

changes during the third quarter of 2017.²³

III. Discussion and Commission Findings

After careful review, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder that are applicable to a national securities exchange.²⁴ Specifically, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act,²⁵ which requires, among other things, that the rules of a national securities exchange 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 facilitating transactions in securities, 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. The Commission finds that the proposed rule change also is designed to support the principles of Section 11A(a)(1)²⁶ of the Act in that it seeks to assure fair competition among brokers and dealers and among exchange markets.

The Commission finds that the Exchange's proposal is consistent with the Act because it provides an optional tool that market makers may use as a backstop to help maintain a continuous quote in satisfaction of the Exchange's minimum continuous quoting requirements, which may assist in the maintenance of fair and orderly markets. The Commission notes, however, that notwithstanding the availability of the Market Maker Peg Order functionality, the market maker remains responsible for meeting its obligations under IEX Rule 11.151, including entering, monitoring, and re-submitting, as applicable, compliant quotations. At the same time, the Commission finds that the proposal is reasonably designed to assist market makers in complying with the regulatory requirements of the Market Access Rule and Regulation SHO. The Commission notes, however, the Market Maker Peg Order does not by itself ensure that the market maker is satisfying the requirements of the Market Access Rule or Regulation SHO, including the satisfaction of the locate

requirements of Rule 203(b)(1) of the Act or any exception thereto.

The Commission believes that the Exchange's proposal to subject all inbound and outbound communications related to Market Maker Peg Orders, including the automatic repricing of such orders, to POP latency is consistent with the Act. In particular, this treatment of the Market Maker Peg Order places a market maker using this order type in the same position as another market maker placing and updating its own quote directly without using the Market Maker Peg Order type—both will be subject to the POP and experience the same latency. In addition, this approach is consistent with the treatment of other displayed orders on the Exchange, all of which are subject to the POP latency.

Further, the Commission believes that the Exchange's proposal to specify how Market Maker Peg Orders will be priced in order to comply with the Tick Pilot Plan is consistent with the Act and Rule 608 of Regulation NMS²⁷ because it implements the Tick Pilot Plan and conforms Exchange rules to those requirements.²⁸

Finally, the Commission notes that other national securities exchanges offer similar order types to the Exchange's proposed Market Maker Peg Order,²⁹ and the Commission received no comments on the Exchange's proposed rule change.

IV. Conclusion

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,³⁰ that the proposed rule change (SR-IEX-2017-22), be and hereby is, approved.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.³¹

Eduardo A. Aleman,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2017-18455 Filed 8-30-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

²⁷ 17 CFR 242.608.

²⁸ The Commission notes that in this regard IEX's proposal is substantially similar to Bats BZX Exchange, Inc. ("Bats") Rule 11.27(c)(5).

²⁹ See, e.g., Bats Rule 11.9(c)(16), Nasdaq Stock Market LLC Rule 4702(b)(7), and Bats EDGX Exchange, Inc. Rule 11.8(e).

³⁰ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

³¹ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-81486; File No. SR-ICC-2017-012]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; ICE Clear Credit LLC; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change Relating to ICC's Liquidity Risk Management Framework and ICC's Stress Testing Framework

August 25, 2017.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934¹ and Rule 19b-4,² notice is hereby given that on August 22, 2017, ICE Clear Credit LLC ("ICC") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") the proposed rule change described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been primarily prepared by ICC. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Clearing Agency's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The principal purpose of the proposed rule change is to revise the ICC Liquidity Risk Management Framework and the ICC Stress Testing Framework. These revisions do not require any changes to the ICC Clearing Rules ("Rules").

II. Clearing Agency's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, ICC 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. ICC has prepared summaries, set forth in sections (A), (B), and (C) below, of the most significant aspects of these statements.

(A) Clearing Agency's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

(a) Purpose

ICC proposes revisions to its Stress Testing Framework and its Liquidity Risk Management Framework. Specifically, ICC proposes changes to enhance ICC's stress testing and liquidity stress testing practices following the clearing of Single Name ("SN") credit default swaps ("CDS") referencing ICC Clearing Participants

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

²³ See *id.* at 32029.

