



8011-01p
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
(Release No. 34-76288; File No. SR-CBOE-2015-096)

October 28, 2015

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change to Amend the Fees Schedule

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 October 20, 2015, 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, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

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

The Exchange proposes to amend its Fees Schedule. The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange’s website

(<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

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

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

1. Purpose

The Exchange proposes to amend its Fees Schedule, effective October 20, 2015.

Specifically, commencing October 20, 2015, the Exchange will list new options on three FTSE Russell Indexes. More specifically, the Exchange proposes to establish fees for the Russell 1000 Index ("RUI"), Russell 1000 Value Index ("RLV") and Russell 1000 Growth Index ("RLG").

By way of background, a specific set of proprietary products are commonly included or excluded from a variety of programs, qualification calculations and transactions fees. In lieu of listing out these products in various sections of the Fees Schedule, the Exchange uses the term "Underlying Symbol List A," to represent these products. Currently, Underlying Symbol List A is defined in Footnote 34 and represents the following proprietary products: OEX, XEO, RUT, SPX (including SPXw), SPXpm, SRO, VIX, VXST, VOLATILITY INDEXES and binary options. The Exchange notes that the reason the products in Underlying Symbol List A are often collectively included or excluded from certain programs, qualification calculations and transactions fees is because the Exchange has expended considerable resources developing and maintaining its proprietary, exclusively-listed products. Similar to the products currently represented by "Underlying Symbol List A," RUI, RLV and RLG are not listed on any other exchange. As such, the Exchange proposes to exclude or include RUI, RLV and RLG in the same programs as the other products in Underlying Symbol List A, as well as add RUI, RLV and RLG to the definition of Underlying Symbol List A in Footnote 34. Specifically, like the other products in Underlying Symbol List A, the Exchange proposes to except RUI, RLV and RLG

from the Liquidity Provider Sliding Scale, the Marketing Fee, the Clearing Trading Permit Holder Fee Cap (“Fee Cap”) and exemption from fees for facilitation orders, and the Order Router Subsidy (ORS) and Complex Order Router Subsidy (CORS) Programs. Like all other products in Underlying Symbol List A (with the exception of SROs), the Exchange proposes to apply to RUI, RLV and RLG the CBOE Proprietary Products Sliding Scale. Unlike the products in Underlying Symbol List A, the Exchange does intend to keep RUI, RLV and RLG volume in the calculation of qualifying volume for the rebate of Floor Broker Trading Permit fees. The Exchange notes that although RUI, RLV and RLG are being added to “Underlying Symbol List A”, it wishes to include RUI, RLV and RLG in the calculation of the qualifying volume for the rebate of Floor Broker Trading Permit fees. The Exchange wishes to continue to encourage Floor Brokers to execute open-outcry trades in these classes and believes that include [sic]

them in the qualifying volume will provide such incentive. The Exchange finally notes, that similarly, RUT is also included in the calculation of the qualifying volume of the rebate of Floor Broker Trader Permit Fees, notwithstanding its inclusion in Underlying Symbol List A.

The Exchange next proposes to establish transaction fees for RUI, RLV, and RLG. Particularly, the Exchange proposes to assess the same fees for RUI, RLV, and RLG as apply to Russell 2000 Index (“RUT”) options. Transaction fees for RUI, RLV, and RLG options will be as follows (all listed rates are per contract):

Customer	\$0.18
Clearing Trading Permit Holder Proprietary	\$0.25
CBOE Market-Maker/DPM	\$0.20
Joint Back-Office, Broker-Dealer, Non-Trading Permit Holder Market-Maker, Professional/Voluntary Professional (non-AIM Electronic)	\$0.65
Joint Back-Office, Broker-Dealer, Non-Trading Permit Holder Market-Maker, Professional/Voluntary Professional (Manual and AIM)	\$0.25

The Exchange also proposes to apply to RUI, RLV, and RLG, like RUT, the Floor Brokerage Fee of \$0.04 per contract (\$0.02 per contract for crossed orders). The Exchange also proposes to apply to RUI, RLV and RLG the CFLEX Surcharge Fee of \$0.10 per contract for all RUI, RLV and RLG orders executed electronically on CFLEX, capped at \$250 per trade (i.e., first 2,500 contracts per trade). The CFLEX Surcharge Fee assists the Exchange in recouping the cost of developing and maintaining the CFLEX system. The Exchange notes that the CFLEX Surcharge Fee (and \$250 cap) also applies to other proprietary index options, including products in Underlying Symbol List A.

The Exchange currently assesses an Index License Surcharge for RUT of \$0.45 per contract for all non-customer orders. Because the fees associated with the license for RUI, RLV and RLG are lower than the license fees for RUT, the Exchange proposes to assess a Surcharge of [sic] \$0.10 per contract in order to recoup the costs associated with the RUI, RLV and RLG license.

