

*Required fields are shown with yellow backgrounds and asterisks.*

Page 1 of * <input type="text" value="121"/>	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549 Form 19b-4	File No.* SR - <input type="text" value="2011"/> - * <input type="text" value="052"/> Amendment No. (req. for Amendments *) <input type="text"/>
Proposed Rule Change by Financial Industry Regulatory Authority Pursuant to Rule 19b-4 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934		
Initial * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amendment * <input type="checkbox"/>	Withdrawal <input type="checkbox"/>
Section 19(b)(2) * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Section 19(b)(3)(A) * <input type="checkbox"/>		
Section 19(b)(3)(B) * <input type="checkbox"/>		
Rule		
Pilot <input type="checkbox"/>	Extension of Time Period for Commission Action * <input type="checkbox"/>	Date Expires * <input type="text"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(4) <input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(2) <input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(5) <input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(3) <input type="checkbox"/> 19b-4(f)(6)		
Exhibit 2 Sent As Paper Document <input type="checkbox"/>		
Exhibit 3 Sent As Paper Document <input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Description</b> Provide a brief description of the proposed rule change (limit 250 characters, required when Initial is checked *). <input 2320="" 5310="" as="" consolidated="" finra="" im")="" in="" rule="" rulebook."="" the="" type="text" value="Proposed Rule Change to Adopt NASD Rule 2320 (Best Execution and Interpositioning) and Interpretive Material ("/>		
<b>Contact Information</b> Provide the name, telephone number and e-mail address of the person on the staff of the self-regulatory organization prepared to respond to questions and comments on the proposed rule change. First Name * <input type="text" value="Brant"/> Last Name * <input type="text" value="Brown"/> Title * <input type="text" value="Associate General Counsel"/> E-mail * <input type="text" value="brant.brown@finra.org"/> Telephone * <input type="text" value="(202) 728-6927"/> Fax <input type="text" value="(202) 728-8264"/>		
<b>Signature</b> Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934,  has duly caused this filing to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned thereunto duly authorized officer. Date <input type="text" value="10/04/2011"/> By <input type="text" value="Stephanie Dumont"/> Senior Vice President and Director of Capital Markets Policy (Name *) (Title *) NOTE: Clicking the button at right will digitally sign and lock this form. A digital signature is as legally binding as a physical signature, and once signed, this form cannot be changed. <input type="text" value="Stephanie Dumont,"/>		

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549

For complete Form 19b-4 instructions please refer to the EFFS website.

**Form 19b-4 Information (required)**

[Add](#) [Remove](#) [View](#)

The self-regulatory organization must provide all required information, presented in a clear and comprehensible manner, to enable the public to provide meaningful comment on the proposal and for the Commission to determine whether the proposal is consistent with the Act and applicable rules and regulations under the Act.

**Exhibit 1 - Notice of Proposed Rule Change (required)**

[Add](#) [Remove](#) [View](#)

The Notice section of this Form 19b-4 must comply with the guidelines for publication in the Federal Register as well as any requirements for electronic filing as published by the Commission (if applicable). The Office of the Federal Register (OFR) offers guidance on Federal Register publication requirements in the Federal Register Document Drafting Handbook, October 1998 Revision. For example, all references to the federal securities laws must include the corresponding cite to the United States Code in a footnote. All references to SEC rules must include the corresponding cite to the Code of Federal Regulations in a footnote. All references to Securities Exchange Act Releases must include the release number, release date, Federal Register cite, Federal Register date, and corresponding file number (e.g., SR-[SRO]-xx-xx). A material failure to comply with these guidelines will result in the proposed rule change being deemed not properly filed. See also Rule 0-3 under the Act (17 CFR 240.0-3)

**Exhibit 2 - Notices, Written Comments, Transcripts, Other Communications**

[Add](#) [Remove](#) [View](#)

Exhibit Sent As Paper Document

Copies of notices, written comments, transcripts, other communications. If such documents cannot be filed electronically in accordance with Instruction F, they shall be filed in accordance with Instruction G.

**Exhibit 3 - Form, Report, or Questionnaire**

[Add](#) [Remove](#) [View](#)

Exhibit Sent As Paper Document

Copies of any form, report, or questionnaire that the self-regulatory organization proposes to use to help implement or operate the proposed rule change, or that is referred to by the proposed rule change.

**Exhibit 4 - Marked Copies**

[Add](#) [Remove](#) [View](#)

The full text shall be marked, in any convenient manner, to indicate additions to and deletions from the immediately preceding filing. The purpose of Exhibit 4 is to permit the staff to identify immediately the changes made from the text of the rule with which it has been working.

**Exhibit 5 - Proposed Rule Text**

[Add](#) [Remove](#) [View](#)

The self-regulatory organization may choose to attach as Exhibit 5 proposed changes to rule text in place of providing it in Item I and which may otherwise be more easily readable if provided separately from Form 19b-4. Exhibit 5 shall be considered part of the proposed rule change.

**Partial Amendment**

[Add](#) [Remove](#) [View](#)

If the self-regulatory organization is amending only part of the text of a lengthy proposed rule change, it may, with the Commission's permission, file only those portions of the text of the proposed rule change in which changes are being made if the filing (i.e. partial amendment) is clearly understandable on its face. Such partial amendment shall be clearly identified and marked to show deletions and additions.

**1. Text of Proposed Rule Change**

(a) Pursuant to the provisions of Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”),<sup>1</sup> Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (“FINRA”) (f/k/a National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (“NASD”)) is filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC” or “Commission”) a proposed rule change to adopt NASD Rule 2320 (Best Execution and Interpositioning) and Interpretive Material (“IM”) 2320 (Interpretive Guidance with Respect to Best Execution Requirements) as FINRA Rule 5310 in the consolidated FINRA rulebook.

The text of the proposed rule change is attached as Exhibit 5 to this rule filing.

(b) Upon Commission approval and implementation by FINRA of the proposed rule change, the corresponding NASD rule and IM will be eliminated from the current FINRA rulebook.

(c) Not applicable.

**2. Procedures of the Self-Regulatory Organization**

At its meeting on September 16, 2008, the FINRA Board of Governors authorized the filing of the proposed rule change with the SEC. No other action by FINRA is necessary for the filing of the proposed rule change.

FINRA will announce the implementation date of the proposed rule change in a Regulatory Notice to be published no later than 90 days following Commission approval. The implementation date will be no later than 90 days following publication of the Regulatory Notice announcing Commission approval.

---

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

**3. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change**

(a) Purpose

As part of the process of developing a new consolidated rulebook (“Consolidated FINRA Rulebook”),<sup>2</sup> FINRA is proposing to adopt NASD Rule 2320 (Best Execution and Interpositioning) and IM-2320 (Interpretive Guidance with Respect to Best Execution Requirements) as a FINRA rule in the Consolidated FINRA Rulebook with several changes, which are described below.

NASD Rule 2320 requires a member, in any transaction for or with a customer or a customer of another broker-dealer, to use “reasonable diligence” to ascertain the best market for a security and to buy or sell in such market so that the resultant price to the customer is as favorable as possible under prevailing market conditions. The rule identifies five factors that are among those to be considered in determining whether the member has used reasonable diligence: (1) the character of the market for the security; (2) the size and type of transaction; (3) the number of markets checked; (4) the accessibility of the quotation; and (5) the terms and conditions of the order as communicated to the member. The rule also includes provisions related to interpositioning (i.e., interjecting a third party between the member and the best available

---

<sup>2</sup> The current FINRA rulebook consists of (1) FINRA Rules; (2) NASD Rules; and (3) rules incorporated from NYSE (“Incorporated NYSE Rules”) (together, the NASD Rules and Incorporated NYSE Rules are referred to as the “Transitional Rulebook”). While the NASD Rules generally apply to all FINRA members, the Incorporated NYSE Rules apply only to those members of FINRA that are also members of the NYSE (“Dual Members”). The FINRA Rules apply to all FINRA members, unless such rules have a more limited application by their terms. For more information about the rulebook consolidation process, see Information Notice, March 12, 2008 (Rulebook Consolidation Process).

market), the use of a broker's broker,<sup>3</sup> the staffing of order rooms, and the application of the best execution requirements to other parties.

In addition to these provisions, NASD Rule 2320(f) (commonly referred to as the "Three Quote Rule") generally requires members that execute transactions in non-exchange-listed securities on behalf of customers to contact a minimum of three dealers (or all dealers if three or fewer) and obtain quotations from those dealers if there are fewer than two quotations displayed on an inter-dealer quotation system that permits quotation updates on a real-time basis. The Three Quote Rule was adopted in 1988 to further define a firm's best execution obligation to customers by setting forth additional requirements for transactions in non-exchange-listed securities, particularly transactions involving securities with non-transparent prices.<sup>4</sup> Since that time, the Three Quote Rule has been amended on multiple occasions to exclude certain securities and transactions.<sup>5</sup> The Three Quote Rule establishes a minimum standard, and compliance with the Three Quote Rule, in and of itself, does not mean that a member has met its best execution obligations under NASD Rule 2320.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The proposed rule change moves part of the provision concerning the use of a broker's broker from paragraph (b) of the rule to Supplementary Material .05.

<sup>4</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 25637 (May 2, 1988), 53 FR 16488 (May 9, 1988).

<sup>5</sup> See NASD Rule 2320(f)(3)(B), (C). See also Securities Exchange Act Release No. 56004 (July 2, 2007), 72 FR 37285 (July 9, 2007); Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43319 (September 21, 2000), 65 FR 58589 (September 29, 2000).

<sup>6</sup> See NASD Notice to Members 00-78 (November 2000).

IM-2320 was adopted in 2006 to codify interpretive guidance that FINRA staff had provided involving compliance with NASD Rule 2320.<sup>7</sup> Specifically, IM-2320 addresses issues involving the term “market” for purposes of the rule as well as the application of the rule to debt securities and to broker-dealers that are executing a customer’s order against the broker-dealer’s quote.

FINRA is proposing to adopt new FINRA Rule 5310, which is based largely on NASD Rule 2320. IM-2320 will be adopted, in substantially the same form, as Supplementary Material to Rule 5310. FINRA is also proposing several changes, which are described below, to the rule.

(1) The Three Quote Rule

Since the adoption of the Three Quote Rule over twenty years ago, the market for non-exchange-listed securities has changed dramatically.<sup>8</sup> FINRA has found that in certain circumstances the Three Quote Rule can hinder, rather than further, investor protection by causing significant delays in obtaining execution of customer orders. As a result, FINRA has created several exclusions to the Three Quote Rule since it was adopted. For example, in 2000, FINRA determined that where there were two transparent, firm quotes for a security, the costs associated with delayed executions resulting from Three Quote Rule compliance outweighed the benefits of obtaining three

---

<sup>7</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 54339 (August 21, 2006), 71 FR 50959 (August 28, 2006).

<sup>8</sup> For purposes of the Three Quote Rule, a “non-exchange-listed security” is any equity security that is not traded on any national securities exchange, but does not include restricted securities. See NASD Rule 2320(f)(4)(C).

telephone quotes.<sup>9</sup> Consequently, the Three Quote Rule currently applies only to non-exchange-listed securities with one or no public quotation.<sup>10</sup> More recently, in 2007, the SEC approved amendments to the Three Quote Rule to exclude certain transactions in non-exchange-listed securities of foreign issuers that are part of the FTSE All-World Index and to exclude certain transactions in Canadian securities executed on a Canadian exchange.<sup>11</sup>

Although the original concerns the Three Quote Rule was designed to address are still valid, FINRA believes that the current requirements in the Three Quote Rule, even with the various exclusions, are overly prescriptive and can often result in unnecessary delay in the execution of a customer's order or impose requirements that do not benefit the customer. Accordingly, rather than maintain the Three Quote Rule and the various exclusions in their current format, the proposed rule change replaces the Three Quote Rule with Supplementary Material emphasizing a member's best execution obligations when handling an order involving any security, equity or debt, for which there is limited pricing information available.<sup>12</sup> The Supplementary Material emphasizes that members

---

<sup>9</sup> See NASD Notice to Members 00-78 (November 2000); see also Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43319 (September 21, 2000), 65 FR 58589 (September 29, 2000).

<sup>10</sup> See NASD Rule 2320(f)(3)(A).