²⁴ In approving this rule change, the Commission has considered the rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. See 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

²⁵ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

²⁶ 15 U.S.C. 78k-1(a)(1).

(“CPs”). ICC also proposes changes to the Stress Testing Framework to enhance compliance with U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (“CFTC”) regulations including 17 CFR 39.36. ICC believes such revisions will facilitate the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions and derivative agreements, contracts, and transactions for which it is responsible. The proposed revisions are described in detail as follows.

Stress Testing Framework

ICC proposes changes to its Stress Testing Framework following clearing of SN CDS referencing ICC CPs. ICC proposes amendments to the ‘Predefined Scenarios’ section of the Stress Testing Framework to amend scenarios classified as Hypothetically Constructed (Forward Looking) Extreme but Plausible Market Scenarios to incorporate additional losses related to the Expected Loss-Given-Default (“ELGD”) of all names not explicitly assumed to enter a state of default in a CP’s portfolio, and not limited to those in the Banking or Sovereign sectors. The ELGD amount will accumulate the LGD of all of the SNs in the portfolio that do not explicitly enter a state of default, weighted by the market observed 1-year end-of-day Default Probability.³

ICC proposes to incorporate an enhanced analysis into the ‘General Wrong Way Risk and Contagion Stress Tests’ section of the Stress Testing Framework that estimates profits and losses (“P/L”) arising from general wrong way risk (“GWWR”) generated by index and SN RFs that exhibit high degree of association with CPs. All positions in the index and SN instruments are used to construct for each CP a hypothetical sub-portfolio subject to an additional stress test analysis. Under the proposed analysis, if the constructed sub-portfolio presents GWWR stemming from positions in SN Risk Factors (“RFs”) that belong to the Banking and Sovereign Sections, additional GWWR related stress losses, deemed to be ‘extreme but plausible’, will be added. These additional GWWR losses are computed as the product of the correlation-weighted uncollateralized LGDs and the SN-specific Default Probabilities. The proposed analysis is based on ICC’s current GWWR P/L calculation, but assumes that the GWWR Kendall-Tau

correlation (currently the greatest of the estimate from the full historical time series, the immediate 250 observations prior to the analysis date, or the 250 observations associated with a relevant stress period) of each CP-Sovereign or Banking RF pair are assumed to approach one, modeling the simultaneous occurrence of losses. The Default Probabilities utilized under the proposed approach will reflect the greater of the average 1-year CP SN Default Probability and the Default Probability implied by a 500-bp spread level at the 1-year tenor.

Further, ICC proposes moving the current contagion GWWR P/L calculation from the ‘Methodology’ section to the ‘General Wrong Way Risk and Contagion Stress Tests’ section of the framework. ICC proposes adding language to the description of the current contagion GWWR P/L calculation, consisting of the correlation-weighted uncollateralized LGDs, to clarify that such scenario is considered extreme (as opposed to extreme but plausible). The extreme scenario is for information purposes only.

ICC proposes adding a new ‘Guaranty Fund Sizing Sensitivity Analysis’ section to the Stress Testing Framework, which describes ICC’s approach to Guaranty Fund (“GF”) sizing. ICC’s GF model aims to establish financial resources that are sufficient to cover hypothetical losses associated with the simultaneous credit events where up to five SNs are impacted. Currently, two of the selected SNs are CP SNs (*i.e.*, “cover-2” GF sizing) and the other three SNs are non-CP SNs. ICC proposes amending the framework to add an additional combination of impacted five SNs, for monitoring and comparison purposes. Specifically, ICC proposes analyzing three CP SNs (*i.e.*, “cover-3” GF sizing) and two non-CP SNs. This alternative combination analysis is intended to provide guidance to the ICC Risk Department and ICC Risk Committee in situations when changes to the GF sizing approach are considered. For example, if a cover-2 deficiency is observed under the current GF size configuration, ICC will analyze the results from the cover-3 analysis as a potential remedy to address the cover-2 deficiency. Monthly summary reports detailing the analysis will be provided to the ICC Risk Committee.

