Permit Conditions.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 226	Permits for State-Delegated Emission Sources.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 231	Non-Compliance	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 232	Notification of Denial	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 241	General Provisions	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 242	Installation Permit Fees/Non-Fee Requirements.	June 1, 1981	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on June 1, 1981.
Rule 243	Open Burning Permit Fees	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 244	Operating Permit Fees	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 251	Permit Fee Studies Related to Inflation.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 252	Periodic Review of Individual Fee Schedules.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 261	Compliance Inspections	June 1, 1981	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on June 1, 1981.
Tables Cited by Rules in Chapter II				
Table 242	Activity Installation Permit Requirements for Construction/Destruction Activities.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Table 243	Open Burning Permit Fee Schedules.	June 1, 1981	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on June 1, 1981.
Table 244–A	Equipment Operating Permit Fee Schedules for Categorical Sources.	June 1, 1981	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on June 1, 1981.
Table 244–B	Equipment Operating Permit Fee Schedules for Non-Categorical Sources.	June 1, 1981	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on June 1, 1981.
Table 244–C	Activity Operating Permit Fee Requirements.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Chapter III: Universal Control Standards				
Rule 301	Planning, Constructing, or Operating Without a Permit.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 302	Non-Compliance with Applicable Standards.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 312	Asphalt Kettles	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 313	Incinerators	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 314	Petroleum Liquids	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 315	Roads and Streets	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 316	Particulate Materials	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 318	Vacant Lots and Open Spaces	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 321	Standards and Applicability	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 331	Applicability	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 332	Compilation of Mass Rates and Concentrations.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 341	Applicability	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 342	Mass—Concentration Ceilings	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 343	Visibility Limiting Standards	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 344	Odor Limiting Standards	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 371	Tucson Nonattainment Areas	December 6, 1983	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on October 18, 1985.†
Rule 372	Ajo Area	December 6, 1983	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on October 18, 1985.†
Rule 373	General County Areas	December 6, 1983	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on October 18, 1985.†

TABLE 7—EPA-APPROVED PIMA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Figure 371–A	Tucson Nonattainment Area for Total Suspended Particulates.	December 6, 1983	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on October 18, 1985.†
Figure 371–C	Tucson Nonattainment Area for Carbon Monoxide.	December 6, 1983	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on October 18, 1985.†
Figure 372	Approximate Boundaries of Ajo Area.	December 6, 1983	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on October 18, 1985.†
Rule 381, paragraph A, subparagraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, and paragraph B only.	ADHS Nonattainment-Area Standards.	December 6, 1983	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on October 18, 1985.†
Tables Cited by Rules in Chapter III				
Table 321, excluding the ''Asbestos-Containing Operation'' standards.	Emissions-Discharge Opacity Limiting Standards.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Approval excludes the ''Asbestos-Containing Operation'' standards. Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Table 332, excluding lines (h)–(m).	Emissions-Discharge Mass Limiting Standards.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Approval excludes lines (h)–(m). Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Table 341, excluding the Beryllium ceilings.	Maximum Allowable Pollutant-Concentration Ceilings in Ambient Air.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Approval excludes the beryllium ceilings. Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Chapter IV: Performance Standards for New Major Sources				
Rule 402	Stack and Shop Emissions	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 403	Applicability of More Than One Standard.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 411	Tucson Area	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 412	Ajo Area	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 413	General County Areas	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 421	Applicability	August 17, 1979	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 422	TSP Clean Air Plan	August 17, 1979	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 423	TSP Emission Data Bank	August 17, 1979	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 424	Emission Offset Requirement	August 17, 1979	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 425	Lowest Achievable Emission Rate.	August 17, 1979	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 426	Existing Sources in Compliance.	August 17, 1979	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Chapter V: Testing and Monitoring				
Rule 501	Applicability of Methodology	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 502	Testing Frequencies	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 503	Notification; Fees	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 504, part E, paragraph 2	Pre-Installation Testing or Modeling Requirements.	August 17, 1979	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	Submitted on June 1, 1981.
Rule 504	Pre-Installation Testing or Modeling Requirements.	August 17, 1979	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 505	Sampling and Testing Facilities	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 506	Stack Sampling	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 507	Waiver of Test Requirements	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 511	General Requirements	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 512	In-Stack Monitoring	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Chapter VI: Recordkeeping and Reporting				
Regulation 60 (''Classification of Pollutants''), Rule 601.	Classification of Common and Hazardous Air Pollutants.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 611, paragraph A only	Recordkeeping for Compliance Determinations.	June 1, 1981	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Approval included paragraph A only. Submitted on June 1, 1981.
Rule 611, paragraphs A.1 to A.3 only.	Recordkeeping for Compliance Determinations.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Approval included paragraphs A.1 to A.3 only. Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 612	Recordkeeping for Emissions Inventories.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 621	Reporting for Compliance Evaluations.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 622	Reporting as a Permit Requirement.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 623	Reporting for Emissions Inventories.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 624	Reporting for TSP Emission Data Bank.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.

TABLE 7—EPA-APPROVED PIMA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Rule 631	Confidentiality of Trade Secrets, Sales Data, and Proprietary Information.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 641	Suppression; False Information	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Tables Cited by Rules in Chapter VI				
Table 603	Methodology for Entering Records of Emissions into TSP Data Bank.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Chapter VII: Violations and Judicial Procedures				
Rule 701	Criminal Complaint	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 703	Injunction	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 704	Precedence of Actions	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 705	Penalties	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 706, paragraphs D.1 and D.2 only.	Reviews for Startup, Shutdown, or Malfunctions.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Approval included paragraphs D.1 and D.2 only. Submitted on June 1, 1981.
Rule 706, paragraphs A to C, D.3, D.4, and E only.	Reviews for Startup, Shutdown, or Malfunctions.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Approval included paragraphs A to C, D.3, D.4, and E only. Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 721	Evasion of Basic Requirements	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 722	Concealment of Emissions	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Chapter VIII: Emergency Episodes and Public Awareness				
Rule 801	State Jurisdiction	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 802	Determination of Emergency Conditions.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 803	Emergency Episode Reporting	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 804	Enforcement Actions	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 811	Continuous Monitoring of Ambient Air Pollution.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 821	Reports to the Public	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 822	General Information	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 823	Public Participation in Rulemaking.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Tables Cited by Rules in Chapter VIII				
Table 802	Air Pollution Episode Criteria	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Table 804	Possible Control Actions During Various Stages of an Air Pollution Episode.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Chapter IX: Appendix				
Rule 901	General Affidavit of Delegation	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 902	Political Sub-Divisions Delegation.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 903	Large Power Plants Delegation	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 904	Unpaved Roads Delegation	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 1.	Sample and Velocity Traverses for Stationary Sources.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 2.	Determination of Stack Gas Velocity and Volumetric Flow Rate (Type S Pitot Tube).	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 3.	Gas Analysis for Carbon Dioxide, Excess Air, and Dry Molecular Weight.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 4.	Determination of Moisture in Stack Gases.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 5.	Determination of Particulate Emissions from Stationary Sources.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 6.	Determination of Sulfur Dioxide Emissions from Stationary Sources.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 7.	Determination of Nitrogen Oxide Emissions from Stationary Sources.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 8.	Determination of Sulfuric Acid Mist and Sulfur Dioxide Emissions from Stationary Sources.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.

TABLE 7—EPA-APPROVED PIMA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 9.	Visual Determination of the Opacity of Emissions from Stationary Sources.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 10.	Determination of Carbon Monoxide Emissions from Stationary Sources.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 11.	Determination of Hydrogen Sulfide Emissions from Stationary Sources.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 16.	Semi-Continuous Determination of Sulfur Emissions from Stationary Sources.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 17.	Determination of Particulate Emissions from Stationary Sources (In-Stack Filtration Method).	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 19.	Determination of Sulfur Dioxide Removal Efficiency and Particulate, Sulfur Dioxide and Nitrogen Oxides Emission Rates from Electric Utility Steam Generators.	June 1, 1981	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on June 1, 1981.
Rule 911 (''Emissions Discharge Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method 20.	Determination of Nitrogen Oxides, Sulfur Dioxide and Oxygen Emissions from Stationary Gas Turbines.	June 1, 1981	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on June 1, 1981.
Rule 913 (''Ambient Air Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method A.	Reference Method for the Determination of Sulfur Dioxide in the Atmosphere (Pararosaniline Method).	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 913 (''Ambient Air Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method B.	Reference Method for the Determination of Suspended Particulates in the Atmosphere (High Volume Method).	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 913 (''Ambient Air Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method C.	Measurement Principle and Calibration Procedure for the Continuous Measurement of Carbon Monoxide in the Atmosphere (Non-Dispersive Infrared Spectrometry).	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 913 (''Ambient Air Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method D.	Measurement Principle and Calibration Procedure for the Measurement of Ozone in the Atmosphere.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 913 (''Ambient Air Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method E.	Reference Method for Determination of Hydrocarbons Corrected for Methane.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 913 (''Ambient Air Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method F.	Measurement Principle and Calibration Procedure for the Measurement of Nitrogen Dioxide in the Atmosphere (Gas Phase Chemiluminescence).	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 913 (''Ambient Air Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method G.	Reference Method for the Determination of Lead in Suspended Particulate Matter collected from Ambient Air.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 913 (''Ambient Air Testing for Common Air Pollutants''), Method H.	Interpretation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 921	General Specifications	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 922	Performance Specification 1 (Opacity).	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 923	Performance Specification 2 (SO_2 and NO_X).	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 924	Performance Specification 3 (CO_2 and O_2).	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 931	Guideline on Air Quality Models.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Rule 932	Workbook for Comparison of Air Quality Models.	August 17, 1979	April 16, 1982, 47 FR 16326	Submitted on October 9, 1979.
Post–1993 Rule Codification Pima County Code Title 17. Air Quality Control Chapter 12. Permits and Permit Revisions Article V. Open Burning Permits				
17.12.480	Open burning permits	October 19, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Submitted on December 30, 2004.

† Vacated by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Delaney* v. *EPA,* 898 F.2d 687 (9th Cir. 1990). Restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.

TABLE 8—EPA-APPROVED ORDINANCES ADOPTED BY PIMA COUNTY AND OTHER LOCAL JURISDICTIONS WITHIN PIMA COUNTY

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Pima County Ordinance No. 1988–72.	Travel Reduction Ordinance.	April 18, 1988	January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on May 26, 1988.
City of Tucson Ordinance No. 6914.	Travel Reduction Ordinance.	April 18, 1988	January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Submitted on May 26, 1988.
City of South Tucson Ordinance 88–01.	Travel Reduction Code	April 18, 1988	January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Adopted through Resolutions No. 88–01 and 88–05.
Town of Marana Ordinance No. 88–06.	Travel Reduction Code	April 18, 1988	January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Adopted through Resolutions No. 88–06 and 88–07. Submitted on May 26, 1988.
Town of Oro Valley Ordinance No. 162.	Travel Reduction Code	April 18, 1988	January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Adopted through Resolutions No. 162, 326 and 327.