<sup>11</sup> Securities Exchange Act Release No. 56004 (July 2, 2007), 72 FR 37285 (July 9, 2007). See Regulatory Notice 07-40 (August 2007).

<sup>12</sup> NASD Rule 2320(f)(2), which is a subparagraph within the Three Quote Rule, generally requires members that display priced quotations on a real-time basis for a non-exchange-listed security in two or more quotation mediums that permit quotation updates on a real-time basis to display the same priced quotation in each medium except for certain customer limit orders displayed on an electronic communications network. Paragraph (f)(4) of the rule includes definitions of terms used in paragraph (f)(2). At this time, FINRA is proposing to move

must be especially diligent with respect to best execution obligations where there is limited quotation or other pricing information available regarding the security that is the subject of the order and requires members to have written policies and procedures in place to address the steps the member will take to determine the best market for such a security in the absence of multiple quotations or pricing information and to document how they have complied with those policies and procedures.<sup>13</sup> The Supplementary Material specifically notes that, when handling orders for such securities, members should generally seek out other sources of pricing information or potential liquidity, which may include obtaining quotations from other sources (e.g., other firms that the member previously has traded with in the security). For example, in many instances, particularly in the context of equity securities with limited quotation information available, contacting other broker-dealers may be necessary to comply with a member's best execution obligations.<sup>14</sup>

---

paragraph (f)(2) into the FINRA Rule 6400 Series (Quoting and Trading in OTC Equity Securities) as FINRA Rule 6438. FINRA is also proposing to replace the term “non-exchange-listed security” with the term “OTC Equity Security” to conform the rule language to other FINRA rules addressing non-NMS stocks. The terms “OTC Equity Security” and “quotation medium” are defined in FINRA Rule 6420. Because the provisions relate to the quotation of OTC Equity Securities, FINRA believes that they should be relocated into the FINRA rule series concerning quoting and trading OTC Equity Securities rather than remain part of the Best Execution Rule.

<sup>13</sup> NASD Rule 3110(b) (Books and Records) generally requires members to indicate on the customer order ticket how they complied with the Three Quote Rule, if applicable. FINRA is proposing to replace this provision with a more general documentation requirement in the Supplementary Material to proposed FINRA Rule 5310. Under that provision, members would be required to retain records sufficient to demonstrate that they had handled orders covered by the rule in accordance with their policies and procedures.

<sup>14</sup> As noted above, FINRA believes that requiring compliance with the Three Quote Rule in all circumstances covered by the rule can cause unnecessary delay in the

(2) Regular and Rigorous Review of Execution Quality

The proposed rule change includes Supplementary Material to proposed FINRA Rule 5310 codifying a member's obligations when it undertakes a regular and rigorous review of execution quality likely to be obtained from different market centers. These longstanding obligations are set forth and explained in various SEC releases and NASD Notices to Members.<sup>15</sup> The proposed rule change codifies this guidance as Supplementary Material and does not alter existing requirements regarding regular and rigorous review.

(3) Orders for Foreign Securities with No U.S. Market

While the determination as to whether a member has satisfied its best execution obligations must take into account the market for a security, NASD Rule 2320 does not specifically distinguish between orders for domestic securities and orders for foreign securities, even if there is no U.S. market for the security. Markets in foreign jurisdictions often do not have identical best execution requirements as those imposed by NASD Rule 2320 and, in many cases, may not have comparable pre-trade or post-trade

---

handling of some customer orders. However, as the Supplementary Material recognizes, contacting other broker-dealers can often be necessary for a firm to meet its best execution obligations. In recognizing the importance of contacting other broker-dealers for pricing or liquidity information, FINRA notes that many firms may choose to adopt policies and procedures that are substantially similar to the current Three Quote Rule but may, for example, allow for firms to adapt their procedures for certain situations if the firm reasonably concludes that those requirements would result in unnecessary delay or otherwise not benefit the customer. Firms must also continue to take into account when developing their procedures that the Three Quote Rule is a minimum standard, and contacting other dealers does not guarantee that a firm has met its best execution obligations in all cases.

<sup>15</sup> See, e.g., Securities Exchange Act Release No. 37619A (September 6, 1996), 61 FR 48290 (September 12, 1996); NASD Notice to Members 01-22 (April 2001).

transparency standards. Thus, the handling of orders for foreign securities with no U.S. market can differ substantially from the handling of orders in securities that trade in the U.S. Consequently, the proposed rule change includes new Supplementary Material concerning members' best execution obligations when handling orders for foreign securities, and in particular foreign securities with no U.S. trading activity.<sup>16</sup>

The new Supplementary Material recognizes that markets for different securities can vary dramatically and that the standard of "reasonable diligence" must be assessed by examining specific factors, including "the character of the market for the security" and the "accessibility of the quotation." Accordingly, the determination as to whether a member has satisfied its best execution obligations necessarily involves a "facts and circumstances" analysis.

The new Supplementary Material notes that even though a foreign security may not trade in the U.S., members still have an obligation to seek best execution for customer orders involving the security. Consequently, a member that handles customer orders for foreign securities that do not trade in the U.S. must have specific written policies and procedures in place regarding its handling of customer orders for these securities that are reasonably designed to obtain the most favorable terms available for the customer, taking into account differences that may exist between U.S. markets and foreign markets. The Supplementary Material further notes that a member's best execution obligations also must evolve as changes occur in the market that may give rise to improved executions, including opportunities to trade at more advantageous prices. Members must therefore

---

<sup>16</sup> As discussed more fully in Section 5(b) below, in Regulatory Notice 08-80 FINRA had proposed a different approach regarding orders for foreign securities with no U.S. market.

regularly review their policies and procedures to assess the quality of executions received and update or revise the policies and procedures as necessary.

(4) Customer Instructions Regarding the Routing of Orders

When placing an order with a member, customers may specifically instruct the member to route the order to a particular market for execution.<sup>17</sup> The proposed rule change includes Supplementary Material to proposed FINRA Rule 5310 addressing situations where the customer has, on an unsolicited basis, specifically instructed the member to route its order to a particular market.<sup>18</sup> Under those circumstances, the member would not be required to make a best execution determination beyond that specific instruction; however, the Supplementary Material mandates that members process the customer's order promptly and in accordance with the terms of the order. The Supplementary Material also makes clear that where a customer has directed the member to route an order to another broker-dealer that is also a FINRA member, the exception would not apply to the receiving broker-dealer to which the order was directed.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> When the order is for an NMS security, these orders are often referred to as "directed orders." See 17 CFR 242.600(b)(19). Of note, directed orders are excluded from the order routing statistics required to be produced under Rule 606 of SEC Regulation NMS. See 17 CFR 242.606.

<sup>18</sup> FINRA also has proposed technical amendments to paragraph (e) of the rule to clarify that a member's best execution obligations extend to all customer orders and to avoid the potential misimpression that the paragraph limits the scope of the rule's requirements.

<sup>19</sup> For example, if a customer of Member Firm A directs Member Firm A to route an order to Member Firm B, Member Firm B would continue to have best execution obligations to that customer order received from Member Firm A.

As noted above, FINRA will announce the implementation date of the proposed rule change in a Regulatory Notice to be published no later than 90 days following Commission approval. The implementation date will be no later than 90 days following publication of the Regulatory Notice announcing Commission approval.

(b) Statutory Basis

FINRA believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the provisions of Section 15A(b)(6) of the Act,<sup>20</sup> which requires, among other things, that FINRA rules must 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. FINRA believes that the proposed rule change adds needed clarification and provisions to the existing best execution requirements that enhance investor protection and promote just and equitable principles of trade. FINRA believes that codifying members' obligations regarding directed orders, regular and rigorous review, and orders involving foreign securities will bring needed clarification to these areas and ensure that all members are aware of their obligations. As discussed above, FINRA believes that replacing the Three Quote Rule with the proposed Supplementary Material will improve the handling of customer orders involving securities with limited quotations or pricing information by decreasing the likelihood that execution of these orders will be unnecessarily delayed while still ensuring that members recognize that their best execution obligations apply to these orders. FINRA believes that each of these provisions will help promote just and equitable principles of trade and will protect investors and the public interest.

---

<sup>20</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78q-3(b)(6).

**4. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement on Burden on Competition**

FINRA does not believe that the proposed rule change will result in any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

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

The proposed rule change was published for comment in Regulatory Notice 08-80 (December 2008). A copy of Regulatory Notice 08-80 is attached as Exhibit 2a. The comment period expired on February 27, 2009. FINRA received nine comment letters in response to the Regulatory Notice.<sup>21</sup> A list of the comment letters received in response to Regulatory Notice 08-80 is attached as Exhibit 2b. Copies of the comment letters received in response to Regulatory Notice 08-80 are attached as Exhibit 2c.

(a) General Comments on the Proposed Rule Change

Although most commenters addressed particular issues in the rule changes proposed in Regulatory Notice 08-80, some commenters raised broader concerns regarding best execution obligations and NASD Rule 2320 in general. SIFMA expressed concerns about the application of the Best Execution Rule to debt securities and reiterated the concerns previously expressed by the Bond Market Association in response to prior

---

<sup>21</sup> Letter from first allied (“First Allied”), dated January 27, 2009; Letter from Sidley Austin LLP (“Sidley”), dated January 28, 2009; Letter from Scottrade, Inc. (“Scottrade”), dated January 29, 2009; Letter from National Association of Independent Broker-Dealers, Inc. (“NAIBD”), dated February 16, 2009; Letter from Cutter & Company, Inc. (“Cutter”), dated February 17, 2009; Letter from Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (“SIFMA”), dated February 26, 2009; Letter from Financial Services Institute (“FSI”), dated February 27, 2009; Letter from Pink OTC Markets, Inc. (“Pink OTC”), dated March 20, 2009; Letter from Liquidnet, Inc. (“Liquidnet”), dated April 24, 2009.

amendments to NASD Rule 2320.<sup>22</sup> In essence, SIFMA asserts that fundamental differences in the operation of the equity and fixed income markets render the Best Execution Rule inappropriate for the fixed income market. SIFMA states that the current Best Execution Rule, as well as many of the amendments in the proposed rule change, may be appropriate for the equity markets but “create problems of interpretation, application and enforcement” in the context of the fixed income markets.

FINRA disagrees. As SIFMA’s letter notes, these concerns have been raised numerous times in recent years, and for the same reasons FINRA has noted before, FINRA believes that the Best Execution Rule is broad enough to apply to both the equity and fixed income markets. As FINRA stated in 2005:

[The] Best Execution Rule looks at a number of factors, including the character of the market for the security, to determine whether a member or associated person(s) has used reasonable diligence. Accordingly, it can be applied in a variety of different markets that can possess divergent characteristics, including the U.S. debt market.<sup>23</sup>

The Best Execution Rule requires the use of “reasonable diligence” when handling a customer order. One of the enumerated factors in assessing whether reasonable diligence has been used is “the character of the market for the security.”<sup>24</sup> This language makes readily apparent that a determination of best execution must take into account the specific facts and circumstances surrounding the market in which a security trades, whether that is an exchange market, the over-the-counter equity market, or the fixed income market.

---

<sup>22</sup> See SIFMA.

<sup>23</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 52637 n.15 (October 19, 2005), 70 FR 61861, 61863 n.15 (October 26, 2005).

<sup>24</sup> See NASD Rule 2320(a)(1)(A).

Different securities trade in myriad ways, and no single rule can address each and every nuance of various types of markets. Moreover, market structure is itself subject to continuous evolution and development; a rule focused on a specific market structure would quickly become outdated. For all of these reasons, the Best Execution Rule is intentionally broad and encompasses all market types by its recognition that a best execution determination cannot be made without first determining the type of market in which the security that is the subject of the order trades.

One commenter suggested that proposed Supplementary Material .01 regarding prompt execution of a marketable customer order<sup>25</sup> be clarified to note that a firm's acceptance of an order "starts the clock" as opposed to the time a customer enters an order or the time an order is received.<sup>26</sup> The Supplementary Material requires "prompt" execution and does not dictate a specific timeframe because FINRA believes the principle-based standard of acting promptly would encompass all reasonable factors that a prescriptive standard could not address in all cases. Best execution requires firms to minimize the time between order receipt, order acceptance, and order entry. Firms may not defend their failure to act promptly in respect of an order because such an order languished between its receipt and entry. In addition, FINRA has already codified the obligation to handle and execute marketable customer orders promptly in FINRA Rule 5320.07.