In order to promote and encourage trading of RUI, RLV and RLG, the Exchange proposes to waive all transaction fees (including the Floor Brokerage Fee, Index License Surcharge and CFLEX Surcharge Fee) for RUI, RLV and RLG transactions through December 31, 2015. The Exchange proposes to add Footnote 40 to the Fees Schedule to make clear that transaction fees will be waived through the end of the year.

Finally, the Exchange proposes to make other non-substantive cleanup changes to the Fees Schedule. First, the Exchange proposes to replace the reference to the proprietary products listed in the Customer row of the Index Options Rate Table – All Index Products Excluding Underlying Symbol List A with the term “Underlying Symbol List A”. The Exchange notes that when it had adopted the term “Underlying Symbol List A”, it had inadvertently not included it in

this particular instance. To maintain consistency throughout the Fees Schedule, the Exchange proposes adding “Underlying Symbol List A” to the Customer row of the Index Options Rate Table – All Index Products Excluding Underlying Symbol List A. Next, the Exchange proposes to delete the reference to “RUT” in the Volume Incentive Program table and Footnote 36. The Exchange notes that it also inadvertently failed to delete these particular references to RUT when RUT became part of Underlying Symbol List A. As Underlying Symbol List A is already provided for in both sections (and RUT is included in Underlying Symbol List A) it is repetitive and unnecessary to maintain the additional references to “RUT”. The Exchange believes the proposed cleanup changes will alleviate potential confusion.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Act”) and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to the Exchange and, in particular, the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act.³ Specifically, the Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the Section 6(b)(5)⁴ requirements that the rules of an 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 regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to, and 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. Additionally, the Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b)(4) of the Act,⁵ which requires that Exchange rules provide for the

³ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

⁴ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

⁵ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4).

equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees, and other charges among its Trading Permit Holders and other persons using its facilities.

Particularly, the Exchange believes it is reasonable to charge different fee amounts to different user types in the manner proposed because the proposed fees are consistent with the price differentiation that exists today for other index products, including RUT. The Exchange also believes that the proposed fee amounts for RUI, RLV and RLG orders are reasonable because the proposed fee amounts are the same [sic] already assessed for a similar product, RUT, as well as are within the range of amounts assessed for the Exchange's other proprietary products.⁶

The Exchange believes that it is equitable and not unfairly discriminatory to assess lower fees to Customers as compared to other market participants because Customer order flow enhances liquidity on the Exchange for the benefit of all market participants. Specifically, customer liquidity benefits all market participants by providing more trading opportunities, which attracts Market-Makers. An increase in the activity of these market participants in turn facilitates tighter spreads, which may cause an additional corresponding increase in order flow from other market participants. The fees offered to customers are intended to attract more customer trading volume to the Exchange. Moreover, the options industry has a long history of providing preferential pricing to Customers, and the Exchange's current Fees Schedule currently does so in many places, as do the fees structures of many other exchanges. Finally, all fee amounts listed as applying to Customers will be applied equally to all Customers (meaning that all Customers will be assessed the same amount).

The Exchange believes that it is equitable and not unfairly discriminatory to, [sic] assess lower fees to Market-Makers as compared to other market participants other than Customers

⁶ See CBOE Fees Schedule, Specified Proprietary Index Options Rate Table.

because Market-Makers, unlike other market participants, take on a number of obligations, including quoting obligations, that other market participants do not have. Further, these lower fees offered to Market-Makers are intended to incent Market-Makers to quote and trade more on the Exchange, thereby providing more trading opportunities for all market participants. Additionally, the proposed fee for Market-Makers will be applied equally to all Market-Makers (meaning that all Market-Makers will be assessed the same amount). This concept also applies to orders from all other origins. It should also be noted that all fee amounts described herein are intended to attract greater order flow to the Exchange in RUI, RLV and RLG which should therefore serve to benefit all Exchange market participants. Similarly, it is equitable and not unfairly discriminatory to assess lower fees to Clearing Trading Permit Holder Proprietary orders than those of other market participants (except Customers and Market-Makers) because Clearing Trading Permit Holders also have a number of obligations (such as membership with the Options Clearing Corporation), significant regulatory burdens, and financial obligations, that other market participants do not need to take on. The Exchange also notes that the RUI, RLV and RLG fee amounts for each separate type of market participant will be assessed equally to all such market participants (i.e. all Broker-Dealer orders will be assessed the same amount, all Joint Back-Office orders will be assessed the same amount, etc.).

The Exchange believes the proposed AIM transaction fees for Brokers Dealers, Non-Trading Permit Holder Market-Makers, Professionals/Voluntary Professionals, JBOs and Customers are reasonable because the amounts are still lower than assessed for AIM transactions in other proprietary products.⁷ The Exchange believes it's equitable and not unfairly discriminatory to assess lower fees for AIM executions as compared to electronic executions

⁷ Id.

because AIM is a price-improvement mechanism, which the Exchange wishes to encourage and support.

Assessing the Floor Brokerage Fee of \$0.04 per contract for non-crossed orders and \$0.02 per contract for crossed orders to Floor Brokers (and not other market participants) trading RUI, RLV and RLG orders is equitable and not unfairly discriminatory because only Floor Brokers are statutorily capable of representing orders in the trading crowd, for which they charge a commission. Moreover, this fee is already assessed, in the same amounts, to the other products in Underlying Symbol List A, including RUT.

