

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 inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Section, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549. Copies of such filing also will be available for inspection and copying at OCC's principal office and on OCC's Web site at http://www.optionsclearing.com/publications/rules/proposed_changes/proposed_changes.jsp. 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-OCC-2005-15 and should be submitted on or before December 22, 2005.

For the Commission by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.¹⁰

Jonathan G. Katz,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. E5-6731 Filed 11-30-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-52827; File No. SR-PCX-2005-56]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Pacific Exchange, Inc.; Order Approving Proposed Rule Change and Amendment No. 1 Thereto and Notice of Filing and Order Granting Accelerated Approval to Amendment No. 2 Relating to the Directed Order Process and the Establishment of Designated Market Makers and Lead Market Makers

November 23, 2005.

I. Introduction

On April 21, 2005, the Pacific Exchange, Inc. ("PCX" or "Exchange"), through its wholly-owned subsidiary PCX Equities, Inc. ("PCXE"), 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 modify its rules governing the Directed Order Process on the Archipelago Exchange ("ArcaEx").³ The PCX filed Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change on October 4, 2005.⁴ The proposed rule change, as amended, was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on October 13, 2005.⁵ The Commission received no comments from the public in response to the proposed rule change. The PCX filed Amendment No. 2 to the proposed rule change on November 17, 2005.⁶ This order approves the proposed rule, as amended by Amendment No. 1; grants accelerated approval to Amendment No. 2; and solicits comments from interested persons on Amendment No. 2.

II. Description

The PCX proposed to add two new classifications of Market Makers, Designated Market Makers ("DMMs") and Lead Market Makers ("LMMs"), in connection with ArcaEx's Directed Order Process. Under the proposal, only DMMs and LMMs would be eligible to receive orders in ArcaEx's Directed Order Process. DMMs would be required to meet certain selection criteria and ongoing performance criteria, making them eligible to participate in the Directed Order Process. LMMs would be granted exclusive eligibility to receive Directed Orders and would be held to higher ongoing performance standards than DMMs in listings for which ArcaEx is the primary market. Such ongoing performance standards would include (i) percent of time the DMM is quoting at the NBBO; (ii) percent of executions better than the NBBO; (iii) average displayed size; (iv) average quoted spread; and (v) in the event the security is a derivative security, the ability of the DMM to transact in the underlying markets. LMMs would be held to higher ongoing performance standards than DMMs. Although the Exchange would have the ability to apply specific levels to be used in defining the performance standards, the Exchange would not modify the types of standards to be used

without changing its rules. The Exchange also proposed to amend PCXE Rule 7.22 to provide the Corporation with the ability to limit the number of DMMs with prior written notice to ETP Holders. Lastly, PCXE Rule 7.25 would be modified to require LMMs to register as Odd Lot Dealers in the securities in which they are registered as LMM.

The PCX also sought to modify its Directed Order process in a number of ways. First, the Exchange proposed to add a provision that requires Users⁷ to be given permission by DMMs in order to send a Directed Order to that DMM. The Exchange also proposed to eliminate the provision limiting the Directed Order Process to the Core Trading Session and proposed to eliminate a provision that suspends the Directed Order Process when a locked or crossed market exists in a security. In addition, the amendment to the definition would also make clear that a Directed Fill specifies the size and price of the Directed Fill.

The Exchange also proposed that marketable Directed Orders would first attempt to match against the DMM to which the order has been directed, but that, prior to execution, Directed Orders matched against DMMs pursuant to their Directed Fill instructions first would be executed against any displayed order in the Arca Book priced at or better than the terms of the Directed Fill before executing as a directed match.⁸ If such matched orders are broken up by orders on the Arca Book, the remaining portion of the Directed Order would be posted in the Arca Book. Lastly, the Exchange proposed to delete a reference in the Directed Order Process rules restricting the price at which executions can occur within the Directed Order Process.

In Amendment No. 2, the Exchange proposed to remove provisions in PCXE Rule 7.34(d) that limit the availability of the Directed Order Process during the Opening Session and Late Trading Session.

III. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning Amendment No. 2, including whether Amendment No. 2 is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

³ See PCXE Rules 7.31 and 7.37.

⁴ Amendment No. 1 replaced and superseded the original filing in its entirety.

⁵ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 52566 (October 5, 2005), 70 FR 59791.

⁶ Amendment No. 1 clarified language in PCXE Rule 7.34(d).

⁷ See PCXE Rule 1.1(yy).

⁸ Accordingly, a Directed Order would only execute against a Directed Fill at a price superior to the Arca best bid or offer.

¹⁰ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

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-PCX-2005-56 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Jonathan G. Katz, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Station Place, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549-9303.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR-PCX-2005-56. 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 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 inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Section, Station Place, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549. Copies of such filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the PCX. 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-PCX-2005-56 and should be submitted on or before December 22, 2005.

IV. Discussion

After careful review, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change, as amended, is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities exchange.⁹ In particular, the Commission finds that the proposal, as amended, is consistent with the provisions of section 6(b)(5) of

the Act,¹⁰ which requires, among other things, that a national securities exchange's rules be designed to prevent fraud and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to remove impediments to and to perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system and; in general, to protect investors and the public interest.

Under the proposal, the two new classifications of Market Makers, DMMs and LMMs, would be entitled to receive Directed Orders. In exchange for this benefit, the Exchange would subject DMMs and LMMs to certain selection criteria and ongoing performance standards. In addition, DMMs and LMMs must comply with obligations currently set forth in the Exchange's rules. In particular, DMMs and LMMs would be required to maintain continuous two-sided Q Orders in those securities in which they are eligible to receive Directed Orders and to engage in a course of dealings to assist in the maintenance of fair and orderly markets. The Commission believes that providing the benefit of receiving Directed Orders to DMMs and LMMs while in turn holding DMMs and LMMs to increased obligations to the market is consistent with the Act. The Commission notes that the Exchange would hold an LMM to higher standards than a DMM. The Commission believes that applying a higher standard to LLMs is appropriate because LMMs would have exclusive access to participate in the Directed Order Process as a Market Maker for primary listings.

The Commission also believes that the amendments to the operation of the Directed Order Process are consistent with the Act. In this regard, the Commission notes that if there is an order displayed on the Arca Book at a price that is at or better than the price of a Directed Fill, the Directed Order would not execute against the Directed Fill. Further, the Commission notes that executions in the Directed Order process may not take place at prices inferior to the NBBO.¹¹ Accordingly, in order for a DMM or LMM to receive a Directed Order execution, the DMM or LMM must improve the best displayed price on the Arca Book, and such price must be equal to or better than the NBBO.

The Commission emphasizes that approval of this proposal does not affect a broker-dealer's duty of best execution. A broker-dealer has a legal duty to seek to obtain best execution of customer

orders, and any decision to preference a particular DMM or LMM must be consistent with this duty.¹² A broker-dealer's duty of best execution derives from common law agency principles and fiduciary obligations, and is incorporated in Self-Regulatory Organization rules and, through judicial and Commission decisions, the antifraud provisions of the Federal securities laws.¹³

The duty of best execution requires broker-dealers to execute customers' trades at the most favorable terms reasonably available under the circumstances, *i.e.*, at the best reasonably available price.¹⁴ The duty of best execution requires broker-dealers to periodically assess the quality of competing markets to assure that order flow is directed to the markets providing the most beneficial terms for their customer orders.¹⁵ Broker-dealers

¹² See, e.g., *Newton v. Merrill, Lynch Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.*, 135 F.3d 266, 269-70, 274 (3d Cir.), cert. denied, 525 U.S. 811 (1998); *Certain Market Making Activities on Nasdaq*, Securities Exchange Act Release No. 40900 (January 11, 1999) (settled case) (citing *Sinclair v. SEC*, 444 F.2d 399 (2d Cir. 1971); *Arleen Hughes*, 27 SEC 629, 636 (1948), *aff'd sub nom. Hughes v. SEC*, 174 F.2d 969 (D.C. Cir. 1949)). See also Order Execution Obligations, Securities Exchange Act Release No. 37619A (September 6, 1996), 61 FR 48290 (September 12, 1996) ("Order Handling Rules Release").