---

<sup>25</sup> In Regulatory Notice 08-80, FINRA proposed to apply the prompt requirement in Supplementary Material .01 to customer market orders. The proposed rule change applies the prompt requirement in proposed Supplementary Material .01 to "marketable customer orders" to clarify that the requirement applies to both market orders and marketable limit orders.

<sup>26</sup> See Scottrade.

(b) Comments Regarding Orders for Foreign Securities with No U.S. Market

In Regulatory Notice 08-80, FINRA proposed to adopt a new provision regarding a member's best execution obligations for foreign securities with no U.S. market. Under that provision, a member would have been deemed to have exercised reasonable diligence pursuant to Rule 5310(a) with respect to an order if:

- (i) the order was for a non-U.S. traded security;<sup>27</sup>
- (ii) the member had adopted written policies and procedures regarding its handling of orders for non-U.S. traded securities that are reasonably designed to obtain the most favorable terms available for the customer;
- (iii) the member reviewed those policies and procedures at least annually, or more frequently as appropriate, to assess the quality of the execution venues included in the member's policies and procedures to determine whether they provide for the most favorable terms reasonably available and whether the policies and procedures needed to be updated or revised;
- (iv) the member had obtained its customers' consent to its policies and procedures regarding the handling of orders for non-U.S. traded securities; and
- (v) the member handled the order in accordance with its policies and procedures.

The proposed provision did not except these orders from the reasonable diligence requirement; rather, in recognition of the differences in how such orders are handled, it

---

<sup>27</sup> For purposes of the provision, FINRA proposed to define a "non-U.S. traded security" as any non-exchange-listed security issued by a corporation or other entity incorporated or organized under the laws of any foreign country for which there is no quotation or indication of interest displayed in any inter-dealer quotation system generally available in the United States at the time the member receives the order.

provided an alternative mechanism, other than the current list of factors in the rule, in determining whether a firm had met the reasonable diligence obligation.

Although several commenters generally supported the proposed provision addressing foreign securities with no U.S. market, commenters raised numerous issues with specific aspects of the provision. Multiple commenters questioned the requirement that a customer consent to the member's policies and procedures.<sup>28</sup> In addition, commenters also requested guidance on several of the provision's terms and requirements, including asking for additional guidance of "a non-exclusive list of elements for what a typical set of execution protocols might cover,"<sup>29</sup> clarification that the presence of American Depositary Receipts with an active market in the U.S. would not affect the analysis with respect to the issuer's ordinary shares,<sup>30</sup> and questioning portions of the definition of non-U.S. traded security.<sup>31</sup>

FINRA continues to believe it is appropriate to address specifically as part of the Best Execution Rule issues involving members' best execution obligations when handling orders for foreign securities with no U.S. market; however, as noted above, FINRA has replaced the proposed provision with Supplementary Material that more generally describes the obligations members have regarding these orders.

- (c) Comments on Proposed Supplementary Material .06 (Orders Involving Securities with Limited Quotations or Pricing Information)

---

<sup>28</sup> See First Allied, Scottrade, SIFMA.

<sup>29</sup> SIFMA.

<sup>30</sup> See Sidley.

<sup>31</sup> See Sidley, Pink OTC.

Six commenters addressed the proposal to replace the Three Quote Rule with more general Supplementary Material regarding a member's obligations when handling an order for a security for which there is limited pricing information available. Of the six commenters, five supported the proposal,<sup>32</sup> and one commenter opposed the proposed change because the commenter believed that the current Three Quote Rule promotes "straightforward best execution compliance."<sup>33</sup> As FINRA has stressed in the past, the Three Quote Rule is a minimum standard that members are required to meet with respect to non-exchange-listed securities with one or no public quotation; compliance with the Three Quote Rule does not, in and of itself, mean that a member has met its best execution obligations.<sup>34</sup> Thus, contrary to the commenter's assertion that the Three Quote Rule established a straight-forward compliance standard, it sets forth only a non-exhaustive minimum standard.

As noted above, best execution requires the exercise of reasonable diligence. If a security has little or no price transparency, FINRA agrees that a member with an order for such a security should generally seek out other sources of pricing information or potential liquidity, which could include contacting other dealers. Consequently, the Supplementary Material specifically notes that members "should generally seek out other sources of pricing information or potential liquidity, which may include obtaining quotations from other sources . . . ." However, FINRA believes that there continue to be instances where contacting additional dealers may not be in the customer's best interest

---

<sup>32</sup> See Cutter, First Allied, Liquidnet, NAIBD, SIFMA.

<sup>33</sup> Pink OTC.

<sup>34</sup> See, e.g., NASD Notice to Members 00-84 (December 2000).

(and, indeed, may be detrimental to the customer).<sup>35</sup> Although the proposed Supplementary Material gives members the ability to determine when that is the case, members continue to have best execution obligations in handling the order.

The commenter also requested that FINRA “state, whether in the text of the Rule or the Supplementary Material, that member firms must execute customer orders at an equal or better price as displayed in any Inter-Dealer Quotation System that permits quotation updates on a real-time basis.”<sup>36</sup> FINRA does not believe it is necessary to specifically address this point with respect to the types of orders currently covered under the Three Quote Rule. As is already the case today, paragraph (a)(1) of the proposed rule requires that members use reasonable diligence to ascertain the best market for the subject 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.” That standard has always applied to orders covered by the Three Quote Rule (indeed, it applies to all customer orders) and will continue to apply under the proposed rule.

As noted above, as part of replacing the Three Quote Rule with Supplementary Material, FINRA has proposed replacing the specific recordkeeping requirements in NASD Rule 3110(b) with a more general recordkeeping requirement. One commenter requested additional guidance on the documentation requirement;<sup>37</sup> however, FINRA is

---

<sup>35</sup> For example, one commenter asserted that contacting multiple dealers regarding an order in a fixed income security could have the effect of moving the market away from the customer in some circumstances. See SIFMA.

<sup>36</sup> Pink OTC.

<sup>37</sup> See SIFMA.

unable to provide specific guidance to a recordkeeping requirement that will vary with the adaptive practices of firms in meeting the principle-based requirements of the rule. Each member must retain sufficient documentation to demonstrate that it has complied with the policies and procedures that it has in place. Because there will no longer be uniform treatment of these types of orders and different firms will have different procedures under the proposal, there can be no uniform recordkeeping requirement.

(d) Comments on Proposed Supplementary Material .09 (Regular and Rigorous Review of Execution Quality)

Five commenters addressed proposed Supplementary Material .09, which codifies the obligations of some firms to regularly and rigorously review execution quality.<sup>38</sup> One commenter questioned the rationale of codifying these obligations, which are already “well understood” by the industry and asserted that codification would take them away from being “fluid and evolving” standards and make them more rigid and difficult to change.<sup>39</sup> FINRA disagrees. As noted above, the proposed Supplementary Material does not alter existing obligations or standards, and the language of the proposed provision is sufficiently flexible to allow the obligations to evolve along with the markets. Although the commenter expressed concern about the ability to change or amend the provision once it is codified within a FINRA rule, the general obligations of regular and rigorous review have not changed substantially since FINRA issued Notice to Members 01-22 in 2001. Moreover, FINRA retains the ability to continue to publish interpretive guidance on the requirements or amend the requirements through rulemaking even if their general contours are codified.

---

<sup>38</sup> Cutter, First Allied, NAIBD, Pink OTC, SIFMA.

<sup>39</sup> SIFMA.

Two commenters suggested that the requirement to periodically review the execution quality of orders not apply to introducing firms with respect to those orders placed through their clearing firm.<sup>40</sup> One commenter stated that, because of the lack of expertise among introducing firms, the requirement leads to a “pro forma review process” that does not meaningfully enhance investor protection.<sup>41</sup> These commenters seem to suggest that, because the clearing firm itself has a best execution obligation with respect to the order, the introducing firm should be relieved of its best execution obligation. FINRA does not find these comments persuasive and has consistently rejected this rationale. Every member has an obligation to ensure that each customer order it handles receives best execution, and regular and rigorous review is one method by which firms that route orders to other members (or execute orders internally) can meet their best execution obligations. That is, regular and rigorous reviews are one way for order entry firms and firms that internalize order flow to satisfy their best execution obligations in lieu of an order-by-order best execution analysis.

Three commenters requested that FINRA provide more specific guidance about the types of information introducing firms should review (and clearing firms should provide) and the frequency of the reviews so that introducing firms can ensure they meet their obligations if they choose to rely on their clearing firm.<sup>42</sup> One of these commenters asked FINRA to confirm whether a review of “those reports prepared and disclosed by executing firms in meeting their obligations under order routing regulations will suffice

---

<sup>40</sup> See Cutter, FSI.

<sup>41</sup> FSI.

<sup>42</sup> See FSI, NAIBD, SIFMA.

for the purposes of this review.”<sup>43</sup> FINRA has previously provided guidance on these questions, and the guidance will continue to be applicable. For example, in Notice to Members 01-22, FINRA stated:

In cases where the introducing broker/dealer is relying on the review conducted by its clearing firm or other executing broker/dealer, the introducing firm must ensure that such analysis is thorough, considers the execution quality of a broad range of market centers, measures the execution quality provided by the clearing or executing firm for the introducing firm’s own orders, and considers market centers to which the clearing or executing firm currently routes its order flow as well as market centers other than those to which the clearing or executing firm currently routes its order flow.

As is the case currently, an introducing firm must review information sufficient to conclude that its clearing firm is providing best execution and is conducting a thorough regular and rigorous review. While in some instances a review of required regulatory reports may suffice, in other instances such a review may not. For example, if a review of required regulatory order routing reports raised concerns or issues, then FINRA would expect the introducing firm to conduct a further inquiry and review. This is currently the case under existing FINRA rules and would remain the case under the proposed rule change. As FINRA stated in Regulatory Notice 08-80, in codifying regular and rigorous review standards, FINRA did not intend to alter existing requirements or obligations.

One commenter asked FINRA to state that regular and rigorous review is only required with respect to “retail-sized, held orders in equity securities for which execution quality statistics are required to be published by market centers pursuant to Rule 605 of

---

<sup>43</sup>

NAIBD.

Regulation NMS.”<sup>44</sup> The commenter further stated that regular and rigorous reviews are not appropriate for not held orders and that “the assessment of execution quality for not held orders is effectively done on an individual, order-by-order basis, in real-time and/or on a post-trade basis.” FINRA does not view regular and rigorous review as ever being “required.” Rather, regular and rigorous review permits order entry firms and firms that internalize order flow to meet their best execution obligations through the use of a periodic regular and rigorous review of execution quality; this review stands in the place of an order-by-order review. Therefore, conducting an order-by-order, individual review for not held orders would eliminate the need for a regular and rigorous review of those order types.

One commenter stated that “efficiency of execution” should be added as a factor for members to consider when conducting their regular and rigorous review.<sup>45</sup> FINRA views “efficiency of execution,” not as a separate factor, but rather as a term that would encompass several of the existing listed factors (e.g., speed and size of execution). Moreover, the list in the Supplementary Material is intended to be illustrative, not exhaustive.

This commenter also suggests that the factors of speed, size, and transaction costs should be qualified by a materiality standard. These factors are already qualified by a materiality standard under proposed Supplementary Material .09(b), which requires that, “[i]n conducting its regular and rigorous review, a member must determine whether any material differences in execution quality exist among the markets trading the security.”

---

<sup>44</sup> SIFMA.

<sup>45</sup> Scottrade.

The Supplementary Material then goes on to identify a number of factors a member should consider when reviewing and comparing execution quality. However, as proposed in Regulatory Notice 08-80, the first two factors identified included an additional reference to “materiality.” To avoid confusion, FINRA has removed the additional reference to materiality in the first two factors to avoid the misimpression that the other factors do not have a materiality standard.