TABLE 9—EPA-APPROVED PINAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Pinal-Gila Counties Air Pollution Control District Regulations				
7–3–1.4(C)	Incineration	August 7, 1980	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579	Adopted by Pinal-Gila Counties Air Quality Control District. Submitted on August 7, 1980. Deleted with respect to Gila County only July 25, 2001, 66 FR 38565.
7–3–1.4 (Excluding Paragraph C).	Particulate Emissions—Incineration.	March 19, 1974	November 15, 1978, 43 FR 53031.	Adopted by Pinal-Gila Counties Air Quality Control District. EPA disapproved paragraph C. Submitted on July 1, 1975. Deleted with respect to Gila County only July 25, 2001, 66 FR 38565.
7–3–1.5	Particulate Emissions—Wood Waste Burners.	March 19, 1974	November 15, 1978, 43 FR 53031.	Adopted by Pinal-Gila Counties Air Quality Control District. Submitted on July 1, 1975. Deleted with respect to Gila County only July 25, 2001, 66 FR 38565.
7–3–1.7(F)	Fuel burning equipment	August 7, 1980	April 12, 1982, 47 FR 15579	Adopted by Pinal-Gila Counties Air Quality Control District. Submitted on August 7, 1980. Deleted with respect to Gila County only July 25, 2001, 66 FR 38565.
7–3–1.7 (Excluding Paragraph F).	Particulate Emissions—Fuel Burning Equipment.	March 19, 1974	November 15, 1978, 43 FR 53031.	Adopted by Pinal-Gila Counties Air Quality Control District. EPA disapproved paragraph F. Submitted on July 1, 1975. Deleted with respect to Gila County only July 25, 2001, 66 FR 38565.
7–3–2.4	SO_2 Emissions—Sulfuric Acid Plants.	March 19, 1974	November 15, 1978, 43 FR 53031.	Adopted by Pinal-Gila Counties Air Quality Control District. Submitted on July 1, 1975. Deleted with respect to Gila County only July 25, 2001, 66 FR 38565.
7–3–5.1	NO_2 Emissions—Fuel Burning Equipment.	March 19, 1974	November 15, 1978, 43 FR 53031.	Adopted by Pinal-Gila Counties Air Quality Control District. Submitted on July 1, 1975. Deleted with respect to Gila County only July 25, 2001, 66 FR 38565.
7–3–5.2	NO_2 Emissions—Nitric Acid Plants.	March 19, 1974	November 15, 1978, 43 FR 53031.	Adopted by Pinal-Gila Counties Air Quality Control District. Submitted on July 1, 1975. Deleted with respect to Gila County only July 25, 2001, 66 FR 38565.

TABLE 9—EPA-APPROVED PINAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
Pinal County Air Quality Control District Regulations Chapter 1. General Provisions and Definitions				
1–1–010	Declaration of policy	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
1–1–020	Air Quality Control District	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
1–1–030	Executive head	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
1–1–040	Investigative authority	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
1–1–060	Authority to study, cooperate and hold public hearings.	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
1–1–070	Severability clause	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
1–1–080	Preservation of rights	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
1–1–090	Copies and effective date	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
1–1–100	Selecting interpretations	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
1–1–106	Jurisdictional Statement	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
1–2–110	Adopted document(s)	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
1–2–120	Adoptions by reference	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
1–3–140	Definitions, 74, Hearing Board	July 23, 2014	August 10, 2015, 80 FR 47859	Adopted by the Pinal County Board of Supervisors through Resolution No. 072314–AQ1. Includes new text that is underlined and excludes removed text which was struck by the board. Submitted by ADEQ on September 4, 2014.
1–3–140	Definitions	July 29, 1998	November 13, 2002, 67 FR 68764.	Submitted on October 7, 1998.
Chapter 2. Ambient Air Quality Standards				
2–1–010	Purpose	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–1–020	Particulate matter	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–1–030	Sulfur oxide (sulfur dioxide)	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–1–040	Ozone	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–1–050	Carbon monoxide	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–1–060	Nitrogen dioxide	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–1–070	Lead	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–2–080	Air quality monitoring methods	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–2–090	Air quality monitoring procedures.	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–3–100	Interpretation of ambient air quality standards.	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–3–110	Evaluation of air quality data	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–4–120	Purpose	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to attainment area classifications. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–4–130	Adopted document(s)	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–4–140	Area classifications within Pinal County.	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–4–150	Attainment status in Pinal County.	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–5–160	Ambient air increment ceilings	October 12, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–5–170	Baseline concentration	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–5–180	Baseline date	October 12, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–5–190	Baseline area	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.

TABLE 9—EPA-APPROVED PINAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
2–5–200	Exemptions	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–5–210	Violations of maximum allowable increases.	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–6–220	Violations of national ambient air quality standards.	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–7–230	Purpose	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to air pollution emergency episodes. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–7–240	Episode procedures guidelines	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–7–250	Definitions	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to air pollution emergency episodes. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–7–260	Standards	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to air pollution emergency episodes. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–7–270	Administrative requirements	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to air pollution emergency episodes. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–8–280	General	June 29, 1993	April 28, 2004, 69 FR 23103	Relates to limits on visible emissions. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–8–290	Definitions	June 29, 1993	April 28, 2004, 69 FR 23103	Relates to limits on visible emissions. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–8–300	Performance Standards	May 18, 2005	March 27, 2006, 71 FR 15043	Relates to limits on visible emissions. Submitted on September 12, 2005.
2–8–302	Performance Standards—Hayden PM_{10} Nonattainment Area.	January 7, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Submitted on June 12, 2009.
2–8–310	Exemptions	June 29, 1993	April 28, 2004, 69 FR 23103	Relates to limits on visible emissions. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
2–8–320	Monitoring and records	June 29, 1993	April 28, 2004, 69 FR 23103	Relates to limits on visible emissions. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
Chapter 3. Permits and Permit Revisions				
3–1–010	Purpose	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–030	Definitions	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–040	Applicability and classes of permits.	October 12, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–042	Operating authority and obligations for a source subject to permit reopening.	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–050	Permit application requirements.	October 12, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–055	Completeness determination	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–060	Permit application review process.	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–065	Permit review by the EPA and affected states.	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–070	Permit application grant or denial.	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–081	Permit conditions	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–082	Emission standards and limitations.	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–083	Compliance provisions	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–084	Voluntarily Accepted Federal Enforceable Emission Limitations: Applicability; Reopening; Effective Date.	February 22, 1995	December 20, 2000, 65 FR 79742.	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–085	Notice by building permit agencies.	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–087	Permit reopening, reissuance and termination.	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–089	Permit term, renewal and expiration.	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–090	Permit transfer	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–102	Permit shields	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.

TABLE 9—EPA-APPROVED PINAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
3–1–103	Annual emissions inventory questionnaire.	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–105	Permits containing the terms and conditions of federal delayed compliance orders (DCO) or consent decree.	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–107	Public notice and participation	February 22, 1995	December 20, 2000, 65 FR 79742.	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–109	Material permit condition	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–110	Investigative authority	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–120	Confidentiality of records	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–132	Permit imposed right of entry	June 29, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–140	Permit revocation	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–150	Monitoring	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–160	Test methods and procedures	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–170	Performance tests	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–173	Quality assurance	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–175	Certification of truth, accuracy and completeness.	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–1–177	Stack height limitation	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–2–180	Facility changes allowed without permit revisions.	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–2–185	Administrative permit amendments.	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–2–190	Minor permit revisions	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–2–195	Significant permit revisions	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–3–200	Purpose	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to permit requirements for new major sources and major modifications to existing major sources. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–3–203	Definitions	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to permit requirements for new major sources and major modifications to existing major sources. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–3–205	Application requirements	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to permit requirements for new major sources and major modifications to existing major sources. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–3–210	Application review process	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to permit requirements for new major sources and major modifications to existing major sources. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–3–250	Permit and permit revision requirements for sources located in attainment and unclassifiable areas.	February 22, 1995	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to permit requirements for new major sources and major modifications to existing major sources. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–3–260	Air quality impact analysis and monitoring requirements.	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to permit requirements for new major sources and major modifications to existing major sources. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–3–270	Innovative control technology	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to permit requirements for new major sources and major modifications to existing major sources. Submitted on November 27, 1995.

TABLE 9—EPA-APPROVED PINAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
3–3–275	Air quality models	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to permit requirements for new major sources and major modifications to existing major sources. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–3–280	Visibility protection	November 3, 1993	April 9, 1996, 61 FR 15717	Relates to permit requirements for new major sources and major modifications to existing major sources. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
3–8–700	General Provisions	October 27, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Relates to open burning. Submitted on December 30, 2004.
3–8–710	Permit Provisions and Administration.	October 27, 2004	May 16, 2006, 71 FR 28270	Relates to open burning. Submitted on December 30, 2004.
Chapter 4. Emissions from Existing and New Non-Point Sources				
4–2–020	Fugitive Dust—General	December 4, 2002	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–2–030	Fugitive Dust—Definitions	December 4, 2002	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–2–040	Standards	June 29, 1993	August 1, 2007, 72 FR 41896	Relates to fugitive dust. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
4–2–050	Monitoring and Records	May 14, 1997	August 1, 2007, 72 FR 41896	Relates to fugitive dust. Submitted on October 7, 1998.
4–4–100	General Provisions	October 1, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to PM–10 Non-attainment Area Rules; Dustproofing and Stabilization for Commercial Unpaved Parking, Drive and Working Yards. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–4–110	Definitions	October 1, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to PM–10 Non-attainment Area Rules; Dustproofing and Stabilization for Commercial Unpaved Parking, Drive and Working Yards. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–4–120	Objective Standards	October 1, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to PM–10 Non-attainment Area Rules; Dustproofing and Stabilization for Commercial Unpaved Parking, Drive and Working Yards. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–4–130	Work Practice Standards	October 1, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to PM–10 Non-attainment Area Rules; Dustproofing and Stabilization for Commercial Unpaved Parking, Drive and Working Yards. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–4–140	Recordkeeping and Records Retention.	October 1, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to PM–10 Non-attainment Area Rules; Dustproofing and Stabilization for Commercial Unpaved Parking, Drive and Working Yards. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–5–150	Stabilization for Residential Parking and Drives; Applicability.	October 1, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to PM–10 Non-attainment Area Rules; Stabilization for Residential Parking and Drives. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–5–160	Residential Parking Control Requirement.	October 1, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to PM–10 Non-attainment Area Rules; Stabilization for Residential Parking and Drives. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–5–170	Deferred enforcement date	October 1, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to PM–10 Non-attainment Area Rules; Stabilization for Residential Parking and Drives. Submitted on June 12, 2009.