ICC also proposes changes to the Stress Testing Framework to ensure compliance with CFTC Regulation 17 CFR 39.36. Specifically, ICC proposes adding an ‘Interest Rate Sensitivity Analysis’ section to the Stress Testing Framework to ensure compliance with

CFTC Regulation 17 CFR 39.36(b). Under the proposed analysis, ICC would shock the Euro and USD interest rate curves up and down to see which scenario lead to further erosion of the GF under the two worst spread based stress test scenarios. The addition of the interest rate sensitivity analysis will have no impact on ICC’s GF sizing methodology. ICC also proposes changes to the ‘Methodology’ section of the Stress Testing Framework related to the calculation of the P/L attributable to sequential or simultaneous defaults, to ensure compliance with 17 CFR 39.36(a). Under the current framework, for each CP Affiliate Group (“AG”), the Specific Wrong Way Risk (“SWWR”) P/L shows losses associated with positions that are self referencing to that CP AG; the remaining GF is then calculated for each CP AG. Under the proposed changes, the SWWR P/L will be expanded to also reflect the accumulation of losses associated with defaulted CP specific exposure and re-labeled “CP-WWR P/L”, where the new CP-WWR P/L for each CP AG will include losses associated with exposure to itself, *i.e.*, SWWR P/L, as well as on previously defaulted CP AG(s). Finally, ICC proposes edits to the ‘Portfolio Selection’ section of the Stress Testing Framework, to incorporate a description of ICC’s current client stress testing practices. There are no changes being proposed to ICC’s client stress testing practices; rather the proposed edits are designed to explicitly state and document ICC’s current client stress testing practices. Specifically, ICC applies the stress test scenarios to all currently cleared portfolios consisting of a CP’s House and/or Client accounts. ICC executes individual client legal entity stress testing at least monthly, and the results are reported on a monthly basis to the Risk Committee. The clients selected for analysis exhibit the largest stress loss over financial resources being tested for each of the top Futures Commission Merchants (“FCMs”) and Broker Dealers (“BDs”) with the largest client Initial Margin. This selection is designed to capture the clients with the largest risk exposure, who are deemed to be “large traders.”

Liquidity Risk Management Framework

ICC proposes revisions to its Liquidity Risk Management Framework to ensure unification of the stress testing scenarios in the Liquidity Risk Management Framework and the Stress Testing Framework. ICC operates its stress testing and liquidity stress testing on a unified set of stress testing scenarios and system. As such, revisions to the liquidity stress testing scenarios are

³ “Default Probability” as referenced throughout the ICC Stress Testing Framework and ICC Liquidity Risk Management Framework is calculated using the Open Source ISDA CDS Standard Model (available at <http://www.cdsmodel.com/cdsmodel/>).

necessary to ensure scenario unification, in light of the proposed changes to the stress testing scenarios related to ICC's clearing of SN CDS on its CPs.

Specifically, ICC proposes to revise the "Hypothetically Constructed (Forward Looking) Extreme but Plausible Market Scenarios" to ensure consistency with the proposed changes to the Stress Testing Framework to incorporate additional losses related to the ELGD of all names in a CP's portfolio, not limited to those in the Banking or Sovereign sectors. The ELGD amount will accumulate the LGD of all of the SNs in the portfolio that do not explicitly enter a state of default, weighted by the market observed 1-year end-of-day Default Probability.