(e) Comments on Proposed Supplementary Material .08 (Customer Instructions Regarding Order Handling)

Proposed Supplementary Material .08 addresses a member’s obligations when a customer directs, on an unsolicited basis, the member to execute the order in a specific market. Only one commenter opposed the proposed Supplementary Material, stating that “it is the firm’s responsibility to always make a best execution determination in all cases whether specifically instructed to route its order to a particular market or not.”<sup>46</sup> FINRA agrees that members have best execution responsibilities with respect to each and every customer order the member accepts; however, when a customer directs a member to execute an order in a specific market, the construct of paragraph (a)(1) of the rule is no longer applicable. As noted above, paragraph (a)(1) of the rule requires a member to use reasonable diligence to ascertain the best market for the subject security. When a customer specifies the market, that is no longer a determination that the member can make. However, the Supplementary Material makes clear that members are still required to handle the order promptly and in accordance with its terms.

---

<sup>46</sup> First Allied.

One commenter suggested that the “unsolicited” requirement not apply to orders involving foreign securities.<sup>47</sup> The commenter suggested that a customer should not be deprived of the firm’s advice in this area. The rule was not intended to, and does not, deprive a customer of a firm’s advice regarding routing decisions; rather, it simply recognizes that in those cases where a customer has made its own routing decision, the member cannot choose a different market for execution without violating the terms of the order. If a member, by contrast, undertakes to advise the customer on routing venues, it should be bound by general best execution obligations with respect to the execution of that order. In addition, however, the commenter stated that a firm and a customer “may on the basis of long usage and course of dealing have concluded that the customer’s orders for foreign securities are most effectively executed in the principal market for such securities in the issuer’s home country.” In the alternative, the commenter suggested that the exception could be available when a customer has instructed that an order for a foreign security be executed in the security’s principal market. FINRA agrees with the commenter to the extent that a customer need not provide the direction on an order-by-order basis. Thus, for example, the rule would apply if a customer has made a more general instruction with respect to particular types of orders or securities.

One commenter, while supporting the proposal, suggested that it be broadened to include orders where the broker’s judgment and discretion are considerably restricted because of other order terms and conditions.<sup>48</sup> FINRA does not agree that the exception should be so broadened. Paragraph (a)(1)(E) of the proposed rule already notes that one

---

<sup>47</sup> See Sidley.

<sup>48</sup> See SIFMA.

of the factors in any analysis of best execution is the terms and conditions of the order. FINRA believes that the exception should only apply in those circumstances where the ultimate decision that must be made with respect to the order (i.e., execution venue) is specifically directed by the customer. All other terms and conditions are adequately addressed in the rule itself.

(f) Comments on Proposed FINRA Rule 6438

FINRA received several comments regarding the proposal to move the same quote requirements in NASD Rule 2320(f)(2) into a separate rule.<sup>49</sup> One commenter suggested that FINRA amend the provision to require “similar,” rather than the “same,” quotes and questioned the application of the provision if a member has multiple trading desks that quote the same security.<sup>50</sup> Another commenter<sup>51</sup> suggested that FINRA not alter the definitions of the terms “quotation medium” and “inter-dealer quotation system” from the way these terms are laid out in Exchange Act Rule 15c2-11(e).<sup>52</sup> This commenter also suggested that the same quote requirements apply to inter-dealer quotation systems rather than quotation mediums. As noted above, at this time, FINRA is proposing to transfer the provisions into a separate rule without change; FINRA believes that the objectives behind adopting this requirement are still valid and is not proposing to amend this provision at this time. In addition, by relocating the provision

---

<sup>49</sup> See Pink OTC, SIFMA.

<sup>50</sup> SIFMA.

<sup>51</sup> Pink OTC.

<sup>52</sup> 17 CFR 240.15c2-11(e).

into the FINRA Rule 6400 Series, the defined terms at issue are already defined in existing FINRA Rule 6420.

(g) Other Comments

Some commenters provided comments on portions of the rule that FINRA has not proposed to change. For example, one commenter requested that the language in proposed Rule 5310(d) be updated to refer to defined industry terms (e.g., “clearing firm”) rather than descriptions (e.g., “third party pursuant to established correspondent relationships under which executions are confirmed directly to the member acting as agent for the customer”).<sup>53</sup> Although the term “clearing firm” is generally understood, it is not defined in any FINRA rule; consequently, FINRA determined to retain the existing descriptions to avoid any unintended changes in the scope of the rule or any misunderstandings regarding the use of the term. In light of this comment, however, FINRA has replaced the references to “introducing firms” and “clearing firms” in Supplementary Material .09(c) in addition to clarifying the scope of that provision as proposed in Regulatory Notice 08-80.<sup>54</sup>

Finally, one commenter asked FINRA to clarify the meaning of proposed FINRA Rule 5310(c) (current NASD Rule 2320(c)) regarding costs borne by a customer.<sup>55</sup> That provision states that “the channeling of customers’ orders through a broker’s broker or third party pursuant to established correspondent relationships under which executions are confirmed directly to the member acting as agent for the customer . . . are not

---

<sup>53</sup> FSI.

<sup>54</sup> See SIFMA.

<sup>55</sup> NAIBD.

prohibited if the cost of such service is not borne by the customer.” The commenter asked whether the provision applied to all costs or, rather, to additional or undue costs. In light of this comment, and the fact that the SEC has approved revisions to the interpositioning provisions in the Best Execution Rule that address sending orders through third parties,<sup>56</sup> FINRA is proposing to delete the sentence from the Best Execution Rule. FINRA believes that the issues the provision covers are adequately addressed in the revised interpositioning provision.

**6. Extension of Time Period for Commission Action**

FINRA does not consent at this time to an extension of the time period for Commission action specified in Section 19(b)(2) of the Act.<sup>57</sup>

**7. Basis for Summary Effectiveness Pursuant to Section 19(b)(3) or for Accelerated Effectiveness Pursuant to Section 19(b)(2)**

Not applicable.

**8. Proposed Rule Change Based on Rules of Another Self-Regulatory Organization or of the Commission**

Not applicable.

**9. Exhibits**

Exhibit 1. Completed notice of proposed rule change for publication in the Federal Register.

Exhibit 2a. Regulatory Notice 08-80 (December 2008).

Exhibit 2b. List of comments received in response to Regulatory Notice 08-80.

Exhibit 2c. Comments received in response to Regulatory Notice 08-80.

---

<sup>56</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 60635 (September 8, 2009), 74 FR 47302 (September 15, 2009).

<sup>57</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

Exhibit 5. Text of the proposed rule change.

EXHIBIT 1

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
(Release No. 34- ; File No. SR-FINRA-2011-052)

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc.; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change to Adopt NASD Rule 2320 (Best Execution and Interpositioning) and Interpretive Material (“IM”) 2320 as FINRA Rule 5310 in the Consolidated Rulebook

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”)<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> notice is hereby given that on , Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (“FINRA”) (f/k/a National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (“NASD”)) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC” or “Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by FINRA. 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

FINRA is proposing to adopt NASD Rule 2320 (Best Execution and Interpositioning) and Interpretive Material (“IM”) 2320 (Interpretive Guidance with Respect to Best Execution Requirements) as a FINRA rule in the consolidated FINRA rulebook with four notable changes. The proposed rule change would combine and renumber NASD Rule 2320 and IM-2320 as FINRA Rule 5310 in the consolidated FINRA rulebook.

---

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

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

The text of the proposed rule change is available on FINRA's website at <http://www.finra.org>, at the principal office of FINRA 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, FINRA 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. FINRA 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

As part of the process of developing a new consolidated rulebook ("Consolidated FINRA Rulebook"),<sup>3</sup> FINRA is proposing to adopt NASD Rule 2320 (Best Execution and Interpositioning) and IM-2320 (Interpretive Guidance with Respect to Best Execution Requirements) as a FINRA rule in the Consolidated FINRA Rulebook with several changes, which are described below.

---

<sup>3</sup> The current FINRA rulebook consists of (1) FINRA Rules; (2) NASD Rules; and (3) rules incorporated from NYSE ("Incorporated NYSE Rules") (together, the NASD Rules and Incorporated NYSE Rules are referred to as the "Transitional Rulebook"). While the NASD Rules generally apply to all FINRA members, the Incorporated NYSE Rules apply only to those members of FINRA that are also members of the NYSE ("Dual Members"). The FINRA Rules apply to all FINRA members, unless such rules have a more limited application by their terms. For more information about the rulebook consolidation process, see Information Notice, March 12, 2008 (Rulebook Consolidation Process).

NASD Rule 2320 requires a member, in any transaction for or with a customer or a customer of another broker-dealer, to use “reasonable diligence” to ascertain the best market for a security and to buy or sell in such market so that the resultant price to the customer is as favorable as possible under prevailing market conditions. The rule identifies five factors that are among those to be considered in determining whether the member has used reasonable diligence: (1) the character of the market for the security; (2) the size and type of transaction; (3) the number of markets checked; (4) the accessibility of the quotation; and (5) the terms and conditions of the order as communicated to the member. The rule also includes provisions related to interpositioning (i.e., interjecting a third party between the member and the best available market), the use of a broker’s broker,<sup>4</sup> the staffing of order rooms, and the application of the best execution requirements to other parties.

In addition to these provisions, NASD Rule 2320(f) (commonly referred to as the “Three Quote Rule”) generally requires members that execute transactions in non-exchange-listed securities on behalf of customers to contact a minimum of three dealers (or all dealers if three or fewer) and obtain quotations from those dealers if there are fewer than two quotations displayed on an inter-dealer quotation system that permits quotation updates on a real-time basis. The Three Quote Rule was adopted in 1988 to further define a firm’s best execution obligation to customers by setting forth additional requirements for transactions in non-exchange-listed securities, particularly transactions

---

<sup>4</sup> The proposed rule change moves part of the provision concerning the use of a broker’s broker from paragraph (b) of the rule to Supplementary Material .05.

involving securities with non-transparent prices.<sup>5</sup> Since that time, the Three Quote Rule has been amended on multiple occasions to exclude certain securities and transactions.<sup>6</sup> The Three Quote Rule establishes a minimum standard, and compliance with the Three Quote Rule, in and of itself, does not mean that a member has met its best execution obligations under NASD Rule 2320.<sup>7</sup>

IM-2320 was adopted in 2006 to codify interpretive guidance that FINRA staff had provided involving compliance with NASD Rule 2320.<sup>8</sup> Specifically, IM-2320 addresses issues involving the term “market” for purposes of the rule as well as the application of the rule to debt securities and to broker-dealers that are executing a customer’s order against the broker-dealer’s quote.

FINRA is proposing to adopt new FINRA Rule 5310, which is based largely on NASD Rule 2320. IM-2320 will be adopted, in substantially the same form, as Supplementary Material to Rule 5310. FINRA is also proposing several changes, which are described below, to the rule.

(1) The Three Quote Rule

---

<sup>5</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 25637 (May 2, 1988), 53 FR 16488 (May 9, 1988).

<sup>6</sup> See NASD Rule 2320(f)(3)(B), (C). See also Securities Exchange Act Release No. 56004 (July 2, 2007), 72 FR 37285 (July 9, 2007); Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43319 (September 21, 2000), 65 FR 58589 (September 29, 2000).

<sup>7</sup> See NASD Notice to Members 00-78 (November 2000).

<sup>8</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 54339 (August 21, 2006), 71 FR 50959 (August 28, 2006).

Since the adoption of the Three Quote Rule over twenty years ago, the market for non-exchange-listed securities has changed dramatically.<sup>9</sup> FINRA has found that in certain circumstances the Three Quote Rule can hinder, rather than further, investor protection by causing significant delays in obtaining execution of customer orders. As a result, FINRA has created several exclusions to the Three Quote Rule since it was adopted. For example, in 2000, FINRA determined that where there were two transparent, firm quotes for a security, the costs associated with delayed executions resulting from Three Quote Rule compliance outweighed the benefits of obtaining three telephone quotes.<sup>10</sup> Consequently, the Three Quote Rule currently applies only to non-exchange-listed securities with one or no public quotation.<sup>11</sup> More recently, in 2007, the SEC approved amendments to the Three Quote Rule to exclude certain transactions in non-exchange-listed securities of foreign issuers that are part of the FTSE All-World Index and to exclude certain transactions in Canadian securities executed on a Canadian exchange.<sup>12</sup>

Although the original concerns the Three Quote Rule was designed to address are still valid, FINRA believes that the current requirements in the Three Quote Rule, even with the various exclusions, are overly prescriptive and can often result in unnecessary

---

<sup>9</sup> For purposes of the Three Quote Rule, a “non-exchange-listed security” is any equity security that is not traded on any national securities exchange, but does not include restricted securities. See NASD Rule 2320(f)(4)(C).