TABLE 9—EPA-APPROVED PINAL COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL REGULATIONS—Continued

County citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Additional explanation
4–7–210	Definitions	June 3, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to Construction Sites in Non-Attainment Areas—Fugitive Dust. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–7–214	General Provisions	June 3, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to Construction Sites in Non-Attainment Areas—Fugitive Dust. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–7–218	Applicability; Development Activity.	June 3, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to Construction Sites in Non-Attainment Areas—Fugitive Dust. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–7–222	Owner and/or Operator Liability	June 3, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to Construction Sites in Non-Attainment Areas—Fugitive Dust. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–7–226	Objective Standards; Sites	June 3, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to Construction Sites in Non-Attainment Areas—Fugitive Dust. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–7–230	Obligatory Work Practice Standards; Sites.	June 3, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to Construction Sites in Non-Attainment Areas—Fugitive Dust. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–7–234	Nonattainment-Area Dust Permit Program; General Provisions.	June 3, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to Construction Sites in Non-Attainment Areas—Fugitive Dust. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–7–238	Nonattainment Area Site Permits.	June 3, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to Construction Sites in Non-Attainment Areas—Fugitive Dust. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–7–242	Nonattainment Area Block Permits.	June 3, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to Construction Sites in Non-Attainment Areas—Fugitive Dust. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–7–246	Recordkeeping and Records Retention.	June 3, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Relates to Construction Sites in Non-Attainment Areas—Fugitive Dust. Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–9–320	Test Methods for Stabilization for Unpaved Roads and Unpaved Parking Lots.	June 3, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Submitted on June 12, 2009.
4–9–340	Visual Opacity Test Methods	June 3, 2009	April 6, 2010, 75 FR 17307	Submitted on June 12, 2009.
Chapter 5. Stationary Source Performance Standards				
5–18–740	Storage of Volatile Organic Compounds—Organic Compound Emissions.	February 22, 1995	December 26, 2000, 65 FR 81371.	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
5–19–800	General	February 22, 1995	December 26, 2000, 65 FR 81371.	Relates to loading of organic liquids. Submitted on November 27, 1995.
5–22–950	Fossil Fuel Fired Steam Generator Standard Applicability.	February 22, 1995	September 29, 2000, 65 FR 58359.	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
5–22–960	Fossil Fuel Fired Steam Generator Sulfur Dioxide Emission Limitation.	February 22, 1995	September 29, 2000, 65 FR 58359.	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
5–24–1032	Federally Enforceable Minimum Standard of Performance—Process Particulate Emissions.	February 22, 1995	April 17, 2012, 77 FR 22676	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
5–24–1040	Carbon Monoxide Emissions—Industrial Processes.	February 22, 1995	April 28, 2004, 69 FR 23103	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
5–24–1045	Sulfite Pulp Mills—Sulfur Compound Emissions.	February 22, 1995	September 29, 2000, 65 FR 58359.	Submitted on November 27, 1995.
5–24–1055	Pumps and Compressors—Organic Compound Emissions.	February 22, 1995	December 26, 2000, 65 FR 81371.	Submitted on November 27, 1995.

(d) *EPA-approved source-specific requirements.*

EPA-APPROVED SOURCE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

Name of source	Order/permit No.	Effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality				
Arizona Electric Power Cooperative's Apache Generating Station.	Significant Revision No. 59195 to Air Quality Control Permit No. 55412, excluding section V.D.	May 13, 2014	April 10, 2015, 80 FR 19220	Permit issued by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. Submitted on May 13, 2014.
Maricopa County Air Quality Department				
W.R. Meadows of Arizona, Inc., Goodyear, Arizona.	V98–0004, condition 23	February 17, 2005	June 14, 2005, 70 FR 34357	Permit issued by the Maricopa County Air Quality Department. Submitted on April 20, 2005.

(e) *EPA-approved Arizona nonregulatory provisions and quasi-regulatory measures.*

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED NON-REGULATORY AND QUASI-REGULATORY MEASURES

[Excluding certain resolutions and statutes, which are listed in tables 2 and 3, respectively] [1]

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or nonattainment area or title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
The State of Arizona Air Pollution Control Implementation Plan Clean Air Act Section 110(a)(2) State Implementation Plan Elements (Excluding Part D Elements and Plans)				
Chapter 1—Introduction	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submittal letter is dated May 26, 1972; received by EPA on May 30, 1972.
Appendix G—Policy Statement on Air Pollution Control.	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submittal letter is dated May 26, 1972; received by EPA on May 30, 1972.
Chapter 2—Legal Authority, excluding section 2.9 (''Jurisdiction over Indian Lands'').	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submittal letter is dated May 26, 1972; received by EPA on May 30, 1972. See table 1 of subsection (c) and table 3 of subsection (e). Section 2.9 was deleted without replacement at 81 FR 7209 (February 11, 2016).
Assertion of State Jurisdiction over Apache, Navajo, Santa Cruz, and Yavapai Counties; Assertion of State Jurisdiction over Cochise County; and Assertion of State Jurisdiction over specific sources in Mohave County.	Apache, Navajo, Santa Cruz, Yavapai, Cochise, and Mohave Counties.	February 3, 1975	July 31, 1978, 43 FR 33245	
Chapter 3—Air Quality Data	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submittal letter is dated May 26, 1972; received by EPA on May 30, 1972.
Chapter 4—Emission Data	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submittal letter is dated May 26, 1972; received by EPA on May 30, 1972.
Chapter 5—Air Quality Surveillance Network (February 1980).	State-wide	February 15, 1980	August 10, 1981, 46 FR 40512	
Chapter 6—Control Strategy	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	SIP elements developed to address CAA requirements in designated nonattainment areas as well as maintenance plans are listed at the end of this table.
Chapter 7—Compliance Schedules.	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submittal letter is dated May 26, 1972; received by EPA on May 30, 1972.
Chapter 8—Emergency Episode Prevention.	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submittal letter is dated May 26, 1972; received by EPA on May 30, 1972.
Appendix E—Emergency Episode Communications Manual.	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submittal letter is dated May 26, 1972; received by EPA on May 30, 1972.
Chapter 9—Review of New Sources and Modifications.	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submittal letter is dated May 26, 1972; received by EPA on May 30, 1972.

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED NON-REGULATORY AND QUASI-REGULATORY MEASURES—Continued

[Excluding certain resolutions and statutes, which are listed in tables 2 and 3, respectively] [1]

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area or title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Setting Applicability Thresholds, pages 1547–1549 in Appendix A to ''State Implementation Plan Revision: New Source Review'' adopted on October 29, 2012.	State-wide	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	
Memorandum, ''Proposed Final Permits to be Treated as Appealable Agency Actions,'' dated February 10, 2015, from Eric Massey, Air Quality Division Director to Balaji Vaidyanathan, Permit Section Manager, submitted on February 23, 2015..	State-wide	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	
''State Implementation Plan Revision: New Source Review—Supplement,'' relating to the division of jurisdiction for New Source Review in Arizona, adopted on July 2, 2014.	State-wide	Submitted on October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013 and July 2, 2014.	November 2, 2015, 80 FR 67319.	
Letter from the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, dated June 1, 1988, committing to administer the provisions of the Federal New Source Review regulations consistent with EPA's requirements.	State-wide	June 1, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	The commitments apply to the issuance of, or revision to, permits for any source which is a major stationary source or major modification as defined in 40 CFR, part 51, subpart I.†
Letter from Maricopa County Department of Health Services, Division of Public Health, dated April 28, 1988, committing to administer the New Source Review provisions of their regulations consistent with EPA's requirements.	Maricopa County	July 25, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	The commitments apply to the issuance of, or revision to, permits for any source which is a major stationary source or major modification as defined in 40 CFR, part 51, subpart I.†
Letter from the Pima County Health Department, Office of Environmental Quality, dated April 24, 1988 committing to administer the New Source Review provisions of their regulations consistent with EPA's requirements.	Pima County	July 22, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	The commitments apply to the issuance of, or revision to, permits for any source which is a major stationary source or major modification as defined in 40 CFR, part 51, subpart I.†
State Implementation Plan Determination of ''Good Engineering Practice'' Stack Height.	Gila County (Hayden Copper Smelter).	September 20, 1979	January 14, 1983, 48 FR 1717	Issued by Arizona Department of Health Services.
Technical Basis of New Source Review Regulations, Pima County, Arizona, February 6, 1980 (AQ–125-a).	Pima County	February 28, 1980	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	
Chapter 10—Source Surveillance.	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submittal letter is dated May 26, 1972; received by EPA on May 30, 1972.
Chapter 11—Rules and Regulations.	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Also, see tables 1 through 6 in section 40 CFR 52.120(c).
Chapter 12—Intergovernmental Cooperation.	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submittal letter is dated May 26, 1972; received by EPA on May 30, 1972.
Chapter 13—Resources	State-wide	May 26, 1972	July 27, 1972, 37 FR 15080	Submittal letter is dated May 26, 1972; received by EPA on May 30, 1972.
Small Business Stationary Source Technical and Environmental Compliance Assistance Program.	State-wide	February 1, 1995	June 15, 1995, 60 FR 31411	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on February 1, 1995.
Small Business Stationary Source Technical and Environmental Compliance Assistance Program.	State-wide	November 13, 1992	June 15, 1995, 60 FR 31411	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on November 13, 1992.
A Revised Analysis of Lead Emissions and Ambient-Air Concentrations in Pima County, Arizona.	Pima County	September 26, 1980	June 30, 1982, 47 FR 28374	
Arizona Lead SIP Revision	State-wide	April 1, 1980	June 30, 1982, 47 FR 28374	

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED NON-REGULATORY AND QUASI-REGULATORY MEASURES—Continued

[Excluding certain resolutions and statutes, which are listed in tables 2 and 3, respectively] [1]

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area or title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Arizona State Implementation Plan, Revision to the Arizona Regional Haze Plan for Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Incorporated, Apache Generating Station, excluding the appendices.	Source-Specific	May 13, 2014	April 10, 2015, 80 FR 19220 ...	Submitted on May 13, 2014.
Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision, Regional Haze Under Section 308 of the Federal Regional Haze Rule (May 2013), excluding:. (i) Chapter 10, section 10.7 (regarding ASARCO Hayden Smelter (PM_{10} emissions) and Chemical Lime Company—Nelson Lime Plant); (ii) Chapter 11, except subsection 11.3.1(3) (''Focus on SO_2 and NO_X pollutants''); (iii) Appendix D: chapter I, except for the footnotes in tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 to the entries for AEPCO [Apache], and the entry in table 1.2 for Freeport-McMoRan Miami Smelter; chapter VI, section C (regarding PM_{10} emissions from ASARCO Hayden smelter); chapter XII, section C, and chapter XIII, subsection D; and (iv) Appendix E.	Source-Specific	May 3, 2013	July 30, 2013, 78 FR 46142	
Arizona State Implementation Plan, Regional Haze Under Section 308 of the Federal Regional Haze Rule (January 2011), excluding:. (i) Chapter 6: table 6.1; chapter 10: sections 10.4, 10.6 (regarding Unit I4 at the Irvington (Sundt) Generating Station), 10.7, and 10.8; chapter 11; chapter 12: sections 12.7.3 (''Emission Limitation and Schedules of Compliance'') and 12.7.6 (''Enforceability of Arizona's Measures''); and chapter 13: section 13.2.3 (''Arizona and Other State Emission Reductions Obligations''); (ii) Appendix D: chapter I; chapter V (regarding Unit I4 at the Irvington (Sundt) Generating Station); chapter VI, sections C and D; chapter VII; chapter IX; chapter X, section E.1; chapter XI, section D; chapter XII, sections B and C; chapter XIII, sections B, C, and D; and chapter XIV, section D; and (iii) Appendix E.	Source-Specific	February 28, 2011	July 30, 2013, 78 FR 46142	

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED NON-REGULATORY AND QUASI-REGULATORY MEASURES—Continued

[Excluding certain resolutions and statutes, which are listed in tables 2 and 3, respectively] [1]