(b) Statutory Basis

Section 17A(b)(3)(F) of the Act⁴ requires, among other things, that the rules of a clearing agency be designed to promote the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions, and to the extent applicable, derivative agreements, contracts and transactions and to comply with the provisions of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder. ICC believes that the proposed rule changes are consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to ICC, in particular, to Section 17(A)(b)(3)(F),⁵ because ICC believes that the proposed rule changes will promote the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions, derivatives agreements, contracts, and transactions. ICC's Stress Testing Framework describes ICC's stress testing practices, which are designed to ensure the adequacy of systemic risk protections. The Stress Testing Framework sets forth the methodology by which ICC evaluates potential portfolio profits/losses, compared to the Initial Margin and GF funds maintained, in order to identify any potential weakness in the risk methodology. The proposed changes to the Stress Testing Framework enhance ICC's approach to identifying potential weaknesses in the risk methodology. As such, the proposed rule changes are designed to promote the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions, derivatives agreements, contracts, and transactions within the meaning of Section 17A(b)(3)(F)⁶ of the Act. The proposed changes will also satisfy the

requirements of Rule 17Ad-22.⁷ In particular, the proposed changes to the stress testing practices set forth in the Stress Testing Framework ensure that ICC maintains sufficient financial resources to withstand a default by the CP family to which it has the largest exposure in extreme but plausible market conditions, consistent with the requirements of Rule 17Ad-22(b)(3).⁸ Finally, the proposed changes to the Stress Testing Framework ensure regulatory compliance with CFTC regulations, including 17 CFR 39.36.

Further, the changes to the Liquidity Risk Management Framework to unify the liquidity stress testing scenarios with the stress testing scenarios set forth in Stress Testing Framework are necessary given the proposed changes to the Stress Testing Framework, as ICC operates its stress testing and liquidity stress testing on a unified set of stress testing scenarios and system. ICC's liquidity stress testing practices will continue to ensure the sufficiency of ICC's liquidity resources. As such, the proposed rule changes are designed to promote the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions, derivatives agreements, contracts, and transactions within the meaning of Section 17A(b)(3)(F)⁹ of the Act.

(B) Clearing Agency's Statement on Burden on Competition

ICC does not believe the proposed rule changes would have any impact, or impose any burden, on competition. To the extent the Stress Testing Framework and Liquidity Risk Management Framework changes impact CPs, the Stress Testing Framework and Liquidity Risk Management Framework apply uniformly across all CPs. Therefore, ICC does not believe the proposed rule changes impose any burden on competition that is inappropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

(C) Clearing Agency's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Received From Members, Participants or Others

Written comments relating to the proposed rule change have not been solicited or received. ICC will notify the Commission of any written comments received by ICC.

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 within such longer period 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 such 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-ICC-2017-012 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-ICC-2017-012. 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 Section, 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 filings will also be available for

⁴ 15 U.S.C. 78q-1(b)(3)(F).

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ 17 CFR 240.17Ad-22.

⁸ 17 CFR 240.17Ad-22(b)(3).

⁹ *Id.*

inspection and copying at the principal office of ICE Clear Credit and on ICE Clear Credit's Web site at <https://www.theice.com/clear-credit/regulation>.

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-ICC-2017-012 and should be submitted on or before September 21, 2017.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.¹⁰

Eduardo A. Aleman,
Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2017-18449 Filed 8-30-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-81483; File No. SR-CBOE-2017-057]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated; Notice of Filing of a Proposed Rule Change To Amend Interpretation and Policy .07 of Exchange Rule 4.11, Position Limits, To Increase the Position Limits for Options on Certain ETFs

August 25, 2017.

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 August 15, 2017, Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated (the "Exchange" or "CBOE") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

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

The purpose of this filing is to amend Interpretation and Policy .07 of Exchange Rule 4.11, Position Limits, to increase the position limits for options on the following exchange traded funds ("ETFs") and exchange traded notes ("ETNs"): iShares China Large-Cap ETF ("FXI"), iShares MSCI EAFE ETF

("EFA"), iShares MSCI Emerging Markets ETF ("EEM"), iShares Russell 2000 ETF ("IWM"), iShares MSCI EAFE ETF ("EFA"), iShares MSCI Brazil Capped ETF ("EWZ"), iShares 20+ Year Treasury Bond Fund ETF ("TLT"), iPath S&P 500 VIX Short-Term Futures ETN ("VXX"), PowerShares QQQ Trust ("QQQQ"), and iShares MSCI Japan Index [sic] ("EWJ").