¹³ Order Handling Rules Release, 61 FR at 48322. See also *Newton*, 135 F.3d at 270. Failure to satisfy the duty of best execution can constitute fraud because a broker-dealer, in agreeing to execute a customer's order, makes an implied representation that it will execute it in a manner that maximizes the customer's economic gain in the transaction. See *Newton*, 135 F.3d at 273 ("[T]he basis for the duty of best execution is the mutual understanding that the client is engaging in the trade—and retaining the services of the broker as his agent—solely for the purpose of maximizing his own economic benefit, and that the broker receives her compensation because she assists the client in reaching that goal."); *Marc N. Geman*, Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43963 (February 14, 2001) (citing *Newton*, but concluding that respondent fulfilled his duty of best execution). See also *Payment for Order Flow*, Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34902 (October 27, 1994), 59 FR 55006, 55009 (Nov. 2, 1994) ("Payment for Order Flow Final Rules"). If the broker-dealer intends not to act in a manner that maximizes the customer's benefit when he accepts the order and does not disclose this to the customer, the broker-dealer's implied representation is false. See *Newton*, 135 F.3d at 273-274.

¹⁴ *Newton*, 135 F.3d at 270. *Newton* also noted certain factors relevant to best execution—order size, trading characteristics of the security, speed of execution, clearing costs, and the cost and difficulty of executing an order in a particular market. *Id.* at 270 n. 2 (citing *Payment for Order Flow*, Securities Exchange Act Release No. 33026 (October 6, 1993), 58 FR 52934, 52937-38 (October 13, 1993) (Proposed Rules)). See *In re E.F. Hutton & Co.* ("Manning"), Securities Exchange Act Release No. 25887 (July 6, 1988). See also *Payment for Order Flow Final Rules*, 59 FR at 55008-55009.

¹⁵ Order Handling Rules Release, 61 FR at 48322-48333 ("In conducting the requisite evaluation of its internal order handling procedures, a broker-dealer

⁹ In approving this proposal, the Commission has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

¹⁰ 15 U.S.C. 78b(f)(5).

¹¹ See PCXE Rule 7.37.

must examine their procedures for seeking to obtain best execution in light of market and technology changes and modify those practices if necessary to enable their customers to obtain the best reasonably available prices.¹⁶ In doing so, broker-dealers must take into account price improvement opportunities, and whether different markets may be more suitable for different types of orders or particular securities.¹⁷

Furthermore, the Commission finds good cause for approving Amendment No. 2 to the proposed rule change prior to the thirtieth day after the amendment is published for comment in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 19(b)(2) of the Act.¹⁸ Amendment No. 2 clarified that the Exchange proposed to make the Directed Order Process available during the Opening Session and the Late Trading Session. The Commission does not believe that Amendment No. 2 materially affects the original proposed rule change, as amended, or that it presents any novel regulatory issues. Accordingly, the Commission finds good cause to accelerate approval of Amendment No. 2.

V. Conclusion

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to section 19(b)(2) of the Act,¹⁹ that the proposed rule change (SR-PCX-2005-56), as amended by Amendment No. 1, be, and it hereby is, approved, and that Amendment No. 2 is approved on an accelerated basis.

must regularly and rigorously examine execution quality likely to be obtained from different markets or market makers trading a security.”). *See also* *Newton*, 135 F.3d at 271; *Market 2000: An Examination of Current Equity Market Developments V-4* (SEC Division of Market Regulation January 1994) (“Without specific instructions from a customer, however, a broker-dealer should periodically assess the quality of competing markets to ensure that its order flow is directed to markets providing the most advantageous terms for the customer’s order.”); *Payment for Order Flow Final Rules*, 59 FR at 55009.