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area or title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Arizona State Implementation Plan, Regional Haze Under Section 308 of the Federal Regional Haze Rule: Appendix D, Arizona BART—Supplemental Information:. (i) Table 1.1—NO_X BART, entry for AEPCO [Apache], ST1 [Unit 1] only. (ii) Table 1.2—PM_{10} BART, entries for AEPCO [Apache], APS Cholla Power Plant and SRP Coronado Generating Station. (iii) Table 1.3—SO_2 BART, entries for AEPCO, APS Cholla Power Plant and SRP Coronado Generating Station.	Source-Specific	February 28, 2011	December 5, 2012, 77 FR 72512.	Certain source-specific Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) limits at three electric generating stations.
Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision under Clean Air Act Section 110(a)(1) and (2); Implementation of the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards, excluding the appendices.	State-wide	October 14, 2011	August 10, 2015, 80 FR 47859	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on October 14, 2011.
SIP Revision: Clean Air Act Section 110(a)(2)(D), 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (December 3, 2015).	State-wide	December 3, 2015	May 19, 2016, 81 FR 31513; correcting amendment on June 6, 2016, 81 FR 31679.	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on December 3, 2015.
Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision under Clean Air Act Section 110(a)(1) and (2); 2008 8-hour Ozone NAAQS, excluding the appendices.	State-wide	December 27, 2012	August 10, 2015, 80 FR 47859	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on December 27, 2012.
Ordinance No. 1993–128, Section 1, 17.040.190 ''Composition'' Section 6, 17.24.040 ''Reporting for compliance evaluations''.	Pima County	December 19, 2013	August 10, 2015, 80 FR 47859	Adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Pima County, Arizona on September 28, 1993.
Ordinance 2005–43, Chapter 17.12, Permits and Permit Revisions, section 2, 17.12.040 ''Reporting Requirements''.	Pima County	December 19, 2013	August 10, 2015, 80 FR 47859	Adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Pima County, Arizona on April 19, 2005.
Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision under Clean Air Act Section 110(a)(1) and (2): Implementation of 2006 $PM_{2.5}$ National Ambient Air Quality Standards, 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ National Ambient Air Quality Standards, and 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards, September 2009, excluding the appendices.	State-wide	October 14, 2009	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on October 14, 2009.
Final Supplement to the Arizona State Implementation Plan under Clean Air Act Section 110(a)(1) and (2): Implementation of 2006 $PM_{2.5}$ National Ambient Air Quality Standards, 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ National Ambient Air Quality Standards, and 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards, August 2012, excluding the appendices.	State-wide	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED NON-REGULATORY AND QUASI-REGULATORY MEASURES—Continued
[Excluding certain resolutions and statutes, which are listed in tables 2 and 3, respectively] [1]

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area or title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Revision to the Arizona State Implementation Plan Under Clean Air Act Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)—Regional Transport (May 2007).	Statewide	May 24, 2007	July 31, 2007, 72 FR 41629	Interstate Transport SIP adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on May 24, 2007.
Part D Elements and Plans (Other than for the Metropolitan Phoenix or Tucson Areas)				
Ajo Sulfur Dioxide State Implementation and Maintenance Plan.	Ajo Sulfur Dioxide Air Quality Planning Area.	June 18, 2002	November 3, 2003, 68 FR 62239.	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on June 18, 2002.
Bullhead City Moderate Area PM_{10} Maintenance Plan and Request for Redesignation to Attainment.	Bullhead City PM_{10} Air Quality Planning Area.	February 7, 2002	June 26, 2002, 67 FR 43020	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on February 7, 2002.
Douglas Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area State Implementation and Maintenance Plan, dated November 29, 2001.	Douglas Sulfur Dioxide Air Quality Planning Area.	December 14, 2001	February 28, 2006, 71 FR 9941.	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on December 14, 2001.
Modeling Supplement-Douglas Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2) State Implementation and Maintenance Plan.	Douglas Sulfur Dioxide Air Quality Planning Area.	April 2, 2004	February 28, 2006, 71 FR 9941.	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on April 2, 2004.
Modeling and Emissions Inventory Supplement for the Douglas Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area State Implementation and Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request, dated September 2005.	Douglas Sulfur Dioxide Air Quality Planning Area.	September 16, 2005	February 28, 2006, 71 FR 9941.	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on September 16, 2005.
Final Miami Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area State Implementation and Maintenance Plan (June 2002) (revised May 26, 2004), excluding appendix A (''SIP Support Information''), sections A.1 (''Pertinent Sections of the Arizona Administrative Code'') and A.2 (''Information Regarding Revisions to AAC R18–2–715 and R18–2–715.01, 'Standards of Performance for Primary Copper Smelters: Site Specific Requirements; Compliance and Monitoring' ''); and appendix D (''SIP Public Hearing Documentation'').	Miami Sulfur Dioxide Air Quality Planning Area.	June 26, 2002	January 24, 2007, 72 FR 3061	Adopted by ADEQ on June 26, 2002. Incorporates replacement pages for the cover page and pages iii, 2, 3, 4 and 49 enclosed with letter from ADEQ dated June 30, 2004. Includes a letter from Stephen A. Owens, Director, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, dated June 20, 2006, withdrawing a section 107(d)(3)(D) boundary redesignation request included in the Miami Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area State Implementation and Maintenance Plan and requesting a section 110(k)(6) error correction.
Morenci Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area State Implementation and Maintenance Plan.	Morenci Sulfur Dioxide Air Quality Planning Area.	June 21, 2002	April 26, 2004, 69 FR 22447	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on June 21, 2002.
Final Update of the Limited Maintenance Plan for the Payson PM_{10} Maintenance Area (December 2011).	Payson PM_{10} Air Quality Planning Area.	January 23, 2012	March 19, 2014, 79 FR 15227	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on January 23, 2012.
Payson Moderate Area PM_{10} Maintenance Plan and Request for Redesignation to Attainment.	Payson PM_{10} Air Quality Planning Area.	March 29, 2002	June 26, 2002, 67 FR 43013	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on March 29, 2002.
Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision for the Nogales $PM_{2.5}$ Nonattainment Area (September 2013), including appendices A and B.	Nogales $PM_{2.5}$ Nonattainment Area.	September 6, 2013	February 9, 2015, 80 FR 6907	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on September 6. 2013.
Final 2012 State Implementation Plan Nogales PM_{10} Nonattainment Area.	Nogales PM_{10} Nonattainment Area.	August 24, 2012	September 25, 2012, 77 FR 58962.	
Final Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision, San Manuel Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area, March 2007.	San Manuel Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area.	June 7, 2007	January 18, 2008, 73 FR 3396	

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED NON-REGULATORY AND QUASI-REGULATORY MEASURES—Continued

[Excluding certain resolutions and statutes, which are listed in tables 2 and 3, respectively] [1]

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area or title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Part D Elements and Plans for the Metropolitan Phoenix and Tucson Areas				
MAG 2014 State Implementation Plan Revision for the Removal of Stage II Vapor Recovery Controls in the Maricopa Eight-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area (August 2014), excluding appendix A, exhibit 2 (''Arizona Revised Statutes Listed in Table 1–1'').	Maricopa Eight-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area.	September 2, 2014	November 16, 2015, 80 FR 70689.	Adopted by the Regional Council of the Maricopa Association of Governments on August 27, 2014.
Final Addendum to the Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision, Exemption of Motorcycles from Vehicle Emissions Inspections and Maintenance Program Requirements in Area A, October 2009 (December 2010).	Area A—i.e., Phoenix metropolitan area.	January 11, 2011	May 22, 2013, 78 FR 30209	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on January 11, 2011.
Final Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision, Exemption of Motorcycles from Vehicle Emissions Inspections and Maintenance Program Requirements in Area A (October 2009), excluding appendices A and C.	Area A—i.e., Phoenix metropolitan area.	November 6, 2009	May 22, 2013, 78 FR 30209	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on November 6, 2009.
September 2006 Supplement to Final Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision, Basic and Enhanced Vehicle Emissions Inspection/Maintenance Programs, December 2005, excluding appendices.	Areas A and B—i.e., Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan areas.	October 3, 2006	March 30, 2007, 72 FR 15046	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on October 3, 2006.
Final Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision, Basic and Enhanced Vehicle Emissions Inspection/Maintenance Programs (December 2005), excluding appendices.	Areas A and B—i.e., Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan areas.	December 23, 2005	March 30, 2007, 72 FR 15046	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on December 23, 2005.
MAG 2013 Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for the Maricopa County Area, March 2013.	Maricopa County Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Planning Area.	April 2, 2013	March 3, 2016, 81 FR 11120	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on April 2, 2013.
MAG Carbon Monoxide Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area and Appendices, dated May 2003.	Maricopa County Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Planning Area.	June 16, 2003	March 9, 2005, 70 FR 11553	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on June 16, 2003.
Revised MAG 1999 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area, dated March 2001.	Maricopa County Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Planning Area.	April 18, 2001	March 9, 2005, 70 FR 11553	Adopted by the Maricopa Association of Governments on March 28, 2001 and by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on April 18, 2001. March 9, 2005 final rule was corrected at September 6, 2005, 70 FR 52928.
Addendum to MAG 1987 Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area, July 21, 1988.	Maricopa County	July 22, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Supplemental information related to the SIP revision of July 18, 1988. Vacated by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Delaney* v. *EPA*. Control and committal measures were restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219. EPA disapproved the attainment demonstration, conformity and contingency portions of the 1988 Addendum at 40 CFR 52.124(a)(1). See 56 FR 5458 (February 11, 1991).

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED NON-REGULATORY AND QUASI-REGULATORY MEASURES—Continued
[Excluding certain resolutions and statutes, which are listed in tables 2 and 3, respectively] [1]

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or nonattainment area or title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) 1987 Carbon Monoxide (CO) Plan for the Maricopa County Area, MAG CO Plan Commitments for Implementation, and Appendix A through E, Exhibit 4, Exhibit D.	Maricopa County Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Planning Area.	October 5, 1987	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Adopted on July 10, 1987. Vacated by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Delaney* v. *EPA*. Control and committal measures were restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219. EPA disapproved the attainment demonstration, conformity and contingency portions of the 1987 MAG CO Plan at 40 CFR 52.124(a)(1). See 56 FR 5458 (February 11, 1991).
MAG 2014 Eight-Hour Ozone Plan—Submittal of Marginal Area Requirements for the Maricopa Nonattainment Area (June 2014), excluding: (i) Sections titled ''A Nonattainment Area Preconstruction Permit Program—CAA section 182(a)(2)(C),'' ''New Source Review—CAA, Title I, Part D,'' and ''Offset Requirements: 1:1 to 1 (Ratio of Total Emission Reductions of Volatile Organic Compounds to Total Increased Emissions)—CAA Section 182(a)(4)'' on pages 8 and 9 and section titled ''Meet Transportation Conformity Requirements—CAA Section 176(c)'' on pages 10 and 11. (ii) Appendices A and B.	Phoenix-Mesa 2008 8-hour ozone nonattainment area.	July 2, 2014	October 16, 2015, 80 FR 62457.	
MAG Eight-Hour Ozone Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for the Maricopa Nonattainment Area (February 2009), excluding the appendices.	Phoenix-Mesa 1997 8-hour ozone maintenance area.	March 23, 2009	September 17, 2014, 79 FR 55645.	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on March 23, 2009.
Letter dated June 13, 2007 from Stephen A. Owens, Director, ADEQ to Wayne Nastri, Regional Administrator, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX.	Phoenix-Mesa 1997 8-hour ozone nonattainment area.	June 13, 2007	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35285 ..	Transmittal letter for Eight-Hour Ozone Plan for the Maricopa Nonattainment Area (June 2007).
Eight-Hour Ozone Plan for the Maricopa Nonattainment Area (June 2007), including Appendices, Volumes One and Two.	Phoenix-Mesa 1997 8-hour ozone nonattainment area.	June 13, 2007	June 13, 2012, 77 FR 35285 ..	
One-Hour Ozone Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area, dated March 2004.	Maricopa County 1-Hour Ozone Air Quality Planning Area.	April 21, 2004	June 14, 2005, 70 FR 34362 ..	Adopted by the Maricopa Association of Governments Regional Council on March 26, 2004 and adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on April 21, 2004.
Final Serious Area Ozone State Implementation Plan for Maricopa County, dated December 2000.	Maricopa County 1-Hour Ozone Air Quality Planning Area.	December 14, 2000	June 14, 2005, 70 FR 34362 ..	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on December 14, 2000.
Letter and enclosures regarding Arizona's Intent to ''Opt-out'' of the Clean Fuel Fleet Program.	Maricopa County 1-Hour Ozone Air Quality Planning Area.	December 7, 1998	June 14, 2005, 70 FR 34362 ..	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on December 7, 1998.