<sup>10</sup> See NASD Notice to Members 00-78 (November 2000); see also Securities Exchange Act Release No. 43319 (September 21, 2000), 65 FR 58589 (September 29, 2000).

<sup>11</sup> See NASD Rule 2320(f)(3)(A).

<sup>12</sup> Securities Exchange Act Release No. 56004 (July 2, 2007), 72 FR 37285 (July 9, 2007). See Regulatory Notice 07-40 (August 2007).

delay in the execution of a customer's order or impose requirements that do not benefit the customer. Accordingly, rather than maintain the Three Quote Rule and the various exclusions in their current format, the proposed rule change replaces the Three Quote Rule with Supplementary Material emphasizing a member's best execution obligations when handling an order involving any security, equity or debt, for which there is limited pricing information available.<sup>13</sup> The Supplementary Material emphasizes that members must be especially diligent with respect to best execution obligations where there is limited quotation or other pricing information available regarding the security that is the subject of the order and requires members to have written policies and procedures in place to address the steps the member will take to determine the best market for such a security in the absence of multiple quotations or pricing information and to document how they have complied with those policies and procedures.<sup>14</sup> The Supplementary

---

<sup>13</sup> NASD Rule 2320(f)(2), which is a subparagraph within the Three Quote Rule, generally requires members that display priced quotations on a real-time basis for a non-exchange-listed security in two or more quotation mediums that permit quotation updates on a real-time basis to display the same priced quotation in each medium except for certain customer limit orders displayed on an electronic communications network. Paragraph (f)(4) of the rule includes definitions of terms used in paragraph (f)(2). At this time, FINRA is proposing to move paragraph (f)(2) into the FINRA Rule 6400 Series (Quoting and Trading in OTC Equity Securities) as FINRA Rule 6438. FINRA is also proposing to replace the term "non-exchange-listed security" with the term "OTC Equity Security" to conform the rule language to other FINRA rules addressing non-NMS stocks. The terms "OTC Equity Security" and "quotation medium" are defined in FINRA Rule 6420. Because the provisions relate to the quotation of OTC Equity Securities, FINRA believes that they should be relocated into the FINRA rule series concerning quoting and trading OTC Equity Securities rather than remain part of the Best Execution Rule.

<sup>14</sup> NASD Rule 3110(b) (Books and Records) generally requires members to indicate on the customer order ticket how they complied with the Three Quote Rule, if applicable. FINRA is proposing to replace this provision with a more general documentation requirement in the Supplementary Material to proposed FINRA Rule 5310. Under that provision, members would be required to retain records

Material specifically notes that, when handling orders for such securities, members should generally seek out other sources of pricing information or potential liquidity, which may include obtaining quotations from other sources (e.g., other firms that the member previously has traded with in the security). For example, in many instances, particularly in the context of equity securities with limited quotation information available, contacting other broker-dealers may be necessary to comply with a member's best execution obligations.<sup>15</sup>

## (2) Regular and Rigorous Review of Execution Quality

The proposed rule change includes Supplementary Material to proposed FINRA Rule 5310 codifying a member's obligations when it undertakes a regular and rigorous review of execution quality likely to be obtained from different market centers. These longstanding obligations are set forth and explained in various SEC releases and NASD Notices to Members.<sup>16</sup> The proposed rule change codifies this guidance as

---

sufficient to demonstrate that they had handled orders covered by the rule in accordance with their policies and procedures.

<sup>15</sup> As noted above, FINRA believes that requiring compliance with the Three Quote Rule in all circumstances covered by the rule can cause unnecessary delay in the handling of some customer orders. However, as the Supplementary Material recognizes, contacting other broker-dealers can often be necessary for a firm to meet its best execution obligations. In recognizing the importance of contacting other broker-dealers for pricing or liquidity information, FINRA notes that many firms may choose to adopt policies and procedures that are substantially similar to the current Three Quote Rule but may, for example, allow for firms to adapt their procedures for certain situations if the firm reasonably concludes that those requirements would result in unnecessary delay or otherwise not benefit the customer. Firms must also continue to take into account when developing their procedures that the Three Quote Rule is a minimum standard, and contacting other dealers does not guarantee that a firm has met its best execution obligations in all cases.

<sup>16</sup> See, e.g., Securities Exchange Act Release No. 37619A (September 6, 1996), 61 FR 48290 (September 12, 1996); NASD Notice to Members 01-22 (April 2001).

Supplementary Material and does not alter existing requirements regarding regular and rigorous review.

(3) Orders for Foreign Securities with No U.S. Market

While the determination as to whether a member has satisfied its best execution obligations must take into account the market for a security, NASD Rule 2320 does not specifically distinguish between orders for domestic securities and orders for foreign securities, even if there is no U.S. market for the security. Markets in foreign jurisdictions often do not have identical best execution requirements as those imposed by NASD Rule 2320 and, in many cases, may not have comparable pre-trade or post-trade transparency standards. Thus, the handling of orders for foreign securities with no U.S. market can differ substantially from the handling of orders in securities that trade in the U.S. Consequently, the proposed rule change includes new Supplementary Material concerning members' best execution obligations when handling orders for foreign securities, and in particular foreign securities with no U.S. trading activity.<sup>17</sup>

The new Supplementary Material recognizes that markets for different securities can vary dramatically and that the standard of "reasonable diligence" must be assessed by examining specific factors, including "the character of the market for the security" and the "accessibility of the quotation." Accordingly, the determination as to whether a member has satisfied its best execution obligations necessarily involves a "facts and circumstances" analysis.

---

<sup>17</sup> As discussed more fully in Section 2(C)(2) below, in Regulatory Notice 08-80 FINRA had proposed a different approach regarding orders for foreign securities with no U.S. market.

The new Supplementary Material notes that even though a foreign security may not trade in the U.S., members still have an obligation to seek best execution for customer orders involving the security. Consequently, a member that handles customer orders for foreign securities that do not trade in the U.S. must have specific written policies and procedures in place regarding its handling of customer orders for these securities that are reasonably designed to obtain the most favorable terms available for the customer, taking into account differences that may exist between U.S. markets and foreign markets. The Supplementary Material further notes that a member's best execution obligations also must evolve as changes occur in the market that may give rise to improved executions, including opportunities to trade at more advantageous prices. Members must therefore regularly review their policies and procedures to assess the quality of executions received and update or revise the policies and procedures as necessary.

#### (4) Customer Instructions Regarding the Routing of Orders

When placing an order with a member, customers may specifically instruct the member to route the order to a particular market for execution.<sup>18</sup> The proposed rule change includes Supplementary Material to proposed FINRA Rule 5310 addressing situations where the customer has, on an unsolicited basis, specifically instructed the member to route its order to a particular market.<sup>19</sup> Under those circumstances, the

---

<sup>18</sup> When the order is for an NMS security, these orders are often referred to as "directed orders." See 17 CFR 242.600(b)(19). Of note, directed orders are excluded from the order routing statistics required to be produced under Rule 606 of SEC Regulation NMS. See 17 CFR 242.606.

<sup>19</sup> FINRA also has proposed technical amendments to paragraph (e) of the rule to clarify that a member's best execution obligations extend to all customer orders and to avoid the potential misimpression that the paragraph limits the scope of the rule's requirements.

member would not be required to make a best execution determination beyond that specific instruction; however, the Supplementary Material mandates that members process the customer's order promptly and in accordance with the terms of the order. The Supplementary Material also makes clear that where a customer has directed the member to route an order to another broker-dealer that is also a FINRA member, the exception would not apply to the receiving broker-dealer to which the order was directed.<sup>20</sup>

FINRA will announce the implementation date of the proposed rule change in a Regulatory Notice to be published no later than 90 days following Commission approval. The implementation date will be no later than 90 days following publication of the Regulatory Notice announcing Commission approval.

## 2. Statutory Basis

FINRA believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the provisions of Section 15A(b)(6) of the Act,<sup>21</sup> which requires, among other things, that FINRA rules must 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. FINRA believes that the proposed rule change adds needed clarification and provisions to the existing best execution requirements that enhance investor protection and promote just and equitable principles of trade. FINRA believes that codifying members' obligations regarding directed orders, regular and rigorous review, and orders

---

<sup>20</sup> For example, if a customer of Member Firm A directs Member Firm A to route an order to Member Firm B, Member Firm B would continue to have best execution obligations to that customer order received from Member Firm A.

<sup>21</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78q-3(b)(6).

involving foreign securities will bring needed clarification to these areas and ensure that all members are aware of their obligations. As discussed above, FINRA believes that replacing the Three Quote Rule with the proposed Supplementary Material will improve the handling of customer orders involving securities with limited quotation or pricing information by decreasing the likelihood that execution of these orders will be unnecessarily delayed while still ensuring that members recognize that their best execution obligations apply to these orders. FINRA believes that each of these provisions will help promote just and equitable principles of trade and will protect investors and the public interest.

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

FINRA does not believe that the proposed rule change will result in any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

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

The proposed rule change was published for comment in Regulatory Notice 08-80 (December 2008). A copy of Regulatory Notice 08-80 is attached as Exhibit 2a. The comment period expired on February 27, 2009. FINRA received nine comment letters in response to the Regulatory Notice.<sup>22</sup> A list of the comment letters received in response to

---

<sup>22</sup> Letter from first allied ("First Allied"), dated January 27, 2009; Letter from Sidley Austin LLP ("Sidley"), dated January 28, 2009; Letter from Scottrade, Inc. ("Scottrade"), dated January 29, 2009; Letter from National Association of Independent Broker-Dealers, Inc. ("NAIBD"), dated February 16, 2009; Letter from Cutter & Company, Inc. ("Cutter"), dated February 17, 2009; Letter from Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association ("SIFMA"), dated February 26, 2009; Letter from Financial Services Institute ("FSI"), dated

Regulatory Notice 08-80 is attached as Exhibit 2b. Copies of the comment letters received in response to Regulatory Notice 08-80 are attached as Exhibit 2c.

(1) General Comments on the Proposed Rule Change

Although most commenters addressed particular issues in the rule changes proposed in Regulatory Notice 08-80, some commenters raised broader concerns regarding best execution obligations and NASD Rule 2320 in general. SIFMA expressed concerns about the application of the Best Execution Rule to debt securities and reiterated the concerns previously expressed by the Bond Market Association in response to prior amendments to NASD Rule 2320.<sup>23</sup> In essence, SIFMA asserts that fundamental differences in the operation of the equity and fixed income markets render the Best Execution Rule inappropriate for the fixed income market. SIFMA states that the current Best Execution Rule, as well as many of the amendments in the proposed rule change, may be appropriate for the equity markets but “create problems of interpretation, application and enforcement” in the context of the fixed income markets.

FINRA disagrees. As SIFMA’s letter notes, these concerns have been raised numerous times in recent years, and for the same reasons FINRA has noted before, FINRA believes that the Best Execution Rule is broad enough to apply to both the equity and fixed income markets. As FINRA stated in 2005:

[The] Best Execution Rule looks at a number of factors, including the character of the market for the security, to determine whether a member or associated person(s) has used reasonable diligence. Accordingly, it can be applied

---

February 27, 2009; Letter from Pink OTC Markets, Inc. (“Pink OTC”), dated March 20, 2009; Letter from Liquidnet, Inc. (“Liquidnet”), dated April 24, 2009.

<sup>23</sup>

See SIFMA.

in a variety of different markets that can possess divergent characteristics, including the U.S. debt market.<sup>24</sup>

The Best Execution Rule requires the use of “reasonable diligence” when handling a customer order. One of the enumerated factors in assessing whether reasonable diligence has been used is “the character of the market for the security.”<sup>25</sup> This language makes readily apparent that a determination of best execution must take into account the specific facts and circumstances surrounding the market in which a security trades, whether that is an exchange market, the over-the-counter equity market, or the fixed income market. Different securities trade in myriad ways, and no single rule can address each and every nuance of various types of markets. Moreover, market structure is itself subject to continuous evolution and development; a rule focused on a specific market structure would quickly become outdated. For all of these reasons, the Best Execution Rule is intentionally broad and encompasses all market types by its recognition that a best execution determination cannot be made without first determining the type of market in which the security that is the subject of the order trades.