The Exchange believes that assessing an Index License Surcharge Fee of \$0.10 per contract to RUI, RLV and RLG transactions is reasonable because the Surcharge helps recoup some of the costs associated with the license for RUI, RLV and RLG options. Additionally, the Exchange notes that the Surcharge amount is the same as, and in some cases lower than, the amount assessed as an Index License Surcharge to other index products. The proposed Surcharge is also equitable and not unfairly discriminatory because the amount will be assessed to all market participants to whom the Surcharge applies. Not applying the RUI, RLV and RLG Index License Surcharge Fee to Customer orders is equitable and not unfairly discriminatory because this is designed to attract Customer RUI, RLV and RLG orders, which increases liquidity and provides greater trading opportunities to all market participants. Additionally, it is equitable and not unfairly discriminatory to assess a lower License Index Surcharge amount to RUI, RLV and RLG transactions as compared to RUT transactions because the costs of the license associated with RUT is greater.

Similarly, the Exchange believes assessing a CFLEX Surcharge Fee of \$0.10 per contract for all RUI, RLV and RLG orders executed electronically on CFLEX and capping it at \$250 (i.e.,

first 2,500 contracts per trade) is reasonable because it is the same amount currently charged to other proprietary index products for the same transactions.⁸ The proposed Surcharge is also equitable and not unfairly discriminatory because the amount will be assessed to all market participants to whom the CFLEX Surcharge applies.

Excepting RUI, RLV and RLG from the Liquidity Provider Sliding Scale, the Marketing Fee, the Fee Cap, and the exemption from fees for facilitation orders is reasonable because other Underlying Symbol List A products (i.e., other products that are exclusively-listed) are excepted from those same items. This is equitable and not unfairly discriminatory for the same reason; it seems equitable to except RUI, RLV and RLG from items on the Fees Schedule from which other proprietary products are also excepted.

The Exchange believes it is reasonable, equitable and not unfairly discriminatory to waive all transaction fees, including the Floor Brokerage fee, the License Index Surcharge and CFLEX Surcharge Fee because it promotes and encourages trading of these new products and applies to all Trading Permit Holders (“TPHs”).

Applying to [sic] RUI, RLV and RLG to the CBOE Proprietary Products Sliding Scale is reasonable because it also applies to other Underlying Symbol List A products. This is equitable and not unfairly discriminatory for the same reason; it seems equitable to apply to RUI, RLV and RLG the same items on the Fees Schedule that apply to Underlying Symbol List A options classes (i.e., proprietary options classes that are not listed on other exchanges).

The Exchange believes it’s reasonable, equitable and not unfairly discriminatory to continue to include RUI, RLV and RLG in the calculation of the qualifying volume for the Floor

⁸ See CBOE Fees Schedule, Index Options Rate Table - All Index Products Excluding Underlying Symbol List A, CFLEX Surcharge Fee and Specified Proprietary Index Options Rate Table - Underlying Symbol List A, CFLEX Surcharge Fee.

Broker Trading Permit Fees rebate because the Exchange wishes to support and encourage open-outcry trading of RUI, RLV and RLG, which allows for price improvement and has a number of positive impacts on the market system.

Finally, the Exchange notes that it always strives for clarity in its rules and Fees Schedule, so that market participants may best understand how rules and fees apply. The Exchange believes that the proposed clarifications and removal of repetitive language in the Fees Schedule will make the Fees Schedule easier to read and alleviate potential confusion. The alleviation of potential confusion will remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system, and, in general, protect investors and the public interest.

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

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule changes will impose any burden on competition that are not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on intramarket competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act because, while different fees are assessed to different market participants in some circumstances, these different market participants have different obligations and different circumstances as discussed above. For example, Market-Makers have quoting obligations that other market participants do not have. The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change to waive all transaction fees through December 2015 will impose any burden on intramarket competition because it applies to all TPHs and encourages trading in these new products.

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule changes will impose any burden on intermarket competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act because RUI, RLV and RLG will be exclusively listed on CBOE. To the extent that the

proposed changes make CBOE a more attractive marketplace for market participants at other exchanges, such market participants are welcome to become CBOE market participants.

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

The Exchange neither solicited nor received comments on the proposed rule change.

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

The foregoing rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act⁹ and paragraph (f) of Rule 19b-4¹⁰ thereunder. 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 necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission will institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change 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 e-mail to rule-comments@sec.gov. Please include File Number SR-CBOE-2015-096 on the subject line.

⁹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

¹⁰ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f).

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-CBOE-2015-096. This file number should be included on the subject line if e-mail is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet website (<http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml>). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for website viewing and printing in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 100 F Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 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-CBOE-2015-096 and should be submitted on or before [insert date 21 days from publication in the Federal Register].

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

Robert W. Errett
Deputy Secretary

¹¹ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