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED NON-REGULATORY AND QUASI-REGULATORY MEASURES—Continued

[Excluding certain resolutions and statutes, which are listed in tables 2 and 3, respectively] [1]

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area or title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
2012 Five Percent Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area, and Appendices Volume One and Volume Two.	Maricopa County PM–10 Non-attainment Area.	May 25, 2012	June 10, 2014, 79 FR 33107 ..	Adopted May 23, 2012.
2012 Five Percent Plan for PM–10 for the Pinal County Township 1 North, Range 8 East Nonattainment Area.	Pinal County Township 1 North, Range 8 East Non-attainment Area.	May 25, 2012	June 10, 2014, 79 FR 33107 ..	Adopted May 25, 2012.
Nonattainment Area Plan for Total Suspended Particulates, Maricopa County Urban Planning Area.	Maricopa County Urban Planning Area.	November 8, 1979	May 5, 1982, 47 FR 19326	
Revision to the Nonattainment Area Plan for Carbon Monoxide and Photochemical Oxidants, Maricopa County Urban Planning Area.	Maricopa County Urban Planning Area.	July 3, 1979	May 5, 1982, 47 FR 19326	
Nonattainment Area Plan for Carbon Monoxide and Photochemical Oxidants, Maricopa County Urban Planning Area.	Maricopa County Urban Planning Area.	February 23, 1979	May 5, 1982, 47 FR 19326	
Letter supplementing the revised transportation control plan.	Phoenix-Tucson Intrastate Air quality Control Region.	October 2, 1973	December 3, 1973, 38 FR 33368.	
Letter supplementing the revised transportation control plan.	Phoenix-Tucson Intrastate Air quality Control Region.	September 21, 1973	December 3, 1973, 38 FR 33368.	
Revised transportation control plan.	Phoenix-Tucson Intrastate Air quality Control Region.	September 11, 1973	December 3, 1973, 38 FR 33368.	EPA approved various transportation control strategies, including certain elements of an inspection program, but disapproved other elements, and approved certain strategies with exception.
2008 Revision to the Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan for the Tucson Air Planning Area (for 2010), excluding appendix D.	Tucson Air Planning Area	July 10, 2008	December 21, 2009, 74 FR 67819.	Adopted by the Pima Association of Governments on June 26, 2008.
Appendix D (Revised)—Supplement to the Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan for the Tucson Air Planning Area (for 2010).	Tucson Air Planning Area	June 22, 2009	December 21, 2009, 74 FR 67819.	Letter from Arizona Department of Environmental Quality re: Vehicle Emissions Inspection Program (VEIP), Revised to include supporting documents authorizing the VEIP from 2009 to 2017. Adopted by the Pima Association of Governments on May 28, 2009.
1996 Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan for the Tucson Air Planning Area (as updated August, 1997).	Tucson Air Planning Area	October 6, 1997	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353; corrected March 18, 2004, 69 FR 12802.	Approval includes base year (1994) emissions inventory; contingency plan, including commitments to follow maintenance plan contingency procedures by the Pima Association of Governments and by the member jurisdictions: the town of Oro Valley, Arizona (Resolution No. (R) 96–38, adopted June 5, 1996), the City of South Tucson (Resolution No. 96–16, adopted on June 10, 1996), Pima County (Resolution and Order No. 1996–120, adopted June 18, 1996), the City of Tucson (Resolution No. 17319, adopted June 24, 1996), and the town of Marana, Arizona (Resolution No. 96–55, adopted June 18, 1996).

TABLE 1—EPA-APPROVED NON-REGULATORY AND QUASI-REGULATORY MEASURES—Continued
[Excluding certain resolutions and statutes, which are listed in tables 2 and 3, respectively] [1]

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area or title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Commitment in the July 22, 1988 submittal letter to apply the oxygenated fuels program of the July 18, 1988 submittal to Pima County.	Pima County	July 22, 1988	January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219	
1987 Carbon Monoxide State Implementation Plan Revision for the Tucson Air Planning Area.	Tucson Air Planning Area	January 6, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Adopted on October 21, 1987. Vacated by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Delaney* v. *EPA.* Control and committal measures were restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.
Improvement Schedules for Transit System and Rideshare Program in Metropolitan Pima County.	Metropolitan Pima County	March 8, 1982	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	Adopted on October 21, 1987.
Metropolitan Pima County Nonattainment Area Plan for TSP.	Metropolitan Pima County	March 27, 1979	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	
Metropolitan Pima County Nonattainment Area Plan for CO.	Metropolitan Pima County	March 20, 1979	July 7, 1982, 47 FR 29532	
Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between Pima County, City of Tucson, City of South Tucson, Town of Oro Valley and Town of Marana, April 18, 1988.	Pima County	May 26, 1988	January 29, 1991	Related to motor vehicle trip reduction.

[1] Table 1 is divided into three parts: Clean Air Act Section 110(a)(2) State Implementation Plan Elements (excluding Part D Elements and Plans), Part D Elements and Plans (other than for the Metropolitan Phoenix or Tucson Areas), and Part D Elements and Plans for the Metropolitan Phoenix and Tucson Areas.
† Vacated by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Delaney* v. *EPA,* 898 F.2d 687 (9th Cir. 1990). Restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY JURISDICTIONS IN MARICOPA AND PINAL COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES IN PM–10 AND CARBON MONOXIDE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Resolution to Implement Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A and Arizona Department of Transportation Plan to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads).	Maricopa County	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Transportation on September 17, 2004.
Resolution to Implement Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 8 pages).	Maricopa County	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Transportation on July 17, 1998.
Resolution to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 24 pages plus index page).	Maricopa County	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Arizona Department of Transportation on June 20, 1997.
Resolution No. C–85–05–005–0–00: Resolution to Implement Additional Measures for the Maricopa County, Arizona Serious PM–10 Nonattainment Area (including Exhibit A).	Maricopa County	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on January 19, 2005.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY JURISDICTIONS IN MARICOPA AND PINAL COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES IN PM–10 AND CARBON MONOXIDE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS—Continued

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Resolution to Adopt the Revised MAG 1999 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area (including Exhibit A, 2 pages).	Maricopa County	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Maricopa Association of Governments on February 14, 2000.
Resolution #9701: Resolution to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 23 pages).	Maricopa County	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Regional Public Transportation Authority on June 12, 1997.
Resolution to Update Control Measure 6 in the Revised MAG 1999 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 2 pages).	Maricopa County	January 8, 2002	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by Maricopa County on December 19, 2001.
Resolution to Implement Measures in the MAG 1999 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 10 pages).	Maricopa County	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by Maricopa County on December 15, 1999.
Resolution to Implement Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 10 pages).	Maricopa County	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by Maricopa County on February 17, 1999.
Resolution to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 9 pages).	Maricopa County	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by Maricopa County on November 19, 1997.
Resolution to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 16 pages).	Maricopa County	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by Maricopa County on June 25, 1997. Transcription error ''1A998'' in the original.
Resolution To Improve the Administration of Maricopa County's Fugitive Dust Program and to Foster Interagency Cooperation.	Maricopa County	May 7, 1997	August 4, 1997, 62 FR 41856	Adopted by Maricopa County on May 14, 1997.
Resolution No. 04–24: A Resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Apache Junction, Arizona, Implementing Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A).	City of Apache Junction	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on September 21, 2004.
Resolution No. 2448–04: A Resolution of the Council of the City of Avondale, Arizona, Implementing Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A).	City of Avondale	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on September 20, 2004.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY JURISDICTIONS IN MARICOPA AND PINAL COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES IN PM–10 AND CARBON MONOXIDE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS—Continued

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Resolution No. 1949–99; A Resolution of the Council of the City of Avondale, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 7 pages).	City of Avondale	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Avondale on February 16, 1999.
Resolution No. 1711–97; A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Avondale, Maricopa County, Arizona, To Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 14 pages).	City of Avondale	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Avondale on September 15, 1997.
Resolution No. 58–04: A Resolution of the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Buckeye, Arizona, Implementing Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emission from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A).	Town of Buckeye	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on November 16, 2004.
Resolution No. 15–97; A Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Buckeye, Maricopa County, Arizona, To Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 5 pages).	Town of Buckeye	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Buckeye on October 7, 1997.
Town of Carefree Resolution No. 98–24; A Resolution of the Mayor and Common Council of the Town of Carefree, Arizona, To Implement Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 4 pages).	Town of Carefree	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Carefree on September 1, 1998.
Town of Carefree Resolution No. 97–16; A Resolution of the Mayor and Common Council of the Town of Carefree, Arizona, To Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 3 pages).	Town of Carefree	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Carefree on September 2, 1997.
Resolution R98–14; A Resolution of the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Cave Creek, Maricopa County, Arizona, To Implement Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 1 page).	Town of Cave Creek	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Cave Creek on December 8, 1998.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY JURISDICTIONS IN MARICOPA AND PINAL COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES IN PM–10 AND CARBON MONOXIDE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS—Continued

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Resolution R97–28; A Resolution of the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Cave Creek, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 4 pages).	Town of Cave Creek	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Cave Creek on September 2, 1997.
Resolution No. 3782: Resolution to Implement Measures to Reduce Re-entrained Dust Emissions from Identified Paved Roads in Chandler As Part of the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for Air Quality (including Exhibit A and Exhibit B).	City of Chandler	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on October 14, 2004.
Resolution No. 2929; A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Chandler, Arizona, To Implement Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 9 pages).	City of Chandler	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Chandler on October 8, 1998.
Resolution No. 2672; A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Chandler, Arizona To Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 16 pages).	City of Chandler	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Chandler on August 14, 1997.
A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Chandler, Arizona, Stating the City's Intent to Work Cooperatively with Maricopa County to Control the Generation of Fugitive Dust Pollution.	City of Chandler	May 7, 1997	August 4, 1997, 62 FR 41856	Adopted by the City of Chandler on March 27, 1997.
Resolution No. R04–10–54: A Resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of El Mirage, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures to Reduce Re-entrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A).	City of El Mirage	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on October 28, 2004.
Resolution No. R98–08–22; A Resolution of the Mayor and Common Council of the City of El Mirage, Arizona, Amending Resolution No. R98–02–04 To Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 5 pages).	City of El Mirage	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of El Mirage on August 27, 1998.
Resolution No. R98–02–04; A Resolution To Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 5 pages).	City of El Mirage	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of El Mirage on February 12, 1998.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY JURISDICTIONS IN MARICOPA AND PINAL COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES IN PM–10 AND CARBON MONOXIDE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS—Continued