One commenter suggested that proposed Supplementary Material .01 regarding prompt execution of a marketable customer order<sup>26</sup> be clarified to note that a firm’s acceptance of an order “starts the clock” as opposed to the time a customer enters an

---

<sup>24</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 52637 n.15 (October 19, 2005), 70 FR 61861, 61863 n.15 (October 26, 2005).

<sup>25</sup> See NASD Rule 2320(a)(1)(A).

<sup>26</sup> In Regulatory Notice 08-80, FINRA proposed to apply the prompt requirement in Supplementary Material .01 to customer market orders. The proposed rule change applies the prompt requirement in proposed Supplementary Material .01 to “marketable customer orders” to clarify that the requirement applies to both market orders and marketable limit orders.

order or the time an order is received.<sup>27</sup> The Supplementary Material requires “prompt” execution and does not dictate a specific timeframe because FINRA believes the principle-based standard of acting promptly would encompass all reasonable factors that a prescriptive standard could not address in all cases. Best execution requires firms to minimize the time between order receipt, order acceptance, and order entry. Firms may not defend their failure to act promptly in respect of an order because such an order languished between its receipt and entry. In addition, FINRA has already codified the obligation to handle and execute marketable customer orders promptly in FINRA Rule 5320.07.

(2) Comments Regarding Orders for Foreign Securities with No U.S. Market

In Regulatory Notice 08-80, FINRA proposed to adopt a new provision regarding a member’s best execution obligations for foreign securities with no U.S. market. Under that provision, a member would have been deemed to have exercised reasonable diligence pursuant to Rule 5310(a) with respect to an order if:

- (i) the order was for a non-U.S. traded security,<sup>28</sup>
- (ii) the member had adopted written policies and procedures regarding its handling of orders for non-U.S. traded securities that are reasonably designed to obtain the most favorable terms available for the customer;

---

<sup>27</sup> See Scottrade.

<sup>28</sup> For purposes of the provision, FINRA proposed to define a “non-U.S. traded security” as any non-exchange-listed security issued by a corporation or other entity incorporated or organized under the laws of any foreign country for which there is no quotation or indication of interest displayed in any inter-dealer quotation system generally available in the United States at the time the member receives the order.

- (iii) the member reviewed those policies and procedures at least annually, or more frequently as appropriate, to assess the quality of the execution venues included in the member's policies and procedures to determine whether they provide for the most favorable terms reasonably available and whether the policies and procedures needed to be updated or revised;
- (iv) the member had obtained its customers' consent to its policies and procedures regarding the handling of orders for non-U.S. traded securities; and
- (v) the member handled the order in accordance with its policies and procedures.

The proposed provision did not except these orders from the reasonable diligence requirement; rather, in recognition of the differences in how such orders are handled, it provided an alternative mechanism, other than the current list of factors in the rule, in determining whether a firm had met the reasonable diligence obligation.

Although several commenters generally supported the proposed provision addressing foreign securities with no U.S. market, commenters raised numerous issues with specific aspects of the provision. Multiple commenters questioned the requirement that a customer consent to the member's policies and procedures.<sup>29</sup> In addition, commenters also requested guidance on several of the provision's terms and requirements, including asking for additional guidance of "a non-exclusive list of elements for what a typical set of execution protocols might cover,"<sup>30</sup> clarification that the presence of American Depositary Receipts with an active market in the U.S. would

---

<sup>29</sup> See First Allied, Scottrade, SIFMA.

<sup>30</sup> SIFMA.

not affect the analysis with respect to the issuer's ordinary shares,<sup>31</sup> and questioning portions of the definition of non-U.S. traded security.<sup>32</sup>

FINRA continues to believe it is appropriate to address specifically as part of the Best Execution Rule issues involving members' best execution obligations when handling orders for foreign securities with no U.S. market; however, as noted above, FINRA has replaced the proposed provision with Supplementary Material that more generally describes the obligations members have regarding these orders.

(3) Comments on Proposed Supplementary Material .06 (Orders Involving Securities with Limited Quotations or Pricing Information)

Six commenters addressed the proposal to replace the Three Quote Rule with more general Supplementary Material regarding a member's obligations when handling an order for a security for which there is limited pricing information available. Of the six commenters, five supported the proposal,<sup>33</sup> and one commenter opposed the proposed change because the commenter believed that the current Three Quote Rule promotes "straightforward best execution compliance."<sup>34</sup> As FINRA has stressed in the past, the Three Quote Rule is a minimum standard that members are required to meet with respect to non-exchange-listed securities with one or no public quotation; compliance with the Three Quote Rule does not, in and of itself, mean that a member has met its best execution obligations.<sup>35</sup> Thus, contrary to the commenter's assertion that the Three

---

<sup>31</sup> See Sidley.

<sup>32</sup> See Sidley, Pink OTC.

<sup>33</sup> See Cutter, First Allied, Liquidnet, NAIBD, SIFMA.

<sup>34</sup> Pink OTC.

<sup>35</sup> See, e.g., NASD Notice to Members 00-84 (December 2000).

Quote Rule established a straight-forward compliance standard, it sets forth only a non-exhaustive minimum standard.

As noted above, best execution requires the exercise of reasonable diligence. If a security has little or no price transparency, FINRA agrees that a member with an order for such a security should generally seek out other sources of pricing information or potential liquidity, which could include contacting other dealers. Consequently, the Supplementary Material specifically notes that members “should generally seek out other sources of pricing information or potential liquidity, which may include obtaining quotations from other sources . . . .” However, FINRA believes that there continue to be instances where contacting additional dealers may not be in the customer’s best interest (and, indeed, may be detrimental to the customer).<sup>36</sup> Although the proposed Supplementary Material gives members the ability to determine when that is the case, members continue to have best execution obligations in handling the order.

The commenter also requested that FINRA “state, whether in the text of the Rule or the Supplementary Material, that member firms must execute customer orders at an equal or better price as displayed in any Inter-Dealer Quotation System that permits quotation updates on a real-time basis.”<sup>37</sup> FINRA does not believe it is necessary to specifically address this point with respect to the types of orders currently covered under the Three Quote Rule. As is already the case today, paragraph (a)(1) of the proposed rule requires that members use reasonable diligence to ascertain the best market for the

---

<sup>36</sup> For example, one commenter asserted that contacting multiple dealers regarding an order in a fixed income security could have the effect of moving the market away from the customer in some circumstances. See SIFMA.

<sup>37</sup> Pink OTC.

subject 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.” That standard has always applied to orders covered by the Three Quote Rule (indeed, it applies to all customer orders) and will continue to apply under the proposed rule.

As noted above, as part of replacing the Three Quote Rule with Supplementary Material, FINRA has proposed replacing the specific recordkeeping requirements in NASD Rule 3110(b) with a more general recordkeeping requirement. One commenter requested additional guidance on the documentation requirement,<sup>38</sup> however, FINRA is unable to provide specific guidance to a recordkeeping requirement that will vary with the adaptive practices of firms in meeting the principle-based requirements of the rule. Each member must retain sufficient documentation to demonstrate that it has complied with the policies and procedures that it has in place. Because there will no longer be uniform treatment of these types of orders and different firms will have different procedures under the proposal, there can be no uniform recordkeeping requirement.

(4) Comments on Proposed Supplementary Material .09 (Regular and Rigorous Review of Execution Quality)

Five commenters addressed proposed Supplementary Material .09, which codifies the obligations of some firms to regularly and rigorously review execution quality.<sup>39</sup> One commenter questioned the rationale of codifying these obligations, which are already “well understood” by the industry and asserted that codification would take them away from being “fluid and evolving” standards and make them more rigid and difficult to

---

<sup>38</sup> See SIFMA.

<sup>39</sup> Cutter, First Allied, NAIBD, Pink OTC, SIFMA.

change.<sup>40</sup> FINRA disagrees. As noted above, the proposed Supplementary Material does not alter existing obligations or standards, and the language of the proposed provision is sufficiently flexible to allow the obligations to evolve along with the markets. Although the commenter expressed concern about the ability to change or amend the provision once it is codified within a FINRA rule, the general obligations of regular and rigorous review have not changed substantially since FINRA issued Notice to Members 01-22 in 2001. Moreover, FINRA retains the ability to continue to publish interpretive guidance on the requirements or amend the requirements through rulemaking even if their general contours are codified.

Two commenters suggested that the requirement to periodically review the execution quality of orders not apply to introducing firms with respect to those orders placed through their clearing firm.<sup>41</sup> One commenter stated that, because of the lack of expertise among introducing firms, the requirement leads to a “pro forma review process” that does not meaningfully enhance investor protection.<sup>42</sup> These commenters seem to suggest that, because the clearing firm itself has a best execution obligation with respect to the order, the introducing firm should be relieved of its best execution obligation. FINRA does not find these comments persuasive and has consistently rejected this rationale. Every member has an obligation to ensure that each customer order it handles receives best execution, and regular and rigorous review is one method by which firms that route orders to other members (or execute orders internally) can meet their best

---

<sup>40</sup> SIFMA.

<sup>41</sup> See Cutter, FSI.

<sup>42</sup> FSI.

execution obligations. That is, regular and rigorous reviews are one way for order entry firms and firms that internalize order flow to satisfy their best execution obligations in lieu of an order-by-order best execution analysis.

Three commenters requested that FINRA provide more specific guidance about the types of information introducing firms should review (and clearing firms should provide) and the frequency of the reviews so that introducing firms can ensure they meet their obligations if they choose to rely on their clearing firm.<sup>43</sup> One of these commenters asked FINRA to confirm whether a review of “those reports prepared and disclosed by executing firms in meeting their obligations under order routing regulations will suffice for the purposes of this review.”<sup>44</sup> FINRA has previously provided guidance on these questions, and the guidance will continue to be applicable. For example, in Notice to Members 01-22, FINRA stated:

In cases where the introducing broker/dealer is relying on the review conducted by its clearing firm or other executing broker/dealer, the introducing firm must ensure that such analysis is thorough, considers the execution quality of a broad range of market centers, measures the execution quality provided by the clearing or executing firm for the introducing firm’s own orders, and considers market centers to which the clearing or executing firm currently routes its order flow as well as market centers other than those to which the clearing or executing firm currently routes its order flow.

As is the case currently, an introducing firm must review information sufficient to conclude that its clearing firm is providing best execution and is conducting a thorough regular and rigorous review. While in some instances a review of required regulatory

---

<sup>43</sup> See FSI, NAIBD, SIFMA.

<sup>44</sup> NAIBD.

reports may suffice, in other instances such a review may not. For example, if a review of required regulatory order routing reports raised concerns or issues, then FINRA would expect the introducing firm to conduct a further inquiry and review. This is currently the case under existing FINRA rules and would remain the case under the proposed rule change. As FINRA stated in Regulatory Notice 08-80, in codifying regular and rigorous review standards, FINRA did not intend to alter existing requirements or obligations.

One commenter asked FINRA to state that regular and rigorous review is only required with respect to “retail-sized, held orders in equity securities for which execution quality statistics are required to be published by market centers pursuant to Rule 605 of Regulation NMS.”<sup>45</sup> The commenter further stated that regular and rigorous reviews are not appropriate for not held orders and that “the assessment of execution quality for not held orders is effectively done on an individual, order-by-order basis, in real-time and/or on a post-trade basis.” FINRA does not view regular and rigorous review as ever being “required.” Rather, regular and rigorous review permits order entry firms and firms that internalize order flow to meet their best execution obligations through the use of a periodic regular and rigorous review of execution quality; this review stands in the place of an order-by-order review. Therefore, conducting an order-by-order, individual review for not held orders would eliminate the need for a regular and rigorous review of those order types.

One commenter stated that “efficiency of execution” should be added as a factor for members to consider when conducting their regular and rigorous review.<sup>46</sup> FINRA

---

<sup>45</sup> SIFMA.