¹⁶ Order Handling Rules, 61 FR at 48323.

¹⁷ Order Handling Rules, 61 FR at 48323. For example, in connection with orders that are to be executed at a market opening price, “[b]roker-dealers are subject to a best execution duty in executing customer orders at the opening, and should take into account the alternative methods in determining how to obtain best execution for their customer orders.” *Disclosure of Order Execution and Routing Practices*, Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43590 (November 17, 2000), 65 FR 75414, 75422 (December 1, 2000) (adopting new Rules 11Ac1-5 and 11Ac1-6 under the Act and noting that alternative methods offered by some Nasdaq market centers for pre-open orders included the mid-point of the spread or at the bid or offer).

¹⁸ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

¹⁹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.²⁰

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E5-6732 Filed 11-30-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-52817; File No. SR-Phlx-2005-47]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change and Amendment No. 1 Thereto To Reduce the Value of the Nasdaq Composite Index® Underlying the Options Traded Under the Symbol QCE

November 22, 2005.

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”) ¹ and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,² notice is hereby given that on November 9, 2005, the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc. (“Phlx” or “Exchange”) 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 Phlx. On November 18, 2005, the Phlx filed Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change.³ The Phlx filed the proposal pursuant to section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act ⁴ and Rule 19b-4(f)(6) thereunder,⁵ which renders the proposal effective upon filing with the Commission.⁶ The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change, as amended, from interested persons.

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

The Phlx proposes to decrease by a factor of ten (10) the value of the index that underlies the options that are approved to trade on the Exchange under the symbol QCE (“QCE Options”) and thereby decrease the strike prices

²⁰ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

² 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

³ In Amendment No. 1, the Exchange asked the Commission to waive the 30-day operative delay required by Rule 19b-4(f)(6)(iii). *See* 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(6)(iii). *See also* discussion *infra* section III.

⁴ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

⁵ 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(6).

⁶ The Phlx has asked the Commission to waive the 30-day operative delay required by Rule 19b-4(f)(6)(iii), 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(6)(iii). *See supra* note 3.

for the QCE Options, in order to eliminate investor confusion between the QCE Options and the QCX Options.⁷ The proposed decrease would be achieved by multiplying the Adjusted Base Period Market Value that is applied to the index underlying the QCE Options (“QCE Index”) by ten. The position and exercise limits applicable to QCE Options (currently 300,000 contracts on either side of the market in the near-term months) would remain unchanged.

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 Phlx 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 Phlx 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

In December 2003, the Commission approved Phlx’s proposed rule change to trade full-value options on the Nasdaq Composite Index®⁸ under the

⁷ *See infra* section II.A.1 for the definition of “QCX Options” and for the general background.

⁸ The composite index is a cash-settled, capitalization-weighted, broad-based, A.M. settled index composed of approximately 3,400 stocks listed and traded on The Nasdaq Stock Market, Inc. (“Nasdaq”). Nasdaq®, Nasdaq Composite® and Nasdaq Composite Index® are registered trademarks of The Nasdaq Stock Market, Inc. (which with its affiliates are the “Corporations”) and are licensed for use by the Philadelphia Stock Exchange. The product(s) described herein have not been passed on by the Corporations as to their legality or suitability. The product(s) are not issued, endorsed, sold, or promoted by the Corporations. The Corporations make no warranties and bear no liability with respect to the product(s).

The Corporations do not guarantee the accuracy and/or uninterrupted calculation of the Nasdaq Composite Index® or any data included therein. The Corporations make no warranty, express or implied, as to results to be obtained by the exchange, owners of the product(s), or any other person or entity from the use of the Nasdaq Composite Index® or any data included therein. The Corporations make no express or implied warranties, and expressly disclaim all warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose or use with respect to the Nasdaq Composite Index® or any data included therein. Without limiting any of the foregoing, in no event shall the Corporations have any liability for any lost profits or special, incidental, punitive, indirect, or consequential damages, even if notified of the possibility of such damages.