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Resolution No. R97–08–20; Resolution To Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 8 pages).	City of El Mirage	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of El Mirage on August 28, 1997.
Resolution No. 2004–63: A Resolution of the Mayor and Council of the Town of Fountain Hills, Arizona, Implementing Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A and Protocol to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads).	Town of Fountain Hills	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on November 18, 2004.
Resolution No. 1998–49; Resolution To Implement Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 7 pages), adopted on October 1, 1998.	Town of Fountain Hills	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Fountain Hills on October 1, 1998. Incorporated materials are pages 4 to 10 of the 11-page resolution package; pages 1 and 2 are cover sheets with no substantive content and page 11 is a summary of measures previously adopted by the Town of Fountain Hills.
Resolution No. 1997–49; A Resolution of the Common Council of the Town of Fountain Hills, Arizona, Adopting the MAG 1997 Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area and Committing to Certain Implementation Programs (including Exhibit B, 5 pages and cover).	Town of Fountain Hills	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Fountain Hills on October 2, 1997.
Resolution No. 2575: A Resolution of the Common Council of the Town of Gilbert, Arizona to Implement Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A and Town of Gilbert Protocol for Reducing PM–10 Emissions from ''High Dust'' Paved Roads).	Town of Gilbert	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on March 29, 2005.
Resolution No. 1939: A Resolution of the Common Council of the Town of Gilbert, Arizona, Expressing its Commitment to Implement Measures in the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Attachment A, 5 pages).	Town of Gilbert	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Gilbert on July 21, 1998. Attachment A is referred to as Exhibit A in the text of the Resolution.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY JURISDICTIONS IN MARICOPA AND PINAL COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES IN PM–10 AND CARBON MONOXIDE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS—Continued

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Resolution No. 1864; A Resolution of the Common Council of the Town of Gilbert, Arizona, Implementing Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Attachment A, 5 pages).	Town of Gilbert	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Gilbert on November 25, 1997. Attachment A is referred to as Exhibit A in the text of the Resolution.
Resolution No. 1817; A Resolution of the Common Council of the Town of Gilbert, Maricopa County, Arizona, Authorizing the Implementation of the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and the MAG Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including 15 pages of attached material).	Town of Gilbert	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Gilbert on June 10, 1997.
A Resolution of the Mayor and the Common Council of the Town of Gilbert, Maricopa County, Arizona, Providing for the Town's Intent to Work Cooperatively with Maricopa County, Arizona, to Control the Generation of Fugitive Dust Pollution.	Town of Gilbert	May 7, 1997	August 4, 1997, 62 FR 41856	Adopted by the Town of Gilbert on April 15, 1997.
Resolution No. 3796 New Series: A Resolution of the Council of the City of Glendale, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A and Glendale Targeted Street Sweeping Protocol to Reduce Dust Emissions).	City of Glendale	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on September 14, 2004.
Resolution No. 3225 New Series; A Resolution of the Council of the City of Glendale, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 9 pages).	City of Glendale	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Glendale on July 28, 1998.
Resolution No. 3161 New Series; A Resolution of the Council of the City of Glendale, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 6 pages).	City of Glendale	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Glendale on October 28, 1997.
Resolution No. 3123 New Series; A Resolution of the Council of the City of Glendale, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 20 pages).	City of Glendale	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Glendale on June 10, 1997.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY JURISDICTIONS IN MARICOPA AND PINAL COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES IN PM–10 AND CARBON MONOXIDE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS—Continued

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
A Resolution of the Council of the City of Chandler, Maricopa County, Arizona, Stating Its Intent to Work Cooperatively with Maricopa County to Control the Generation of Fugitive Dust Pollution.	City of Glendale	May 7, 1997	August 4, 1997, 62 FR 41856	Adopted by the City of Glendale on March 25, 1997.
Resolution No. 04–941: A Resolution of the Mayor and Council of the City of Goodyear, Maricopa County, Arizona, to Authorize the City Manager to Implement Measures to Reduce Re-entrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A and Protocol for Reducing Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads).	City of Goodyear	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on October 25, 2004.
Resolution No. 98–645; A Resolution of the Council of the City of Goodyear, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Attachment III, 7 pages).	City of Goodyear	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Goodyear on July 27, 1998.
Resolution No. 97–604 Carbon Monoxide Plan; A Resolution of the Council of the City of Goodyear, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 21 pages).	City of Goodyear	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Goodyear on September 9, 1997. Adoption year not given on the resolution but is understood to be 1997 based on resolution number.
Resolution No. 8344: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Mesa, Maricopa County, Arizona, Stating the City's Intent to Implement Measures to Reduce Particulate Pollution (including Exhibit A).	City of Mesa	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on October 4, 2004.
Resolution No. 7360; A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Mesa, Maricopa County, Arizona, to Implement Measures in the MAG Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 8 pages).	City of Mesa	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Mesa on May 3, 1999.
Resolution No. 7123; A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Mesa, Maricopa County, Arizona, to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 10 pages).	City of Mesa	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Mesa on December 1, 1997.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY JURISDICTIONS IN MARICOPA AND PINAL COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES IN PM–10 AND CARBON MONOXIDE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS—Continued

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Resolution No. 7061; A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Mesa, Maricopa County, Arizona, to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 13 pages plus index page).	City of Mesa	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Mesa on June 23, 1997.
A Resolution of the Mesa City Council Stating the City's Intent to Work Cooperatively with Maricopa County to Control the Generation of Particulate Air Pollution and Directing City Staff to Develop a Particulate Pollution Control Ordinance Supported by Adequate Staffing Levels to Address Air Quality.	City of Mesa	May 7, 1997	August 4, 1997, 62 FR 41856	Adopted by the City of Mesa on April 23, 1997.
Resolution Number 1084: Resolution to Implement Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A).	Town of Paradise Valley	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on September 23, 2004.
Resolution Number 945; A Resolution of the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Paradise Valley, Arizona, to Implement Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 5 pages).	Town of Paradise Valley	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Paradise Valley on July 23, 1998.
Resolution Number 913; A Resolution of the Town of Paradise Valley, to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 9 pages).	Town of Paradise Valley	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Paradise Valley on October 9, 1997.
Resolution No. 04–235: A Resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Peoria, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A and City of Peoria Targeted Paved Roadways Dust Control Protocol, September 24, 2004).	City of Peoria	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on October 5, 2004.
Resolution No. 98–107; A Resolution of the Mayor and Council of the City of Peoria, Arizona, to Approve and Authorize the Acceptance to Implement Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 7 pages).	City of Peoria	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Peoria on July 21, 1998.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY JURISDICTIONS IN MARICOPA AND PINAL COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES IN PM–10 AND CARBON MONOXIDE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS—Continued

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Resolution No. 97–113; A Resolution of the Mayor and Council of the City of Peoria, Arizona, to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area and Directing the Recording of This Resolution with the Maricopa County Recorder and Declaring an Emergency (including Exhibit A, 8 pages plus index page).	City of Peoria	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Peoria on October 21, 1997.
Resolution No. 97–37; A Resolution of the Mayor and Council of the City of Peoria, Arizona, to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibits A, 5 pages, and B, 19 pages).	City of Peoria	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Peoria on June 17, 1997.
Resolution No. 20114: A Resolution Stating the City's Intent to Implement Measures to Reduce Air Pollution (including Exhibit A, City of Phoenix 2004 Protocol and Implementation Plan for Paved Streets with Potential for Dust Emissions, and Attachment A).	City of Phoenix	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on June 16, 2004.
Resolution No. 19141; A Resolution Stating the City's Intent to Implement Measures to Reduce Particulate Air Pollution (including Exhibit A, 10 pages).	City of Phoenix	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Phoenix on September 9, 1998.
Resolution No. 19006; A Resolution Stating the City's Intent to Implement Measures to Reduce Air Pollution (including Exhibit A, 13 pages).	City of Phoenix	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Phoenix on November 19, 1997.
Resolution No. 18949; A Resolution Stating the City's Intent to Implement Measures to Reduce Air Pollution (including Exhibit A, 19 pages).	City of Phoenix	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Phoenix on July 2, 1997.
Resolution 1889A Resolution of the Phoenix City Council Stating the City's Intent to Work Cooperatively with Maricopa County to Control the Generation of Fugitive Dust Pollution.	City of Phoenix	May 7, 1997	August 4, 1997, 62 FR 41856	Adopted by the City of Phoenix on April 9, 1997.
Resolution 175–98; A Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Queen Creek, Maricopa County, Arizona to Implement Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 9 pages).	Town of Queen Creek	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Queen Creek on September 16, 1998.
Resolution 145–97; A Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Queen Creek, Maricopa County, Arizona to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 1 page).	Town of Queen Creek	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Queen Creek on November 5, 1997.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY JURISDICTIONS IN MARICOPA AND PINAL COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES IN PM–10 AND CARBON MONOXIDE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS—Continued

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Resolution 129–97; A Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Queen Creek, Maricopa County, Arizona to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 3 pages).	Town of Queen Creek	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Queen Creek on June 4, 1997.
Resolution No. 6588: A Resolution of the Council of the City of Scottsdale, Maricopa County Arizona, Authorizing Implementation of Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A and Attachment #1—Protocol to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads).	City of Scottsdale	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on December 6, 2004.
Resolution No. 5100; A Resolution of the City of Scottsdale, Maricopa County, Arizona, To Strengthen Particulate Dust Control and Air Pollution Measures in the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 10 pages).	City of Scottsdale	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Scottsdale on December 1, 1998.
Resolution No. 4942; Resolution of the Scottsdale City Council To Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 13 pages).	City of Scottsdale	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Scottsdale on December 1, 1997.
Resolution No. 4864; A Resolution of the City of Scottsdale, Maricopa County, Arizona, To Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area: Stating the Council's Intent to Implement Certain Control Measures Contained in that Plan (including Exhibit A, 21 pages).	City of Scottsdale	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Scottsdale on August 4, 1997.
A Resolution of the Scottsdale City Council Stating the City's Intent to Work Cooperatively with Maricopa County to Control the Generation of Fugitive Dust Pollution.	City of Scottsdale	May 7, 1997	August 4, 1997, 62 FR 41856	Adopted by the City of Scottsdale on March 31, 1997.
Resolution No. 04–163: A Resolution of the Mayor and Council of the City of Surprise, Arizona, to Implement Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A and Protocol).	City of Surprise	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on September 23, 2004.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY JURISDICTIONS IN MARICOPA AND PINAL COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES IN PM–10 AND CARBON MONOXIDE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS—Continued

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Resolution No. 98–51; A Resolution to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 6 pages).	City of Surprise	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Surprise on September 10, 1998.
Resolution No. 97–67; A Resolution to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 3 pages).	City of Surprise	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Surprise on October 23, 1997.
Resolution No. 97–29; A Resolution to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 4 pages).	City of Surprise	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Surprise on June 12, 1997.
Resolution No. 2004.84: A Resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Tempe, Arizona, to Implement Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A and Protocol for Reducing Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads, September 30, 2004).	City of Tempe	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on September 30, 2004.
Resolution No. 98.42, Resolution of the Council of the City of Tempe Implementing Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 8 pages).	City of Tempe	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Tempe on September 10, 1998.
Resolution No. 97.71, Resolution of the Council of the City of Tempe Stating Its Intent to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 6 pages).	City of Tempe	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Tempe on November 13, 1997.
Resolution No. 97.39; Resolution to Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 18 pages).	City of Tempe	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Tempe on June 12, 1997.
A Resolution of the Council of the City of Tempe, Arizona, Stating Its Intent to Work Cooperatively with Maricopa County to Control the Generation of Fugitive Dust Pollution.	City of Tempe	May 7, 1997	August 4, 1997, 62 FR 41856	Adopted by the City of Tempe on March 27, 1997.