The text of the proposed rule change is also available on the Exchange's Web site (<http://www.cboe.com/AboutCBOE/CBOELegalRegulatoryHome.aspx>), at the Exchange's Office of the Secretary, and at the Commission's Public Reference Room.

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

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

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

1. Purpose

Position limits are designed to address potential manipulative schemes and adverse market impact surrounding the use of options, such as disrupting the market in the security underlying the options. The potential manipulative schemes and adverse market impact are balanced against the potential of setting the limits so low as to discourage participation in the options market. Position limits for options on ETFs and ETNs, such as those subject to this proposal, are determined pursuant to Exchange Rule 4.11, and vary according to the number of outstanding shares and the trading volume of the underlying stocks, ETFs, or ETNs over the past six-months. Pursuant to Exchange Rule 4.11, the largest in capitalization and the most frequently traded stocks, ETFs, and ETNs have an option position limit of 250,000 contracts (with adjustments for splits, re-capitalizations, etc.) on the same side of the market; and smaller capitalization stocks, ETFs, and ETNs have position limits of 200,000, 75,000, 50,000 or 25,000 contracts (with adjustments for splits, re-capitalizations,

etc.) on the same side of the market. Options on FXI, EFA, EWZ, TLT, VXX, and EWJ are currently subject to the standard position limit of 250,000 contracts as set forth in Exchange Rule 4.11.³ Interpretation and Policy .07 of Exchange Rule 4.11 sets forth separate position limits for options on specific ETFs and ETNs as follows:

- Options on EEM are 500,000 contracts;
- Options on IWM are 500,000 contracts; and
- Options on QQQQ are 900,000 contracts.

The purpose of this proposal is to amend Interpretation and Policy .07 to Exchange Rule 4.11 to double the position and exercise limits for FXI, EEM, IWM, EFA, EWZ, TLT, VXX, QQQQ, and EWJ.⁴ As such, options on FXI, EFA, EWZ, TLT, VXX, and EWJ would no longer be subject to the standard position limits set forth under Exchange Rule 4.11. Accordingly, Interpretation and Policy .07 to Exchange Rule 4.11 would be amended to set forth that the position limits for option on FXI, EFA, EWZ, TLT, VXX, and EWJ would be 500,000 contracts. These position limits equal the current position limits for option on IWM and EMM and are similar to the current position limit for options on QQQQ set forth in Interpretation and Policy .07 to Exchange Rule 4.11. Interpretation and Policy .07 to Exchange Rule 4.11 would be further amended to increase the position limits for the remaining options subject to this proposal as follows:

- The position limits for options on EEM would be increased from 500,000 contracts to 1,000,000 contracts;
- The position limits on options on IWM would be increased from 500,000 contracts to 1,000,000 contracts; and
- The position limits on options on QQQQ would be increased from 900,000 contracts to 1,800,000 contracts.

In support of this proposal, the Exchange represents that the above listed ETFs and ETNs qualify for either: (i) The initial listing criteria set forth in Exchange Rule 5.3.06(C) for ETFs holding non-U.S. component securities; or (ii) for ETFs and ETNs listed pursuant to generic listing standards for series of portfolio depository receipts and index fund shares based on

³ See <https://www.theocc.com/webapps/delo-search>.

⁴ By virtue of Exchange Rule 4.12, Interpretation and Policy .02, which is not being amended by this filing, the exercise limit for FXI, EEM, IWM, EFA, EWZ, TLT, VXX, QQQQ, and EWJ options would be similarly increased.

The Exchange also proposed to make non-substantive corrections to the names of IWM and EEM in Rule 4.11, Interpretation and Policy .07.

¹⁰ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.