<sup>46</sup> Scottrade.

views “efficiency of execution,” not as a separate factor, but rather as a term that would encompass several of the existing listed factors (e.g., speed and size of execution). Moreover, the list in the Supplementary Material is intended to be illustrative, not exhaustive.

This commenter also suggests that the factors of speed, size, and transaction costs should be qualified by a materiality standard. These factors are already qualified by a materiality standard under proposed Supplementary Material .09(b), which requires that, “[i]n conducting its regular and rigorous review, a member must determine whether any material differences in execution quality exist among the markets trading the security . . . .” The Supplementary Material then goes on to identify a number of factors a member should consider when reviewing and comparing execution quality. However, as proposed in Regulatory Notice 08-80, the first two factors identified included an additional reference to “materiality.” To avoid confusion, FINRA has removed the additional reference to materiality in the first two factors to avoid the misimpression that the other factors do not have a materiality standard.

(5) Comments on Proposed Supplementary Material .08 (Customer Instructions Regarding Order Handling)

Proposed Supplementary Material .08 addresses a member’s obligations when a customer directs, on an unsolicited basis, the member to execute the order in a specific market. Only one commenter opposed the proposed Supplementary Material, stating that “it is the firm’s responsibility to always make a best execution determination in all cases whether specifically instructed to route its order to a particular market or not.”<sup>47</sup> FINRA agrees that members have best execution responsibilities with respect to each and every

---

<sup>47</sup> First Allied.

customer order the member accepts; however, when a customer directs a member to execute an order in a specific market, the construct of paragraph (a)(1) of the rule is no longer applicable. As noted above, paragraph (a)(1) of the rule requires a member to use reasonable diligence to ascertain the best market for the subject security. When a customer specifies the market, that is no longer a determination that the member can make. However, the Supplementary Material makes clear that members are still required to handle the order promptly and in accordance with its terms.

One commenter suggested that the “unsolicited” requirement not apply to orders involving foreign securities.<sup>48</sup> The commenter suggested that a customer should not be deprived of the firm’s advice in this area. The rule was not intended to, and does not, deprive a customer of a firm’s advice regarding routing decisions; rather, it simply recognizes that in those cases where a customer has made its own routing decision, the member cannot choose a different market for execution without violating the terms of the order. If a member, by contrast, undertakes to advise the customer on routing venues, it should be bound by general best execution obligations with respect to the execution of that order. In addition, however, the commenter stated that a firm and a customer “may on the basis of long usage and course of dealing have concluded that the customer’s orders for foreign securities are most effectively executed in the principal market for such securities in the issuer’s home country.” In the alternative, the commenter suggested that the exception could be available when a customer has instructed that an order for a foreign security be executed in the security’s principal market. FINRA agrees with the commenter to the extent that a customer need not provide the direction on an order-by-

---

<sup>48</sup> See Sidley.

order basis. Thus, for example, the rule would apply if a customer has made a more general instruction with respect to particular types of orders or securities.

One commenter, while supporting the proposal, suggested that it be broadened to include orders where the broker's judgment and discretion are considerably restricted because of other order terms and conditions.<sup>49</sup> FINRA does not agree that the exception should be so broadened. Paragraph (a)(1)(E) of the proposed rule already notes that one of the factors in any analysis of best execution is the terms and conditions of the order. FINRA believes that the exception should only apply in those circumstances where the ultimate decision that must be made with respect to the order (i.e., execution venue) is specifically directed by the customer. All other terms and conditions are adequately addressed in the rule itself.

#### (6) Comments on Proposed FINRA Rule 6438

FINRA received several comments regarding the proposal to move the same quote requirements in NASD Rule 2320(f)(2) into a separate rule.<sup>50</sup> One commenter suggested that FINRA amend the provision to require "similar," rather than the "same," quotes and questioned the application of the provision if a member has multiple trading desks that quote the same security.<sup>51</sup> Another commenter<sup>52</sup> suggested that FINRA not alter the definitions of the terms "quotation medium" and "inter-dealer quotation system"

---

<sup>49</sup> See SIFMA.

<sup>50</sup> See Pink OTC, SIFMA.

<sup>51</sup> SIFMA.

<sup>52</sup> Pink OTC.

from the way these terms are laid out in Exchange Act Rule 15c2-11(e).<sup>53</sup> This commenter also suggested that the same quote requirements apply to inter-dealer quotation systems rather than quotation mediums. As noted above, at this time, FINRA is proposing to transfer the provisions into a separate rule without change; FINRA believes that the objectives behind adopting this requirement are still valid and is not proposing to amend this provision at this time. In addition, by relocating the provision into the FINRA Rule 6400 Series, the defined terms at issue are already defined in existing FINRA Rule 6420.

(7) Other Comments

Some commenters provided comments on portions of the rule that FINRA has not proposed to change. For example, one commenter requested that the language in proposed Rule 5310(d) be updated to refer to defined industry terms (e.g., “clearing firm”) rather than descriptions (e.g., “third party pursuant to established correspondent relationships under which executions are confirmed directly to the member acting as agent for the customer”).<sup>54</sup> Although the term “clearing firm” is generally understood, it is not defined in any FINRA rule; consequently, FINRA determined to retain the existing descriptions to avoid any unintended changes in the scope of the rule or any misunderstandings regarding the use of the term. In light of this comment, however, FINRA has replaced the references to “introducing firms” and “clearing firms” in

---

<sup>53</sup> 17 CFR 240.15c2-11(e).

<sup>54</sup> FSI.

Supplementary Material .09(c) in addition to clarifying the scope of that provision as proposed in Regulatory Notice 08-80.<sup>55</sup>

Finally, one commenter asked FINRA to clarify the meaning of proposed FINRA Rule 5310(c) (current NASD Rule 2320(c)) regarding costs borne by a customer.<sup>56</sup> That provision states that “the channeling of customers’ orders through a broker’s broker or third party pursuant to established correspondent relationships under which executions are confirmed directly to the member acting as agent for the customer . . . are not prohibited if the cost of such service is not borne by the customer.” The commenter asked whether the provision applied to all costs or, rather, to additional or undue costs. In light of this comment, and the fact that the SEC has approved revisions to the interpositioning provisions in the Best Execution Rule that address sending orders through third parties,<sup>57</sup> FINRA is proposing to delete the sentence from the Best Execution Rule. FINRA believes that the issues the provision covers are adequately addressed in the revised interpositioning provision.

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 (i) as the Commission may designate up to 90 days of such date 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:

---

<sup>55</sup> See SIFMA.

<sup>56</sup> NAIBD.

<sup>57</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 60635 (September 8, 2009), 74 FR 47302 (September 15, 2009).

(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 e-mail to [rule-comments@sec.gov](mailto:rule-comments@sec.gov). Please include File Number SR-FINRA-2011-052 on the subject line.

Paper Comments:

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Elizabeth M. Murphy, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street, NE, Washington, DC 20549-1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR-FINRA-2011-052. 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, DC 20549, on official business days between the hours of 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. Copies of such filing also will 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-2011-052 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.<sup>58</sup>

Elizabeth M. Murphy  
Secretary

---

<sup>58</sup> 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

**EXHIBIT 5**

Exhibit 5 shows the text of the proposed rule change. Proposed new language is underlined; proposed deletions are in brackets.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Text of Proposed New FINRA Rule  
(Marked to Show Changes from NASD Rule 2320 and IM-2320; NASD Rule 2320 and IM-2320 to be Deleted in their Entirety from the Transitional Rulebook)**

\* \* \* \* \*

**0100. GENERAL STANDARDS**

\* \* \* \* \*

**0150. Application of Rules to Exempted Securities Except Municipal Securities**

(a) through (b) No Change.

(c) Unless otherwise indicated within a particular Rule, the following FINRA and NASD rules are applicable to transactions in, and business activities relating to, exempted securities, except municipal securities, conducted by members and associated persons: FINRA Rules 2010, 2020, 2060, 2150, 2261, 2269, 2320(g), 3220, 3270, 4120, 4130, 4210, 4311, 4530, 5160, 5210, 5220, 5230, 5310, 8110, 8120, 8210, 8310, 8311, 8312, 8320, 8330 and 9552; NASD Rules 2210, IM-2210-1, IM-2210-2, IM-2210-3, 2310, IM-2310-2, IM-2310-3, [2320,] 2330, IM-2330, 2340, 2430, 2510, 3010, 3020, 3040, 3050, 3110, IM-3110, 3140.

\* \* \* \* \*

**5000. SECURITIES OFFERING AND TRADING STANDARDS AND PRACTICES**

\* \* \* \* \*

**5300. HANDLING OF CUSTOMER ORDERS**

[2320] 5310. **Best Execution and Interpositioning**

(a)(1) In any transaction for or with a customer or a customer of another broker-dealer, a member and persons associated with a member shall use reasonable diligence to ascertain the best market for the subject 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. Among the factors that will be considered in determining whether a member has used “reasonable diligence” are:

- (A) the character of the market for the security[,] (e.g., price, volatility, relative liquidity, and pressure on available communications);
- (B) the size and type of transaction;
- (C) the number of markets checked;
- (D) accessibility of the quotation; and
- (E) the terms and conditions of the order which result in the transaction, as communicated to the member and persons associated with the member.

(2) In any transaction for or with a customer or a customer of another broker-dealer, no member or person associated with a member shall interject a third party between the member and the best market for the subject security in a manner inconsistent with paragraph (a)(1) of this Rule.

(b) When a member cannot execute directly with a market [maker] but must employ a broker's broker or some other means in order to [i]ensure an execution advantageous to the customer, the burden of showing the acceptable circumstances for doing so is on the [retail firm] member. [Examples of acceptable circumstances are where a customer's order is “crossed” with another retail firm which has a corresponding order on the other side, or where the identity of the

retail firm, if known, would likely cause undue price movements adversely affecting the cost or proceeds to the customer.]

(c) Failure to maintain or adequately staff an over-the-counter order room or other department assigned to execute customers' orders cannot be considered justification for executing away from the best available market; nor can channeling orders through a third party as described above as reciprocation for service or business operate to relieve a member of [his] its obligations under this Rule. [However, the channeling of customers' orders through a broker's broker or third party pursuant to established correspondent relationships under which executions are confirmed directly to the member acting as agent for the customer, such as where the third party gives up the name of the retail firm, are not prohibited if the cost of such service is not borne by the customer.]

(d) A member through [whom] which an [retail] order is channeled[, as described above,] and [who] that knowingly is a party to an arrangement whereby the initiating member has not fulfilled [his] its obligations under this Rule, will also be deemed to have violated this Rule.

(e) The obligations described in paragraphs (a) through (d) above exist not only where the member acts as agent for the account of [his] its customer but also where [retail] transactions are executed as principal [and contemporaneously offset]. Such obligations [do not relate to] are distinct from the reasonableness of commission rates, markups or markdowns, which are governed by NASD Rule 2440 and IM-2440.

[(f)(1) Except as provided in subparagraph (3) below, in any transaction for or with a customer pertaining to the execution of an order in a non-exchange-listed security, a member or person associated with a member shall contact and obtain quotations from

three dealers (or all dealers if three or less) to determine the best inter-dealer market for the subject security.]

[(2) Members that display priced quotations on a real-time basis for a non-exchange-listed security in two or more quotation mediums that permit quotation updates on a real-time basis must display the same priced quotations for the security in each medium, except with respect to a priced quotation that represents a customer limit order displayed on an electronic communications network in conformance with the exception to FINRA Rule 6460 provided in paragraph (b)(5) of that rule.]

[(3) The requirements described in subparagraph (1) above shall not apply:]

[(A) when two or more priced quotations for a non-exchange-listed security are displayed in an inter-dealer quotation system that permits quotation updates on a real-time basis; or]

[(B) to any transaction for or with a customer pertaining to the execution of an order in a non-exchange-listed security of a foreign issuer that is part of the FTSE All-World Index if such transaction is executed during the regular business hours of the foreign market for the foreign security and no trading halt or other similar trading or quoting restriction is in effect in any foreign market on which such foreign security is listed; or]

[(C) to any transaction for or with a customer pertaining to the execution of an order in a non-exchange-listed security that is listed on a Canadian exchange, provided that (i) such order is executed by the member or a person associated with the member on a Canadian exchange in an agency or riskless principal capacity; and (ii) the member or a person associated with the member

conducts, pursuant to NASD Rule 2320(a) and the duty of best execution, regular and rigorous reviews of the quality of the execution of such orders in such securities.]