TABLE 2—EPA-APPROVED RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY JURISDICTIONS IN MARICOPA AND PINAL COUNTIES TO IMPLEMENT MEASURES IN PM–10 AND CARBON MONOXIDE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS—Continued

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or non-attainment area	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Resolution No. 947: A Resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Tolleson, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures to Reduce Re-entrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A), adopted on September 28, 2004.	City of Tolleson	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on September 28, 2004.
Resolution No. 808, A Resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Tolleson, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures in the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A).	City of Tolleson	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Tolleson on July 28, 1998.
Resolution No. 788, A Resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Tolleson, Maricopa County, Arizona, Implementing Measures in the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 12 pages).	City of Tolleson	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the City of Tolleson on June 10, 1997.
Resolution No. 1308, Resolution To Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 4 pages).	Town of Wickenburg	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Wickenburg on August 18, 1997.
Resolution No. 05–01: Resolution to Implement Measures to Reduce Reentrained Dust Emissions from Targeted Paved Roads in the Revised PM–10 State Implementation Plan for the Salt River Area (including Exhibit A).	Town of Youngtown	October 7, 2005	August 21, 2007, 72 FR 46564	Adopted on January 20, 2005.
Resolution No. 98–15: Resolution To Implement Measures in the MAG 1998 Serious Area Particulate Plan for PM–10 for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 8 pages).	Town of Youngtown	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Youngtown on August 20, 1998.
Resolution No 98–05: Resolution Stating Intent to Work Cooperatively with Maricopa County to Control the Generation of Fugitive Dust Pollution (including Exhibit A, 2 pages).	Town of Youngtown	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Youngtown on February 19, 1998.
Resolution No. 97–15, Resolution To Implement Measures in the MAG 1997 Serious Particulate Plan for PM–10 and MAG 1998 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Area (including Exhibit A, 4 pages).	Town of Youngtown	February 16, 2000	July 25, 2002, 67 FR 48718	Adopted by the Town of Youngtown on September 18, 1997.

TABLE 3—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA STATUTES—NON-REGULATORY

State citation	Title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES Title 15 (Education) Chapter 12 (Community Colleges) Article 3 (Community College District Boards)				
15–1444	Powers and duties	March 23, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30220; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	Subsection C only. Senate Bill 1360, section 6.†
Chapter 13 (Universities and Related Institutions) Article 2 (Arizona Board of Regents)				
15–1627	Control of vehicles and non-pedestrian devices on property of institutions under jurisdiction of board; sanctions; compliance with emissions inspection; definition.	July 18, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	House Bill 2206, section 2.†
Title 28 (Transportation) Chapter 2 (Administration) Article 6 (Unblended Gasoline Shortages) [1]				
28–2701	Definitions	July 18, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	House Bill 2206, section 6.† Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.
28–2702	Department Survey of Availability of Unblended Gasoline.	July 18, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	House Bill 2206, section 6.† Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.
28–2703	Determination of Shortage: Declaration.	July 18, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	House Bill 2206, section 6.† Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.
28–2704	State Set-aside Volume	July 18, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	House Bill 2206, section 6.† Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.
28–2705	Assignment of Set-aside	July 18, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	House Bill 2206, section 6.† Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.
28–2706	Price	July 18, 1988	January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219	House Bill 2206, section 6. Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.
28–2707	Application	July 18, 1988	January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219	House Bill 2206, section 6. Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.
28–2708	Appeals	July 18, 1988	January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219	House Bill 2206, section 6. Delayed effective date per section 29 of HB 2206.
Chapter 7 (Certification of Title and Registration) Article 5 (Registration Requirements Generally)				
28–2153	Registration requirement; exceptions; assessment; violation; classification.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
Title 35 (Public Finances) Chapter 2 (Handling of Public Funds) Article 2 (State Management of Public Monies)				
35–313	Investment of trust and treasury monies; loan of securities.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
Title 36 (Public Health and Safety) Chapter 6 Article 8 (Air Pollution)				
36–772	Department of Health Services; Studies.	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–775	Powers and Duties	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	

TABLE 3—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA STATUTES—NON-REGULATORY—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
36–779.01	Permits; Exceptions; Applications; Fees.	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–779.02	Grant or Denial of Applications	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–779.04	Permit Nontransferable	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–779.05	Expiration of Permit	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–779.06	Posting of Permit	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–779.07	Notice by Building Permit Agencies.	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–780	Classification and Reporting: Production of Records; Confidentiality of Records; Violation; Penalty.	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–789	Unlawful Open Burning; Exceptions; Violation; Penalty.	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–789.02	Defenses	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–790	Limitations	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–791	Preservation of Rights	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
Chapter 14 (Air Pollution) Article 1 (State Air Pollution Control)				
36–1704	Hearing Board	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–1707.02	Grant or Denial of Application	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–1707.03	Appeals to Hearing Board	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–1707.04	Permit Nontransferable; Exception.	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–1707.05	Posting of Permit	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–1707.06	Notice by Building Permit Agencies.	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–1708	Classification and Reporting; Production of Records: Confidentiality of Records; Violation; Penalty.	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–1717	Motor Vehicle and Combustion Engine Emissions; Standards.	August 5, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–1718	Limitations	August 5, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–1718.01	Preservation of Rights	August 5, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–1720	Violation; Classification; Agreement Provisions.	August 5, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
36–1720.01	Defenses	July 13, 1981	June 18, 1982, 47 FR 26382.	
Title 38 (Public Officers and Employees) Chapter 1 (General Provisions) Article 1 (Definitions)				
38–101	Definitions	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
Article 8 (Conflict of Interest of Officers and Employees)				
38–501	Application of article	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
38–502	Definitions	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
38–503	Conflict of interest; exemptions; employment prohibition.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
38–504	Prohibited acts	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.

TABLE 3—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA STATUTES—NON-REGULATORY—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
38–505	Additional income prohibited for services.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
38–506	Remedies	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
38–507	Opinions of the attorney general, county attorneys, city or town attorneys and house and senate ethics committee.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
38–508	Authority of public officers and employees to act.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
38–509	Filing of disclosures	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
38–510	Penalties	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
38–511	Cancellation of political subdivision and state contracts; definition.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
Title 41 (State Government) Chapter 1 (Executive Officers) Article 1 (The Governor)				
41–101.03	State Employee Ride Sharing Program; Designated State Agency; Fund.	July 18, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	House Bill 2206, section 7.
Chapter 4 (Department of Administration and Personnel Board) Article 7 (Management of State Properties)				
41–796.01	Adjusted work hours	September 1, 1999	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353	House Bill 2189, section 3.
Chapter 15 (Department of Weights and Measures) Article 2 (State Administration of Weights and Measures)				
41–2065	Powers and Duties	June 11, 1991	March 9, 1992, 57 FR 8268	House Bill 2181, section 1.
41–2066	Enforcement powers of the director and inspectors.	July 18, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	House Bill 2206, section 10.≤†
41–2066(A)(2)	Enforcement powers of the director and inspectors.	January 22, 2004	March 4, 2004, 69 FR 10161	Included in submittal entitled ''Supplement to Cleaner Burning Gasoline Program State Implementation Plan Revision.''
Title 49 (The Environment) Chapter 1 (General Provisions) Article 1 (Department of Environmental Quality)				
49–103	Department employees; legal counsel.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.

TABLE 3—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA STATUTES—NON-REGULATORY—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
49–104, subsections (A)(2), (A)(4), (B)(3), and (B)(5) only.	Powers and duties of the department and director.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–106	Statewide application of rules ..	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
Chapter 3 (Air Quality) Article 1 (General Provisions)				
49–402	State and county control	October 29, 2012, and supplemented on September 6, 2013.	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	West's Arizona Revised Statutes, 2012–2013 Compact Edition.
49–403	Air Quality Compliance Advisory Committee.	July 18, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	House Bill 2206, section 15.†
49–404	State implementation plan	September 1, 1999	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353	House Bill 2189, section 42.
49–404	Department of transportation pilot project on oxygenated fuels, compressed natural gas and liquid propane gas; reports.	July 18, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	House Bill 2206, section 15.†
49–405	Attainment area designations ..	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–405	Oxygenated Fuel Fleet Studies Reporting Requirements.	July 18, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	House Bill 2206, section 15.≤†
49–406	Nonattainment area plan	August 11, 1998	June 8, 2000, 65 FR 36353	Senate Bill 1427, section 15.
49–406	Clean burning reporting requirements; definitions.	July 18, 1988	August 10, 1988, 53 FR 30224; vacated; restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.	House Bill 2206, section 15.†
Article 2 (State Air Pollution Control)				
49–421	Definitions	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–422	Powers and duties	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–424	Duties of department	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–425	Rules; hearing	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–426, excluding paragraphs D, E.1, F, I, J, and M.	Permits; duties of director; exceptions; applications; objections; fees.	July 28, 2011, and supplemented on May 16, 2014.	September 23, 2014, 79 FR 56655.	West's Arizona Revised Statutes, 2012–2013 Compact Edition.
49–433	Special inspection warrant	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.

TABLE 3—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA STATUTES—NON-REGULATORY—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
49–435	Hearings on orders of abatement.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–441	Suspension and revocation of conditional order.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–455, subsections (A) and (B)(2) only.	Permit administration fund	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–460	Violations; production of records.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–461	Violations; order of abatement	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–462	Violations; injunctive relief	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–463	Violations; civil penalties	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–465	Air pollution emergency	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
Article 3 (County Air Pollution Control)				
49–471	Definitions	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–473	Board of supervisors	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–474	County control boards	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–476.01	Monitoring	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–478	Hearing board	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.

TABLE 3—EPA-APPROVED ARIZONA STATUTES—NON-REGULATORY—Continued

State citation	Title/subject	State submittal date	EPA approval date	Explanation
49–479	Rules; hearing	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–480.02	Appeals of permit actions	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–482	Appeals to hearing board	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–488	Special inspection warrant	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–490	Hearings on orders of abatement.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–495	Suspension and revocation of conditional order.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–502	Violation; classification	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–510	Violations; production of records.	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–511	Violations; order of abatement	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–512	Violations; injunctive relief	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.
49–513	Violations; civil penalties	August 24, 2012	November 5, 2012, 77 FR 66398.	Arizona Revised Statutes (West's, 2011–2012 Compact Edition). Adopted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 24, 2012.

† Vacated by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Delaney* v. *EPA,* 898 F.2d 687 (9th Cir. 1990). Restored on January 29, 1991, 56 FR 3219.
[1] Approved as Chapter 22 (Unblended Gasoline Shortages), Article 1 (General Provisions).

[FR Doc. 2016–27685 Filed 11–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 81 Wednesday,
No. 226 November 23, 2016

Part IV

The President

Federal Register
Vol. 81, No. 226
Wednesday, November 23, 2016

Presidential Documents

Title 3—

The President

Proclamation 9544 of November 18, 2016

National Family Week, 2016

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Through every passing generation, families have formed the backbone of our society. With pride, passion, and a commitment to their loved ones, family members give of themselves to create opportunities they never had and forge a brighter future for themselves and their children. This week, we honor the families who have built the America we know today and reaffirm our commitment to ensuring every family can have their chance at a fair shot.

Nobody should have to choose between spending time with their family and financially supporting them, and my Administration has prioritized efforts to strengthen families and address the challenges we face in our workforce. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, the uninsured rate has never been lower, and more families have been able to get quality, affordable health care. But there is more work to be done. The United States is the only advanced country that does not guarantee paid family or sick leave, and too often, American workers have to make painful choices about whether they can afford to be there when their families need them most. Workers also deserve fair work schedules that ensure predictability and certainty. And women should be paid the same as men for doing the same jobs—a principle that is not just fair and ethical, but also necessary because more women are their family's main breadwinners than ever before.