[(4) Definitions]

[For purposes of this paragraph (f):]

[(A) The term “inter-dealer quotation system” means any system of general circulation to brokers or dealers that regularly disseminates quotations of identified brokers or dealers.]

[(B) The term “quotation medium” means any inter-dealer quotation system or any publication or electronic communications network or other device that is used by brokers or dealers to make known to others their interest in transactions in any security, including offers to buy or sell at a stated price or otherwise, or invitations of offers to buy or sell.]

[(C) “Non-exchange-listed security” means any equity security that is not traded on any national securities exchange. The term “non-exchange-listed security” shall not include “restricted securities,” as defined by Securities Act Rule 144(a)(3).]

[(5) Pursuant to the Rule 9600 Series, the staff, for good cause shown, after taking into consideration all relevant factors, may exempt any transaction or classes of transactions, either unconditionally or on specified terms, from any or all of the provisions of this paragraph if it determines that such exemption is consistent with the purpose of this Rule, the protection of investors, and the public interest.]

**[IM-2320. Interpretive Guidance with Respect to Best Execution Requirements]**

[Rule 2320(a) requires, among other things, that a member or person associated with a member comply with Rule 2320(a) when customer orders are routed to it from another broker/dealer for execution. This Interpretive Material addresses certain interpretive questions concerning the applicability of the best execution rule.]

• • • Supplementary Material: -----

**.01 Execution of Marketable Customer Orders.** A member must make every effort to execute a marketable customer order that it receives fully and promptly.

**.02 Definition of “Market.”** [The term “market” has been in the text of Rule 2320 since its adoption, but it is an undefined term.] For the purposes of Rule 5310 and the accompanying Supplementary Material [2320], the term “market” or “markets” is to be construed broadly, and it encompasses a variety of different venues, including, but not limited to, market centers that are trading a particular security. This expansive interpretation is meant to both inform broker[/]-dealers as to the breadth of the scope of venues that must be considered in the furtherance of their best execution obligations and to promote fair competition among broker[/]-dealers, exchange markets, and markets other than exchange markets, as well as any other venue that may emerge, by not mandating that certain trading venues have less relevance than others in the course of determining a firm’s best execution obligations.

**.03 Best Execution and Debt Securities.** Rule [2320] 5310(a)(1)(D) provides that one of the factors used to determine if a member has used reasonable diligence in exercising best execution is the “accessibility of the quotation.” [“location and accessibility to the customer’s broker/dealer of primary markets and quotations sources.”] In the context of the debt market, this means that, when quotations are available, [NASD] FINRA will consider the [“]accessibility of such quotations[”] when examining whether a member has used reasonable diligence. For purposes of

debt securities, the term “quotation” refers to either dollar (or other currency) pricing or yield pricing. [NASD notes, however, that a] Accessibility is only one of the non-exhaustive reasonable diligence factors set out in Rule 5310(a)(1) [2320]. In the absence of accessibility, members are not relieved from taking reasonable steps and employing their market expertise in achieving the best execution of customer orders.

**.04 Best Execution and Executing Brokers.** [Lastly, NASD is clarifying that a] A member’s duty to provide best execution in any transaction “for or with a customer of another broker[/]-dealer” does not apply in instances when another broker[/]-dealer is simply executing a customer order against the member’s quote. [Stated in another manner, t] The duty to provide best execution to customer orders received from other broker[/]-dealers arises only when an order is routed from the broker[/]-dealer to the member for the purpose of order handling and execution. This clarification is intended to draw a distinction between those situations in which the member is acting solely as the buyer or seller in connection with orders presented by a broker[/]-dealer against the member’s quote, as opposed to those circumstances in which the member is accepting order flow from another broker[/]-dealer for the purpose of facilitating the handling and execution of such orders.

**.05 Use of a Broker’s Broker.** Paragraph (b) of the Rule provides that when a member cannot execute directly with a market but must employ a broker’s broker or some other means in order to ensure an execution advantageous to the customer, the burden of showing the acceptable circumstances for doing so is on the member. Examples of acceptable circumstances are where a customer’s order is “crossed” with another firm that has a corresponding order on the other side, or where the identity of the firm, if known, would likely cause undue price movements adversely affecting the cost or proceeds to the customer.

**.06 Orders Involving Securities with Limited Quotations or Pricing Information.** Although the best execution requirements in Rule 5310 apply to orders in all securities, markets for securities differ dramatically. One of the areas in which a member must be especially diligent in ensuring that it has met its best execution obligations is with respect to customer orders involving securities for which there is limited pricing information or quotations available. Each member must have written policies and procedures in place that address how the member will determine the best inter-dealer market for such a security in the absence of pricing information or multiple quotations and must document its compliance with those policies and procedures. For example, a member should analyze pricing information based on other data, such as previous trades in the security, to determine whether the resultant price to the customer is as favorable as possible under prevailing market conditions. In these instances, a member should generally seek out other sources of pricing information or potential liquidity, which may include obtaining quotations from other sources (e.g., other firms that the member previously has traded with in the security).

**07. Orders Involving Foreign Securities.**

The obligation in Rule 5310(a) that a member use “reasonable diligence” in exercising best execution applies to customer orders in both domestic and foreign securities. However, Rule 5310(a) also recognizes that the markets for different securities can vary dramatically, and the standard of “reasonable diligence” must be assessed by examining specific factors, including “the character of the market for the security” and the “accessibility of the quotation.” Accordingly, the determination as to whether a member has satisfied its best execution obligations necessarily involves a “facts and circumstances” analysis.

The handling of customer orders in foreign securities that do not trade in the U.S. can differ substantially from the handling of orders in U.S.-traded securities. In particular, the character of the particular foreign market and the accessibility of quotations in certain foreign markets may vary significantly. Some foreign jurisdictions, for example, may not have similar best execution requirements as those imposed by Rule 5310, or may not have comparable access and pre-trade or post-trade transparency standards.

Even though a security does not trade in the U.S., members still have an obligation to seek best execution for customer orders involving any foreign security. Consequently, a member that handles customer orders involving foreign securities that do not trade in the U.S. must have specific written policies and procedures in place regarding its handling of customer orders for these securities that are reasonably designed to obtain the most favorable terms available for the customer, taking into account differences that may exist between U.S. markets and foreign markets. While best execution obligations take into account differing market structures, best execution obligations also must evolve as changes occur in the market that may give rise to improved executions, including opportunities to trade at more advantageous prices. As such, members also must regularly review these policies and procedures to assess the quality of executions received and update or revise the policies and procedures as necessary.

**.08 Customer Instructions Regarding Order Handling.** If a member receives an unsolicited instruction from a customer to route that customer's order to a particular market for execution, the member is not required to make a best execution determination beyond the customer's specific instruction. Members are, however, still required to process that customer's order promptly and in accordance with the terms of the order. Where a customer has directed that an order be routed to another specific broker-dealer that is also a FINRA member, the receiving

broker-dealer to which the order was directed would be required to meet the requirements of Rule 5310 with respect to its handling of the order.

**.09 Regular and Rigorous Review of Execution Quality.**

(a) No member can transfer to another person its obligation to provide best execution to its customers' orders. A member that routes customer orders to other broker-dealers for execution on an automated, non-discretionary basis, as well as a member that internalizes customer order flow, must have procedures in place to ensure the member periodically conducts regular and rigorous reviews of the quality of the executions of its customers' orders if it does not conduct an order-by-order review. The review must be conducted on a security-by-security, type-of-order basis (e.g., limit order, market order, and market on open order). At a minimum, a member must conduct such reviews on a quarterly basis; however, members should consider, based on the firm's business, whether more frequent reviews are needed.

(b) In conducting its regular and rigorous review, a member must determine whether any material differences in execution quality exist among the markets trading the security and, if so, modify the member's routing arrangements or justify why it is not modifying its routing arrangements. To assure that order flow is directed to markets providing the most beneficial terms for their customers' orders, the member must compare, among other things, the quality of the executions the member is obtaining via current order routing and execution arrangements (including the internalization of order flow) to the quality of the executions that the member could obtain from competing markets. In reviewing and comparing the execution quality of its current order routing and execution arrangements to the execution quality of other markets, a member should consider the following factors:

(1) price improvement opportunities (i.e., the difference between the execution price and the best quotes prevailing at the time the order is received by the market);

(2) differences in price disimprovement (i.e., situations in which a customer receives a worse price at execution than the best quotes prevailing at the time the order is received by the market);

(3) the likelihood of execution of limit orders;

(4) the speed of execution;

(5) the size of execution;

(6) transaction costs;

(7) customer needs and expectations; and

(8) the existence of internalization or payment for order flow arrangements.

(c) A member that routes its order flow to another member that has agreed to handle that order flow as agent for the customer (e.g., a clearing firm or other executing broker-dealer) can rely on that member's regular and rigorous review as long as the statistical results and rationale of the review are fully disclosed to the member and the member periodically reviews how the review is conducted, as well as the results of the review.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **6000. QUOTATION AND TRANSACTION REPORTING FACILITIES**

\* \* \* \* \*

## **6400. QUOTING AND TRADING IN OTC EQUITY SECURITIES**

\* \* \* \* \*

## **6438. Displaying Priced Quotations in Multiple Quotation Mediums**

Members that display priced quotations on a real-time basis for an OTC Equity Security in two or more quotation mediums that permit quotation updates on a real-time basis must display the same priced quotations for the security in each medium, except with respect to a price quotation that represents a customer limit order displayed on an electronic communications network in conformance with the exception to Rule 6460 provided in paragraph (b)(5) of that rule.

\* \* \* \* \*

**6630. Applicability of FINRA Rules to Securities Previously Designated as PORTAL Securities**

(a) The following are specifically applicable to transactions and business activities relating to securities that, prior to October 26, 2009, had been designated by The Nasdaq Stock Market LLC for inclusion in the PORTAL Market (“PORTAL securities”):

(1) NASD Rules 2310, 2440, and FINRA Rules 0130, 0140, 2010, 2020, 2232, 2251, 2261, 2262, 2269, 5310, 8210;

(2) through (3) No Change.

(b) The following are specifically applicable to transactions and business activities relating to PORTAL securities, with the exceptions specified below:

[(1) NASD Rule 2320, except for paragraph (f), which requires that a member obtain quotations from three dealers to determine the best inter-dealer market for the subject security;]

(2) through (3) redesignated as (1) through (2).

(c) through (d) No Change.

\* \* \* \* \*

**9000. CODE OF PROCEDURE**

\* \* \* \* \*

**9600. PROCEDURES FOR EXEMPTIONS**

**9610. Application**

**(a) Where to File**

A member seeking exemptive relief as permitted under NASD Rules 1021, 1050, 1070, 2210, [2320,] 2340, 3010(b)(2), 3020, or 3150, or Rules 2114, 2310, 2359, 2360, 4210, 4311, 4320, 5110, 5121, 5122, 5130, 7470, 8211, 8213, 11870, or 11900, or Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board Rule G-37 shall file a written application with the appropriate department or staff of FINRA.

(b) through (c) No Change.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Text of NASD Rule to Remain in the Transitional Rulebook**

\* \* \* \* \*

**3000. RESPONSIBILITIES RELATING TO ASSOCIATED PERSONS, EMPLOYEES,  
AND OTHERS' EMPLOYEES**

\* \* \* \* \*

**3100. BOOKS AND RECORDS, AND FINANCIAL CONDITION**

**3110. Books and Records**

(a) No Change.

(b) **[Marking of Customer Order Tickets]** Reserved.

[A person associated with a member shall indicate on the memorandum for each transaction in a non-exchange-listed security, as that term is defined in Rule 2320, the name of

each dealer contacted and the quotations received to determine the best inter-dealer market; however, the requirements of this paragraph shall not apply if the member can establish and has documented that:]

[ (1) two or more priced quotations for the security are displayed in an inter-dealer quotation system, as defined in Rule 2320(f), that permits quotation updates on a real-time basis for which NASD has access to historical quotation information; or]

[ (2) the transaction is effected in compliance with Rule 2320(f)(3)(B) or (C).]

(c) through (j) No Change.