We all have a role to play in lifting up families, and the Federal Government is leading by example. To help give more families the comfort of safe and nurturing child care, my Administration published a new rule earlier this year to strengthen quality, health, and safety standards for child care programs. Earlier this year, I took action to expand overtime protections to more than 4 million workers, and because no one who works full time should have to raise their family in poverty, I have called on the Congress to raise the Federal minimum wage—in the meantime, cities, States, and businesses across our country have taken action, answering the call to raise the minimum wage and helping American families everywhere.

Families of every race, religion, and background have written America's story and embodied our founding notion: that out of many, we are one. Adoptive and foster families open their hearts and their homes to welcome children in need, patriotic military families sacrifice precious time with their loved ones to give us the opportunity to be with ours, and last year, the families of gay and lesbian couples who fought so long for basic civil rights were finally recognized as equal under the law.

Through challenging moments and difficult times, America's families are representative of the strength and unity at the core of our communities. Their love is an enduring reminder of what is best about our country. This week, let us celebrate the devotion of dedicated family members across our Nation and pledge to give them the support they need to thrive.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, BARACK OBAMA, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim November 20 through

November 26, 2016, as National Family Week. I invite all States, communities, and individuals to join in observing this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities to honor our Nation's families.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this eighteenth day of November, in the year of our Lord two thousand sixteen, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and forty-first.

[FR Doc. 2016–28466
Filed 11–22–16; 11:15 am]
Billing code 3295–F7–P

Presidential Documents

Proclamation 9545 of November 18, 2016

National Child's Day, 2016

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

No matter what zip code they are born into, every young child in America deserves the opportunity to learn, grow, and realize their dreams in a safe and healthy environment. From ensuring they are cared for and nourished to helping them become educated participants in our democracy, we must all do our part to support the next generation of leaders. Today, let us lift up every child in need and strive to leave behind a world that we are proud of for children across our country.

My Administration has worked to put children in every community on a path to a healthier future. Through First Lady Michelle Obama's *Let's Move!* initiative, we have fostered environments that support healthy choices, promote physical activity, and reduce childhood obesity. We have also fought to improve Head Start and expand quality, affordable child care, which promotes healthy development and school readiness in young children and helps families be more financially secure at home. Because of the broader coverage expansions made possible by the Affordable Care Act (ACA), and improvements made to the Children's Health Insurance Plan through legislation I signed during my first month in office, more than 3 million children have gotten health insurance and the uninsured rate among children has fallen by almost half since 2008. And because of the ACA, children can no longer be denied coverage because of a pre-existing condition. They can also remain on a parent's health insurance plan until age 26, and all plans on the Health Insurance Marketplace are now required to cover basic pediatric services. Anyone who is in need of health insurance can visit www.HealthCare.gov to find coverage for themselves and their children. You can also visit www.Medicaid.gov to find out if you qualify for coverage through Medicaid.

It is one of our greatest obligations to create cleaner and safer environments for our children to live in. Not only must we protect our planet against climate change and secure it for future generations, but we must continue taking concrete action to reduce the effects that dirty air and water can impose on our children—such as the potential for higher incidence of asthma attacks. We must also work to keep our children safe from violence and abuse, prevent youth substance use and its consequences, and modernize our juvenile justice system to hold youth accountable for their actions without consigning them to a never-ending cycle of incarceration.

We know that when we invest in young children, the outcomes are significant—and by investing in early education and preschool for all, we can set children up for success later in life. Education has the potential to unlock ladders of opportunity and empower children to pursue their passions, and we must continue working to strengthen our Nation's education system for children at every grade level. That is why my Administration has pursued efforts to bring higher education within reach for more students and make college more affordable.

Our journey is not complete until all our children are cared for, cherished, and safe from harm. On National Child's Day, let us forge a future of greater opportunity and prosperity for every young person, and let us seek

to reach our greatest potential as a Nation by ensuring our daughters and sons can live up to theirs.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, BARACK OBAMA, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim November 20, 2016, as National Child's Day. I call upon all citizens to observe this day with appropriate activities, programs, and ceremonies, and to rededicate ourselves to creating the bright future we want for our Nation's children.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this eighteenth day of November, in the year of our Lord two thousand sixteen, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and forty-first.

[FR Doc. 2016–28467
Filed 11–22–16; 11:15 am]
Billing code 3295–F7–P

Reader Aids

Federal Register

Vol. 81, No. 226

Wednesday, November 23, 2016

CUSTOMER SERVICE AND INFORMATION

ELECTRONIC RESEARCH

World Wide Web

Full text of the daily Federal Register, CFR and other publications is located at: **www.fdsys.gov.**

Federal Register information and research tools, including Public Inspection List, indexes, and Code of Federal Regulations are located at: **www.ofr.gov.**

E-mail

FEDREGTOC (Daily Federal Register Table of Contents Electronic Mailing List) is an open e-mail service that provides subscribers with a digital form of the Federal Register Table of Contents. The digital form of the Federal Register Table of Contents includes HTML and PDF links to the full text of each document.

To join or leave, go to **https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/USGPOOFR/subscriber/new**, enter your email address, then follow the instructions to join, leave, or manage your subscription.

PENS (Public Law Electronic Notification Service) is an e-mail service that notifies subscribers of recently enacted laws.

To subscribe, go to **http://listserv.gsa.gov/archives/publaws-l.html** and select *Join or leave the list (or change settings);* then follow the instructions.

FEDREGTOC and **PENS** are mailing lists only. We cannot respond to specific inquiries.

Reference questions. Send questions and comments about the Federal Register system to: **fedreg.info@nara.gov**

The Federal Register staff cannot interpret specific documents or regulations.

CFR Checklist. Effective January 1, 2009, the CFR Checklist no longer appears in the Federal Register. This information can be found online at **http://bookstore.gpo.gov/.**

FEDERAL REGISTER PAGES AND DATE, NOVEMBER

CFR PARTS AFFECTED DURING NOVEMBER

At the end of each month the Office of the Federal Register publishes separately a List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA), which lists parts and sections affected by documents published since the revision date of each title.

72.....78022
429.....79224, 79261
430.....79261
431 .....79224, 79261, 79991
Proposed Rules:
34.....78732
71.....83171
73.....78062
430.....76877, 80008
431.....75742
460.....78733
835.....81701
1016.....80612

11 CFR

Proposed Rules:
1.....76416
2.....76416
4.....76416
5.....76416
6.....76416
7.....76416
100.....76416
102.....76416
103.....76416
104.....76416
105.....76416
106.....76416
108.....76416
109.....76416
110.....76416
111.....76416
112.....76416
114.....76416
116.....76416
200.....76416
201.....76416
300.....76416
9002.....76416
9003.....76416
9004.....76416
9007.....76416
9032.....76416
9033.....76416
9034.....76416
9035.....76416
9036.....76416
9038.....76416
9039.....76416

12 CFR

209.....84415
309.....83643
708a.....76495
708b.....76495
747.....78028
790.....76495
1005.....83934
1026.....83934
1200.....76291
1201.....76291
1229.....76291
1238.....76291
1239.....76291
1261.....76291
1264.....76291
1266.....76291
1267.....76291
1269.....76291
1270.....76291
1273.....76291
1274.....76291
1278.....76291
1281.....76291
1282.....76291
1290.....76291
1291.....76291
Proposed Rules:
Regulation H.....78063
22.....78063
208.....78063
326.....75753
339.....78063
343.....83174
390.....83174
391.....75753
614.....78063
701.....78748
760.....78063

13 CFR

Proposed Rules:
131.....83718
300.....79394
301.....79394
302.....79394
303.....79394
304.....79394
305.....79394
307.....79394
309.....79394
314.....79394

14 CFR

23.....83112
29.....78707, 78708
39 .....75684, 75686, 75687, 76843, 76845, 76848, 76851, 78708, 78711, 78899, 79381, 79384, 81660, 83648, 83653, 83655, 83657, 83660, 83662, 83665
71 .....76854, 76855, 76857, 76858, 78902, 78904, 78905, 78906, 83668
73.....78029, 79998
97.....83669, 83670
234.....76300, 76800
241.....76300
244.....76800
250.....76800
255.....76800
256.....76800
257.....76800
259.....76800
399.....76800
Proposed Rules:
23.....83737
27.....83744
29.....83744
39 .....75757, 75759, 75761, 75762, 76532, 76540, 76883, 76885, 78080, 78083, 78085, 78944, 78947, 79395, 80009, 81018, 81021, 81704, 81707, 81709, 83180, 83182, 83745
71 .....76886, 76888, 78088, 78756, 78949, 80618, 80620, 83749, 83750

15 CFR

730.....78714
738.....76859
740.....76859
742.....76859
744.....78714, 81663
746.....76859
770.....83114
774.....83114
902.....84419, 84434
Proposed Rules:
923.....78514

16 CFR

455.....81664
Proposed Rules:
314.....80011
1241.....83556

17 CFR

3.....80563
200.....81870, 83494
210.....81870, 82084
230.....83494
232.....81870
239.....81870, 83494
240.....81870, 83494
249.....81870, 83494
270 .....81870, 82084, 83494
274.....81870, 82084
275.....83494
Proposed Rules:
240.....79122

18 CFR

Proposed Rules:
33.....76542, 78756
35.....78756
40.....76542
45.....76542
153.....76542
157.....76542
340.....76542
341.....76542
342.....76315, 76542
343.....76315, 76542
344.....76542
345.....76542
346.....76542
347.....76542
357.....76315
380.....76542

19 CFR

12.....84458
103.....83625

20 CFR

Proposed Rules:
220.....78757

21 CFR

5.....78033
10.....78500
73.....75689
74.....75689
101.....84459, 84465
117.....75692
176.....83672
201.....81685
211.....81685
330.....84465
507.....75693
1105.....80567
1308.....79389
Proposed Rules:
1.....78526, 79400
101.....76323, 84516
573.....78528

22 CFR

121.....83126

24 CFR

5.....80724, 80989
91.....80724
92.....80724
93.....80724
200.....80724
247.....80724
574.....80724
576.....80724
578.....80724
880.....80724
882.....80724
883.....80724
884.....80724
886.....80724
888.....80567
891.....80724
905.....80724
960.....80724
966.....80724
982.....80567, 80724
983.....80567, 80724
985.....80567
1000.....80989, 83674
1003.....80989
1005.....80989
1006.....80989
1007.....80989

25 CFR

170.....78456
517.....76306
584.....76306
585.....76306

26 CFR

1 .....76496, 76497, 78908, 80587, 80993, 80994
Proposed Rules:
1 .....76542, 76544, 84518

27 CFR

Proposed Rules:
4.....81023
24.....83752

29 CFR

102.....83135
1910.....82494
4022.....80002
4044.....83137
Proposed Rules:
1208.....79400

30 CFR

250.....80587, 80994
700.....80592
701.....80592
773.....80592
774.....80592
777.....80592
779.....80592
780.....80592
783.....80592
784.....80592
785.....80592
800.....80592
816.....80592
817.....80592
824.....80592
827.....80592
Proposed Rules:
250.....81033

31 CFR

Ch. V.....76861
501.....76861

LIST OF PUBLIC LAWS

Note: No public bills which have become law were received by the Office of the Federal Register for inclusion in today's **List of Public Laws**.

Last List October 19, 2016

Public Laws Electronic Notification Service (PENS)

PENS is a free electronic mail notification service of newly enacted public laws. To subscribe, go to *http://listserv.gsa.gov/archives/publaws-l.html*

Note: This service is strictly for E-mail notification of new laws. The text of laws is not available through this service. **PENS** cannot respond to specific inquiries sent to this address.